University of Dayton
eCommons

Teacher Education Faculty Publications | Department of Teacher Education

6-2012

Fostering Academic and Social Growth in a Primary Literacy Workshop Classroom: "Restorying" Students with Negative Reputations

Jo Worthy
University of Texas at Austin

Annamary L. Consalvo
University of Texas at Tyler

Treavor Bogard
University of Dayton, tbogard1@udayton.edu

Katie W. Russell
University of Texas at Austin

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.udayton.edu/edt_fac_pub

🎨 Part of the Elementary Education and Teaching Commons, and the Other Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons

FOSTERING ACADEMIC AND SOCIAL GROWTH IN A PRIMARY LITERACY WORKSHOP CLASSROOM

"Restorying" Students with Negative Reputations

ABSTRACT

In most classrooms, there are students who have academic, behavioral, and/or interpersonal challenges that can disrupt the classroom community. In some cases, these challenges can build momentum, leading to a negative reputation or "story" that can follow the student throughout school. This academic, yearlong case study focused on Mae Graham, an exemplary teacher, and the cases of two students who began second grade with negative behavioral, emotional, and academic reputations from previous years in school. We describe how Mae "restoried" the students through personalized instruction and attention, classroom structure and curriculum, and social interactions in the classroom. We base restorying on theory and research in social identification, effective teaching, culturally responsive/relevant pedagogy, and the ethic of care.

Jo Worthy
Annamary L. Consalvo
Treavor Bogard
Katie W. Russell
UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS,
AUSTIN

As classroom teachers, observers of preservice teachers, and researchers, we have read about and seen in many classrooms students who have acquired reputations or "stories" as being troubled or causing trouble. These negative reputations can result from inappropriate, challenging, or odd behavior; interpersonal difficulties; challenges in academic development; insufficient schooling; or any combination of these. If a student's story continues uninterrupted, it can gain momentum, and the student may be implicitly or explicitly labeled a problem, with the negative story following him or her throughout school and interfering with academic, emotional, and interpersonal progress.

In our ethnographic study of an exemplary teacher, Mae Graham, and her second-grade classroom, we were impressed by the teacher's ability to turn such students around academically as well as socially. Although we found a wealth of research describing the work of exemplary and culturally relevant teachers, we were unable to find in-depth studies focusing on the kind of process we observed in Mae's class-room. In this article, we focus on Mae's literacy instruction and the cases of two students who began second grade with negative behavioral, emotional, and academic reputations from previous years in school. We describe how Mae supported them through "restorying," a concept we base on theory and research in social identification, effective teaching, culturally responsive/relevant pedagogy, and the ethic of care. Our question of interest was, how are students with behavioral, emotional, and academic challenges restoried in Mae's classroom?

Restorying: Foundational Theory and Research

Academic Learning and Social Identification

In framing restorying, we begin with Wortham's (2004, 2005) concept of social identification. According to Wortham, "when students and teachers discuss subject matter, at least two processes generally occur: Students and teachers become socially identified as recognizable types of people, and students learn subject matter" (2004, p. 715). Drawing on Lemke's (2000) work, Wortham (2005) asserted that students enter classrooms with sociohistorical identities developed over various "timescales," including centuries, years, months, days, and moments—even milliseconds—prior to the beginning of a school year. All students are identified as ethnic, gendered individuals, and some bring additional identity baggage, including school labels (e.g., learning disabled), along with more personalized identities formed in response to situations and interactions in previous contexts. Shaped by situations, interactions, and events that take place over time in the classroom, in conjunction with attitudes and actions of teachers and peers, students develop social identities specific to the current classroom (Wortham, 2005).

The teachers in the classroom studied by Wortham presupposed a gendered local identity model of "promising girls" and "unpromising boys" (2004, p. 719) and imposed it through curricular and social interactions with students in the classroom. Most students' local identities eventually conformed to the model, and Wortham (2005) showed how this was accomplished in the case of William, partly through the teachers' use of literary themes in naming students' actions and attitudes. William was a 14-year-old African American male football player with a history of school challenges. He sat in the back of the classroom, was an unwilling class participant, and was known to tease and shove girls who baited him about his classroom and school behavior. Wortham contended that the teachers and several female students, imposing negative stereotypes and sociohistorical models about race, gender, and school success, positioned William in the classroom as a resistant Black male and consistently interpreted his actions and talk through these stereotypes. Using characters from literature the class was studying, the teachers and females in the class-room repeatedly bolstered the negative identity they imposed on William. For instance, when the class discussed *The Pearl*, they invoked William when discussing the main character, Kino, who was "content with his low station" and "unwilling to work

to improve it" (Steinbeck, 1947, p. 87). For the resistant-Black-male label to stick, other students and William himself had to be complicit in his "trajectory of identification" (Wortham, 2005, p. 59), which is the representation of the series of events, over time, across which identities emerge and solidify.

Wortham's work (2004, 2005) demonstrates the power of the social environment and curriculum in identifying students, but William's story shows how social identification can go awry. William's teachers could have taken a different path by targeting him as a "project"—socially identifying him in positive ways (or restorying him) instead of reinforcing and adding to his negative reputation (Wortham, 2005, p. 60). In the following sections, we review theory and research in effective teaching, culturally relevant pedagogy, and the ethic of care. We highlight teacher qualities, beliefs, and expectations, along with characteristics of classroom environments, instruction, and curriculum that positively influence students' academic and personal growth and add to the concept of restorying.

High-Quality, Effective, Exemplary Teaching

A consistent finding in educational research is that effective teachers are perhaps the most important influence when it comes to improving students' learning and achievement (Darling-Hammond, 1997; Nye, Konstantopoulos, & Hedges, 2004). From an observational study of over 800 classrooms in the United States, Stuhlman and Pianta (2009) developed profiles of classroom quality. The classrooms labeled "high overall quality"—23% of the total—were managed well and boasted warm, friendly classroom atmospheres. The teachers provided effective literacy instruction and "frequently engaged students in conversations about their ideas, their work, and the process of learning" (Stuhlman & Pianta, 2009, p. 332). The teachers built positive relationships with students, supported students' autonomy, did not stifle their enthusiasm, and were responsive to students' learning and affective needs.

Research on literacy teaching has also shown that teacher effectiveness is the most salient factor in developing students' reading and writing proficiency (Blair, Rupley, & Nichols, 2007; Taylor, Peterson, Pearson, & Rodriguez, 2002). In a cross-national survey of first-grade teachers, Pressley, Allington, Wharton-McDonald, Block, and Morrow (2001) found that highly effective teachers reported using a variety of research-supported literacy practices—including read alouds, process writing, curriculum integration, thematic instruction, and explicit teaching—within print-rich environments. The teachers made instruction relevant and motivating by giving students choice in materials and writing topics. A supportive, risk-free atmosphere, including an appropriate balance of success and challenge, helped build students' self-confidence and independence.

In the first-grade studies, as well as in a study of exemplary fourth-grade literacy teachers (Allington & Johnston, 2001), the researchers found that teachers combined and coordinated content knowledge, pedagogical skill, and instructional materials in expert ways to guide their students rather than using a particular instructional program or method. The fourth-grade teachers also focused on student engagement rather than curricular coverage, emphasized curricular integration, and offered students choices in materials at a range of levels. Personalized instruction was based on knowledge gained through personal relationships. Teachers valued student self-evaluation, individualized goal setting, and progress and effort over attainment of

external standards. Small-group and individualized instructional formats were favored over whole class. Teachers were warm, caring, supportive, and enthusiastic. Classroom talk was respectful and emphasized inquiry and meaning making. In the book *Choice Words*, Johnston (2004) employed data from Allington and Johnston (2001) to show how teachers can use language in ways that influence students' learning, self-reflection, and positive identity development and to cultivate positive classroom environments.

Skilled teachers also have the ability to make thoughtful, in-the-moment decisions that seem just right for the situation at hand. This skill has been described as reflection-in-action, thinking on one's feet (Schön, 1983), active knowing (Ryle, 1949), and tacit personal knowledge (Polyani, 1958). Van Manen described the related concept of "pedagogical tact" as being characterized by a perceptive understanding of children, along with a feeling for the right action to take in a given moment: "A tactful teacher seems to have the ability of instantly sensing what is the appropriate, right or good thing to do on the basis of perceptive pedagogical understanding of children's individual nature and circumstances" (1995, pp. 44–45).

Research in culturally relevant and culturally responsive pedagogy focuses specifically on teaching and teachers of African American students and overlaps in many ways with effective-teaching research reviewed in the previous section. Corresponding qualities include skillful pedagogy, deep content knowledge, positive and supportive classroom environments, instruction based on students' experiences and backgrounds, respect for students' ideas, high expectations for students' achievement, and getting to know students personally. We consider these to be foundational assets in teachers with potential to positively restory students. As described in the next section, students' language, community, culture, and lived experiences are considered central in culturally relevant and responsive teaching, and these are foundational to restorying as well.

Culturally Responsive/Relevant Approaches to Teaching

Culturally responsive teaching "is based on the assumption that when academic knowledge and skills are situated within the lived experiences and frames of reference of students, they are more personally meaningful, have higher interest appeal, and are learned more easily and thoroughly" (Gay, 2000, p. 106,). Building on the work of Purcell-Gates, Jacobson, and Degener (2004) and Irvine (2003), Compton-Lilly (2008) described ways teachers can effectively teach students of all backgrounds through learning about and embracing their "ways of being"—their strengths, interests, beliefs, feelings, and values—which are shaped through their experiences and relationships with significant people in their lives.

Drawing from case studies of exemplary teachers of African American students, Ladson-Billings (1994, 1995a) outlined three criteria of culturally relevant pedagogy (CRP). Criteria consistent with culturally responsive teaching are first, academic success is nonnegotiable; second, students must develop and maintain competence in their own culture. A third criterion of culturally relevant pedagogy identified by Ladson-Billings is the development of a political consciousness necessary to "critique the cultural norms, values, mores, and institutions that produce and maintain social inequities" (1995a, p. 162). Using data from the case studies, Ladson-Billings (1995b) developed a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy, with the goal of making the

practice more accessible for educators. The theory is expressed in propositions concerning beliefs about self and others, social relations, and knowledge, including the core principles that all students can succeed academically, that teaching is an art and a continuous learning process, and that teaching is a way to "give back to the community" (Ladson-Billings, 1995b, p. 478). Culturally relevant teachers believe knowledge is actively constructed, teacher scaffolded, and shared among students and teachers. Culturally relevant theory provides a model for classroom interaction that contributes to constructive learning and the development of classroom community. In culturally relevant classrooms, teachers see students as having expertise and as being responsible for their own and their peers' success, and they arrange their classrooms so students can share knowledge and collaborate in a variety of formats.

The Ethic of Care

Extending the work of Gilligan (1982), Noddings coined the term *ethic of care* to describe the "recognition of and longing for relatedness" that is a basic human need (1984, p. 16). In Noddings's model of education, teaching and nurturing play dual roles, with interpersonal relationships at the center of both. Caring teachers feel responsible for meeting students' needs and know that understanding students and their experiences will aid in building curriculum and environments that cultivate students' academic, social, and emotional growth (Noddings, 1984). Noddings (1992, 1998) proposed a curriculum model focused around caring for others, the environment, objects in the world, and ideas. The curriculum includes four components— modeling, dialogue, practice, and confirmation—designed to influence students' moral development such that they are more likely to become caring individuals. In restorying, we draw on the fourth component, confirmation, in which the teacher sees all students as having the potential for academic and personal success, regardless of past performance or behavior (Noddings, 1998). The teacher does not look for what is not there in the child or use preconceived or unrealistic expectations but uncovers students' strengths and abilities that may be hidden. In providing "personalized leadership" (Alder & Moulton, 1998), an extension of confirmation, the teacher gives the student "positive direction and explicit guidance" (Alder, 2002, p. 243), leads him to reflect on his actions, and guides him on a more constructive path toward a "fresh start" (Alder, 2002, p. 244). Confirmation and personalized leadership are important in restorying because students' strengths may have become hidden behind negative reputations.

The concept of restorying, then, starts with a student with a negative story or reputation from previous years in school. The teacher finds the student's strengths, interests, and ways of being through observing and working closely with the student, her family, and others close to her. Making use of the curriculum, along with effective, responsive, personalized teaching, the teacher intentionally interrupts the student's trajectory of identification (Wortham, 2005), building up the student in the eyes of the classroom community, and enlisting support from other students in positive social (re)identification. Over seconds, days, weeks, and months of social and curricular interactions (Lemke, 2000; Wortham, 2005), the student comes to be restoried as a contributing member of the classroom community, leading to social and academic progress.

Method

Setting and Participants

Miller Elementary School serves a middle-income neighborhood in a midsize city in the Southwest. The student population of about 350 is 69% White, 24% Latino, 4% African American, and 3% Asian, with 11% categorized as low income. Mae Graham (all names are pseudonyms) has a reputation among the faculty in our university as one of the finest teachers in the large urban district that surrounds us. Mae has been recognized for exemplary teaching by her school and district and is a grade-level and school-curriculum leader in mathematics and literacy. Her students consistently achieve above the school and district average in reading and math, the only subjects for which data are available. We chose to study her both because she is an exemplary teacher and because she is one of a handful of teachers in the district who use non-ability-grouped instruction and reading and writing workshop, practices we were interested in researching. At the time of the study, Mae had been teaching a total of 19 years in first and second grade at the current school and previously in fifth grade at a school serving an urban, high-poverty community. Mae's second-grade general education and special education inclusion classroom included 19 students: four Latin American, one African American, one Middle Eastern American, and 13 European American.

Five researchers—a professor and four doctoral students in the language and literacy studies program at the University of Texas at Austin—were involved in the study. The professor and two students were former elementary teachers; two students were former secondary English teachers with experience in the elementary teacher preparation program.

Data Collection and Analysis

We used an ethnographic approach to data collection (Dyson & Genishi, 2005; Erlandson, Harris, Skipper, & Allen, 1993), spending intensive and extensive time in Mae's classroom, and gathering data from multiple sources. The professor and an elementary-focused doctoral student were participant observers in Mae's classroom from the end of August through the end of May during the 2007–2008 school year. Our focus was the 2-hour literacy block of read aloud and reading and writing workshop, as well as "morning menu," a 20–30-minute time when students worked on self-selected cross-curricular projects.

Across the year, we observed a total of 38 days, taking ethnographic field notes and extending the notes after each observation (Emerson, Fretz, & Shaw, 1995). We video-recorded 18 of the observations and used a modified form of multimodal transcriptions, noting teacher and student gestures, facial expressions, sounds, and actions, as well as movement, when visible on the tape (Nelson, Hull, & Roche-Smith, 2008). Data also included transcriptions and notes from three formal interviews and many informal conversations with Mae, along with notes from numerous informal conversations with students. We shared with Mae our emerging interpretations of what we were seeing in her classroom, asked her to comment, and used the notes as data and for member checking.

During data collection, observing researchers wrote analytic and theoretical memos two to three times per month (Erlandson et al., 1993) and met every 6 weeks

to share experiences in the classroom as well as data sets and emerging categories and themes. As we finished data collection in mid-May, the three additional doctoral students joined in the analysis. We began by open coding the entire set of data to capture recurring and salient patterns (Graue & Walsh, 1998), consisting of both comparable examples and examples of variation. Through a recursive process of group discussion, data analysis, and reading research and theory, we began to shape the idea of restorying and then focused data analysis on six students whom we identified as having been restoried during the year. We then followed each student through the data, analyzing their actions and interactions in video and field notes, examining work samples, noting Mae's comments about them in interviews, and asking Mae for additional information when needed. Finally, from among the six students, we chose Lydia and Edward for the case studies presented in this article. Both demonstrated striking social and emotional challenges, along with academic strengths and difficulties. Furthermore, in our early observations we saw Lydia as highly reserved and anxious, while we observed Edward as oppositional and boisterous. These two cases help to illustrate the range of restorying we saw in Mae's classroom.

Findings and Discussion

Restorying is anchored in effective and culturally relevant pedagogy. Thus, in the findings we begin with a description and analysis of Mae's instruction in light of research in these areas. Next, we present the cases of Lydia and Edward, two students who entered Mae's classroom with negative academic and emotional reputations who were restoried through Mae's instruction and classroom environment.

Mrs. Graham's classroom was a small portable filled with supplies for mathematics, science, writing, and projects; three outdated computers (two with Internet access); a printer; and a teacher's desk pushed into the corner of the room. Student desks, arranged in groups of four to five to facilitate collaboration, took up most of the room's space. The heart of the classroom community was Mae's rocker and a rug, where read alouds and meetings took place. The classroom was consistent with the print-rich environments described in research on exemplary language arts teachers (Allington & Johnston, 2001; Pressley et al., 2001). Floor-to-ceiling bookshelves lined one side of the room, with materials on a range of levels, genres, and topics arranged in tubs and on the shelves and student work and language charts displayed throughout the room.

Literacy Instruction in Mae's Classroom

As in the classrooms of exemplary teachers, curriculum integration was a hallmark of Mae's instruction, and reading and writing were ubiquitous across content areas. However, because they were the focus of our observations, we mainly describe literacy instruction practices here—read aloud, reading workshop, and writing workshop—along with morning menu.

Read aloud. Although Mae read aloud across the curriculum, we focused on the after-lunch read aloud, in which she usually read a novel, chosen for its age appropriateness and relevance to students. In the course of reading, the class discussed issues relating to family and cultural experiences, relationships, feelings, and ethical

dilemmas. Mae considered this time central to her teaching practice, and she guarded it carefully despite pressure she said she felt to spend more time on tangible student work: "I feel like if I'm tight with my time [she whispers conspiratorially], I have a full 30 minutes for read aloud" (April interview). Mae also told us that read alouds contributed to community and relationship building: "It's a bonding time. . . . It's all of us together" (October interview). Read-aloud discussions, as well as other talk in the classroom, were characterized by a high proportion of student talk, student-initiated ideas, and student negotiation of meaning, along with teacher scaffolding, as in the classrooms of effective and culturally relevant teachers (Allington & Johnston, 2001; Johnston, 2004; Ladson-Billings, 1995a). In the following example, Mae had just read an excerpt from *Ereth's Birthday* (Avi, 2001) in which a fisher, Marty, was caught in a hunter's trap. Roger, a student, raised his hand.

> **Roger:** I have two predictions. I think that they're gonna let him out, but when he tries to get Ereth he's gonna land on the snowmobile.
> **Mae:** Cause we heard the snowmobile, didn't we?
> **Shelly:** And he'll get run over by the snowmobile.
> **Hector:** I think they're still gonna let Marty out but once he gets out he's gonna try to get Ereth, and then he's gonna get run over.
> **Alice:** Yeah. (Transcript, February 13, 2008)

Discussions around literature brought up issues that were uncomfortable but important to grapple with, according to Mae, such as whether it is ever okay to break the law for a good cause and why the city does not take better care of its homeless population. Confronting and dealing with such issues is a precept of culturally relevant pedagogy in that it is an arena for students to "develop a critical consciousness through which they challenge the status quo of the current social order" (Ladson-Billings, 1995a, p. 160). The read-aloud discussions in which students shared personal feelings and experiences afforded Mae many opportunities to learn about her students' interests, beliefs, and values, in accordance with culturally responsive teaching (Gay, 2000). The individual time she was able to spend with students in reading and writing workshop and in morning menu, described in the next sections, was also important for building student relationships as well as for providing students with the personalized instruction characteristic of effective teachers.

Reading and writing workshop. Mae chose to use a reading and writing workshop approach, modeled on Atwell's *In the Middle* (1987), because she valued student choice, process writing, and instruction focused on students' purposes and interests, again in concert with effective and culturally responsive teaching. Her official schedule included 45 to 50 minutes each of separate, back-to-back times for reading workshop and writing workshop. However, in practice, students could be seen reading or writing during either time period. Mae liked that the workshop approach offered flexibility in giving students extended time to read, write, and work on projects when they needed it, as well as giving her time and opportunity to build personal relationships with students through conferencing. She explained, "And I think the workshop approach just allows that because it's the time, and then the choice, and then the response for whatever you do. And so nothing starts and stops—it's never ending" (October interview).

Mae contrasted reading workshop with the district-sanctioned reading approach in which teachers met with groups of students who read the same "leveled" book while other students worked independently or in literacy centers. In reading workshop, students select books of interest on their own reading level from among the texts in the classroom, the school library, and books brought from home. Instead of grouping students by ability, Mae used a variety of grouping formats, as do exemplary teachers (Allington & Johnston, 2001; Pressley et al., 2001). For example, she sometimes gathered a group of students at varying reading levels to share challenges they were having in their instructional level texts, which could range from easy books with repetitive language to complex nonfiction magazines. She also brought together small groups of students who needed to work on a particular skill, such as reading fluency or decoding multisyllabic words, or helped a small group practice a reader's theater script. Other essential components of the reading workshop, according to Mae, were minilessons focusing on comprehension, vocabulary, and decoding strategies; instructing students in choosing appropriately challenging and interesting texts; providing a regular time for students to share the books they were reading; and assessing and conferring with students during individualized conferences. She provided instruction based on assessment, explaining, "I get to know the kids well so I know what their very next step needs to be" (October interview).

In the writing workshop, Mae typically started with a minilesson, and then students wrote about topics of their choice. She required that they try each of the genres and techniques she taught, but students chose what they spent time revising and publishing, and topics were always self-selected. Mae's workshops were anchored in the culturally relevant principle of shared knowledge. Thus, students were free to work in pairs or independently as long as they were productive. Mae met with students individually and in small groups, as in reading workshop, to discuss challenges and share drafts. The class gathered on the rug two to three times per week as several students shared drafts or published pieces in the "author's chair."

Morning menu. Mae described the 20–30-minute morning menu time at the beginning of each day as something that started "organically" to give students more time to read or to finish writing, science, or math work. Gradually, students began proposing ideas for collaborative projects, including a pair who made a poster of Texas birds, a group who explored a movie fan site and wrote letters to the actors, and a group who made an interactive game board based on a science fiction book series. Because morning menu afforded the highest degree of individual choice during the day, Mae considered this time, along with the workshops, to be particularly conducive to building relationships with students, as she spent time talking with students about their work and learning about their interests, motives, and personal lives.

Mae focused her curriculum and instruction on the skills her students needed while providing choice and time for thoughtful engagements around texts. However, for Mae, students' academic progress was intertwined with the social and affective factors that impact learning. Against the backdrop of interactive read alouds, personalized support, and opportunities for developing academic independence within a collaborative environment, Mae supported students and their peers in shaping positive local identities and, where necessary, interrupting and restorying negative or potentially negative identities.

Restorying: The Cases of Lydia and Edward

Mae's second-grade students entered her room on the first day of school with sociohistorical identity traits associated with second-grade boys and girls, cultural and ethnic backgrounds, school labels, and more individual dimensions associated with personal experiences and interactions. As the year progressed, local identities more specific to Mae's classroom developed and shifted in response to interactions and classroom situations (Wortham, 2005). For some students, the negative stories that preceded their entrance into second grade were firmly entrenched because they had been building momentum for years. We illustrate the restorying process with two of these students, Edward and Lydia.

Lydia: The importance of believing. Lydia, a willowy girl, was described in early field notes as having a "worried look—almost a scowl—on her face" (field notes, September 15, 2007). As participant-observers in the classroom, the two observing researchers were accustomed to interacting with students during workshops and morning menu, and most eagerly shared what they were working on. When either of us approached Lydia, however, she turned her head and shrank in her seat. A touch on the shoulder from either of us made Lydia moan with apparent anxiety, so we learned to follow Mae's lead and keep a physical distance. Although she was an avid reader, Mae considered Lydia the most reluctant writer in the classroom; during our writing workshop observations, she usually sat staring at a blank sheet of paper or wrote a word or two and erased them. During the first 6 weeks of school, we rarely saw Lydia speak to other students, and during our observations of read aloud, she stayed in her seat or she sat in the back of the group, fiddling with books on the shelf, and rarely looking at Mae. Until early November we did not hear her speak a word during read aloud.

We wondered why Mae did not insist upon more participation from Lydia, but understood when Mae explained her background in the October interview. Lydia's mother told Mae that several family members had a history of anxiety that had interfered with educational progress. Her parents were divorced and had an antagonistic relationship and vastly different parenting styles, and Lydia went back and forth between their houses during the week. Lydia had an active fantasy life and believed that fairies lived in her house. Her first-grade teacher reported that she was "in her own world" and spent the entire year crouching under the table during most of the school day. These and other behaviors had led some in the school to suggest a possible diagnosis of Asperger's syndrome for Lydia. Mae consulted often with Lydia's former teacher and with her parents, as well as the school psychologist, for advice on how best to work with and support her.

Mae's restorying of Lydia focused on using her strength and interest in reading to help her become more comfortable in social interactions while maintaining high expectations for her general academic success and accelerating her stagnant writing progress, in concert with culturally responsive and effective teaching (Gay, 2000; Stuhlman & Pianta, 2009). Mae used the flexibility and time afforded by workshops and morning menu to gradually gain Lydia's trust and learn about her ways of being. Mae made herself available without forcing interaction, first simply sitting near Lydia and then speaking quietly and gently touching her on the shoulder. Mae's patient work with Lydia recalls Van Manen's concept of pedagogical tact in that Mae seemed

to understand "almost automatically how far to enter into a situation and what distance to keep in individual circumstances" (1995, p. 44).

Students' support for and collaboration with their classmates is a principle of culturally relevant pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 1995b), and the workshop environment, along with Mae's encouragement, seemed to naturally foster this support. During reading workshop, Mae set up a meeting for Lydia with Shelly, a low-key, friendly student with similar interests in books, and the two often read together. Perhaps in the absence of pressure to participate, Lydia also began to interact with other students by small degrees.

Wortham's (2005) research showed that discussion of literature could provide a powerful environment for social identification, and we saw this potential in the read-aloud discussions in Mae's class as well. However, although we noticed Lydia beginning to sit with the class regularly during read-aloud discussions in October, in our observations her participation was limited to short answers to questions Mae asked her. Mae made an important breakthrough in the restorying of Lydia in late November. During a read-aloud discussion of mythical characters in Eric Carle's poetry collection, *Dragons, Dragons* (1991), Ellie mentioned a book series about fairies she had been reading. Lydia had been facing away from Mae during the entire discussion, head down on her desk, squirming or staring into space. At the mention of fairies, Lydia turned around, raised her hand, and initiated the first comment we had heard from her during a read aloud:

> **Mae:** Lydia, thank you for waiting.
> **Lydia:** Um, I have a fairy named Violet, and she's—purple. She's like—I read about that kind, it's like this kind of fairy, that protects your, you from bad dreams. She's actually real [inaudible].
>
> [Lydia turns to a student next to her and says, "It *is* real."]
>
> **Mae:** And you know you started a little draft in your WW [writer's notebook] about Violet.
> **Lydia:** Yeah you can get [inaudible].
> **Mae:** Really? Do you think you might like to add on to Violet's story? Maybe? Because the words that you just said? Those would be the words you would write down in your WW. And that would be your story. (Transcript, November 21, 2007)

Employing pedagogical tact (Van Manen, 1995), Mae took Lydia's extraordinary remarks in stride and made a connection to Lydia's writing. As shown in the transcript below, as the conversation continued, Mae further capitalized on the moment by using Lydia's comments to confirm and socially identify her as an author (Noddings, 1992; Wortham, 2005). Turning to the rest of the class and gesturing toward Lydia, Mae said:

> **Mae:** Give me a thumbs or thumbs down. Thumbs up if it's true or thumbs down if it's not true. When you tell a story to a friend, those

exact words could be what you write in your writing notebook for a story you might write later.

[Lydia looks around the room at students while they display their thumbs-up signs.]

Mae: That is true. And in fact, many, many authors—probably, I'm guessing more than half of the authors, I don't know, I'm just guessing—talk to other people about their stories while they're writing them. [Inaudible] story and they tell someone and they think about it for a while. So, if you want to start a new story, your very first step might be thinking about it, but your very second step might be telling someone your story. (Transcript, November 21, 2007)

By asking students to give her the thumbs-up sign, Mae enlisted community support for Lydia, a component of culturally relevant pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 1995b). Apparently feeling emboldened by being identified as someone who does what authors do, Lydia again raised her hand to speak. Watching and listening with rapt attention, Mae again accepted Lydia's comments and offered further suggestions for her writing:

Lydia: I know how you can tell if a fairy's in your house or not.
Mae: See this would be good for you to write in your WW. Tell us what you would write.
Lydia: Well . . .
Mae: So your lead would be, "I know how to tell if a fairy's in your house or not."
Lydia: You, like, put a cookie out at night, and then it's [holds hands up in the air] gone. Just . . . gone. (Transcript, November 21, 2007)

As the year progressed, we observed that Lydia became more involved in read-aloud discussions and that her comments became more focused and connected to the topics being discussed, as in the following conversation. In April (April 15, 2008), after Mae had finished a read-aloud book, she asked the students to help her choose the next book. She described one she was thinking of reading and warned students that it contained some scary parts, including a kidnapping and the death of a character. Robert then started an intertextual discussion of books with tragic events and how they can cause worries and fears: "Well, it's kind of a connection, but I just like I uh, um, it makes me really sad, like when I was listening to *The Lightning Thief* where um, Percy's mom gets choked by the minotaur, it made me really sad because I didn't want to lose my mom." Robert's comment inspired similar ones, including Edward's remarks about deaths in *Frankenstein* and *Harry Potter*. Ellie then shared that she was often afraid before going to sleep and that reading usually helped. Lydia raised her hand and, speaking clearly and confidently, shared her own strategy for comforting nighttime fears: "Sometimes at night, whenever my eyes trick me, I sorta pull up the covers because I feel much, much better if I can't see because then I feel real scared. I like, pull the covers over my head, and then I'll probably bring a stuffed animal." Later in the conversation, when Tyisha shared that she gets "scared a lot

when I go to bed," Mae confirmed Lydia as a person with valuable expertise to share (Ladson-Billings, 1995b; Noddings, 1998) by asking Tyisha, "Have you tried Lydia's strategy of getting in bed and pulling up the covers real tight?"

In addition to taking every opportunity to encourage Lydia's peer interactions and her social identification as an author and contributing member of the classroom community, Mae spent time working intensively with Lydia on her writing. During workshop conferences and other classroom activities, she keyed in to Lydia's interests as topics for writing, as Stuhlman and Pianta (2009) saw in the classrooms of high-quality teachers. In October, Lydia interrupted a writing conference between Mae and Shelly to tell Mae a story about a butterfly. Mae said to her, "Oh my gosh! That would be a great story. You should write it down!" (field notes, October 9, 2007). Thus, rather than scolding her for interrupting, Mae bent the usual "don't interrupt during conferences" rule because, she explained to us after the observation, it seemed more important to give Lydia the message that, although the academic task at hand is important, "you still matter more" (Noddings, 1984, p. 176). Small moments such as these, which could have easily slipped by unnoticed, were key in Mae's restorying of Lydia. Mae also consulted with Lydia's parents for help with her writing: the three adults had brainstormed ideas to address Lydia's writing challenges. Lydia's father had begun writing with her at home, and he regularly communicated with Mae about Lydia's progress. Such positive relationships with students' families are hallmarks of culturally responsive pedagogy, and this strategy was an important component of Lydia's restorying (Compton-Lilly, 2008; Gay, 2000).

Although focusing on writing during school continued to be an issue for Lydia, the impact of writing with her father was noticeable, affirming the power of grounding the curriculum in students' lived experiences (Compton-Lilly, 2008; Gay, 2000). He talked about his work with her and shared family photographs at Mae's suggestion, and these topics became focuses of her writing. In mid-October Lydia wrote a short piece about a state she had visited several times with her family. Later the same month, she allowed Mae to read a paragraph she had written to the class. The quantity of her writing also increased—from an average of fewer than five words in her writer's notebook each day to more than 25. She also became a more confident writer, publishing six original books in a variety of genres during the year and sharing them with the class. At the end of the year, during author's chair, Lydia shared her nonfiction book, *Shocking and Amazing Jellyfish*, the culmination of the research she had been conducting over the past month. The video shows her sitting in the author's chair waiting for the students gathered around her to settle down before beginning to read:

> Her relaxed stance—one leg crossed casually over the other and one arm draped across the back of the chair—contrasts sharply with the visibly anxious child we observed in the first few months of school. As she finishes reading each page, Lydia shows the illustrations, holding the book up and slowly moving it from side to side so all students can see her vividly colored illustrations. At the end, she reads her "about the author" page and then calls on several students, who compliment her illustrations, ask about her favorite jellyfish, and wonder why she decided to study jellyfish. "Because I want to be a marine biologist," she answers. (Videotape notes, May 15, 2007)

The scene illustrated the restoried Lydia and the changes in her social identification that had occurred over the year (Wortham, 2004). The socially withdrawn, uneasy girl who previously refused to write had become a confident participant in a classroom ritual and a member of the social community of the classroom. She appeared to now see herself and be viewed by her peers as an author, illustrator, researcher, and future professional. A social isolate during her previous school years, by spring Lydia had formed close friendships with two classmates and was participating in the life of the classroom. Due to the improvement in Lydia's interpersonal relationships, the possibility of Asperger's syndrome was not pursued.

Edward: Interrupting the downward spiral. Edward, a wiry force of nature, came to second grade with a history of frequent office referrals for behavior and pride in his reputation for driving teachers crazy (personal communication, Edward's first-grade teacher, April 14, 2008). Edward's family, including his younger brother, who had a neurological disorder, spent several years in a Southeast Asian country where, according to his mother, neighbors did not appreciate the boys' rough, overactive behavior. Edward's mother confessed to Mae that she did not know her children were considered "so bad" until they entered elementary school in the United States, and she saw they were not getting invited to birthday parties and other events by peers.

Field notes from the early months of the school year affirmed Edward's disruptive presence in the classroom. Sitting still seemed nearly impossible for Edward; he careered through the classroom, making his presence impossible to ignore with loud, often rude complaints and comments. He could be sarcastic and sometimes mean; he relentlessly teased other students, especially girls, sometimes bringing them to tears. Mae said other students refused to work with him on projects after several attempts had dissolved into arguments over his oppositional behavior and unwillingness to compromise. During morning menu one day, mild-mannered Trey confronted Edward's overbearing behavior, as shown in the following example. Trey was working on the computer, and Edward was standing behind him. I asked what they were looking at:

> **Edward:** The Astronomy Picture of the Day. Saturn's moon has (inaudible) on it. Whoops! Comet over California. Whoosh!

Trey continues to look at the screen.

> **Edward:** [reaching over Trey's head and clawing the screen] Alien monster gods. Go back there, Trey. I found something that's like radar, and it's so cool . . .
> **Trey:** [rolling his eyes and speaking sharply] You don't have to control everything we do! (Transcript, November 9, 2007)

In her October interview, Mae described Edward as "the type of student who can make or break a classroom community." She commented that she had seen many teachers engage in power struggles with students like Edward, which invariably leads to a cycle of negativity and further erosion of behavior: "If you can recognize it and keep the patience. I mean, I can recognize it, but keeping the patience is hard. But if you get on that behavior jag with them, they're only going to spiral down" (October interview).

Academically, writing was Edward's biggest challenge. During a writing workshop observation, while Mae was conferring with Lydia, she glanced at Edward's paper and noticed he hadn't written anything: "Mae is sitting next to Lydia writing on a notepad. She stands up and prompts Edward to begin writing. She walks away and talks to another student. Edward still does not write. Mae goes back to Edward and prompts him to write again. Edward begins to write, and Mae returns to sit next to Lydia, and continues to make notes. Edward stands up and asks Mae a question; he has written one word" (field notes, October 9, 2007). Later the same week, Edward broke and sharpened his pencil three times in five minutes, apparently to avoid writing. The final time, he whispered conspiratorially to the researcher taking field notes that she should warn teachers to "keep an eye on your students" (field notes, October 21, 2007).

In response to what she learned about Edward through reading and writing conferences, talking with his parents, and classroom interactions, Mae developed strategies for supporting him socially and academically. To help him focus on writing and mathematics, she explained, "I have to sit with him like this one-to-one, and then he can do it. But he's excellent at distracting *you* from what his needs really are." Mae was able to work with Edward and other students who needed her help in this intense manner because she had spent the early weeks of school building her workshop environment— one in which students had become accustomed to working purposefully with appropriate, relevant materials and topics, as students in the classrooms of effective teachers do (Pressley et al., 2001). Through status checks, she knew what each student was working on every day, and students worked mostly independently as Mae moved from student to student or group to group to have conferences, scanning the room to check on students' activity and behavior. Another strategy Mae used was to offer Edward the freedom to work on projects with other students, although she had to initially persuade them to allow Edward to join their group projects because of his past behavior, and she kept a close eye on the dynamics.

Edward clearly enjoyed the read-aloud time; we observed that he was the first to go to the carpet after lunch and often asked Mae, "When are we going to start reading?" Our observations show Mae used read aloud as a primary vehicle for Edward's restorying. However, his behavior presented a range of challenges during that time. During our read-aloud observations, we scanned the group at regular intervals, noting students' activity and signs of engagement. Edward was often fidgeting, facing away from Mae, and/or trying to get the attention of other students through funny faces, gestures, and noises. For example, the title character in *Ereth's Birthday* speaks in alliterative, silly, and sometimes gross phrases (e.g., "loudmouth lollie," "giraffe gas"). Each time Mae pronounced one of Ereth's phrases, Edward would repeat it, guffaw, and look around, hoping to enlist others in the silliness. In field notes from October, one observer wrote that Edward's "constant chatter and activity would drive me crazy." Every read-aloud observation mentioned Edward's multiple interruptions; in fact, he interrupted 17 times during a single read aloud to say something silly to another student, laugh loudly, or make a smart-aleck comment, as in the example below:

> **Mae:** What do you call it when an animal acts like a human—has human qualities like talking or playing music?
> **Edward:** [in a sassy tone] Um, unnecessary? (Transcript, October 16, 2007)

When other students misspoke about something or were trying to collect their thoughts during discussions, Edward was quick with a know-it-all correction:

> **Roger:** I don't think the fisher should have deserved to get in that trap anyway, um, um, because he didn't really do anything until like the end. Um, but, um. But I really don't think he deserved to get killed in that trap.
> **Edward:** He *didn't* get killed.
> **Mae:** What are you thinking Reilly?
> **Reilly:** Um. I'm glad he got in the spring trap because—
> **Edward:** [interrupting] You mean the *cage* trap. (Transcript, February 13, 2008)

Despite Edward's sometimes seemingly senseless chatter, bids for attention, and restless, apparently off-task behavior, Mae saw that much of what he contributed to read-aloud discussions was "right on" (April interview). Although we were sometimes exasperated by his behavior while we were observing, our later analysis of Edward's gestures and comments in the videos affirmed Mae's assertion. In Noddings's (1992) terms, she was confirming or seeing the best in him. For example, he often spoke directly to characters or acted out events in the text, both examples of what Sipes termed "expressive, performative engagement" (2002, p. 476). Further, between his silly comments, Edward made many thoughtful contributions, as shown in the following excerpt from *Ereth's Birthday* (Avi, 2001) about Marty the fisher and the hunter's trap. Mae had just read a scene in which the title character, Ereth, and his companions, a litter of fox kits, were discussing whether to free Marty from the trap. Hearing the conversation, Marty offers his opinion:

> **Mae:** [reading from the text] "Of course you should," said Marty, "The weak always have to help the strong. We're the important ones."
> **Edward:** No!
> **Mae:** Who said no? What are you saying no to Edward?
> **Edward:** The weak don't always have to help the strong because if they're a criminal or something, that might make it worse. (Transcript, February 13, 2008)

Edward's comments started a discussion among students who gave other reasons why the weak should not help the strong and why Ereth and the kits should or should not free Marty from the trap. Mae said she worked on achieving a delicate balance between giving Edward space to contribute and feel valued and keeping him from taking over conversations and inciting other students to lose control, as we observed him trying to do on many occasions. It was during the read aloud, then, that Mae's restorying of Edward was most evident. Similar to Wortham's (2005) study, Mae used interactions around the curriculum—the discussions of literature—to help Edward shape his learning identity. However, in contrast to Wortham's example of William, who was marginalized in this process by his teachers and peers, Mae recognized Edward's academic interests and strength in literature—albeit buried under behavioral challenges. Seizing them as vehicles for his behavioral, academic, and interpersonal growth, she nurtured his potential through confirmation and person-

alized leadership (Alder & Moulton, 1998; Noddings, 1992). In the transcript excerpt above, for example, his initial remark ("no!") could have easily been overlooked, but Mae saw it as an opportunity for Edward to make a serious contribution to the discussion.

At the same time, also in keeping with effective teaching and culturally relevant pedagogy, Mae kept her expectations for him at a high level, such as when Edward did not follow the conventions of the community to show respect for others in conversations, as shown in the following observation: "Mae makes her expectations clear but also makes it known that she wants to hear what he has to say. This is done respectfully; it's not a 'gotcha' kind of thing: Mae says to Edward: 'Edward you started to say something. I called on Reilly because she was raising her hand. I want to come back to you because what you were saying sounded important, and I'd like for us to hear it'" (transcript, May 10, 2008). Similar to the high-quality teachers observed by Stuhlman and Pianta (2009), however, Mae did not chide Edward when he could not contain his enthusiasm about a story, such as when he spoke directly to characters or acted out story events (also illustrative of engagement and understanding, according to Sipes [2002]), but simply smiled and continued reading.

Mae also stressed that it was important for other students to see Edward as a positive leader (April interview) and that she valued his contributions, as shown in the earlier example from *Ereth's Birthday*, as well as in the following example:

> **Mae:** Chapter 14 is called "Orpheus." That's surprising to me because Orpheus comes from a very old adult story. [Looking at Edward] Do you know what it is?
> **Edward:** Yes.
>
> Edward gives a very long summary of the story. At one point, he stops and says he knows Orpheus has muses but he doesn't know what a muse is. Reilly says, "We can look in that book." Mae asks Reilly to get the book about Greek mythology from the shelf, and she brings it to Mae while Edward finishes talking.
>
> **Mae:** You just told us a great—kind of a long—but a good summary Edward.
>
> Edward has more to say, and Mae lets him continue. When Edward finishes, Mae thanks him and opens the book to the page about Orpheus. Edward spontaneously moves to the front to point out some of the characters he was talking about. Mae thanks Edward again, points out the muses, reads about them, and continues with the read aloud. (Transcript, April 10, 2008)

Mae used her knowledge of Edward as a person and as a reader interested in Greek mythology in this exchange, showcasing his expertise in the way Ladson-Billings described (1995b), as well as confirming him as someone with valuable knowledge (Noddings, 1992, 1998). These moves on Mae's part influenced other students' perceptions of Edward and contributed to his restorying, as evidenced when the class later studied ancient myths. We noted that students sought Edward out to provide background knowledge and help them brainstorm ideas for writing their own myths

at the culmination of the unit—he was thus socially identified as an expert in the subject. Field notes show that Edward appeared very engaged in writing during this time as well, as he created a mythical character based on a combination of traits from read alouds and personal readings of Greek, Roman, and Chinese myths (field notes, April 22, 2008).

In a similar way, during workshop meetings, Mae deliberately held Edward up to his peers as an example of a thoughtful, helpful student—one who could provide expert support to his peers in a knowledge-sharing context consistent with culturally relevant pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 1995b). For example, Mae often pulled together small, heterogeneous groups of students to talk about the challenges they were having in reading books on their instructional levels. One day, Edward had shared a strategy for defining words and, when Ellie had a similar challenge, Mae referred her to him for advice:

> **Ellie:** I have trouble knowing what some of the words mean.
> **Mae:** In a book that fits you will have some words that are not understood. Did you see how Edward solved that? (Transcript, April 9, 2008)

Edward appeared proud as he explained to Ellie that he had used the strategy of reading ahead to see if he could find clues that would help define the word. Mae affirmed that books written for young readers often provide those kinds of context clues. Later, in the same meeting, Trey shared that his challenge was in understanding some of the instructions in a booklet for an action-figure game. Edward suggested that Trey go to a website that offered tips for playing the game, and Trey eagerly headed to the computer as soon as the meeting ended. In turn, Trey, who often collaborated with a group on writing and morning menu projects, invited Edward to join a project in process—the first time Mae had not intervened on Edward's behalf. These examples illustrate the ways in which the social collaborative curriculum of Mae's classroom, which we found consistent with principles of effective and culturally relevant teaching, afforded space, time, and opportunity to showcase Edward's strengths among his peers, thus enlisting their support in his restorying.

At the end of the year, it became evident that Mae's restorying of Edward had resulted in greater peer acceptance for him, as illustrated in field notes:

> Mae has decided not to begin another read aloud but instead to read excerpts of books students have asked her to read. Today's book is *Johnny Texas*, a book Edward has brought from home and is currently reading. Edward looks so proud as Mae reads his book, shows the illustrations, and the students comment and make predictions. . . . Mae stops after a few pages, and says if they're interested, students can ask Edward about the book. There is a round of "Awwww" (they want her to continue reading), and then students start crowding around Edward to ask him questions. A couple of the boys call, "Hail Edward! Hail Edward!" Edward looks delighted. He has become a celebrity. Mae has fostered so much interest in Edward and his book through the way she shows her own interest. (Field notes, May 10, 2008)

Edward did not become a different person. He still teased students and avoided writing—although not nearly as much in either case. However, like Lydia, his story had undergone a noticeable transformation. He had come to be seen by his peers as someone with knowledge and skills, his social interactions were more pleasant and productive, and, as a result, he was invited by students who previously avoided him to participate in their projects.

Conclusion

In her second-grade classroom, Mae built an environment in which students' agency, interests, responsibility, and collaboration were valued. The workshop structure of her classroom afforded Mae the opportunity to get to know her students and provide the instruction each needed. This was especially evident for students who entered her classroom with learning, behavioral, and emotional challenges and negative reputations from previous years in school.

It was not acceptable to Mae for Edward to spend half the year in the principal's office or for Lydia to crouch under her desk, as they had in first grade. Instead, through modeling and enlisting the support of other students, Mae helped Edward, who had been in serious behavioral trouble and on the way to becoming a pariah in his school, harness unruly behaviors, smooth rough edges, negotiate interpersonal relationships, and make academic progress through his interests and strengths in literature and previously untapped leadership abilities. In Lydia, Mae saw a child who needed time and patience rather than the referral to special education and a battery of tests suggested by others. Mae's persistent yet gentle guidance and a curriculum and environment that allowed her to progress at her own pace were key for Lydia to find her writing voice and identity and join the classroom community. Mae purposefully disrupted Lydia and Edward's negative stories and supported them in building positive learning and social identities through restorying.

Importance of the Study

In developing the concept of restorying, we employed elements of social identification theory, effective teaching, culturally responsive theory/culturally relevant pedagogy, and caring to offer an explanation for how students with negative academic, social, and behavioral reputations can become part of an academic and social classroom community; the two case studies recounted here illustrate the process. Each of the theories added important elements, yet none was sufficient alone to explicate the process of restorying.

Wortham's work is an important component in that it illustrates the centrality of the academic curriculum in influencing students' learning identities. Another important dimension that Wortham's research adds to restorying is the explicit description of the role of peers, in addition to the teacher, in the process of social identification through interactions around the curriculum. This process was evident in Mae's work with both Lydia and Edward during read-aloud discussions and with Edward during small-group meetings. However, positive social identification and academic progress were not necessarily the goals of the teachers in Wortham's (2005) research, as illustrated in the case of William, who never escaped his identification as a resistant Black male. Culturally relevant pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 1995b) pro-

vides a theoretical model for the kind of collaboration, shared knowledge, and development of supportive community that were evident in Mae's classroom. This community provided a fertile environment for Mae to enlist students' support in the restorying of Edward and Lydia both through literature discussions and through the social collaborative venues of workshop and morning menu.

Finally, restorying depends on a knowledgeable, pedagogically skillful teacher who provides a challenging yet supportive classroom environment in which all students are expected to achieve academically (Allington & Johnston, 2001; Pressley et al., 2001; Stuhlman & Pianta, 2009), including students who are negatively constructed in school and those from nondominant racial and linguistic groups (Gay, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 1994). Mae developed personal relationships with Lydia and Edward and based her expectations and personalized instruction for them on what she learned about their academic, social, and personal needs along with their individual interests, passions, and strengths (Compton-Lilly, 2008; Gay, 2000; Noddings, 1998).

Implications for Research and Practice

We provided a rich, thick description of Mae's classroom through the use of a variety of data sources collected over a school year. The extensive data contributed to our conceptual and theoretical thinking and gave us multiple forms of evidence for explicating the process of restorying. However, studying one classroom has limitations, and we recommend further research in other contexts and settings. One suggestion is to conduct, across varying contexts, a study of teachers who are identified both as exemplary and as skilled in working with challenged students. Another suggestion is to identify students who are restoried in one classroom and to follow them across time.

When we asked Mae to recommend implications for practice, her suggestions were for teachers to use workshop approaches. Through her years of using literacy workshop, along with the recently added practice of morning menu, she has found that these approaches foster academic success and personal development by providing time and space for student choice, self-direction, and peer collaboration, as well as personalized teacher input that enhances relationships between and among teachers and students. In addition, Mae stressed that the shared experience of regular, relevant, thought-provoking read alouds and discussion allowed her to further know and respect students and their interests and motives. In Mae's hands, the dialogue afforded students space to share ideas, build new meanings, and develop an appreciation for the perspectives of their classmates—including students like Lydia and Edward, who needed to be seen in a positive light.

Like Mae, we found her workshop and read-aloud approaches central to her work with students, and we are troubled by trends we see in schools that threaten their existence. As is the case with virtually all public schools, more and more of Mae's teaching time was being displaced with testing and clerical duties intended to prove she was doing her job (Assaf, 2008; Bomer, 2005). She continued doing her read aloud during these times because she refused to give it up. Students read and wrote while she was testing, but she was unable to provide as much personalized input, and the noisy, messy business of student collaboration had to be restricted. These practices may be seen as enrichment rather than a necessary part of the curriculum and are usually the first to go in an atmosphere of accountability because they might not be seen as directly related to the improvement of test scores (Barksdale-Ladd &

Thomas, 2000; Bomer, 2005). How would such an environment affect the process of restorying and students like Edward and Lydia? The personalized feedback and support from Mae and the social interactions with classmates that both influenced their academic progress and supported them in becoming valued members of the classroom community would be severely curtailed in such an atmosphere.

References

Alder, N. I. (2002). Interpretations of the meaning of care: Creating caring relationships in urban middle school classrooms. *Urban Education*, **37,** 241–266.

Alder, N. I., & Moulton, M. (1998). Interpretations of the meaning of care: Creating caring relationships in a middle school classroom. *Research in Middle Level Education Quarterly*, **21,** 15–32.

Allington, R. L., & Johnston, P. H. (2001). *Reading to learn: Lessons from exemplary fourth-grade classrooms*. New York: Guilford.

Assaf, L. (2008). Professional identity of a reading teacher: Responding to high-stakes testing pressures. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, **14,** 239–252.

Atwell, N. (1987). *In the middle: New understanding about writing, reading, and learning* (1st ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Avi. (2001). *Ereth's birthday*. Logan, IA: Perfection Learning.

Barksdale-Ladd, M. A., & Thomas, K. F. (2000). What's at stake in high-stakes testing: Teachers and parents speak out. *Journal of Teacher Education*, **51,** 384–397.

Blair, T. R., Rupley, W. H., & Nichols, W. D. (2007). The effective teacher of reading: Considering the "what" and "how" of instruction. *Reading Teacher*, **60,** 432–438.

Bomer, K. (2005). Missing the children: When politics and programs impede our teaching. *Language Arts*, **82,** 168–176.

Carle, E. (1991). *Dragons, dragons.* New York: Philomel.

Compton-Lilly, C. (2008). Teaching struggling readers: Capitalizing on diversity for effective learning. *Reading Teacher*, **61,** 668–672.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1997). *Doing what matters most: Investing in quality teaching.* New York: National Committee on Teaching and America's Future.

Dyson, A., & Genishi, C. (2005). *On the case: Approaches to language and literacy research.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Emerson, R., Fretz, R. I., & Shaw, L. L. (1995). *Writing ethnographic fieldnotes.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Erlandson, D. A., Harris, E. L., Skipper, B. L., & Allen, S. D. (1993). *Doing naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Graue, M. E., & Walsh, D. J. (1998). *Studying children in context: Theories, methods, and ethics*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Irvine, J. J. (2003). *Educating teachers for diversity: Seeing with a cultural eye.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Johnston, P. (2004). *Choice words: How our language affects children's learning.* Portland, ME: Stenhouse.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The dreamkeepers.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995a). But that's just good teaching! The case for culturally relevant pedagogy. *Theory into Practice*, **34,** 159–165.

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

Lemke, J. (2000). Across the scales of time: Artifacts, activities, and meanings in ecosocial systems. *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, **7,** 273–290.

Nelson, M. E., Hull, G. A., & Roche-Smith, J. (2008). Challenges of multimedia self-presentation: Taking, and mistaking the show on the road. *Written Communication*, **25,** 415–440.

Noddings, N. (1984). *Caring: A feminine approach to ethics and moral education* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Noddings, N. (1992). *The challenge to care in schools* (2nd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.

Noddings, N. (1998). The caring professional. In S. Gordon, P. Benner, & N. Noddings (Eds.), *Caregiving: Readings in knowledge, practice, ethics, and politics* (pp. 161–171). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Nye, B., Konstantopoulos, S., & Hedges, L. (2004). How large are teacher effects? *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, **26,** 237–257.

Polyani, M. (1958). *Personal knowledge.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Pressley, M., Allington, R., L., Wharton-McDonald, R., Block, C. C., & Morrow, L. M. (2001). *Learning to read: Lessons from exemplary first-grade classrooms.* New York: Guilford.

Purcell-Gates, V., Jacobson, E., & Degener, S. (2004). *Print literacy development: Uniting cognitive and social practice theories.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Ryle, G. (1949). *The concept of mind.* London: Hutchinson.

Schön, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action.* New York: Basic Books.

Sipes, L. (2002). Talking back and taking over: Young children's expressive engagement during storybook read alouds. *Reading Teacher*, **55,** 476–483.

Steinbeck, J. (1947). *The pearl.* New York: Bantam.

Stuhlman, M. W., & Pianta, R. C. (2009). Profiles of educational quality in first grade. *Elementary School Journal*, **109,** 323–342.

Taylor, B. M., Peterson, D. S., Pearson, P. D., & Rodriguez, M. C. (2002). Looking inside classrooms: Reflecting on the "how" as well as the "what" in effective reading instruction. *Reading Teacher*, **56,** 270–279.

Van Manen, M. (1995). On the epistemology of reflective practice. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, **1,** 33–50.

Wortham, S. (2004). The interdependence of social identification and learning. *American Educational Research Journal*, **41,** 715–750.

Wortham, S. (2005). *Learning identity: The joint emergence of social identification and academic learning.* Boston: Cambridge University Press.