Racial literacy in a second-grade classroom: Critical race theory, whiteness studies, and literacy research

REBECCA ROGERS
University of Missouri, St. Louis, USA

MELISSA MOSLEY
Washington University in St. Louis, Missouri, USA

Within social struggles for freedom and justice, literacy has always been deeply enmeshed with race (e.g., DuBois, 1903/1989; Harris, 1992, 1998; Moore, Monaghan, & Hartman, 1997; Prendergast, 2003; Watkins, 2001; Willis, 2002; Young, 2001). When literacy education for African Americans ceased to be prohibited and punishable under state laws, literacy tests continued to function as a replacement of property as a means of preserving the rights of citizenship for whites. Following the Civil Rights legislation, ongoing racial stratification of urban schools and the accompanying political economy continue to deny children of color an equitable education (Guinier, 2003, 2004; Lipman, 2004; Watkins). As a result, people of color have restricted access to the political, economic, and educational structures necessary to gain equitable outcomes in society. This social stratification helped to construct literacy education, in the U.S. imagination as well as in the policy and practices of schools, as a *right* for white children and a *privilege* for children of color (Prendergast). As Ladson-Billings (2003) asserted, from a critical race theory perspective, literacy represents a form of property. It is "property that was traditionally owned and used by whites in the society" (p. ix).

Guinier (2004) argued the need for *racial literacy*, which requires us to "rethink race as an instrument of social, geographic and economic control of both

There is a pervasive silence in literacy research around matters of race, especially with both young people and white people. In this article we illustrate that young white children can and do talk about race, racism, and anti-racism within the context of the literacy curriculum. Using a reconstructed framework for analyzing "white talk," one that relies on literature in whiteness studies and critical race theory and draws on critical discourse analytic frameworks, we illustrate what talk around race sounds like for white second-grade students and their teachers. This research makes several contributions to the literature. We provide a detailed method for coding interactional data using critical discourse analysis and a lens from critical race theory and whiteness studies. We also illustrate the instability of racial-identity formation and the implications for teachers and students when race is addressed in primary classrooms. Ultimately, we argue that racial-literacy development, like other literate process in the classroom, must be guided.

Racial literacy in a second-grade classroom: Critical race theory, whiteness studies, and literacy research

Existe un silencio persistente en la investigación en alfabetización en cuanto a las cuestiones de raza, especialmente con jóvenes y con blancos. En este artículo mostramos que los niños blancos hablan de raza, racismo y anti-racismo en el contexto del currículo de alfabetización. Mediante un marco reconstruido para analizar el "habla de los blancos" basado en la literatura sobre los estudios de la "blancura", la teoría crítica de la raza y el análisis crítico del discurso, ilustramos cómo se percibe el hablar sobre la raza entre estudiantes blancos de segundo grado y sus docentes. Esta investigación hace varias contribuciones a la literatura. Proporcionamos un método detallado para codificar los datos de la interacción usando el análisis crítico del discurso y una perspectiva de la teoría crítica de la raza y los estudios de la "blancura". También ilustramos la inestabilidad de la formación de la identidad racial y las implicancias para docentes y estudiantes cuando se toca el tema de la raza en la escuela primaria. Por último argumentamos que el desarrollo racial de la alfabetización, como otros procesos educativos en el aula, debe ser guiado.

Alfabetización racial en un aula de segundo grado: Teoría crítica de la raza, estudios sobre la "blancura" e investigación en alfabetización

Es besteht ein hartnäckiges Schweigen in der Schreib- und Leseforschung über Rassenangelegenheiten, besonders sowohl bei jungen Leuten als auch unter Weißen. In diesem Artikel zeichnen wir auf, dass junge weiße Kinder über Rasse, Rassismus und Anti-Rassismus innerhalb des Schreib- und Leselehrplankontextes sprechen können und auch sprechen. Durch Anwendung eines rekonstruierten Rahmenwerkes zum Analysieren von „weißem Gerede", welches aufs Schreiben und Lesen von Studien darüber weiß zu sein und auf einer kritischen Rassentheorie beruht und sich auf den kritischen Diskurs analytischer Rahmenbedingungen beruft, illustrieren wir wie Gespräche um Rassenzugehörigkeit unter weißen Schülern der zweiten Klasse und ihren Lehrern klingen. Diese Untersuchung besteht aus verschiedenen Beiträgen zur Literatur. Wir vermitteln eine detaillierte Methode zum Kodieren von wechselwirksamen Daten unter Nutzung der kritischen Diskursanalyse und einem Bereich kritischer Rassentheorie und der Studien des Weißseins. Ebenfalls illustrieren wir die Instabilität in der rassenzugehörigen Identitätsformation und die Auswirkungen für Lehrer und Schüler, sobald die Rasse in Klassenräumen der Unterstufen angesprochen wird. Schließlich argumentieren wir, dass rassisch bedingte Schreib- und Leseentwicklung, wie andere Bildungsprozesse, im Klassenraum anleitend gesteuert werden müssen.

Rassenbezogenes Schreiben und Lesen im Klassenraum der zweiten Klasse: Kritische Abstammungstheorie, Studien zum Weißsein und der Schreib- und Leseforschung

小学２年生の教室における人種的リテラシー：批判的人種理論、ホワイトネス研究、リテラシー研究

リテラシー研究において、特に若者と白人の両方で、人種問題に関して沈黙が蔓延している。本稿では、若い白人の子供達が、リテラシーのカリキュラムの状況の中で、人種、人種差別、反人種差別について論じることができ、そしてそれらについて実際に論じるのだということを明らかにする。『白人トーク』を分析するための再構築された枠組みで、ホワイトネス研究と批判的人種理論の文献と批判的ディスコース分析の枠組みを拠り所とするものを用いて、人種に関する話が白人の小学２年生や彼らの教師達にどのように聞こえるのかを説明する。本研究は、関連文献に幾つかの点において貢献する。批判的ディスコース分析と批判的人種理論及びホワイトネス研究のレンズを用いて、相互行為のデータを分析する詳細な方法を提供する。また、人種的アイデンティティーの形成の不安定性と人種が小学校の教室で取り上げられた場合の教師や生徒への示唆を説明する。最後に、人種的リテラシーの発達は、教室における他の学問的過程同様、手引きをしなければならないと議論する。

Lecture-écriture raciale dans une classe de seconde année : théorie critique de la race, études blanches et recherche en lecture-écriture

Il y a un silence pesant dans la recherche en lecture-écriture au sujet des questions de race, notamment quand il s'agit de jeunes et de blancs. Dans cet article nous montrons que de jeunes enfants blancs peuvent parler et parlent effectivement de race, de racisme, et d'anti-racisme dans le contexte du programme de lecture-écriture. En utilisant une structure reconstruite pour analyser le « parler blanc », en relation avec la littérature des études blanches et la théorie critique de la race et qui s'inspire des structures analytiques du discours critique, nous montrons à quoi ressemble ce que disent de la race des enfants blancs de seconde année et leurs maîtres. Cette recherche fournit plusieurs contributions à la littérature. Nous apportons une méthode détaillée de codage de données interactives utilisant une analyse critique du discours et une loupe provenant de la théorie critique de la race et des études blanches. Nous montrons également l'instabilité de la formation de l'identité raciale et l'implication des maîtres et des élèves quand il est question de race à l'école primaire. Enfin, nous soutenons que le développement de la lecture-écriture raciale, comme tout autre processus de lecture-écriture à l'école, doit être dirigé.

Развитие расовой грамотности у второклассников: критическая теория рас и исследования понятия "белокожий"

Среди молодежи и всего белокожего населения в целом существует тенденция замалчивать темы расовой дискриминации, и исследования в этой области грамотности практически не ведутся. В данной статье мы демонстрируем, что белокожие учащиеся начальных классов способны беседовать на эти темы и обсуждать такие понятия, как расовая принадлежность, расизм и противостояние расизму в контексте уроков по развитию общей грамотности. Для анализа дискурса среди белокожих учеников мы применили схему, основанную на научной литературе, посвященной понятию "белокожий", на критической теории рас и на других схемах анализа дискурса в целом. Используя эту схему, мы иллюстрируем, как происходит подобный дискурс среди белокожих второклассников и их учителей. Это исследование вносит многогранный вклад в научную литературу. Мы предлагаем подробно разработанную методику декодирования данных дискурса – на основе его критического анализа с учетом критической теории рас и исследований понятия "белокожий". Мы также исследуем сам процесс формирования расовой идентичности и его значение для учителей и учеников начальной школы. Наш вывод состоит в том, что становление расовой грамотности не происходит само собой и, подобно развитию других видов грамотности, требует должного руководства.

whites and blacks. Racial literacy offers a more dynamic framework for understanding American racism" (p. 114). A racially literate person, according to Guinier (2003), uses "race as a diagnostic device, an analytic tool, and an instrument of process" (p. 202). First, racial literacy defines racism as a structural problem rather than as an individual one. Second, racial literacy locates debates about public process, which are often cloaked in the subtext of race, within an explicitly democratic context that is forward looking. Third, the process dimension to racial literacy can be used to guide participatory problem solving. Guinier (2003) wrote, "in order to change the way race is understood, race has to be directly addressed rather than ignored" (p. 207).

Literacy education in schools must address race, racism, and antiracism in an educative manner to prepare children to participate in U.S. democracy. However, as Greene and Abt-Perkins (2003) have pointed out, there is a noticeable silence in literacy research and teaching around issues of race, racism, and antiracism. Conversations about race in literacy research are framed in the language of diversity, multicultural education, culturally relevant education, and multiliteracies. Multicultural educators (Banks, 2003; Harris, 1996; Lee, 2003; Nieto, 2003) observed that white teachers can engage with multicultural education without ever having to interrogate the ways that white people are the beneficiaries of inequality in society. Indeed, Ladson-Billings (2003) pointed out that, in classrooms, even when teachers use children's books that explicitly deal with matters of race and racism, they do not *talk* about race. This may be because of a lack of critical analysis of classroom discourse around these matters. Therefore, a deeper exploration of the ensnarement of race, literacy, and whiteness is in order.

Our research and pedagogy are situated within two complementary literacy frameworks that offer reconciliation between accelerative and critical approaches to literacy education (e.g., Dozier, Johnston, & Rogers, 2005). We refer to this approach as teaching for literacy acceleration within a critical framework. Critical frameworks, which attend to matters of social justice, do not often attend to the details of teaching for acceleration (for exceptions, see Bomer & Bomer, 2003; Heffernan & Lewison, 2003; Lensmire, 2000; Luke & Freebody, 1997, 1999; Vasquez, 2003). Teaching for literacy acceleration, a set of approaches that focus on developing flexible, strategic reading and writing in students' zone of proximal development, does not often attend to matters of power, justice, and race. We respond to a call by Nieto (2003),

> Racism is a problem that must be confronted in research, in classroom practice, in the assumption and beliefs that researchers and teachers have about the intelligence and capabilities of children of color, and even in the very way we understand literacy. (p. 205)

A combined framework can provide a useful set of designs for guiding the reading of race, drawing on the commonalities of critical and accelerative literacy processes.

In this article we carry out a multilayered analysis, using critical discourse analysis (CDA) within the ethnographic context of a second-grade public school classroom in the midwestern United States, to inquire how students' literate positions are acquired and constructed through the lenses of whiteness and race. As a university researcher and second-grade teacher (both white), we collaboratively designed and carried out this research, alternating teaching and research responsibilities. We brought the construction of race to the surface through the ongoing project of teaching for literacy acceleration within a unit on African American history, specifically focusing on the Civil Rights movement in the United States within the context of literacy instruction. The central research question that guided this analysis was "In what ways do white students and their white teachers take up race in the literacy curriculum?"

Theoretical frameworks

Critical race theory and whiteness studies

Critical race theory (CRT) is an intellectual tradition derived from a set of frameworks from critical legal studies (Bell, 1992; Delgado & Stefanic, 2001; Guinier, 2003, 2004; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Matsuda, Lawrence, Delgado, & Crenshaw, 1993). CRT recognizes racism as an enduring and pervasive part of life in the United States and works toward eliminating racial oppression as part of the broader goal of ending all forms of oppression (for a summary of the tenets of CRT, see Matsuda et al., 1993). Dixson and Rousseau (2005) argued that the constructs outlined in CRT scholarship in the law have yet to be used to their full potential in education. For example, some scholars have examined whiteness as a construct of privilege but not as an idea that manifests and affects schooling in tangible ways, such as setting standards for "normal" and "acceptable" actions. Thus, whereas the examination of

whiteness (and whiteness as a function of racism) is central to a CRT analysis, white scholars in education have not fully examined the material effects of whiteness and how whiteness is deployed and maintained materially as an aspect of property.

Whiteness studies

Whiteness studies are related to the intellectual movement of CRT and seek to theorize and problematize the construction of whiteness as an absent racial category and dominant social norm. The majority of whiteness scholars agree that whiteness is connected to institutionalized power and privileges that benefit white Americans (Giroux, 1997; Karenga, 1999; Roediger, 1999; Stokes-Brown, 2002). Whiteness has been defined in many ways, including the social distance from blackness and a cultural practice that constructs race-based hierarchies. Of course, a complete understanding of domination must include an analysis of the fabric of oppression, which includes the ways that racism, classism, sexism, ableism, and heterosexism intersect (Young, 1992).

There are at least two positions within whiteness studies. Some scholars argue that whiteness inevitably means racism. Indeed, much scholarship on whiteness focuses on how whiteness is necessarily a reproduction of domination, oppression, and racism. Roediger (1999) stated, "it is not just that whiteness is oppressive and false; it is that whiteness is nothing but oppressive and false" (p. 9). Giroux (1997) pointed out that this line of theorizing is ultimately unproductive because,

> As whiteness increasingly becomes an object of historical and critical analysis, there have been few attempts to provide a theoretical language, in which white youth can refuse to reference their whiteness only through the common experience of racism and oppression. Hence, it becomes difficult for white youth to view themselves as both White and antiracist at the same time. (p. 292)

Other scholars argue for a view of whiteness that includes a positive theorization of what whiteness can mean, including a more fully developed notion of whiteness that includes the idea of white allies (e.g., Giroux, 1997; Helms, 1992).

White privilege, the way that white people benefit from a racist society, refers to unearned advantages that are based solely on skin color and sometimes unnoticed by white people. For example, if parents never have to wonder about whether their children will see themselves in the books they read in class or if their children's grades were based on the color of their skin, these parents are privileged by whiteness (McIntyre, 1997, pp. 97–98). All whites benefit from whiteness and racism but do not benefit equally. Factors such as socioeconomic class, ability, age, religion, and sexuality intersect to mediate access to power and privilege. Only recently has research been conducted that explores whiteness, white identity, and the impact internalized dominance and white privilege has on white people (Aldous Bergerson, 2003; Hytten & Warren, 2003; Rich & Cargile Castelan, 2004; Thompson, 2003; Wagner, 2005). What seems to be agreed upon is that whiteness is neither inherently good nor inherently bad. Rather, whiteness is a social construct.

The construction of whiteness

A complex range of discursive, psychological, economic, and political structures holds racism in place. Thus, understanding the construction of whiteness means attending to each of these frameworks, each of which assumes that race is socially constructed through ideologies and institutions. In this research, we privilege the discursive framework but, at the same time, argue that the discursive framework is rooted in materialist (e.g., Callinicos, 1993; Chouilaraki & Fairclough, 1999; Shapiro, 2004) and psychological frameworks. Material theories of whiteness combine structural and institutional factors, which structure racial hierarchies. That is, theorists argue that the consequences of racism are more than discursive or psychological but result in inequities (economic, political, educational) across racial lines. Many scholars have pointed out the material consequences of continued racism (Guinier & Torres, 2002; Shapiro). Shapiro argued that family inheritance, asset accumulation, and continuing racial discrimination in areas such as home ownership are reversing gains earned in schools and on jobs and worsening racial discrimination. Callinicos wrote,

> Racism remains one of the main features of the advanced capitalist societies. It is institutionalized in the systematic discrimination that black people experience in jobs, housing and the education system, and the harassment they suffer at the hands of police and immigration authorities. (p. 9)

Psychological frameworks assume that race identity emerges from a construction of race difference that accords privilege and punishment differently to people. White identity theories describe the psychological shifts that whites undergo in moving toward a fully committed form of antiracism. These

theorists suggest distinct stages that white people pass through in the development of a racialized identity (Cross, 1991; Helms, 1992, Tatum, 1992, 1994). The material and psychological frameworks are important for understanding the deep-rooted nature of racism in U.S. society and in particular educational institutions. However, we argue that the discursive framework is perhaps the most compatible framework for literacy research.

Discourse theories of whiteness

According to a discursive perspective, racism is not a personal deviation but structured into the fabric of our society. Thus, changing racist practices and policies needs to include changes in habits of mind coupled with changes in economic and political structures. Morrison (1993) wrote,

> For both black and white writers, in a wholly racialized society, there is no escape from racially inflected language, and the work writers do to unhobble the imagination from the demands of that language is complicated, interesting, and definitive. (pp. 12–13)

Not only is racially inflicted language pervasive, it is also subversive. Van Dijk (1987) argued that racism is perpetuated in subtle, symbolic, and discursive ways—through everyday talk and texts—such as newspapers, conversations between teachers and students, television, movies, textbooks, debates, political propaganda and so on. This is important because such inscriptions of white privilege are encoded through talk and texts.

McIntyre (1997) referred to this lack of naming of race as *white talk*. This is "talk that serves to insulate white people from examining their/our individual and collective roles in the perpetuation of racism" (p. 46). Common examples of white talk include using humor to avoid difficult conversations, using the passive voice to remove responsibility from a person or group, using distancing pronouns and silences, and changing the topic. White talk can also include more subtle markers that Solorzano, Ceja, and Yosso (2001) referred to as "micro-aggressions," which are "are subtle insults (verbal, nonverbal and/or visual) directed toward people of color, often automatically and unconsciously" (p. 60).

Discursive frameworks focus on how talk and texts provide artifacts for people to see the ways that social/institutional and cognitive models of racism unfold and have material consequences for their participants. Indeed, we learn or unlearn racism through texts and talk (Smitherman & van Dijk, 1998; van Dijk, 1987). A discursive framework connects the various structures and strategies of talk and text to political, economic, and social frameworks. Discourse is conceptualized as a set of social practices that both construct and reflect the social world and benefit some people at the expense of others. Discourse may be seen as the crucial interface between the social and cognitive dimensions of race. Tools such as language, symbol systems, nonverbal gestures, art, and media all work to construct and represent whiteness as normalized and privileged. Competing values are seen as deviant. Through our tools for sense making, whiteness is normalized and the associated privileges are made invisible.

Perry (2003) has argued that in a post–Civil Rights era, racism is much more insidious. Hate speech and crimes, while ever present, take on a different tenor and tone than they did 50 years ago (van Dijk, 1987). Similarly, following *Brown v. Board of Education*, it is harder to spot racism and discrimination than when segregation was enforced through Jim Crow laws. The goal of discourse theories of whiteness is to reveal and denaturalize the socially constructed nature of race, white privilege, and racism in the social and cognitive architecture of our lives so it can be noticed, named, deconstructed, and reconstructed.

Significance of this research

This study locates race through *interactions* that occur in teaching and learning settings. Most critical discourse analyses of race, racism, or antiracism have been conducted primarily within texts such as newspaper reports and media documents (e.g., Fairclough & Wodak, 1997; Martin & Wodak, 2000; Wigginton, 2005). We present a reconstructed coding system for identifying white talk that expands on the discourse frameworks that are currently available in the research (McIntyre, 1997; van Dijk, 1987). We have mapped McIntyre's concept of white talk onto a discourse framework that includes both the form and function of language. Although McIntyre identified speech tactics that white people often use when they talk about (or do not talk about) race, she did not draw on the theory or method of discourse analysis to describe, interpret, and explain how white talk plays out in children's books and in discussions around race in classrooms.

Discourse theorists, on the other hand, have nuanced procedures for analyzing the form and function of talk but have not specifically focused their analysis on racism and antiracism. Smitherman and van Dijk (1998) have focused on discourse and discrimination but have not used the Critical Discourse

Analysis framework of genre, discourse, and style or ways of interacting, representing, and being to map linguistic markers (Chouilaraki & Fairclough, 1999; Fairclough, 2003). Thus, we bring McIntyre's (1997) analysis of white talk in line with the work that has been done around discourse and racism in discourse studies (Smitherman & van Dijk; van Dijk, 1987) to propose an expanded framework of understanding race and talk in classrooms. In line with our theoretical frameworks, we demonstrate where white talk exists on a continuum, from evading discussions around race to actively interrogating racism and setting up alliances and other antiracist actions.

Further, although there has been research on race and whiteness in high schools (Bolgatz, 2004; Ginwright, 2004; Lee, 2004; Perry, 2003) and with adults, particularly college students (e.g., Bonilla-Silva & Forman, 2000; Chubbuck, 2004; Hytten & Warren, 2003; Marx & Pennington, 2003; McIntyre, 1997; Solomon, Portelli, Daniel, & Campbell, 2005; Thompson, 2003; Wagner, 2005; Webster-Brandon, 2003; Willis, 2003), there is much less work that illuminates the construction of race with primary-grade children (for exceptions see Berlak & Moyenda, 2001). This is important because young children (white children and children of color) demonstrate racial understandings, including racist and antiracist attitudes and actions.

Research design

Context

St. Louis, Missouri, is a city with a history of racial division between African Americans and whites (Heaney & Uchitelle, 2004). The city is characterized as maintaining the status quo with regard to inequities along education, housing, and employment lines despite progressive reform attempts such as school desegregation (Morris, 2001; Wells & Crain, 2001). Cities and schools within the metropolitan St. Louis area are racially segregated, and racial distinctions are thought of primarily in terms of black and white.

The district in which the study occurs is racially and economically diverse and does not participate in the voluntary desegregation program. It is located within the metropolitan area in close proximity to the city of St. Louis. In the school where this study occurs, racism is coded in discussions of class. Most of the students who attend this school live and play in an integrated working class neighborhood. When students follow the cultural norms and expectations

of the school, race is ignored. Racism among teachers in the school is targeted toward African American students who move into the district from the city of St. Louis. Teachers often complain that the parents of these students are not supportive of the teachers' expectations for behavior and academics.

The inquiry we report on in this article reveals one slice of the classroom life for this group of students and teachers during the course of the 2002–2003 school year. In Melissa Mosley's classroom, there were 5 African American students, 1 Korean American student, and 13 European American students. In December, when this study began, 2 African American female students left the class. Two African American males joined the class in January. The students had an active learning community that Melissa attributes to the focus on peer learning and social issues in the curriculum. Throughout the course of the year, the students explored their own funds of knowledge; they discussed justice and inequity in their own lives and the lives of others; they constructed social actions (such as writing letters and constructing a play that carried a message for parents and adolescents in their lives); and they read and discussed issues pertaining to Civil Rights, peace and war, and justice in the United States and globally. See Appendix A for a timeline of events, activities, and data sources in the classroom.

For the inquiry reported here, we selected literature that was at the children's instructional reading levels and that presented issues from multiple viewpoints and time periods, especially books that were written and illustrated by African Americans. Books were used for guided reading, listening centers, and an independent reading center. As Appendix B notes, we used a variety of children's literature written by both people of color and white people and representing a variety of viewpoints. It was difficult to find books at the reading level of the students that raised consciousness of social issues in an antiracist way. We chose books that were already part of the classroom library or from booksellers who provide multicultural and antiracist texts. Sometimes these books met our standards as being historically accurate and socially responsible. However, we often used our critical literacy tools with the students to critique how authors represented people and events (see Appendix C).

Literacy instruction

Melissa used an accelerative approach to literacy instruction within a critical literacy framework throughout the school day. Accelerative literacy instruction refers to approaches that are centrally in-

tended to help the slowest developing students through focused literacy instruction. Clay (1993) wrote that acceleration is "achieved as the child takes over the learning process and works independently discovering new things for himself inside and outside the lesson" (p. 9). Johnston (2002) described three such guideposts that are integral to teaching for acceleration: (a) the development of an executive system or a self-extending system, (b) emphasis on teaching context-based strategies from the outset, and (c) the importance of responsive teaching. Guided reading was the main structure for teaching for acceleration within a critical framework.

During guided reading, students' self-extending problem-solving systems develop as they learn decoding and comprehension strategies during book introductions, independent reading, and minilessons after the reading of a book. Running records are used to track a student's progress and to identify miscues and cueing systems a student is using to make errors and self-correct. Peers and teachers both fulfill the role of more knowledgeable other in the zone of proximal development. Instructional-level texts are texts that children can read with a 90–95% accuracy rate, which means that children are engaging in problem solving to figure out unknown words and concepts, but the problem solving is not interrupting their fluency and comprehension. The reading groups are flexible and change to accommodate the students' needs in terms of problem solving as well as their understanding of concepts presented in books.

Melissa valued the social nature of literacy learning, and she believed that students learned best when they had time for both independent reading and writing and discussions about texts. Therefore, after small groups were finished reading and discussing texts, the whole group would come together and have discussions about big themes and ideas. Many times, a read-aloud focused a whole-group discussion. Students brought their experiences from their independent and small-group work into these whole-group discussions.

Participants

During the inquiry, students were in four reading groups based on their instructional level for decoding texts. We also took into consideration the students' ability to bring personal experiences into texts and discuss social issues. At the beginning of the research, we chose 10 white case-study students and put them in two guided-reading groups. We selected these children according to ability level, disposition, gender, and whether they had returned

permission slips signed by their parents or guardians to participate in the research. All of the children came from working class families. The other two guided-reading groups had an even number of African American students and white students. The white students in our case study had opportunities throughout the day to discuss texts and social issues with African American students in literacy centers and whole-group instruction.

We have focused on one of these groups in this article. The group members are Katrina, Brad, Larry, Sandra, and Sam (all names are pseudonyms). Each of these students was proficient at navigating the structures of the classroom and the school. Their families emphasized the importance of school and had a variety of tools to help them succeed. Each student participated differently in literacy activities. For example, during choice time, the boys read silently and but socially shared books with one another. Katrina wrote stories about friendship and relationships during choice time, and Sandra usually read independently.

The students' descriptions of their parents' occupations provided us with one dimension of life outside of school. Sam reported that he plays pool and watches wrestling on pay-per-view television with his dad, a cement pourer who "makes a lot of money." Sam and Larry agreed that when their parents don't work, they don't get paid. Sam announced that his dad makes more money than his mom. His mom works at a computer company. Larry told us that his mother is a waitress who works at a roadside restaurant and makes "pretty good money," but she started looking for another job because the restaurant was going out of business. His father works at a Harley Davidson T-shirt shop, printing T-shirts. Katrina's dad "helps doctors find patients" far away from where they live. He came to parent–teacher conferences while her mother took care of the kids. Her mom works at a grocery store and, according to Katrina, "changes jobs every day from the register, to stocking shelves." Katrina stated that when she grows up she wants to work at the drive-in restaurant because the waitresses there roller skate and it looks like they are having fun. Sandra and her family had just moved into a house from the apartment where they were living. Her mother, a high school teacher, and father had divorced but often came to school together for conferences.

Our research team as a teacher/researcher and researcher/teacher brought a number of affordances and constraints to our project. Melissa considered herself an "insider" to the community, having grown up and gone to school within the same district where she

was currently teaching. Some of the norms, values, and beliefs of this context were familiar because she lived there throughout her public schooling. However, the dynamics of the community were visibly shifting over time as the neighborhoods became less racially segregated. New housing developments, some federally subsidized, were available to the residents of the community. Some neighborhoods were becoming less desirable and run-down, probably a result of unemployment that came with the closing of several major factories located nearby. Through her discussions with parents and other school staff and volunteers, she learned about the community. Rebecca, on the other hand, was an "outsider" to this particular community as she was a transplant from another state and a completely different geographic area. Melissa often would explain to Rebecca the history of a particular practice or routine. Together, the two researchers were able to complicate Melissa's role as an insider and make the invisible "visible" for Rebecca.

As white, female researchers the team brought racialized frames to bear on this work. Melissa, the teacher and researcher in the study, found that many of the central experiences that constructed the social identity of the participants were part of her own socialization in a white, working class community. She went to a high school that participated in the voluntary desegregation program but noticed that segregation remained intact through academic tracking. Through a university education that emphasized race as creating an unjust system of schooling, Melissa was able to envision bringing race to the forefront as a critical social issue. Prior to stepping out of the community and then reconnecting with the school where she taught, this perspective would have been unavailable to her.

Rebecca, the university researcher and, at times, teacher in this study, grew up in a rural community in upstate New York that was predominantly Christian, white, and working class. Over the years as people push their way out of the nearest major metropolitan area it has become more suburban, similar to the community in this study. This town was historically based on agriculture and major factories (e.g., carpet mills, toy factories), all of which have been closed down. Upon reflection, it is very clear to Rebecca the way in which her entire educational history was whitewashed. After moving to St. Louis, where racial divisions are obvious, stark, and the focus of much public dialogue, the geographic differences in treatment of racial divides became obvious. Rebecca has participated in a weeklong institute called Dismantling Racism Institute for Educators, which is sponsored by National Council

of Christians and Jews, and continues to interrogate the construction of race, and whiteness, in her teaching and research.

Both Melissa and Rebecca belong to a group called the Literacy for Social Justice Teacher Research group, and both live in the city of St. Louis. Neither have children. Both are active in social justice initiatives and are currently teaching a school-based literacy methods course for preservice teachers together that foregrounds matters of race, antiracism, and multicultural education. Both have made personal and professional commitments to actively interrogate white privilege and facilitate antiracist/projustice pedagogy.

Data collection

Participant observation

Melissa Mosley was the primary teacher in the classroom. She was educated in teacher research methodology as a part of her master's degree in education. Rebecca Rogers was the university researcher who has conducted ethnographic studies both in and out of schools. Because of our experiences, we each took the role of participant/observer in the classroom, rotating roles as classroom teachers and as researchers. Each of us was involved in the ongoing data collection and data analysis over a period of seven months. We recorded classroom literacy lessons through ethnographic documentation and field notes (Emerson, Fretz, & Shaw, 1995; Spradley, 1980).

During any given episode in the language arts classroom there may have been two or three collaborative learning opportunities occurring. As Melissa was leading a guided-reading group, small groups were working around the room. For example, several of the students might be discussing multicultural literature at the listening center, while another pair of students worked on the script for a play. Thus, we had three to four video cameras and audio recorders running at any given time to capture the orchestration of literacy learning within the classroom. Overall, we recorded over 100 hours of teaching and learning in this classroom. After data collection ended and analysis formally began, we studied each videotape and provided a "thick description" of each tape. We took field notes retrospectively, attending to language as well as nonverbal communication (gestures, tone, emotions, eye gaze, body language). We then matched our descriptions of the tape with the rest of the data record (e.g., field notes, writing samples, books, transcripts) from that session.

Researcher/teacher journal

After many lessons, we debriefed and informally analyzed the lesson. Both of us took retrospective field notes at the end of the lesson (Melissa often had a break period) or at the end of the day. This journal guided us in the process of remembering events and experiences; describing the situations; and developing ideas, questions, and goals that were important in the teaching and research.

Document collection

We collected all of the teacher and student artifacts that related to each activity during the language arts block (e.g., running records, guiding questions, children's writing samples, writing around the artifact centers, teacher lesson plans, and anecdotal records). We collected copies of the students' informal writing (e.g., students would go home and write plays that included African American people they had read about). We collected and read the local and city newspapers that contained articles about the local economy and important points of interest to understanding of the social–political–economic context of the community. We also gathered census data and historical reports from the town library.

Interviews

We tape recorded informal interviews throughout the inquiry. We interviewed the children about their lives in and out of school and their attitudes and beliefs about peer interaction (Rubin & Rubin, 1995). We conducted open-ended interviews with the children while they were working. Rebecca interviewed Melissa before the study began to learn more about her history, how she organized her classroom, the students in her classroom, and the community.

Data analysis

To address our research question, we needed to analyze multiple sign systems including language, visual images, illustrations, use of space and gestures, the racialized history of the community, and texts. We brought the "critical" lenses of critical ethnography and CDA to bear on the data. What each approach had in common was its "stance" toward interrogating the ways that power and knowledge are reproduced, consumed, and transformed through the dynamic interplay of micro and macro interactions and human agency (Collins, 2001; Fairclough, 2003; Kress, 2003).

Procedurally, after the data collection was over, we made data packets for each of the episodes within language arts time. We took all of the transcripts from guided reading for the case study group and analyzed each of the guided-reading lessons over time for each of the groups. We then looked at each group within the context of the group members' peer discussion, discussions around artifacts, read-alouds/whole-group discussions, and play writing. The data packets helped us to see the connections across contexts, the learning, and the changes in the discourse patterns.

Reconstructive analysis

Critical ethnography, described by Carspecken (1996), draws on ethnographic tradition and specifically seeks to interrogate truth and reality claims that noncritically reproduce regimes of truth. Reconstructive analysis, the analytic tool of critical ethnography, is a process of building a thick description and attending to the multiple explanatory possibilities that any utterance, gesture, interaction, or social practice may hold.

We conducted preliminary reconstructive analysis that consisted of reading and rereading the primary data record. During this phase, we constructed low-level codes with few inferences. As we were analyzing the data we also immersed ourselves in the literature in critical race theory and whiteness studies. This was especially important because as white educators and researchers we were not able to see the subtle ways that race and whiteness were enacted and disrupted. Each time we read the data, our understandings of race and whiteness, and consequently our interpretations, deepened. Second, we targeted specific places in the data that corresponded to our research questions to generate possible meaning fields. Specifically, we chose key transcripts that displayed evidence of engaging around issues of race and whiteness.

Key transcripts, corresponding to our research questions, were analyzed by using the process of "open coding" (Miles & Huberman, 1994). We began with a list of 10 broad categories that answered our research questions. We came up with the following categories: interactional patterns, types of questions, problem solving (textual/social level), skin color, accelerative strategies, changing laws, whiteness, whiteness embedded in comments, equity, and colorblindness. We refined our research questions to specifically ask about the construction of whiteness and analyzed the transcripts again. We continued to read the literature on whiteness studies and critical

race theory. Finally, we constructed three primary categories: "noticing race," "enacting white privilege," and "disrupting white privilege." We discussed the places where our interpretations differed or where there were questions about the cultural norms or intentions of the participants. We revisited the videotapes, the data across time, and our interpretations as teachers and researchers in the classroom to confirm or disconfirm these developing hypotheses.

Critical discourse analysis

CDA draws on critical social theory and multimodal analysis to offer a description, interpretation, and explanation of the relationships between texts, discursive practices, and social practices. There are many different approaches to CDA. Some include a close textual analysis rooted in systemic functional linguistics (Chouilaraki & Fairclough, 1999; Fairclough, 2003); others include a multimodal analysis that interrogates the grammars of design and focus on the visual sign systems (Kress, 2003; Kress & van Leeuwen, 2001).

After generating the three themes, we wanted to provide a closer analysis of select transcripts and describe, interpret, and explain the ways that meaning was made in each of the interactions. We conducted two related forms of CDA: a textual and a visual analysis (Chouilaraki & Fairclough, 1999; Fairclough, 2003; Kress, 2003; Smitherman & van Dijk, 1988). Our textual analysis was informed by systemic functional linguistics and was used on the classroom discourse. Using McIntyre's (1997) and Smitherman & van Dijk's (1988) work on discourse, racism, and whiteness, we constructed a coding chart that brought together literature in racism with the forms and functions of talk. Further, the coding chart was constructed as we analyzed the data and from our analysis of the larger ethnographic corpus. See Appendix D for a detailed coding chart.

After identifying key transcripts for each of the themes, we conducted a CDA at the intersecting levels of genre, discourse, and style (Fairclough, 2004; Rogers, 2004; Rogers & Mosley, 2004). Genre refers to ways of interacting, discourse to ways of representing, and style to ways of being. The assumption is that each utterance functions in three ways simultaneously. That is, genre, discourse, and style are always working together to construct meaning. In terms of genre, or ways of interacting, we looked for the ways that talk "hangs together" through aspects of language such as humor, interruptions, resistance, metaphor use, overlapping talk, repetition. In terms of discourse, or ways of representing, we paid partic-

ular attention to the discourses of whiteness and race that appeared in text and talk. Finally, in terms of style, or ways of being, we coded for politeness conventions, passive or active construction of the sentences, absence of talk, the existence of cognitive or affective statements, the use of pronouns (or favoring third-person pronouns over first-person pronouns, which functions to distance the speaker from the action), and marked and unmarked categories. We defined these categories following Myers-Scotton (1998) as

> markedness as those linguistic choices that are not predicted by community norms, that are less likely to be expected for the situation. Knowledge of the markedness status of a linguistic item enables speakers to choose between linguistic items with some guess as to how the communication will be received and understood. (p. 9).

Our goal was to look for patterns across the discussions, rather than focus on isolated discussions. We looked for reoccurring themes and patterns, silences and absences in the data, and inconsistent data, as well as emergent themes.

We also conducted a semiotic analysis of the videotapes of guided-reading lessons to lead us to a deeper understanding of the meanings that the children constructed. In terms of visual elements (images and symbols) (Fairclough, 1992; Hodge & Kress, 1988; Kress & van Leeuwen, 2001), we asked the following question: What visual resources are used besides the text? Kress argued that the design of each mode is related to the materiality of the semiotic mode: sound, temporality and sequence, spatiality, visual images, and so forth.

After analyzing classroom discourse texts using CDA, we noticed patterns of talk that sounded like the language in the literature that the children had read. In typical ethnographic fashion, we turned our attention to the children's literature to conduct a discourse analysis of the language and visual structure of the books the children had read.

Continuing to use the multimodal tools of critical discourse analysis, we asked how race, racism, and antiracism were constructed in the children's book through personal relations, laws, and institutions. We analyzed the books in terms of the illustrations, story lines, characters, stereotypes, tokenism, and heroism.

Cross-checking our analyses

Part of the social and ethical responsibility of studying and writing about race as two white women means cross-checking our interpretations with schol-

ars of color as well as with white scholars who consider themselves antiracist. We asked five scholars prominent in the field of critical race theory, whiteness studies, and literacy research to read and respond to our interpretations.

Results: Making meaning of whiteness

In the following sections, we describe, interpret, and explain the construction of whiteness, embedding our critical analyses within our ethnographic description. Our findings indicate that the children started to notice whiteness in their visual and linguistic analysis of the texts, and, as they did so, they both enacted and disrupted white privilege. The noticing, the enacting, and the disrupting occurred almost simultaneously in terms of time and context (e.g., over the course of several weeks within the context of a few books, even within the same conversation). That is, it is not as if the children went through "stages" where they enacted white privilege and then moved to disrupt white privilege. Rather, their development of racial literacy was characterized by hybrid discourses of whiteness enacted and whiteness disrupted, sometimes within the same book and within the same day. The sections below are not represented in chronological order. We have represented the interpretations through vignettes that highlight the combination of ethnographic and discourse analytic strategies. The themes we describe in the following sections link the children in the classroom with ourselves and between ourselves as white researcher/teachers in complicated ways. We return to this complexity in the discussion.

"I think it was a white man": Noticing and naming race

One aspect of the children's discussions around race was characterized by their beginning explorations of noticing and naming race. In one representative example of students noticing whiteness and the ambiguity of the text in naming whiteness, we observed both the independent noticing of race, the coconstruction of the invisibility of whiteness, and the disruption of this line of theorizing.

The Bus Ride (Miller, 1998) is a children's book written at a Guided Reading level K. The author, William Miller, is a white man who has written *Richard Wright and the Library Card* (Lee & Low, 1999) and *Zora Hurston and the Chinaberry Tree* (Lee & Low, 1996). He teaches African American literature at York College in Pennsylvania. The illustrator, John Ward, is an African American man who has illustrated books such as *Kente Colors* (Walker, 1997) and *The Freedom Riddle* (School Specialty, 2003). The foreword to the book is a letter to readers, written by Rosa Parks. In the book, Sara, an 8-year-old African American girl, takes actions similar to those of Rosa Parks and boycotts segregated public transportation. The author presents two readings of Sara's actions. Breaking the law is seen as unintended, and some characters say she made a mistake. In this reading, acts of social activism are interpreted as acts of confusion. Other characters see her as a brave martyr for equal rights.

The role of whites and African Americans in the book raised a red flag during our analysis of the text. White people are represented as passive participants on the bus or as enforcers of the segregated laws (e.g., bus driver, police officer). The white writer in the story works for a newspaper that supports activism, but the book does not say that the person, himself, was an activist. Whites are also presented as hard workers who wanted to get to work on time. None of the white people represented in the book are actively antiracist in protesting with Sara, or other African Americans, against Jim Crow laws (Foundrie, 2001; Harris, 1996). People of color play passive roles in the book as well (McNair, 2003; Sims, 1982). With the exception of Sara and her mother, African Americans are bystanders and onlookers. There is some discussion about one of the police officers, a man represented as having brown skin. Other African Americans who ride the bus and walk to work are portrayed in similar clothes and as integrated with white folks, and are differentiated by physical features.

When the laws of segregation were repealed, Miller (1998) writes, "people got so mad they finally changed the law" (p. 10). There is no mention of *who* changed the law, and the change is attributed to an emotion rather than to sets of policies and practices that were unjust and a string of planned and coordinated acts of civil disobedience aimed at dismantling racism (Kohl, 1993). One theme in our analysis of the children's literature we reviewed for this unit was that the authors often did not name the social actors in the story. This is significant because, as our analysis indicated, children take up the linguistic and ideological patterns of the text as they read and interact with one another, thus reproducing the invisibility of a particular way of talking about people and actions.

In the following interaction around the book *The Bus Ride*, students sat together around the horseshoe-shaped reading table. Each child had a book in front of him or her, and Melissa sat on the other side of the table. There was a quiet hum of children at literacy centers behind the table. The children read silently, and Melissa watched as they tracked words with their fingers. Their problem-solving strategies were primarily internal and self-monitored.

Sam's finger paused on the word *sergeant*, and Melissa intervened. "What's that word? Try it." As the students finished reading, Melissa pointed out that Sam found a tricky word, *sergeant*, and the students began to discuss the word. The unfamiliar word became an entry point to a discussion of race relations in the story. Melissa drew the students' attention to the sergeant and the newspaper reporter who were in the police station with Sara after she was carried from her seat on the bus to the police station. First, Brad reported that the newspaper reporter said that he writes about people who do brave things. The group then began to discuss the sergeant who did not think Sara was brave but that Sara made a mistake by breaking the law "on accident." These opposing viewpoints led to statements such as "we don't know" when Melissa asked them if Sara made a mistake.

Sandra, Katrina, Brad, Larry, and Sam looked down toward their books, and Melissa tapped a pencil eraser-side down on the table as she spoke. Melissa pointed out the opposing viewpoints of the two white men in the story, asking, "Did anyone say something that supported what Sara did? Or didn't support what Sara did?" Melissa prompted for evidence, which is a strategic practice in both accelerative and critical literacy frameworks. Larry, with his head in his hand, looked down at the book. Sandra's hands pressed down on the table as she shook her head, as if to disagree. Brad looked up and to the right, as if drawing on prior knowledge, and prepared to respond.

Brad looked up at his teacher and began, "They didn't tell us but I think it was a white man, I think it was a white man, he said, 'that jail will do you good.'"

In this interaction, Brad revoiced a line from the book to support his answer. He also repeated the cognitive statement "I think it was a white man" twice in his statement. This repetition may have signaled that he was self-monitoring his speech, particularly because it was the first mention of whiteness in the discussion. It could have also signified his general uncertainty. In terms of the discursive themes

that came out of this statement, we noticed the discourse of race discussed as color, but the emergence of racial markers discussed in association with social status and power. That is, the "white man" in this interaction had the power and associated status to say, "jail will do you good." We also notice that Brad used the first-person pronoun and spoke in his "I" voice to construct a response while he implicitly challenged the unmarked category of whiteness in the text (e.g., "they didn't tell us"). Interestingly, Brad used a third-person pronoun (*they*) to refer to the author, which puts distance between his critique and the person who wrote the book. Later in the discussion, we will see how Melissa brought the author back into the discussion by naming him and questioning why he chose to write the way he did.

Again prompting for evidence, Melissa asked, "Why did you think it was a white man?" In this move, she furthers the discussion around noticing and naming race.

Brad replied to Melissa's question, "Because, because I think, mostly when it said black, black people, or what color of their skin it was, and it said what they said, but here it didn't say it was white or black."

Melissa prompted Brad to give evidence for his thinking, to theorize about his position on the spot, an important aspect of accelerative and critical literacy instruction. What was particularly revealing (and exciting) about this set of interactions is that we were privy to Brad's developing notions of the social construction of race.

Just as Brad repeated "white man" in the above interaction, here he repeated the word "black," which could signal that he was monitoring his speech as he constructed his response. He referred to the book using the impersonal pronoun *it*, which further distanced the reader from the writer of the book ("it said"). Brad seemed to use the constructs of race and skin color interchangeably. Importantly, Brad's observation critiqued the dominant discourse, which positions whiteness as the norm and blackness as "othered."

Again, Brad used his "I" voice to express his observation that whiteness is an unmarked category in terms of naming race in literature, often a feature of "white talk." Noticing the difference between marked and unmarked linguistic categories (Myers-Scotton, 1998) is even more powerful when put in conjunction with a sociological analysis of the ways that racial group membership functions in society. Critical race theorists argue that white people, by virtue of their membership in the dominant group in society, construct identities defined as "normal"

and consequently set the standard for which racial and ethnic minorities are assessed (Dixson & Rousseau, 2005; Ladson-Billings, 1999).

In the next interaction around the book *The Bus Ride* (Miller, 1998) on the following day, Sandra independently noticed a conflict between the text and the illustration. She pointed out a critical absence in the text: White people were not represented as "allies" or as supporting Sara, the character in the book who resisted the segregated bus laws. After reading a section of the text when several people responded to the story the newspaper writer has published in the daily paper, Sandra hypothesized that there was a problem with the way the illustrator represented the event. The group members sat around the horseshoe table, as their hands and eyes examined pages. Sandra, sitting between Larry and Brad, looked directly toward Melissa and shook her head vigorously.

She leaned forward across the table and verbalized her confusion,

> I don't get it. It says, "many white people and black people came up to shake her hand" but I don't get it. I see black people but I don't see white people. Except for that one.

Sandra's repetition of the phrase, "I don't get it" functioned to highlight her ambiguity and the exploratory nature of her contribution to the dialogue. Similar to Brad, she used the third-person pronoun to depersonalize the author of the book, which functions to remove any sort of accountability from the choice of the person who wrote the book ("it says" rather than "the author wrote"). She also revoiced a passage from the text to support her statement. Here, she compared two modalities—the illustration with the text and the words on the page—and independently noticed a conflict.

The theme or discourse of her statement reduced a discussion of race to a discussion of color without association to positions or status. This observation served to highlight the absence of white people as allies, and like Brad, she independently raised a critique. It is important to note that Sandra also used her "I" voice to raise her points. We also noted the embodiment and physical expression of emotion as she was making sense of this conflict. Emotions were often present in the interactions throughout this inquiry as the children made sense of their whiteness within an accelerative literacy curriculum.

As Sandra raised this issue to her peers, she was drawing on another critical literacy strategy, noticing disjuncture between viewpoints and modalities.

Larry, who often drew on textual evidence to support or contradict someone's claim, agreed with Sandra's observation and provided an example of one white person in the illustration, "Yeah, except for the newspaperman. See, he sells newspapers." It is important to note that he does not *name* the person as white but points out a white person in the illustration as a counterexample. In the children's literature we used, we noticed that race was rarely explicitly named in the literature. This absence was also evident in Brad's earlier comment about the naming of race in dialogue. Often, in these texts, the reader needed to infer race from the illustrations. This practice reifies a silence around race, including not marking whiteness as racialized. Race-neutral language negates the social, historical, and political contexts and fails to challenge white dominance and privilege.

Seeking clarification from Sandra, Melissa asked, "What do you think is weird? That a white person would shake her hand or that there are no white people in the picture. Which part?"

Sandra responded, "There aren't any white people in the picture."

Melissa asked the children to investigate the next page in the book to facilitate this line of inquiry. Her intention was to keep the children progressing through the book. Melissa affirmed that there was ambiguity between the illustration and the text and stated, "and still on the next page, we don't see any people who are white actually behind her." Melissa changed the phrase "white people" to "people who are white," the latter implying a focus on the person before their race.

Larry, who had been studying the illustrations, joined the conversation. "It says white but they are actually pink." Here, Larry noticed differences in the shades of white skin, which studies demonstrate white people are less likely to do than people of color (van Ausdale & Feagin, 2001). Melissa continued to narrate the illustrations and keep the children progressing through the book. She stated, "OK, and then on the next page when they're on the bus and she's giving her mother the seat, a lot of people are smiling, white and black." In this example, the illustrator chose to represent the people of color as smiling and happy even though it didn't fit with the message in the text.

The children resumed their reading of the book *The Bus Ride* (Miller, 1998) at their tables as Melissa called another group, composed of African American and white children, over to the table to conduct a guided-reading lesson with *The Bus Ride*. This group's discussions were more focused on the historical context of the story, specifically on Rosa

Parks. The other two groups read a text at a lower instructional level.

The next day Melissa called the first group again over to the guided-reading table, recalling their attention to the story. Sam, a small blond boy with dark, round glasses, had an interactional history of interrupting discussions in the guided-reading groups in school-sanctioned ways, such as stating he has a question rather than asking whether he may ask a question. In this next set of interactions, Sam independently raised a question about skin color but also asked questions based on the social positions that are connected with skin color. He listened as the previous speaker, Katrina, clarified a statement to Melissa. As she spoke, Sam raised his hand in the air and, before getting a response from Melissa, stated, "Miss Mosley, I have a question."

At this point, Sam had the floor. Katrina looked at him, tilted her head as if listening, and looked across the table at the teacher. Sam pointed to the book and continued, "What I don't get is how, why is this guy a policeman and so is this black guy? That guy's black and that guy's white. So why can't she sit on the bus anyway?" Sam flipped his hand up toward the ceiling and continued, "I don't get it, there's a black police officer." Larry and Sandra began flipping back and forth in the pages of the book, looking for evidence of what Sam was saying. This example illustrates the social nature of problem solving in this guided-reading setting.

Sam noticed a disjuncture between the historical context and the illustrations; that is, if there was an African American police officer in the police station and it was in the same area as the white man, then why couldn't Sara sit on the bus? This example marked the beginning of theorizing about racism as discriminatory actions that can be extended into learning about institutional racism. His question "why can't she sit on the bus anyway?" functioned as an implicit critique of Jim Crow laws. As he spoke, frustration marked his tone. His statement "what I don't get" is a phrase that opens up uncertainty and dialogue around the issue. There is evidence that his linguistic patterns replicate the pattern of the text in terms of not naming whiteness but naming people of color when he asks, "why is this guy a policeman and so is this black guy?" However, as he moved on with his thought, he marked race in a parallel way saying, "that guy's black and that guy's white." We found that this type of hybridity, in terms of genre, discourse, and style, was characteristic of the children's talk as they coconstructed meanings around race.

Just as Sam opened the floor for discussion, Sandra interrupted before he finished his thought and, in her response, reiterated the social structure of her explanation of why the African American man was in the police station. As she spoke, she leaned forward across the table and exclaimed,

> Hey, maybe, different places, like, what if there is two places in a police station, this one's the white room and this one's the black room. What about that? So what if he's just walking to his room?

The phrases "hey, maybe" and "what if" and the rhetorical question "what about that?" marked the genre of Sandra's turn as posing an idea or possibility that functions to open the floor to theorize about possibilities. The discursive theme of the possibility that Sandra offers is to name the "separate but equal" laws under Jim Crow. Here she connects the personal discrimination with institutionally sanctioned policies.

Katrina looked, eyes wide at Melissa, as Sam shook his head "no." Melissa posed another question to the group, trying to elicit responses to Sandra's assertion, "Do you think that the police officers were separate? Sandra thinks the police officers were probably separated by their color." Melissa named race as "color" in this turn, which, over time, could function to equate race with skin color. Sandra took this question as an invitation to give a further explanation of her argument and raised her arms up again. "Because remember back then, black and white people couldn't be together so they had to be separated so there might be *two....*" Sandra drew an intertextual connection to the whole-class discussions they had around society and racism based on texts such as movies or read-alouds. While she drew on historical evidence, her statement "black and white people couldn't be together" does not name actors or agents in the segregation, a common linguistic pattern in the children's books they read.

The children continued to debate whether the illustrator included shadows in the book or if the man is African American for a few more turns. Melissa was afraid that their focus on shadows rather than on any substantive issues dealing with race might have been a rhetorical tactic to dismiss talking seriously about issues of race and racism. In some cases, this could occur unintentionally because of a discomfort with these issues. McIntyre (1997) stated, "the language of white talk actively subverts the language white people need to de-center whiteness as a dominant ideology" (p. 47). Instead of letting the conversation continue in this direction, Melissa stated,

The illustrator chose to draw these people in a certain way, and I'm not exactly sure why he chose to draw them in that way. Let's turn the page and go on and look. Let's look at the people on this page. I really like the way this illustrator draws people to look like real people.

By supporting her students' interrogation of the illustrations and the choices of the illustrator, Melissa drew her students' attention to the various modes of meaning making (textual and visual) that were available for them to understand the text, the relationships in the text, and how these interactions represented the state of affairs as it relates to Civil Rights. While she did not draw their attention back to systemic issues of racism here, she did so in whole-class lessons around the read-alouds, watching a Martin Luther King, Jr. movie, and whole-class discussions of the books discussed at the listening centers.

Reiterating white privilege

Martin Luther King, Jr. and the March on Washington (Ruffin, 2001) was another children's book used in our focused analysis of race in the guided-reading groups. Frances E. Ruffin is the author of many biographies written for children including activists such as Clara Barton and Sojourner Truth. The illustrator, a white man, lives in New York State and is a freelance illustrator of children's books. The book describes the events and social and political issues of segregation as they lead to a portrayal of King's address in Washington, DC.

During a guided-reading lesson of this text with Rebecca, the students illustrated a misunderstanding about history, that the African American people had equal rights and sitting on back of the bus was "not so bad." The students did not know the historical information as to people's intentions or feelings about racism and Civil Rights. It was problematic that the students placed themselves in the part of heroic people such as Rosa Parks from the perspective of a child living in the year 2003. Identifying with people from the 1960s, whose perspective was different, was not in the zone of proximal development of the students. The next set of interactions, beginning with a student reading aloud, illustrates how second-grade white children and their teacher reiterated white privilege.

Sandra read from the book (the underlined text signifies that children are reading). As in other cases, the author failed to name the actors during segregation; that is, the author used passive voice to communicate the intention of the text, without ex-

plicitly naming the actors and those acted upon (e.g., "there are laws to keep black people and white people apart"). Further, neither racism nor white people were ever explicitly named in the children's book. Notice also the use of politeness conventions to refer to Jim Crow laws—"there are laws"— fails to acknowledge that people, specifically white people, created and reinforced these laws that legitimized violent hate crimes against people of color. In the next line, we will see the common use of the third-person pronoun *they*, which serves to distance the reader from people of color and to keep from naming African Americans.

Sandra reads, "In the South and in some other states, there are laws to keep black people and white people apart. Black people cannot eat in many restaurants or stay in many hotels."

Rebecca indicated that another student should continue the reading.

Katrina continued, "In movie theaters, they must enter by separ-ate/separate doors and sit way up on the balcony."

Attentive to the importance of teaching for strategies, the heart of acceleration, Rebecca praised Katrina for her problem solving at the word *separate*. Rebecca stated, "I like the way you reread to make sense there."

Katrina continued reading, "On public buses they had to sit in the back."

At the end of the page, the students studied the illustrations and Sam independently stated, "Well, that is better than walking, isn't it? Than not riding the bus."

Beginning a dialogue between himself and Sam, Larry responded, "Walking is better because it gets you stronger."

Sam responded to Larry's statement with excitement, "Yeah!"

"It is good exercise," continued Larry, in a move to reinforce the idea he introduced.

Sam continued to coconstruct with Larry, "They should be/The blacks should be happy even if they are on the back because at least they get to ride the bus."

Drawing on his own experience with riding the bus, a connection that must seem logical for a second grader, Larry continued, "In first grade I walked to school in the rain."

Embedded in Sam and Larry's construction was an implied audience of other white people (the children and teacher) who were sitting next to him. Sam's rhetorical question "that is better than walking, isn't it?" seemed to come from his position as a child who walks to school and might prefer to take

the bus. The question functioned, as in past interactions, to open up a space for other children to coconstruct meaning with him. Larry took up this invitation, and together they projected their feelings about walking versus bus riding onto the segregated policies of Jim Crow. This projection functioned to minimize the consequences of racism. Looking more closely at Sam's statement, we see that Sam does this through his tone of voice and in the linguistic construction of his talk: He relied on the third-person pronoun *they* to refer to people of color; a move that functions to distance "them" from "him." Further, he referred to African Americans as "the blacks," which functioned to represent African Americans as a group of people having a monolithic identity, rather than as individuals. This discursive theme of positioning people of color as part of a group and white people as individuals is a common form of white talk (McIntyre, 1997). His statement could have also signified a white, working class understanding of making do with limited resources. The passion with which Sam made his point about the insignificance of Jim Crow laws was emphasized by the modalities ("should be," "even if," and "at least") in his statement. These modalities functioned to minimize the consequences of racism on people of color and emphasized a white point of view (i.e., "the blacks should be happy"). Finally, this set of interactions effectively pulled the group away from talking about oppression and privileged the white students' feelings and thoughts about the hardships of walking to school in less-than-ideal weather conditions.

At this point in the conversation, the racial understandings the children were coconstructing surprised Rebecca (researcher journal, January 10, 2003). She feared that the comments would not get interrogated but resisted critiquing the children because she wanted to provide a safe place for the children to coconstruct meaning. In the next interaction, Rebecca simultaneously tried to engage and critique a group of white participants around issues that might threaten their white self-concepts. In a careful move, Rebecca stated, "Let's listen to what Sam is saying and think about it and someone respond to it. Sam, what were you saying?"

Instead of providing a critique of Sam's statement, which would have been important because Sam was such a strong personality in the group, Rebecca asked Sam to reiterate his point. Rebecca would have served as a model for resisting white privilege and institutionalized racism if she critiqued Sam's statement, but instead she made the choice to open the topic to the group. Rebecca did not directly

engage with matters of racism by using this form of white talk.

Sam restated and extended his comment in response to Rebecca.

> The black people, they should be happy because, uh, they should be happy that they get to ride the bus instead of just walk. They had to ride the bus than walk. But who cares? They probably care. But I wouldn't really [care] if I was black. As long as I got to sit on the bus.

Adding to our analysis above about the use of modalities (they "should be"), we interpreted Sam's use of a rhetorical question to, again, minimize the significance of racism to an issue of riding the bus or walking. Further, the starts and stops that characterized Sam's talk in this interaction provide insight into how he was constructing meaning around race and racism from his position as a young white boy. He recognized that black people "probably care" even if, "I wouldn't really [care] if I was black." He lacked the historical information about the conditions of segregation, but his self-correction in the middle of his thought "they probably care" revealed that he is monitoring his talk about racism and starting to develop an empathetic stance.

Rebecca responded in a more assertive tone and addressed the group, "respond to what Sam is saying. Would you care if you were a black person and had to sit on the back of the bus instead of walking?"

In an unexpected set of turns, the students rallied behind Sam's assertion that riding on the back of the bus was much better than walking. Sandra, in the next interaction, brought race explicitly to the discussion and stated,

> I would agree with that. Because if I was black, and I had to sit in the back, I wouldn't care. As long as I can ride the bus and not walk, then I would be fine.

Larry added a further rationale to Sam's theory and stated, "'Cause my feet could get tired." In this turn, Larry enacted a particular type of white talk, using colorblind language. This statement, which could be interpreted as connected to the values of the working class, ultimately results in minimizing the experiences of black oppression and equates a personal sacrifice with institutional racism.

Sam stated, "And you know what I learned? Whenever people go into stores...[there are] white and black people, but the black goes last."

In this turn, Sam independently noticed an example of present-day racism. To reengage the rest of the students in the discussion, Rebecca asked the

students if "they ever see anything like that happen today." Sam responded, "No, because MLK changed everything." This type of response facilitated another commonly held position by white people; that is, that racism no longer exists today. Rebecca, herself using the aspect of the genre of white talk—avoidance—to mask a set of interactions that should have been explored further, stated, "Let's keep on reading and thinking about this."

Rebecca wrote at length in her researcher journal about this set of interactions and remembered vividly her discomfort in the discussion. She was hoping that one of the students would critique Sam's racist talk. She wondered if she would silence the group if she provided the critique and, ultimately, relieve them of the responsibility of examining white privilege and racism. She also wondered what the conversation would have been like had a child of color been in this group. It was clear as they made their way through this interaction that an argument can be made for the importance of white-on-white and black-on-black talk about race, racism, and antiracism. Tatum (1997) wrote,

> To many whites it seems inconceivable that there would be any value in participating in an all White discussion of racism. Although there is value in cross-racial dialogue, all-white support groups serve a unique function. Particularly when whites are trying to work through their feelings of guilt and shame, separate groups give white people the space to speak with honest and candor rarely possible in racially mixed groups. Even when whites feel comfortable sharing these feelings with people of color, frankly, people of color don't necessarily want to hear about it. (pp. 110–111)

Whereas Sam had not reached a place where he saw the significance of his comments or felt guilt, we will see he does arrive (and move past) this place, in part because of the many opportunities he had to learn about the historical context of race in the United States and his participation in both interracial and intraracial conversations about race.

Perhaps Sam, Larry, and Sandra are enacting whiteness in a different way, as well. As white, working class children, they knew that there are certain things that are not fair but that are accepted ways of life. Making the best of a situation may be a common experience of these students, and asking them to theorize about injustice they have not experienced may be beyond their zone of proximal development. To move beyond this familiar understanding, one of the children would have to have a different perspective or know something more about the historical conditions of oppression, or the teacher would need to intervene to deconstruct these understandings.

Had this discussion come up in a racially integrated guided-reading group, the white children would have had access to multiple points of view. Instead, the interaction ended with the children unaware of how whites are and have been implicated into institutional racism and unearned white privilege, an understanding that the white teacher unintentionally coconstructed. Some of the discourses that were embedded in reiterating white privilege were apparent in the last two interactions. These were colorblindness, tolerance, and whiteness as "standard."

We often found traces of the discussions that occurred during the whole-group discussions in the conversations that took place in the guided-reading groups. A colorblind discourse often showed up in the all-white guided-reading groups. During a guided-reading interaction, Melissa asked the group what the author meant when she wrote, "the seat doesn't care what color your bottom is." Brad responded, "It really doesn't matter what color your skin is." Brad used a subtle marker of a colorblind discourse that, without interruption, could develop into a worldview. A colorblind theory assumes that noticing race is racist. Racism is focused on a personal attribute or perception rather than a material or institutionally structured set of policies and practices. Such a theory indicates a reluctance to acknowledge racial differences and an unwillingness to see the ways that white people are part of a racist society. A failure to recognize color masks a "dysconscious racism" or "an uncritical habit of the mind that justifies inequity and exploitation by accepting the existing order of things as given" (Ladson-Billings, 1995, p. 32). This theory is problematic because as Ladson-Billings asserted, "if we pretend not to see student's racial and ethnic differences, we really do not see the students at all" (p. 33).

Another form of white privilege is seeing whiteness as the standard. Such ideologies are often invisible and yet frame the way white people see and interact with people. One remnant is the discourse of equality, which often gets taken up as everyone should be treated like white people, assuming whiteness is the standard. We saw and heard evidence that the white second graders with whom we worked had already internalized whiteness as standard. Brad, for example, during the introduction to the book *Martin Luther King, Jr. and the March on Washington* (Ruffin, 2001) stated that black people, "should be treated just like white people" (January 9, 2003). Similarly, during the same book reading he also stated that the African American people in the book were "a different race than the whites." In this state-

ment, white is privileged, indeed the norm, and everyone else is "othered" (Morrison, 1993).

During a discussion around photographs and other cultural artifacts on January 8, 2003, the students discussed Martin Luther King, Jr.'s speech during the March on Washington, which they watched on video. We asked them to talk about a series of questions in small groups. One question they talked about was "Who is in the audience?" Sandra responded, "Actually, I think James Earl, James Earl Ray, whatever his name is, was in the audience because remember that time when they show him the man two times, remember the man they showed us? He kept on turning his head. That might have been James Earl Ray. He might have been listening because he might of not liked it but he needed to go and find out for sure." Sandra hypothesized that the only white person that she sees in the crowd was the person who killed King, not a white ally or activist, which is an unfamiliar identity for a white person. As students explored the literature and other texts in the classroom more in depth we heard them making sense of the complexity of whiteness, a line of inquiry that is necessary for the development of an antiracist identity.

Whiteness disrupted: White allies

Throughout the inquiry we could see the students struggling cognitively, emotionally, and even physically to understand their place in a world of literature that did not name race, racism, or the role of white people in maintaining and deconstructing racism. White people in these books were cast in the roles of abolitionists, journalists, and racists and were named in illustrations but rarely in the text itself. The implicit message this gives children is that white people fighting against racism is a "fiction," a set of actions and people without specific names and consequences.

There is a long history of what Stokes-Brown (2002) referred to as "white allies," or white people who systematically resist the privilege that is bestowed upon them because of their inherited status as a white person and join, in solidarity, with people of color who struggle for social justice. Few white allies make their way into literature for children or adults. Instead, we hear narratives of heroes and heroines such as Rosa Parks and Martin Luther King, Jr., which lead us to believe that actions for justice are extraordinary. The legacies of allies and protesters such as Fannie Lou Hamer, Myles Horton, Septima Clark, Herbert Kohl, Virginia Durr, Joanne Robinson, Judge Waring, Anne Braden, and many

others are virtually absent in literature and public discourses on social change. Examples of allies and protesters are important for white people because as Giroux (1997) explained,

> when Whiteness is discussed in educational settings, the emphasis is almost exclusively on revealing it as an ideology of privilege mediated largely through the dynamics of racism. While such interventions are crucial in developing an anti-racist pedagogy, they do not go far enough. (p. 297)

Rather, we need to provide counter examples of the productive and powerful ways that whiteness can be used to benefit society, rather than to reiterate racism. At the same time, we need to be careful not to recenter whiteness.

During this unit, the entire class would convene daily in the reading corner and listen and discuss a book about Civil Rights. These books were at a higher reading level than all students could read independently. The books read and discussed during this time extended the guided-reading group discussions and served to clarify misunderstandings, introduce historical information, and allowed opportunities for interracial conversations around race. These whole-class discussions became the place where historical context was provided and misunderstandings were clarified. Children brought their emerging understandings that they had constructed during the guided-reading groups to bear on the whole-class discussions. As is often the case when young people are learning history, there were many misunderstandings. For example, Michael, one of the African American boys, believed that Malcolm X stopped slavery. Many of the white children thought that racism ended because of Martin Luther King, Jr. Alex, another African American boy in the class, commented that his grandfather, who is 58, was a slave. None of the children could name any white people that had fought for Civil Rights. Gerry, an African American boy in the class, contributed many facts about African American history to the discussion, such as knowing that Rosa Parks didn't get off the bus and knowing the name of Martin Luther King, Jr.'s assassin. Melissa listened closely to what her students already knew about African American history and Civil Rights to guide their reading and understanding of race.

On this day, Rebecca read the book *The Story of Ruby Bridges* (Coles, 1995) aloud to the class as Melissa ran the video camera and took field notes. We chose this version of the Ruby Bridges story because it was part of the literature collection in Melissa's classroom. The purpose of this read-aloud

was to provide more background information about Ruby Bridges and to clarify some of the misunderstandings that had occurred in the guided-reading groups. We later learned that the historical information was not as complete as Bridges's own account of her historic actions. Here we reflected on the importance of careful selection of materials. The selection of texts for white students and students of color is instrumental in disrupting a history of how literacy materials have historically functioned to shape the identity of the reader (Harris, 1998; Young, 2001).

After the read-aloud, Rebecca facilitated a whole-class discussion. Alex, one of the African American boys, commented on an illustration where Ruby Bridges was alone in the classroom,

> I think that she is all alone in the school because black people didn't like white people and the white people didn't like black people then and they didn't want their children to, like, be with them or anything.

A few pages later, Sandra independently commented in a frustrated and angry tone, "What could one black person do to 100 or less white people? It's just one black person and a *whole* bunch more white people."

Rebecca drew on the emotion that Sandra noticed and reflected, "So why do you think people were so angry?" Notice that Rebecca did not name the people as *white* people.

"Except one person is brown. And all the rest are white. Now, how can one brown person hurt a whole bunch more white people?"

Sandra asked a question that does not get taken up. Instead, Rebecca repeated her question, "So why were they angry?" to which Sandra offered a response, "Maybe because they didn't want her in there, maybe they thought that she would be mean?"

Rebecca then asked Joanne, a child who is biracial, what she thought. Joanne commented, "I think they were angry because the judges didn't want a black person coming but I don't think it really matters because black people don't do anything to white people and white people don't do anything to black people."

"Yes they do," stated Alex, an African American boy sitting next to Joanne, in a low tone.

Joanne continued, "They should all just get along because if they get along they'll all be friends and they won't have to worry about 'I don't want to play with this person or that person.'"

We noticed that the comment Alex made in a low tone marked, on the one hand, his insight about the pervasive nature of racism and, on the other

hand, his trepidation of sharing this insight with the entire class. His comment, although heard on the videotape and in our analysis, was overlooked in the discussion and, had it been picked up on, could have led to a powerful discussion. In the following interaction around reading *The Bus Ride* (Miller, 1998), Sam and Sandra jointly grapple with the problem of racism. Sandra, with an active stance and an exasperated tone, stated,

> And they do have to sit in the back, and, I mean, I don't get it either? What is all the fuss about? I mean [pause] the law. They don't want blacks to sit with the whites. The blacks don't like the whites and the whites don't like the blacks. So why don't they just get rid of the law? I mean, nobody likes each other. The whites get more better stuff and the blacks don't.

Here Sandra revoices, almost verbatim, what Alex, the African American student, stated in the whole-group discussion around *The Story of Ruby Bridges* (Coles, 1995). She extends this statement, though, by recognizing the economic and material privilege associated with whiteness, "the whites get more better stuff and the blacks don't." She wondered with exasperation, "why don't they just get rid of the law?" Dixson and Rousseau (2005) cited Crenshaw's (1988) definition of restrictive and expansive views of equality. A restrictive view of equality focuses on the practices of equality rather than the outcomes. In Sandra's statement, she focused on the outcome of discrimination, the inequitable distribution of resources, which is an expansive view of equality. However, her ambiguous labeling of "they" undermined the strategy and organization that led to overturning Jim Crow laws. Further, her analysis was focused on individual actions rather than on community and organizational responses. This ambiguous language, referencing people who were acted upon and people who were actors, was a pattern throughout the discussions, and also was a pattern in the books that the children read.

Sam, sitting next to Sandra, stated, "Well, that was then, this is now." Just as Sandra disrupted white privilege, Sam reenacted it. Sam's comment echoed what he said in an earlier interaction; that Martin Luther King, Jr. "changed everything" and that racism is a legacy of the past. His statement was left unchallenged, perhaps because of his status in the group, perhaps because of the silence around racism that often characterizes white talk (McIntyre, 1997).

In another interaction, Melissa read a passage about the violence of a white bus driver toward an African American passenger immediately preceding the Montgomery bus boycott. When asked to

respond, Sandra stated, "That's not fair. Black people lose their jobs when they had to get up and white people didn't." In this interaction, Sandra recognized the economic basis of racism; that is, that capitalism separates black and white workers, which allows the system to keep wages low (Callinicos, 1993; Guinier & Torres, 2002). Brad added, "black people lose their jobs for barely doing anything and the [white] bus driver hit the [black] man with a piece of metal and he didn't lose his job." Indeed, the issue of losing jobs was a particularly sensitive area of discussion for the white working class children in this classroom. During the time of this inquiry, several factories that served as the focal points of blue-collar employment in the community were downsizing.

Brad and Sandra were beginning to recognize what is referred to as interest convergence, a theory of how white privilege is held in place. Whites, who have economic interests to keep black and white workers in separate jobs, hold the discriminatory actions they cite in place. The theory of interest convergence is that remedies for the negative effects of discrimination are implemented only when the remedy is in the interest of white people (Bell, 1992; Guinier, 2004; Tate, 2003). Brad and Sandra were recognizing injustice, which is a turn from earlier discussions of white privilege where unfair practices such as sitting at the back of the bus are seen as being "not a big deal" because "walking makes you stronger."

Also in these interactions we see that Brad and Sandra have opened a space for themselves as white people to critique the unfair practices of other white people. Their language denotes a form of false empathy, a position that a caregiver may take up vis-à-vis a person without resources or privilege, a position that serves to construct the "other" as the victim of that injustice (Delgado, 1996). Although critique of unjust practices is necessary, it cannot sustain an antiracist agenda, which calls for deconstructive and reconstructive practices (e.g., Collins, 2000; Freire, 1995; Luke, 2004).

There were times during the inquiry when we asked the students to place themselves in the role of a white person who is an activist against racism. For example, after watching the video of Martin Luther King, Jr.'s "I Have a Dream" speech, Melissa asked the students, "If you were in the audience, and you were listening to the speech, how would you feel? How do you think the audience felt?"

Sam (the same child who earlier made the comment that it was OK for African Americans to sit on the back of the bus as long as they were not walking) responded,

> Some whites didn't like it because they wanted to keep it white only. Whites would get better things than blacks. And I think they should have been treated equally, and now I am done with my sentence.

When asked to step into the rally at the monument in Washington, as a white person, Sam's linguistic choice to position white people as "they" instead of "we" or "me" worked to distance himself from the white people who did not think Civil Rights was a good decision. He goes on to critique this position and, in doing so, steps into the first-person pronoun to signal that he disagreed with white privilege. We see, in real time, Sam developing a moral consciousness about the privileges associated with whiteness.

Just a few turns later Sam again steps into the role of a white apologist, another position that is often available for white people (Stokes-Brown, 2002). He stated, "If I was there, and I was white, which I am, I wouldn't feel very good but I would apologize." Sam, for the first time, has identified himself as a white person. He reiterated this refrain, "If I was white, which I am" during several other literacy events. For example, in another artifact discussion Sam stated, "If I was white, which I am, back then, I would, if I was white and I was back then, I would help Harriet Tubman to save the blacks even if I was white. I wouldn't care." In this interaction the repetition and starts and stops signified his discomfort of identifying himself as a white person and positioned himself as an ally to a person of color. This interaction was one of the few examples of children identifying as white and constructing a position for themselves as an ally. Just as colorblindness shields whites from having to recognize or resist white privilege, guilt focuses on whites' feelings rather than the situation and the consequences for people of color. Taking on the alleviation of guilt as antiracist work keeps whiteness at the center of antiracism (Thompson, 1997).

This naming of self as white is an important part of racial identity development (e.g., Cross, 1991; Helms, 1992; Tatum, 1992, 1994). Often, white people spend a lifetime not acknowledging that white is, indeed, a race and has an associated culture of dominance. In the same conversation, Katrina brought up how James Earl Ray, the only white person who is explicitly mentioned in the text, who was the person who murdered King, Jr., might have felt during the Civil Rights movement. She stated,

> If he wasn't at the speech, he should have been there because he might have liked it. He might have liked the idea.

But he probably didn't go because he didn't like MLK and black people and white people.

Katrina acknowledged how white people's racial understandings can change when they have the opportunity to learn from people of color. The role of the ally should be complicated so that it moves beyond false empathy and active white/passive black. An ally, as Tatum (1994) pointed out, is not a "helper." Rather, an ally is someone who, on his or her own account, "speaks up against systems of oppression" and challenges other whites to do the same. It has been argued that white identity theories continually recenter whiteness at the center of antiracism; in other words, antiracism is organized around white people's growth with little attention paid to the psychic, discursive, and material realities of racism for people of color.

Earlier in the inquiry when the children were reading and discussing slavery and abolition, Sandra stated, "I would, I would help by sneaking into the building where the master is and take away his whip that is hung on the wall. That way he can't hit the slaves," making sense of her identity as white people and hypothesizing about how to be an ally as a white person. She was performing white talk, but a type of white talk that directly engaged with matters of race and sought to position white people as allies.

There was also evidence that the children started to see white people as part of a racialized group, which is an important part of learning to be antiracist. A common phrase that was repeated throughout the inquiry was the children's reference to the phrase "the whites." Whiteness study advocates argue that an analysis of whiteness as a group is important because white people don't see themselves as part of a racial group that has privilege (Howard, 1999; Tatum, 1994). They see themselves as individuals without race. On the other hand, generalizations about white people are just as demonizing as stereotypes about other groups, especially when the "group" mentality functions to reproduce the idea that there is only one "type" of white person. There was also the beginning of recognition that whites, as a group, are also diverse.

In this section we have described and interpreted the ways that the young children critiqued white privilege and started to rebuild an understanding of white allies, all within the context of the literacy curriculum. We must be careful in locating these spots of hopefulness that we do not recenter whiteness in our attempt to problematize it.

Discussion

In this article we have seen racial literacy development as an interactive process in which the teachers/researchers and children use race as an analytic tool, a diagnostic device, and as an instrument of process. The children (and the teachers) in this classroom made three primary whiteness "moves" in their journey toward becoming racially literate: noticing whiteness, enacting white privilege, and transforming whiteness into liberatory alliances. Our findings indicate that as the children become racially literate within an accelerative literacy classroom, they transferred the sociocognitive problem solving (e.g., questioning the author, noticing conflicts between the illustrations and the text, looking for absences and contradictions) across literacy practices. The finding is significant because it demonstrates that racial literacy can create spaces for white, working class children to step into texts to identify, problematize, and, most importantly, reconstruct whiteness in relation to social justice.

The complexity of the construction of race illustrates the hybrid nature of emerging understandings around race. That is, although there was more evidence of "noticing whiteness" and "enacting white privilege" than there was of "disrupting whiteness or privilege," we found evidence in all three categories. We think finding evidence in all three categories is significant because Chouilaraki and Fairclough (1999) argued that the more hybrid the discourses, the more unstable (and thus open to change) the social practices. Stable discourses (e.g., consistent enactment of whiteness or even consistent disruption of whiteness) indicate social practices that are more fixed and regimented. It seems as if the children in this second-grade classroom are at an important point where ideas about privilege or antiracism can be solidified or challenged.

Our analysis has demonstrated an expanded version of what McIntyre (1997) referred to as white talk. Rather than viewing white talk as a set of linguistic strategies that are solely associated with white privilege, the children in this study have illustrated that white talk, even among second graders, can be a set of linguistic and multimodal strategies that directly engages with discourses associated with race and racism (rather than with colorblind theories), that seeks to extend rather than shut down conversations, and where white people acknowledge whiteness and the associated privilege and take responsibility for channeling this acknowledgment into conscious antiracist actions. It seems important to further explore the complexity of talk around race

across the lifespan using this reconstructive understanding of white talk.

We return to one of the children, Sam, we have presented in this article to exemplify the hybrid set of discourse practices surrounding race and whiteness and the implications that teaching and research in whiteness studies may have. Throughout this inquiry we observed and took part in Sam's construction of race and whiteness. We heard him grapple with what it meant to be white and try on different positions and perspectives as a white person. We heard him step into white talk that affirms there is no racism today (e.g., "Martin Luther King, Jr. changed everything"), we heard him reproduce white privilege (e.g., "sitting on the back of the bus is better than walking"), we heard him assert his whiteness (e.g., "If I were white and I am, I would apologize"), and we heard him say that if he were white (and he is) back then, he would have apologized for mistreatment and fought for the African American people who were escaping from slavery. Sam embodies the contradictions of what it means to be white in our racist society. We hear the emergence of a racialized identity that accepts privilege and colorblindness and denies the existence of any sort of racist practices. However, we also hear the emergence of an understanding of the deeply rooted nature of racism and resistance to the privileges associated with whiteness. Both identities are emerging simultaneously. The question for educators interested in facilitating the development of racial literacy is "How can we support the development of a white racial identity that denies the privileges associated with whiteness and sets up the conditions where white children can practice a type of whiteness where race and privilege is acknowledged and systematically resisted, and coalitions are constructed across differences?"

We can imagine Sam progressing through the elementary school where he is enrolled, moving year after year through the "typical" classroom curriculum where race is not addressed. We can imagine a situation where commonly held positions about race that white people hold, such as race does not matter, racism does not exist today, or feeling guilty about the wrongs of racism, would be reinforced to Sam and develop over time and with the repetition of the *absence* of discourse around race. Indeed, if we think about the ways that curricular silences around topics reinforce a particular type of talk, in this case "white talk," we can see why race is such a difficult conversation for adults in our society (McIntyre, 1997). Indeed, we are socialized not to talk about race, racism, and antiracism.

Our analysis of texts leads us to believe that, within a curriculum of silence, texts and the media will provide messages about race and racism that will go unchallenged. When Sam encounters discussions about race it will be in a "heroes" and "villains" manner, which typifies extraordinary acts of one or two people of color and demonizes the actions of white people or, alternatively, does not bring white people into the conversation at all. Or he will encounter commercials, movies, video games, and television shows that perpetuate stereotypes of people of color. In suburban St. Louis, where families often make real estate and property decisions based on racial demographics, Sam is likely to experience how blatant racist practices are coded as economic decisions. White talk that insists that discussing race is not important, coupled with societal messages of racism, will reinforce Sam's behaviors and actions that perpetuate racism. Not having counternarratives of what it means to be white *and* to be antiracist, Sam's identity as a white person will develop around the discourses and material practices of colorblindness, denial of racism, and the uncritical reproduction of white privilege. People who share a shade of skin that is associated with being white often do not have a language for talking about whiteness that moves them beyond the usual roles of apologist, denying the importance of racism, or accepting it exists and not dealing with it. Further, white is not named as a race, thus denying the social construction of race and the privileges associated with race.

We can also imagine, as educators who work toward antiracist teaching and learning, a set of curricular practices that would support Sam's construction of a positive white identity. In this classroom, whiteness would be named and explored as a racial identity. Sam would have multiple opportunities for constructing meaning around whiteness and race; students would be afforded opportunities to make errors, to try on different roles, and to experiment with the social construction of race. Sam would also have the opportunity to critique unfairness and privilege through simulations, theater, and authentic problem-posing and problem-solving exercises. Moved to action through emotions that are always present (and would be encouraged) in children such as anger, joy, sadness, and confusion, Sam would be supported to act, using language and literacy in authentic ways, to solve problems in his social world. Sam would also have exposure to white allies across the lifespan who have resisted the privileges associated with whiteness in their daily actions so that everyone can experience living a life without the oppressive shackles of racism, sexism, and classism.

White allies would be present in the books that Sam reads and in movies that Sam watches, and such images and actions would get supported and reinforced at home. Teachers would be allies and would directly interrogate racist language and practices in texts and in classroom life. Distancing phrases such as "Let's keep reading and thinking about this" would be avoided. Over time, Sam would internalize the tools of racial literacy—recognizing race as a diagnostic device, as an analytic tool, and as an instrument of process—that would allow him to challenge racism in obvious and subtle forms. He would be prepared with the language to confront such forms of racism and to work against white supremacy.

This "reconstructed" version of Sam's antiracist journey is somewhat difficult to imagine given that his working class background mediates his access to the power and privilege associated with whiteness. Unlike some of the studies that have been conducted with white working class adolescents (Finn, 1990; Gee, 2000; Willis, 1977), which demonstrate that adolescents develop oppositional identities to schools and institutions, Sam demonstrates a proficiency and fluency with schooled discourses, a congruence that is reinforced and supported at home. Such alignment might predict his continued academic achievement, but the changing nature of the work world and Sam's developing understanding of the relationships between school and work complicate such alignment. Still, we would argue that understanding racism is particularly important to address with white working class children because of the ways that oppression is maintained through the intersections of race and class. That is, in a global capitalist economy, workers are often divided along racial lines, and racism is sustained through the creation of a non-white underclass that is "othered." As Guinier (2004) wrote,

> racism normalizes racialized hierarchies; it diverts attention from the unequal distribution of resources and power they perpetuate. Using race as a decoy offers short-term psychological advantages to poor and working-class whites, but it also masks how much poor whites have in common with poor blacks and other people of color. (p. 114)

Thus, resisting oppression (for all workers) means forging coalitions across racial and class lines for the building of a more just society.

We need to also point out that although we have been quite critical at times of Sam's comments around race we *do* recognize his young age. We would not necessarily focus our attention during a literacy session on teaching Sam the difference between saying "they" and "African Americans" or other subtle

linguistic markers. What we are asking is that teachers who teach children are aware of the power of linguistic choices and the ways that linguistic choices reflect and construct social relations. Teachers can model, in their own language choices and in the books they use, a critical inquiry into language. Indeed, another implication of this research is that the teacher/researchers were engaging in a double-sided type of critical discourse analysis, making sense out of the discourse as it unfolded in the classroom but also modeling the strategies of textual analysis and critical discourse analysis in guided-reading groups. It is our hope that we have demonstrated that second-grade children can and do talk about race, racism, and antiracism in quite sophisticated ways. This evidence should counter the critique that young children are not "ready" to talk about race.

We realize that the inquiry we have focused on in this article has not been an exemplary case of becoming racially literate in a second-grade classroom. We have been careful to show examples where we as teachers and researchers were on the edge of our own zone of proximal development, have made errors, or wished we had said one thing instead of another, which is often the case with critical pedagogy. Often these insights come after hours of pouring over transcripts, discussing with colleagues, and reading in critical race theory. We would like to make these types of insights more natural, more of the routine of teaching and learning of teachers in their classrooms. Foregrounding matters of race, antiracism, and whiteness in our literacy methodology courses is one way we do this.

Concluding thoughts

The critical frameworks we brought to bear on the data are inherently reflexive, as we have demonstrated throughout this article. Recently Rebecca used in a graduate class she was teaching the transcript in which the children argue that riding on the back of the bus is better than walking, without naming who the teacher was. After critiquing the teacher's use of politeness conventions and her failure to interrupt the dialogue, Rebecca told the class that she was the teacher. There was silence in the room. It was possible that the professor could facilitate discussions that generated meanings around racism rather than antiracism. Rebecca had broken the silence around racism and whiteness by turning the analytic lens on herself as the teacher and researcher.

Too often, researchers are in other people's classrooms, studying other people's practices and other people's literacy education. Throughout this

process, CDA was integral in transforming Melissa's practice and the classroom community. Therefore, Melissa used the CDA framework to understand her own racial identity as a member of the white, working class community where she taught and the ways that racism is silently perpetuated. This examination allowed Melissa, as a teacher, teacher educator, and researcher, to see how her own racial identity shapes her interactions with students.

We side with researchers and educators who recognize that becoming racially literate is a political project that espouses justice as its goal. Too often and for too long race-neutral curriculum has not been seen as a political project when, indeed, it is. We are aware that such research and pedagogical designs need to be carried out alongside other social, political, and economic decisions, as changes in talk alone will not lead to the redistribution of wealth and power that underlie institutionalized racism.

Matsuda et al. (1993) argued that the goal of using any critical (race) method (pedagogical or research) is to further the cause of racial justice. However, we recognize the ethical implications associated with the teacher perceived as a powerful authority. Giroux's (1997) quote resonates with us,

> Teacher voice represents a basis in authority that can provide knowledge and forms of self understanding allowing students to develop the power of critical consciousness. At the same time, regardless of how politically or ideologically correct a teacher may be, his or her "voice" may be destructive for students if it is used to silence them. (p. 299)

The essence of this classroom, with or without the layer of research, was to construct the conditions where children can and do speak with authority and voice about their social worlds. As teachers and researchers, we took on a number of rhetorical strategies to background our own voices and to foreground students constructing meaning with one another. Our intention is to follow our students' leads, and, as Lather (1996) wrote,

> To "trouble" and "worry" ideas is more important than understanding them. "Coming clear" is part of the process of knowing, but never "being clear," which suggests a final end point. "Being clear" is not a posture of knowing, but of dogma and stasis. (p. 535)

Although we would agree that discussions around race for white people are virtually absent across the lifespan (we can look to literature in primary grades, secondary grades, and teacher education for evidence), we also would argue that not just any conversations about race will do. That is, ulti-

mately we argue that like other literate process, racial literacy development should also be guided. There might be a parallel set of practices of accepting approximations, looking for praise and teaching points, and developing a self-extending system where students, rather than teachers, start to look for conversations and discussion around antiracism and generalize these conversations across contexts. Future research and teaching designs might incorporate children's books that are written from multiple perspectives on the same topic; for example, juxtaposing Ruby Bridges's autobiographical children's book against the story written by Robert Coles. Another area of research might be exploring racial literacy across the lifespan. We encourage research into literacy teaching and learning that uses critical race theory and whiteness studies as theoretical frameworks. Such scholarship can help us as a community of educators become more literate about the role race plays in structuring political, economic, and educational opportunity.

REBECCA ROGERS is an associate professor in the College of Education at the University of Missouri in St. Louis. Her research focuses on critical literacy learning and teaching across the lifespan. Her 2003 book, *A Critical Discourse Analysis of Family Literacy Practices*, was awarded the Edward Fry Book Award for outstanding contribution to literacy research. She is the coauthor of a recently published book called *Critical Literacy/Critical Teaching: Tools for Preparing Responsive Teachers* (2005) with Cheryl Dozier and Peter Johnston. She can be contacted at University of Missouri St. Louis, 369 Marillac Hall, One University Boulevard, St. Louis, MO 63121-4400, USA, or by e-mail at rogers3948@aol.com.

MELISSA MOSLEY is a doctoral candidate at Washington University in St. Louis. Her research interests are critical approaches to literacy teaching and learning in university and classroom contexts. Her dissertation explores the development of teachers' identities as literacy educators in a longitudinal study using methods of multimodal discourse analysis within the ethnographic tradition. She can be contacted at One Brookings Drive, Campus Box 1183, St. Louis, MO, 63130, USA, or by e-mail at mrmosley@wustl.edu.

REFERENCES

ALDOUS BERGERSON, A. (2003). Critical race theory and white racism: Is there room for white scholars in fighting racism in education? *Qualitative Studies in Education, 16,* 51–63.

BANKS, J. (2003). Teaching literacy for social justice and global citizenship. *Language Arts, 81,* 18–19.

BELL, D. (1992). *Faces at the bottom of the well: The permanence of racism.* New York: Basic Books.

BERLAK, A., & MOYENDA, S. (2001). *Taking it personally: Racism in the classroom from kindergarten to college.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

BOLGATZ, J. (2004). *Talking race in the classroom.* New York: Teachers College Press.

BOMER, R., & BOMER, K. (2003). *For a better world: Reading and writing for social action.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

BONILLA-SILVA, E., & FORMAN, T. (2000). I am not a racist but...: Mapping white college students' racial ideology in the USA. *Discourse & Society, 11,* 51–86.

CALLINICOS, A. (1993). *Race and class*. London: Bookmarks Press.

CARSPECKEN, P. (1996). *Critical ethnography in educational research: A theoretical and practical guide*. New York and London: Routledge.

CHOUILARAKI, L., & FAIRCLOUGH, N. (1999). *Discourse in late modernity: Rethinking critical discourse analysis*. Edinburgh, Scotland: Edinburgh University Press.

CHUBBUCK, S. (2004). Whiteness enacted, whiteness disrupted: The complexity of personal congruence. *American Educational Research Journal, 41*, 301–333.

CLAY, M. (1993). *Reading Recovery. A guidebook for teachers in training*. Auckland, New Zealand: Heinemann.

COLES, R. (1995). *The story of Ruby Bridges*. New York: Scholastic.

COLLINS, J. (2001). Selling the market: Educational standards, discourse and social inequality. *Critique of Anthropology, 21*, 143–163.

COLLINS, R. (2000). Situational stratification: A micro-macro theory of inequality. *Sociological Theory, 18*, 17–43.

COMBER, B., THOMPSON, P., & WELLS, M. (2001). Critical literacy finds a "place": Writing and social action in a neighborhood school. *The Elementary School Journal, 101*, 451–464.

CRENSHAW, K. (1988). Race, reform, and retrenchment: Transformation and legitimation in anti-discrimination law. *Harvard Law Review, 101*, 1331–1387.

CROSS, W. (1991). *Shades of black: Diversity in African American identity*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

DELGADO, R. (1996). *The coming race war? And other apocalyptic tales of America after affirmative action and welfare*. New York: New York University Press.

DELGADO, R., & STEFANIC, J. (2001). *Critical race theory: An introduction*. New York: New York University Press.

DIXSON, A., & ROUSSEAU, C. (2005). And we are still not saved: Critical race theory in education ten years later. *Race, Ethnicity, and Education, 8*, 7–27.

DOZIER, C., JOHNSTON, P., & ROGERS, R. (2005). *Critical literacy/critical teaching: Tools for preparing responsive teachers*. New York: Teachers College Press.

DUBOIS, W.E.B. (1989). *The souls of black folk*. New York: Bantam. (Original work published 1903)

EMERSON, R., FRETZ, R., & SHAW, L. (1995). *Writing ethnographic fieldnotes*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

FAIRCLOUGH, N. (1992). Intertextuality in critical discourse analysis. *Linguistics and Education, 4*, 269–293.

FAIRCLOUGH, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. New York: Routledge.

FAIRCLOUGH, N. (2004). Semiotic aspects of social transformation and learning. In R. Rogers (Ed.), *An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education* (pp. 225–236). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

FAIRCLOUGH, N., & WODAK, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In T. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as social interaction* (pp. 258–284). London: Sage.

FINN, P. (1990). *Literacy with an attitude. Educating working-class children in their own self-interest*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

FOUNDRIE, S. (2001). "Gentle doses of racism": Whiteness and children's literature. *Journal of Children's Literature, 27*(2), 9–13.

FREIRE, P. (1995). *Pedagogy of hope: Reliving Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Continuum.

GEE, J. (2000). New people in new worlds: Networks, the new capitalism, and schools. In B. Cope & M. Kalantzis (Eds.), *Multiliteracies: Literacy learning and the design of social futures* (pp. 43–68). London: Routledge.

GINWRIGHT, S. (2004). *Black in school: Afrocentric reform, urban youth, and the promise of hip-hop culture*. New York: Teachers College Press.

GIROUX, H. (1997). Rewriting the discourse of racial identity: Towards a pedagogy and politics of whiteness. *Harvard Educational Review, 67*, 285–320.

GREENE, S., & ABT-PERKINS, D. (2003). How can literacy research contribute to racial understanding? In S. Greene & D. Abt-Perkins (Eds.), *Making race visible: Literacy research for cultural understanding* (pp. 1–34). New York: Teachers College Press.

GUINIER, L. (2003). Admissions rituals as political acts: Guardians at the gates of our democratic ideals. *Harvard Law Review, 117*, 113–224.

GUINIER, L. (2004). From racial liberalism to racial literacy: Brown v. Board of Education and the interest-divergence dilemma, *Journal of American History, 91*(1), 92–118.

GUINIER, L. & TORRES, G. (2002). *The miner's canary: Enlisting race, resisting power, and transforming democracy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

HARRIS, V. (1992). African-American conceptions of literacy: A historical perspective. *Theory Into Practice, 31*, 276–286.

HARRIS, V. (1996). Continuing dilemmas, debates, and delights in multicultural children's literature. *The New Advocate, 9*, 107–122.

HARRIS, V. (1998). Historic readers for African-American children (1868–1944): Uncovering and reclaiming a tradition of opposition. In M.J. Shujja (Ed.), *Too much schooling, too little education: A paradox of black life in white societies* (pp. 143–178). Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press.

HEANEY, G., & UCHITELLE, S. (2004). *Unending struggle: The long road to an equal education in St. Louis*. St. Louis, MO: Reedy Press.

HEFFERNAN, L., & LEWISON, M. (2003). Social narrative writing: (Re) constructing kid culture in the writer's workshop. *Language Arts, 80*, 435–443.

HELMS, J. (1992). *A race is a nice thing to have: A guide to being a white person or understanding the white persons in your life*. Topeka, KS: Content Communications.

HODGE, R., & KRESS, G. (1988). *Social semiotics*. Cambridge, England: Polity Press.

HOWARD, G. (1999). *We can't teach what we don't know: White teachers, multiracial schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.

HYTTEN, K., & WARREN, J. (2003). Engaging whiteness: How racial power gets reified in education. *Qualitative Studies in Education,16*, 65–89.

JOHNSTON, P. (2002). Commentary on "the interactive strategies approach to reading intervention." *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 27*, 636–647.

KARENGA, M. (1999). Whiteness studies: Deceptive or welcome discourse? *Black Issues in Higher Education, 16*, 26–27.

KOHL, H. (1993). The myth of "Rosa Parks the tired." *Multicultural Education, 1*(2), 6–10.

KRESS, G. (2003). *Literacy in the new media age*. London: Routledge.

KRESS, G., & VAN LEEUWEN, T. (2001). *Multimodal discourse. The modes and media of contemporary discourse*. New York: Oxford University Press.

LADSON-BILLINGS, G. (1995). *Dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

LADSON-BILLINGS, G. (1999). Just what is critical race theory and what's it doing in a nice field like education? In L. Parker, D. Deyhle, & S. Villenas (Eds.), *Race is...race isn't: Critical race theory and qualitative studies in education* (pp. 7–30). New York: Westview Press.

LADSON-BILLINGS, G. (2003). Foreword. In S. Greene & D. Abt-Perkins (Eds.), *Making race visible: Literacy research for cultural understanding* (pp. vii–xi). New York: Teachers College Press.

LADSON-BILLINGS, G., & TATE, W. (1995). Towards a critical race theory of education. *Teachers College Record, 94*, 47–68.

LATHER, P. (1996). Troubling clarity: The politics of accessible language. *Harvard Educational Review, 66*, 525–545.

LEE, E. (2003). Taking multicultural, anti-racist education seriously: An interview with Enid Lee. *Rethinking Schools, 6*(1), 19–22.

LEE, S. (2004). *Up against whiteness: Race, school, and immigrant youth*. New York: Teachers College Press.

LENSMIRE, T. (2000). *Powerful writing, responsible teaching*. New York: Teachers College Press.

LIPMAN, P. (2004). *High stakes education: Inequality, globalization, and urban school reform*. New York: Routledge.

LUKE, A. (2004). Notes on the future of critical discourse studies. *Critical Discourse Studies, 1*, xi.

LUKE, A., & FREEBODY, P. (1997). Shaping the social practices of reading. In S. Muspratt, A. Luke, & P. Freebody (Eds.), *Constructing critical literacies* (pp. 185–225). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton.

LUKE, A., & FREEBODY, P. (1999). A map of possible practices: Further notes on the four resources model. *Practically Primary, 4*(2), 5–8.

MARTIN, R., & WODAK, R. (Eds.). (2000). *Semiotics of racism*. Vienna: OPassagenverlag.

MARX, S., & PENNINGTON, J. (2003). Pedagogies of critical race theory: Experimentations with white preservice teachers. *Qualitative Studies in Education, 16*, 91–110.

MATSUDA, M., LAWRENCE, C., DELGADO, R., & CRENSHAW, K. (1993). *Words that wound: Critical race theory, assaultive speech, and the first amendment*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

MCINTYRE, A. (1997). *Making meaning of whiteness: Exploring racial identity with white teachers*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

MCNAIR, J. (2003). "He may mean good, but he do so doggone

poor!": A critical analysis of recently published "social conscience" children's literature. *Multicultural Review, 12*(1), 26–32.

MILES, M., & HUBERMAN, M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.

MILLER, W. (1998). *The bus ride.* New York: Lee & Low Books.

MOORE, D., MONAGHAN, E., & HARTMAN, D. (1997). Values of literacy history. *Reading Research Quarterly, 32,* 90–102.

MORRIS, J. (2001). Forgotten voices of black educators: Critical race perspectives on the implementation of a desegregation program. *Educational Policy, 15,* 575–600.

MORRISON, T. (1993). *Playing in the dark: Whiteness and the literary imagination.* New York: Vintage Books.

MYERS-SCOTTON, C. (1998). *Codes and consequences: Choosing linguistic varieties.* Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

NIETO, S. (2003). Afterword. In S. Greene & D. Abt-Perkins (Eds.), *Making race visible: Literacy research for cultural understanding* (pp. 201–206). New York: Teachers College Press.

PERRY, P. (2003). *Shades of white: White kids and racial identities in high school.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

PRENDERGAST, C. (2003). *Literacy and racial justice: The politics of learning after Brown v. Board of education.* Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

RICH, M., & CARGILE CASTELAN, A. (2004). Beyond the breach: Transforming white identities in the classroom. *Race, Ethnicity, and Education, 7,* 351–365.

ROEDIGER, D. (1999). *The wages of whiteness: Race and the making of the American working class.* London: Verso.

ROGERS, R. (2004). (Ed.) *An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

ROGERS, R. & MOSLEY, M. (2004). Learning to be just: Peer learning in a working class classroom. In E. Gregory, S. Long, & D. Volk (Eds.), *Many pathways to literacy: Learning with siblings, peers, grandparents, and in community settings,* (pp. 142–154). New York: Routledge.

RUBIN, H., & RUBIN, I. (1995). *Qualitative interviewing.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

RUFFIN, F.E. (2001). *Martin Luther King, Jr. and the March on Washington.* New York: Grosset & Dunlap.

SHAPIRO, T. (2004). *The hidden costs of being African American: How wealth perpetuates inequality.* Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

SIMS, R. (1982). *Shadow & substance: Afro-American experience in contemporary children's fiction.* Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

SMITHERMAN, G., & VAN DIJK, T. (1988). *Discourse and discrimination.* Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press.

SOLOMON, P., PORTELLI, J., DANIEL, B., & CAMPBELL, A. (2005). The discourse of denial: How white teacher candidates construct race, racism, and white privilege. *Race, Ethnicity, and Education, 8,* 147–169.

SOLORZANO, D., CEJA, M., & YOSSO, T. (2001). Critical race theory, racial microaggressions, and the campus racial climate: The experiences of African American college students. *Journal of Negro Education, 69,* 60–72.

SPRADLEY, J. (1980). *Participant observation.* Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace.

STOKES-BROWN, C. (2002). *Refusing racism: White allies and the struggle for civil rights.* New York: Teachers College Press.

TATE, W. (2003). The "race" to theorize education: Who is my neighbor? *Qualitative Studies in Education, 16,* 121–126.

TATUM, B. (1992). Talking about race, learning about racism. *Harvard Educational Review, 62,* 1–24.

TATUM, B. (1994). Teaching white students about racism: The search for white allies and the restoration of hope. *Teachers College Record, 95,* 462–476.

TATUM, B. (1997). *Why are all of the black kids sitting together in the cafeteria?* New York: Basic Books.

THOMPSON, A. (1997). For: Anti-racist education. *Curriculum Inquiry, 27,* 7–44.

THOMPSON, A. (2003). Tiffany, friend of people of color: White investments in anti-racism. *Qualitative Studies in Education, 16,* 7–29.

VAN AUSDALE, D., & FEAGIN, J. (2001). *The first R: How children learn race and racism.* Boulder, CO: Rowman & Littlefield.

VAN DIJK, T. (1987). *Communicating racism. Ethnic prejudice in thought and talk.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

VASQUEZ, V. (2003). *Getting beyond "I like the book": Creating space for critical literacy in K–6 classrooms.* Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

WAGNER, A. (2005). Unsettling the academy: Working through the challenges of anti-racist pedagogy. *Race, Ethnicity, and Education, 8,* 261–275.

WATKINS, W. (2001). *The white architects of black education: Ideology and power in America, 1865–1954.* New York: Teachers College Press.

WEBSTER-BRANDON, W. (2003). Toward a white teachers' guide to playing fair: Exploring the politics of multicultural teaching. *Qualitative Studies in Education, 16*(1), 31–50.

WELLS, A., & CRAIN, R. (2001). *Stepping over the color line: African American students in white suburban schools.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

WIGGINTON, S. (2005). Character or caricature: Representations of blackness in Dominican social science textbooks. *Race, Ethnicity, and Education, 8,* 191–211.

WILLIS, A. (2002). Literacy at Calhoun Colored School (1892–1945). *Reading Research Quarterly, 37,* 8–44.

WILLIS, A. (2003). Parallax: Addressing race in preservice literacy education. In S. Greene & D. Abt-Perkins (Eds.), *Making race visible: Literacy research for cultural understanding* (pp. 51–70). New York: Teachers College Press.

WILLIS, P. (1977). *Learning to labour: How working class kids get workingclass jobs.* Farnborough, England: Saxon House.

YOUNG, I. (1992). Five faces of oppression. In T. Wartenberg (Ed.), *Rethinking power* (pp. 174–195). Albany: State University of New York Press.

YOUNG, P. (2001). Roads to travel: A historical look at The Freedman's Torchlight—An African American contribution to 19th century instructional technologies. *Journal of Black Studies, 31,* 671–698.

TIMELINE OF GUIDED READING, BOOK CLUBS, AND HUMAN AND CIVIL RIGHTS

Date	Activity	Data source/artifact
	Theme: Family and community knowledge; sharing our stories	
10/31/02	One-on-one discussions of ability and gender as researchers/teachers (R/T) get to know case-study students	Field notes from participant observation
10/31/02	Native storytelling read aloud	Field notes from participant observation
11/6/02	"Comber prompts" What worries you or bothers you? (Comber, Thompson, & Wells, 2001)	Student writing samples and artwork
11/7/02	Sharing of videos and posters that represent family stories	Field notes from participant observation
11/12/02	"Comber prompts" What would you change about your neighborhood or school? (Comber et al., 2001)	Student writing samples and artwork
11/15/02	Guided reading (GR) of *The First Strawberries: A Cherokee Story* (Bruchac, 1998)	Field notes from participant observation
11/19/02	GR of family story *Music, Music for Everyone* (Williams, 1998)	Field notes from participant observation
	Literacy centers	
11/19/02	Research design—peer learning and critical literacy	Field notes from research meeting
1/3/03	Interview of classroom teacher	Transcript from audio recording
1/23/03	Interviews with case-study students	Transcript from audio recording
2/1/03–4/1/03	Life timeline in writers workshop	Field notes from participant observation
	Theme: African American history, racism, and social action for human and Civil Rights	
1/6/03	Read aloud *For Every Child* (2001) Children make "freedom" illustrations	Field notes from participant observation; student artwork
1/7/03	K-W-L chart of African American history	Transcript from audio recording
	Peer discussion (large group) about African American history	
	Students find books at home about African American history	
1/8/03–1/9/03	Artifact centers: photographs, poems, videos, and objects from African American history	Transcript from audio/video recording
1/9/03	GR *Martin Luther King, Jr. and the March on Washington* (Ruffin, 2001)	Transcript from audio/video recording
	GR *Underground Railroad* (Johns, 2000)	
1/10/03	Discussion of Martin Luther King, Jr. and Civil Rights and *Weekly Reader*	Field notes from participant observation
1/13/03	K-W-L about African American history	Field notes from participant observation
1/14/03	GR *Martin Luther King, Jr. and the March on Washington* (Ruffin, 2001)	Transcript from audio/video recording
1/14/03	Read-aloud *The Story of Ruby Bridges* (Coles, 1995)	Transcript from audio/video recording
1/14/03	Small-group peer discussion *Martin's Big Words* (Rappaport, 2001)	Transcript from audio/video recording

(continued)

TIMELINE OF GUIDED READING, BOOK CLUBS, AND HUMAN AND CIVIL RIGHTS (continued)

Date	Activity	Data source/artifact
1/14/03	What's unfair in school and community journal	Student writing and artwork
1/15/03	GR *The Underground Railroad* (Johns, 2000 Whole-group discussion: Role models in African American history	Transcript from audio/video recording
1/21/03	Large-group peer discussion after watching movie called *Our Friend, Martin*	Transcript from audio/video recording
1/21/03	Small-group peer discussion *Cracking the Wall: The Struggles of the Little Rock Nine* (Lucas, 1997)	Transcript from audio/video recording
1/22/03–1/23/03	GR *The Bus Ride* (Miller, 1998)	Transcript from audio/video recording
1/22/03	*A Million Postcards* video journal: How you can protest unfair actions? What's unfair in your school and community?	Transcript from audio/video recording Student writing in journals
1/23/03	GR *Allen Jay and the Underground Railroad* (Brill, 1993)	Transcript from audio/video recording
1/24/03	Writers' workshop—playwriting	Field notes from participant observation Transcript from audio/video recording
1/24/03	Peer workshop of letter to Martin Luther King, Jr.	Field notes from participant observation
1/29/03	Read-aloud of *Rosa Parks* (Greenfield, 1973)	Transcript from audio/video recording
1/29/03	Small-group activity: "100 ways to keep MLK's dream alive"	Student writing samples Transcript from audio/video recording
1/29/03	Read-aloud of *Abe Lincoln Remembers* (Turner, 2001)	Transcript from audio/video recording
1/29/03	Read-aloud of *Mr. Lincoln's Way* (Polacco, 2001) about racism	Transcript from audio/video recording
2/5/03	Playwriting	Transcript from audio/video recording
	Conversations about Ku Klux Klan, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, labor unions	Field notes from participant observation Student writing—journals and petitions
	Automotive plant discussion, role playing	
2/12/03	Read-aloud and dramatization of *Be Boy Buzz* (hooks, 2002) about racism	Field notes from participant observation
2/1/03–3/1/03	Rehearse play on littering and social action	Field notes from participant observation Transcript from audio/video recording Teacher/student-produced video recording of play Student writing—scripts
Theme: Internment camps, war and peace, and global rights		
2/1/03–2/14/03	Conversation club (preparing for book clubs)	Field notes from participant observation
4/9/03–4/16/03	Letters and correspondence with professor Patrick Shannon about corporate farming	Field notes from participant observation Student writing–letters
5/8/03–5/9/03	*Sadako* (Coerr, 1997) Teacher-guided book club	Transcript from audio/video recording Student writing—journals
5/14/03	*The Faithful Elephants* (Tsuchiyu, 1951) Student book clubs	Transcript from audio/video recording Student writing—journals

TIMELINE OF GUIDED READING, BOOK CLUBS, AND HUMAN AND CIVIL RIGHTS (continued)

Date	Activity	Data source/artifact
5/22/03	*The Bracelet* (Uchida, 1993) Student book clubs	Transcript from audio/video recording Student writing—journals
5/28/03	*Baseball Saved Us* (Mochizuk, 1995) Student book clubs	Transcript from audio/video recording Student writing—journals

CHILDREN'S BOOKS USED

Aardema, Verna. (1987). *Oh, Kojo! How could you!* New York: Puffin Pied Piper. E
Adler, David A. (1993). *A picture book of Frederick Douglass.* New York: Holiday House. A
Adler, David A. (1992). *A picture book of Harriet Tubman.* New York: Holiday House. A
Adler, David A. (1993). *A picture book of Rosa Parks.* New York: Holiday House. A
Alexander, Lloyd. (1992). *The fortune tellers.* New York: Puffin. E
* Bradby, Marie. (1995). *More than anything else.* New York: Scholastic. A
Bray, Rosemary L. (1995). *Martin Luther King.* New York: Mulberry. C
* Brenner, Barbara. (1978). *Wagon wheels.* New York: HarperTrophy. E
* Brill, Marlene Targ. (1993). *Allen Jay and the Underground Railroad.* Minneapolis, MN: Carolrhoda. A
Bruchac, Joseph. (1998). *The first strawberries: A Cherokee story.* New York: Puffin.
Bull, Angela. (2000). *Free at last! The story of Martin Luther King, Jr.* London: Dorling Kindersley. C
Carlson, Margaret. (1999). *The canning season.* Minneapolis, MN: Carolrhoda. C
Cobblestone. (1999). *African American pioneers and homesteaders.* Peterborough, NH: Cobblestone. E
Coleman, Evelyn. (1998). *The riches of Oseola McCarty.* Morton Grove, IL: Albert Whitman. E
Coleman, Evelyn. (1996). *White socks only.* Morton Grove, IL: Albert Whitman. C
Coles, Robert. (1995). *The story of Ruby Bridges.* New York: Scholastic. C
Connell, Kate. (1992). *Tales from the Underground Railroad.* Austin, TX: Steck-Vaughn. A
Coerr, Eleanor. (1977). *Sadako and the thousand paper cranes.* New York: Puffin.
Davidson, Margaret. (1968). *Frederick Douglass fights for freedom.* New York: Scholastic. A
Edwards, Pamela Duncan. (1997). *Barefoot: Escape on the Underground Railroad.* New York: HarperCollins. A
Erickson, Paul. (1997). *Daily life on a southern plantation.* New York: Lodestar. A
Golenbock, Peter. (1990). *Teammates.* San Diego, CA: Voyager. C
* Greenfield, Eloise. (1973). *Rosa Parks.* New York: HarperTrophy. C
Greenfield, Eloise. (1977). *Africa dream.* New York: HarperCollins. E
Greenfield, Eloise. (1991). *Night on Neighborhood Street.* New York: Puffin Pied Piper. E
* Greenwood, Barbara. (1998). *The last safe house: A story of the Underground Railroad.* New York: Scholastic. A
Grimes, Nikki. (1996). *Come Sunday.* Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdman Books for Young Readers. E
hooks, bell. (2002). *Be boy buzz.* New York: Hyperion.
* Hopkinson, Deborah. (1993). *Sweet Clara and the freedom quilt.* New York: Dragonfly. A
Hopkinson, Deborah. (2002). *Under the quilt of night.* New York: Atheneum Books for Young Readers. A
Hughes, Langston. (1994). *The Dream Keeper and other poems.* New York: Knopf. E
Isadora, Rachel. (1991). *At the crossroads.* New York: Greenwillow. E
* Jackson, Garnet. (2001). *Martin Luther King, Jr.: A man of peace.* New York: Scholastic. C
January, Brendan. (1993). *The Dred Scott decision.* New York: Children's Press. A
* Johns, Linda. (2000). *The Underground Railroad.* Bothell, WA: Wright Group/McGraw-Hill. A
Johnson, Angela. (1990). *When I am old with you.* New York: Orchard Books. E
Johnson, Dolores. (1993). *Now let me fly: The story of a slave family.* New York: Aladdin. A
Johnson, James Weldon. (1995). *Lift ev'ry voice and sing.* New York: Scholastic. E
Kelso, Richard. (1992). *Walking for freedom: The Montgomery bus boycott.* New York: Steck-Vaughn. C
Kent, Deborah. (1996). *African-Americans in the thirteen colonies.* New York: Children's Press. A
King, Casey, & Osborne, Linda Barrett. (1997). *Oh, freedom!* New York: Knopf. C
* Kulling, Monica. (2000). *Escape north! The story of Harriet Tubman.* New York: Random House. A
Lawrence, Jacob. (1968). *Harriet and the promised land.* New York: Aladdin. A
* Levine, Ellen. (1990). *If you lived at the time of Martin Luther King.* New York: Scholastic. C
Lucas, Eileen. (1997). *Cracking the wall: The struggles of the Little Rock Nine.* Minneapolis, MN: Carolrhoda. C
Martin, Lee Ann. (1999). *A march for freedom.* Bothell, WA: Wright Group.
McDermott, Gerald. (1992). *Zomo the rabbit: A trickster tale from West Africa.* New York: Scholastic. E
* McGovern, Ann. (1965). *Runaway slave: The story of Harriet Tubman.* New York: Four Winds. A
Milich, Melissa. (1997). *Miz Fannie Mae's fine new Easter hat.* New York: Little, Brown. E.
Miller, William. (1995). *Frederick Douglass and the last day of slavery.* New York: Lee & Low. A
* Miller, William. (1998). *The bus ride.* New York: Lee & Low. C
Mitchell, Margaree King. (1993). *Uncle Jed's barbershop.* New York: Simon & Schuster. C

CHILDREN'S BOOKS USED (continued)

Mochizuk, Kevin. (1995). *Baseball saved us.* New York: Loe & Low.
* Nevinski, Margaret. (2001). *Ruby Bridges.* Bothell, WA: Wright Group. C
Nolen, Jerdine. (1999). *In my momma's kitchen.* New York: Amistad. C
Pinkney, Andrea D. (1996). *Bill Pickett: Rodeo-ridin' cowboy.* San Diego, CA: Voyager. E
Polacco, Patricia. (2001). *Mr. Lincoln's way.* New York: Philomel. C
Rappaport, Doreen. (2001). *Martin's big words: The life of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.* New York: Hyperion. C
* Ringgold, Faith. (1991). *Tar beach.* New York: Crown. E
* Ringgold, Faith. (1992). *Aunt Harriet's Underground Railroad in the sky.* New York: Dragonfly. A
Ringgold, Faith. (1995). *My dream of Martin Luther King.* New York: Dragonfly. C
Rochelle, Belinda. (1993). *Witnesses to freedom: Young people who fought for civil rights.* New York: Dutton. C
* Roop, Peter, & Roop, Connie. (1998). *Grace's letter to Lincoln.* New York: Scholastic. A
* Ruffin, Frances E. (2001). *Martin Luther King, Jr. and the March on Washington.* New York: Grosset & Dunlap. C
Sanders, Scott Russell. (1997). *A place called Freedom.* New York: Atheneum. A
San Souci, Robert D. (1995). *The faithful friend.* New York: Simon & Schuster Books for Young Readers. E
Schroeder, Alan. (1996). *Minty: A story of young Harriet Tubman.* New York: Puffin. A
Seeger, Pete. (2001). *Abiyoyo.* New York: Aladdin. E
Steptoe, John. (1987). *Murfaro's beautiful daughters: An African tale.* New York: Scholastic. E
Thomas, Joyce Carol. (1998). *I have heard of a land.* New York: Joanna Cotler Books. E
Tsuchiya, Yukio. (1951). *Faithful elephants: A true story of animals, people, & war.* New York: Houghton-Mifflin.
Turner, Ann. (2003). *Abe Lincoln remembers.* New York: HarperTrophy. A
Uchida, Yoshiko. (1993). *The bracelet.* New York: PaperStar.
UNICEF. (2001). *For every child.* New York: Dial. E
Williams, Vera B. (1988). *Music, music for everyone.* New York: Harper Trophy.
Winter, Jeanette. (1992). *Follow the drinking gourd.* New York: Dragonfly. A
Woodson, Jacqueline. (1996). *Martin Luther King, Jr. and his birthday.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Silver Burdett. C
* Wyeth, Sharon Dennis. (2002). *Flying free: Corey's Underground Railroad diary,* book two. New York: Scholastic. C
* Vernon-Jackson, Hugh. (1999). *African folk tales.* Mineola, NY: Dover. E

Videos

Our Friend, Martin: A magical movie adventure inspired by the life of Martin Luther King, Jr. (1998). United States: 20th Century Fox. www.ourfriendmartin.com
Harriet Tubman: Animated Hero Classics. (1996). United States: Nest Entertainment.

Notes.
* Designates multiple copies
A stands for African American history: Abolition of slavery, Underground Railroad
C stands for African American history: Civil Rights movement
E stands for African American experience and includes folk tales, stories, and fiction not related to abolition of slavery or the Civil Rights movement.

CRITICAL LITERACY PROMPTS

1. What is the same about this book and other books that you have read?
2. Why do you think the characters or people in this book did what they did?
3. What surprised you about this book?
4. Why did the author write the book this way?
5. Who is in charge or has power in this book? How do you know?
6. How would the story be different if another person was in charge?
7. How would the story be different if another person was telling it?
8. Are the characters in the story strong or weak? How?
9. Could this story happen today? Why or why not?
10. If you chose this book to read, why did you choose it?
11. What was the problem in the book? How would you solve a problem like that?
12. How is that different from what the author chose as a solution?
13. What people do the characters in the book remind you of?
14. Are you the same as any of the characters? How?
15. What else?

NOTICING AND NAMING WHITE TALK: FORMS AND FUNCTIONS

Genre (McIntyre, 1997; Smitherman & van Dijk, 1998)
  Interruptions
  Humor
  Resistance
  Metaphors
  Overlapping talk
  Changing the topic
  Rhetorical questions
  Silences
  Evading questions
  Dismissing counter arguments
  Staying on topic
  Drawing on intertextual resources to support arguments
  Repetition
  Truncated speech
  Consensus
  Statements moving into questions in a single turn
  Questioning for clarification
  Coconstruction
  Making a counter point

Discursive themes (Chubbuck, 2004; Howard, 1999; McIntyre, 1997)
  Exceptions to the rules
  "We" versus "them"
  Reverse discrimination
  Difference from the "other"
  Privileging white feelings about racism over people of color's feelings about racism
  Locating racism as personal deviance rather than institutionally sanctioned and reproduced
  Myths of individualism, hard work, and meritocracy (along with white working class myths of "that's life")
  "The rush to complexity" (e.g., "The issue is class, not race")
  Philosophy of education (high expectations, equal treatment, get to know my students)
  Colorblindness
  Blaming or not taking responsibility
  Equating ageism with racism
  Activism as martyrdom
  Myth that separate can be equal
  Group identification
  Establishing a "white" viewpoint
  Resolving issues of race by reducing race to a discussion of color
  Positioning color before the person; "black people" rather than "people that are black/African American"
  Naming racism as institutional and pervasive rather than as personal deviation

Style (Fairclough, 1992)
  Lack of using "I" voice (favor the third person versus the first person)
  Distancing language
  Politeness conventions
  Use of research studies to back positions (e.g., intellectual or academic talk)
  Passive/active construction of sentences
  Nominalizations (turning verbs into nouns; e.g., *discrimination* instead of *discriminated against*)
  Not naming race, whiteness, antiracism, or whiteness
  Absence of talk (invisibility of language)
  Marked and unmarked terms (Myers-Scotton, 1998)
  Qualifying language
  Cognitive/affective statements
  Affective responses (e.g., feeling hopeless, feeling overwhelmed, feeling guilty)
  Modalities