

MOKYKLOS BENDRUOMENĖ IR KLASĖS KULTŪRA SCHOLL COMMUNITY AND CLASS CULTURE

Complexity, Contradiction, and Carnival: Microethnographic Research on Student Disruption in a High School English Language Arts Classroom

Matt Seymour

Department of Teaching and Learning,
The Ohio State University,
Email: Seymour.170@osu.edu

Abstract. *When teaching, many educators must respond to unruly and disruptive students. While most scholarship on student disruption focuses on classroom management strategies and tactics, few studies consider the nature of the disruption, its ideological significance and the social consequences that follows. Via ethnographic methods and microethnographic discourse analysis, this paper examines the complexity and contradictions of macro- and microstructures as they manifest during a student's disruption of a classroom discussion of a novel in an 11th and 12th grade English Language Arts class in the United States. Using Bakhtin's notion of carnival as a theoretical framework, this paper examines the pattern of disruption in the classroom that evoked multiple and contradictory ideologies and both maintained and subverted power structures in the context. Contrary to the belief that classroom disruptions are always challenges to power, they sometimes reinforced power relations on a broader cultural level. This paper urges that research and scholarship embrace complexity and contradiction as inherent in the interactions of people in schools and seeks to rethink how educators view and respond to classroom disruption. It concludes by advocating that embracing complexity and contradiction will better allow teachers and researchers to think through systems of education as a way to effectively and ethically intervene when these structures prove problematic.*

Keywords: *microethnographic, discourse analysis, classroom disruption, carnival, classroom management.*

Introduction

Nearly all educators have faced the challenge of teaching amidst unruly and disruptive students. Regardless of context or nationality, classrooms are comprised of multiple people with differing backgrounds, agendas and needs; these factors can come into conflict and often result in the disruption of a teacher's curricular

agenda. Classroom management has long been recognized as one of the most salient factors in effective teaching (Emmer, Sanford, Clements & Martin 1982), and some studies have shown that effective classroom management has greater impact on students' academic achievement than home environment, motivation and socioeconomic status (Wang, Haertel & Wal-

berg 1993/1994). It follows that if teachers cannot gain the cooperation of their students, then it would be difficult to engage them in a rigorous academic curriculum. While there is research that addresses classroom management and discipline (e.g., Everston & Emmer 1982; Marzano & Marzano 2001; Simonsen, Fairbanks, Briesch, Myers & Sugai 2008), little of it examines the nature of disruption, who does it, what ideologies it represents, how it occurs and under what circumstances it is realized (c.f. Weinstein, Tomlinson-Clarke & Curran 2004). Students who disrupt the agenda and tenor of a classroom do not do so in a vacuum, nor does their behavior come from nowhere. Instead, it is socially embedded, often a response to other people and the contexts they are in, and can be far more complex than simply “misbehaving” or challenging the teacher’s authority. To illustrate these points, I use ethnographic methods and microethnographic discourse analysis to examine a student’s disruption of a classroom discussion as it occurs in an 11th and 12th grade English Language Arts (ELA) classroom, during literature instruction. This analysis seeks to understand the nature of classroom disruption and what it reveals about the ideologies surrounding the practice of teaching and learning literature in a particular classroom.

American schools are both material and social constructions that largely promulgate the values and customs of a white middle-class (Au 2016; Leonardo & Broderick 2011; McDermott, Raley & Seyer-Ochi 2009). These are not abstract systems distant from people’s experiences of formal education, but rather they are present, lived and enacted in and through

language by students and teachers every day in schools (Bloome, Power-Carter, Carlisle, Christian, Otto & Shuart-Faris 2005). Far from cohesive or coherent, the intersections of these systems are layered with contradictions and complexities that create the tensions that people must live in and navigate as they teach and learn.

Schools and curricula are arguably designed by people for specific social purposes. However, those social purposes are often thwarted as the stakeholders in classroom settings have different and conflicting agendas. Researchers might view student disruption in classrooms as social manifestations of systemic incoherence and contradiction in the classroom, since by definition, coherence and cohesion require continuity. Perhaps the most well-known guiding principle of ethnographic research is “making the familiar strange and the strange familiar.”¹ Put another way, researchers enter the field with the understanding that they are going to complicate and challenge their outsiders’ or “etic” perspective and assumptions by gaining an “emic,” or insiders’, perspective that better describes, explains and understands the insiders’ systems and ways of being (Pike 1965). Conversely, ethnographic studies may require researchers to challenge their own understanding about a community with which they are already familiar and challenge themselves to interrogate their assumptions of the status quo. From both etic and emic perspectives, in describing and theorizing, researchers may impose a singular rationality that seeks to make a

¹ According to Heath and Street (2008), this term was likely coined by an “18th century German poet-philosopher Freidrich von Hardenberg.”

coherent sense of contradictory systems, but this assumes there is coherent and consistent sense to be made between systems. In recent years, there have been calls to further embrace the layers of chaos and the complexity that come with researching human social behavior and life in everyday settings (Agar 2013; Leander 2004).

Building on this call, this paper seeks to disrupt and undermine simplistic understandings of schools and the disruptions that occur within them. As Green and Bloome (2004) remind, ethnography and ethnographic studies are continuously evolving, and as such, we should embrace and acknowledge the complexity, contradictions and tensions inherent in human social life and its institutions so that we may effectively and ethically intervene when these systems prove problematic. Using an interaction between a teacher and students in an 11th and 12th grade English Language Arts classroom as a “telling case” (Mitchell 1984) for making theoretical inferences, this paper argues for a paradigm shift from one where researchers strive for a single, clear but ultimately flawed pattern to research that recognizes and embraces complexity and contradiction and the tensions they create within the micro- and macrostructures of the everyday life in schools.

Microethnographic (Bloome et al. 2005) perspectives and analyses have the potential to facilitate this paradigm shift and to highlight the density and evolution of unruly systems by making explicit how complexity and contradiction occur in the context of schools. I begin by analyzing a literacy event (Heath 1983) in which a high school English Language Arts (ELA)

teacher was attempting to lead her class in a discussion about a novel and was disrupted by a young man’s remark. Using this analysis, I examine how it happened in and through language and discuss the implications and impacts of how this event occurs within the tensions and complexities of contradicting systems. Upon close examination, this paper finds that contrary to the belief that classroom disruptions are always challenges to power, they sometimes reinforced power relations on a broader cultural level and the interactions between students and teacher can evoke multiple and contradictory ideological systems embedded in the context of the classroom.

Review of Literature

Although studies on student disruption and classroom management date back nearly 50 years, scholarship on these phenomena in high school classrooms lacks a robust research base. Research has largely focused on elementary level classrooms and conceives of student disruption as a problem to be solved through routinizing classroom procedures, classroom management techniques and disciplinary interventions (Simonsen et al. 2008). Furthermore, there is a dearth of ethnographic studies on classroom disruption and management, with the field being dominated by psychological (e.g., Brantley & Webster 1993), process-product (e.g., Evertson & Emmer 1982) and meta-analysis (e.g., Marzano, Marzano & Pickering 2003) research approaches.

Kounin (1970) represents some of the earliest researchers on classroom disruption and management. He examined the

behaviors teachers exhibited toward maintaining control of their students. He analyzed video recordings of nearly 50 elementary school classrooms in the US and identified four traits of effective classroom management: 1) Articulating behavioral expectations; 2) Variety and challenge in class work; 3) Smoothness and momentum during instruction and lessons; 4) “Withitness,” a teacher’s awareness of student behavior that might need immediate attention and correction. He concluded that the final trait was the most important factor toward minimizing student disruption.

A study conducted by Brophy and Evertson (1976) was among the first to connect students’ scholastic achievement to classroom management. While classroom management was not the primary focus of their research, they concluded that the teachers’ ability to manage the behavior of students was the most important factor that correlated with students’ academic achievement. Evertson continued this work and was involved in several large-scale studies, taking place at both the elementary and junior high schools. These studies helped create a larger research base that supported classroom management as the most salient quality of effective teachers whose students showed high academic achievement (Emmer, Evertson & Anderson 1980; Evertson & Anderson 1979; Evertson & Emmer 1982; Sanford & Evertson 1981). In addition to affirming the importance and correlation with classroom management and academic achievement, these studies also found that the teachers’ establishing of consistent routines and procedures early in the school year had significant positive impact.

Brophy and McCaslin (1992) added further depth to the understanding of effective classroom management, as they conducted interviews with 98 teachers about how they would respond to 12 different kinds of “problem students.” Their study had two sets of teachers, ones described by their principals as outstanding at dealing with difficult students and ones described as average. The researchers described 2 scenarios of classroom disruption to the teachers and asked them how they would respond. The study found that the teachers designated as outstanding classroom managers demonstrated a facility for adaptive responses to different types of disruption, showed a greater proclivity to show personal interest with the student, and they described long-term strategies for quelling disruption, whereas the teachers designated as average managers tended to rely on the same tactics repeatedly.

Marzano et al. (2003) conducted a meta-analysis of the research on classroom management and developed a “best practices” type model based on their generalizations and findings. The analysis included over 100 research reports and examined 4 dimensions of effective classroom management: 1) Rules and procedures; 2) Disciplinary interventions; 3) Teacher-student relationships; 4) The mental set. This study found that teachers who reliably and effectively employed these techniques significantly reduced occurrences of student disruption. Regarding academic achievement, the results affirmed previous research that showed students demonstrated greater academic achievement and gains than ones in classrooms with teachers who were less effective at responding to student disruption.

Despite having consistent findings regarding the positive correlation between effective classroom management and student achievement, these studies do not recognize and examine the demographics or the nature of disruption and their cultural and ideological variation. The rate and frequency that disciplinary interventions have been applied in classrooms disproportionately impact marginalized populations in the United States (Johnston 2000; McCadden 1998; Monroe 2006; Skiba, Michael, Nardo & Peterson 2000). Students fitting these demographics have had far higher rates of dropping out, being suspended from school and becoming incarcerated (Farmer 2010; Katz 1996; Laura 2014; Smith 2015).

In a response to these inequities of discipline, there have been calls for implementation of and research on “culturally responsive classroom management” (CRCM) (Weinstein et al. 2004). The theory of CRCM builds upon the work of Ladson-Billing’s (1994) notion of culturally responsive teaching (CRT) as a way to create more equitable classrooms. Noting the disparity of discipline across the lines of culture and race, Weinstein et al. (2004) advocated that teachers should engage in interrogating their own biases and strive to gain better understandings of the cultural practices and behavior among their students. They and others (Gutierrez & Rogoff 2003) caution, however, that teachers should be careful not to essentialize students based on broad generalizations of cultural and racial groups, and instead should make an active effort to inquire about each student’s cultural norms and values to better respond to behavior they

may find inappropriate for the classroom. Finally, Weinstein and colleagues advocated that teachers manage their classroom by creating an environment that shows students they are valued and cared for.

Taking up the framework of Weinstein et al. (2004), Milner and Tenore (2010) studied two early career teachers and how they used CRCM in an urban and diverse middle school. The researchers noted that although each teacher exhibited a different style of teaching, they were both able to effectively use CRCM in their classrooms. From their analysis, Milner and Tenor also derived several principles teachers and researchers might use to further implement CRCM successfully. These principles largely emphasize that teachers address equity and inequality and build substantial relationships with the students and their communities. Bondy, Ross, Hambacher and Acosta (2012) found that indeed building substantial relationships was critical in creating successful, culturally relevant and high-achieving classrooms with their study of two early career elementary school teachers who sought to be “warm demanders.” Being a warm demander is an aspect of CRT that emphasizes “approaching [...] students with unconditional positive regard, knowing students and their cultures well, and insisting the students perform to a high standard” (p. 58, Bondy & Ross 2008). In the study, one teacher understood being a warm demander as a stance toward students and effectively used it to build strong relationships with them and established her authority as an educator, whereas the other teacher saw it as a set of classroom management tactics to gain students’ compliance toward

achieving academic goals. In conceiving of this culturally responsive teaching principle as only a strategy toward classroom management, the researchers argued the latter teacher had difficulty establishing her authority as a teacher and struggled to meaningfully engage her students.

Conceptualizing classroom management as more than a suite of techniques continues to be an underdeveloped area of theory and research. This study seeks to disrupt the generalizable yet reductive understandings of classroom management and disruption by showing the complexity that can occur through disruption during classroom instruction. Understanding how disruption occurs, who is doing it and to what end it has the potential to move our understanding of classroom management from being a program for gaining compliance to an opportunity for understanding the complex and contradictory ideologies that are present and manifest in classrooms and the ways people teach and learn.

Theoretical Framing

Building on the theoretical constructs of Bloome et al. (2005), this paper frames its research as people “acting and reacting in response to other people, what they have done and what they will do” (p. 6). Undergirding this construct is Volosinov’s (1973) conception of language that every act and utterance is both a reflection and refraction of what came before it, in the present and anticipating a response in the future. The notion of “what came before” embodies the history of the interlocutors including the micro- and macrocontexts that are present in language as a form of the dialo-

gic (Bakhtin 1981). As such, meaning can only be understood as contextually embedded, part of a greater whole and continuously developing in social interaction with people.

Books on ethnographic and qualitative research often refer to the contexts and conduct of this kind of educational research as being “messy” (Blommaert & Jie 2010; Hammersley & Atkinson 1983; Heath & Street 2008). This acknowledgement of messiness supports the legitimacy of this research in that the validity of one’s findings lies not in controlling variables but rather in ecological validity; that it is the study of phenomena in their *actual* settings and a consideration of the histories, intersections and layers that contribute to actions and meanings at particular times and spaces (Agar 2013). This paper builds on the notion of “messy” ethnographic research and extends it by advocating that the messiness is not something to be waded through and navigated in pursuit of coherence but rather embraced as a form of the unruly, complex and contradictory systems present in schools and the lives of people. To examine the unruliness and complexity of human social interaction, this paper employs Bakhtin’s (1984) conception of the “Carnival.”

In the introduction to *Rabelais and His World*, Holquist (1984) asserts that all of Bakhtin’s writing is “double-voiced” (xiv). In other words, while Bakhtin was, in one sense, writing about literature, he was also using literary criticism as a façade to philosophize, critique and comment on the more immediate world he lived in – Stalinist Soviet Russia. Carnival was antithetical to the strict totalitarianism that Stalin en-

forced in Russia, and Bakhtin conceptualized it as a democratizing force that undermined hegemonic systems. In *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, Bakhtin (1984) explains that “[c]arnival is the place for working out, in a concretely sensuous, half real and half-play-acted form, a *new mode of interrelationship between individuals*, counterposed to the all power socio-hierarchical relationships of noncarnival life” (emphasis by Bakhtin, p. 123). Carnival, in this sense, becomes a type of living, bubbling cauldron of human interaction and relation in which boundaries are not only melted away but specifically thwarted by people who are free to act and interact without being bound by the typical norms of their cultural systems. Perhaps Bakhtin chose to analyze the revelry of the medieval carnival because it was so irreverent and opposed to the oppressive systems of feudalism and monarchy that resembled the reach and depth of the oppressive systems in Soviet Russia. But more than just an unruly public party, carnival is a *response* to the structures that create it and not separate or abstracted from the times and spaces of its enactment.

Bakhtin (1984) argues that carnival suspends “hierarchical structure and all the forms of terror, reverence, piety and etiquette connected with it – that is, everything resulting from the sociohierarchical inequality or any other form of inequality among people” (p. 123). Given this description, carnival, to a large degree, is about creating a time and space in the public arena that challenge social positions and the constructs that uphold them. This suspension of hierarchies and norms creates a

palpable unruliness that brings to light the multitudes of structures that work to give ordinary life the illusion of coherence, and it exposes the contradictions within them. For example, Bakhtin explains that a central aspect of carnival is the “*mock crowning and subsequent decrowning of the carnival king*” (emphasis by Bakhtin, p. 123). This act is an ambivalent and contradictory one in that contained within the act of crowning is the implicit and inevitable act of decrowning. In other words, it is an act of building up to tear down. Actions within the carnival contain this double-sidedness, ambivalence and contradictory nature. Yet they are not unlike or apart from everyday life. Instead, the carnival is a *response* to everyday life and is a time and space where people expose its ambivalence and contradiction.

Carnival is not driven by structure or logic but by socially derived aspects of being human. Bakhtin (1984) argues that “[c]arnival is, so to speak, functional and not substantive. It absolutizes nothing, but rather proclaims the joyful relativity of everything” (p. 124). Put another way, the carnival is not an alternative, abstract reality, but an alternative way of living, viewing and responding to the reality of which a person is part. It is about deriving joy from living in, pointing out and flouting at the tensions of the relativities and contradictions of everyday life. I draw on this framework because it is particularly illuminating when it comes to specific types of disruption in schools: humor, clowning and laughter. And I argue that this carnivalesque behavior is a response to living in the tensions between contradictory systems in schools.

Methods

Using ethnographic methods and microethnographic analysis (Bloome et al. 2005), I conducted a qualitative study examining the nature of the teaching and learning of a close reading over the course of an entire school year as part of a larger research project funded by the Institute of Educational Sciences (IES). With the teachers' and the students' permissions, I set up digital video and audio and recording devices at the front right of the room, as it was a vantage point that best captured how both the teacher and students interacted with and responded to one another during class. During the observations, I took field notes and recorded summaries of classroom events and transitions in instructional focus, the times of the events and transitions, my own actions, and noted theoretical constructs that might help, explain or interpret the situations I observed. The participants of the study were aware of my presence and purposes and occasionally asked for my help on their school work if the teacher was occupied with other students. The teacher introduced me as "Mr. Seymour" and let the students know I had been an English teacher prior to becoming a researcher. Overall, the students and teacher positioned me as if I were another teacher in the room and responded to me accordingly. On one occasion, a student asked my permission to leave the class to use the restroom, which highlighted my positionality as being an authority figure, aligned with the teacher and school.

Throughout this study, I noticed that the agenda of the students and teacher seemed in conflict with some students

challenging the authority of the teacher by disrupting her instruction. As such, I asked: "what is the nature of this disruption during classroom instruction, and how and under what circumstances does it occur?" I noted times students would challenge the teacher and socially position themselves differently in the classroom. I also noted the ways they were using the texts they were reading (if at all) during the social positioning in hopes to better understand the literacy ideologies present in the classroom (Street 1984).

Over the course of the year, I conducted several one-on-one interviews with the teacher and with both male and female students, and I asked them questions about the purpose of the class as they understood it, about what counted as good reading and writing, and what curricular activities resonated most with them. Using descriptive coding to examine and find patterns of interaction within the classroom and interviews, I scrutinized my field notes looking for moments of cooperation and resistance and selected a literacy event (Heath 1983) that I saw as the unruliest and most representative of the broader patterns of disruption, complexity and contradiction that I observed throughout the school year. As such, a microethnographic analysis proved an invaluable analytic tool for understanding this event. Erickson (1992) reminds that

[e]thnographic microanalysis of audiovisual recordings is a means of specifying learning environments and processes of social influence as they occur in face-to-face interactions. It is especially appropriate when such events are rare or fleeting in duration or when the distinctive shape and character

of such events unfold moment-by-moment, during which it is important to have accurate information on the speech and nonverbal behaviors of particular participants in the scene (p. 204–205).

I transcribed the interaction, putting their talk into message units (Green & Wallat 1981) with each line representing a new unit. In addition to spoken language, the transcript includes some description of actions in brackets, such as who is talking to whom, and verbal actions that were not clearly articulated words, such as “laughter,” and the words that speakers emphasized are *italicized*. During my analysis of the transcript, I reiteratively watched the clip noting the pitch, tone, prosody, stress, volume and pace of the interlocutors’ speech and noted their body language, facial expressions, gaze and reactions to warrant my interpretation. Finally, I showed the clip of this interaction to the teacher and asked for her interpretation of the event to gain a further insider’s perspective. Although this paper examines only a brief two-and-a-half-minute interaction, the coding and analysis of all my data helped provide insight and interpretation of the events that unfolded.

Setting

Taking place in spring of 2017 and located in a suburb of a major metropolitan Midwestern city, Western Academy² hosted around 1 500 students who attended nine 45 minute periods of instruction in different subjects/disciplines daily, in class sizes of 20–30 students. The school opened in the early 1960s and was one of three public

² All names of people and places are pseudonyms.

high schools that served the area’s population of nearly 40 000 residents³ (census.gov, 2016). Western Academy’s student population in 2017 was approximately 57% White, 25% Black, 8% Multiracial, 4% Asian and .13% American Indian.⁴ Around 10% of their student population was classified “Limited English Proficient” and 31% were on the Free and Reduced Lunch Program. According to the US Census Bureau, the city’s median household income in 2016 was about \$85 000 with a poverty rate of 6.5%. These numbers marked the setting of the school as a relatively affluent, middle-class community.

The district and school openly offered evidence of their scholastic success. Outside of Western Academy, a road sign boasted that they were ranked as a “Silver Medal” school by the popular magazine *U.S. News and World Report*. Moreover, the district’s website noted that *Newsweek* magazine and *SchoolMatch.com* rated Western Academy’s district as having highly desirable schools. The district’s website also offered that the school “enjoys a history of being recognized by the [state’s] Department of Education as a high-performing school district.”

To graduate, all students at Western Academy had to take 4 years of ELA. And like many high schools in the United States, Western Academy sorted its students into class sections by ability, with “Advanced Placement Language” and “Advanced Placement Literature” repres-

³ All numbers are approximate rather than exact to protect the anonymity of the school and subjects.

⁴ Demographic numbers come from the district website but are not cited to protect the anonymity of the school and subjects.

enting the highest level ELA courses available to students. The class I observed was titled “Film and Literature” and took place during the 9th period at 12:15pm just after lunch. Film and Literature was an “inclusion” class, meaning it included students with special needs and learning disabilities who had government-mandated accommodations and supports provided by the school in an effort to help mitigate these students’ different learning needs. Furthermore, sometimes, two additional teachers with backgrounds in special education would be in the room to help provide supports for students who were entitled to them.

The teacher, Mrs. Carlisle, was a white woman in her early 40s from the American Midwest. Prior to becoming a teacher, Mrs. Carlisle worked in the corporate offices of a major electronics retail chain and, despite experiencing success in business, Mrs. Carlisle chose teaching as her second career because she wanted a job that she felt would make a more meaningful difference in people’s lives. Some of the ways she made this difference stem from what and how she chose to teach. Her approach to teaching reading often attempted to engage students in using classroom texts as a springboard for discussing important, real-world issues and conflicts, all in the safety of a school setting. Her experience in the private sector was manifest in her teaching style, as she comported herself incredibly professionally, an ethic that can be difficult to uphold around some adolescents who sought to disrupt the agenda and tenor of the classroom.

Greg, Anya, Eric and Joe were students in Mrs. Carlisle’s 9th period, 11th and 12th

grade, ELA class during the 2016–2017 school year. Greg, Anya and Eric often sat themselves in a group at the front of the class, and Joe typically sat off to the side with his back to the wall. Greg and Joe, who were both athletes, male, tall and white, regularly answered Mrs. Carlisle’s questions (often flippantly) and frequently interjected during instruction without being called upon. At times, they would dominate classroom conversations and discussions. Greg and Joe demonstrated a pattern of language and behavior that they used to disrupt many lessons’ foci; however, they did this in a way that prevented themselves from ever getting into trouble of any real consequence. Namely, Greg and Joe used a type of clowning that evoked aspects of Bakhtin’s (1984) carnival to thwart school norms and briefly socially position themselves as the centers of the classroom. Greg and Joe’s behavior often succeeded in interfering with Mrs. Carlisle’s lessons. These disruptions, I argue, brought to light some of the complex and contradictory power structures within and beyond the classroom.

Analysis

The event described below took place around 30 minutes into class, during a teacher-led discussion regarding Vikas Swarup’s novel *Q&A* (2005), a story about a young man in India who was doing suspiciously well on a nationally televised game show and whose answers and story are framed by his experiences growing up in poverty.⁵ The students had just finished

⁵ The 2009 Academy Award-winning movie *Slumdog Millionaire* is based off this book.

putting *Q&A*'s story into a plot/Freytag pyramid (1872) and had been sorted into groups and assigned a color – e.g., a blue group, yellow group etc. To create her discussion questions, Mrs. Carlisle had used Beers and Probst's (2013) *Notice and Note*, a practitioner book that advocated teaching students to identify “sign post” moments in literature to help them select important passages for analysis. Although Mrs. Carlisle was attempting to engage the class in discussion, an entirely different and carnivalesque interaction was going on right in front of her.

1. Teacher: These are those realizations that make us go OOOOOOOOOOOOh now I get it, right? Um so number 1
2. Eric: [to Anya] *Inaudible*
3. Anya: [to Eric] She what?
4. Noooooo
5. She didn't
6. ?? shh
7. Greg: [to Eric] Ask her.

Mrs. Carlisle initiated the classroom interaction in line 1 by reminding the students of the signpost of the “Aha Moments” (Beers & Probst, p. 128). As she was speaking, Greg was looking down and tapping his pen on his leg. His eyes tracked over to the screen of Anya's phone, but she promptly put it down, placed her elbows on the desk, and slightly straightened her posture indicating she was shifting her attention from her phone to the teacher. In line 3, Eric quietly asked Anya a question or said a comment, which, although inaudible to the recording equipment, seemed to be playfully subversive or at least aimed at getting a rise out of Anya as indicated by Eric's eyebrow raise and grin as he asked. At first, Anya did not understand Eric's

utterance and indicated her confusion as the pitch of her voice went higher at the end of her question: “she what?” line 3. A moment later, Anya comprehended Eric's question or comment as something inappropriate, as indicated by her response: a hasty, emphatic and slightly elongated “no” in line 4. As she said “no,” Anya's gaze quickly darted over to Mrs. Carlisle, which I interpret as seeing if the teacher overheard Eric's untoward utterance. Anya sharply corrected Eric, saying “she didn't” in line 5, reprimanding him in a firm, flat tone while furrowing her brow and slightly snarling the side of her mouth. She then fixed her eyes on the slide projected on the whiteboard and away from Eric's gaze thereby ending this interaction with him. However, Greg had taken up Eric's jape and did not share Anya's irritation. Instead, he seemed to be amused, and encouraged Eric in line 7 saying “ask her” at a louder volume than either Anya or Eric used, and he slightly tossed his head back, smiled and playfully shifted around in his chair as he slumped back into his seat.

In this first interactional unit, a dynamic was established between Eric, Greg, Anya and Mrs. Carlisle. While Anya's attention was divided between the teacher and her classmates and Mrs. Carlisle was attempting to engage the class in a discussion about the novel, Greg and Eric's interactions indicated that they were pursuing different agendas and acting to socially position themselves and others. Eric initiated an utterance that, while inaudible to my equipment, was somewhat inappropriate for the classroom as evidenced by his low volume and the social consequence of Anya's reaction, rebuffing

him and then ending the interaction. Eric tried to socially position himself as the object of Anya's attention, while Anya was navigating being at the table as part of a group and being a well-behaved student. Greg's reaction to the question was to take up Eric's comment and position himself as the object of Eric's attention. At a volume the teacher might pick up – but not quite loud enough for a teacher to label as deliberately disruptive – Greg advocated that Eric ask the teacher the question, and then Greg reveled in amusement at the prospect of Eric's question being posed in front of the whole class.

Greg's attempt at misbehavior evoked aspects of the carnival. He was visibly amused at the prospect of asking an inappropriate question, and that amusement was a response to the idea of thwarting some hierarchical values and challenging what students were supposed to talk about during literature instruction in school. Instead of adhering to the teacher's participation structure, Eric and Greg were socially positioning themselves around the literature instruction in a way that was not necessarily sanctioned by the classroom norms. Their actions created a carnivalesque amusement, at least for Greg.

When I showed this clip to Mrs. Carlisle, she could not recall whether she chose not to take up Greg's comment or simply didn't hear it, but the video showed she did not respond, and she continued with the lesson as she read a quote from the book and followed with questions that might engage students in a teacher-sanctioned discussion or understanding of the material. In the next segment, she used the student group color scheme, e.g., a yellow group, a

blue group to call on students, and attempted to elicit answers. She called on both Joe and Greg, whose initial response was a flippant yet playful refusal to participate in the discussion.

8. T: "The city may have chosen to ignore the ugly truth of Dharavi
9. but a cancer cannot be stopped simply by being declared illegal."
10. Are there any other problems that go unacknowledged
11. because they are too painful to face?
12. If so what impact does this have on the characters?
13. ??[inaudible]
14. T: What do you guys think?
15. A: Um
16. T: [Joe] what color are you?
17. Joe: Uh, yellow
18. T: Yellow, what do you think about that?
19. Class: *laughter*
20. J: No opinion
21. Class: *Laughter*
22. T: "No opinion"?
23. You always have an opinion.
24. *Inaudible*
25. T: *Laughter*, then maybe you won't um. [to Greg] Blue is that you?
26. G: Nope
27. ? & T: Yes
28. A: *Laughter*

Mrs. Carlisle initiated the question 3 times and attempted to get students to respond (lines 14, 18, 25). On line 20, Joe refused to answer, claiming in a flat tone that he had "no opinion." Mrs. Carlisle was justified in her incredulous tone as she responded on line 22: "You always have an opinion"; throughout my months of observations of this class, Joe freely offered his opinion, often without prompting, and frequently gave glib, double-voiced (Bakhtin 1984) answers that could count

both as participation and as a mocking of his teacher's questions. As such, his typical answers evoked aspects of carnival through their ambivalence and his visible enjoyment of asking them. In this instance, Joe elicited carnivalesque laughter from the class by giving yet another double voiced response, which was a non-answer. These double-voiced responses gave Joe a loophole through which he might be able to get out of trouble should the teacher choose to discipline him or accuse him of being disrespectful. Bakhtin (1984) explains: "[a] loophole is the retention for oneself of the possibility for altering the ultimate, final meaning of one's own words" (p. 233). Joe's comment in line 20, "no opinion," indexed a formal register showing he was using appropriate and respectful language in a classroom setting to "politely" refuse the teacher, yet he implicitly undermined her authority to solicit answers from a student by refusing to give one. Had Mrs. Carlisle chosen to get him in trouble, he could always protest that he politely refused and was being unjustly punished for simply not having anything to say. In other words, the double-voiced answers would let him subvert the teacher's authority, while also leaving reasonable doubt that he was not. His refusal to answer was also a source of humor and laughter, line 21, for the other students because of the contradiction in a lexically serious but contextually insubordinate response.

On line 25, Mrs. Carlisle asked if Greg, who was slouching in his chair, leaning back with his hands resting behind his head in a relaxed position, was in the blue group, to which he jokingly replied "nope," line 26, with a rising tone and a slight smirk on

the side of his mouth. Greg's "nope" was a softer negation or refusal than him flatly saying "no" or "no comment," but his response did continue Joe's insubordinate reaction to being called upon. Mrs. Carlisle and another student quickly replied "yes," which elicited laughter from Anya and a smile from Mrs. Carlisle effectively foiling Greg's thin ruse.

During this interaction, Greg's clowning clinched a pattern of this carnivalesque disruption as being at least somewhat gendered. First, in lines 4 and 5, it was Anya, a young woman, who shut down Eric's untoward comment and closed the interaction by switching her gaze to her female teacher. Furthermore, Anya seemed to be aligning herself with Mrs. Carlisle in that she laughed, line 28, when Greg's ruse was thwarted. Second, it was two male students, both Joe and Greg, who refused to answer, in a half participating, half insubordinate manner. Third, as Mrs. Carlisle asked her question, Greg and another young man in the view of the camera were displaying the same kind of incredibly open, shifting and discourteous body language by slouching in their chairs with their hands behind their heads. Their body language demonstrated them not taking seriously and somewhat openly flouting the seriousness of Mrs. Carlisle's questions and her position as a teacher. Finally, while nearly all the young men's behavior on camera was displaying some form of irreverence toward their female teacher, the young women were sitting upright and tracking Mrs. Carlisle with their eyes. This is not to say that the young men in this class held malicious contempt toward their teacher or women in general,

but rather that they had taken up and enacted cultural norms and behaviors that undergird patriarchy and make it more difficult for women to be in positions of power. In response to Joe's and Greg's flippant responses, Mrs. Carlisle used her institutional role to restore her authority and pressed Greg to submit to her participation structure and to give an adequate answer to the question she posed.

29. G: Uhh, I think there were a lot of problems that went unfixed
30. T: Like what?
31. Unacknowledged you mean?
32. G: Yeah, um like...
33. T: Like what?
34. G: Like, the corruption the government didn't really do anything because they were corrupt
35. T: Ok, good, right.
36. What else?

In line 29, Greg delayed by interjecting a prolonged "uh" and then revoiced the question in a slightly slower and flat tone, giving him more time to think of another answer. In line 30 at a clipped pace, Mrs. Carlisle asked him to give an example, and, in line 31, corrected his diction from "unfixed" to "unacknowledged," thereby asserting her authority through a more accurate use of language. Having been corrected and now cooperating with the teacher, Greg sat up, put his arms down and attempted to answer the question. In line 32, he again used interjections and stalled for time, and again Mrs. Carlisle repeated her request, line 33, for an example at a clipped pace. Her increased pace of speech helped maintain her authority and the repetition of the question indicated to Greg that she would not relent until he

gave what she deemed to be a satisfactory answer. In line 33, Greg offered a broad and somewhat circular answer, which appeared to mollify Mrs. Carlisle, since she ended the Initiation-Response-Evaluation (IRE) sequence with punctuated stops between affirmations and a rising pitch to indicate approval and a withdraw of aggression: "ok, good, right," line 35. She then opened the question to the rest of the class, line 36.

In the above lines, Mrs. Carlisle acted to counter the young men's insubordination by using several contextualization cues (c.f. Gumperz 1986) to assert her institutional authority as a teacher. As she asked Greg to give an example from the text, she moved closer to him using her proximity to indicate her seriousness, increased the pace of her speech to press for an answer and lowered the pitch of her voice to convey more dominance, lines 30 and 33. These tactics effectively countered Greg's previous assertion of carnivalesque behavior and temporarily gained his acquiescence. Greg's circular answer lacked depth, but it did show Mrs. Carlisle that he would cooperate, and consequently, she stopped pressing him and opened the question to the rest of the class, line 36. Following this interaction, Greg made an inappropriate comment and finally succeeded in disrupting the agenda and tenor of the classroom.

37. G: [posed as a general question to the group] Who else is blue?
38. T: What else went unacknowledged that you're like,
39. "oh my gosh I can't believe this is happening and nobody is stopping it!"
40. ??: The orphanage

41. T: Maman! The whole orphanage, right?
42. This guy is legally “*adopting*” these orphans, *crippling* them on purpose and then
43. putting them out on the streets to earn money for *him*
44. G: [looking at Eric] Gotta respect the hustle
45. A: [to Greg] Shut!
46. Class: *Laughter*
47. G: [To Teacher] Kidding, kidding
48. [to Eric] He got rich doing that

Not giving up on the topic, Mrs. Carlisle again attempted to engage the class in discussion about the book by rephrasing how she asked the question. In lines 38 and 39, she advanced the question again and then languaged the thinking she hoped the students would use to get to an answer: “What else went unacknowledged that you’re like, ‘oh my gosh I can’t believe this is happening and nobody is stopping it!’” The tone and prosody of her voice changed to indicate and emphasize the quality of the internal thought process she attempted to elicit in the students, and ostensibly it worked as a student brought up the orphanage from *Q&A* (Swarup 2005). On line 41, Mrs. Carlisle excitedly repeated “orphanage,” indicating her approval of the answer, and elaborated upon its significance to furthering the discussion by saying: “This guy is legally ‘adopting’ these orphans, crippling them on purpose and then putting them out on the streets to earn money for him” In these lines, Mrs. Carlisle took on a more serious tone by making her voice louder and enunciating words distinctly. In lines 42 and 43, she also stressed the words “adopting,” “crippling,” and “him,” thereby emphasizing

the relationship between the egregious actions and the perpetrator of them.

Immediately after Mrs. Carlisle finished speaking in line 43, Greg’s clowning continued, and, unlike his previous behavior, he crossed a normative boundary. With a grin, he said to Eric “Gotta respect the hustle” at a volume many of his classmates could hear, and several of the boys began laughing at Greg’s transgression. It appeared Greg knew he had crossed a line since he immediately hedged his comment saying, “kidding,” but he quickly and quietly indicated to Eric that Maman’s exploitation of children was indeed a shrewd hustle because, in Greg’s words, “he [Maman] got rich doing that.”

Greg’s disruptive and carnivalistic comment, “Gotta respect the hustle,” evoked numerous layers of meaning, contradictions and tensions that students live in at school. To begin, Greg’s comment was a racial microaggression, as the phrase “Gotta respect the hustle” is a hip-hop culture aphorism. Greg said it to Eric, a young African American man, and clearly enunciated “got to” as “gotta” indexing African American Vernacular English. Greg’s comment appeared to be performative for Eric, in that he used a register that could be associated with Eric’s race, and the comment’s unruliness echoed the key of Eric’s earlier untoward comment to Anya. Greg’s attempt to align himself with Eric failed however, as Eric was not among the students who laughed at Greg’s comment. The word “hustle” in this context indexed that for people on the margins, the ability to make money within a capitalist system is often not a level playing field, and the only way to survive may be through de-

ceitful and/or illegal actions. The character Maman had taken the value system of capitalism to an extreme and placed it on the lives of children. India's transition into a capitalist system and its interaction with India's history of social stratification and colonization is a central theme and conflict throughout *Q&A*. Greg's comment, although callous, was insightful in this respect. He recognized how systems of value were working within the novel and their similarity to some marginalized communities in the United States, and his comic and carnivalistic understatement about Maman's "hustle" or actions to make money both participated in discussing the book while flouting its seriousness.

Mrs. Carlisle's initiation of this topic attempted to get students to recognize Maman's actions of human trafficking and child slavery as an atrocity and as part of larger oppressive systems. However, this recognition posits a value system at odds with the economic system present in context of which the book was being taught. Capitalism is an economic system in which all value is *market* value – i.e., people are worth the money they can make, have or be exchanged for. There is a contradiction in schools with how they create value for students and society within a capitalist system. In a sense, students are completing a curriculum that should enhance their quality and appreciation of life, but also increase their own market value. People with high school diplomas have access to and make more money than those without them, and having a high school diploma gives people better access to universities that grant degrees which also lead to higher earning potential (see bls.gov, 2018). In part, the

value of a classroom curriculum can be interpreted as the value it imbues in students to enter a capitalist work force. As such, students have market value in capitalist culture that increases or decreases based on their academic achievement. Contradictorily, they create their own value by essentially making materials that are without market value – e.g., worksheets, essays etc. (Sidorken 2004). And while these materials may not have any market value, they could have a different kind of value, which serves to enhance students' understanding of themselves or the world around them. Mrs. Carlisle's condemnation of Maman was in opposition to the application of exchange and market value to humans, yet she condemns it in a context in which the students' participation and cooperation with her curriculum directly contributes to their value as people in a capitalist culture. This is not to say that Mrs. Carlisle was engaged in any kind of hypocrisy, but rather that she and her students are embedded in a context with multiple systems of value that are present and often irreconcilable. Greg's comment brought this contradiction forward and in doing so, he violated a social norm. For a moment, the class arguably embodied carnival as many of the students in the class laughed and reveled in opposition to its typical norms and values. In the next sequence, some people in the class further embraced carnival but also scrambled to restore order by suggesting a punishment for Greg's behavior.

49. A: [Covers mouth and whispers to the teacher]
50. T: No, it's on camera
51. we'll all get in trouble.
52. I can't smack him right now

53. A: Wait, he can just put his hand over the camera
54. E: He can just go like, “it blacked out for a second”
55. ?? Yeah
56. Class: *Laughter*

Greg’s callous yet humorous comment brought the discussion to a temporary halt, and Mrs. Carlisle once again had to re-establish her authority as a teacher. As Anya had with Eric a minute earlier, she rebuffed Greg and told him to “Shut [up]” while furrowing her brow, line 45. Like Eric, Anya is also a person of color, and she responded more severely to Greg’s untoward comment. She blocked her mouth from the camera with her hands, as one would do to whisper something to a friend, and presumably said to Mrs. Carlisle, “you should smack Greg for that comment.” While Mrs. Carlisle’s tight-lipped frown showed her disapproval of Greg, in no way, shape or form did it indicate she would actually consider striking him. Instead, Mrs. Carlisle calmly positioned herself closer to Greg, used her proximity to quell his fun, and treated Anya’s suggestion half seriously and as a joke.

Mrs. Carlisle joined in the carnival and gave humorous reasoning for not smacking Greg – that they would all get in trouble because I was video recording, line 50 – and she added another layer of meaning to the interaction by echoing Foucault’s (1975) notion that observation is the primary means of authority and behavioral control in modern society. She affirmed this notion in line 52, as she reasoned that she could not discipline Greg in this way “right now,” implying that she could do later when I was not present, observing and re-

ording. This positioned me and my camera as an authority aligned with cultural powers greater than the teacher’s in the classroom, such as the school’s administration and law enforcement. This response brought forward the norms associated with acceptable actions and disruptions when being digitally recorded and observed. Anya and Eric aligned themselves with Mrs. Carlisle and attempted to pull me in to their scheme by jokingly asserting that I could simply block the camera’s view to create an opportunity for Mrs. Carlisle to “smack” Greg. In doing so, they implied that since the camera did not record them, they wouldn’t be held accountable. In this interaction, the two students of color were the most cautious not to be caught on camera misbehaving. Eric’s unruly comment toward the beginning of the interaction was quiet and inaudible and Anya blocked her mouth from the view of the camera and whispered her comment to Mrs. Carlisle. In contrast, neither of the young, white males showed any occlusion toward their misbehavior but only made their disruption equivocal. Arguably, in hiding their actions and words from the camera, Eric and Anya were responding to and evoking their sense that what counted as proof of their misbehavior was different than what counted for Joe and Greg. While Joe’s and Greg’s disruptions were typically double-voiced and skirted the burden of proof for punishment through equivocation and uncertainty, Anya’s and Eric’s actions indicated that a record of what could be construed as misbehavior might be sufficient to get them in trouble.

Having crossed a line, Greg’s carnivalesque behavior was flipped on him as

Eric, Anya, and Mrs. Carlisle evoked carnival and had a laugh at the prospect of the teacher violating a social norm by using corporal punishment on an unruly student. However, Mrs. Carlisle effectively repositioned herself as the leader of the interaction and classroom again, as she got the final say of what would happen to Greg and leveraged the authority of my video recording to end the joking. Their appropriation of carnival effectively checked Greg's behavior and positioned him as needing to be disciplined, and afterward, he worked to re-establish himself as a good student by giving more substantive answers to Mrs. Carlisle's book discussion:

57. T: Ok, so yeah right, the orphanage, what else?
58. G: No one's got money.
59. T: What?
60. G: It's because no one had money to turn him in,
61. but someone Ram or Rham gets money and he turns him in
62. T: True but there were plenty of people that were aware.
63. Who was aware this was going on?
64. G: Nilly, is that how you say it?
65. T: Yes, Neelima Kumari, right,
66. She knew this was happening!

In line 57, Mrs. Carlisle put an end to the interaction that floated, striking Greg for his clowning, and changed the topic back to the book by raising the volume of her voice, enunciating the words more distinctly and stressing "what else?" After Mrs. Carlisle dismissed the idea of striking Greg, she changed the subject, in effect saving him from the ridicule and scorn of the class. And Greg's response was to finally cooperate with answering her question in a manner more aligned with

Mrs. Carlisle's IRE participation structure. Greg's body language became more closed, he sat up in his seat, fixed his gaze on Mrs. Carlisle and gave his voice a flat, measured tone. Mrs. Carlisle's response to Greg's answer showed skepticism at first, and she initially challenged his answer by affirming it slightly, but redirected the question's focus thereby showing that Greg's previous answer did not sufficiently meet her standards, line 62. From lines 57 to 62, both Greg and Mrs. Carlisle were repairing their relationship in response to the previous interaction, and both were re-establishing their positions in the classroom as teacher and student. Greg's answering Mrs. Carlisle's question and citing events from the book showed that he would cooperate with her curricular agenda by doing what he thought was expected of him. It served as recompense for his disruption, showed he had read and understood the book, and demonstrated that he acknowledged her as an authority by affirming her IRE participation structure. Mrs. Carlisle hesitated to let Greg mend his transgression so easily, as that might have undermined her reclaimed authority, but she did not dismiss his answer outright, thereby preserving their relationship and creating an opportunity for Greg to continue to rejoin the discussion on her terms. And Greg did rejoin by giving the answer Mrs. Carlisle was looking for, line 64. Quickly and excitedly, Mrs. Carlisle affirmed Greg's answer and revoiced it with a rising tone showing her approval. However, this interaction quickly came to a halt, as Mrs. Carlisle noticed other students acting outside the bounds of what she sanctioned as acceptable classroom behavior.

67. T: Guys, can you put your phones away please.
68. I know games are way more interesting than I am right now
69. but it's really annoying to me
70. so, thank you,
71. um there's a lot of things no one talks about and they just ignore.
72. Uh, number 2

Mrs. Carlisle used a quick pace and irritated tone to indicate her dissatisfaction with students playing on their smart phones in lines 67–69, and she completely shifted her attention away from Greg and his more substantive answer to reprimand them. In line 71, Mrs. Carlisle iterated the point she had used to initiate the discussion and ended the interactional unit by transitioning to the second question, line 72. This soft disruption was what finally thwarted Mrs. Carlisle's efforts to discuss little-acknowledged human rights violations that occurred in the book, and as a consequence, they remained unacknowledged by characters in the book and the class.

Discussion

Within about two and a half minutes, Greg made 3 bids to socially position himself, and one of them succeed in disrupting Mrs. Carlisle's lesson. Mrs. Carlisle responded and quickly moved the class back toward her lesson. From a Bakhtinian (1984) perspective, Greg's disruptions were carnivalesque in nature, as he and other students in class demonstrated enjoyment and revelry at the challenging and thwarting of typical classroom hierarchies. But more than clowning, carnival is a response to and illumination of the rules and contra-

dictions inherent in the norms and activities of everyday life. Greg's clowning socially positioned himself as the temporary center of the classroom and of equal or greater social importance to the teacher. In doing this, his actions showed that the teacher's authority in the classroom was not a given, but rather that it existed, in part, when the students were willing to uphold the authority through validating the teacher's participation structure. This aspect of power became more complicated, as Greg and Joe gave double voiced answers and contradictorily both upheld and subverted the authority of the teacher and her curriculum.

The transcript and video showed that Greg and many of his male classmates found his clowning to be funny as evidenced by their laughter. Bakhtin argues, "[c]arnivalistic laughter likewise is directed toward something higher – toward a shift of authorities and truths, a shift in world orders" (p. 128). Greg's successful disruptions achieved this kind of laughter and shifted the tenor and hierarchy of the classroom as well as the agenda of how the book should be read and understood. While the teacher attempted to use the book and an IRE participation structure to maintain her authority, the young white men used it to assert their privilege and mock institutional authority and values. Greg's laughter was carnivalesque in that it was a directed toward the temporary subversion of the student teacher hierarchy and toward a value system the teacher employed to read and interpret the novel. The irony and contradiction inherent in this, however, is that while Greg was thwarting the microhierarchy of the classroom,

he was reinforcing the macrohierarchy of patriarchy from a privileged white, male position. Instead of the carnival being an anti-authoritarian force, as Bakhtin described, it had essentially been used to uphold an oppressive system. Furthermore, in saying “gotta respect the hustle,” Greg actively subverted the teacher’s proposed value system regarding people, and he affirmed an extreme capitalist notion of humans’ worth being that of market value and indexed racial and economic inequality. In both instances, he simultaneously subverted and upheld power structures present in the classrooms.

Greg and a few other white males in this class found an effective method for disrupting the serious work of a teacher. In going through my corpus of data throughout the school year, in every instance I noted of a student vocally disrupting the teacher’s curricular agenda, it was a male student, and the white male students most often disrupted through carnivalesque clowning and double voiced answers. This approach often made Mrs. Carlisle’s job more difficult and at times displaced the opportunity of other students, especially female students, who rarely spoke, to have more serious and substantive conversations about literature with one another and a professional, skilled teacher. While Bakhtin may have been exploring carnival as part of being human and as a challenge to a hegemonic and totalizing Soviet government, carnival can also be used to disrupt more substantive and equitable systems that seek to give opportunities to all, and as a result, it can be used to uphold the privileges of the powerful. Having been at this site for nearly a year, I had not once observed a female student vocally

disrupt Mrs. Carlisle’s classroom agenda, and I often saw them speaking to her after class about their goals, achievements, and interests regarding reading and writing. Moreover, in this instance, it was a female student, Anya, who, while friendly with Greg and Eric, reacted and helped Mrs. Carlisle mark their behavior as unacceptable. In this case, Greg’s comments were a little too unruly, as the rest of the class positioned him as needing punishment and acknowledged the presence of my recording them.

Anya, Eric and Mrs. Carlisle’s awareness of my recording and presence brought forward an inescapable reality of doing ethnographic research about education and people. The researcher is part of and not separate from the study. I was in a strategic location to record the interaction, and that position allowed me to gather specific information. It also impacted how the participants behaved. This was not a flaw with my research design, but rather it added a layer of meaning to examine and to better understand the context and interaction. As Anya covered her mouth with her hands and whispered to Mrs. Carlisle, she revealed that she knew what she was saying was against the rules, so she acted to hide her behavior from me and the camera. This action exposed Anya’s understanding of what was acceptable behavior and punishment and that the burden of proof for a person of color might be lower than the one for white males. This complicates Foucault’s (1975) notion of observation as a means of control in that it acts disparately toward different groups of people. Furthermore, Eric’s joking comment that I could block the camera lens, so Mrs. Carlisle could smack Greg,

also revealed that he saw me as a potential member of their group who might assist them in disciplining Greg. This comment made even more explicit how transgressive Greg's comment was, since the students were aligning themselves with adults to counter a peer's unruly behavior.

Our understandings of classroom management should be informed by who is disrupting, how they are doing it, the histories of the participants and contexts, and what ideologies they are invoking. If classroom management is reduced to a series of strategies and tactics, their impacts will be disparate, since aspects of race, gender and age are at play and grant different affordances and constraints on students. In other words, acceptable behavior may be different for different demographics of students. While Mrs. Carlisle was able to regain the cooperation of the class, there was no conversation that critically interrogated what Greg had said and done. Some scholars might be tempted to argue that Mrs. Carlisle should have acted differently; however, it would ignore that I also could have acted differently to address Greg's callous comment. Everyone, including the researcher, was part of the event.

When I first showed this clip to Mrs. Carlisle, she told me that it looked like a typical interaction she had working with students who had personalities that were "larger than life." At the time I observed this interaction, I only made a note of it and moved on. However, after looking more closely at the nature of disruption and the language used to do it, who was doing it and under what circumstances, I began to see how these contradictory and ideological systems may be manifest in edu-

cational settings, and I started to rethink what disruptions were. Problematizing disruptions gives teachers and researchers the opportunity to respond to them in new and perhaps more meaningful ways. It positions classroom management not as separate from the curriculum but rather as part of it, because disruption occurs in the context of and in response to teaching and learning. Thus, the content and nature of Greg's disruption shed light on the ideological systems in the novel as well as in the classroom.

Conclusion

This analysis was limited to a short interaction between four students, one teacher, one researcher and one classroom setting. Furthermore, there were ideologies and critical lenses beyond those discussed here that that would be productive toward analyzing the participants' behavior – critical literacy (Janks 2000), for example. My aim in this analysis was not to interrogate every aspect of the disruption nor to generalize and say that all disruptions are as ideologically complex as this one. Instead, my point is that disruptions may not be as simple as what we deem "misbehavior." Instead of arguing that the teacher should have acted differently or used a different strategy or technique to direct the class back to her question, my hope is that this analysis reveals that disruptions might not only be behavior needing to be managed or variables to be explained, but rather they could be opportunities for critical interrogation, understanding or even a restructuring of how students and teachers discuss literature and ideology. Further research is

needed across multiple settings and situations to gain a more fully developed understanding of the complexity that occurs during classroom disruptions.

Each time I observed a student disrupt class, Mrs. Carlisle effectively countered it and re-established her authority through her use of language, proximity, and sometimes with the help of other students. Mrs. Carlisle did not need a classroom management program to help her with discipline, as she showed facility in responding to ostensibly unruly students, maintained hers and her students' dignity, and usually redirected the conversation back toward her curriculum. Because the complexities of students' histories, their relationships, their wants and needs and agendas will inevitably come into conflict with one another and in new ways each time. In this instance, Greg's disruption seemed to be a response to his peers, the curriculum, the teacher and numerous other factors in the classroom. And it also gave insight to how one of the students was making sense of the book in the context he was in and who he was with.

We could impose a framework that creates a single rationality in a context in which there are many in an attempt to try and reconcile the contradictions inherent in classrooms and carnival. Orderliness and coherence lack contradiction. Ethnographic studies and microethnography have the ability to understand and articulate classroom life to the degree that schooling is not only about the acquisition of knowledge and skills but about who people are together, how they are together, and how they are learning to be together (Bloome et al. 2005). It allows us to think through the complex and contradictory aspects of being in schools. These aspects are created in and through language. As we try to make sense of unruliness, we must be careful that we are not doing so by imposing a simplistic fiction. As such, our representations and analysis of everyday classroom life should fully embrace and interrogate the complexity and contradictions that create the tensions in which students and teachers exist and navigate every day in our educational systems.

REFERENCES

- Agar, M. (2013). *The lively science: Remodeling human social research*. Hillcrest Publishing Group.
- Au, W. (2016). Meritocracy 2.0: High-stakes, standardized testing as a racial project of neoliberal multiculturalism. *Educational Policy*, 30(1), 39–62.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays* (Vol. 1). University of Texas Press.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1984). *Problems of Dostoevsky's poetics*. U of Minnesota Press.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1984). *Rabelais and his world* (Vol. 341). Indiana University Press.
- Beers, G. K., & Probst, R. E. (2013). *Notice & note: Strategies for close reading*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Blommaert, J., & Jie, D. (2010). *Ethnographic fieldwork: A beginner's guide*. Multilingual Matters.
- Bloome, D., Power-Carter S., Carlisle, S. P., Christian, B. M., Otto, S., & Shuart-Faris, N. (2005). *Discourse analysis and the study of classroom language and literacy events: A microethnographic perspective*. Routledge.
- Bondy, E., & Ross, D. D. (2008). The teacher as warm demander. *Educational Leadership*, 66(1), 54–58.
- Bondy, E., Ross, D. D., Hambacher, E., & Acosta, M. (2013). Becoming warm demanders: Perspectives and practices of first year teachers. *Urban Education*, 48(3), 420–450.
- Brantley, D.C, Webster, R.E. (1993). Use of an independent group contingency management system in a regular classroom setting. *Psychology in the Schools*, 30(1), 60–66.

- Brophy, J., & Evertson, C. M. (1978). Context variables in teaching. *Educational Psychologist, 12*(3), 310–316.
- Brophy, J., & McCaslin, M. (1992). Teachers' reports of how they perceive and cope with problem students. *The Elementary School Journal, 93*(1), 3–68.
- Emmer, E. T., Evertson, C. M., & Anderson, L. M. (1980). Effective classroom management at the beginning of the school year. *The elementary school journal, 80*(5), 219–231.
- Emmer, E. T., Sanford, J. P., Clements, B. S., & Martin, J. (1982). Improving classroom management and organization in junior high schools: An experimental investigation (R & D Rep. No. 6153). Austin: University of Texas. *Research & Development Center for Teacher Education*.
- Erickson, Frederick (1992) Ethnographic microanalysis of interaction. *The Handbook of Qualitative Research in Education*. Margaret D. LeCompte, Wendy L. Millroy, and Judith Preissle, eds. pp. 201–225. San Diego: Academic Press, Inc.
- Evertson, C. M., & Anderson, L. M. (1979). Beginning school. *Educational Horizons, 57*(4), 164–168.
- Everston, C. M., & Emmer, E. T. (1982). Effective management at the beginning of the school year in junior high classes. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 74*(4), 485.
- Farmer, S. (2010). Criminality of Black youth in inner-city schools: “Moral panic,” moral imagination, and moral formation. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 13*, 367–381. doi:10.1080/13613324.2010.500845
- Foucault, M. (1975). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Freytag, G. (1872). *Die technik des dramas*. Leipzig: Verlag von S. Hirzel.
- Green, J., & Bloome, D. (2004). Ethnography and ethnographers of and in education: a situated perspective. In *Handbook of research on teaching literacy through the communicative and visual*, ed. J. Flood, Sh. B. Heath, D. Lapp, (pp. 181–202), Mahwah, New Jersey, London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers
- Green, J., and C. Wallat. 1981. Mapping instructional conversations. In *Ethnography and language in education contexts*, ed. J. Green and C. Wallat, 162–195. Norwood, MA: Ablex.
- Gutiérrez, K. D., & Rogoff, B. (2003). Cultural ways of learning: Individual traits or repertoires of practice. *Educational researcher, 32*(5), 19–25.
- Hammersley, M., & Atkinson, P. (1983). *Ethnography: principles in practice*. London: Tavistock.
- Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life and work in communities and classrooms*. Cambridge university Press.
- Heath, S. B., & Street, B. V. (2008). *On Ethnography: Approaches to language and literacy Research*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Holquist, M. (1984). Introduction. *Rabelais and his World*. (Trans. Hélène Iswolsky). Bloomington: Indiana University.
- Katz, S. R. (1996). Presumed guilty: How schools criminalize Latino youth. *Social Justice, 24*(4), 77–95.
- Kounin, J. S. (1970). *Discipline and group management in classrooms*. Oxford, England: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Janks, H. (2000). Domination, access, diversity and design: A synthesis for critical literacy education. *Educational Review, 52*(2), 175–186.
- Johnston, R. (2000). Federal data highlight disparities in discipline. *Education Week, 19*(41), 3.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African-American children*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- Laura, C. T. (2014). *Being bad: My baby brother and the school-to-prison pipeline*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Leander, K. M. (2004). “They Took Out the Wrong Context”: Uses of Time-Space in the Practice of Positioning. *Ethos, 32*(2), 188–213.
- Leonardo, Z., & Broderick, A. (2011). Smartness as property: A critical exploration of intersections between whiteness and disability studies. *Teachers College Record, 113*(10), 2206–2232.
- Marzano, R. J., & Marzano, J. S. (2001). The key to classroom management. *Educational Leadership, 61*(1), 6–13.
- Marzano, R. J., Marzano, J. S., & Pickering, D. (2003). *Classroom management that works: Research-based strategies for every teacher*. Alexandria, Virginia: ASCD.
- McDermott, R., Raley, J. D., & Seyer-Ochi, I. (2009). Race and class in a culture of risk. *Review of research in education, 33*(1), 101–116.
- Milner IV, H. R., & Tenore, F. B. (2010). Classroom management in diverse classrooms. *Urban Education, 45*(5), 560–603.

Mitchell, C. J. (1984) 'Typicality and the case study', in Ellen, P. F. (ed.) *Ethnographic Research: A Guide to General Conduct*. New York: Academic, pp. 238–41

Monroe, C. R. (2005). Why are "bad boys" always black?: Causes of disproportionality in school discipline and recommendations for change. *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas*, 79(1), 45–50.

Pike, K. L. (1965). *Language in Relation to a Unified Theory of the Structure of Human Behavior*. The Hague: Mouton.

Sanford, J. P., & Evertson, C. M. (1981). Classroom management in a low SES junior high: Three case studies. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 32(1), 34–38.

Skiba, R. J., Michael, R. S., Nardo, A. C., & Peterson, R. (2000). The Color of Discipline: Sources of Racial and Gender Disproportionality in School Punishment. Policy Research Report.

Sidorkin, A. M. (2004). In the event of learning: Alienation and participative thinking in education. *Educational Theory*, 54(3), 251–262.

Simonsen, B., Fairbanks, S., Briesch, A., Myers, D., & Sugai, G. (2008). Evidence-based practices in classroom management: Considerations for research to practice. *Education and Treatment of Children*, 31(3), 351–380.

Smith, M. (2015). A generation at risk: The ties between zero tolerance policies and the school-to-prison pipeline. *McNair Scholars Research Journal*, 8, 125–141.

Street, B. V. (1984). *Literacy in theory and practice* (Vol. 9). Cambridge University Press.

Swarup, V. (2005). *Q&A* (New York: Scribner). *Unemployment rates and earnings by educational attainment*. (2018). *Bls.gov*. Retrieved 7 May 2018, from https://www.bls.gov/emp/ep_chart_001.htm

Vološinov, V. N. (1973). *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Harvard UP.

Wang, M. C., Haertel, G. D. & Walberg, H. G. (1993/1994). What helps students learn? *Educational Leadership*, 51(4), 74–79

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

KOMPLEKSIŠKUMAI, PRIEŠTARAVIMAI IR KARNAVALAI: MIKROETNOGRAFINIS VIDURINIO UGDYMO MOKINIŲ TRUKDYMO PER ANGLŲ KALBOS PAMOKAS TYRIMAS

Matt Seymour

S a n t r a u k a

Mokymo proceso metu daugeliui ugdytojų tenka reaguoti į nepaklusnius ir trukdančius mokinius. Dauguma atliekamų mokinių trukdymo tyrimų fokusuojama į klasių valdymo strategijas ir taktikas, tačiau tik nedaugelyje jų gilinamasi į pačių trukdymo prigimtį, jo ideologinę reikšmę ir socialinius trukdymo padarinius. Taigi šiame darbe, pasitelkiant etnografinį metodą ir mikroetnografinę diskurso analizę, nagrinėjami mikro- ir makrostruktūrų kompleksiškumai ir prieštaravimai, kurių kyla Jungtinių Amerikos Valstijų vienuoliktos ir dvyliktos klasės mokiniams pradėjus trukdyti anglų kalbos pamokų metu vykstančias diskusijas apie tekstus. Remiantis Bakhtino karnavalo sąvoka, darbe nagrinėjama trukdymo klasėse struktūra, kuri paskatina daugialypes bei prieštaringas ideologijas ir tuo pat metu palaiko

bei griaua galių struktūras. Priešingai nei bendras įsitikimas, kad trukdymas klasėse kelia iššūkių egzistuojančiai galiai, tam tikrais atvejais jis kaip tik paskatina galių santykius platesniame kultūriniame lauke. Šiame straipsnyje išryškunami kompleksiškumai ir prieštaravimai, būdingi skirtingų asmenų mokyklose sąveikai bei skatinama permąstyti, kaip ugdytojai vertina trukdymą per pamokas ir reaguoja į jį. Galiausiai straipsnyje akcentuojama, kad, priimdami kompleksiškus ir prieštaravimus, ugdytojai ir tyrėjai gali pažvelgti į ugdymo sistemą kaip būdą veiksmingai ir etiškai įsiterpti į struktūras, kai šios tampa problemiškos.

Pagrindiniai žodžiai: mikroetnografinis tyrimas, diskurso analizė, trukdymas pamokų metu, karnavalas, klasės valdymas.

Įteikta 2018 05 05

Priimta 2018 06 08