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Abstract

This dissertation is centered upon qualitative observations of life in a small number of school systems in southern California during the 1996-1997 and 1997-1998 school years. During this time, I sat in classrooms in elementary schools and made observations, but the majority of observations were done while working as a substitute teacher for these districts.

My primary concern was to observe something communicated via discourse in (or about) a school, something indicative of a type of discursive environment, which could be understood by way of a "politics." During this era, the subject of education is becoming increasingly the subject of scrutiny by political performers in established political arenas.

The first chapter of my dissertation locates the world of "late capitalism" in time and space, and identifies the problem of the relation between politics and education in this world, that this problem is a problem of "what education is for" in a world of dependent, heteronomous consumerism such as is the world of southern California, the site of my ethnographic researches.
The second chapter lays out the theoretical framework for understanding "what education is for" in terms of "what is the purpose of what is going on in school." I will argue with Michel Foucault's description of school in *Discipline and Punish*, that school is largely but not entirely a place for the production of "docile bodies", bodies that will participate in instructional rituals in an orderly manner. The 3rd chapter will describe my dissertation as an attempt to penetrate this semi-disciplinary world of schooling. Substitute teaching became an important entree for me into this politicized world of schooling, in that it allowed me to enter school systems with a role that identified me as a legitimate participant in school.

Chapter 4 of this dissertation is about "aspects of substitute teaching of general interest," about things I learned while on the job as a substitute teacher.

Chapters 5, 6, and 7 of this dissertation will place a special emphasis upon interpreting the texts of the substitute teacher, texts that enabled me to conduct instructional ritual, and showing how they indicate a "politics." I look in turn at texts specifically for substitutes, classroom management texts, and "semi-critical classroom management" texts (which diversify the idea of classroom management substantially) in turn.

Chapter 8 will summarize my findings, limited as they are to interpretations of texts constructing school from management perspectives.
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CHAPTER 1
OVERVIEW OF THE PROJECT IN LARGER CONTEXT

Since the rise of settled societies some eight to ten thousand years ago the majority of the world's population have lived in conditions of grinding poverty...However in the last two hundred years a sizeable minority of the world's population has achieved a material standard of living that would have been unimaginable for previous generations. But this relatively sudden and recent improvement has been obtained at a significant price -- a vast increase in materials, widespread pollution from the industrial processes involved and a variety of social problems.

In addition, it has raised major questions of equity about the distribution of wealth within individual countries and about the comparative standards of living in the industrialized world and the Third World. (p. 315)

-Clive Ponting, from Green History of the World

Against the will of its leaders, technology has changed human beings from children into persons. However, every
advance in individuation of this kind took place at the expense of the individuality in whose name it occurred, so that nothing was left but the resolve to pursue one's own particular purpose... The only reason why the culture industry can deal so successfully with individuality is that the latter has always reproduced the fragility of society. (p. 155)

Max Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno, from *Dialectic of Enlightenment*

The above quotes represent an overall context which frames what I wish to achieve in this introduction, namely, how I came to do an ethnography of an American urban educational setting in the context of the present period of human history.

If we were to comment upon our present-day society as if from an "outside" perspective, the perspective some recommend as appropriate for an ethnography, we would first have to comment upon the relative state of industry of the society of the present day as compared with the historical conditions of industry. Never before has industry so blanketed the land as it does today (especially given its position as a barometer of "progress" within industrial discourse), and the main marvel of aerial urban photography is that it reveals the fact of human domination of the landscape. But it is not merely one's view of the landscape that is changed by industrialization; it is also the
culture of modern society that has become tied to the industrial process, even though its members cling (sometimes rabidly) to non-industrial conceptualizations of themselves through the vehicles of religion and cultural identity. The unspoken presuppositions that form what we call normality, the taken-for-granted that Jurgen Habermas, via Edmund Husserl, named as the "lifeworld" (Habermas, 1984), are bound together with industrialized ways of getting what we want from the world. This, philosophers will remember, was what the later Heidegger criticized about modernity, that it created a realm of technologically-inspired taken-for-granted convenience.

Now this binding of technology with the lifeworld has been made possible, as sociologists since Max Weber (The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism) have known, by a certain configuration of the rules of society, buttressed by a certain "ethic" or discursive formation if you will. For the most part, then, discourse about society's rules, about politics and power, has in the modern era of industry been pervaded with the relationship of people to the primary industrial processes, which are 1) production and 2) consumption. More specifically, political discourse concerns itself today with justifications of who deserves to consume what and who should be obligated to produce what, within the confines of what sort of industrial system. Behind the prominent labels carried by political issues exists this taken-for-granted reality; debates about welfare engage the rhetoric of "forcing people to work," gun ownership is
about the right to consume guns, ammunition etc., drug policy is about the moral status of drug consumption, education policy is about requiring students to do a certain kind of work and consume a certain kind of educational product, etc. etc.

Within the realm of political rhetoric, there are elitist discourses, that would privilege a certain class of humanity as deserving a monopoly of power over the above concerns, and egalitarian discourses, which presuppose a hypothetical ideal world where everyone consumes and produces in some "equal" way. It must be observed here that the ideological debate between various representations of either or both of these two discourse types underlies the various political conflicts of the present day. Neither discursive type really comes to doubt, however, the necessity of the production processes themselves, even though such processes are problematic when viewed from the standpoint of a generalized concern with humanity, as Clive Ponting points out in the above quote.

Therefore, we can thus re-observe, as Horkheimer and Adorno observed in *Dialectic of Enlightenment* above, the power of the industrial process over politics, culture, and people themselves. The cultural glue that defines the interwoven relationships of the society of the present is pervaded, even though such glue may vary subtly and vastly from cultural site to cultural site across the globe, by industrial processes. What Horkheimer and Adorno are observing in the above quote, however, is something about the status of people as they "come
into society." The people, observe Horkheimer and Adorno, are no longer mere children to be placed in the custody of the nobility or of sovereign monarchs; but today this social form has been replaced by a mass society that merely "follows its own purpose" in a way that can be controlled by the culture industry (through advertising, marketing, economic compulsion etc.), that is to say by the industrialization of the lifeworld by technology in the hands of big business. Thus the transformation of people from children into persons, the genesis of responsible individuals within democracy that is, has never really created a society of exemplars of individuality, but rather instead it has created "the masses."

Perhaps this industrialization of the lifeworld is nowhere more plain and evident that in southern California, the wealthy, over-suburbanized media center of America (a nation of consumers); it was (we can suppose) no coincidence that it was in Los Angeles that Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer, both German students of longwinded and abstract 19th century philosophers such as Hegel and Schopenhauer, wrote the Dialectic of Enlightenment, a book that tersely describes the culture industry's domination of human life in the present era. One can furthermore see the connection between the values generated by the culture industry (as it influences every aspect of modern society) and the layout of southern California. Southern California is allowed to function as an industrial entity through elaborate canals stretching from northern California 400 miles away and
across the vast Mojave Desert from the Colorado River; the oil that paves and motorizes southern California's extensive network of freeways comes largely from elsewhere as well. Southern California is an extensive metropolis practically unmixed with agriculture and characterized by some of America's highest property values, suburb after suburb connected by freeways, entertained by shopping malls and by Hollywood (America's mass-media center), fed by supermarkets, housed in endless stretches of small homes and apartments. The values expressed by southern California residents, consequently, are heteronomously dependent upon the products of big businesses (and the money it takes to buy such products), and evince passively consumerist values in a way that is especially exemplary, and are reflective of a prosperity that is apportioned unequally, as Mike Davis reflected of southern California in his area history City of Quartz.

Within Horkheimer and Adorno's above quote is a reverence to the fact that "technology has changed human beings from children into persons." Of course, American society does not see technology as the mechanism bringing children into adulthood, Ralph Nader's comments about the children of today being raised by the television set notwithstanding. The process transforming people from children into persons within the southern California environment can today be observed, not through the industrial process which has historically replaced medieval society with the "bourgeois public sphere," but rather
through the public school system, which inducts the masses (when they are young) into the schooling process, in hopes of transforming such masses according to some stated or unstated model of personhood. In short, schooling is America's ostensible mechanism for producing adults.

But schooling is, of all the institutions of southern California consumer life, the most problematically integrated into late capitalism's schemes of consumption and production. We can see this if we apply the production paradigm to an analysis of school activities: for instance, homework and schoolwork are unclear as to whether they represent products with use-value (or are just a mere wastage of the child labor force). There is a product to be expected from the school system; folk wisdom about schools is often repeated in terms of bad schools and good schools, and within the schools, bad students and good students. The product, one must presume, is good schools and good students. Philosophers may decree that schooling experiences are much too complex to be deemed a "product" -- nevertheless, schools are paid for with tax moneys and consumed by students who are expected to produce, and thus the discourse of production/consumption pervades school systems, regardless of whether any such additional activity as the transformation of children into "persons" (i.e. civically-participant adults), such as cannot be conceptually reduced to a production process, is going on. Perhaps in real life the task of transforming people within the consumerist environment of American late capitalism is
accomplished through repeated inculcation to the discourses and images of television and other mass media; nevertheless, educational systems and families are the primary systems whereby people are ostensibly transformed from children into persons. In this regard aggregate qualitative data about educational systems is more accessible to researchers than aggregate qualitative data about families or their television-watching. Furthermore, schools are demarcated by typical social rules, within American society, as places where researchers (i.e. teacher-researchers) can engage processes of social transformation. Thus my interest in schools. But one needs a narrative of "how things got this way" within schools, so as to bridge two narratives of school within society: school as a transformative place of human development, with school as a product of an industrial system. To understand the integration of school into society (as conceived thusly), one must understand the politics of education, encompassing the dominant narratives through which public school systems are promoted and maintained.

Education, it might be assumed, is currently a "hot political topic" now, amidst the media-trumpeted American prosperity of the second Clinton Administration. And the discourses almost always taken by political pundits in light of this political "hotness" appear to manifest what Woodiwiss (1993), following Jacoby (1977), called "social amnesia," or rather a general social forgetting of its conditions of existence, through the use of
functionally-specific forgetting narratives. One can see this forgetting in Ira Shor's recent history of American schooling titled *Culture Wars*, specifically a history of the various reforms of the "restoration era" (1969-present) in education, where each reform is described as having as its pretext "less respect for teacher authority among students" (Shor, p. 147), with its proponents seemingly forgetting (among other things) that the last reform used that perception as its pretext as well.

Since, as I said above, the reigning discourses of late capitalist political life concern themselves with who deserves to produce and who deserves to consume, and come in two forms, elitist and egalitarian, the reigning discourses about education come in these forms as well. I will explain my dichotomy as follows:

Egalitarian educational politics discourses draw upon traditions of the equal rights of all to an adequate education, or rather to educational parity (as promised by the 1964 Civil Rights Act etc.), to the right of all to an education tailored to individual needs (as promised by Public Law 94-142, the Federal mandate requiring districts to provide special education for students with special needs or handicaps), and to civic education, to education as the idea of preparing students for participation in democratic life.

Elitist discourses of educational politics do not come out and announce themselves as being elitist -- that is to say, the elitist ideologues of education to not come out and say that they are in
favor of an ideal model of better education for some, and worse education for others, to be implemented at once. Rather, advertising for elitist aims decks itself out in egalitarian discursive clothing. Gee, Hull, and Lankshear, in their (1996) book *The New Work Order*, explain how the newest discourses of educational reform, congruent with what I will call "semi-critical classroom management" in Chapter 7, dovetail with an older, familiar world of cutthroat capitalism. The newest discourse of education, explain the authors, heralds a form of "cooperative education" that appears egalitarian on the surface, incorporates egalitarian work organization into its structures, but nevertheless brings its students into a world of global capitalist winners and losers in a way that promotes moral obliquity amidst a world where

the new capitalism's complex global systems further operate to drive large numbers of people into misery comparable to the worst excesses of the beginnings of industrial capitalism -- even amid the high-tech successes of an enchanted few (Gee et al., 147)."

Thus within each of the manifold changes in recent fashion about educational discourse since the 1960s (as described, for instance, in Ira Shor's book), one can identify a "social amnesia" -- educational planners (working in a politicized context) promote the idea that what they are doing is paving the way for an egalitarian world of wealth, all the while forgetting the lessons they teach are in conformity with a world of capitalism that
produces a persistently-large population of "losers." Popular discourse bears out the presence of this amnesia more plainly than Gee et al.'s complex analysis of the contexts of curricular innovation. Thus political talk about American education has since the passage of the "GOALS 2000 Educate America act" (in 1994) focused upon Clinton's catchwords "accountability" and "standards" as if these catchwords could be applied to create school systems which are uniformly "above average."

Meanwhile the same educational policy makers, with an agreeing public voting behind them, are allowed to forget the distortion of academic objectives perpetrated upon schools by the mania for testing and accountability, to deprive their students of learning experiences that aren't "accountable" for the sake of other such experiences which are, and to forget that the mere imposition of "standards" will stigmatize but not improve the lives of those who fail to meet such "standards." GOALS 2000 has, furthermore (according to Arons (1997)), replaced the possibility of serious debate about American educational goals with a push toward nationwide standardization and a political battle to determine what exactly what names that standardization will acquire.

Against dominant elitist discourses of education, discourses that have incidentally pervaded hierarchical systems of education as they exist in America and throughout the world, Gee et al. advocate a counter-discourse which would
disavow the consumer determinism of the new capitalism. It would argue for the reinvigoration of the local as against the faux local of the new capitalism. It would see critique as necessary to real learning and thus as part and parcel of critical thinking and the empowerment of workers. Most importantly, it would envision a new 'global citizenship' in terms of which we all begin to care about the members of the cooperative in (the poorer countries) and about the poor in our own communities — as being linked to each other and ourselves — if only to avoid degradation of all our spaces and lives. (Gee et al., p. 166)

This goal is much too general to spell out any particular remedy for the malaise of education as described within a critical narrative, a narrative that asks what the dysfunctional effects of the whole system (as it has run so far) are. On the other hand, it's nice to say that one should promote global caring within education, but the revolution in process that would allow teachers, the intended audience of Gee et al.'s book, to do so when the a priori of the educational process itself is the industrial process that pervades all of culture under late capitalism — that's a different prescription.

In describing the educational systems I see, I would start with the relationship between teachers and students -- if teachers are to make education anything more than an inefficient culture industry producing a "student body," they must begin by regarding "student action" as the "results" of teaching, rather
than by narrowly regarding the whole system as producing nothing but test scores and well-entertained (or hard-working) "normal" students and less-well-entertained and less-hard-working "at risk" students, within a human warehouse legally defined as a school. School life must, in other words, be accepted as legitimate by students, to count as an arena of "learning." To make this happen, schools must actually be legitimate in the eyes of students -- if there isn't the wherewithal in the school setting to legitimize learning as a goal of the community of students acting for itself, the school system can be described thusly as a mere disciplinary system, of the type Foucault lumped with prisons, factories, hospitals, barrackses etc. in *Discipline and Punish*. Given the structural concerns about culture, production, and capitalist industry I have raised, it is not surprising that this reversion pervades the school systems I analyze. Thus, later in this dissertation, I will discuss disciplinary behaviors as representing the majority of my observances in the various subject districts of my study.

Further hindering the above goal is this matter: if the "legitimized school" outcome is to be the result of an adult-planned program of school reform (of schools that presently don't "count" to the students), these same meanings of schooling that are legitimate to the students, and other participants in the schooling process as well, must appear legitimate to adult authority-figures. This, of course, is the idea of "manifest politics" as it would appear within the discourse of critical
pedagogy. The various school systems are disciplinary systems, today, and changing them in ways that affect their disciplinary character is important, to be sure (and we will discuss one such change in a discussion of the "Unz Initiative," California's Proposition 227, an initiative that will become important to my subject districts), but these changes are not politically important to the advocate of critical pedagogy.

To understand student action, student willingness to learn, one must therefore go to the schools, and see students in action in order to get an appreciation of "what students do" in an ongoing social construction of the lives of the participants in school. In order to make this social construction narratively manifest, I must offer an ethnographic narrative of a school or (in my case) a school system, a narrative of what students do, how this doing becomes important in the various contexts that fill the lives of participants in a school day.

The following ethnographic study (comprising the bulk of this dissertation), therefore, starts from the premise that it is the study of the discourse about educators, namely, about substitute teachers, but it is the study of such discourse from the presupposition that "what students do" is important to the justification of school as school. To accomplish this study, I spent two years as a substitute teacher in the public schools of southern California, building upon previous experience in that line of work.
Besides being a substitute teacher-ethnographer employed by a number of school systems, I participated in the commodity-life of southern California. Schooling, like most other aspects of "lifestyle" for Californians, is also a commodity which generally in the United States is paid for through the permission of the State (and not entirely through unsubsidized private enterprise). But schooling-as-commodity, privately or publically funded, bears little relationship to any consensus notion of how schooling is experienced in the eyes of its participants, since schooling appears differently if we think of students, teachers, other employees as mere producers and consumers of a commodified learning to take place within a paid-for time-space, than if we add the narrative of schooling that regards learning as something about how human beings experience the world.

When school becomes irrelevant to students' participation in experience, when the lesson goes on because the experience is a paid-for commodity and not because anyone is paying attention, when in the commodified context of schooling the majority of students have rejected the school's content and formed anti-school cultures (often students in these schools have a non-standing with adults as school-consumers). "Authentic learning" in this era becomes the television set and its generation of genres of "chismes" or of "gossip," the main language-arts product of many of the children I observed as a substitute teacher. The form of "authentic learning" practiced by these children combines with a privatizing common teacher notion of
"classroom discipline," to create a set of public spaces essentially rendered as "anti-public public spaces," public spaces which follow the division of space between "streetcorner state" (publicity) and "student state" (privacy) as described in Peter McLaren's *Schooling as a Ritual Performance*. In McLaren's narrative of educational motives miscarried, the educator-as-shaman that McLaren sees as a powerful ritual moment in the Catholic school he studied becomes downgraded to the model of the educator-as-cop, with the effect that education becomes the mere ritual of "making Catholics" for McLaren, and meaninglessly fitting them into lower-class jobs as a result. I won't make the broader claim McLaren makes, also made by Paul Willis in *Learning to Labour* (among many other researchers), that schooling reproduces the class structure of everyday business society, but I do feel my experience within the schools validates the disciplinary models they use, to study the disciplinary schools they (and I) observe.

In the next chapter I shall describe how I acquired the position to do this ethnographic study, both theoretically and practically. I will first outline my descriptive theory for the rituals of schooling and their connection to a politicized reality, which is derivative of the theory of disciplinary schooling as portrayed in Michel Foucault's *Discipline and Punish* and the theories of ritual of Victor Turner and most especially of Peter McLaren's school ethnography *Schooling as a Ritual Performance*. I will then give an experiential account of how I positioned
myself as an observer of the schools through substitute teaching, with an emphasis upon showing the importance of the ethnographer's subject-position in school ethnography.

Then in the third chapter I shall proceed to an account of my own story as an ethnographer, summarizing what phenomena I tended to see in the context of substitute teaching, with an emphasis on the meanings to be made from these experiences.

The next three chapters are literary reviews. The fourth chapter will consider and analyze the texts about substitute teaching, both professionally-printed texts and more-or-less "field" texts like lesson plans left for substitutes. The fifth chapter will concern itself with the narrative analysis of texts in classroom management, defined here as a genre of discourse centrally concerned with maintaining instructional ritual according to a script executed prominently by a teacher. The sixth chapter will analyze "semi-critical classroom management" as a refinement upon the discourse of classroom management.

The last chapter will sort out political meaning, as it has been hinted at in previous chapters. I will summarize here the important distinction between latent politics, politics as signified and anticipated in the everyday life of school, and manifest politics, political action as it counts to a world of public participation and government edict.
In contextualizing what happens in the schools I placed under study, I meant to ask an encompassing question about such schools amidst their operation: "What are such schools for?" Why does the situation in California (or America, or the world for that matter) support large, publicly-funded institutions sheltering children for a large (6 1/2 hours is standard for California schools) portion of 180 days of each school year? In the following pages I will look at this process of schooling in order to understand comprehension of its outcome, to consider what it is in view of its immersion of the world of late-capitalism.

I will identify two important discourses that have arisen to respond to these questions of school purpose. One discourse arises in response to the matter of "classroom management," reflecting a concern about what sort of social process is supposed to occur within the environment of instruction, usually (in the California districts I observed) within a classroom. Another discourse reflects orientation toward the product of schooling, and can be discursively organized in terms of a political debate over how the State and the various School Districts in the state of
California are to administer schooling. This political debate can extend to the matter of how schooling is to be administered, in terms (for instance) of what sort of classroom management strategies are to be used in a particular classroom, or what language instruction is to be given in, or what test is to be mastered after the instructional period is over. It can also be a wider-ranging debate about how one is to judge the schooling system as a whole from the "qualities" of the students, as regarded from a wide variety of perspectives: personal qualities, professional qualities, capabilities, propensities to violence, etc.

What makes the above two discourses important, it should be stated, is their combination in influencing the realities of the practices of adult authority-figures, as they play their roles within school. These practices can be described as practices of "classroom management," and they can be described in terms of what they prepare, in terms of what product comes out of the schools. I will need to be careful in showing how discourses of school's product tied to discourses of classroom management, and vice-versa. But, in the next paragraphs, I will focus on discourses of production, for the sake of understanding how schools can be conceived as loci of production.

As far as the product-orientation of schools is concerned, I would like to address the wider debate mentioned above, the debate about what greater personal qualities are produced by school, for I would like to reveal managerial discourse about schools as revolving around implicit, disciplinary, assumptions
about what schooling is for, assumptions which can be understood from an analysis of the discourse of "classroom discipline" (or, more generally, "classroom management"). What such discourse reveals is a disciplinary hidden curriculum, a curriculum which I will reveal as taking an implicit stand within the political debates about "what education is for." And within this political debate about education that encompasses practices within the schools, I will outline the "side" of the debate most responsible for widening this debate, the side taken by critical scholars of the educational process.

In this dissertation, I argue that managerial discourses about schooling conform to an implicit notion of schooling-as-production that constrains the public debate about schooling as if school were a typical field of industrialized endeavor. The question that such discourses prompt is one of how does one understand schooling as a whole, given that "what schooling produces" is multivalent. We can understand how this question is prompted if we pose implicit answers to the question of what schooling is for. School produces intelligent children, or it produces high test scores, or it produces so many hours/so many days of school spent by so many children (and this is the measure of the State of California's requirement for the length of a school year), or it produces children with certain definable skills in literacy and numeracy. Which "product" one sees coming out of school depends upon how one is inclined to measure the schooling process as it is.
The conclusion one can draw from this reductionistic line of reasoning is that school conceived thusly is a culture industry, a vehicle for producing children as cultural artifacts in a more-or-less assembly line. School promotes industrially-produced artefacts of culture (toys, books, textbooks, writing implements and surfaces, music, video products, athletic equipment, the school grounds themselves) in a totalizing manner upon a captive audience whose labor is "made efficient" according the principles of scientific management popularized by Frederick Winslow Taylor and employed on the assembly line by Henry Ford. But, of course there are many distinct ways in which one could judge a school as itself being a culture industry, according to its product. Even so, there is a kernel of truth to the notion of schooling as an assembly line where students are produced.

In analyzing schools, I might start from the twin assumptions of managerial discourse and assembly line production, and if I were searching for the practical link between these assumptions, I would wind up with a picture of what happens in schools as guided by the techniques of "classroom management." A book that vividly illustrates this "path not (merely) taken" in my observation of schooling is Michel Foucault's *Discipline and Punish*, which offers a history of disciplinary institutions, and in doing so compares schools to prisons, factories, barracks, hospitals, and other modern institutions. In thus grouping together of institutions, Foucault lays bare the traditional purpose of behavioral manipulation in
schools; schools, like the other above institutions, are to produce "docile bodies." In this process of production, power is to be exerted upon bodies in order to produce "aptitude" through "discipline," both particularly scholastic-sounding terms, but terms also suited to discourse about the other disciplinary institutions. Here is Foucault's analysis of how it was described:

...discipline produces subjected and practiced bodies, 'docile' bodies. Discipline increases the forces of the body (in economic terms of utility) and diminishes these same forces (in political terms of obedience). In short, it dissociates power from the body; on the one hand, it turns it into an 'aptitude', a 'capacity' which it seeks to increase; on the other hand, it reverses the course of the energy, the power that might result from it, and turns it into a relation of strict subjection. If economic exploitation separates the force and the product of labour, let us say that disciplinary coercion establishes in the body the constricting link between an increased aptitude and an increased domination (Foucault, 1977, p. 138).

Foucault's analysis of the historical literature about the manipulation of human beings may have, incidentally, unearthed the essential link between the regimes of "classroom management" (or, in a more Foucauldian vein, "classroom discipline") and the application of the production paradigm in conceiving "what school is for." Foucault, of course, also gives us a glimpse of "what the schools are doing" amidst the other disciplinary
institutions of late-capitalist society — in them, docile bodies are
to become useful ("utility") instruments within the other
disciplinary frameworks, through their instilling of "obedience."
Karl Marx's application of the production paradigm to the work
processes of capitalism, analogously, unearthed the fact of the
alienation of labor. According to Marx's explanations, the labor
forces are separated from the product of labor so that production
could be alienated from labor by the bourgeoisie for profit; to
shift back to Foucault and schooling, discipline dissociates its
power from the bodies it is invested in, and places it instead in
an "aptitude" that can be appropriated (by adult society) as the
disciplinary product of schooling. "Aptitude" is commonly
conceived as the product of schooling that standardized tests
measure, and is defined in the dictionary in terms synonymous
with "talent." It is aptitude as product, says Foucault, that can be
appropriated for the sake of domination.

One needs a broader framework than that offered by
*Discipline and Punish*, however, in order to get from the
dynamics of management which Foucault's spells out, to
answering questions as to the purpose of the human systems
described so well in disciplinary terms. The question about
"what school is for" that is left unanswered by applying Foucault
is the matter of who dominates through the investment of
aptitudes, and how, i.e. what is the further purpose of "aptitude."

The other question that would be left unanswered in a
simple application of Foucault's ideas of disciplinarity to the
schools, is the question of what sort of theoretical framework will situate communication within schools (as seen within the performances of each school day) amidst the overall social and political purposes attributed (by the society) to schooling. Adult society has made education into a "political issue," an issue that has received an intense public focus in my ethnographic situation, amidst political battles over standardized testing and the ballot victory of Proposition 227, a law passed by California's voters which would essentially eliminate bilingual education throughout the state. This, as I will show in the following paragraphs, has reignited the debate over "what education is for" -- it might also change the actual routine in the schools themselves as well as stimulating a debate about how schools are to be studied. I will get to the theoretical problem of situating the performance of the school day amidst the attributed purposes of schooling later; for now, I want to concentrate on the necessity of including the debate about "what school is for" into the Foucauldian approach to understanding "classroom discipline" within disciplinary schooling.

Although Foucault describes the productive process of discipline (described above) as a "political anatomy," and says that "discipline is the political anatomy of detail," he is long on describing the matters of disciplinary detail and short on what the actual politics of institutional discipline might happen to be. Of course, such politics is not Foucault's topic in Discipline and Punish, but one has to read the Foucault opus through The
History of Sexuality. Parts 2 and 3. to find Foucault speculating about the possibility that one can use disciplinary practices to dominate oneself; thus also disciplinary practices in the schools can be used for student self-domination, and thus student empowerment. The detail that is short within Foucault's specification of "the composition of forces," where he argues that discipline is an art of "composing forces in order to obtain an effective machine," is the detail of what difference it would make if the forces imposed upon the schooled bodies were to be composed in one way, or another. Are "disciplined" bodies capable of forming a public sphere, rebelling against schooling, performing well in school assignments and tests, choosing tasks, working efficiently in groups, playing efficiently in groups etc. In short, do different constellations of power in these "effective machines" benefit different groups of people differently?

The only way this detail can be addressed is if one provides a theoretical context for the question of what school is for. This is the question any managerial approach to schooling will have claimed to answer beforehand (for one cannot produce without an idea of what one is producing). Jo Sprague's pathbreaking essay on instructional communication, "Expanding the Research Agenda for Instructional Communication: Raising Some Unasked Questions" (Communication Education 41 (1992), pp.1-25) starts by criticizing the "managerial" paradigm in research on organizational communication (p. 5), and continues by explaining the perspectives of radical pedagogy from a communication
research perspective, culminating in a "critical research agenda for instructional communication" that states the important questions for critical researchers in this subfield.

Often the "politics of schooling" is adopted as a political assessment of the content of the curriculum, of the matter of "how should schools teach reading?" (and for instance in this regard the State of Texas has mandated phonics in its public schools as a teaching-reading technique) or "to what extent should public schools be allowed to require students to repeat grades they do not pass?" These are important political questions about school, but it should also be remembered that there's much more happening in a public school than that that which enters into adult political discussions about "the schools." Thus the central questions asked by critical scholarship involve the necessity of researching children within the schooling process in order to discover what makes schooling itself "political."

This critical approach might argue against a managerial understanding of schooling, which would take the objectives that are imposed bureaucratically upon schools as natural. Schooling according to this understanding is a system, where the school system is made to conform to the role the administrators try to impose upon it. Such systems are imposed upon schools with the advertised claim of "improving" schools by imposing standards for compliance to the wishes of school managers, but rarely is it asked about the managerial approach to schooling as to whether the standards it sets satisfy the full range of our understandings
of "what school is for." Is the point of schooling, today an institution required commonly among the world's children, the imposition of management strategies upon children in order to "get" these children to achieve standards? Is that the whole point of schooling? The critical approach to the problem of "what schooling is for" might ask as to whether there are other end-goals to the schooling process as it exists, especially whether there are social ideals (such as freedom, democracy, justice, social harmony) that are in any way promoted by schooling.

Live, ethnographic critical research in school communication will try to politicize schools in a way that will bring to life the ideals of pedagogy, so as to introduce new possibilities for changing educational systems, and so its narratives have as their ultimate "ends" the creation of narratives of political change. Thus such research would use itself as a tool for changing the situation of schools. This is clear from a quick review of the literature, when we look at some of the paradigmatic authors whose names arise in critical communication studies treatments of education. In the Prison Notebooks, Antonio Gramsci tried to combat class-based educational culture in his native Italy by structuring his narrative of radical education around the identification and cultivation of "organic intellectuals" (Gramsci, p. 25) — Paulo Freire's primary narrative of liberatory education, Pedagogy of the Oppressed, progresses narratively toward the unfolding of "conscientizao," ostensibly the bringing of a people to a
transaction of liberatory social change, to be brought about through a process of "problem-posing education," and this narrative progression informs Freire's other books as well. Such research starts by identifying a kernel of possibility within the status quo that is substantial enough to allow the researcher to narrate the struggle for a better world, a world where education is directed toward the unfolding of students as agents for change, where it is assumed that education is "for" a process of social transformation.

Critical research in school communication will not be baptized into existence with one essay on how such theory works, however; the narrative expression of the desire for politics will lose its potential if it stays within the safe confines of the latent politics of (academic) theory.

A whole host of problems remains for the critical researcher within the academy who wishes to disrupt the static understanding of school provided by managerial (i.e. academically-reproductive) research on the school setting, aiming instead to create a narrative that has political change as its ultimate end. First among these problems must be the many taken-for-granted assumptions that influence teacher and student activity in classroom settings. Regardless of what actually happens within the school setting, there is an observable demand for school to be what its managers (superintendents, school board members, principals, teachers, parents, and sometimes even students) say it should be. The result of it all can be school
where the various parties come with their expectations, and the unexpected will happen. Thus the performance of the rituals of schooling is not entirely a reflection of managerial practice.

Discussion in the later chapters of this dissertation, of the rituals of substitute teaching, will reveal that deviation from managerial practice is made especially possible in classrooms where a substitute is placed in charge. However, as will also be shown later, substitute teaching will in itself not produce an outcome favorable to liberatory education, because of the transitory tenure of the substitute.

The critical text cannot redirect the narrative of schooling toward the end of political change, however, merely by educating us (as academic readers) about what to think about education. Patti Lather's statement in her book *Getting Smart* that "a text that might help enable movement beyond received habits of thought and practice is a form of political intervention, even given the (largely unknowable) limits of discursive challenge" (Lather, p. 154) is on the side of the political optimists; a contrary opinion would argue that texts might not help enable movement, and political intervention might have to do more with knowing what constitutes a performed discursive challenge to the status quo (in the situation at hand) than with any power presumed to be in a text, itself. The problem, from this opposing perspective, is not Lather's opinion, but rather in the performatively-static social construction of the academic reader, in the failure of society to construct the academic, the teacher, as an activist.
Studying ideology, critiquing it and transgressing it, is important toward the goals of critical social science that Jo Sprague put forth, but it is a half-measure: what the critical student of the school needs is a performed political, something to embody politics, rather than merely a symbolic political, a stock-in-trade for the academic. The important thing in this regard is that the performance of the critical text about education be something that contributes to the ongoing political reality.

Michelle Fine's critical ethnography of schools *Framing Dropouts* is one text that reveals how the performance of a challenge to the status quo can become more important than the mere use of the vocabularies of emancipation. Fine's book, furthermore, is a prime example of how the critical ethnography of educational institutions will not come to a political conclusion about such institutions if it restricts itself to a political analysis of the communication prevalent in the classroom, but must also do a political analysis of the rituals performed in such schools. As such, *Framing Dropouts* will be the starting point for a theorizing practice that will situate communication within schools amidst the overall social purpose, the political dynamic of the school system itself. First, however, I will analyze the political and communicative dynamic of the subject school of Fine's study, then I will discuss its larger theoretical implications.

Fine's book is the product of a study of a comprehensive high school in New York City with a high dropout rate. In her study, she tries to understand to what extent the graduates and
dropouts she studies have the capacity to critique their social circumstances, whether they blame their circumstances upon themselves or whether they also understand them as products of a system. What she finds is that "many high school dropouts developed budding, confused, and critical social consciousness," but that "in contrast, many of the graduates... displayed far less initially in the way of critical consciousness" and that "they typically produced belief systems that portrayed the world as fair and even handed." (Fine, p. 126) What makes this conclusion especially interesting is her evisceration of the opinions of a student she calls "Donald": "Donald, who often read Malcolm X during class, presented a view of education as uncritically associated with social and economic mobility." (p. 129) So in the environment of Fine's school, it isn't the texts read in the classroom that connect the students to "critical consciousness," so much as it is the circumstances of dropping out or staying in this particular school which allow the students to produce texts that evoke this critical consciousness. Fine has the students produce essays so that she can assess this critical consciousness.

So what makes the school Fine studies such, that its graduates do not evoke a critical consciousness? She explains:

Urban, public, comprehensive high schools serving low-income students are... often organized in ways that...nurture participation, democracy, and critique largely in students who demonstrate that they are unlikely to rebel or act on anything that is unsafe to name (p. 199)
So it is the exclusion of those symbols which signify rebellion or that which is "unsafe to name," within the school environment, that keeps the students from displaying any critical consciousness of their particular environment, regardless of the critical nature of the texts read in the classroom. The symbolism of reading Malcolm X in school must be read separately from any performance that would politicize the school environment itself.

Fine's ethnography reveals that the most prominent symbolic divide in the environment of New York City dropouts and high school graduates has less to do with the symbols themselves than it does with the status of the students. She says of the student body as a whole that:

Quite counterintuitive portraits of dropouts and stayins emerged. Students who dropped out were significantly less depressed, more likely to say "If a teacher gave me a B and I deserved an A I would do something about it," and less likely to provide highly conforming responses to the social desirability questionnaire. In contrast, students who remained in school were significantly more depressed, more likely to say "If a teacher gave me a B, I would do nothing about it; teachers are always right." They also presented themselves as extremely conformist." (Fine, p. 4)

From this quote we get a portrait of communication, the communication of the students about themselves to the researcher Michelle Fine, that is controlled by a managerial (and
disciplinary) criterion: if one drops out, and is no longer
disciplined by the school, one talks differently than if one is
being disciplined within the school. But Fine's chapter on
communicative practices at the school gives us a much more
varied picture of communication as a whole within the
institution, a picture not unilaterally determined by disciplinary
criteria.

We also get a portrait of school policy that would seek to
portray images of student success while hiding its creation of
student failure behind a large dropout rate. "I remember the first
PTA meeting, when the principal announced, 'I'm proud to say
that 80 percent of our graduates go on to college.' I wondered --
and later learned what he didn't say, that only 20 percent of
incoming ninth graders would ever graduate (p. 2)." In her
discussion of the public sphere informing the school she studies,
Fine furthermore shows that the public and the participants in
schooling has a highly diverse notion of what schooling is for, but
she also details a list of excuses (she calls them "ideological
fetishes" and "material fetishes" on pp. 179-204) that her
informants offer, for the sake of not resisting the status quo of
schooling, a status quo filled with mandates and with failure for
those who do not meet such mandates. So the pattern of the
public sphere and the pattern of communication in the classroom
present the same performative pattern, according to Fine -- a
diversity of voiced opinion tends to reinforce a status quo
because of asymmetries of power and the absence of public or student resistance.

So, not surprisingly, Fine, a psychologist, chooses "silencing" as the discursive form that most prominently symbolized the exclusions that were taking place in the school, at the administrative level of the school, and in the public sphere about schooling. This appears in *Framing Dropouts* as an expansion of discourse about schooling, much as Foucault's *History of Sexuality Part 1* notes the silencing of sexual discourse in the Victorian Era in England as an expansion of discourse. The opposite of "silencing," for Fine, is "nurturing student voices," a communicative activity that apparently happens at the school she studies, but does not predominate. Silencing provides Fine with a "metaphor" (p. 61) for the structural organization of the school, but Fine notes that "the practices of administration, the relationships between school and community, and the forms of pedagogy and curriculum applied were all scarred by the fear of naming, provoking the move to silence," but it is never made clear what the relationship is between the various silences in administrative, community, and school communication.

Instead, Fine concentrates on her observations of silencing in classroom communication to arrive at a determination that "if silencing prevailed throughout CHS (the school), some moments in each school day were nevertheless created by teachers who invited fragments of student lives into the realm of 'what counts,' and used these fragments vividly as the stuff of education." (p. 34)
53) The researcher then goes on to depict a multitude of learning experiences in which student voices are nurtured. So it isn't clear that silencing is uniformly a part of the scholastic experience at CHS, but that nevertheless it is the main trope symbolizing the difference between those who stay and those who drop out. It's also unclear whether and to what extent silencing in the classroom has any effect upon the students' tenure at CHS. After reading the chapter on silencing, I wanted to ask its author what effect the classroom ritual had (if any at all) in determining what sort of outlook students had upon life, since the rituals of dropping out and of staying in school appeared to be the determining rites.

To theorize "dropping out" within Michelle Fine's ethnographic discoveries of classroom communication, to connect the politics she describes with the performance she observes, one will need a theory of "politics, ritual, and symbol" rather than a theory of mere "symbol," that would look at silencing and nurturing student voices as communicative activities to be interpreted as signs that oversaw a disciplinary order, wherein student bodies were to be made into docile bodies that declined any symbolically "disruptive" performances (as defined by school rules, classroom rules, and the expectations of adult authority figures concerning "proper" student behavior, in short the whole authoritarian apparatus of the school system), and then leaving it at that.
Such a theory can be extrapolated from the symbolic anthropology of Victor Turner, with especial reference to the notion of "social drama." For Turner, the social drama was the ongoing performance of a society as a whole, and was characterized by the notion of crisis: social dramas began with a breach in the social order, which leads to crisis, to a redressive ritual (through which the tensions of the crisis work themselves through), and which culminates in the reintegration of the social order or the recognition of an irreparable schism within such an order.

The connection between social drama and performance is analogous to the connection made in disciplinary schooling between the purposes of schooling and classroom management. The purposes of schooling are implicit within the disciplinary process; students are to attend school for a standard 180-day school year, where they are to learn skills as enumerated in a standard curriculum that is generated by the State and interpreted by each district and school), and classroom management is conceived as the set of techniques through which each student is to comply with the abovestated purposes of schooling. Critical schooling, of course, would put both goals of disciplinary schooling and techniques of classroom management under question.

Framing Dropouts appears to follow the pattern of social drama that Victor Turner describes: According to Fine, there are various crisis moments in the lives of the students, and the
"redressive ritual" for these crisis moments appears to be the ritual of schooling – only, for Fine, the schooling fails in its ritual capacity, and the end result is a schism within the social order, the schism created by a high dropout rate.

In an essay titled "Are There Universals of Performance in Myth, Ritual and Drama?" (from pp. 291-301 of Victor Turner's *On the Edge of the Bush*), Turner graphs what he sees as the relationship between social drama, by which we mean the social order (or "politics") as conceived in performative mode, and performed drama (and in this instance we mean not merely drama on the stage but also the drama observed by the ethnographer: the classroom session, the staff meeting etc.).
Figure 1. The interrelationship of social drama or stage (or performed) drama (Turner 1985, p. 300).

The noteworthy thing about this graph is that it links the staged drama to the social drama, and that these dramas are linked through "implicit" phases of social activity. The implicit social process is easy to describe: social drama needs to pass through a phase of ratiocination, of working-through of social norms and needs of the moment, before it becomes any particular performed drama. Thus, in observing the performed drama of the rituals of schooling, one should be able to observe the results of the "working-through of social norms" regarding schooling, most importantly (for this study) the norms regarding "what school is for." This theoretical notion of implicit social
process is precisely the reason why I am importing Victor Turner's theories of symbol, myth, ritual, social drama into this dissertation. The framework for anthropological study which has been labeled "symbolic anthropology" will be applied to a system which looks suspiciously like a relative of the historical systems of schooling described in Michel Foucault's *Discipline and Punish*. For that matter, Catherine Bell describes in her book *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice* how "ritual is basic to Foucault's notion of the constitution and exercise of power" because Foucault describes how "power relations have an immediate hold upon (the body); they invest it, mark it, train it, torture it, force it to carry out tasks, to perform ceremonies, to emit signs." (Bell, p. 202; Foucault, 1977, p. 25). So concepts of symbol and ritual were nothing new to Foucault.

Turner's framework will also underscore the complexity of the debate about "what school is for," rather than narrow it down to the notion that school is a locus of production for some particular product such as docile bodies or test scores. School is "for" something if we can see a particular purpose enacted within the performed rituals and symbols of schooling. And, Turner implies, we can understand these rituals as performing moves within overall social dramas, giving them a more widely encompassing focus than we would give them if we were to look merely at "discipline" as the "political economy of detail" without looking at the political economy of discipline.
So, to a certain extent, Turner's theories for looking at symbol, ritual, performance, and social drama mirror the explication of "discipline" as the "political economy of detail" in Foucault's *Discipline and Punish*. But, whereas Foucault focuses upon "the meticulous control of the operations of the body" (p. 137), or rather the technique of creating docile bodies, I want to take a step back and look at what the technique and the docile bodies mean to a larger process, the process of schooling as it occurs in southern California. In the context of this larger drama, I would incorporate Foucault within Turner thusly: I would look at the performed drama (with especial attention to its political economy of detail), to understand its connection (via Turnerian concepts such as the "social structure" and the "liminal" rituals that dissipate its effect) to the larger "social drama."

Returning to Turner's graph of social dramas and performed dramas, the implicit rhetorical structure, on the other hand, is, I suppose, what structuralist-functionalist have labeled the "structure" of a society, but is clearly more than that. I have created an analogous graph to illustrate what I think is going on with the politics of education:
Fig. 2. The interrelationship between the performance of school ritual and the manifest politics of school.

The social drama of school systems (considered as whole systems) provide a sort of "manifest politics" as reflected in the curriculum, which then (when combined with the hidden curriculum and the thinking of each participant in the schooling process) becomes the implicit social process informing the performance of school, i.e. what goes on inside each classroom every day. This mass performance of the schooling process generates a politics of culture, which, in its turn, affects the social drama (usually in a passive way, however).

In order to focus more specifically on the phenomena of schooling, I have composed a graph with the same structure as Turner's, and similar (yet different) terms. My graph seeks to outline performances in school, to connect them to a phenomenon I call politics, because it is directed by a politicized,
democratically accountable hierarchy. Manifest politics is a performed entity, but one that sometimes produces texts, especially as concerns written laws that govern schooling. The implicit social process is a symbolic working-through, which is sometimes a text but is more commonly the spoken words of the participants in schooling. The performance of school life is of course a performed communication, and it in its turn generates the politics of culture, an interpretation of this performed communication that have some cultural bearing upon politics, as a producer of school culture.

Within this system as I have graphed it above, the politics of culture (as generated by the performance of school) plays a passive role, mostly defining "what school is" or subjunctively "what school should be" so that school can be a cultural object of scrutiny for the parents, District authorities, politicians, and other involved adult onlookers of the schooling process, those which have political control over school systems. Schools don't usually produce political actions. But the things that happen within their boundaries, exerting no political force in themselves, are things with latent political importance.

The following chapters of this dissertation will place a special emphasis upon interpreting the texts that bear upon the substitute teacher, and showing how they indicate a "politics" to the culture that surrounded me. Mostly, I will look at texts that construct a picture of (or for) the substitute teacher: my notes, my lesson plans, books that offer advice to substitute teachers,
and general advice on "classroom management." From there, I will discursively evaluate the discourse of classroom management as a guide to the successful performance of instructional ritual, in order to understand the political danger of instructional ritual that is completely scripted, that has become a charade performed to maintain order in the classroom without producing any student communication of importance. The result is that two separate scripts are created; one that dominates in the classroom, and another, a counterscript, that is the object of student learning in "language arts" (and a subsequent influence upon the culture of the students themselves), but which has no value in the classroom.

What does "classroom management" do for such completely-scripted classrooms, what happens to classroom scripts when the substitute teacher is there, and what is the political value of the performance of instructional ritual within classrooms, are questions which will be asked.

So, in the following analyses of the discourses and performances I observed/composed as a substitute teacher, I will emphasize the difference between manifest politics and latent politics as being important to our understanding of how the performance of school life, with emphasis upon the communicatings of teachers and students within the confines of classroom activities, can be political.
CHAPTER 3
HOW I ARRIVED AT THE SUBSTITUTE TEACHER/ETHNOGRAPHER
ROLE

In the last chapter, I asked the question of what education is for, and in approaching an answer to my own question, I showed how the question was to be answered by approaching preconceived notions about what education was for, through expanding dialogue about such notions.

Originally I had desired to write an ethnography about "critical consciousness," having convinced myself that it was the substance out of which education should be made. I was inspired by radical educators such as Paulo Freire and Ira Shor, and by radical researchers such as Michelle Fine and Peter McLaren. More theoretically, I was inspired by Jurgen Habermas, whose theories of the public sphere and of communicative action presupposed rational argumentation as the basis for empowering learning. Furthermore, a local university whose education program was renowned for developing critical pedagogies was associated with some of the schools I was studying.

However, upon studying the schools I had chosen, what I decided was that the rhetoric used to described critical consciousness at these schools was somewhat of an
epiphenomenon -- that the most important thing about schooling, as I told the principal at the school within Valley USD where this rhetoric was most in use (and who nodded in agreement), was that it was disciplinary. I could envision an ethnography that centered around classroom management and the managerial paradigm, that the structure of managing classrooms was what made classrooms what they were, that if there was any student resistance to classroom management, that it too would become epiphenomenal to the main activities of schooling, which were the scheduled activities. The rhetoric of critical consciousness, on the other hand, perhaps served as a means for its believers to declare solidarity with each other as teachers, and only peripherally as a way of producing critical consciousness: at least it did at one school I taught at. School might be "for" the production of critical consciousness for such people in an idealized, subjunctive sense, when, at the same time, the real sense of school (at such a school) is that school is "for" the perceived immediate learning needs of students. These needs might be needs as simple as reading competency in English, or grade-level understandings of mathematics that will allow the students to survive in middle school.

So my interest in the environment under question also became an interest in the managerial discourse that determines the goings-on in these places. Is a place that is as "managed" as the Valley Unified School District also a place devoid of critical consciousness? I began to rethink the pretext for examining
these schools, that they were something more than the source of money they were for me when I was working toward a teaching credential, or when I was working on my Master's degree, but they were something less than my theoretical fantasies indicated. Does the problem extend from managerial practices -- should I start with an examination of practices at schools, starting with the managerial pretexts of schooling, and work from there to an understanding of where "critical consciousness" enters the picture?

From that point I began to work on a theory of schooling that had a "latent" and a "manifest" side to this question of what school is for, to accommodate both what I was seeing in schooling routines, and the potential of schooling I suspected was somehow "there." Most obviously, there are manifest purposes to schooling, such as 1) that school acts as a holding place for students while their parents earn wages, or 2) that teachers press students to learn in order to earn a reputation for producing intelligent students or high test scores or to earn some other publicly-recognized mark of success that will reflect upon both students and teachers. One might start to understand the latent side of the question, however, by observing the communication that would occur in any school setting, and within this communication one would observe an overall theme, around which the social drama would occur, and then beside the manifest themes of managed schooling, as I have described above and as they exist in each classroom, school and district,
there would be numerous subtexts that would indicate latent themes in the observational details of school existence, thus the potential of schooling.

The theorist is thusly relieved of the pressure to produce hard evidence of "critical consciousness" or any such "critical" mark, and thus may probe communication in schools as it produces latent themes of the purpose of school, themes that could be dominant themes if society were to grant school a different set of dominant purposes. But even the latent themes of "what school is for" have to exist manifestly, they have to bear some communicative mark or sign, otherwise they don't exist.

The problem that proceeded from my theoretical dilemma (as it was outlined above) was a practical problem. How would I put myself in a position within the school system, so as to observe such latent themes? Perhaps the first thing to be said about school systems is that they are based largely upon hierarchical principles. When I was a long-term substitute teacher at Southern Elementary School (not its real name) at the beginning of the 1997-1998 school year, and thus considered potentially a "real teacher," one of the first things I was given in the required school meetings I attended was a hierarchical chart showing where the academic direction of the school came from, from the State through its curricular experts to the District, down to the school, to the teacher (through the teachers at the top of each hierarchy, the unit leaders), and finally into the student. So
one might safely conclude that a school constitutes a social group that is based on status distinctions.

Now a social group that is based on status distinctions might not appear to present special difficulties to the researcher who merely wishes to study it in order to understand the status distinctions in some merely-overt description of hierarchy, leaving it at that. If I had wanted to stop research with the chart I was handed at Southern Elementary, my research task would have been much easier. But my task was to start with a notion of ritual as it takes place in schools, and ritual is, as I outlined above, the connectors between the reasoning-through of a school's norms, and the latent politics that is produced by the school (see my figure #2). Schools can be studied from the "fly-on-the-wall" perspective, in order to understand the managerial perspective per se, and perhaps to understand a little of the resistance of that-which-is-being-managed, but not much. The procedure for gaining permission to do such research illustrates its bias -- one gains permission from the District authorities, the principal, and finally the teachers one wishes to study, assuring all of the above authorities that one's intentions are the best and that the identity of the participants will remain confidential to protect the schools from the perceptions and effects of negative publicity (even though the schools in question may be deserving of such publicity). Even so, the rhetoric of research would have to conform to the rhetoric that the adult authorities of a school would use to protect the order of the classroom, in order to retain
the permission of the teachers one is observing. The "fly on the wall" researcher will use a defensive rhetoric in order to maintain his or her place in the classroom. Perhaps Michelle Fine or Peter McLaren had the experience and theoretical positions to be ethnographers in the "normal" way without feeling obligated to defend the schools they were researching, and yet turn out critical ethnographies of noncritical schools. I didn't feel that the school environment I was studying would produce an ethnography that would get interesting results, results that would reveal anything new about the schools I was studying, if pursued thusly. So I tried a different role than (mere) observer, one less estranged from the school setting -- the role of ethnographer as substitute teacher. In order to get an ethnographic perspective that would reveal a new angle of more than merely disciplinary schooling, a new story of its meaning, end, or purpose, I joined the substitute teaching corps (once again, I should add).

The issue of roleplaying within educational ethnography is dealt with in great detail by Mary Haywood Metz ("What can be learned from educational ethnography?" Urban Education 17:4 (Jan. 1983), pp. 391-418). Metz's goal in the above essay is to show how "the problem of subjectivity" is managed by a working qualitative researcher, an ethnographer. The problem that is the subject of immediate focus as she enters the field, importantly enough, is that of the effect of latent roles on data gathering (p. 396). Ethnographers may play the formal role of "field worker"
when they enter social situations, but there are other, latent, roles, that the social situation inscribes upon the ethnographer. These latent roles, as Metz describes, are connected to the race, gender, age, and perceived intelligence and social position of the ethnographer. But, as Metz continues in ethnographic work, she discovers that actually playing a role in the school setting may actually form part of the database. She warns at first that:

Ethnographers familiar with the literature I have cited know that one of their first duties is the careful scrutiny of deed, word, and thought for signs that their cultural or personal biases are affecting either their interaction with others in ways that will skew the data...(pp. 401-402)

but later Metz claims that what she was interpreting as a bias was in fact a trained insight "to be fostered":

Thus, it was not just an interesting sidelight of the research but an indication of the teacher's impact on the class that I blushed and wished momentarily to disappear in a sixth grade class when I had my pencil and notepad in action as the teacher prissily told the class, "Everyone put down your pencils. When I speak I want your full attention."

Similarly, my suppressed and suffused feelings or anger and moral disapproval when a teacher shouted at a student over some tiny infraction, or when a teacher greeted students belligerently at the start of a class hour were probably very accurate parallels of the feelings the children experienced in the same situations. (pp. 403-404)
The point is that the availability of perceptions about an environment under study is an aspect of the latent roles one may play in that environment. Metz's examples show that this effect of latent roleplaying upon ethnographic perception (i.e. data) is rather strong when one is studying the life of a classroom. Metz explains:

Classrooms are very private places. Strong norms establish them as the territory of single teachers who let other adults in rarely and often reluctantly. (p. 403)

So, in doing ethnography of schools, one can hardly avoid "choosing sides" when one has extracted permission to enter the "territory." In the above scene, Metz is an ethnographer, but she is also "sitting in the students' seats, hour after hour, day after day" (p. 403) and so falls into an emotional identification with the student roleplayers in the classroom. This opens her to the fact of the classroom environment, that the search for data about the classroom draws one into roleplaying within it. Metz then goes on to discuss the opportunities to observe a school system that opened to her when she was doing an ethnography of a school district while serving as the president of a parent-teacher organization (pp. 408-413).

I started this ethnography at Local Elementary School, a school containing mostly Latino and Asian-American students, which serves some of the economically poorer students of Valley Unified School District. In the beginning, I went to the school, made an appointment with the principal, and proposed my
ethnographic project as a mere matter of participant-observation. In response, the principal gave me blanket permission to observe such classrooms as a mere participant-observer, so I developed a routine where (1) I would follow the class from the line-up before the class began, introducing myself to the teacher as soon as possible (usually as the teacher was shepherding the students through the doorways of the portable classrooms I was visiting), tell her or him my purpose "I'm conducting an ethnographic study with the Ohio State University, I'm not here to evaluate you, and if you need any help, just ask." I thought, at the beginning of my survey of southern California schools, that it would be safest if I adopted the role of teacher's helper. (2) I would offer to the teacher to introduce myself in front of the teacher's class. It usually soon became evident from the classroom proceedings that I would have to introduce myself -- students would otherwise ask about why I was there, in an Nth grade classroom taking notes in a corner. Usually, (3) I would introduce myself to the class, "hi my name is Sam, I'm here to write a book about your school, I'll be observing and taking notes, I'm not here to get anyone in trouble or to evaluate anyone." And then I would stay through the day or until lunch, compiling notes from a desk in a corner of the room, going out to observe the children play at recess. In another school, I used the same routine (after having gone through an elaborate routine of getting a note from my advisor and permission from the assistant principal of elementary schools and the principal of that school),
and, interestingly enough, at one point during the lesson I was observing, the teacher came over and remarked to me that the students were behaving differently because I was in the room, and that it had nothing to do with what I was doing there. My interaction with this teacher occurred at another school beside Local, and in it, the teacher remarked that it was my mere presence that caused them to be more "hyperactive" than usual. So, despite my best intentions, and my offers to "blend in" as a teacher's helper, the teachers in many of the classrooms I observed identified me as the "other" merely by my presence. (Interestingly enough, the children in these classrooms had no problem with my presence and grew to liking me). Perhaps it is this teacher identification of researchers that prompts Geoffrey Maruyama and Stanley Deno to remark, in a Sage manual simply titled Research in Educational Settings, that "few teachers eagerly welcome research" (ix), beside the one ostensibly given, that few teachers research theory. In some circumstances, I was greeted with the reaction teachers might have had to an evaluative observer, that I was given the reflex a teacher might give to an evaluative observer appointed by a university granting the teacher his or her credential. Such observers, commonly employed by California universities, observe teachers to evaluate the quality of their teaching, or principals who observe teachers to see that students are "well-behaved."

Indeed, the above story is about me, not about the schools or classrooms I visited, and I offer it as one of the more
interesting stories that can be gotten from this brand of research. There are indeed other interesting stories of researcher subjectivity in qualitative research. Peter McLaren's essay "Field Relations and the Discourse of the Other" (in the anthology Experiencing Fieldwork, pp. 149-163) relates how he was "kicked out" of the school he observed in order to write Schooling as a Ritual Performance, because some of the teachers at his school were afraid of him in his role as observer, and these weren't even teachers he was observing. Having read this essay before doing my research contributed to my nervousness about the role of "non-participant" observer in public schools. I wasn't merely looking for administrative definitions of order when I went to a particular school to do research; I was looking for expressions of student culture, too. But adopting the "fly on the wall" attitude of an adult observer of children, in this environment, produced more of a story about me than it produced a story written, or an act performed, by the children all by themselves. Much of this development has to do with the fact that I wasn't looking for "anything particular" in the school environment — in Framing Dropouts, Michelle Fine, for instance, looked for dropouts, and in Jocks & Burnouts Penelope Eckert was looking for customs that defined the two primary student cultures of the school being studied. I was doing some preliminary study of the classroom environments at this school that looked as if it was going to remain a preliminary study.
In doing the ethnographic study, however, I noted that there was one class that interacted with me on the recess playground -- I got to appreciate its love of soccer, and I allowed them to interview each other and the faculty and administrators at the school, with my tape recorder and microphones. (None of these tape recordings amounted to anything important in terms of dissertation data.) The use of this technology, of course, created an added diversion from the routine of everyday school life, which focused on print media and "reading skills." I was a liminal figure in that situation, an exception to the daily routine (especially with the tape recorder, which the children considered a toy), but a liminal figure with little understanding of what I was doing. By the time I was to exploit the cultural capital I had built up with the students and teachers of the school, I had run out of money and had to work as a substitute teacher, in another district. And so the process of my becoming an ethnographer had to start all over again, this time in a different role: The Sub As Ethnographer.

What I discovered, as a substitute teacher doing an ethnography, was that the substitute teacher could be a liminoid figure within the classroom space, a pretext for student attitudes that indicate leisure. Perhaps it would be safer to say that this liminoid personality of the substitute teacher role is the respect in which substitute teaching is important as a role in its own right; substitute teaching introduces an element of "play" into the "traditional" classroom, where the class must struggle to create a
routine amidst the absence of the regular teacher and his/her replacement by a teacher who has to be "filled in" with the rituals of that classroom in particular and of classrooms in general. It cannot be assumed, in the environment in which I conducted my study, that I had been "filled-in" on the narratives guiding these rituals through any exposure I might have had to a long period of mutual familiarity between me and the students of any class, through my attendance at any faculty meetings of a specific, or through any specific teacher-preparation program, all of the above rituals constituting ritual "advantages" in experience accruing to regular teachers. So to a certain extent, more or less, as a substitute I was more of a "stranger" put in charge of a class than the regular teacher was.

Thus the presence of the substitute teacher within the daily routine of the classroom contains within it the potential for a sort of "play" not necessarily seen in the regular teacher's purview of ritual events. This notion of play, and subsequent labeling of the substitute teacher as "liminoid" figure, may be nothing more than a theoretical translation of a common notion about students who are trying to get away with "misbehavior" when a substitute teacher, an ostensible faux authority-figure, is put in charge of a classroom where such students are ordinarily expected to behave in a "disciplined manner." Within this role of authority-figure, the substitute represents a danger to the authority complex of the school, and thus substitute teaching is a dangerous profession. But the sub's role and presence in the classroom may
also be an indicator of possibility -- the possibility that the substitute teacher may be able to see something interesting in the student body.
CHAPTER 4
ASPECTS OF SUBSTITUTE TEACHING OF GENERAL INTEREST

In this chapter, I will create a narrative of what I learned of subbing, an ethnography of myself, to eviscerate the process of discovery that substitute teaching entails, so that my own ethnographic path can be traveled by others who wish to make further discoveries. Here I want to outline the form of subjectivity which subs are constrained to enter, and thus to outline not only the limitations and opportunities of "the sub as researcher," but also to detail the contours of the "political structure" of the substitute teacher, to show subbing as it exists beside the latent purposes of schooling.

My Narrative
(of the beginning of a particular day of substitute teaching)

I get up at 6:15 in the morning, and prepare to go to work by brushing my teeth, using the toilet, shaving, and showering, when the phone rings at 7:30am, by which time I am dressed to go to work.

At this time, I usually have an assignment already, either because I called a sub caller (Hill USD) or because a sub-calling machine called me and offered me an assignment, which I accepted by punching the appropriate number on the keypad of 58
my touch-tone telephone (Valley USD). But for this week, the machine for Valley USD is down, and on this day, the sub caller from Hill USD, and the sub caller from East Hill USD, do not have work for me.

At any rate, back to my description of the particular day I wish to illustrate here. I pick up the telephone receiver, and the voice on the other end is the secretary from Valley Unified School District, who offers me a choice between two assignments, both of them to teach 5th grade. I can choose to go either to School A or School B. I choose School A because, last I heard, School B was a "fundamental school," with a dress code of coat and tie for substitute teachers, and I have no ready coat-and-tie outfit to wear. The sub calls me back in five minutes and pressures me to go to School B. I say, "but that's a fundamental school, and I have no coat and tie ready." She says, that's OK, School B is no longer a fundamental school. Dress casually. (I heard later that the notion of "fundamental school" appeared to be tied to some desire for "traditional schooling," and that they once required a dress code for teachers that required women to wear dresses and men to wear ties, except that a teacher sued the District over this policy and managed to get the school to withdraw it.) I have barely enough time to check the e-mail and to put my shoes on and drive off to School B, where I park in the faculty parking lot and walk in the front door of the main building of the school, turning left and opening a glass door that is the front door of the school's main office, walking to the front
desk of the office. I hand the time card to the secretary and tell her that I am here to sub a 5th grade class. The secretary tells me to come back to the teacher's lounge, where the teacher's boxes are. She hands me the key to the room (which she obtained while I was waiting at the front desk) and the attendance sheet, and tells me where the rest rooms are, and where the class I will be working in that day is.

I walk to the classroom I will be in charge of, a portable in back of the school as it used to be before the neighborhood's population expanded. There are at least a dozen portables in this part of the school grounds, arranged in two rows with a courtyard between them. The District had to buy a large number of portables to accommodate the extra children, when the neighborhood population went up. I open the front door of the portable with the key, and walk into the portable, where I observe a piano in one corner that has been painted yellow, a large number of desks, a CD player-boom box in another corner, the teacher's desk in one corner, where I head immediately and begin reading the lesson plan that will dictate what I do with this class that day.

The class lines up in front of the classroom in two rows, one for boys and one for girls. I welcome them into the classroom and explain to them that I am "Mr. F.," that they can use my full name "Fassbinder" if they like but that nobody likes to pronounce my name, that I speak both English and Spanish, and
that I understand well that they are to be well-behaved through the
day I am in charge of them as their teacher-for-the-day...

This is a narrative of how the day begins for me as a substitute teacher, from a particular day of subbing. But there are also beginning narratives of how I found out about subbing, about what one has to do to be a substitute teacher, submitted below.

How I became a substitute teacher

I was attracted to substitute teaching as a job that would pay well, with good hours, for someone like myself with academic experience and a bachelor's degree but not a lot of "documentable skills" (such as they counted in the labor market of suburban southern California). I had little clue of what the need for subs or the pay for subs was until I saw an advertisement in a local paper, that the County of Outlands needed substitute teachers and substitute instructional aides. So, after going to an employment fair at East Valley High School, I was put on the list of the County of Outlands, and I went to various special education locations, from April of 1988 to June of 1988. The next school year, September of 1988, I signed up with East Valley District, asked them for English and math assignments, and enrolled at a California State University campus in a program leading to a credential in math and English. I tried to get through student teaching, and found that being a student teacher was far more difficult and less satisfying than was being a substitute teacher. I quit student teaching in the middle, quit the
program at Cal State, and went to graduate school in a Department of English in northern California, where I substitute-taught rather infrequently for one year.

While going to graduate school, I went back into substitute teaching, for two years (1990-1991, and 1991-1992), with the County of Outlands, a "district" that is composed of individual special education classrooms which are administered directly through the County Superintendent of Schools' Office (and not through any specific district), with Backcountry Unified School District, and with several other districts. High school work with East Valley District became less common as work with Backcountry USD and the County of Outlands became more common. At one point I was told by the substitute caller at East Valley that I had been removed from the substitute teacher list, that I was supposed to report to the principal of a particular high school to respond to a complaint about my performance as a substitute teacher. In meeting with that principal, I discovered that someone had accused me of permitting some sort of misbehavior that hadn't even occurred in the room where I was stationed.

Generally, during that period, I found the County of Outlands to provide relaxed teaching work, and Backcountry USD had some rather stressful assignments, especially at a new high school built by that District which had attracted "gang activity." At one point I was given a high school English class to conduct for four days, where about half the class enjoyed the creative
assignment I was giving the class (I was asking them to write dramatic plays), and the other half of the class was in rebellion against the schooling process. I kept sending out groups of students who wanted to put together plays, i.e. who wanted to escape the noise in the classroom in order to work, and the school hall monitors kept sending these groups back to the classroom. I decided that creativity in teaching was difficult, yet possible, within this particular school's context.

The "County" of Outlands "Schools" assignments were all "special education" assignments. As I found out later, Public Law 94-142 requires that students who are diagnosed as being unable to function in typical classrooms (and at that time, the typical classrooms in California all had between 28 and 32 students), were put in "special education" classrooms, where there were instructional aides and where the student ratios could be as low as was necessary, usually perhaps ten or fifteen students per teacher. Of course, none of the lessons I was to deliver were at grade level. But I generally enjoyed subbing for the County; the adult assistance of the instructional aides was an effective security net, that an adult authority figure was always there to calm the class down and to tell me what was the appropriate thing to do at any point in time. And I could tell that being a sub in a special education classroom was much easier than being a regular teacher, for the regular teachers had to fill out "IEP" or individualized education program forms detailing what the students had learned and what they were going to
learn, and from what I could tell, the students in these programs hadn't learned very much at all by the structure's standards.

The easiest assignment I had when I worked for the County was an eight-day assignment at a high school, where the students in the special education class were extremely shy of new teachers and there were plenty of adult teachers and aides to take care of the few students that had to enroll in that class. The only way I could be helpful in that class was to bring doughnuts to the students and teachers as they arrived. Sometimes I had to change the diapers of students who had not been able to learn toilet-training.

When my coursework for the Ph. D. was finished, I went back to subbing again, this time to understand the schools I was in, and to make money that I wasn't making as a fly-on-the-wall observer at Local Elementary School, a school which hired me to substitute teach one of their upper-grade classes for two-and-a-half weeks, which I discuss below. At any rate, when I went back to subbing, my dissertation subject was reworked, to include as its primary topic substitute teaching at Valley USD, since that is where I had the most consistent work. It took me a long time to get on the list at Valley USD. The requirements that needed to be fulfilled before one could be put on this list were; one needed to have three employment recommendations, one needed to turn in all of one's undergraduate transcripts, as well as having to turn in all of the other documents (TB test, proof of having passed the CBEST (California Basic Educational Skills Test),
and an application) and pass an interview. I applied to be on Valley USD's substitute list in September, and there was a persistent confusion in the Personnel Office as to whether I had sent them the three recommendations they requested; eventually I had one of my recommenders send me the recommendation personally (the Personnel Office claimed to have no record of the one he sent them directly), which I copied and sent to the Personnel Office. Meanwhile I worked as a substitute for Backcountry Unified School District, to pay the bills. For a certain period of about two weeks, I was granted control of a 5th grade class, which I handled in a somewhat clumsy way. Otherwise, I was given assignments that lasted a day at a time.

Then there was a confusion in Personnel as to whether I needed to turn in my graduate transcripts. The people in this Office appeared to believe that my graduate record was an undergraduate record, until I pointed out to them (during an off-day when I was not working for Backcountry), that I didn't need to turn in these transcripts. The secretary who was handling my case said, then, that "we'll be calling you." They eventually put me on the list two months later, only after I walked into the office and demanded an interview. At about the same time, I was put on Hill USD's list too. Backcountry USD was not giving me enough work to live off of its monthly paychecks, in March of 1997 at that time. Valley USD and Hill USD combined, on the other hand, to keep me working every work day, something I
had never experienced before in my years as a substitute teacher.

As it turned out, the administration at Backcountry USD had intentionally removed me from the sub list, and the Assistant Superintendent of Personnel sent me a letter a month or so after my last assignment with them, asking me to meet with this Assistant Superintendent in the District Personnel office. At that meeting, I was asked about some incident I knew nothing about, that occurred at a time and in a classroom that the Assistant Superintendent would not specify. I denied knowing anything about this vague allegation that was being leveled against me. The Assistant Superintendent said, "We'll do our own investigation of this incident," and I left the room. The next week, I was called by the automated substitute caller. I could thus presume that I was no longer blacklisted by the district, although Backcountry did not use me as a substitute teacher at all throughout the following year. But what I learned from this incident was that substitute teachers, as well as students, can be the objects of discipline, by the implicit threat that they will be removed from service to a District, even if said District is using no other mechanism to insure their presence in the classroom as "docile bodies." Subs work under the pressure of wanting to please the district, so as to be called back to work by the district after any particular day's assignment.

My first understanding that there was some political importance to the way school was taught was in substitute
teaching with East Valley School District, a lower-grade school district that used, by districtwide mandate, Lee Canter's *Assertive Discipline* as a classroom discipline policy. (Decisions about the "what" and "how" of schooling are not often made clear to substitute teachers, who are routinely given lesson plans to execute without even the briefest knowledge of the circumstances surrounding such plans). I substitute-taught with East Valley from September to December of 1988, when I was just beginning to understand substitute-teaching, and I quit after only four and a half months because, even though I liked substituting lower-grade bilingual classes where I was asked to speak Spanish throughout the classroom day, I disliked being asked to enforce the system of school discipline used in each classroom in the District. Canter's system involves a system of rewards and demerits that are to be issued impartially according to whether the student's behavior hasn't or has followed a set of rules. Canter reminds me of Watsonian behavioralism, or perhaps (more vividly) of Pavlov's experiments where scientists could make dogs salivate upon hearing the sound of a bell. Students may learn to behave well under Canter's system when the regular teacher is there, but when I was running the classroom as a substitute teacher, the children would talk endlessly about whose name belonged on the board and whose name didn't belong on the board, and this irritated me, that I felt that children conditioned under this system could find nothing better to do with their time than discuss whose name was or
wasn't on the board. What was generally learned from this three-month experience, was that classroom discipline was going to be a prominent part of my teaching experiences, but that what made substitute teaching disciplinary was also what made it disagreeable. (Canter's system, furthermore, is very popular in Valley USD as well, though it is not district-mandated there.)

In fact, I might guess that my main concern about classroom discipline (and the reason I have reserved the last chapter of this dissertation for a discussion of "classroom management," involving "classroom discipline" but also much more), was that I regretted that its mastery, the task of keeping large numbers of children "in line" within the confines of classrooms, was the main qualifying condition for new "regular" teachers, and one of the main qualities whereby a substitute teacher might "control" the classroom, appearing to simulate a teacherly quality of the regular teacher. My own idealism about teaching had led me to believe that somehow I was to magically reunite classroom ritual with the ideals of "learning" which allowed me to learn so much when I myself was faithful to them. My allegiance to "learning" as a raison d'être of the educational system gave me, I felt, license to devalue classroom discipline, and look for ways of teaching everyone in a classroom without heavily concerning myself with whether their classroom behaviors met certain standards of decorum.

Now, having provided my general personal history of substitute teaching, in order to show what sort of learning
process substitute teaching provides (and to elicit something of
the long-term knowledges that can be acquired in doing this type
of research), I want to go over the daily ritual of substitute
teaching, to focus more particularly on the sub's acquisition of
knowledge about daily routines.

A typical day of substitute teaching might involve several
routines, listed as follows:

1) I get up in the morning, sometimes when a phone call
comes in with an assignment. When I was working with districts
that used a human being as a sub caller, I often had a choice as to
what sort of assignment I was allowed to choose. During the
1990s, however, Backcountry USD and Valley USD automated the
sub caller, and replaced the human being calling the substitute
teachers with a machine that called my phone number, or at least
with a human being that fed instructions to a machine that would
call my phone number. With the automated programs these
districts used to call me, I was given the choice of one
assignment, take it or leave it.

There was another option during the period I worked with
Valley USD: get an assignment with Hill USD. In practice this
meant persistently calling the sub caller's message machine. If
the sub caller had an assignment, she would leave the
assignment on my message machine, and I would go directly to
the assignment she left, without needing to confirm with her.

For two weeks during 1998, the machine at Valley USD
went off-line. Replacing the machine was a human sub caller; yet
the human sub caller would often call quite late in the day to offer me an assignment. This changed the dynamics of getting work; if the district that was calling me early was then calling me late, I was more tempted to accept assignments from other districts than Valley. After that two weeks, a new machine was installed at Valley, a machine that I could call before 5pm after work to get assignments for the next day, rather than having to wait until after 5pm to get the machine to call me. This was a convenience for me, for it meant much less time spent at night waiting for the phone to ring.

2) I prepare for the classroom day. Usually this means no more than preparing a lunch and selecting some books from my library to be read by the students during the "quiet reading time" ritual that is commonly scheduled sometime during the school day in most classrooms I have visited. During the assignment at Southern Elementary, it meant having to schedule activities for the upcoming day, and it meant having to create a schedule for work, and to correct work done the previous day. (Since only a minority of the students in that class actually did work, it wasn't surprising that my attempts to complete these tasks failed for that assignment.)

3) I check in with the secretary in the front office of the school. This occurred at 8am every morning I subbed at Valley, whose elementary schools are all on the same daily schedule. I give the secretary my time card (except with Hill USD, which didn't use time cards) and the secretary gives me a key to the
classroom and (sometimes) directs me to the teacher's box in the 
teachers' workroom, which contains the attendance sheet.

4) I go to the classroom, armed with the attendance sheet, 
my key, and my daypack, where I open the door to the classroom 
and look around, first on the teacher's desk and then on any 
other tables in the classroom, for the lesson plan. When I found 
the lesson plan, I would read it. I would read first for things I 
was required to do right away with the children, looking for the 
equipment I was to use in doing these things, and then if there 
was any spare time I would look for the equipment to be used 
the rest of the day. If there was something I really didn't 
understand, I would call the front office when it was convenient, 
and ask them to explain the lesson plan for me, especially if I 
thought it meant something to the teacher that I conform to her 
lesson plan.

Rituals of Substitute Teaching

The rituals of communication in the public school system 
separate out into types of disciplinary ritual, that can be 
regarded as "typical" of substituting experience.

1) "Control" demands placed by adults upon my classroom, acting 
as administrative authorities:

I experienced this frequently in a 5-6 grade assignment I 
had for eleven days in November and December of 1997, at Local 
Elementary School; the old teacher, who had been these 
children's teacher for a year and three months, came in to 
reprimand the students, the principal (who suspendecame to
reprimand them, the janitor reprimanded them, and the teacher in the portable next door came to reprimand them. I was not blamed for their misbehavior, yet I felt I was implicated in the misbehavior of the class as a whole even as my efforts to gain classroom control were applauded. Perhaps I was being implicated in their misbehavior because the school principal wanted an additional justification to cut my leadership of that class short, and bring in an off-track teacher with Valley USD, who was also a regular teacher at that school. At any rate, I was only assigned to teach at that post from mid-November until Christmas at the latest, anyway. So I might infer from my experience that my replacement as a substitute was a testament to the replaceable nature of the substitute teacher as District employee, and not necessarily of any failing of mine at the art of substitute teaching. But there are many other experiences I can remember when outside authority-figures came into my classroom and justified my presence in authoritarian ways for their own specific purposes.

I remember being asked to substitute a 3rd grade classroom for two days, in a school at Backcountry USD in the Fall of 1996, which had lost its regular teacher, and which didn't have me or anyone else as its replacement sub. The principal came into my room after I had asked for help controlling the office, and screamed at my students in a derogatory sort of way. There was, in the districts I subbed, often a general demand placed on students to "behave themselves," that superceded whatever slim
autonomy I was granted as the teacher-for-the-time of the classroom I was placed in.

In one sixth-grade classroom in a school at Valley USD, the neighboring teacher came in and sternly lectured my class about the importance of being quiet, and soon after that, the principal came in to lecture my students: "Now Mr. F. doesn't have to go to school any more, but you do..." From my journal:

Thursday, March 18, 1998
At the beginning of the day I walked into the old, small office and handed the secretary my time card. There was something I was being asked to wait for, some papers or something, while the secretary was on the phone. I went to the room to read the lesson plan. There was a standard book lesson plan, something I couldn't read very well. I went back to the office and received a faxed lesson plan. The room I was to teach in was a dimly lit, beige room with books and science equipment in one corner of the room and blackboards adorning the other corner. It was connected by a door inside the building to an octagonal room with computers, that was also connected to three other rooms; I stored my bicycle in the octagonal room. We were to start the day with a math assignment, something about converting improper fractions to mixed fractions. Everyone claimed they had already done the math assignment, and so I did some math tricks while we were waiting for the
Mad Libs to be dittoed (with the principal in attendance, I dared the class to come up with a math problem I could not solve in my head), and when they came I taught everyone to do Mad Libs. I had brought a book of Mad Libs, which are a parlor game, played with a partner, which one needs to know the parts of speech, grammar, to play. It took two Mad Libs before most of the students learned how to play, and at that time the class became very loud, and another teacher, with a thick Jamaican accent, came in to chastize our class, and then the principal came into our class to chastize it, and then the lesson plan recommended: "10:42 -- 11:00 Eng. Adjectives are needed for S.R.A.. Trial test in Spelling lesson 17."

I didn't recognize the spelling lesson on my desk, and at any rate the students wanted to proceed to the work in their folders, which was based on these readers and some comprehension questions they were supposed to answer. Some of them seemed truly to enjoy this work. I had Anna, a student, hand out the folders, and count them when they were retrieved just before lunch.

After lunch, we were supposed to work on country reports, a matter which was hard to police as there were a lot of students wandering around the room and wasting time with talk, people whom I probably should have sent to the office but didn't. They were loud and I had to yell at the misbehaving students to sit in their seats, over their
voices, when the teacher with a Jamaican accent came in to yell at my students some more. Then there was another science class, which came from another room, which I had read a science lesson and which I sent back into their rooms early. I then had my class, just back from PE, which was to do a science lesson on light and concave and convex lenses, all of it seatwork involving reading the text and answering the questions at the end of the section. I talked a lot of sloppy stuff about light and seeing Jupiter in binoculars, in an attempt to liven up a lesson. Apparently this was a GATE class, as I learned toward the end of the day while looking through the teacher's notes. The day ended, I copied the lesson plans on the copy machine in the octagonal room, I picked up my time card and left. (End of journal entry.)

In the various SDC (special day class) classes I accepted while at Valley, there was a rigid system of control, usually maintained in my presence by the instructional aide who was there during most of the school day, and intended to keep students on task, even though these students were significantly "below grade level" in their studies.

2) Student behavior labeled as "unwanted" according to (my) adult definitions of behavior: semi-rebellion:

This often expressed itself as endless chatter between students (a topic which I will discuss in more detail below), and could also express itself as fighting between students, "tattling"
(especially in grades K-4), often-repeated requests to use the bathroom or the drinking fountain, or refusal to do work. Teachers generally labeled these behaviors as "students pulling one over on the sub," yet what this label made clear was a definition of the teacher role that made the teacher into a judge of wanted and unwanted student behaviors, compliances and resistances. The subject of student resistance is covered best, and very thoroughly, in Peter McLaren's ethnographic study of schooling in an immigrant neighborhood of Toronto titled Schooling as a Ritual Performance, and no synopsis of his book will do it justice. Suffice it to say that I observed that the sub can be drawn into the dialectic of student resistance and teacher authoritarianism described by McLaren, where the students sporadically attempt to set up a private "streetcorner state" within the confines of the classrooms, against the teacher attempts to set up a "student state" for the students through authoritarian bullying.

3) Periods of elective student activity intentionally scheduled by teacher or administrative authorities:

In Valley Unified School District, this mostly involved "centers" as it was expressed in Kindergarten classrooms, or periods of elective activity that were meant to soak up time that teachers found "hard to manage" — at one school at Backcountry USD, the last half-hour of every Friday was made into outdoor recess supervised by the teachers themselves. Observed rituals of elective student activity differ from recess only in that they
must necessarily be supervised by the teachers themselves, rather than (as was often the case, especially at Valley USD and Backcountry USD) by noon duty aides. Recess at Hill USD was largely supervised by the teachers themselves, but in this respect they acted as noon duty aides, rather than as teachers held responsible for particular groups of twenty to thirty-two students, as they would be in a "classroom situation."

Sometimes elective student activity could be the only "out" for me as a sub -- in the 5th grade class I mentioned above, the class that was in revolt, the only thing I could do with those students, I felt, was to take them out to the playground, let them have a recess supervised by me, and report any serious problems to the principal through those few students willing to run errands for me. Some lower elementary classrooms were very largely run through elective activities -- with these classrooms I found it best to try to find an activity that each student was willing to do, and maintain my own peace of mind by dismissing insignificant conflicts between students (when they would fight over use of a book or pencil) and mediating significant conflicts by trying to encourage constructive dialogue between the participants.

4) Entertainment ritual led by the substitute teacher of his (in my case) own volition:

The literature of substitute teaching, specifically elementary (grades K-6) substitute teaching, commonly mentions the notion of a "bag of tricks," a cluster of activities the substitute
can engage in case a lesson plan is not submitted to the substitute teacher, or in case the substitute teacher finds the lesson plan inadequate to the situation he/she finds him/herself in. My experience as a substitute teacher led me to believe that the "authority," the willingness to comply, that elementary students grant to a substitute teacher will often correspond to the entertainment value perceived in the substitute-teacher's proposals for classroom ritual, the liminoid character of such ritual. Such sub-led entertainment rituals might also have educational value, of course, and in that regard I felt obliged as a "professional" to make them learning experiences.

I found that proposing such "entertainment ritual" to be an easier thing to do when I was teaching a lower-grade elementary-school class, a class with only 20 students in it, rather than a class with the 30-32 students that was typical of classes in grades 4-6 in the state of California. Oftentimes the entertainment rituals I led were connected to a common teacher-directed arrangement-of-students-for-ritual called "centers." When I became proficient enough as a substitute teacher to use the logic of "centers," situations where small groups of students (although these "small groups" could constitute half the class, as they did in one class I substitute-taught) would work with more than one piece of educational equipment, I found "centers" a successful vehicle for instructional ritual. I found that it was at times somewhat easy for me to create "centers" not merely for Kindergartners but for first and second grade students as well;
these centers were directed centers, but I could think of "fun things to do" for each of them. Children would like it when I read to them, which (for me) usually meant asking questions to them, about their experience, as it would be related to a book which I was reading to them.

I could set up a creative writing lesson where I would show first and second graders how to make little books with two 8 1/2" by 11" pieces of paper, folded in half and stapled together at the seam, and decorated with words and pictures. This would keep students entertained in that they could entertain each other for at least an hour at a time. Often I would combine this lesson with peer review of the books (having students read each other's books to insure that each page had pictures and words on it), and with sessions where students could volunteer to sit in the teacher's chair and read their books in front of the whole class.

When the lesson plans demanded a "quiet reading time," a time that was often the most joyous time of a particular school day, I would bring out a collection of "Magic School Bus" books, books that were accessories to a very popular PBS animated television series about a class of students that had magical adventures that taught them about various important concepts in science. Students would commonly flock to my pile of books, and I would feel obligated to stand near them to make sure they would not fight over books, that everyone had one book (that no particular student was taking more than one), that the students knew how to share the books.
There were times when I could use the position of substitute teacher to elicit student validation of my role as a "liminoid" servant, as a purveyor of rituals perceived as containing fun and choice. The above constitutes some examples of such rituals.

5) Spontaneous (or spontaneous-looking) whole-class student actions:

Sometimes the students would all agree to get a drink of water at once, and so I was besieged with requests for a drink of water, from an entire class of 20, each of them individually. There were times when a whole class would agree on an activity to be pursued. In one second grade class, a class I was subbing for one day, where the teacher was using Lee Canter's "Assertive Discipline," I allowed the class to have "free time," which most of them chose to use playing with an array of computers. At the same time, I had agreed with a neighboring teacher that we were going to show a film in her room late in the day. When the time came to show the film, each and every one of them told me that he or she did not want to see the film, an indication that they wanted to continue using the computers in the workstation. It was only through repeated coercion that I was able to get all students to crowd into the room where the film was being shown. Each and every second-grader initially resisted my movie suggestion.

In one assignment, I had a combination Kindergarten and first-grade class, an unusual combination for an elementary
school classroom, where, at the end of the day, I had to "finish up the day" as the only adult supervising a classroom of eight first-graders, after the twelve Kindergartners in the class had spent the morning with myself and a tutor who was probably recruited from a local college, and then left at lunch. The lesson plan asked me to show a film, which the students did not watch, and then I was to ask the first graders to write about the film. When they all said they didn't want to write, I asked them what they wanted to do. After encouraging them to read a story (or listen to me read a story), which they didn't want to do either, I let them write on the writing board, which was a white board which they could write on (and erase) with erasable ink markers. Finally one of them suggested that she could take out pains and paint with them, a suggestion which quickly became popular. I responded to this idea by asking them to put newspaper under the paints they used and pictures they painted. The students behaved responsibly with the paints and put them away at the end of the day. I tried to use this experience as an opportunity to teach these students something about responsibility and co-operation.

6) Students helping the substitute teacher perform the "normal" routine:

This was often the case when I was substituting a first or second grade class (most often a first grade class), and the lesson plan was vague about how to perform the ritual known to these classes as "calendar." In classrooms that used Lee Canter's
"Assertive Discipline" rituals of classroom management, students would often "help" me by setting up the list of good and badly behaving students. Students would often "fill me in," as well, by telling me rewards the teacher would mete out for good behavior or for completed and turned-in homework.

7) "Privatized public" student and teacher behaviors:

This is really two types of behavior: 7a) Teacher behavior discouraging publicity, 7b) Student refusal of publicity — but in one experience I had as a "long-term substitute teacher," I was implicated in an ongoing process of 7a) at the school where I was teaching, while witnessing an active process of 7b) as expressed by students. What this is, really, is public resistance to publicity; and it is important insofar as it specifies that a population is only capable of interacting within a context of "domination" as Foucault describes it in Discipline and Punishment (with its flip side of "delinquency") and has rejected the "self-mastery" (Foucault 1990) required for a population to constitute itself as a "public" capable of organizing itself as a whole group. (The way in which self-mastery can lead to public life will be discussed in Chapter 7, about "semi-critical classroom management.")

During the first twenty-two days of the 1997-1998 school year, when I was a "long-term substitute teacher" for Southern Elementary School, I experienced a dynamic to the public behaviors of students and teachers that disdained the public life of the school while encouraging separate private spheres for student life, one for student peer-group behavior, and another
for student behavior under the control of the teacher. Now, the
notion of the "student state," the state of student life when under
the control of teachers within the classroom, and the notion of the
"streetcorner state," the state of student life when participating
in peer-group talk, shouldn't be news to those who have read
Peter McLaren's *Schooling as a Ritual Performance*, but in my
observations of life at Southern, I could observe behaviors where
the two states of ritual existence, as they were performed, there,
collaborated to produce a "privatized" form of public life.

Teachers at Southern revealed to me some of the ways they
had of getting control of their classrooms, a control that appeared
to them to be urgently necessary as, as one teacher confided to
me, students at that school were generally considered "wild" by
adults. Other teachers told me they would publicly humiliate
disobedient students, they told me they would hand out
homework until the students would be quiet at the end of the
day (privatizing the ritual of home life through homework as a
response to surplus student publicity, i.e. talk not wanted by
teachers), they commonly, like much of Valley and many other
southern California districts, used the "Assertive Discipline"
practice of putting the names of rule-breaking students upon the
board, a practice which discourages publicity by publicizing in
front of the entire class, as a potential "public sphere," the names
of those whose publicity is to be punished; thus through this
practice publicity itself is punished (as it produces as byproduct,
emanating from the students' mouths, the negative form of
discourse known as "chismes" or in English "tattlings," student accusations against each other made directly at the teacher, as a way students label each other as "delinquent").

Perhaps the most tell-tale sign that publicity was publicly discouraged at Southern was in my misguided efforts to create a public sphere within the classroom through the practice of "community circle" (following Gibbs (1995)): most of the students appeared to resist my efforts to get them to talk to the whole group (as fervently as they resisted my efforts to get them to listen to me, efforts which they were more used to hearing from teachers), and they mostly resisted my efforts to get them to speak to the whole group, even revealing to me (as many of them did, on one of my last days teaching that class) that they thought of this whole-class conversation ritual (that I was trying to coerce upon them) as a form of shame. The peer-group conversation that was that class's choice, on the other hand, was divided somewhat strictly upon gender lines, with girls rarely talking to boys and vice versa, and it was often directed toward shaming other students in front of their peer groups. Its claim upon classroom ritual was nearly infinite, disappearing now and then when I tested them or (to a certain extent) during a math assignment. Apparently testing was a ritual that could persuade these students to submit to the rigors of the "student state," and math was the most private of learning experiences within the curriculum I could establish within that classroom.
Thus I concluded that much of the conflict between student peer-group life and teacher demands for classroom control made its mark upon student life, at Southern and perhaps also throughout much of Valley USD, through "privatizing" publicity, publicity that discourages publicity. All I have really come up with, here, is a communicative clue to how the exercise of power for the sake of creating "docile bodies," however incomplete it may be, affects the complex possibility that constitutes public life in schools (here not thoroughly explored): more research, of course, will be necessary to assess the significance of such a clue.

The category or categories described above might allow us to consider the category below;

8) Student talk (as it maneuvered around teacher-talk-to-students):

I observed this even in classrooms I was merely observing, where teachers claimed to be "in command." Communication between students did not seem to come to a complete stop even when a class sat silently in front of a teacher, often shifting to a nonverbal realm to avoid being labeled as "talk." Discussion between individual students thus appeared to me, from the beginning of my exploration of the teaching profession, to be one of the most plentiful discursive resources available to a teacher. Such discussion appeared to me to be generally more plentiful as one moves up the grades in an elementary school context, from Kindergarten through sixth grades, although I would not argue for any direct correspondence between grade level and amount
of classroom talk. It would seem, generally, that the schooling process is thusly engaged in a multiplicity of discourses. My observation of this multiplicity will form the basis of an observation about how the theorizing adult is to understand student talk, at the end of Chapter 6 ("Classroom management").

Discoveries About the Districts

Valley USD was, as the reader may have already understood, a district with many Mexican-origin students who were taught in Spanish in grades K-2, a fact which meant (for me) plenty of work with Valley, as I spoke Spanish. This was perhaps a privilege only for elementary school, and the lower grades at that, as the district policy appeared to "transition" the students to English-speaking classes by the third grade at the earliest. The fourth-grade class I had to teach at Southern Elementary School appeared to exist due to a decision not to transition students, perhaps an unusual decision in the context of Valley USD, as most of the classrooms I was assigned, in grades 3 and upward, spoke English almost entirely.

The cultural identity of the students, however, did not mean that such students behaved in a drastically different way than, for instance, the students at Hill USD, who were largely European-Americans whose classes were all conducted in English, with a significant minority of Asian-Americans, African-Americans, and Latinos. In fact, the respect given to the cultural identity of Spanish-speakers at Valley USD, through Valley's extensive programs of transitional bilingual education, appeared
to be a matter of creating a climate of overall student conformity; the main argument for bilingual education as above a program of English-language immersion (the main way of integrating students at Hill USD whose parents spoke Spanish, or so it seemed), was that bilingual education allowed Spanish-speaking students to "stay with" their English-speaking peers in literacy and numeracy skills, whereas (it was argued) if they were to be forced through an immersion program in a Spanish-speaking area such as the area of Valley USD, they would "fall behind." (This was President Bill Clinton's main given reason for opposing Proposition 227, a proposition that will basically create a "poison pill" for bilingual education in the state of California if it is not met with firm resistance, as the reader will learn in the subchapter below).

Outlands USD, a district twenty miles distant from where I was living when I was a substitute teacher, appeared to "have something to hide" in its practices. Firstly, it was being sued by two groups accusing it of racist educational practices, and secondly, after substituting there throughout most of the 1996-1997 school year, I suspected that the District wasn't calling me simply because it wanted to save money, and forcing the schools to do without substitute teachers even though I was available every day.

Political Observation I Made of the Environment Under Study

The most important matter of politics that I observed in my year of subbing, mostly with Valley USD, was the matter of
bilingual education. For reasons that appear related to the absence of other issues, one of the most "bankable" issues for the political elites in the latter half of the 1990s in the United States is education, and the issue that became most important, as the 1997-1998 nine-month school year drew to a close, was education.

A member of the Assembly of the State of California, Barbara Alby, had proposed bills, AB 1610 and AB 1612, which were passed by the State Assembly and the State Senate and signed by Governor Pete Wilson. These bills required all teachers, including substitutes, to get background checks by the California Department of Justice, who had to clear us teachers before we could work one day in a classroom. This bill passed on September 30, 1997. My credential expired October 31, 1997, and was a "30-day emergency" substitute credential, to be renewed each year. "30 day" in the credential name meant that one couldn't teach with such a credential for more than 30 days in any school year without another credential, which was called a "long-term substitute teacher" credential.

Before AB 1610 and AB 1612, teachers would renew credentials just before they expired, and one was granted a credential waiver until the credential application was renewed. Today, one needs approval of a background check in order to renew a teaching credential in the state of California. The district told me of this about two weeks before my credential expired, and I waited one week before I renewed my credential. The
result? I was not called by the district for a week and a half, eight work days, before the District called me to say that my security check went through and that the substitute caller was to put me back on the list of available substitutes, to be called at any time (usually in the evening, for me, this year) between 5 and 9 in the evening, or between 5 and 9 in the morning, Monday through Friday. I thought of it, financially, as the loss of (potentially) more than $800 in wages.

Bilingual education was a political matter for two reasons. The first was the standardized test the students had to take (by virtue of a mandate coming from the state of California); this was the Stanford 9 achievement test, which is displayed at the Web site http://www.startest.org/. The thing that made the Stanford 9 test a political thing was that the governor, Pete Wilson, had decreed that the test was to be given only in English. Since the meaning and use of this test was not made fully clear to its participants, it wasn't clear what political import the various relative scores, higher and lower, were to have, besides there being some sort of imputation that a school with higher test scores graduated "better-educated" students than a school with lower test scores.

The thing that made the test political despite this vagueness was the decision to test only in English, which meant that taking the test was rendered practically meaningless for those whose lack of language skills rendered them incapable of taking the test. Even so, districts around the State were required
to give the test to all students, English ability or no, to all students between 2nd and 12th grades. In response, San Francisco Unified School District, at one point, made a district policy to not give the test to students without the ability to understand the test's directions in English, a policy which has apparently prompted a lawsuit from the State of California. A political conflict arose as a result of Stanford 9: the San Francisco Unified School District sued the State to block Wilson's mandate that limited-English ability students be required to take the Stanford 9 unless otherwise granted a parental waiver. San Francisco USD won its case in court.

The other thing that appears to politicize bilingual education in California is the coming resolution of the passage of the Unz Initiative, which appeared on the June 1998 ballot as Proposition 227. Proposition 227 will, if it is successful, replace bilingual education throughout the state of California with "English immersion" education. Proposition 227, calling itself the "English for the Children" initiative, was popular from the beginning of its campaign as an initiative: it had a 63% voter approval rating according to a Harris Poll taken in March 1998, and was said by a Los Angeles Times article ("Bilingual Education Ban Widely Supported" by Cathleen Decker, 4/11/98, page A1) to have had wide support amongst California's voting citizens of all ethnic groups. It was passed in the June 1998 general election by a 22% margin of the voting electorate in California, and appears to have withstood, for the time being, the court challenge
made against its passage by MALDEF (the Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund). If 227 prevails, bilingual education, such as the teaching-in-Spanish I participated in daily at Valley USD, would be abolished by law in California. Instead, Kindergarten classes (and all other classes with Spanish and all other non-English-speaking students) would all become language-learning immersion classes, where students would learn only English as a Second Language. Such classes would be classified as "English language classrooms" where "the language of instruction used by the teaching personnel is overwhelmingly in the English language." (Proposition 227, article 2. 305.-306.)

Thus Proposition 227 represents a discursive restriction upon teachers, a restriction symbolized by the teachers who attended the school board meeting of the Los Angeles Unified School District on July 21, 1998, wearing yellow gags around their mouths as a protest. (from Louis Sahagun's article "Prop. 227's 'Bumpy Ride,' " Los Angeles Times, 7/22/1998, p. B1.)

There is an interesting exception to this new law, listed in the wording of Proposition 227, that parents may apply to their children's schools to allow their children to be placed in a bilingual classroom under certain circumstances. There are three listed circumstances in Proposition 227; the first is for students who already speak English, and the second is for students under ten years of age, a qualification which doesn't apply to the majority of bilingual students. The third is for "children with special needs." It requires that children have been placed in
English language classrooms for "a period of not less than thirty days during the school year," and that it is subsequently the informed belief of the school principal and educational staff that the child has such special physical, emotional, psychological, or educational needs that an alternate course of educational study would be better suited to the child's overall educational development. A written description of these special needs must be provided and any such decision is to be made subject to the examination and approval of the local school superintendent, under guidelines established by and subject to the review of the local Board of Education and ultimately the State Board of Education. (from Proposition 227)

So, basically, a significant number of bureaucratic cogs must turn before the vast majority of limited English ability students would be able to gain exemptions from Proposition 227, including approval of the State Board of Education, without which no student gains exemption. Guidelines must be designed and met, and signatures must be gathered. Descriptions of "special need" must be accumulated in order to allow exemptions to have legal standing, or a bilingual education program could be successfully sued by any concerned citizen.

Strangely enough, for the flood of discussion that has come out of the mass media concerning Proposition 227, little was said (prior to the event) about what the public schools were to look
when the Unz Initiative passed. In an article in *The Nation* magazine of 4/20/88, Gregory Rodriguez tells us that

Administrators at L.A. Unified, the largest school district in California and home to close to a quarter of the state's limited-English children, are predicting chaos if the ballot measure passes. In a preliminary review, district staff have painted a picture of a school district torn asunder, one with test scores dropping even lower than their current unacceptable lows. The lack of a pedagogical plan other than the one year of "sheltered English" makes it unclear how and what educators will teach newly transitioned students, let alone those whose bilingual programs collapse under them. (Rodriguez, p.18)

Conceivably, the school systems of California are also looking at a period of protracted political movement, most likely including a legal challenge to Proposition 227 should it pass. The Web page organized by SmartNation, an anti-227 organization (http://www.smartnation.org/), states that the Unz Initiative runs contrary to a Supreme Court decision *Lau v. Nichols* (1974), which states that some form of linguistically-appropriate education is necessary in order to enforce 601 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which bans discrimination based "on the ground of race, color, or national origin," in "any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance." Whether the Unz Initiative, which stipulates that "Children who are English learners shall be educated through sheltered English immersion..."
during a temporary transition period not normally intended to exceed one year," meets the bilingual requirement established by Lau v. Nichols (1974) is an open question, presumably one to be decided in a court of law.

The issue at stake in Lau v. Nichols (1974) is one of whether school districts can "discriminate" in refusing to meet the needs of children who have a "language deficiency" in English. The issue at stake, then, with Proposition 227 is in whether or not the law it created "discriminates" against these same students. Lau v. Nichols maintains the implicit premise, however, that speaking another language than English is of no consequence in itself, that bilingual education exists not for language-learning skills in general but to remedy a "language deficiency" in English. This stigmatizing premise, combined with the failure of the No on 227 campaigns to discursively defend bilingual education in public, doubtless contributed to 227's success in gaining public votes. One of the main arguments of 227's opponents attacks the one-year requirement, wherein it is assumed that students will be capable users of academic English needing no special attention after only one year of experience in an English immersion program. Researchers such as James Crawford (whose Website at http://ourworld.compuserve.com/homepages/JWCRAWFORD/ offers a comprehensive if biased overview of the politics of bilingual education) argue convincingly that it typically takes
much more than one year to teach non-English-speaking children a mastery of academic English.

*Castaneda v. Picard* (1981) and *Keyes v. School Dist. No. 1* (1983) are two cases that rely for the nature of their judgments on the requirement stated in *Lau v. Nichols*. Interestingly enough, I found out about these cases by pursuing a carrel filled with handouts in the office of an elementary school in the Valley USD. These handouts warned parents, in English, that their children were limited English speakers and that the school had therefore decided to place them in a bilingual classroom, and that they had several options (including placing their children in English-language classrooms) available to them.

Curiously enough, this was the same elementary school where I visited teachers and students organizing a protest against Proposition 227. *Castaneda v. Picard* argues that school districts cannot group limited-English ability students as deficient in "general ability"; *Keyes v. School Dist. No. 1* asks about one bilingual education program whether it was "based on a sound educational theory" and had "adequate resources, personnel, and practices." Implementations of Proposition 227, from district to district, may eventually stand or fall on the status of judicial interpretations of educational theory in determining whether particular applications of Proposition 227 discriminate against limited-English ability students.

So far, the courts (see Nick Anderson and Louis Sahagun's "Judge Refuses to Stand in Way of Prop. 227," *Los Angeles Times*, 95
7/16/98) have yet to explicate these precedents in the current context (from what little I can find in the newspapers), while allowing 227 to stand.

So conceivably Proposition 227, like Proposition 187 before it (a proposition which would have required teachers to inform the INS of the presence of suspected illegal immigrants in their classrooms, if it hadn't been invalidated in the judicial system after it was approved by the voters), may pass in a public vote, only to be later invalidated in a court of law. But, so far, the one court of law that has ruled on MALDEF's challenge to Proposition 227 has let it stand. The Oakland and San Francisco school districts "have pledged an all-out fight to preserve bilingual education" (Sahagun and Anderson, p. A13) -- and it appears that such a fight has borne fruit, but only to a certain extent. A recent ruling ("Bilingual Teaching Backers Win Key Court Decision," by Maura Dolan and Nick Anderson, Los Angeles Times 8/28/98) allows districts to apply for waivers to Proposition 227 as it is written in the state's Education Code, and to sue the state if their waiver isn't granted.

"Full resistance" and "full compliance," however, would be inadequate as descriptions of the only two District strategies for coping with Proposition 227. A newspaper article by Louis Sahagun and Nick Anderson ("Schools Draw Up Plans to Implement Prop. 227", Los Angeles Times 7/21/98., pp. A1, A13) graphs a variety of different District responses as they have emerged so far. Los Angeles Unified proposes a program of
"English immersion with an option for native language support." Fresno USD proposes a program of "English immersion with up to one-third of school day in native language." The authors speculate that "in a state with 1,000 school districts -- with each fiercely guarding its autonomy -- there may well be 1,000 Proposition 227 plans." (Sahagun and Anderson p. A 13)

As a discursive observation about 227, I would be remiss if I did not add that discussion of this political issue had in fact made its way into the classrooms where I taught. I did substitute-teach, for two days, in one classroom where the students were organizing a protest against Proposition 227. But, overall, the politicization of my classroom appeared to be an external thing, imposed upon the status quo of schooling from without. The encouragement of student initiative, though most manifestly displayed in the abovementioned classroom, appeared to have no overall effect upon the system, because it was in latent form. The march being planned was a children's event, a walk around the block. Of course, the ineffectual nature of politics as it is constructed in schools is so not out of any fault of schooling per se, that even in its most political forms it only produces latent politics, but because the concepts of learning and education, as they are commonly understood, bear upon the latent possibilities that students perceive in themselves, as this affects the possibilities the future brings to all of us.

School may have become an academic culture industry, bound up with the production of test scores and student
portfolios and students and teachers who are to consume a set list of text books, pencils, dittos, and notebooks during an assigned period of time constituting "the school year." However, the reasons for schooling may be more bound up with the hopes of parents that their children "succeed" in school, and other idealisms about school, than it would with any collectively-agreed-upon statement that school produce some single tangible thing, in the way that the sugar industry produces sugar for instance. So there is a diffusion of purpose in schooling not captured by the culture industry metaphor.

This latent power of students as they learn in school, being not a mere political latency (as I have been discussing) but rather the potential of adult human being, appears to be relatively small amidst the present-day world of political/social drama, with its expensive campaigns (such as the statewide petitioning effort launched by millionaire Ron Unz to get Proposition 227 on the ballot in the first place) and the heteronomous economy of globalization today, where the prosperity of millions rests today on commodity prices. A view from above upon the vast urban/industrial metropolises of California, from Sacramento to San Francisco to Los Angeles to San Diego, puts the latent possibilities of education in the perspective of a vast difference between the potential of today's schoolchildren and the disciplinary nature of human social systems around the globe as described by Foucault. What could schoolchildren do that would be genuinely "political" in this
context? Two of them, in only one classroom I visited as a substitute, were allowed to organize a schoolwide protest of 227. That was the extent to which I saw Proposition 227 used by the system as an opportunity to learn about political power.

Manifest politics does not appear today to be something students and teachers create for themselves. The politics of education acts within a history of continuing statewide imposition of doctrines of education (such as the Unz Initiative's insistence that all bilingual education should consist of one-year immersion programs, or the politics of the STAR test throughout California). The people, the courts, the political agents have spoken, and the result is more mandates; intellectual capital has once again spoken, and the intellectual labor of teachers and students must once again change its product, as it had to change its product before with Lau v. Nichols and the various other mandates that produced the bilingual education system in the first place. When confronting legal proclamation about schools, the schools themselves have so far had to be places of disciplinary ritual, the power of their students latent (not yet of voting age), dormant (not voicing the discourses of political power) and tranquilized (with no political power over their own processes of education, which remains in the hands of teachers following mandates). The democratically-operated State of California proclaims its schools as factories for docile bodies (i.e. bodies of potentially infinite malleability) regardless of its democratic character or (in the case of Proposition 227) of the
pleas of sociolinguistic researchers that non-English-speaking schoolchildren simply cannot learn academic English in one year. Legal proclamation is ostensibly supposed to "make it so."

CONCLUSION

My own writings seem to offer a glimpse of school life in southern California as a world of work, play, and talk, a world that is privatized and set away from the politics that appears to it as an adult mandate. It is because this political reality is so constructed that I felt I could observe a predominance to Foucault's (1977) themes of "domination," "docile bodies," "resistance," and "delinquency," despite the fact that the environment of schooling also contains cultural elements of "choice," "dialogue," "solidarity," "play," and "publicity" which are capable of predominating in specific school contexts. In the next chapters, I will look at adult mandates as they appear to the adults, starting with writings for and about substitute teachers, and continuing with writings about "classroom management," and in each set of writings I will probe for concerns that will further reveal the "politics" of the schooling enterprise as I have observed it so far.
CHAPTER 5

SUB STUFF: ADVICE AND EQUIPMENT FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF SUBSTITUTE TEACHING

Literature on substitute teaching

The point of this chapter is to look at specifically written textual constructions of the role of the substitute, documents that name substitute teaching as a specific form of work, as cultural background for defining, describing, and understanding actual narratives of substitute teacher experience such as I described in the last chapter.

In this chapter I will adhere to the model of textual analysis that is described in Norman Fairclough's Media Discourse:

Critical discourse analysis of a communicative event is the analysis of relationships between three dimensions or facets of that event, which I call text, discourse practice, and sociocultural practice...By 'discourse practice' I mean the processes of text production and text consumption. And by 'sociocultural practice' I mean the social and cultural goings-on which the communicative event is a part of.

(Fairclough p. 57)
One can see the usefulness of this model to the theoretical framework that has been mentioned previously by narrowing Fairclough’s categories a bit. Discourse practices are ways in which the texts about the sub relate to practices of symbolic manipulation in the classroom. Sociocultural practices, which I will also discuss in detail with respect to classroom management in the next chapter, are the actual practices of the substitute teacher within the overall ritual framework of the school.

I will also attempt to answer Fairclough’s list of three sets of questions about media output, with respect to texts about the sub:

1. How is the world (events, relationships, etc.) represented?
2. What identities are set up for those involved in the programme or story (reporters, audiences, 'third parties' referred to or interviewed)?
3. What relationships are set up between those involved (e.g. reporter-audience, expert-audience or politician-audience relationships)? (Fairclough p. 5)

One can see how these questions will reveal the world as it is constructed, through texts about the substitute teacher, as well. The above questions really scrutinize what Fairclough calls the "sociocultural practices" of the text.

So my use of Fairclough’s narrative technique will fit well with the theories I outlined in Chapter 2, if only to connect the texts in question to my theory of schooling as ritual which
manipulates symbols, a theory borrowed largely from the anthropology of Victor Turner.

For the most part, the literature I will be analyzing will use imagery to define a stereotype of the substitute teacher, so as to narratively normalize the ritual of substitute teaching. This is perhaps congruent with the relations of textual production and consumption. School personnel, and the substitute teachers themselves, need to produce a model of appropriate (yet achievable) substitute teaching so that schools can appear to harbor classrooms that do not interfere with the investment of bodies with "aptitudes" (Foucault, 1977), and so that the substitutes themselves can feel as if there are appropriate guidelines for substitute teaching regardless of their own abilities to invest student bodies with such "aptitudes."

These needs, as I described them above, basically mirror what Norman Friedman perceived as "task demands/adaptations," in an ethnography of schools he did "during the 1979-1980 school year in three small to medium-sized California school districts in the eastern section of Los Angeles County" while working as a substitute teacher (Friedman, p. 115). Yes, there is a precedent for my formal project. The first task demand he saw as "order-maintenance," which meant the proper following of routines and disciplining of students, and the second task demand was supposedly "assignment-execution," meaning the maintenance of the continuity of the educational program. In my years of substitute teaching...
teaching, in the geographical area to which Friedman refers, I never found that much concern with whether substitute teacher were to follow the second task demand (as we might interpret it strictly as regarding the school's or the District's educational mission), even when I was a long-term substitute teacher -- maintaining the continuity of the educational program was supposedly the responsibility of a teacher that had somehow been placed under contract with the district, and was therefore obliged to follow the district's larger vision of curriculum (which often consisted of a school-wide interpretation of state mandates, as I perceived when reading Southern Elementary School's rules for teaching the various subjects of the required curriculum). So also, I observe that the main emphasis given in manuals for the sub is on construction of a typical substitute teacher that can perform typical practices of order-maintenance by creating typical routines to engage a typical classroom for the typical day.

The aim of textual production for substitute teachers is thus itself congruent with the typical sociocultural practices of substitute teaching, which require the typical substitute teacher to spend a day rehearsing some variation upon "basic skills" abilities, with children who are to be assembled in classrooms under individual teachers for a significant portion of the day.

Besides the published texts of guides that aim to "help the sub," or at least to help create the role of the sub through administrative labor, there are, most crucially, lesson plans that have been left for the substitute teacher. The first part of this
chapter will deal with guides; the second part with lesson plans. Although I cannot claim to have copied every lesson plan I was left with in the many days I substitute-taught, I will look at some representative lesson plans in order to discuss the relation of lesson plan to actual classroom ritual.

The stereotypes of subs, to be sure, are also roles (within the dramatic stage of the school, or, anthropologically, within school society as a whole), but their textual content communicates various types of coded imagery. To remind us of this, the Random House Dictionary of the English Language (2nd Ed.) reminds us that a "stereotype" is "a simplified and standardized conception or image invested with special meaning and held in common by members of a group." So a stereotype defines the communication of an image beheld by a group, representing a mold of the typical.

Theoretical format for this literary review:

Each of these texts creates a stereotype of some aspect of the ritual of substitute teaching. Each text exemplifies a specific genre of discourse practices about subbing, with an implied speaker (usually an "expert," but sometimes merely a first-person observer) and an implied audience, and an implied intention-toward-the audience. Substitute teacher texts thus, re Fairclough (1995), imply discourse events of textual consumption and textual production, and we can read into each text a certain genre of textual consumption event, from an understanding of the text's way of proceeding.
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This literature implies events of textual consumption by its construction of writer and reader roles, and by its intended practical use as 1) substitute teacher manual and/or 2) substitute teacher equipment. The consumption events that these genres represent are staged in terms of the constructed roles of the authors (of the texts) as they gives advice to readers whose constructed identities are also coded in the texts.

It is beyond the ambit of this dissertation to do a full "sociology of the text" with respect to substitute teaching. It is worth consideration, however, that I purchased many of the texts in question at an educational supply store, where one can also buy most of the other equipment important to decorating an elementary school classroom. I purchased these research items at a well-decorated store in a mini-mall in southern California, a store which also sold me the paper strips which I used to decorate an empty 1st grade classroom I substitute-taught (for one week at a school in Valley USD) with pictograms illustrating the English-language alphabet, and with a calendar for purposes of doing a calendar-marking ritual. This store also sold me addition flash cards, "Magic School Bus" books in English and Spanish, other children's books in English and Spanish, and games for my classroom.

Below, I will discuss the various stereotypes of the substitute teacher as I read them, by critically reviewing selected texts that elicit this stereotype within a significant cross-section of literature that conceptualizes substitute teachers.
Stereotypes of the substitute in literature that advises administrators

This is literature that allows administrators to focus subs into the administration of the school ritual, and proceeds first by establishing a stereotype to give administrators a "general idea" of the sub so as to better manage his or her position within the school hierarchy.

Getting Better Results from Substitutes, Teacher Aides, and Volunteers by Dr. Bryce Perkins is a 1966 guide to substitutes for administrators. This booklet classifies subs with teacher aides and volunteers as part of a category "paraprofessional and auxiliary personnel." It provides a stereotype of the sub that is gender- and age-typed, cast in quotes, and portrayed as "natural": "The typical substitute is a married woman who 'at one time taught full time and quit her regular job at marriage or a few years thereafter. She raised one or two children to school age and then realized she had time to go back to work on a part-time basis. Quite naturally, she chose her part-time work in the field she knew best — teaching," quoting from an NEA research bulletin of 1955 (p. 10). This guide offers some interesting advice, including: "invite substitutes along with new staff members to the preschool building indoctrination or orientation session. They will profit from meeting regular members of the faculty, both old and new -- and also from the instructions given the new teachers. If you develop "new teacher clinics" or similar organized meetings, invite the substitute." (p. 25) This advice was
supposedly given "since new substitutes need the same information as other teachers new to the system." (p. 23) I have only been invited to such meetings on the occasion when I was appointed at the beginning of the year (1997-1998 in my case) as a long-term substitute teacher. From my experience (having started substitute teaching in April of 1988), day-to-day substitutes are generally excluded from the information about the required teaching duties of year-long teachers that is given to long-term substitutes, who are expected to take on the roles of regular teachers but are in some circumstances still "on an emergency basis." This book assumed a more "connected" relationship between substitute teachers and schools/districts than the relationships I have had.

"Making Effective Use of the Substitute Teacher: An Administrative Opportunity" by Jackson M. Drake, is a short article that provides a stereotype of the substitute as someone performing a largely thankless task who can drift into three negative stereotypes unless management acts decisively to select, train, evaluate, and support substitutes. These negative stereotypes are: 1) the substitute as babysitter, maintaining quiet and doling out busywork, 2) the substitute as bare-minimum teacher, instructing without putting out much effort, 3) the substitute as improviser, deviating from standard curriculum and replacing it with "personal curriculum." Interestingly enough, due to the perceived difficulty of imposing classroom discipline upon a class while in the role of substitute teacher (a perception
reinforced by my own experience as a substitute teacher and by numerous anecdotal accounts from other teachers), Drake's negative stereotype #3 sometimes can be a favored role for the sub, as many teachers have told me. More specifically, teachers have told me that if the substitute has a lesson plan he or she can successfully present, that it "doesn't present a problem."

The Supply Story, edited by Sheila Galloway and Marlene Morrison, is an edited volume coming from the UK about substitute teaching, which it calls "supply teaching". Many of the perspectives offered by its contributors are concerned with the duties of the sub co-ordinator, and those of other managers responsible for co-ordinating the duties of teachers. It therefore de-emphasizes the role of the sub's experience in telling "the supply story," although one author, Kath Green, defends the value of such experience in a piece titled "Celebrating Experience."

Effective Substitute Teachers: Myth, Mayhem or Magic? by Terrie St. Michel offers a stereotype of the substitute teacher that is managerial: the sub is an ineffective teacher who comes in for the day and finds a classroom full of students who are poorly-prepared for a day of learning under the authority of the sub, and is him/herself poorly prepared to teach the children "as a teacher." Thus the substitute is stigmatized with a "deficit" evaluation, as Kath Green would argue in "Celebrating Experience" (The Supply Story, pp. 16-30.) This deficit evaluation is to be remedied with large quantities of "staff development," involving six (!) workshops scheduled throughout various periods
of the year that the substitute is to attend, four of which are to be 2 1/2 hours in length, two of 7 hours. Implementing such a plan would appear to be quite an extravagance in preparing what are, by the market rules of the game, disposable day laborers.

Process stereotypes (of the ritual of "getting through the day") in texts that advise the substitute

These process stereotypes offer advice on how to instruct children properly as a substitute teacher of a particular day-assignment. They try to identify techniques for allowing the substitute teacher to look like a "meaningful" substitute teacher. The constructed audience for these texts is usually the elementary school substitute teacher, as perhaps "getting through the day" for the secondary teacher has become an already well-constructed stereotype within the institutional context of secondary teaching.

Substitute Teaching: Planning for Success by Kappa Delta Pi is a guide offering "30 subject related lesson plans with student worksheets written by 'real' teachers." Many of the lesson plans offered in this book appear to be more complex than the usual routines of regular teachers in the schools I observed at Valley Unified School District, involving prior knowledge I am not sure such students have.

A Handbook for Substitute Teachers by Anne Wescott Dodd attempts to be a comprehensive guide to substitute teaching. This book has no pictures, nor Dodd starts by warning the reader of the game of "get the sub," and then proceeds to tell the reader
about some standard ways of getting a job as a substitute teacher, of "surviving on the job" (basically recommending ways that the substitute can maintain order in usually-authoritarian classrooms), and recommending intellectual exercises, "sponge activities" as they were once advertised to me when I was in a teacher credential program at California State University at San Bernardino. This would be a good comprehensive guide for a substitute teacher aiming to be "typical," although I would not use it myself for that reason.

"Management Advice for Substitutes," from Instructor Magazine, is a one-page anecdotal discussion of substitutes culled from letters to the magazine. One letter, from Martine Wayman of Bothell, Washington, advises: "When a student acts up, quietly put your hand on his or her shoulder. If a child is a consistent problem, calmly ask her to go to a specific area, away from others. Then talk to the child and invite her to help you with something. It works!" Note the taken-for-granted notions of "acting up," and "consistent problem," note also the idea of "it works," meaning that some sort of use of technique to surmount behavior problems of stereotypical students is ostensibly at the essence of working as a substitute.

John Nidds and James McGerald's "Substitute Teachers: Seeking Meaningful Instruction in the Teacher's Absence" repeats an important set of common ideas about the role of substitute teachers. To the question, "What is the most difficult problem substitute teachers face?" the article answers: "All of the
responses identified control of student behavior," and to the question "What teaching methodology works for substitute teachers?", the answer "Basically, use of detailed reading and writing assignments, collected for evaluation by the regular teacher, was the practice most recommended for the substitute teacher" was given.

"What makes Effective Secondary Education Teachers?" by Edward D. Ostapczuk, is a short literature review that can be found in ERIC. It argues that substitute teachers aren't as effective as regular teachers, and specifies "classroom management" as the hurdle for subs to overcome. It suggests: "Be prepared," "Be assertive," "Remember, 'kids are kids',," "Keep students busy," "Try not to raise your voice," "Circulate throughout classroom," "Leave feedback for regular classroom teacher," "Teaching experience depends on how you frame it." Only the last piece of advice can be said to do more than offer advice to a stereotype, and the stereotype is one of the substitute teacher as a poorly-supported teacher who must therefore rely upon a makeshift structure of "classroom control."

"The Plight of the Substitute Teacher," by Kenneth L. Calkins, is a short first-person narrative from a former substitute captures the "fleeting" feel of being a substitute teacher and getting to observe the changing behaviors of participants at a junior high school. Reads like the textbook version of "how to write a short story."
The **Substitute Survival Kit** offered by corporate author "Instructional Fair" codes itself as "equipment" from a reading of the front cover, which pictures books, pencils, crayons, and an apple. It advises on page 1 that subs carry a tote bag with books and school equipment, offers a standard class report, and offers a series of dittos for the students. It appears to be geared to the 2nd grade level and offers the advice: "Don't count on the school to have supplies." The book contains some rather sophisticated math and language arts dittos, and it contains large quantities of "teacher's stickers," with pictures of smiling faces and words of teacher encouragement printed in bright colors on them.

S. Harold Collins' and Lorraine Wilde-Oswalt's **Substitute Ingredients** is a regular book with words written in paragraphs, but also with many diagrams and pictures. The diagrams and pictures illustrate a series of games that children can play with paper and pencil. This book offers tangrams, mandalas, math games. Some of these games are sophisticated, and some of the games appear to be merely ideas for games, which the sub must develop him/herself. The point of such books appears to be to offer the raw material with which substitute teachers can create educational games. There appears to be a limited acceptance here of the substitute as a liminoid figure, an advertisement for play.

Another book by Collins, **Classroom Management for Substitute Teachers**, is a textbook claiming to deal with classroom discipline problems specific to substitute teachers. It is
interesting in that it combines the jargon of classroom management with numerous inkpen illustrations of animals. The conductor of the training seminar the substitutes were given at Hill USD called these sorts of illustrations "warm fuzzies." This book starts with a list of expectations for teacher training institutions, administrators, regular classroom teachers, and substitute teachers. Tries to spell out in great detail the role of the substitute teacher. It recommends:

Here is a sampling of rules Substitute Teachers might consider:

* Follow directions the first time they are given
* Keep hands, feet, objects to yourself
* Use acceptable language
* Ignore bad behavior of others
* Stay at assigned task.
* Arrive on time to class.
* Move quietly in the classroom.
* Raise your hand to talk.

A laundry list of rules will be less than effective. Choose four, or five at most, to apply. (Collins, 1982)

"Ignore bad behavior of others" might be an unwritten rule in many classrooms I have been in, "Arrive on time to class" would be considered a school rule and not a mere classroom rule, and "Move quietly in the classroom" might be judged as deterring too trivial an offense to qualify as a classroom rule. Otherwise
these rules might be typical of the lower-grade elementary school classrooms I saw in Valley USD.

Mary McMillan's *Lifesavers for Substitutes* is subtitled "A Good Apple Teacher Resource for Grades 2-6" and "A Wealth of Ideas for the Classroom Teacher as Well," and appears to have some easy-to-use activities that require little planning on the part of the teacher. This book is almost entirely composed of masters for copying on a ditto machine, the same ditto machines that dominate the teacher-construction of activities in schools such as Southern Elementary School. Some of these masters appear to be ideologically-coded to suit patriotism or the War on Drugs or environmentalism -- there are maps of the USA to color, there are "drug free paper dolls," there are "save the earth" coloring sheets. The substitutes that are the audience of this book are elementary subs -- advice for secondary subs goes under the name of "sponge activities" that are supposed to take up the amount of time a secondary sub spends with each group of students. McMillan's list of rules (p. iv) to follow to be a good substitute runs as follows: 1) "Come prepared!" 2) "Keep them busy and learning at the same time!" 3) "Be on your toes!" (continuing the quote) "Even the best of students become adventuresome when the teacher is away." Thus McMillan reflects on the liminal or liminoid nature of being a student when the substitute is in charge, comparing it to an event Turner would associate with liminality, an adventure. Lastly, there is 4)
"Inform the teacher!" meaning "write a note saying how the day went."

Stereotypes of students in texts that advise substitutes

These are stereotypes of the students given out as part of advice to the substitute teacher. Here I only discuss one prominent, and early, text, which is perhaps a rarity because attempts to generalize about students using stereotypes are likely to mischaracterize a diverse American student body.

Mary Frances Redwine's 1970 book Substitute Teacher's Handbook: Activities for Grades K Through Six was one of the few commercially-available handbooks on subbing that I could find in any educational supply store in southern California that had no pictures or pages offered for photocopying. It is interesting to note that this is a 27-year-old textbook and that it is still in print. Redwine claims to be a "Substitute Teacher" in the "Hillsborough County (Florida) Public Schools." In the second paragraph, headlined ADVANTAGES OF SUBSTITUTE, it states: "Substituting is also an ideal job for many older women whose families are grown." It offers stereotypes of each grade, such as "Kindergartners love finger plays and songs," "First graders are notoriously talkative," "Children in the second grade will be very helpful," "You may begin to have some discipline problems in this grade, not chattering or clowning as with younger children, but open hostility toward authority. You should not tolerate any abuse, whatsoever, and should try to nip any discipline problems in the bud," "Fourth graders are sometimes a little self-conscious
and unsure of themselves around adults they do not know," "You cannot be permissive with children in the upper grades and get any respect from them," "Sixth graders are somewhat like fifth graders..."

This is both a compendium of stereotypes of students and of the curriculum -- there are small lessons, mini-"lesson plans" one can teach if one needs something other than the advice of the given lesson plan.

Texts that advise the regular teacher on how to handle substitutes

These are texts written for teachers that often offer advice to them about how to leave the room and write the classroom instructions for the substitute. Interestingly enough, very few texts went into any detail about how to cope with substitute teachers; there were only two that I could find, within my search (detailed in the next two chapters) for guides to classroom management.

Charles and Senter's Elementary Classroom Management is a book advising regular teachers in a comprehensive way on how to manage the behaviors of others in school situations, from students to administrators to paraprofessionals (including substitutes). This book is discussed more detail in the next chapter, on "classroom management." There is, however, a subchapter of this book about substitutes. This book advises teachers to provide substitutes with:
* Discipline plan that clearly lays out the control techniques used in the class.
* Seating chart, showing where every child is supposed to sit, for checking attendance.
* Names of students with special needs, and detailed instructions concerning medication and so forth.
* Class list of names only, with space for notations to the teacher about behavior problems, homework, and helpfulness.
* Class schedule that gives days and times of various program activities.
* Lesson plans, in detail, for the day or days of absence.
* Duty schedule that highlights the days and times of the teacher's assigned duties for playground, buses, crossing, or lounge cleanup
* Monitor list that shows the names of student helpers and their classroom duties, with the name of the substitute teacher monitor highlighted.
* School map with classroom, playground, office, drinking fountains, restrooms, library, nurse's station, faculty workroom, and faculty lounge marked.
* Name and room number of a teacher who has agreed to help the substitute if needed. (Charles and Senter, p. 217)

This list follows the ideal laid out in the rest of the chapter, that a thorough support system be in place for the substitute teacher, necessitated by the presupposition that "teachers know
that students often consider substitutes fair game" and that "teachers should therefore talk seriously with students about class behavior during the teacher's absence." (p. 216). Some classrooms at Valley USD apparently did just that with classes which I substitute-taught, giving "my" whole class recess detention for incidents which I complained about. It is also likely that these classrooms had done advance work for the appearance of the sub, that the class had discussed beforehand what it would be like with a substitute in charge, as Elementary Classroom Management also advises.

At any rate, the above list represents clues to a generalized daily classroom script which I try to piece together at the beginning of the day about the instructional ritual I am to construct for any particular class. Some observations as regards my on-the-job understanding of this detail:

* Discipline plans that worked for the teacher may not work for the substitute teacher, because students may choose to ignore or dislike the substitute teacher. At times I have felt justified in ignoring instructions (as written on lesson plans) to "be strict" with classrooms of students, for fear of alienating students. I have heard more than one (regular) teacher tell me in discussions in teacher's lounges in Valley USD (while relating experiences of "subbing") that there is much less one can do to "enforce discipline" as a substitute than one can do as a regular teacher.
* Seating charts may not be valid because teachers may have changed the seating spaces of students without composing a new seating chart, or because students are switching seats without telling the substitute. I usually asked students' names before assuming their identities, just to be safe.

* If students have special needs, especially medicinal needs, schools, teachers, and students were always careful to notify the substitute teacher of these needs.

* Class lists were readily available, and (at Valley) could often be found in the teacher's information box in the teacher's lounge or the front office.

* Class schedules were often posted on a wall.

* Lesson plans are supremely important; I discuss them in a special section of this chapter below.

* Duty schedules were something required of elementary school teachers at Hill USD, usually involving being a playground monitor. Nevertheless, I sometimes missed duty because I did not arrive at the assignment in time to watch children on the playground. One morning, I was busy reading the lesson plan at a school at Hill USD when a teacher entered to remind me that I had duty. I might thus assume of this school that it had some level of communicative teacher support that allowed its teachers to maintain "duty" duties even when substitute teachers were scheduled for particular days.

* "Monitor lists" -- who exactly had what special duties within a class was something I often forgot, amidst my rush to
understand how I was to conduct the instructional ritual in a classroom at any particular hour of any day. Usually the students would remind me

* The school map was something that came from the front office in schools at Valley USD.

* The name and room number of a helpful teacher was rarely given to me at Valley USD, unless such a teacher was also "team teaching" with the teacher I replaced for that day. When such a name was offered, however, it turned out to be quite useful when the lesson plan was not workable or when I needed to send students with inappropriate behaviors to another room in order to continue instructional ritual.

The rest of the chapter on substitutes gives advice to the substitute teachers themselves, mostly involving discipline ("enforce the regular teacher's discipline plan, or bring your own") and curriculum ("teach your favorite lesson.")

Ellen Kronowitz' *Your First Year of Teaching and Beyond* is ostensibly a guide for first-year teachers; it shares many of the same components of guides to classroom management that I will discuss in the next two chapters. It offers a list of things for teachers to leave for substitutes; within its suggestions are presumptions about instructional ritual. For instance, it advises that teachers leave a seating chart for the substitute: "The seating chart will also help the substitute quickly catch those who decide to pull a switcheroo and sit with a friend for the day" (Kronowitz p.121), implicitly assuming that sitting with a friend is not part
of a student's role in an instructional ritual. Also, Kronowitz advises teachers to leave information about discipline, cautioning that "if you don't, the chorus of voices will again take over and tell the sub when and how to give points, hold a class meeting, or put marbles in a jar" (p. 122). From my experience, information about discipline is most effective in communicating to a substitute something of how to respond to this chorus of voices, which will express itself anyway.

Kronowitz also recognizes a sort of "reality principle" of subbing in that, if there is no explicitly written lesson plan available for the sub, "you will still have your planbook for the sub." The lesson plans I have read in such planbooks are often quite vague, or in error; a math assignment turns out to be something they've done already, or a writing assignment is written in undecipherable handwriting, so there have been times where I called the office to decipher it (if I perceive the regular teacher demands adherence to the lesson plan as something I need to do to be "called back" to that classroom); reading a planbook makes following a lesson plan harder. Often an activity will be named with one word in a planbook, which means that one will have to ask the students (who might give the sub an answer that will allow them to skip the parts of the assignment they don't want to do), or a teacher or administrator (who might be too busy to give the sub a significant answer).
The handbook offered by Hill Unified School District, 100 pp. long including a 28 pp. supplement, is really two handbooks offered with the inservice for substitutes which I was required to attend. One handbook was from the corporate agency who hired the former substitute teacher who talked to us for three hours in connection with the handbooks. The handbooks was meant to convey a sense of pride in the schools of the district, and was something I received and was asked to look at from time to time during a three-hour required inservice given to substitute teachers employed by Hill USD before the beginning of the school year. It goes over the routines governing the substitute teacher's day, and then proceeds to introduce the schools of the district, complete with lists of school rules and maps of each school. At the end is a set of suggestions for classroom management and "sponge activities" followed by a series of legal and district policy documents concerning rules and laws governing substitutes. These documents, which outline the legal codes regarding dress and grooming, sexual harassment, drug- and alcohol-free workplaces, and worker's compensation, construct stereotypes of the substitute as well. The handbooks put out by the corporation offered advice for "assertiveness" and "empathy" and on how to read a lesson plan, plus it offered a typology of students for the sake of helping substitute teachers identify "behavior problems" as they appear in students. The discourse of the corporate handbook appears partially borrowed from the discourse of
motivational speaking, which was the self-announced "professional background" of the inservice presenter.

The handbook offered by Backcountry Unified School District is only 4 pp. long. Backcountry USD sent me a Handbook for Substitute Teachers at the beginning of the 1996-1997 school year, when I was re-hired. It offers extremely brief advice on how substitute teachers should "conduct themselves." Its "suggestions for classroom discipline" include a series of on-task cues. From its suggestions for "Your Voice": "State your directions clearly in a tone that says you know exactly where you're going." This handbook says relatively little about substituting, being only four pages long (as opposed to Hill's handbook, which ran to fifty pages, with Hill's inservice corporation's handbook running to twenty-eight pages of length). The concern reflected in these pages is that of a substitute teacher who was capable of managing appearances. The handbook sent me by Valley Unified School District Manual was 28 pp. long, and it listed the requirements for applying (requirements one must already have met to receive the manual, it would seem!), offered a set of directions for using the machine that Valley USD used to call its substitutes, a list of obligations of substitutes, payroll information, and a list of responsibilities of schools, teachers, substitutes and students. It spells out the business and instructional rituals that have to occur if substitute teachers are to succeed at working, at being hired to substitute for regular teachers, and at avoiding the displeasure of principals. According
to a paragraph in the manual, "The Principal, at any time during the school year, may request that a substitute teacher may no longer be assigned to that school due to unsatisfactory performance. If three schools make such a request, the substitute may be terminated." Valley's manual uses a legalistic discourse of rights and responsibilities.

It is interesting that three official District manuals that wish to discuss the same topic, substitute teachers and their duties, base their content on such widely-differing discursive forms.

Other Texts

In the category of "other" belongs John Brenot's The Substitute's Handbook: A Survivor's Guide. This appears to be a small-press issue of a humorous guide to subbing, the humor being generated in this book from the stress of various substituting experiences by the author himself. One interestingly-political paragraph states:

One major question frequently asked of male subs is whether he is gay. Answer that one immediately. Even though you're really adept at delivering biting sarcasm, don't say, "Is there some special reason you want to know?" The rest will probably laugh, but that embarrasses the kid who asked, and you've made at least one enemy. Even if the question doesn't come up, I've noticed in classes that if early on I make some allusion to my teenage sons or my wife, there's a general relaxing of tension. You can see
students slump slightly. They're very insecure about this issue, so it seems better to face it frontally. If I were a divisive (sic) bachelor, I'd be tempted to invent a wife. My wife, who is teaching somewhere else, is doing so and so, is a, has three, believes in, enjoys the game of, who is also a blond, loves to garden, whose favorite color is, plays tennis well, etc. She exists, sort of. (Brenot, p. 6)

The power of antihomosexual stereotypes of being "gay" or "a fag" upon the pubescent, grades 5-9, student collectivity (as expressed openly when classrooms of such students are confronted with a substitute teacher), permits the students to script the teacher's identity as being "gay" or "not gay." I have at times felt the need to justify the claim (basically true) that I was heterosexual, in response to the inquiries of pubescent students: "Are you gay?" When in fact my reflex answer, the answer that I first wanted to give such inquiries, was, "none of your business," or "what does it matter?" or "Are you homophobic?", answers which would have rudely questioned whether being or not being "gay" would affect my status as "sub," in that student's idea of society.

The humor from Brenot's description appears to be derived from his suspicion that the substitute teacher is best advised to adapt to a situation that has already organized itself, rather than "taking command" of the unknown. Brenot illustrates in example after example that the substitute is not entirely the agency in control of the behavior of the classroom, and so the sub reading
this text is offered an exaggerated guide to the other agencies in the classroom so he or she can deal with them.

Summary of Texts about the Substitute

Most of the literature tries to stereotype a "substitute teacher role," which is then provided with advice as to how to perform the role of a substitute teacher, based on guesses and expectations about the sub's participation in the "typical classroom," which is itself a narrative composed of expectations concerning the symbolic value of substitute teachers and their teachings. These stereotypes and assumptions are ostensibly intended to fill the symbolic void created when a stranger steps into the role usually occupied by the regular teacher. Often substitutes are advised to consult administration to give substance to their claims to being authority figures in usually-authoritarian classrooms. This literature also tries to address a perceived symbolic deficit in the creation of the substitute role, to be remedied by the marketing of symbols for the sub's consumption and manipulation (with ludic effect) with classrooms of students. Some literature for substitute teachers proceeds primarily by stereotyping students, as Mary Frances Redwine's The Substitute Teacher's Handbook does, in order to allow substitutes to "read" classroom situations.

In Substitute Survival Kit, the implicit expectation is that subs may not receive the material support necessary to perform a teacher-role: This book's advice is, "don't count on the school to have supplies," and it also suggests that it itself is about
situations when "you will need to write lesson plans of your own." Literature such as Terrie St. Michel's book *Effective Substitute Teachers* advises district-level managers on the problem of how to create effective substitute teachers.

In literature meant to advise substitutes, there is also coded advice on how to develop a "substitute teacher personality." "Classroom Management for Substitute Teachers" is clear that the sub should "teach to maintain a continuity in lesson plans of the regular classroom teacher, teach to provide new experiences to students, teach to reinforce skills appropriate to competency levels," which argues for ways the sub can help the regular teacher, the students, and the administration in their expected roles. The inservice I attended for Hill Unified School District tried to provide its attendees with a comprehensive understanding of how to develop a "substitute teacher personality."

*Lifesavers for Substitutes, Substitute Ingredients, and Substitute Survival Kit* cater to the minimal preparation time the sub has to work with, to equip the sub with a prefabricated lesson that could possibly be adapted to any of a wide number of classroom situations.

I will conclude this chapter by discussing texts written "for the moment" for substitute teachers, which for the most part means lesson plans written by regular teachers, but can also mean texts that are part of the substitutes "bag of tricks" as recommended by many of the above texts. About the "bag of
tricks" I will be brief. Sometimes I would bring in something other than books for students to read, such as I discussed in mentioning the store where I bought substitute teacher equipment. At times I have brought pop-up books, a microphone attached to a tape recorder, candy (which I had to hide, and bring out only when I wanted to share with everyone at once even if such candy was only for me to eat), games such as "Othello" or chess, music CDs or cassettes to play for the class, and movies to watch. But one type of book deserves especial mention as a piece of classroom equipment for the substitute (below).

Ad hoc texts FOR the substitute

Lesson plans: The sub's clues toward navigating through the day

Using the framework set up by Turner for associating the social drama with any particular performed drama (see figs. 1 and 2 below), we can place the lesson plan in between the two dramas, as forming part of the preconception the substitute teacher will have about the day at school. At times, however, it is important to diverge from the lesson plan, especially when the regular teacher has laid out unrealistic or insufficient expectations about what should happen when a substitute teacher is in charge of a classroom. On one assignment, I noted, a regular teacher (who was assigned team-teaching duties with the teacher I was replacing) came into my classroom, apologized for the lack of a detailed lesson plan and taught that morning's lesson herself, leaving me to help her with teaching duties. The regular teacher had only left me a lesson-plan notebook, with the
titles of each lesson vaguely scratched in each box in the grid that decorated the particular page of the book that was marked with that day's date. On other assignments, however, lesson plans would come in bare-bones form, with the mere titles of the assignments to be handed out, and I would have to rely upon the students for advice as to how the classroom day normally proceeded, what were the micro-rituals to be performed.

Often, however, lesson plans would contain hints as to what the school day was to be like, hints I could use or discard (although there were certain districts that advised their substitute teachers to follow their lesson plans rather exactly). In the following subchapter, I will focus my commentary largely upon elementary school lesson plans, since at the secondary level the lesson plans would largely contain seatwork assignments lasting the length of a 50-minute period, and did not have the complexity of the elementary school lesson plan. Some of the hints are:

Lists of "good students," students expected to help the teacher with duties, and lists of "problem students," students expected to disrupt the classroom activities. Sometimes a lesson plan will have a list that tries to "notify" the teacher of students whose behaviors need to be "attended to." One lesson plan notified me of this in a confusing way, a fifth-grade lesson plan from East Hill USD, a district with rather well-off children:

Lesson Plans
I am out with a bad cold. Kids over all are good. 4 boys (names listed) need to complete behavior analysis before they can participate with class. They need to spend recesses in office.

Here is a rough schedule of our day. Feel free to change anything.

8:40-9:40 Give students new RIMES to make words for spelling test: ide, ast, ad, og ush
write as many words as possible for each
Then can do starters: Computers, writer's workshop,
Rhyming matching

9:40-10:25 Read James and the Giant Peach
Mrs. Iberg (resource teacher) should come in and read w/ kids

10:25-10:45 Recess (no duty)

(etc.)

Often this information (about the four boys listed above, for instance) was useless even if it was true, since the sub (I, in this case) was expected to keep order in the classroom regardless of who was bad or good, which would become plainly obvious before the first recess. At any rate, lists as such are extensions of the folkloric tendency to separate students into "good students" and "bad students" notwithstanding the basically American notion that each student has an equal right to learn in an appropriate environment (as substantiated by PL 94-142, the Equal Educational Opportunity Act of 1974, and other such laws).
Discipline arrangements. Often this would be limited to an instruction to "tell the class your expectations for them," and then beyond that I was implicitly expected to have a style for enforcing the rules I expected the students to follow. In all my years of substitute teaching, I never developed a single way of telling students my expectations in a way they would understand and appreciate. For the most part, I would define my expectations to the class only after observing how they behaved as a group, since this way it was easier to observe the communicative habits of each peer group within the class, and thus to get the group to control itself. This strategy of classroom discipline was rendered irrelevant when applied toward the long-term position I was granted at Southern Elementary School at the beginning of the 1997-1998 school year. What constitutes a "successful" discipline arrangement is discussed in another genre of texts, which I will review later.

Here is a list of typical activities as listed on elementary school lesson plans:

* Calendar/morning ritual. This ritual was common in Kindergarten and 1st grade, and was usually divided into several parts, wherein I would have students put the new date on the board, we would read the days of the week, identify today's day-of-the-week, what day yesterday was, what day tomorrow would be. It would include the pledge of allegiance, sometimes to be performed both in Spanish and English, and attendance-taking, which was sometimes done by having students take cards with
their names on them and present them to the teacher, me. We would sing songs, often including songs titled "Days of the Week" and "Months of the Year" which were usually to be played on vinyl records that were recorded by two singers named "Greg and Steve" (as was typically observed in classrooms in Valley Unified School District). Often I would read just the word "calendar" on the lesson plan, in which case I would be required to make up a routine, or ask the students myself. Generally if this happened the result would be chaotic; some students would perhaps take advantage of my confusion to start conversations with each other, and then I would have to demand quiet several times before proceeding. These moments of chaos would occur even though I would become rather familiar with calendar as a ritual of K or 1 classrooms, since each teacher would perform it differently.

An example of a description of morning ritual, for a 1st/2nd grade class, Hill Unified School District, from a fairly well-organized class:

Opening:
Meet students outside at pole (second from end).
Walk into class.
Meet on the rug in a circle. We say "Good Morning" individually around the circle.
Take attendance by counting students around the circle -- each student says his or her number as you point to them around the circle. If there are 18, everyone is
here. If not, ask the students how many students are missing. Then, who are those students? Record them on the attendance sheet.

Take the lunch count, counting in the same way as you did for attendance. You may double-check this by asking the students how many must be bringing their lunches, doing a count, and making sure the number adds up to the number of students here today. Choose a helper from the cat mug on the counter, give him or her a standing ovation, and send him or her with the attendance. Put the name stick in the other mug. All sit down in the circle. Tell the students what they will be doing today.

Calendar:

Helper assists with calendar. They know the routine pretty well by now. Analyze the pattern with the class, and ask for predictions for Monday. Please do not validate answers as right or wrong, but put them on the board to check Monday.

Morning song:

This is a good time to refocus the students' attention. The helper chooses a song (please refer to the list in this folder), then you may decide that another might be appropriate.

* Quiet reading time. This was a ritual required each day in almost all elementary-school classrooms of Valley USD, and it was usually one of the best times of the day, even in the worst classrooms, and this was so usually because I brought my collection of books, including the Magic School Bus series. These
books were very popular because they were educational and furthermore they were tied in with a popular television series on PBS.

* Centers. I usually enjoyed centers too, and this was usually so because it meant that the regular teacher had put a lot of time teaching the students how to organize themselves in groups. Usually centers activity was enjoyable, and the children would spend plenty of time on it; sometimes it wasn't, and I would be stuck inventing things to do for the children who boycotted centers.

* Daily Oral Language. In the upper grades of elementary school, usually grades 3 through 6, there was an activity where the students were to rewrite incorrectly grammaticized sentences, written upon the board, onto Daily Oral Language journals. This ritual was common to many of the most authoritarian classrooms, and was often orderly although sometimes it wasn't, and students would talk instead of doing Daily Oral Language (and I felt obligated to continually yell instructions rather quickly in order to keep the routine going).

* After lunch cooling-off activities. It was often, though not always the case, that "cooling off" activities were scheduled just after lunch or toward the end of the day. I tend to think of these activities as "re-integrative" activities in the sense in which Van Gennep posited that after a liminal activity, there would be an activity that would re-integrate the performers into the mainstream of social activity. Sometimes there would be a "quiet
time" or a "quiet reading time" just after lunch, so as to re-integrate the students from the noise and play of lunch and lunch-recess into the supposed order of classroom academic activity. Sometimes there would be activities such as art and physical education that would involve a certain amount of play, that would be organized at the end of the day so as to re-integrate the students into the relative chaos of the day after school (assuming, in this instance, that the school day is a liminal phase between successive phases of life under the control of one's parents). I remember substituting one 2nd grade class for a span of two days, where the lesson plans called for physical education after lunch, and it was my experience that the students were so hyperactive after lunch, lunch recess, and PE (which often turned out that this class was too disorganized to participate in for more than 10 or 15 minutes and would drift away from the activity I assigned and talk in peer groups) that I showed a movie each day after PE so that I could "cool them down" and thus could assign the work the regular teacher left me to fill the rest of the day, with a minimum of resistance.

*ELD, or ESL: English for Spanish-Speakers. Since I have an adequate command of the Spanish language, Valley USD recruited me often to teach in bilingual classrooms. Given the 70% Latino ethnic composition of most of the area of Valley USD, what this meant was that many classes for very young children, including sometimes as many as half of the Kindergarten classes, were conducted largely in Spanish, but also including periods where
teachers were ostensibly to speak English and give an assignment in English. Usually the assignment involved some very simple words, that were to be represented by pictograms that were to be cut and pasted onto other pieces of paper, or we were to sing a song or choral read a poem. It seemed to me that students spent a rather small amount of time (relative to the school day, maybe an hour and twenty minutes each day maximum, of a 6 1/2 hour day) on ELD, yet almost all students were capable of speaking, reading and writing in English. I tried to understand that, however, the English abilities of LEP students in the Valley Unified School District were, as I was told, not "up to grade level" even with the group of Spanish-speaking and English-speaking students I was given for 2 1/2 weeks at Local Elementary School. That group of students had been in 5th and 6th grade when I taught them, and thus they had supposedly been learning English for as many as seven years.

The Magic School Bus books

Even though this series of books designed for children does not explicitly refer to how the substitute teacher is to use these books in classroom settings, they were rather successful in enlivening the periods of quiet reading that were part of each day's schedule according to the lesson plans I followed. Students would sometimes fight over their favorite Magic School Bus books in my presence. I really do think their popularity is due to the TV tie-in -- "The Magic School Bus" is a popular animated PBS television series about a classroom at "Walker Elementary School"
where the students go on field trips to study scientific concepts
by being within various science experiments or natural
phenomena. Scholastic, the company selling the books, also sold
video tapes of the TV series which were commonly available at
department stores such as Target, and sometimes I would show
those video tapes.

The teacher guiding these field trips (and driving the bus,
furthermore) is "Miss Frizzle," played by the voice of Lily Tomlin,
who always has a definitive solution for any problems (scientific
or practical) that the class encounters in the various adventures
she takes them on. Sometimes the class would be shrunk
microscopically, or they would go back in time, or they would be
transformed into animals or plants, in order to demonstrate some
scientific fact. The theme song to the series, played at the
beginning of each show, is sung by Little Richard and was well-
known by the students I taught. Miss Frizzle's class appears to
be modeled upon third or fourth grade, and the books appear to
be written at a second, third, or fourth grade level, where at any
rate they are most popular. I collected an entire set of the Magic
School Bus books, in both English and Spanish. Some students in
2nd grade would read them only in Spanish, students in
Kindergarten or 1st grade would often take my books and look
quickly at the pictures, with the effect that they wanted another
book every two minutes or so. I would often read one of the
books to the assembled students (usually in first grade), and ask
them questions every other page (or so) about the topics
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discussed in the book. The Magic School Bus series appeared to me to be a way I could introduce a ludic pattern to the schooling process while maintaining "classroom control."

Summary

The various periods of the elementary school classroom day, as named and divided by the lesson plan, provided for more flexibility than the 50- or 55- (and sometimes as much as 60) minute periods of classroom activity in secondary schools. Within this flexibility is the ability to design classroom periods that are more "ludic," allow the children more leeway to play, but nevertheless conform to learning goals that are specified in the instructional guides of the school's institutional hierarchy. Within this space, I was often able to create enjoyable experiences for very young children, although this ability of mine seemed to diminish with grades 3-6. Even if I didn't accomplish anything important in terms of allowing the children I was teaching to participate in actively creating a "politics of culture," I allowed school to be "fun." And, since I was a substitute teacher, I was there for a short period of time, usually from one to seven days, which meant that my appearance was capable of earning an aura of being "special," and I was not given disciplinary and curricular guidelines to follow which might have interfered with my achieving a "liminoid" status.
CHAPTER 6
CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT AND ITS EFFECT ON THE SUBSTITUTE'S ENVIRONMENT: AN EXPLANATION

Texts "about the sub," as I revealed above, can all be read meaningfully from one focal perspective; the sub is a type of teacher who is constantly trying to decode a state of "normality" (i.e. the ritual life of the classroom) within any particular classroom situation, and encode a day's activities upon that ritual life. This is what the sociology of the texts "about the sub" contributes to substitute teaching life, at least from my experience of it. Now the various experiences I underwent while substitute teaching from March, 1997 to June, 1998 in the Valley Unified School District range from communally joyful to solemn to chaotic. There were certain regularities in the ritual life I might experience, and these regularities would vary with where I was going, who I was teaching, and what I would be doing on any particular day. But there would also be a regularity that would proceed in terms of how I learned a code called "classroom management" that "helped me function" as a substitute teacher in the classrooms where I taught.

This code, in its most direct expression, is the lesson plan, but it's more than a lesson plan, because the most distinguishing
feature of the lesson plan is in how it implicates a series of gestures and postures constituting a classroom routine, that the substitute teacher is assumed to know already, or to find out by asking others. Knowing the implicit routine in a classroom appears, from my experience, to be more important the younger one's students are on any particular day of subbing. I often had to rely upon previous experience in performing the ritual of "calendar," which was (in Valley) very important in Kindergarten or 1st grade, and became less important in the typical 2nd grade classroom.

I learned the risks of experimentation with routine in my assignment at the beginning of September 1997, a 4th and 5th grade "long term" assignment with a class that spoke almost no English and a hard-to-guess amount of Spanish, but I was willing to put up with the great uncertainty of each day because I felt that I could behave as an authoritarian teacher were I to need to do this in order to get control of my classroom, that I could "get by" with some non-threatening measures to control my classroom, despite the generally "controlled" feel of the other classrooms at that school. I tried to get students to sit in a circle and to discuss matters of school, to get the attention of the class, but they were more interested in talking to each other. In the end, what my students seemed to fall into was a loud and disorganized style of "learning" where they would get up out of their seats and wander around the classroom, playing. By the time I really developed the longing for classroom control above
all else, I was unwilling to do the hard work to "discipline" the students, because I was unsure that I was succeeding in gaining their attention in any "non-disciplinary" way. I felt like I didn't know yet how to be anything better than a bad disciplinary teacher with these students, when I wanted to be a "good teacher," a teacher who taught something with serious content, but also a teacher who could manage a classroom. I concluded that my poor knowledge of classroom management was my undoing in that situation.

I felt that the more days one is a substitute in a single classroom, the more one has to learn the codes of "classroom management," because in shorter assignments one could usually rely upon a disciplinary pattern, that there would more likely be a short lesson plan for a shorter assignment, and furthermore it would be likely that the regular teacher would have a pattern of classroom management that would hold for the one day he or she was not there. But when one is in a longer assignment, one is more liable to learn the disciplinary patterns and other codes of classroom management, and to become more like a regular teacher. And, furthermore, these codes appear to follow, to a certain extent, a logic that encourages privatization while discouraging publicity. So, even though I didn't successfully imitate a successful teacher when presented with an opportunity to do so, my findings about classroom life showed a tendency with political implications. I will talk about these private versus public implications later -- here I wish to underscore the concept
of classroom management as a set of codes, codes supposedly hidden in the existential situation of the committed classroom teacher, that is supposed to signify success for teachers, leaving for the last part of this text the implications for publicity.

As a general rule, as I said earlier, classroom management becomes the name for the key to understanding teaching as the tenure of the teacher in any particular single classroom increases, from the day position of the substitute (where the lesson plan offers some advice for classroom management, where the regular teacher is "still in charge" despite her/his absence that day, and where the task-at-hand is "getting through the day" and thus extraordinary), to the commitment faced by the long-term sub (where the sub is in essence a "regular teacher").

My discussion of the significance of the lesson plans I acquired, in Chapter 4, showed the importance of teacher directions in the life of short-term substitute teachers facing classrooms full of students that have become more-or-less "disciplined" to follow the directions for classroom ritual that had been arranged by the regular teacher. Here I will try to address the more general concerns about teaching of classroom management, a concern not necessarily faced by short-term subs in the same way it is faced by regular teachers. To tell the truth, there were one-day assignments where the children I was placed in charge of appeared to be in a state of near-rebellion, and thus classroom management appeared as an important thing for me to understand as a short term sub.
There was, for instance, a one-day assignment I had substituting for Mr. ****'s class, a 5th grade class I had to tend for a day very late in the 1996-1997 school year, which wouldn't watch the movie I was supposed to show them, wouldn't do the work I assigned, and insisted on a "free time" ritual which had some basis for being "normal" for them -- but what they insisted on doing, during this "free time," was going outside and tearing up the lawn in the playground, and throwing grass at each other. Many of the students in this class also claimed to have a strong disliking to me personally, the reason for which I never quite understood, in only being able to spend one day with them. I remember returning to the classroom with the students, keeping them at an arm's distance at the end of the day to avoid being ridiculed by them too much further, and being greeted by Mr. **** himself, who immediately engaged a conversation with one of the hardest-to-persuade students, a young woman who wouldn't do what I told her to do, who said she wouldn't come to school on a particular day, and was at that point tentatively suspended by Mr. ****, who said, "OK, if you don't come in with the paper, you can't attend school unless you have it signed by your parents" or something along those lines. So, upon having heard that, I had the feeling that the difficulty I was having in getting students to follow orders that day was a difficulty the regular teacher also experienced. In future experiences of whole-class refusal to perform a task, I learned to be flexible in my understanding of what the class could do, often ignoring the
lesson plan entirely for the sake of creating peace between myself and the students.

But with Mr. ****'s class I might make the rule a bit more tentative, and argue that, typically, the sub needs more classroom management skills in a longer assignment because a longer assignment implies more discretion to shape "his (her) class" on the part of the sub, rather than the sub's leaning on a lesson plan, a discipline plan, and a prior arrangement of classroom materials and personal classroom relationships. Nevertheless, it appeared as if the instructions to the sub amounted to this hidden "map" of classroom management, a map that books about classroom management attempt to provide.

What did apply, however, was that my skill at making the best of "classroom management" in any substitute teaching situation depended on my level of understanding of the ritual life of the classroom. And to understand this ritual life also meant understanding my role within it.

What I understood, in the final analysis, about my role, was that the substitute teacher is always to a certain extent what Victor Turner would call a liminoid figure, within a context that has been semi-tribalized, laden with status symbols and "disciplinary" communications, for the sake of classroom management. When seen as a liminoid figure, the latent politics of the sub's subbing will become apparent.

My understanding of the sub as liminoid figure is accomplished through a translation from the discourse of
education, the discourse of classes, activities, and curricula, to the discourse of symbolic anthropology, the discourse of rituals, myths, and tribes. The typical class, most principally the typical elementary school class, is a tribe of sorts, a tribe brought together by administrative means, and this tribe exists to follow a myth, the curriculum, that is to be illustrated performatively through the rituals known as "classroom activities." Classroom management is the force that creates the ritual bond, the "organic solidarity" of the classroom a la Durkheim, and the authorities presume that in the classroom context that this organic solidarity is supposed to originate in the efforts of the teacher. The way classroom management is handled in classrooms can have a latent political meaning, as one can understand from a reading of Chapter 2 of Paulo Freire's *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* -- there it is shown that an education that silences students and commands them to believe in their own powerlessness before the received word of the teacher is politically different from an education that would try to empower the student to create a more egalitarian society. So what does classroom management mean to the sub as liminal figure, and how is that political? In the hierarchical context that I understand the school system, the substitute teacher is a convenience of the principal, who cannot find a teacher to instruct a particular classroom on a particular day, and for some students, the sub is a liminoid object, a symbol of play and of choice, to the students, whose routine has been disrupted.
by a teacher who cannot behave exactly as the regular teacher behaves.

The substitute-teacher role as liminoid object become significant in terms of "student-centered" education, a type of education (different from Paulo Freire's idea of "problem-posing education," but more about this later) which I will elaborate below. When the substitute teacher is asked (by the lesson plan) to arrange student-centered education, the element of "choice" that appears to students with the substitute teacher is incorporated into the student-centered activity, because student-centered activities incorporate "choice," or some sort of liminoid aspect of schooling, into the performance of the activity. (My experience at Valley USD and other districts would seem to indicate that this form of education is most common in Kindergarten and first grade, possibly due to the pressures of standardized testing (in this case the STAR test (http://www.startest.com/), the standardized test given to grades 2-12 in California starting in the 1997-1998 school year) and popular notions of "traditional schooling" upon the school definitions of classroom success.) Student-centered education can make the substitute teacher into a resource more readily than teacher-centered education, and this has some latent political importance for educational systems whose members share a dependency on substitutes and a concern for the efficiency with which their students learn a curriculum.
Classroom management has become, to be sure, the "key word" describing the investment of classroom ritual with its ultimate meaning, whether that ultimate meaning be described as "learning," or "success," or the making of a coherent "class" of students through the interaction of students and teachers who have been brought together by administrative means. As Robert Di Giulio points out in his book Positive Classroom Management, research clearly shows that students learn more — and they learn more efficiently — in smooth-running classrooms. In a recent analysis of 50 years of educational research, of the 28 factors evaluated, classroom management had the greatest effect on school achievement... classroom management affects learning more than factors such as home environment, cognitive processes, school climate, school policies, and parental support (Di Giulio, p. 5)

So the research record weighs heavily in favor of the concept of classroom management, as a key term in understanding the causes of the attributed successes of classroom ritual.

Furthermore, a dissertation on substitute teachers, "The Perceived Importance of Selected Teacher Functions in Substitute Teacher Training Programs As Viewed by High School Principals, Classroom Teachers, and Substitute Teachers," written in 1990, concluded that training substitute teachers in classroom management was considered important by "high school
principals, classroom teachers, and substitute teachers, regardless of the type of school district -- rural, suburban, or urban -- in which they work" (Adkins, 1990). So classroom management is generally considered a vital skill regardless of the tenure of the teacher using it.

The effect of this research record, its weight in analyzing the performances of regular teachers and the relative scarcity of the academic treatment of substitute teachers (and in library searches I saw rather little on that subject), means that books on classroom management are relatively easy to find, and in large number, in college libraries. Classroom management is also a common topic of books to be found on the shelves of textbooks to be purchased in college bookstores for classes given by education departments, so much so that one can assume that an intended audience of books on classroom management is teachers-in-training.

The social arrangement of "classroom management," in the physical setting of the classroom, is to be conveyed through a series of codes, and these codes can be classified as a set of genres of advice. These discourse genres of teacher advice, that fill the various books on classroom management, provide a clue to understanding what classroom management signifies to the authors who discuss it.

A literary review of classroom management texts will reveal five important genres of discourse about classroom management, all of them advice to teachers, as follows:
(A) advice on how to communicate properly to students, how to communicate "instruction" in the rituals of instruction

(B) advice on how to create an appropriate classroom environment by appropriate arrangement of material objects and appropriate use of scheduled classroom time

(C) advice on how to design classroom rituals by giving appropriate instructions

(D) appeals to teacher philosophies of student "control" and corresponding rituals of student behavior management, what one might call "teacher-centered educational ritual." These appeals are phrased in the discourse of a psychology that has been instrumentalized for such ritual purposes.

(E) ways of using teacher power to ritualize student-led learning initiatives, i.e. student-centered educational ritual.

Strictly speaking, a guide to classroom management cannot be "student-centered," since such guides are by definition written for an audience of teachers. Today, there are guides written for audiences of students on how to handle (and how to avoid) the ritual process of schooling; the most important of these that has come to my attention is Grace Llewellyn's The Teenage Liberation Handbook, and most of the thrust of Llewellyn's book is in showing teens how they can become home-schooled if they do not want to go to school anymore. There are of course other guides to how to think critically in school, and how to succeed at tests, but I read such books as lessons in internalized compliance, i.e. teacher-centered literature for students. Books such as The
Teenage Liberation Handbook, on the other hand, are offered directly to students for students, and so they offer a different discourse from that of student-centered guides to classroom management, which are for teachers. An examination of the literature on (teacher-centered) classroom management will buttress this dissertation's above categorization of genres of advice. But first, I will show how one book can exemplify all of the genres at once.

C.M. Charles and Gail W. Senter's Elementary Classroom Management, a text I found in the educational text section of a local university, is perhaps comprehensive in its gloss of these genres of advice. This book offers a guide to "classroom management" that can easily be recast in the terms of ritual performance and anthropology, though, strictly speaking, it offers a guide to classroom management strictly from a "management science" perspective -- my recasting of its discourse in terms of the the discourse of symbolic anthropology is to show that what classroom management aims for at the elementary level is the creation of an educational "tribe," the class.

Basically this book offers a laundry list of items to be mastered by new teachers, organized thusly by chapter: Chapter 1 of this book is an introductory chapter. Chapter 2 starts a discussion of how to lay out the school year, i.e. the overall ritual, including the curriculum, the overall symbolic hagiography of the class (B). Chapters 3, 4, and 5 discuss the overall environment, the matter of how a classroom society, or tribe, is to be physically
and socially organized (B). Chapters 6 and 7 discuss the creation of work routines, the setup of the primary rituals of the classroom (C). Chapter 8 is about managing studying behavior, which is that quality of formality that accrues to the non-liminal rituals of a tribe, when the status structure holds (C). Chapter 9 is about assessment, and assessment is important as a way of fitting students into an overall status structure (in a preliminary way; grading and retention policies are decidedly more important in middle school and high school), but also, assessment is important because it measures to what extent the students have gained a knowledge of the curriculum, the institutional myth that is to be learned in classroom literature (D). Chapters 10-12 discuss in what ways one is to best communicate with students, parents, and school personnel (A), important in the way in which school communication is to reinforce the status structure of the school.

So the various chapters of a standard manual of classroom management offer advice as to how to conduct the communicative rituals of the school year, in the genres I mentioned above. Other standard manuals offer the same genres of advice, and a brief cross-section of the literature will bear this out. Some are more student-centered, having more of (E), and others are more teacher-centered, having more of (D). Other books in "classroom management" also use these themes: Beatrice S. Fennimore's *Student-Centered Classroom Management* and James S. Cangelosi's *Classroom Management Strategies* are almost
entirely a discussion of how best to communicate to students, though Fennimore's book is initially concerned with the experience of the students whereas Classroom Management Strategies is oriented toward "gaining the cooperation of students," as the title says. Jones and Jones' textbook Comprehensive Classroom Management is about communication also, but with a strong emphasis upon using one's communicative behaviors to control students. A collection of authors (Evertson, Emmer, Clements, and Worsham), have a guide titled Classroom Management for Elementary Teachers that is largely centered upon using psychology for control purposes (D), though there are chapters to this book on "Organizing Your Classroom and Supplies (B)" and "Communication Skills for Teaching (A)," and the psychology recommended is fleshed out in ritual scenarios (C), involving seatwork, group work, and "centers." The same authors have a similar book titled Classroom Management for Secondary Teachers, organized in a similar way. Levin and Nolan's Principles of Classroom Management seeks to take the varying approaches and combine them into a do-it-yourself "decision-making model," emphasizing that classroom management is a problem involving (D), teacher use of psychology to ward off unwanted student behaviors.

On the other hand, the Learning Library's collaboration titled Classroom Management is a combination of suggestions about how to create an attractive classroom and about how to organize effective classroom rituals; its advice about student
discipline is student-centered to a certain extent, but with an emphasis upon designing a ritual that will allow "students to learn to work together successfully," indicating a prior teacher arrangement of co-operative learning situations. (I will discuss the tension between this type of classroom management and the type of classroom management that relies upon (D) in the next chapter.) Classroom Management's advice is this regard is heavily contextualized; its focus is upon my category (C), offering advice as to how to design a classroom ritual for specific classrooms. Hal Malehorn's Elementary Teacher's Classroom Management, on the other hand, is heavily weighted toward suggestions for how to create a good classroom environment.

My own reading of the "genre" scheme above is that, although different categories of advice may have different levels of importance in any particular manual, they all point to a central necessity; that represented by "category C," the construction and performance of classroom ritual. Teachers succeed in following curricula, and substitute teachers succeed in following lesson plans, to the extent to which they can successfully conduct classroom rituals. In the paragraphs below, I will use one of the above "typical" sources of classroom management narrative to understand how such narrative can function additively as strategies of ritual planning, how mastery of the communicative and physical environments, a successful "following" of the advice in discourses (A) and (B) and some form of advice using either or both of (D) or (E) are prior (and ongoing) necessary conditions.
before a teacher can follow (C), advice on how to construct rituals that one's class will successfully follow. So the integrative discourse of classroom management, the one that incorporates all the others, is the discourse of how to create rituals.

So what types of rituals are considered in books of "classroom management"? In constructing a typology of ritual, I would start with the basic elements of "postures and gestures" used to capture the physical and symbolic aspects of ritual in Ronald Grimes' *Beginnings in Ritual Studies*. Charles and Senter, in *Elementary Classroom Management*, see ritual as a rather complex thing in an elementary school classroom, but encapsulate it in chapter 9, "Managing Students at Work." Behind each ritual, I argue, is a norm of student behavior that will allow communication during the ritual to take place, and in each case I will attempt to specify the norm at work.

I am choosing Charles and Senter's book not because of any special attributes it might have, but because I view it as typical of classroom management books that are offered to students in collegiate teacher training programs, i.e. future teachers. I found Charles and Senter's book in a college bookstore in the education section of the text section. Most such books offer the idea of classroom management as a laundry list of preparations one needs to make in order to be a successful teacher. Below, I recast *Elementary Classroom Management* in the discourse of "instructional ritual" in order to show what metanarratives direct it.
First, Charles and Senter specify as rituals "opening activities" which can be a complex ritual drama involving the singing of songs and the playing of music and the placing of dates upon a calendar, (Charles and Senter, pp.112-113). Volunteers are often chosen from the student bodies, which are sitting on the carpet. Sometimes norms for calendar will appear partially optional, such as when the class is singing or dancing or walking around the room, shaking hands and saying "good morning," as was the ritual in one classroom I taught; not everyone in the class has to sing or dance or shake hands in order to allow the class to follow the norm and successfully perform the ritual. Necessary norms for calendar might be "don't interrupt the teacher" and "raise your hand before talking," since the only type of talk that will facilitate such rituals consists of questions addressed to the teacher, or requests to volunteer for an activity, and in raising one's hand, a student warns the class that he or she will be talking. Such norms will also be appropriate for the ritual of "instructions for doing assigned work" (pp. 113-114), since teachers talk and students listen for that ritual. The communicative principle at work in specifying these norms is one I have asked Kindergartners often: "Can you listen and talk at the same time?" to which the scripted answer is, "no, you can't."

Rituals of "movement in the room" and "obtaining, using, and replacing materials" (pp. 114-117) need to be governed by norms of "respect for the classroom" and "staying on task" that will specify guidelines regarding going to the bathroom,
sharpening pencils, using glue, scissors, rulers, and other important classroom equipment.

Rituals of work involve, of course, the ritual the teacher must use to organize it (p. 118) and rituals of "monitoring" (pp. 119-120) where the teacher allots disciplinary duties such as taking attendance and caring for equipment to the students; but in a more complex vein, there is the ritual of performing classwork, which is listed in the chapter titled "Managing instruction." Here the authors identify "two instructional approaches," direct teaching and facilitative teaching, which are categorized in terms of "instructional strategies." Direct teaching is associated with the "instructional strategies" of "clinical instruction" (teacher talk followed by seatwork, followed by a question and answer period followed by more seatwork), "advance organization" (teacher talk followed by seatwork), "concept attainment" (teacher talk followed by seatwork followed by student presentation), and "mastery learning" (seatwork with teacher talk in the form of tutoring). So we have five basic rituals to be performed within the ambit of "direct teaching": teacher talk, seatwork, student presentation, question and answer, tutoring. All of which require students to be silent and "on-task" (listening or working, which usually means inscribing marks on pieces of paper) when they are not performing toward the entire class, for successful ritual performance.

Facilitative teaching is said by Charles and Senter to use two primary strategies: "inquiry," which involves student rituals
that will "gather, verify, and interpret (and explain) information" (student observing, writing, and reading) and "cooperative learning," which involves groups of students in teamwork (writing and reading while talking). In cooperative learning, each student must perform his or her assigned role within the group for the ritual to be successful.

The facilitative teaching rituals involve a considerable amount of teacher power over students, to assure that students perform the appropriate rituals to maintain "on-task behavior," but they also require students to have a certain amount of power over themselves. Inquiry, for instance, requires a particular perspective upon the subject at hand; as the authors say in advertising inquiry as a good strategy for teachers to direct: "The strategy encourages open-mindedness, as students frequently encounter conflicting information and opinions (Charles and Senter, p. 100). Cooperative learning, as well, requires students to work together well, which requires them to learn important skills of cooperation, but which can't merely be scripted as a contrived dialogue that teachers will require students to enact.

The role of scripts in the performance of classroom ritual becomes apparent once we try to imagine norms governing successful performance of facilitative learning rituals. Rituals of direct teaching can be made to follow a script, where the student communicative behavior that follows the norm involves either silence or saying what the teacher wants the students to say. Rituals of facilitative learning need something of a script as well,
but they also appear (as well) to demand independent communication from students. Both types of ritual involve what Courtney Cazden (Cazden, pp. 99-110) would call "communication as scaffold," teacher communication of a framework for performance, for the sake of coercing the student production of "learning" communications.

This topic, of the successful performance of ritual within the classroom, involving the successful imposition of the communicative scaffold upon the students by the teacher, appears to me to be the primary ability involved in "classroom management." Often, "classroom management" is taken to be synonymous with "classroom discipline," but as the chapter on "Managing Student Behavior" makes clear, classroom discipline is about misbehavior, and misbehavior is serious because "misbehavior disrupts learning" and "misbehavior disrupts teaching," (Charles and Senter, p. 133) both of which are represented in the classroom by the rituals described above. So, the proceeding discussion in the chapter on "Managing Student Behavior" is also about preconditions for the maintenance of the classroom ritual.

So, on the one hand, classroom management can appear as teacher imposition of classroom ritual. But furthermore, there is a dialectic of power in classroom interactions, a sense of negotiation between adult and student for power over the rituals of learning, that one can see illustrated in the discourse of some books on classroom management. Weinstein and Migriano's
Elementary Classroom Management is a classroom management text which discursively elaborates upon the problem of managing a physically-existent classroom. This book starts out with the assertion that one of the primary qualities of the classroom is that "teachers work with captive groups of students (6)."

However, having denied the contribution of the student to the formation of the classroom setting, the book later illustrates the discourse of exemplary teachers who involve students in learning to "exercise some choice (Weinstein and Migriano, p. 79)." So even though it is asserted factually in the above book that public school students are "captive," there is some move to allow students to exercise responsibility within that captivity.

A book on classroom management that is more directly centered upon the invocation of "control," of category (D) of classroom management advice, is Bob F. Steere's Becoming an Effective Classroom Manager. Steere is really interested in justifying classroom discipline, in finding models taken from science to show the best way to keep order in classrooms. His main consideration is phrased in the discourse of mechanical physics:

Classrooms are largely managed by forceful efforts, some of which are less obvious than others. Force is defined here as the energy that is brought to bear upon a situation (Steere, p. 6)
and his notions of how to use this force are psychological. The discussion of control in Steere's book reflects Foucault's notion of "discipline" in *Discipline and Punish*.

Steere's second chapter is a review of various psychologically-based marketings of classroom discipline, from Haim Ginott to Abraham Maslow to Rudolf Dreikurs to William Glasser to Lee Canter to Frederic Jones. Like many books with "classroom management" in their titles, Steere's book offers 31 flavors of psychology for that the reader may want believe in when trying methods of control upon students. These authors appeal to the notion that teachers can understand student behavior, appeal to common motivators of student behavior, and thus "psych" students into behaving well. Many of these same names of psychologists are also given in *Comprehensive Classroom Management*, and the psychological discussion of students and of management in classroom was an important topic in at least two classes I was required to take when I was applying for a teaching credential in 1988 and 1989. So there is a large market for the discourse of psychology within education, as a talisman granting teachers power over students who would otherwise disrupt classroom ritual.

The remainder of Steere's book is concerned with efficient expedition of the techniques that supposedly have this basis in psychology (a basis that is not proven but, curiously, left up to teacher discretion). Steere devotes an entire chapter to "time on
task," a term that recalls (and, in this instance, means) the creation of "docile bodies" in Foucault's *Discipline and Punish*. Foucault specifies that the creation of docile bodies has two basic compositions, modeled upon the categories of dynamics and thermodynamics as basic categories of Newtonian physics:

> Discipline is (not) simply an art of distributing bodies, of extracting time from them and accumulating it, but of composing forces in order to obtain an efficient machine. (Foucault, 1977, p. 164)

So, according to Foucault, discipline imposes problems of distributing matter in time-space (dynamics), and of making energy do work efficiently (thermodynamics). The same thing exists in Steere's literature, although Steere's literature is not so much about making energy work in terms of converting heat to force, as it is about making students do their assigned work efficiently. Distributing matter in time-space and arranging its forces is indeed the subject of Steere's book. There is a chapter in Steere's book that is about "time on task," and there is a further chapter explaining how to arrange the spaces and time-divisions in a classroom day in order to improve the classroom's measured efficiency. The chapter on "time on task" reads like a long "laundry list" of recommended teacher postures subtitled "Approaches to Increasing Time on Task" (with no guarantees of the effectiveness of such approaches). This is preceded, and followed, by directions for how to get a quantitative assessment
of what portion of instructional time has actually been spent "on task.". I will quote a chunk of the laundry list at random:

- Have all students perform in unison.
- Require the remainder of the class to read silently while one child reads aloud.
- Use more frequent shifts of activities as opposed to long periods of just listening, copying, or completing multiple worksheets.
- Realize that busywork types of duplicating sheets may keep students occupied but are not worthy on-task assignments.
- When correcting a student, consider giving only a simple reprimand instead of a nagging sermon.
- Plan and structure the day so that necessary time is not lost because of poor directions, materials not readily accessible, procedures, traffic jams, handling in materials, and so forth. (Steere, pp. 92-93)

Similarly, Foucault addresses the genesis of the disciplinary school (according to the Prussian model of schooling, the model historically adopted by American public schools) in the asking of the question of "How can one organize profitable durations," (Foucault, 1977, p. 157) and this is a question that is to be answered by the device called "exercise (Foucault, 1977, p. 161)."

Steere's aphorisms of advice all are about exercise, and the type of exercise that Steere implicitly thinks is "worthy." In Steere's model, time is to be drawn away from the other minutiae of
schooling and oriented toward scripted ritual devoted toward "task." Task is being "engaged" in "assigned activities" for Steere; what this is supposed to mean (besides paying attention to "the subject" of instructional ritual, whatever that's supposed to be) is left as an open question. No explicit statement of why students should be in school is implied in his discussion of time on task. Being engaged for Steere (in his view of student behavior) is really defined as not being unengaged, which for Steere fits into four (really five) categories: students doing transitional activities, students preparing for instructional ritual, students socializing, students being disciplined, or students doing unoccupied observing. If students are not doing these above things, they are "on task."

There is something of a judgment about "task," here, however: Steere's definition of time on task is "the amount of time students spend on worthy tasks (Steere, p. 81). But, unfortunately for Steere's reader, he offers no description of the ideal worthy task (rather instead relying upon the typical task, "seatwork,")) nor any defined norm of worthiness; Steere's judgment is hidden (although he does appear to be implicitly endorsing the "privatized publicity" such as I observed at Southern Elementary, however, in his exclusion of "students socializing" as an on-task activity). Foucault, interestingly enough, accompanies his descriptions of the growth of the industrial process of creating docile bodies (Foucault, 1977, pp. 135-169) with no explicit normative advice either.
The point of my explication of Steere is to show that the Foucauldian discussion of the technique that is involved in creating docile bodies, in making people "shapable," has its component in the literature of "classroom management." When the discourse of "classroom discipline" in its teacher-centered sense is elaborated in logical form as "time on task" as Steere does, it is what Foucault calls "extracting time from bodies." and when it is unhindered by discussion of the necessity of student initiative in internalizing learning (Cazden, p. 108 for instance), what one reads is a list of directions for operating the classroom as a production process for a culture industry that uses power to manipulate bodies with the notion of time on task, without assessing the task that has been assigned according to any ethical ideal of schooling.

The question prompted by books like Steere's is the question of what actual definition of "education" does his technical description of classroom discipline support. If teachers were to consider promoting "education" as the process of attaining responsible adulthood in today's world, would Steere's book be their guide to classroom management?

But even if one were to reject Steere's discourse of classroom management in order to reproblemize "what education is for," there is a considerable justification for putting the classroom teacher in the role of manager, and it comes from the economic-administrative hierarchy. One might say that, with respect to the "regular teacher's" planning of classroom ritual,
orienting classroom activity according to the requirements of the curriculum (regardless of who plans it) ostensibly represents a standard for student success, and that "unit planning" according to "learning objectives" is an activity that is supposed to combine curriculum with classroom management, in order to justify the teacher's preparation of classroom ritual to the adult population whose political power is brought to bear upon public education. Thus managerialism in public schooling is justified by the politics of the status quo.

But teacher justification of classroom ritual isn't necessarily aimed at the children themselves, the recipients of this education, rather it is aimed at some instrumental adult notion of what children are to learn that is a ritual that can be performed with a script, where children are to remain on-task in terms of their following the teacher's script, paying attention to the teacher's subject in some measurable way. Public school "education" can thus be aimed entirely at the teacher's success in maintaining classroom management while performing scripted instructional rituals. The danger is that real student learning, student capacity for making meaning of instructional ritual, can instead focus on what Kris Gutierrez et al. (1995) call the "student counterscript," while still allowing the instructional ritual to have a meaning for the teacher, to symbolize student learning while creating a separate, perhaps secret, discourse of student learning content. Gutierrez et al. explain:
Even in a classroom where procedures and talk are strictly monitored, the teacher does not succeed in completely stifling student voices and capacities for meaning making. Although students in... class are unwilling to directly challenge the teacher script, occasional student utterances take the form of a student counterscript that appears to challenge the teacher's participation rules. (Gutierrez et al., p. 422)

The counterscript exists in a social space Gutierrez et al., borrowing from Goffman, calls the "underlife." Brooke (1987) explains the underlife most succinctly:

Exactly because organizations offer definitions of identity, they also offer individuals the opportunity to respond to the definitions in creative ways. Because definitions of self exist in organizations, individuals can give information about how they see themselves by rejecting the definition offered. Institutional underlife is exactly such a case: actors in an institution develop behaviors which assert an identity different from the one assigned them. (Brooke, p. 143)

The danger, as Gutierrez et al. (1995) warns, is that the student role within the totally-scripted classroom may become a charade, and both script and counterscript become forms of "procedural display," with the counterscript becoming the opportunity within this display for "making meaning." Furthermore, the scripted classroom may create "subjugated
perspectives," owned by students who offer neither script nor counterscript to the classroom, and who are shunned by both the student collective and the teacher.

Gutierrez's example of the "subjugated perspective" is a student she observed whom she names "Nora," who has been required to sit in the classroom, isolated and away from the other students, and whose classroom utterances are self-marginalizing within the classroom situation because they do not follow the teacher's script. The owner of the "subjugated perspective" is the big loser in this form of education, instructional ritual performed entirely according to a teacher script. Nora is characterized as a failing student and a potential highschool dropout.

All of which might beg the question of why completely-scripted educational ritual is so often seen as successful. One answer to this question might be that completely-scripted educational rituals can be successful when students have the necessary background to understand the teacher script and the necessary willpower to appreciate the script and learn from it. Another reason for the apparent success of such ritual is that it might be viewed as part and parcel of a particular role of schooling, that is to say, schooling might be assumed under such a (completely-scripted) model as "keeping students down." In short, and to bring Gutierrez's analysis into an earlier thread of this dissertation, some forms of scripted schooling (especially those characterized by the "rigid system of control" Gutierrez cites as characterizing her example of the subjugated
perspective) may merely produce what Foucault calls "delinquency" (Foucault, 1977, pp. 264-272) with respect to prisons. The school system that operates primarily through such forms of classroom management may produce docile bodies, but it also experiences bouts of "delinquency" coming from such bodies, a delinquency that can function within the overall school system as part of a "general tactics of subjection," an economy of rule-breaking, as it does in Foucault's observation of prisons. (Foucault, 1977, p. 272).

A script, of course, is important and necessary in establishing some sort of order to instructional ritual. Scripts such as the lesson plans I discussed above were and are important in helping teachers such as myself create activities for students. Scripts, however, do not have to establish a "general tactics of subjection" within instructional ritual, and can be used in several ways, as I will observe in the next chapter.

My own experience in observing classrooms, within Valley USD and elsewhere, would tend to support my suspicion that the counterscript, the talk that occurs between students independently of teacher talk, takes the form of a constant urge to talk in class elicited by the elementary school students I observed/taught, an urge that is expended in discussion, whispering, even hand signals between students, in classrooms from first or second grade onward, in every opportunity where students do not take as a situation of punishment, quiet learning, conditioned silence, or sleep. In this light, educators ignore the
counterdiscourse in their classrooms (and their root causes) at their peril.

My experience in substitute teaching in special education classrooms at Valley Unified School District (in these cases I am referring to classrooms labeled SDC, special day classes) is that, when there is no aide actively "keeping discipline," the student counterscript appears to dominate over and above any simple invitation I might make to them to "do work." This counterscript becomes something I observe, when I am the substitute teacher, as a form of oral learning that goes on separately from regular classroom activity, carrying greater significance to the students themselves than being in school. Presumably, resistance to or inability to do grade-level work according to the regular-education script put the students in special education programs classified as "significantly below grade level" by whatever standard Valley USD used. Two one-day assignments, in two separate SDC classrooms, where this counterdiscourse was dominated by the use of "put-downs," dissuaded me from accepting most assignments in special education at Valley. The counterscript was in those cases something that scared me, as a particular given outcome of a schooling process.

The view of repressive, scripted classrooms offered by Gutierrez et al. (1995) revisits in communicative form the bad infinity described in Peter McLaren's *Schooling as a Ritual Performance*, where student participation marks a "streetcorner state" which is in constant competition within the classroom with
a "student state" to be imposed by teachers under the pretext of the instructional script. The two student "states" described by McLaren aren't analytical opposites, and don't necessarily have to be separate: curriculum could be integrated and reoriented toward student-chosen and community-oriented goals of success, to make the "liminoid" figure of the teacher (or substitute teacher) into an educational success, and to allow the ritual and communicative goals and requirements of classroom management, choice, play, and community (i.e. public, as opposed to "privatized public," as I observed in the class at Southern I taught at the beginning of the 1997-1998 school year) appreciation of learning to all be met together. This should ideally happen whether the regular teacher or a substitute were there to "guide" (i.e. be legally responsible for) the ritual.

So there is a political form to "classroom management" as it is laid out in these texts; and such form has to do with creating a social world where students obey a ritual manager in a way that is wholly separate from their tendency to behave in situations that aren't instructional ritual. Classroom management is the strategy that teachers are required to use in order to impose order upon the encapsulated the schooling environment, created with the separation of schooling from the business of the rest of the social world, and formed in a bureaucratic imitation of that social world. Seymour Sarason discovers the political importance of this encapsulation when he says that:

171
I became aware of the very unsettling fact that my thinking, like that of everybody else, rested on an axiom that wholly or in large part was invalid. The axiom was that education (schooling) best takes place in encapsulated classrooms in encapsulated schools. So... I began to examine seriously the implications of the axiom's invalidity, and then I wrote *Schooling in America: Scapegoat and Salvation* (1983). Very briefly, I argued as follows:

1. Schools generally are and have been uninteresting places for students and others. They are intellectually boring places.
2. In this century, developments in the mass media, and their ever-growing influence (especially through television), have created for young people a wide, unbridgeable, experienced gulf between two worlds: that of the classroom and school and the "real" world. In terms of interest and challenge, the former cannot hold a candle to the latter.
3. By virtue of their encapsulation, physical and otherwise, schools have two virtually impossible and related tasks: to simulate the conditions that engender interest, challenge, and curiosity, and to make the acquisition of knowledge and cognitive skills personally important and meaningful.
4. As long as we uncritically accept the axiom and think of reform only in terms of altering classrooms and schools --
what goes on in them -- educational reform is doomed.
(Sarason, p.111-112)

Admittedly this is a distorted picture -- but for those the system has classified as "at risk," it carries with it a kernel of truth. Classroom management is the teacher's alibi for failing to meet the "impossible tasks" Sarason mentions -- whether such tasks are in fact possible or impossible with respect to any particular school situation is a question I will leave open. And, by extension, it's the school's alibi for compartmentalizing the rituals of school within classrooms, because classrooms haven't so far been replaced by anything else.
CHAPTER 7
"SEMI-CRITICAL CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT":
THE DIVERSIFICATION OF A DISCURSIVE FORM

In my own classroom management practice as a substitute teacher, and especially in the disastrous twenty-two days I was trying unsuccessfully to teach in a classroom at Southern Elementary School, I went in search of a "critical" pattern of classroom management, keeping in mind my need to conform to normal classroom practices as deemed appropriate by the school and District hierarchies, and the students' needs for respect and care, needs which would have had the ultimate primacy were I actually to find such a thing as "critical classroom management." In short, if I had to apply classroom management as an alibi for an understocked classroom full of undermotivated and rebellious children, I would want to apply a form of classroom management that was respectful and caring.

I am calling this genre of classroom management discourse "semi-critical," because this discourse leaves as uncriticized the basic idealism that inspires public school teachers to conduct instructional ritual; that education can be a joy as it is experienced in such an environment, and can lead to emotional and/or intellectual and/or financial success in later life. Authors
such as John Holt (Instead of Education) or John Gatto (Dumbing us Down) argue instead against school per se, that schooling is bad for children, from the perspective of advocates of the homeschooling movement. The reader identity set up by such texts is less distinctly that of "schoolteacher" than the identity set up by a classroom management book, since they conclude by recommending a different sociocultural practice than the one performed by schoolteachers. Semi-critical classroom management books instead criticize the social, political, and ritual basis of repressive instructional ritual in order to re-make (or rehabilitate) such ritual into a ritual capable fulfilling idealistic notions of community possessed by teachers, to the extent possible within real-life teaching situations in public schools.

I will not discuss comprehensively the varieties of semi-critical classroom management that exist in today's market for advice to teachers. Instead, I will limit my discussion to three texts on classroom management that I found in the teaching environments I experienced as a substitute, and two formative psychological guides to semi-critical classroom management that informed my initial interest in a career in teaching. Of the classroom management texts, the first one, Alfie Kohn's Beyond Discipline, was one I discovered in the office of the assistant principal of Local Elementary School, when I was working there; the second text is Jeanne Gibbs' Tribes, a text I have already mentioned; the third text is Moorman and Dishon's Our
Classroom, which I discovered in a cabinet of a classroom in Local Elementary where I was working.

I formed an audience for a particular type of classroom text, or a consumer for a text to be consumed, the "critical classroom management" text. Largely, I pursued this path because the changes I would have to make in my own habits of behavior to become a disciplinarian required too much effort and did not seem to me to be worthwhile in terms of my overall deportment-toward-others. When I found behavior that was "out of context" (or "disruptive") within the ritual of a lesson I was being asked to conduct (and this often took the form of loud talking or fighting during time reserved for seatwork), I would usually try to resolve the conflict between the regular teacher's expectations for student behavior and actual student behavior by dialoguing with students about what was expected of them by others, and about what they could do in the classroom without "getting me in trouble." But often I was asked to be the figure of disciplinary control myself, and in such situations I felt attracted to the sociocultural practices implied in texts of semi-critical classroom management.

When I was given primary "command" of a classroom within the implicit hierarchy of the system, most notably at the beginning of the 1997-1998 school year, I faced the problem inventing a standard for these children to meet, a standard I felt confident holding up, given my relative unwillingness to adopt the discourse of standards Southern Elementary School marketed
to its teachers. The classroom materials I was given for this class, at the beginning of the year, were too complex for the children; when I assigned them textbook materials to read and textbook comprehension questions to answer, the answers I received to the textbook questions made no sense, and revealed a general student incomprehension of the material. (Well, maybe one or two of the 5th grade students, in a classroom which had nine 5th graders and nineteen 4th graders, understood the textbook work.) The series of subskills which were to be mastered, which the school had its own name for, did not appear to be given any particular motivating force, as if I was supposed to know beforehand what motivated these students to comply with what I thought they would be bored by -- so there was a misunderstanding on my part as to what motivated the students.

What motivated the students in the midst of the chaos of Southern Elementary, I concluded in the end, was doing simple math problems and handwriting busywork (while talking to their friends and behaving chaotically), and reducing my teaching practices to adapt to this situation, I concluded, did not interest me as much as the possibility of getting a "better" job. Perhaps it might be easy to accuse me of an elitist disdain for these often rebellious students in the situation I found myself; nevertheless, my attitude was one it was easy for me to retreat into, given my lack of support as a long-term substitute teacher and the difficulty of getting them to do the various activities I had planned for them. Reading to them was an impossibility; P.E. was
chaotic and resulted in my students scattering to the various corners of the playground, most of them talking and/or fighting in small groups; they did not like to do creative writing, reading, or drawing, with anything resembling a sustained effort.

The closest thing I have encountered to a genuinely "critical" critique of the typical lore of classroom management is a book by Alfie Kohn called Beyond Discipline. As the cover illustrates, Kohn offers "a provocative challenge to the field of classroom management," and proposes a political difference in the way classrooms behave, "from compliance to community" as the book's subtitle says.

Alfie Kohn's book, according to his introduction, started with his quest to understand the secret of dealing with discipline problems, while observing classrooms. "My assumption was that I would learn more from seeing how talented practitioners responded to obnoxious behavior than I could from reading books on the subject." What he discovered, he says, is that discipline wasn't what these teachers were doing, that it in fact interfered with their goals. Kohn then goes into a long discussion of how the psychological "experts" in classroom discipline (especially Dreikurs, Canter, and Albert) are basically vindictive in their attitudes toward children, all the while attacking these "experts"' recommendations that teachers unthinkingly coerce children using threats and bribes.

Kohn wants to question why it is necessary "for teachers to be in control of their classrooms." (p 59), but then moves to an
argument for negotiation between students and teacher as the
main structure holding the classroom together, with a view
toward advertising "the practical advantage of letting children
make decisions" within this structure. This argument is
primarily addressed to experienced teachers, of course. Kohn's
ultimate aim within this argument is "building community," that
within this aim he wants to emphasize that "serious commitment
offers an invitation to move beyond discipline." (p. 107)

Kohn is well known as an advocate of freedom of choice for
children (see "Choices for Children," Phi Delta Kappan, September
1993, pp. 8-22), an opponent of competition (No Contest: The
Case against Competition), and a critic of external reinforcement
as a teacher strategy (Punished by Rewards): his primary
argument about classwork is that if one wants one's students to
do well in school, one should give students work that is fulfilling
in itself, rather than depending on external reinforcements to
goad students to work. (Kohn's endorsement of "choice" seems to
fit in well with the "liminoid" role I played at times as a
substitute, since what characterizes the "liminoid" is precisely
this element of choice). His suggestions all appear perfectly
reasonable, and might, according to the definition of classroom
management narrative posed above, be a model of classroom
management in themselves. However, in reading his book, I felt
tempted to ask questions about Kohn's ideas which would test
the extent to which they were possible in real-life public school
classrooms.
Kohn addresses critical questions of classroom management most directly. One matter at hand for Kohn is "why students should have a say" in the classroom ritual, about which he says:

...we can move on to consider the practical advantages of letting students make decisions. The first benefit is that giving them some say will make it more likely that they will do essentially what we want. Choice promotes compliance and minimizes misbehavior (Kohn, p. 81)

Kohn may be able to use this assertion to visualize a truly possible classroom (despite the overall framework of the factory of "docile bodies" that conditions the history of public schooling in America), but doesn't his assertion depend upon what it is that "we want"? If students are given rights to choose classroom activities, are they also more likely to boycott onerous state-mandated standardized tests, for instance, and isn't it also possible that some students will cling to an extended boycott of the schooling process itself, having been previously trained to dislike schooling and to perform its rituals only because they were deemed compulsory? I mention these possibilities especially in light of the freedom I granted my students at Southern Elementary School, which they used to conduct endless gossip sessions in which they, to a large extent, ignored my role as teacher of the classroom, but I also mention it because my example points up some of the real political conflicts inherent in empowering students. As a side note, one also sees these student-teacher conflicts confronted in books advertising "free
schooling," about private schools where students are given the freedom to reject instructional ritual altogether, if they so desire -- for instance, in A.S. Neill's *Summerhill*, students who rebel against classes and teachers, and how the school's headmaster Neill (himself) allowed such students to avoid schooling entirely, are described in great length. I do not foresee that as a substitute teacher I will be empowered to turn public schools into "free schools," but at any rate such schools advertise an increased ability to empower students, more than any of the schools I taught in.

Also, Kohn, like many writers of texts on classroom management, advocates the use of classroom meetings to resolve problems. But not among Kohn's visualizations of classroom problems is the possibility that the teacher may be too overburdened with existing relationships or conflicts between students, or "emotional baggage" students bring into classrooms, to be able to start a classroom meeting in the first place. And convening the meeting, it must be remembered, is a first step. Creating a classroom on Kohn's model requires teachers "to provide other things I've talked about in this book: the opportunity to make decisions, the caring and safe community, the valuable curriculum, and the social skills," and Kohn warns that "Without these things, chaos may turn out to be the alternative to control after all." But are teachers really powerful enough to create "caring and safe community," the power to make decisions that won't be self-destructive, a curriculum the
students will value, and social skills for students? Part of me supposes Kohn might want more management, and not less, that perhaps a social manager more powerful than a teacher (in certain contexts) might bring this "community": a principal, perhaps, or a superintendent, or a Congressmember powerful enough to channel urban aid to America's impoverished inner cities. Alfie Kohn offers an attractive argument telling us what we should want from schools, while being short on discussion of the obstacles we might face in getting there. Schooling remains problematic as an agency-in-itself for changing society. Kohn's best tactic, given his preference for negotiation as a strategy for social order, is in trying to negotiate with the reader as regards how much of his program the reader is willing to implement.

In light of the above discussion, the problems of classroom management may appear to many teachers to be onerous, difficult, and obliging the teacher to use extensive "emergency powers" in order to have a coherent classroom at all within the current political context, while at the same time these teachers might desire students empowered to solve their problems, an empowerment which isn't granted them if teachers are using these emergency powers. Thus I call the genre that I use to group Kohn's book "semi-critical classroom management."

Many of the writers in such a genre recognize, as did Kohn, that student initiative is the first step in any real learning process, and that such initiative can't be coerced out of students. Their texts are "semi-critical" because in applying them, a regular
teacher would have to compromise the goals of Kohn's ideal of community in order to create an expedient classroom order, given that public schools coerces children into an enclosure (Foucault, 1977, p. 141) and then asks them to conform to classroom order demands, curricular demands, standardized testing, and other legal demands which they may with justification consider unfair or otherwise not worth doing. (A substitute teacher would have more leeway to allow students freedom, but only to a certain extent).

Jeanne Gibbs' book *Tribes*, a book I cited earlier as a canonical guide to classroom management at Local Elementary School, is certainly a book of semi-critical classroom management. *Tribes* (when it isn't underlined, *Tribes* refers to the system in *Tribes* the book) is basically a system for implementing cooperative learning in the classroom, under a system where "the classroom is student-centered (people no longer relate primarily to the teacher, but work with peers)" and where teachers are to consider, "how can we help students formulate their own learning goals" (p. 25). The techniques of *Tribes* are centrally aimed at forming "community," the goal of *Tribes* and of Kohn's book as well. There are two main rituals indicated: 1) community circle, where all students and teachers sit in a circle, and where everyone takes turns speaking, one person at a time, all the way around the circle. There are four norms for the successful performance of community circle:
1. Attentive Listening: not merely being quiet, but "letting others know that they have been heard and checking for understanding"

2. Appreciation/No Put-Downs: "avoiding negative remarks, name-calling, hurtful gestures and behaviors"

3. Right to pass: if you don't want to say anything, you merely say "pass" and it's the next person's turn

4. Mutual respect: "resolving conflicts that naturally emerge due to the differences among us."

These are referred to as "agreements," without consideration of the possibility that students may not (initially at least) agree to them. "Tribes agreements are very important and need to be posted in a prominent place in the classroom. The teacher asks people to help each other remember them at all times." (p. 75) So the book prescribes peer pressure between students as a way of binding these agreements.

The other form of Tribes organization, clearly, is the "tribe": the teacher is to split the class up into groups. Elementary school and middle school are to be grouped in groups of four and five. At Local, each group had a name and much classwork was to be done cooperatively, with "tribes" given responsibility for completing assignments. So what we have is a system that is open to democratic and communal organization, that is supposedly brought into being by teachers. A list of possible rituals for community circle, tribes, and other groupings is given at the back of the book. There are other tools, advertised in the
Tribes Web page (http://www.tribes.com/) for accomplishing this system.

As part of "my story" I tell the story of how, when I was given a long-term substitute teaching position at Southern Elementary, I found out, after about 20 days at the teaching position, how to properly enforce the system of "community circle" when I was doing it poorly all along. I needed to know what to do in case the system didn't catch on, because I was working with a classroom (at that time) that wasn't succeeding with what I was doing. The point I'm making in this chapter is that Tribes, though it may be "democratic education" in certain ways, might require an authoritarian teacher presence at the beginning of its implementation (under certain conditions) if community circle, the separation of the class into "tribes," etc. is to be made possible at all with certain students, most specifically the ones at Southern Elementary I describe above. Otherwise students who are repeatedly asked to sit in a circle will spend their time talking with their immediate friends, and attempts to get them to talk in front of the entire class will not succeed. Thus any possibility that students may have wished to resolve conflicts with other students through the community circle process, or to use the process to improve the quality of classroom activity, was abrogated through student rejection of the process itself.

I cite Tribes because it was used with especial thoroughness at Local Elementary, including (and I was allowed
to observe this) the ritual of the "put-down funeral," which ritualized the strategy of "putting down the put downs" given on p.368 of Tribes. Local Elementary made this into an elaborate ceremony involving (at times) nearly the entire school. In this ceremony (as I saw it performed), the classrooms would be brought out into a semicircle, where the assistant principal would talk with the students, identifying them by classroom and by name, and praising each of them, which would eventually lead to a whole-school ceremony where everyone would chant "NO PUT DOWNS!" and "WE HATE PUTDOWNS YES WE DO/ WE HATE PUTDOWNS HOW ABOUT YOU?" over and over again, in English and Spanish and Cambodian, with singing and clapping exercises as well. The final ceremony was when each classroom would present huge lists of put-downs, statements they thought derogatory, to the janitor, who would put them in a trashcan placed in the center of the semicircle, and burn them with a pocket lighter. A fire extinguisher was sitting next to the trashcan. New Orleans funeral music was played in the background throughout the ceremony. This was the ceremony used at Local to inculcate a low regard for derogatory statements in the student body.

A similar classroom management scheme to Tribes was used at another school in the Valley Unified School District, only this school employed a popular "semi-critical" system or ethos that was marketed to them as "Peacemakers," and which used a classroom meeting similar to the Community Circle used in
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**Tribes.** I did not, however, get to witness any elaborate disciplinary ceremonies at this school (outside of practice for 6th grade graduation, which looked to be a fairly standard ritual practice).

In the last analysis, I felt that Tribes was also used as a mechanism of classroom control, as was confessed to me by another teacher at Local. Another teacher said to me that "democratic education" was something they didn't do at Local Elementary. I concluded that sometimes "community building" can mean the building of a community where one person leads and everyone else follows. However, the use of Tribes at Local didn't appear to magically increase the "control" substitutes had over their classes, as my observations of substitute teachers (and I only had the opportunity to observe subs two or three times) at Local would seem to show -- substitutes were sometimes ignored by the upper-grade classes I observed. My own experience substitute teaching at Local would seem to confirm that I had as little authority at Local as I did anywhere else in the District, although it appeared at times that classrooms at Local Elementary went rather smoothly because the teachers had worked hard to prepare the class for the appearance of a substitute, and because there didn't appear to be much conflict between students at Local.

It's likely, however, that the use of Tribes at Local helped create an atmosphere of harmony between students, as was emphasized in the ritual of the Put-Down Funeral and in the
relatively conflict-free relations I had with students there. The *Tribes* promotional movie one could obtain from Center Source Systems, the publishers of *Tribes*, emphasized that students got to know each other more thoroughly when *Tribes* was used as a guide to classroom ritual in classrooms than when it wasn't.

Another book of semi-critical classroom management which advertises a "community of caring" (p. 3) is Chick Moorman and Dee Dishon's *Our Classroom*. I cite this book as an exemplar of how semi-critical classroom management can be applied in practice, because I saw it on the desk of a first-grade classroom where I was substitute teaching, for a week, at Local Elementary School. I met the regular teacher some time after the assignment, and she congratulated me on doing well with her class.

In the chapter of this book titled "Classroom Management," Moorman and Dishon propose that we imagine a continuum between "student control" and "teacher control" in a classroom. In a student-controlled classroom, say the authors, teachers are not needed and students have no direction. In a teacher-controlled classroom, they say, students tend to "act out in the lunchroom, during recess, and when a substitute teacher is in charge." (Moorman and Dishon, p. 48). The alternative, say these authors, is shared control. Shared control is phrased in terms of an invitation:

"Our Classroom" practitioners invite their students to enjoy one another, act cooperatively, and perform self-responsible behaviors. They invite children to participate in
an evolving environment of mutual respect and caring.  
(Moorman and Dishon, p. 51).

One of my main points in elaborating on Our Classroom is that the goals it illustrates are radically different from the stated goals of a typical state-mandated curriculum, which will measure progress solely upon student mastery of linguistic and mathematical skills, as can be formulated in terms of correct problem-solving by individual students taking standardized tests. Our Classroom would erect a social standard for the whole class's success, and specify a curriculum for the attainment of that standard, in a way that Moorman and Dishon suggest would be good for teachers.

Technique for Our Classroom involves a series of rituals for inviting student input, inviting student responsibility, managing the mind of the teacher, and managing the classroom for cooperation. Inviting student input involved the creation of suggestion boxes (by teachers) and the creation of journals (by students) and goal statements (by students). The authors argue that students should be invited to create class norms and learn a problem-solving process to solve "problems" as they are voiced by participants in classroom ritual. "Inviting student responsibility" involves delegating the duties of classroom ritual to the students, and creating "Choice Time" (or perhaps Choice Times, in the plural) where students are allowed to choose between several alternatives. The teacher-imposed limitation of these alternatives, or "controlled choices," is what the authors are
proposing. "Managing my own mind" is basically advice about
the dialogue teachers conduct with themselves, and "managing
the classroom for cooperation" is a discussion of how to teach
social skills in cooperative learning rituals.

In Our Classroom, Chick Moorman and Dee Dishon construct
a typical reader whose primary interest is "classroom control," and in constructing that reader, invites that reader to understand
the idea of management as invitation (p. 50). The authors offer a
philosophy of control that make it clear that "control" is
invitation, too.

As a teacher, you have no control over whether or not your
invitations are accepted. You only control whether your
invitations are sent. And because sending invitations is
within your control and accepting invitations is not, it
makes sense to concentrate on what you have control over.
(p. 51)

Our Classroom's advice about classroom supplies typifies
this spirit of invitation that pervades the book:

Another simple way to make yourself dispensable is to get
the materials out where children can get at them. If you're
making twelve trips a day to the top shelf of the teacher's
closet to get supplies for students, then you're
indispensable to that environment. Chances are you need
the children more than they need you. (p. 90)

One teacher created a common materials area by spreading
butcher paper over a table and taping it underneath. Then she
laid all the materials out on the table, traced around them, and put the objects back. When a student took the scissors, the outline and the word scissors were left as a reminder of where they were to be returned. (p 90)

Our Classroom wishes to begin a brainstorming dialogue about how students can be invited to maintain classroom ritual. "Reminders" are used, of course, with the assumption that they actually do remind, that what we're doing here is inviting children to remember. In the above case, children are being invited to remember to put equipment back, and not to lose it or make it useless or throw it away or make the ritual of equipment use otherwise impossible. "Permits" are suggested, too, as one possible invitation: "One third-grade teacher trains students in the proper use of audiovisual equipment. Only students with an operator's license can operate the equipment." (pp. 91-92)

What if they don't remember to take care of equipment? Well, the back-up solution appears to be the idea that we can offer them a permit to take care of it. And if that isn't accepted? "Invitations are not always accepted" (p. 51), we're told, but of course we aren't told what to do when invitations are refused, or accepted. Our Classroom moves forward in idealistic spirit, offering more and more diverse suggestions for creating the enjoyable-sounding classroom its authors want to propose. Perhaps classroom rituals in classrooms can diversify and allow for more complex forms of "permission" and "invitation" in the ways Moorman and Dishon recommend. That can happen if
conditions permit it, if the Our Classroom classrooms are ready to accept Moorman and Dishon's form of social order.

Something should lastly be said about two important psychologists' versions of semi-critical classroom management that are praised by Alfie Kohn in Beyond Discipline. They are Thomas Gordon, author of T.E.T. Teacher Effectiveness Training, and William Glasser, author of several books, the most pertinent to this study of which would be Control Theory in the Classroom. T.E.T. relies formally upon training teachers in a ritual form of communication that would emphasize the building of conflict resolution skills in students and teachers. The skills involve 1. Silence and attentive listening, 2. Acknowledgment responses, 3. Door openers, invitations to talk, 4. Active listening (Gordon, pp. 87-89). Teachers and students are to learn to assert themselves through "I-messages," just as is proscribed as the norm in Tribes. T.E.T. tries to redescribe problems in "classroom management" as problems in conflict of interest between students and teachers, and offers control of the classroom space as a means for teachers to set up a classroom that is free of conflict, where they don't need to use "force" to solve problems. Gordon views the use of "force" as counterproductive because, he argues, coercion is demeaning to the coerced.

Unlike Seymour Sarason, whom I quoted at the end of Chapter 6, Thomas Gordon believes firmly in the efficacy of adjusting the room to fit the learning styles of students; a whole chapter is dedicated to classroom environments as loci of teacher
control. Gordon also specifies a specific ritual in order to create a
disciplinary order in the classroom, the "rule-setting classroom
meeting (Gordon, pp. 261-278)". This ritual is ostensibly the
showcase for his method, which he calls "Method III" and
advertises as a dialogic method using the skills outlined above.

Control Theory in the Classroom starts from a theory of
innate human psychological need. Glasser describes as follows:
Humans not only need..(1) to survive and reproduce, but also (2)
to belong and love, (3) to gain power, (4) to be free and (5) to
have fun. (Glasser, p. 23)

Glasser thus describes education as successfully meeting
those needs, and the last sections of this book try to outline his
solution; "the learning-team model," or more commonly
cooperative learning. Glasser's criticism of "classroom
management" is that, unless it successfully identifies
"misbehavior" as the communication of one of the above needs,
and tries to teach in a way that satisfies the above needs, it will
not work. Glasser constructs his reader directly: "You have been
using s-r theory all your life. It takes time and a lot of effort to
change to this new, more responsible, and much more
comprehensive explanation of how we behave" (p. 59) Glasser
prescribed cooperative learning, thusly, as a curative for the
simple systems of punishments and rewards that dominated, and
dominate, instructional ritual in many classrooms.
Conclusion

Semi-critical classroom management thus appears as a strategy for diversifying the discourse about "classroom management" to make it more "delegated" and appear less "coerced" and more "invited" than it is in its form of "traditional schooling." Such a form appears to the above authors as completely defective in some school situations, resulting in forms of student communication which teachers call "misbehavior." The goals of semi-critical classroom management are those of "building community" within classrooms in a way that is ostensibly more "democratic," or perhaps just more well-delegated.

Another thing that might be a "goal" of semi-critical classroom management, or at least a reason for implementing it, is the way it dovetails with the "new capitalism" as described by Gee et al., in The New Work Order, a book I introduced in the introduction to this dissertation. The thesis of The New Work Order is that capitalism is becoming "fast capitalism," as the saturation of markets with goods is increasingly requiring producers to customize their products for consumers at a local level (Gee et al., pp. 17-18). This, in turn (say the authors), requires a different sort of educated person to work for it:

The new capitalism, because of these changes, wants and needs far fewer managers in the middle between the top and bottom of a business...it is a principle of the new capitalism to push down control and responsibility to the
lowest possible level, closest to the actual products, services, and customers of the business... Workers must now take responsibility, usually in teams, for whole and meaningful tasks which they understand and seek to improve. (Gee et al., pp. 18-19).

It is conceivable that semi-critical classroom management, with its emphasis upon cooperative learning, shared responsibility, and interchangeable work teams, might become attractive to certain schools not because of any desire to use it to create "community," but rather to produce workers that can adapt to changing conditions of the late capitalist work environment. *Tribes* lays this possibility out most clearly when it quotes Robert Reich, former US Secretary of Labor and proponent of "new capitalism," as regards the virtues of group learning: "This is an ideal preparation for life-times of symbolic analytic work" (*Tribes*, p. 19).

My experience as a substitute teacher tended to support the notion that semi-critical classroom management could be used successfully in some circumstances (when the ground had been prepared for such success by the regular teacher or teachers), to ameliorate the needs for scripts, for repressive instructional rituals, and for systems of discipline requiring external reinforcement that are required of many teachers today.
CHAPTER 8:
CONCLUSION:
SUBSTITUTE TEACHING AND THE SOCIAL/POLITICAL DRAMA

For this concluding chapter, I will 1) review the theories, both critical and communicative, that have informed the research so far, and 2) review what the research I've done has said, in light of my theoretical presuppositions. The results will likely be indeterminate; this is a preliminary study, intended to understand whether this sort of ethnographic study, combined with this sort of theoretical position, could discover anything of significance at all, with respect to a field within the social drama that I marked "politics," and that I marked "politics" because public education in the state of California, as shown through events such as the passage of Proposition 227, is a political event, beholden to the public for its continued funding, beholden to a larger schoolwide, districtwide, and ultimately statewide hierarchy for its general design, and responsible to the public for any criticism that might come up about the way education is done, criticism that becomes "politics" insofar as it is performed as a political event.

My original theoretical perspective was based upon the theories of symbol and ritual of Victor Turner. Turner was
concerned to see the routines of a society or of a group of people as "ritual" -- with his reference group for the analysis of ritual being a group called the Ndembu, who live in southern Africa. Turner analyzed Ndembu ritual (and the ritual of various other societies across the globe including American society) through an elaboration upon the framework of Van Gennep, who looked at "liminal" rituals, where a group of people would separate from the larger society in order to temporarily relieve themselves of the stresses of life in that larger society. Discussing school in terms of ritual initially looked like a good choice of discursive forms for me to use for this dissertation, since public schooling does indeed look like a ritual as the mainstream students of ritual would observe it (see Ronald Grimes' Beginnings in Ritual Studies for a more detailed mainstream study of ritual).

Indeed there are a wide variety of ritual phases to the elementary school day, with students adopting a wide variety of postures and gestures; recess, lunch, centers, calendar, seatwork, art, physical education, mathematics, quiet reading time. Within these ritual phases, I had hoped to understand where ideals about what schooling could be, especially my own ideals of "critical pedagogy." I wanted to understand realities of what schooling is and of what people say schooling is for, and to understand its potential for change, what it could be, the present and subjunctive questions about schooling. I also wanted to study "the politics of culture" within schooling.
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But later, after much more detailed analytical thought about the schools I was observing, I started to conceptualize school as a disciplinary event, and relying upon the writings of Michel Foucault to characterize what I was seeing. For the most part, Foucault reflected what I was seeing in classrooms I substituted, in 4th grade and upward (through high school graduation). The children's bodies I was observing were "the object and target of power" (Foucault, 1977, p. 137). Children were being trained to sit down and perform seatwork according to "general formulas of domination" (p. 138) that ran by the name of "classroom management," and that if I did not teach as if this were true, then I was going to invite serious administrative reprimand, especially in dealing with "at-risk" students. Even so, I began to seize upon Foucault's (1977) notion of discipline as the political economy of detail.

So from there I started to wonder what part of Foucault's analysis of discipline did not encompass the ritual I was observing. It could be the part of the ritual of a classroom day under the substitute where the children found the biggest opportunity to rebel, and resist, the official dictate that classrooms be opportunities for seatwork. I've seen plenty of acting-out, frustration, rebellion in these classrooms -- high school students who would cluster together in peer groups and talk demeaningly of me and of other students while dismissing my attempts to get them to do any work, the classroom I discussed previously, whose favorite activity was in going to the
grassy area of campus and tearing up the grass and throwing it at each other, 6th graders who ran out of the classroom after dirtying the floor and tables in the classroom with paints, and then would sneak out of the classroom to the girls' bathroom to have a paint-fight. In this case I called the assistant principal, and the principal stormed into the classroom and helped us all clean up the paint and criticized the whole class for "running a circus." I was told by this principal not to come back to that particular school ever again -- so here it must be added that classroom "rebellion," intentional or otherwise, can result in the substitute teacher him/herself becoming an object of disciplinary power as well.

But such rebellion easily becomes the object of discussion between the students and the adult authority figures in the class, and the inevitable administrative reaction to all such rebellions was swift, in its revocation of "privileges" (granted ritual periods of play) and its imposition of the environment of quiet, solemn work, or classroom suspension, combined with the adult attempt (not always successful) to impose the interpretation of "punishment" upon the imposed activity.

So in rebellion we are back to the dynamic of adult attempts to impose the model of "docile bodies" upon the schooling process. Rebellion may be a stellar example of student initiative -- it is through an understanding of "the politics of culture" with respect to schooling that we can see its powerlessness as an event. Rebellion as ritual produced behavior
that can be seen as latently political, yet the performance of such rituals invited an adult reading which foreclosed an understanding of its power in favor of an adult-centered model of the purpose of education as "holding the lid down" on students whose behaviors could be disruptive, without reading the student-centered subtext that might have produced the rebellion. (In one 2nd grade classroom I was observing, the teacher attempted to punish some students for disobedience, but the students did not appear to understand that they were being punished. From that observation I came away with the impression that "punishment" is a learned behavior, as is being a "docile body").

However, perhaps other instances of student-directed behavior, behavior the later Foucault would consider under the rubric of "dominating oneself," would be important as indicators of a schooling process not entirely dominated by the "docile bodies" model. The model that the later Foucault advocated was one of "mastery of the self," which was usually the creation of oneself as a moral subject capable of performing moral action:

In short, for an action to be "moral," it must not be reducible to an act or a series of acts conforming to a rule, a law, or a value. Of course all moral action involves a relationship with the reality in which it is carried out, and a relationship with the self.

Such "mastery of the self" needs to be distinguished from "mastery by the teacher" as is ostensibly imposed upon
students through systems of classroom management. I am referring to student initiatives that do not start with teacher initiatives. (Foucault, 1985, p. 28)

Some schools in Valley Unified School District tried to encourage what they saw as the creation of a moral self, by encouraging students to adopt codes of conduct through group meetings. This would be done through a practice called "community circle" (as advertised in a book by Jeanne Gibbs called TRIBES), or it would be done through a similar practice called "Peacemakers." This appeared to me to be a worthwhile thing, one that would allow me to trust students rather than looking upon them as members of a hostile community. In these schools, where some of the class time appeared to be devoted to the study of moral conduct, sometimes lower-grade classes would "run themselves" efficiently. This was also true of schools that did not use time toward the study of moral conduct.

In some classroom situations, students were able to avoid conflict with each other, so that I felt comfortable in diverging from the systems of external reinforcement that were a central focus of Discipline and Punish. In these classes I tried negotiating individually with students, or meeting with them in "community circle" as advertised in TRIBES. Most of these classes that I taught were in the younger grades; the fact that grades K-3 usually had 20 students per teacher rather than 32 students per teacher (as was the standard maximum ratio throughout every class 4-12 in the state of California) was a controlling factor in
allowing personal relations, and also perhaps in allowing the regular teacher to teach students how to exert self-discipline toward their own learning aims. Arguably, student learning of moral conduct could be considered latent politics, in that students that sought to fashion themselves as moral subjects might also want to be part of the decision as regards how their education was to proceed.

However, classrooms attained more ludic potential by 4th grade, since by then the student-teacher ratio increased so that there are 32 students in each classroom (and thus more students are there to disrupt the continuity of instructional ritual), and the curriculum of 4th grade (and beyond) seemingly becomes at the same time less ludic, more chained to seatwork (or perhaps the teachers become more fond of these things; to me as substitute teacher, it amounted to the same thing), so that the tension between ludic and serious modes of classroom performance becomes a struggle to establish "order" or "play" within the classroom that occluded any attempts I might make to understand "self-domination" within these classroom environments, in terms of watching children form themselves as moral subjects as they grew older.

Since I chose substitute teaching as the vehicle for these observations, my ability to record them was hampered by my need to perform the rituals of a substitute teacher, taking attendance, insuring on-task behavior, monitoring physical education or centers, arranging students in some particular
pattern. Thus it might be said that not only is ethnographic observation by substitute teachers cluttered with duties to be performed by the person who's supposed to report the ethnography, it is also deprived of time and energy that might be spent in taking ethnographic jottings, tape- or video-recording classroom proceedings, photographing the scenes of classroom ritual, or intensively interviewing its subjects. This, perhaps, is why Norman L. Friedman ("High School Substituting: Task Demands and Adaptations in Educational Work," Urban Education 18:1 April 1983 pp. 114-126) can only presuppose communicative behaviors, while describing them in relatively thin detail. He tells us:

The substitute has to quickly (in the first few minutes, or even as students come in before the bell rings for class to start) manage and convey the impression of "being a teacher" — that is, of being or appearing to be just as much a "real teacher" and adult authority figure as is the regular teacher (p. 120)

and then goes on to tell us about the presence or absence of this quality called "impression management" without defining in communicative terms what it is for any particular class. My own suspicion is that Friedman was too busy managing impressions to arrive at any objective description of "impression management."

The problem with arriving at such a definition might have been related to the job of the substitute teacher — since students are sizing up "subs" according to either comparative notions of
what they're like compared to the regular teacher or another substitute, or subjunctive notions of what a perfect substitute teacher might be like, the "sub" remains ill-informed about what effect his or her behavior is going to have.

Substitute teaching thus produces "chaotic" data that resist being molded into the form of a scientific experiment. One might see new groups of students every day, or a new impression from a teacher who might expect one to be at a school for a certain number of days before going elsewhere. But nevertheless I conclude that substitute teaching showed me potentials that might have gone unreported had nobody gone forward to do an "ethnography of the sub." Students showed me that they could try to control the ritual situations in their classrooms, that they could fashion themselves as subjects.

Thus what I've attempted to do is produce an "off-the-wall," marginal, liminal ethnography that appropriates experience in order to try to stimulate it with a theory of "latent politics," so that later researchers might do a more thorough job in documenting the potentials that I can only here suspect, and outline.

Subbing is a great opportunity to discover the strength of the "counter-discourse" in classrooms where there is a counter-discourse. The students are communicating to you, the ethnographer-substitute, and the conditioned communication between student and teacher that occurs in totally-scripted instructional ritual has been put in a subjunctive mode ("if the
regular teacher were here, this would be a normal day, but since the teacher isn't here...") because you're not the regular teacher. You're the substitute teacher. So you get to see things the regular teacher might not get to see, and the "counter-discourse" phenomenon is one of them. Since the role of the substitute teacher puts in a subjunctive case the power of the regular teacher, it might be interestingly situated to observe the potential that can be appropriated from the politics of culture in the classroom. One isn't sure what one is observing when one is observing the "counter-discourse," whether one is observing a reaction to one's own teaching, or a reaction to the conditioning the students have received from the regular teacher, but whatever one sees is an indicator of the degree to which the classroom has been made into a place where public discourse is appreciated or disparaged.

The substitute teacher is, however, in a difficult position to appropriate the discourse of students. In this dissertation, I managed to capture the "substitute teacher voice," my voice in particular, but I did not do much to capture the voices of other substitute teachers, of regular teachers, of the children placed in classrooms where I was assigned. My silence about such matters thus deserves an explanation. Teachers' voices have already been a subject of numerous books; other substitute teachers were difficult for me to find given my position as a full-time substitute teacher. The lack of a "student voice" in my dissertation requires a more lengthy explanation, however, since my ethnographic
work originally intended to capture such a voice. Capturing the "student voice" became problematic because:

1) Such a voice was conditioned by the commercialized signifiers that pervaded the world I was in, and thus was rendered culturally less interesting than the environment of power and ritual I found myself participating in. Students would talk of Beetle Borgs or Mighty Morphin Power Rangers, soccer broadcasts as seen on Spanish-language television, Bill Nye the Science Guy, the Magic School Bus, or Barney. A survey I took of my class at Southern Elementary School, disorganized as it was, revealed that the lives of my (lower class, Spanish speaking) students was importantly dominated by television-watching.

2) My role was inappropriate. "Listening in" on peer-group discussion in these circumstances would have meant adult intervention, and thus changed the nature of the discussion, since (as a man in his thirties substituting largely in elementary-school classes) I was much older and from a different cultural context than my students. Befriending members of the student body at Local Elementary School was personally satisfying -- I'm not sure it was significant.

3) I didn't have time or energy to do otherwise. When I became a substitute teacher for Valley Unified, I was kept busy with teacher duties throughout entire days, and then when I went home to do a write-up of these days, often fatigue made it difficult for me to inscribe significant details of each day's events. In fact, the typology of ritual that makes chapter 4 the most
ethnographically- and theoretically-significant part of this
dissertation arose partly as a matter of personal convenience to
me, since recording things within that typology became the
easiest way for me to do write-ups.

A larger panorama of the social drama that encompasses
substitute teaching, regular teaching, student life etc. might be
available if ethnographer-substitute teachers were to work
together on ethnographic portraits of districts, in concert with
ethnographers working as teachers or ethnographers
investigating from the outside of a school situation ("fly on the
wall" ethnography e.g.). My main understanding of the
experiences of regular teachers and students was inference; since
I really couldn't measure how the sub's experience and the
teacher's experience differed, I had to infer it from the many
clues confronting me as a sub. To understand the difference
between my experience as a substitute and the experiences of
other actors in the schooling process, a multiple ethnography
would provide important clues to how different viewpoints aid in
producing multiple voices that speak upon the schooling process.

Politics was also a difficult matter to capture for this
dissertation, except as an observer. As a substitute teacher, it
should also be clear, is politically impotent to change the system
of education as a whole, to intervene in the politics of culture
that he or she observes every work day. Most of this impotence
has to do with the transiency of substitute teaching and the
powerlessness of the substitute vis-a-vis the district, as an on-
call day laborer. The value of substitute teaching as an ethnographic tool is in bringing to consciousness another form of classroom politics, one not to be observed as performed ritual not merely by going along with the normalcy imposed by regular teachers.

However, what I tried to show by introducing the topics of Proposition 227 here, of classroom testing, and of classroom discipline in order to reveal a "politics," was that in talking about "the political," it is important for academic thinkers to distinguish between the manifestly political, the changes that are made by politicians or by those who succeed at having their laws passed by statewide initiative process, and the latently political, the small-scale political action that occurs each day as teachers, students, principals etc. assert themselves in the world. The politics of schooling on the manifest level (as I experienced it in southern California) operates on the level of law and policy -- a policy is inscribed into law or mandate, a district response to that policy is communicated, and material aspects of the school systems of southern California are affected -- as regards who can teach in one, what may they teach, how much teachers are paid, what equipment will the State buy for them, who may serve them administratively, etc. All of which has repercussions in the discursive debate about "what school is for" -- Proposition 227 starts with an affirmation that "literacy in the English language is among the most important" of skills taught by the public school system," for instance.
There is also, however, a latent politics, and to find this latent politics one must look to instructional ritual as it occurs each day in each classroom. I have sought to unearth such latent politics within the implications of instructional ritual for "what schooling is for." How one views instructional ritual in this light depends on what one views it as doing. Is it a ludic event, celebrating play, and what does that play itself produce? Does it exist for the sake of producing high test scores, or successful evaluations of "classroom discipline," or students literate in English, or math, or technology? What priorities are displayed each school day by students and teachers?

Manifest politics, to be sure, has a role in shaping the latent politics of everyday classroom life. Part of the identity of classrooms has to do with the fact that they are funded a certain way (20 students per teacher for grades K-3 classrooms in California, 32-1 for grades 4-12), that they must obey certain laws and mandates (Proposition 227, for instance, or the Lau v. Nichols-based mandate for bilingual education, or the mandated Stanford 9 test for instance, or any of the previously mandated statewide standardized tests). But an identity for classrooms was also forged through the relation of the classroom life to the "script" that was offered or the "invitation" that was given by the teacher to the students, for the sake of instructional ritual. Is the script being used productively by the students to produce a valued thing? Does the script generate a "counterdiscourse" and an "underlife" that then becomes the main object (and objective)
of student life in the classrooms? The resolution of these issues in any particular classroom, school, district, or state, would seem to have quite a lot of "say" in "what schools are for." But, so far, the latent political issues of instructional ritual appear only as latent issues. Teaching style is "left up to the individual teacher" as sequestered in an isolated classroom, or it's given advice about "classroom management" in teacher training programs. Giving students a "choice" in their instructional rituals appears to be a matter that has today not yet become part of any political program.

Proposition 227 will affect the above, latent political issue, insofar as it will, in many districts, replace one set of scripts marked "bilingual" with another set of scripts marked "immersion," and forbid the teaching of some scripts using non-English languages. The provision that "all children be placed in English language classrooms," where the "language of instruction used by the teaching personnel is overwhelmingly the English language," (Proposition 227, Article 2. 305-306) would seem to eliminate many non-English language scripts for learning (according to how each district defines "overwhelmingly," and it appears that Valley USD will ask its teachers to teach in English at least 80% of the time), and this will (in Moorman and Dishon's words) reduce the number of possible "invitations to learn" teachers can offer. One could, as a result of this provision, conceivably observe classrooms where the teacher script is spoken in English and becomes a "procedural display" and the
student counterscript is spoken in Spanish and becomes the unintended focus of learning, with the effects Gutierrez et al. (1996) describe. But the danger of instructional ritual becoming "procedural display" existed before 227.

One immediate danger facing California administrators, as they see it, is the absence of a script for immersion education, or a textbook for student use, or a preparatory college program for teachers of limited-English students that will help them comply with the new law. Victoria Castro, president of the Los Angeles USD School Board, says of Proposition 227, "There is no college or system to prepare us for this. Everyone will have to go through the initial chaos together" ("Prop. 227's 'Bumpy Ride," Los Angeles Times 7/20/1998, p. B8). I imagine the problems I face when, as a substitute teacher, I confront a classroom without a lesson plan, with a limited number of clues as to how I can invent a script for a day's activities, and then I imagine this problem magnified into a districtwide problem.

During that small portion of the total time spent when I wasn't following a lesson plan and had some room to invent, my own practice as a substitute teacher emphasized education as an event involving "play" applications of learning material. It centered on adaptation to a classroom that was (for the most part) in the lower elementary grades. My practice seemed to operate thusly because, to a certain extent, children under my care were playing anyway, and even if I "cracked down" on it they would use my attempts to "discipline" as an object of play in...
itself. This practice seemed to "generate itself" out of my inquiries into the \textit{constant impulse to discourse} that almost all students in the Valley Unified School District seemed to exude.

In behaving thusly as a substitute teacher, I hope to have contributed positively to the learning experiences of very young people, who may have learned important social and literacy skills through my efforts to communicate with them. I developed a respect for the designers of "semi-critical classroom management" insofar as their designs for instructional ritual attempted to use the "counterdiscourse" of the students as the raw material of instructional ritual, while at the same time discovering the limitations of my role within a politicized social system that delivers instructional ritual to students.
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