The Social Life of an Essay

Standardizing Forces in Writing

MARGARET SHEEHY

University at Albany, State University of New York

Standardization discourse is dominantly linked to tests; yet standardization occurs in practices of everyday social life, too. This research seeks to understand standardization processes involved in the writing done by a class of seventh grade students, half of whom did not do well in school or on tests. Acting as participant observer in a classroom where a civics project resulted in the writing of an essay, the author collected audiotaped classroom and group discussions, student writing, field notes, and texts (a history booklet, a neighborhood-planning book, two videos, census data) students drew from to write a speech which their language arts teacher taught as an essay. One essay/speech was delivered to the school board. The author examined the exchange of ideas, across the 8-week project, to consider how standardization as a process of production, consumption, and distribution played in students' writing. The author found that standardizing forces involved direct teaching, genre memory, and several strategies employed to bring cohesion and unity to diverse ideas.

Keywords: *standardization and writing; literacy event; writing as production trajectory; articulation/rearticulation*

"There's no why, there's no nothing. It happened." This is what seventh grader Paco said when he learned that he and his 90 classmates could not present a building project to their school board. The seventh graders scored worse on their standardized tests than any other middle school students in Crayton, a city of 1 million; yet they wrote a speech that had the attention of all members of the audience, when—as citizens rather than students—they delivered it to their school board, 3 months after being told they couldn't.

The seventh graders' building project provides an opportunity to explore standardization in writing. The Building Project was fraught with tensions (which I detail in the data analysis) and made the complexity of standardization visible. Standardization, although

dominated by testing rhetoric, is a play of power that can be charted both in the act of writing and in written forms' effects. For instance, that Paco found the speech repression unsurprising was very surprising to me, an outsider to the Sanders neighborhood, situated across the river from Downtown Crayton. I had been researching at Sanders Middle School (SMS) only 5 months, when Jade, the seventh graders' science and social studies teacher, learned of the presentation curtailment. Only a week earlier, at the behest of the vice principal, the city superintendent had visited Jade's classroom and praised her work. Results of community surveys hung on the walls, model buildings were lined up on the window sills, and students' stories about life in Sanders papered the bulletin boards. The superintendent spoke of sending cameras to Jade's classroom. No cameras arrived. A week later, Jade's teammate Audrie was informed that the seventh graders could not go to the school board. The vice principal told her there was a rule whereby students in Crayton Schools could be represented at board meetings only once during the school year. SMS had already been represented. When I phoned Crayton Schools to ask about this rule, I was told there wasn't one. Literacy has effects, which influence writing practices—from text production to interpretation and distribution. The survey results must have caused concern. They showed that the majority of SMS students, school staff, and the seventh graders' parents did not want a new school. A week after the superintendent visited Jade's classroom, distribution of the seventh graders' speech was interrupted.

The Building Project was political, although not by design. It came about in November, when Jade and Audrie had been planning a unit on "walls." I had been researching at SMS for a month, when the school board, after a year-long debate about school closure, voted to close SMS. Because Jade and Audrie were going to teach a unit on walls, I asked them if they'd want to have their students survey the Sanders community to learn what they'd want in a new school and to build model buildings based on the results. Audrie was a seasoned language arts teacher at SMS and Jade was new to the school. I had good rapport with Jade because she and I often talked about the problems she experienced when teaching through projects. Jade had taught in a wealthy school in another state and was frustrated that SMS students were not used to projects. Because Jade liked to collaborate, I asked her if I could research in her classroom and coteach the project with her, in exchange. Thus, the Building Project was born. It

involved (a) general introductory activities about Sanders and buildings, (b) writing and distributing surveys to the seventh graders' parents, the SMS student body and school staff, (c) a Sanders community study, (d) building model buildings based on the survey results, and (e) writing (in Audrie's classroom) speeches to the school board. The 90 seventh graders voted for one speech to go the board, and the entire SMS student body chose four buildings to be displayed there. When the seventh graders eventually spoke to the school board, I took them at the end of the school year.

The seventh graders' speech writing, which Audrie taught as a five-paragraph essay, sheds light on standardization. Standardization has not been reckoned with in composition studies. Therefore, a discourse *on* standards, which is dominated by tests and scores, occludes understandings about standardization in day-to-day literacy practices. We are left not knowing how or whether people have any say in their own struggles for taste, nor how they recuperate institutionalized standards for their (or others') purposes. Focusing on standardization in writing is one means of explaining how power operates as students learn to write the kind of essays they're tested on.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Standardization

Standardization discourse dominates current discussions of school in the media and certainly impacts school practices. In teachers' lounges, at conferences, and in university classrooms, teachers say that their practices are constricted by statewide standardized tests. While one effect of standardization is the development, distribution, and taking of tests followed by the dissemination of results, standardization is not solely a testing practice. Foucault (1977/1984) warned,

I think there is a widespread and facile tendency, which one should combat, to designate that which has just occurred as the primary enemy, as if this were always the principal form of oppression from which one had to liberate oneself. . . . There is in this hatred of the present or the immediate past a dangerous tendency to invoke a completely mythic past. (p. 248)

Standardizing practices occur in social life and occurred prior to this testing era. Therefore, rather than treat standardization as a "primary enemy," it may be more fruitful to understand how it operates in everyday practices. Bourdieu (1977) and others (Milroy & Milroy, 1985; Shuman, 1986) have argued that groups develop notions of standard from their uses of and purposes for forms. For Bourdieu, forms are always caught up in the game of social life, which he argued was a struggle for taste. Accordingly, a test and what it asks a student to do—write an essay, for instance—is one stake in this struggle. Culture, Bourdieu argued, demands that one take part in the game of social life, the struggle for taste.

What does this struggle look like for students and teachers in neighborhoods like Sanders, where, for a decade, half the adult population has not completed high school? How might writing reveal the struggle to participate in school? During the 8-week-long Building Project, 33% of the seventh graders were usually absent from school. By the end of the school year, 84% of the entire SMS student body was not in school. Lack of engagement has been a major concern in writing research (e.g., Applebee, 1981; Emig, 1971), resulting in major changes in both writing instruction and research. Teachers now have knowledge about craft, revision, feedback, writing for specific purposes and audiences, social resources, and teaching particular genres. Writing research has not made much of standardization, however, even though one of the most common school forms—the essay—"is used regularly in the selection (or gatekeeping) processes of various institutions in our society, thus assuring its importance as a register and its continued validity" (Farr, 1993, p. 12).

In focusing on the essay in this research, I risk perpetuating Street's (1993) concern that literacy has been constructed as an autonomous, a-cultural ability to produce and reproduce a seemingly stable set of characteristics that looks like an essay. I also risk constructing the notion that processes of standardization occur only in school. I am arguing, however, that focusing on standardization, via the essay, reveals instabilities in writing and just as important, reveals how individuals in schools, where such writing is emphasized, play Bourdieu's game of social life. While there is research discussing the effects of writing and power (e.g., Lensmire, 1994; Stuckey, 1991) and research which engages specifically in redistributing power (e.g., Davies, 1993; Fiore & Elsasser, 1988; Freire, 1973; Shor 1987), there is no empirical research examining forces of standardization in youths' "essayist writing" at school.

An essay, as a text, is marked by rationality held within the text which is accomplished through decontextualization of the author from the text, emphasis on logical order (Farr, 1993), and “disguising the construction of text at a social level” (Trimbur, 1990, p. 82). Essayist literacy is a style of discourse marked, in schools, by critical analysis and backing opinions with facts (Gee, 1988, quoting Oakes). Scollon and Scollon (1981) traced the essay’s beginnings to the 17th and 18th centuries when knowledge structures in Europe were reorganized around Enlightenment ideals of natural law. Texts that read as though they were unconstructed were legitimate, according to Enlightenment thought, and production of such texts became the goal of schooling (Scollon & Scollon, 1981). Applebee (1981) found that the essay was the dominant form of writing in high schools across the United States.

Shuman (1986) questioned the notion of “decontextualization,” as the major marker of essayist writing. Her ethnography of adolescents’ writing revealed important insights into standardizing processes. Upon studying the oral and written language of urban adolescents over 2 years, Shuman determined that decontextualization placed too much emphasis on text and disregarded the contexts which written (and oral) texts made available to readers (and listeners). Shuman argued that the appropriate term for determining the effectiveness of a text was not *decontextualization*, which emphasized clarity, comprehensibility, and elaboration, but *recontextualization*. Recontextualization, Shuman explained, made contexts, through use of other texts, available to readers and listeners. In Shuman’s research, the extent to which decontextualized language occurred among adolescents depended upon just how much recontextualization of other contexts was required by readers and listeners. When an audience was distanced from the event being recontextualized, comprehensibility depended upon a text being like other texts of a specific category, suited to that situation. A reader determined the authenticity of text in relation to other texts of the same kind. Thus, standardization came into play (through use of the appropriate form) to decrease the distance between the context being recounted and the reader whose access to the context was only the writing. Standards among the adolescents were dependent on the community in which texts were produced. Thus, Shuman concluded that decontextualization and standardization were “dependent on patterns of exchange, notions of audience, and situations of use of texts” (p. 97).

In a similar vein, Miller (1984) argued that recurring forms, like essays, become conventional genres because they "arise in situations with similar structures and elements and because rhetors respond in similar ways, having learned from precedent what is appropriate and what effects their actions are likely to have on people" (p. 152). A genre, Miller contended, is action, acquiring meaning from a specific situation in a social context.

From Shuman (1986), Miller (1984), and others, we can accept that standards and forms cannot be fixed. If we want to understand how and whether writers participate in the production of seemingly stable genres, like the school essay, it is necessary to situate writers within the contexts of their writings. Kamberelis and de le Luna (in press) suggest that writing is best understood as three coconstructed dimensions: text features, situated power relations, and proximal and distal forces that exert effects on writing. In this research, I use similar dimensions as a framework for standardization: text as a trajectory of exchange, articulation of relations, and centrifugal and centripetal forces.

Dimensions of Standardization

Text as a trajectory of exchange. In classrooms, exchanges in talk, writing, gesture, silence, and other representations are means of trading information, and they become the text of written and oral products. Information is a commodity (Wells, 1993). The essay can be viewed, also, as a commodity, since it is used in gatekeeping practices that allow and refuse access to academia—not only to the university, but (in some states, such as the one where this research took place) to high school. Because standardization involves determining value, one means of describing textual products is to map their full trajectory of production, exchange, and use/interpretation. Appadurai (1986) wrote,

Let us approach commodities as things in a certain situation, a situation that can characterize many different kinds of thing, at different points in their social lives. This means looking at the commodity potential of all things. . . . It also means breaking significantly with the production-dominated Marxism view of the commodity and focusing on its *total* trajectory from production, through exchange/distribution, to consumption. (p. 13)

Critical language studies examine literacy within this full trajectory, from production to consumption and distribution. With this goal in mind, Fairclough (1992) treated oral and written language as text, explaining that texts are produced in specific ways in different situations, with people taking different roles in their production. For example, friends on a playground engage in different conversation than the same friends in a classroom. A classroom conversational text is formal, talk on the playground is informal, and roles children take differ in the two situations. Certain types of texts are produced in particular places and with particular people. They can be differentiated by linguistic features such as, but not limited to, grammar, vocabulary, and genre.

Consumption, Fairclough explained, also occurs differently in different social situations. Consumption may differ across and within situations because interpretation may differ. For example, one might skim a test to get an idea of what is going to be on it, and one might also read it very closely, in hopes of performing well. In addition, certain text genres set up certain modes of interpretation. Rosenblatt (1989), for instance, theorized that readers take efferent and aesthetic stances to text because specific genres set up particular stances. A novel is typically read aesthetically, whereas a biology textbook conveys efferent information and is read differently from a novel. In each case, texts are put to different uses. A novel is often read for pleasure, whereas a reader studying for a test may take notes while reading.

While textual features, such as genres, vocabulary, and text register set up relations between producers and consumers of texts, so does distribution. Fairclough explained that some texts have simple distributions. A conversation's distribution may end between interlocutors. Other texts' distribution can be more complex. A speech, for instance, may be listened to by many people, and that distribution influences production. As I will demonstrate in the data analysis, distribution figured very powerfully in the seventh graders' speech production. Addressing the school board influenced the seventh graders' language choices.

In this research, I chart the oral and written language in the seventh graders' speech across the full trajectory of its production: production, consumption, and distribution. Rather than demonstrate standardizing forces via Fairclough's (1992) linguistic analysis, however, I examined the articulation of relations (Grossberg, 1992) across the 8-week Building Project.

Articulation of relations. Grossberg's and Fairclough's methods of explaining cultural production, consumption, and distribution are similar because they make use of some of the same theoretical constructs, including Gramsci's articulation and rearticulation. Like other critical theorists writing in Europe before and after WWII, Gramsci attempted to theorize power in such a way that one could explain its forces. Gramsci did this through his concept of hegemony. Lawner (in Gramsci, 1973) defined hegemony as a perceived equilibrium between civil society and political society—between leadership based on consent and domination based on coercion. Fairclough (1992), noting that power has changed since Gramsci theorized hegemony, determined that hegemony is accomplished, not through coercion but through alliances made across discursive practices in processes of integration.

Gramsci theorized that society's arts, laws, economic life, and education are structured by diverse ideologies which come to be structured and restructured by processes of articulation and rearticulation. According to Grossberg (1992), "Articulation is the construction of one set of relations out of another [and] often involves delinking or disarticulating connections in order to relink or rearticulate others" (p. 54). Rearticulation occurs through constant struggle to reposition practices within a shifting field of forces (Grossberg, 1992). Examination of the seventh graders' speech writing clearly reveals these processes. As the seventh graders' interest in their survey results and community study developed, they wanted to address the school board with their concerns; however, because they were less powerful than school board members, they linked and delinked ideas from several texts (e.g., census data, their own stories about Sanders, Sanders history books) in order to make their ideas palatable to a school board that intended to close their school.

Fairclough (1992) uses Bakhtin's (1981) intertextuality and Foucault's (1972) orders of discourse to demonstrate articulation and rearticulation of relations. His Critical Discourse Analysis demonstrates linking and delinking of ideas through language choices that intertwine texts and contexts, thus making use of Bakhtin's intertextuality. To demonstrate alliances across unusual fields, which construct interdiscursive hegemony, Fairclough examines discourses. An example of interdiscursive alliances evident in this research was an international insurance company being referred to as a "citizen" in the Crayton newspaper. The newspaper integrated discourses of business and citizenry, and a business with global interests

became a local citizen. This integration of alliances had repercussions for the Sanders community; however, the community was not a blind blob upon which city and global politics operated. When the insurance company/citizen proposed to level a major historical landmark in Sanders and put up a parking lot for Downtown Crayton's use, the Sanders citizenry launched a signature-gathering campaign and stopped the swing of the wrecking ball with 10,000 signatures. Integrated discursive alliances do not always articulate, in practice, as a blanket of power; hegemony is unstable.

Like Fairclough, Grossberg demonstrates hegemony, but not through linguistic features. Instead, he articulates an "event." The goal of articulating an event is to make concrete the numbers of contexts that intertwine within specific social practices. In Grossberg's (1992) words, "Rather than making reality linguistic, I propose to make language real" (p. 51).

The event, as Grossberg has bound it, breaks radically from the "literacy event" traditionally used as a unit of analysis in sociocultural literacy research. Heath (1983) describes literacy events as having "social interactional rules which regulate the type and amount of *talk* about what is written, and define ways in which *oral language* denies, extends, or sets aside the written material" (p. 392). In addition, she explains that literacy events "are rule-governed, and their different situations of occurrence determine their internal rules for talking—and interpreting and interacting—around the piece of writing" (p. 392). Scholars have illustrated a range of literacy events, from the Morning Message in early childhood classrooms (Miriage, 2001), to conversation around an attempt to obtain a visa (Baynham, 1993). In such events, the structure of talk enables the researcher to consider participants' language choices in relation to the structure of the event.

For Grossberg, events are "practices and the results of practices. A practice is a mode by which effects are produced and reality transformed" (p. 51). With attention to practice, the event is more broadly bound than the traditional literacy event (Street, 1993), and the work of the researcher is to make concrete the numbers of contexts that actually intertwine within a specific situation. Hence, an event may be visible but is not bound by what can be seen. Bringing forth unseen contexts within a situation (or traditional literacy event) requires moving beyond the visible.

According to Grossberg (1992), analysis of an event involves reconstructing the relationships of the event. The event should include specific contexts where practices have effects, because it is there that

identities and relations exist. These contexts should be looked at from within; the networks of their relations should be made visible. However, one does not merely connect the pieces because that recreates the notion that context is local. Instead, one explains the nature of a fit between oddly allied entities (as in my earlier example of the insurance company and citizenry). An articulation of an event, which reveals multiple contexts, also reveals effects of practices and their structure. By revealing a structure, it is possible to find where, within it, there are openings for change. The end result should be a map that interrelates structure and differences within it.

Kamberelis (in press) demonstrated aspects of these methodologies, though not using Grossberg as a model. Using rhizomatic struggles between structure and breaks with structure, Kamberelis demonstrated how African American slave literacies articulated lines of flight from dominant White European literacies. Slaves' literacy practices articulated a context that politically reorganized people's participation in literacy and life. By articulating the real, Kamberelis demonstrated networks of relationships (for instance, relationships between slave owners and African American pastors, between churches and the underground railroad, between dominant literacies and literacies with hidden messages). In another example of articulation/rearticulation, Kamberelis demonstrated alliances made across unusual entities on a contemporary Web site. In both the Web site and the slave literacy examples, Kamberelis showed that literacy events, when viewed as articulations, attenuate the real and reveal the instability of structures and how change is possible within their openings.

Centripetal and centrifugal forces. Prior to analyzing data from the Building Project, I determined that demonstrating articulation of an event via descriptive methods of mapping text production, consumption, and distribution would provide new ways of understanding standardizing processes in writing. Upon analyzing these maps and contexts, however, I found *tension* to be so central to the seventh graders' motivation to write that I turned to Bakhtin's (1981) centripetal and centrifugal forces to theorize the tensions that played so powerfully in the seventh graders' writing. In fact, it is these forces that Bakhtin used to explain standardization of language.

Centripetal and centrifugal forces are the forces that make up the concept of heteroglossia (Bakhtin, 1981), a concept whereby language is viewed as at once unitary (which is the centripetal, or standardizing force of language) while also partaking in social and historical diversity (the centrifugal forces that stratify social life). To examine these,

the researcher asks, what are the standardizing forces at work here, and what are the ones that stratify? These questions allow one to examine visible, proximal forces as well as distal forces that may require that the researcher make links from data to unseen contexts. With the seventh graders, I found centripetal and centrifugal forces operating at points of text distribution, especially when students were figuring out who they were in relation to a number of audiences that would receive and interpret their words. For example, tensions of language choice occurred when they practiced delivering their surveys to the student body and again when Paco and his writing group practiced their speech in front of the class. Paco said he was embarrassed to be using “business-like words” in front of his peers. Yet when Paco’s group wrote their speeches, business-like words enabled them to articulate a powerful set of relations for themselves. Through writing, they created a reality in which they were not positioned as powerless. They made openings in reality through the alliances they made with their texts; thus, they rearticulated reality as an elaborate essay.

These three dimensions of writing—text as a production/consumption trajectory, articulation of relations, and writing as a play of centripetal and centrifugal forces—enable an exploration of standardization that accounts for the dynamism of language in the struggle for position in a game of social life. Grossberg (1992) explained, “What is important in history is what practices are available, how they are deployed or taken up and how they transform the world” (p. 51). The analysis herein explains standardization as this process.

METHOD

Setting and Participants

This report extrapolates from a larger time/space study I conducted, over 8 months, in the seventh graders’ science and social studies classroom at SMS. SMS was the only middle school in Sanders, a neighborhood of 16,000 in the city of Crayton, a city of 1 million. SMS students were largely from economically disadvantaged families and most of Sanders also lived in poverty. 30 students, teachers Jade, Audrie, and Sarah, and an adult community organizer in Sanders agreed to participate in the research. The teachers and community organizer were Euro-American as were 80% of the

Table 1
List of Participants Named in Article

Teachers	
Jade	Euro-American science and social studies teacher
Audrie	Euro-American language arts teacher
Sarah	Euro-American math teacher
Students	
Zacharia	Euro-American girl
John	Euro-American boy
Mariah	African American girl
Tyrone	African American boy
Gemini	Euro-American boy
Kylene	Euro-American girl
Rocky	Euro-American girl
Students in Focus Group B	
Janet	African American girl
Mary	Euro-American girl
JoAnn	Euro-American girl
Shakir	Euro-American boy
Joseph	Euro-American boy
Michelle	Euro-American girl
Paco	Euro-American boy
Researcher	
Margi	Euro-American woman

students. Twenty percent of the students were African American and one was Asian American. Participants quoted in this article are listed in Table 1.

Jade and her team taught 90 students, in three 90-minute blocks. Jade taught science and social studies, Audrie taught language arts, and Sarah taught math. I observed for a month in Jade's classroom before beginning the Building Project. Jade and I planned the project over the winter break, and we taught it, over 8 weeks, from mid-January to mid-March. Jade would not have participated in the Building Project had "Structure and Design" not been a major category on the 8th grade standardized test. She said that you can't teach concepts like structure and design, "You have to be involved in them." The project involved five phases of involvement:

1. Introduction: Week 1 of Project (video on Ohio schools; floor plans of SMS; census data about Sanders and a wealthy community in the area; information about Sanders Flood Wall and Flood Plain)
2. Writing, administering, and analyzing surveys: Weeks 2 and 3

3. Sanders History: Week 3 (writing about living in Sanders; reading about Sanders; watching a video about Sanders)
4. Building model school buildings, using survey results: Weeks 4, 5, and 6
5. Writing speeches to the school board: Weeks 7 and 8

My role as participant observer was not consistent. It was difficult for students to relate to me as both researcher and teacher. It was difficult for me, as well, to be responsible for moving students forward in the project while trying to understand how they interpreted school on their own terms. Midway through the project, I asked Jade if I could observe more than participate in teaching. She agreed to this arrangement. Thus, when students began the building portion of their project, in week 4, I worked with small groups, but I rarely instructed the whole class. I continued to plan with Jade until the end of the project.

I participated in all three blocks Jade taught but arrived to the first block two thirds into the class period. I collected data in the second block and remained into the third block to help teach. My relationship with students was similar across the three blocks. All students knew I was a researcher and that I was collecting data in the second block. Ten of the 30 student participants, however, were in the other two blocks. (I interviewed these participants to gain further insight into the project.)

Data

I called the classroom in which I collected data the “focus class.” Within this class, students worked in groups from Week 4 through Week 8. I collected both whole-class and group data.

I chose two focus groups based on my rapport with some of the students in these groups. In the months I observed prior to the project, I had developed good rapport with Paco and Janet. They were quite verbal and comfortable talking with me. I had also developed good rapport with Gemini and Rocky, for the same reasons. Thus, I decided to focus my observations on the groups these participants were in. I called these groups Focus Group A and Focus Group B. Besides observing and writing field notes (which I sometimes wrote in class but more often wrote after school), I audio- and videotaped the classroom activities. When students worked in groups, I placed audiotape recorders on each of the focus groups’ tables and alternated videotaping between focus groups. I transcribed all audiotapes, using the

video for anecdotal information and to determine who was speaking when it was not clear from the audiotapes. Transcription resulted in over 600 pages of whole class and focus groups discussions.

In addition to transcripts and field notes, data sources were participant interviews, the community surveys, Focus Group B's speech drafts, and other texts used for the project (students' "place stories" about Sanders; a Sanders history booklet; a Sanders neighborhood planning document; census data about Sanders and a nearby, wealthy community called Bonner; a video about school funding in Ohio; students' notes about the video; a video about Sanders; students' journaling; and students' essays about the project).

Data Analysis

Two levels of analysis were necessary in order to explain standardizing forces in the seventh graders' essay writing. Both enabled me to reduce data for different purposes. The first level of analysis enabled me to reduce data in order to map ideas produced in the speech across the entire project, so that I could construct writing as a trajectory of production, consumption, and distribution. The second level of analysis enabled me to reduce data from the first analysis in order to explain the tensions that were revealed, in the first analysis, at points of distribution.

First level of analysis: Charting production, consumption, and distribution as articulation of the Building Project. In order to map the production trajectory of the speech, I first bound the entire project as an event. Then, as a starting point for analysis, I mapped each idea (production) in the speech across its uses and distributions throughout the project. To do this, I made a chart (see the appendix), with three columns: ideas of the speech (production); use (consumption/interpretation) of ideas; and distribution. I numbered the 40 productions in Focus Group B's speech and labeled them *A* through *L* (*A* signifying the greeting; *B* through *K*, paragraphs in the body; and *L*, the closing.) Once I had charted the productions, I mapped consumption and distributions. Working first from my field notes, on which I'd recorded what materials were used in a day, I reread the data set, looking for uses of the same productions. Where I found the same productions, either spoken or written, I jotted them in the consumption column, signifying use of the idea. In charting just production and consumption, I could see that productions, when spoken or written, were cast in relations. Thus, in the distribution column, I made note of distrib-

uted relations. The resulting Production Trajectory Map is an analytic tool which enabled me to chart how consumption and distribution played in writing the speech/essay.

Table 2 is the trajectory of one production (Idea A-1) in the speech, taken from the Production Trajectory Map (appendix). Following Table 2, I provide a reading of the table so that readers may examine the analysis in the Appendix, in similar fashion.

Reading the trajectory. Idea A-1 is the production, "Superintendent . . . Members of the school board." This production, charted across the data, was discussed nine different times, examples of which are in the consumption column. These nine uses were also nine distributions of student-school board relations, which I note in the distribution column. The production trajectory can be read as follows.

On January 20 and on page 18 of the transcripts for that day, Margi asked students if they believed their school would be replaced. Students said they thought it would be and one said, "I hope it will." At this time, it was not evident what students felt about their school board, but it was evident that some of the students did hope their school would be replaced. On that same day, and on page 20 of the transcripts for the day, Jade asked students if the school board had been to SMS. The students did not believe the school board had been there. Jade planted the idea that the school board may never have been inside the building they voted to replace. The school board was, at that point in the project, an unknown entity to the students. On January 29 and on pages 10 and 11 of the transcripts for that day, the class was talking about the surveys they were going to distribute. John said, "But we don't want the school board to vote for us, we want the community, students, teachers, staff." For John, school board relations to students were uncertain, and John questioned whether the school board could adequately represent Sanders students.

On February 2 and pages 9 and 10 of the transcripts for that day, the class was talking about what happened when they distributed the surveys to student body and teachers:

Mariah: They wanted to know, after . . .

Jade: . . . after it goes to the school board?

John: [talking about telling student body about school board] . . . you got to tell them.

Paco: They don't care what we want.

Jade: Oh, I don't know.

Paco: Little kids.

(text continued on p. 351)

Table 2
Excerpt of Production Trajectory Map

Idea Produced	Description of Use	Description of Distribution
A (1) Superintendent, members of the school board	T: 1/20/p. 18: Margi asks sts if they believe school will be replaced. Some "hope it will."	Margi situates sts in question of project: SB and decisions about SMS kids.
	T: 1/20/p. 20: Jade asks sts if School Board has been to SMS. Sts do not believe SB has been there.	Jade plants idea that school board may not have been inside the building they voted to replace. School Board is, at this point, an unknown entity to sts.
	T: 1/29/pp. 10-11: Talking about surveys. John: But we don't want the school board to vote for us, we want the community, students, teachers, staff.	SB relations to students remains uncertain; issues of representation. (Should SB represent sts?)
	T: 2/2/pp. 9-10: Talking about having distributed surveys to student body and teachers: Mariah: They wanted to know, after . . . Jade: . . . after it goes to SB? John: [talking about telling student body about SB] . . . you got to tell them. Paco: They don't care what we want. Jade: Oh, I don't know. Paco: Little kids	Distribution uncertain. Mariah expresses sts' care. John feels secure in voice; telling SB what SMS kids want, but frustrated that other student body does not have that confidence. Paco doubts SB cares and thinks the SB thinks of seventh graders as "little kids." Distribution of sts-SB relations precarious, uncertain, powerful, and powerless.

T: 2/2/p. 12: Talking about what kids want:

John: I think they should have a vote for students. . . .

Students got to have something they think they would go for.

Jade tells sts they should tell the SB that.

T: 2/3/pp. 10-12: Margi reviewing project to date:

Margi: The school board, they don't have any control over how much money they've got . . . so you need to make an argument for what you want and it depends on the results of the survey. . . . What are some things you can get? You have to set some goals.

Rocky: Repair the structure.

Margi: . . . Good. So you can ask for that, and you should demand that.

Jade: [changing subject] The board may not know how to get to Sanders.

Zacharia: Well, we'll show them.

2/6/p. 7: Discussing what needs to get done with survey analysis:

Paco: Then we have to bring all these reports to the board?

Jade: . . .

Paco: After all this work, I want the school board to know."

John resituates his interests in distribution of SB-sts relations. The resituating depends on SB knowing what kids want. The survey is thus important.

Margi situates sts' relations to SB in economic situation: there's not money available for sts to get all they want. They need to be strategic, and make demands on what they can get. This conversation lends to notion of having a say and this attitude is evident when Zacharia tells Jade, confidently, that they'll "show them" [the board] how to get to SMS.

Paco situates "work" in SB relations; he wants them to know what the class has done. It's as though this work SHOULD be distributed to others, that they should know what the SMS students did. Work is valued, and Paco resituates his position with a SB he has gone in and out of trusting.

(continued)

Table 2 (continued)

Idea Produced	Description of Use	Description of Distribution
2/25/pp. 4-6: Jade introduces a graphic organizer, for beginning to draft speech, to sts: Jade: They need to know who you are, why are here . . . S: What is the board for? Jade: . . . Gemini: Where is the school board?		In the speech, the sts need to make clear their relationship to the board. Who they are and why they're there will establish that relationship, will distribute student ideas to the SB. After so much discussion about the SB, a student returns to uncertainty about who they are. Gemini wants to know where they are. As speech nears, sense of distributed relations are not as sure as often expressed earlier.
2/27/pp. 8-9: Group A debating info to write down for speech: Gemini: She won't put down my idea. Rocky: Well you don't, I don't know how to put that . . . Gemini: You don't know how to put . . . Rocky: Put that in a more professional way.		Rocky's search for "the right register" indicates her knowledge of her position with the SB. Gemini does not consider register a problem, which suggests a simpatico with the SB that Rocky does not believe exists.

NOTE: SMS = Sanders Middle School; T = transcripts; SB = school board; S = unidentified student; and sts = students.

Students seemed uncertain about how the student body received their surveys. Mariah expressed that the student body did care, since they wanted to know what was going to happen next. John felt secure in his own position. He was emphatic that “you got to tell” the school board what SMS wanted in their new school, but he was also frustrated that some of the student body did not share his confidence. Paco doubted that the school board cared about SMS kids; he felt the school board would see the seventh graders as “little kids.” The distribution of student-school board relations was precarious, uncertain, powerful, and powerless.

On February 2 and on page 12 of the transcripts for that day, the class was analyzing survey results and talking about what they thought the school board would want in a new school. John said, “I think they should have a vote for students. . . . Students got to have something they think they would go for,” and Jade told the students that they should tell the school board that. John situated his interests in a new distribution of school board-student relations. In order for John to articulate his position with the school board in a powerful manner, he asserted his feeling that the school board had to know what kids wanted. John thus deemed the survey important.

On February 3 and on pages 10 through 12 of that day’s transcripts, Margi had been reviewing, with the class, the project to date:

Margi: The school board, they don’t have any control over how much money they’ve got . . . so you need to make an argument for what you want and it depends on the results of the survey. . . . What are some things you can get? You have to set some goals.

Rocky: Repair the structure.

Margi: . . . Good. So you can ask for that, and you should demand that.

Jade: [changing subject] The board may not know how to get to Sanders.

Zacharia: Well, we’ll show them.

Margi articulated the students’ relations to the school board within the economic situation: There was not enough money available for the students to get all they wanted. They needed to be strategic and make demands based on what they could get. This conversation enforced the notion that students should have a say, and this attitude was evident when Zacharia told Jade (who believed the school board knew so little about SMS that they didn’t even know how to get there) that they’d “show them” how to get to there. Zacharia asserted herself as someone the board should pay attention to.

On February 6 and on page 7 of the transcripts for that day, the class was discussing the further work to be done with survey analysis. Paco, who had been skeptical about whether they would ever complete the project and also about whether the school board would listen to seventh graders, said, "Then we have to bring all these reports to the board?" Jade responded to him and he replied, "After all this work, I want the school board to know." Paco articulated the "work" that had to be done within school board relations; he wanted the board to know what the class had done. It was as though this work *should* have been distributed to the board—that the board should know what the SMS students did at school. Work in the Building Project was valued, and Paco articulated his position with a school board that he, at different times during the project, trusted and mistrusted.

On February 25 and on pages 4 through 6 of the transcripts for that day, Jade introduced the seventh graders to a graphic organizer that Audrie designed, so that students could begin to draft the speech in Jade's classroom. Jade explained how to approach the speech:

Jade: They need to know who you are, why you are here . . .

S: What is the board for?

Jade: . . . [answers]

Gemini: Where is the school board?

Jade wanted students to be clear about who they were, so that the school board would understand the importance of their speech. Who they were and why they were in front of the board would establish a relationship between students' ideas and the school board. Even after so much discussion about the board, across the project, one student returned to uncertainty about who the board was. Gemini wanted to know where the board was. As the speech neared, the students' relationships to the school board were not as sure as they had frequently been expressed earlier in the project.

On February 27 and pages 8 through 9 of the transcripts, Group A was debating information to write down in their speech. When they could not agree on what to write, they discussed this problem with Audrie:

Gemini: She won't put down my idea.

Rocky: Well you don't, I don't know how to put that . . .

Gemini: You don't know how to put . . .

Rocky: Put that in a more professional way.

Rocky's search for the appropriate register—a professional one—indicated her knowledge of her position with the school board. Gemini, however, did not consider register a problem, which suggests he felt a *simpatico* with the school board that Rocky did not believe existed.

My intention, in providing the reading of Table 2, is to enable an independent reading of the Production Trajectory Map. From reading the trajectory of just one production in the speech, one can see the changing uses of ideas distributed in diverse relations across the project. These different uses of ideas across distributions resulted in the eventual rearticulation of the speech. Mapping the changed ideas across distributions, as I did with the Production Trajectory Map, does not explain the forces of change, however. What the map does reveal is that the consumption and distribution columns are replete with difference of opinion; yet the production column (the speech itself) is strikingly unified. Mapping exchanges of difference and unity does not explain whether students used these forces and/or whether the forces used them; therefore, I developed a second level of analysis to explain how difference and unity played in the seventh graders' writing. Bakhtin (1981) explained unifying and stratifying forces of language production as centripetal and centrifugal forces.

Second level of analysis: Centripetal and centrifugal forces in writing. Conflict is not evident in the final speech, because it contained deproduction components (Trimbur, 1990) of an essay, yet it was evident when the same ideas were discussed in the classroom. I analyzed tensions evident in the Production Trajectory Map, using centripetal and centrifugal forces as a framework. To examine these forces, I first looked at the speech/essay itself. Could it be considered standard fare? Did it have the intended impact on its audience? As a speech, yes, it was well received. The audience broke out in applause when Paco was finished reading. Board members and audience members approached the youths after the speech and complimented them on their work and Paco's eloquence. A video technician told me, after viewing a videotape of the speech, that Paco could be a politician. As an essay, it passed on the categories used to judge essays in schools: (a) It was written in an appropriate register, and vocabulary and grammar were also appropriate to the address; (b) topics were well introduced and supported; (c) contexts to which the school board did not have access were recontextualized; (d) transitions from one topic to another were smooth, particularly for a speech requiring recontextualization of many contexts (survey distribution, making buildings,

studying Sanders history, etc.); and (e) it appeared unconstructed. If the seventh graders had been evaluated on the essay for their state-wide standardized test, they would have passed. Because Audrie taught the speech as an essay, I examined the speech as an essay. To explain centripetal and centrifugal forces, I asked, What were the standardizing forces at work in students' writing? and What were the forces that stratified?

An obvious unifying force in the students' writing was Audrie's graphic organizer, and I began the second level of analysis with it. The first column of Table 3 is the organizer Audrie provided the seventh graders. Along with it, she provided a "master organizer," with blank lines where students would fill in the topics and supporting details which they brainstormed with their groups. Focus Group B relied heavily on the organizer to write their speech. Their speech is outlined in the second column of Table 3.

Using the Graphic Organizer/Speech Comparison Chart, I noted which parts of the organizer Focus Group B used, which parts they didn't use, and what, in addition to the organizer, they included in their speech. As the chart depicts, the students used all the suggested topics (Introduction, Sanders history, Surveys, Dream school, and Conclusion), in the order suggested. While Audrie had expected students to write only one paragraph for each topic, thereby ending up with a five paragraph essay, Focus Group B veered from this form and wrote nine paragraphs. They also added a greeting and a closing to the overall form, since they were writing a speech. The students did not include 8 of the 27 supporting details Audrie suggested, and they added one detail that Audrie did not suggest. The first finding, using the comparison chart, was that Audrie's direct teaching, using the organizer, was a unifying force in the students' writing. They followed the organizer almost verbatim, thereby appropriating the essay genre with the aid of Audrie's explicit instruction.

Because I wanted to examine unifying and stratifying forces that played in the tensions revealed in the Production Trajectory Map, and the comparison chart revealed mainly a unifying force, I added a third column to the comparison chart, and labeled it Points of Tension (POT). Next, I returned to the Production Trajectory Map and noted where production and use of ideas produced tense articulations in their different distributions. I labeled these productions in the POT column on the Comparison Chart. I compared the play of centripetal and centrifugal forces across the examples, resulting in the following findings.

Table 3
Graphic Organizer/Speech Comparison Chart

Graphic Organizer	Focus Group B Speech (on Appendix A)	POT
I. Introduction	I. Address (Section A) ^b	A-1
Who we represent	II. Introduction (Paragraphs B, C, D)	
Seventh grade	Who we are	
Sanders Middle School	What we want	
Concerned about school's future	Better school	C-5
Funding and power about wishes ^a	Dream built	
Why we are speaking to you	Left alone or turned into landmark	C-7, 8
Share neighborhood's history	Can't have what we want, so . . .	C-9
Tell you what we've researched	Studied school design . . . community	D-11
Share what we've created	Dream, appeal to action	D-13
What we want in dream school	III. Sanders history (E, F, G)	
II. Sanders history	Flood plain	E-16,17
Where located	Place stories	
Significant history/video	Hopes, fears, citizens, gangs	F-19,20
Family ^a	Need building/dream ^b	
Flood plain	Enticement to stay in school ^b	G-21
Place stories	Free from violence	
Need place to congregate ^a	IV. Surveys (Paragraph H)	
III. Surveys	Results and how buildings made	H-24
Results	Results	
Graphs/breakdown results (staff, etc.) ^a	New, fun, safe	
How put together ^a	Pool, football field, track, lab, stores	
Who surveyed	Model schools show results	
How results included in model buildings	V. What we want in school (I, J)	
IV. Dream school	Gang-free, drug free	

(continued)

Table 3 (continued)

Graphic Organizer	Focus Group B Speech (on Appendix A)	POT
Video of Ohio schools ^a	Something to do	
Process of building schools	Not plain, regular school	
What you chose and why ^a	Want school in same neighborhood	J-35
V. Conclusion	Families	
Say you care	VI. Closing (K)	
Explain research done ^a	Who we are	K-37
Explain what you want	We care	K-38
	We are community, want to be heard	K37, 39
	VII. Thank you (L) ^b	

NOTE: POT = points of tension.

a. Not included in students' speech.

b. Not included in Graphic Organizer.

FINDINGS

Unifying Forces

Two unifying forces played in the seventh graders' writing: explicit teaching and genre memory. The most influential unifying force was Audrie's graphic organizer, already mentioned. Just as Jade taught the project because it enabled her to teach the test category, "Structure and Design," Audrie took over the speech-writing because it enabled her to teach an essay, what she perceived to be a major responsibility of her job. Thus, distal forces played in both Audrie's and Jade's teaching, but they played out differently. Both teachers were responsible for teaching particular content, and this responsibility played invisibly but forcefully in the students' writing. The entire content of the students' essay was built in Jade's classroom. It is the effect of her work, how she rearticulated curriculum in her classroom. The form of the students' essay was due to Audrie's explicit teaching, using the organizer.

Focus Group B's speech was also influenced by explicit teaching in Jade's classroom. When the seventh graders spoke to the board, they framed their project as a dream:

We are the seventh graders. . . . We want our dreams to be built. Although we want our school to be left alone, or turned into a historical landmark, we can't have everything we desire. . . . We discovered what our community wanted . . . as well as their dreams. Let us be real though, dreams can't be fully completed. We do not have the technology to do so.

They continued the dream appeal in their presentation of Sanders history, "By creating a dream that can only be seen as a dream, we can provide new activities . . ." and also in their concluding remark, "We want our dreams to be heard."

This framing of the project began in Jade's classroom (A-1):

Margi: To write a speech, to convince the school board of something . . . let's talk about what we'd like to convince the school board of. What demand are you going to make of the school board?

Rocky: That we want a new school.

Margi: [writing Rocky's idea on overhead] . . . What if they don't have control of that? Why don't they have control of that?

John: . . . Not only the school board doesn't have control, the community doesn't.

Margi: . . . The school board doesn't have any control over how much money they've got . . . so you need to make an argument for what you want and it depends on the results of the survey. But one of the great questions that came up yesterday is, What happens if we don't get what we want? First you have to find out, what can you get? . . . What are some things you can get? You have to set some goals. Some goals you can get, some goals you can dream. [I write two columns on the overhead] What are some, some you can get? [point to get column] Some that you want? [point to want column]

Tyrone: For ones that we want, a swimming pool.

Rocky: You can get more books.

Tyrone: [referring to his pool idea, which I was writing on the overhead] That's more a want, not a get.

Margi: You might be able to ask them things like, at least upgrade what we've got.

[and so on]

Focus Group B took up the idea, from class discussions, of approaching their project as a dream they couldn't have in its entirety. They also relied on "genre memory" to make the dream, in Audrie's words, "pull on those heartstrings." Genre memory is the concept Bakhtin used to explain Dostoevsky's use of carnivalistic forms when Dostoevsky did not know, firsthand, of carnival (Morson & Emerson, 1990). Bakhtin concluded that genres hold memory; hence, it was not important to understand what influenced a writer but how generic tradition was continued and through what mechanisms (Morson & Emerson, 1990). The generic traditions of the essay and speech were passed along through explicit instruction; however, students' knowledge of both speeches and essays involved other genres and was distributed, in part, via those genres. For instance, Paco had acted in the play *Inherit the Wind*, a play in which speeches figure prominently. Paco's knowledge of the delivery and reception of speeches, which he shared with his group, was further distributed to writers in Focus Group A by Audrie (C, 5-9):

What I was talking to [Paco's group] about was, trying to pull on those heartstrings. Paco was kidding about putting soap in his eyes so his eyes would get all teary when he goes up there, but you know, really, your intro is what's going to make it or break it, because you want to pull those people in, make sure that they're going to listen to the rest of what you're saying. It's in the first couple seconds that they're going to

decide whether or not they're going to listen to you or not. So you really want to say some things here that make them want to hear what you have to say down there.

Speeches in Paco's experience were recounted by Paco and then by Audrie. Strategy was distributed in Audrie's informal writing lesson about the technique, pulling on heartstrings. Genre memory also took up representational space, as a fixed form. The "down there" Audrie referred to was the graphic organizer students were writing on. She explicitly taught the essay by providing organizers, a form of memory. Genre memory was also continued through Audrie's past instruction. The following essay, written by Paco, follows the five paragraph format Audrie taught, whereby students were to line out three topics they'd discuss in the first paragraph, discuss them in the second through fourth paragraphs, and recap the three topics in the fifth paragraph:

The building project meant a lot too me. You really have to work together. Talking was a large necessity. It helped to have patience. The project would help in the future.

Working together was a large part of the project. A lot of the people get on your nerves. A lot of jobs got done due to workings of the whole group. It helped meet our requirements. The job was hard but I did it.

Talking was just as important. Associating helped get the work done. Talking help rise ideas. Its good to talk. Talking was basicly the whole project.

Patiance was the biggest part. It was the key to making it all work. Patiance helped you get ideas. It helped you understand. It even helped to calm yourself.

The building project really meant a lot to me. Patiance, talking, and working together were the most important things. those 3 things got the work done.

In "What the project meant to me," Paco followed what Audrie called "the basic format of an essay." Audrie felt students should first learn this format before they "veer off and do all the funky stuff." There's no funky stuff in "What the project meant to me." Structure prevails. Audrie's organizer structured the speech similarly. She expected five suggested topics would result in five paragraphs. Focus Group B divvied up the five topics of the organizer after first meeting as a group to compile lists of ideas for the five sections on a master organizer. Once the master list was complete, students used the notes

to write individual sections. Paco wrote the introduction, Joseph wrote the Sanders information, Shakir wrote the survey results, and Janet, Joann, and Mary wrote about the buildings (rearticulated as "What we want in a school"), with Janet choosing to write alone. (Michelle did not write because she chose, instead, to paint a picture of their model building, which Audrie wanted done for an Open House.) When Audrie responded, in writing, to Focus Group B's draft, Paco took her suggestions and revised the essay. Audrie had only one suggestion, that paragraph K be moved from the introduction to the conclusion. The organizer and Audrie's comments were centripetal forces that helped the students organize ideas as an essay. The organizer demanded a certain structure. Students supplied the appropriate information, but they also veered off and did some funky stuff. The appeal to the dream, compared to the stiff structure of the "What the project meant to me" essay, was funky and effective. Genre memory of essays and speeches provided rhetorical resources for both use of and veering from form. Centripetal (unifying) and centrifugal (stratifying) forces operated in tandem as Focus Group B appropriated the essay and speech genres.

The Play of Unifying and Stratifying Forces as Strategic Dearticulation/Rearticulation

The essay, as finally written, is organized, flows, is well supported with details, and recontextualizes several contexts for the school board. However, the essay is not stiffly structural, as Paco's "What the project meant to me" essay is. An examination of the tensions in the POT column in Table 3 suggest that writing the essay required strategic use of dearticulation/rearticulation, so that the essay/speech would reveal the complexity of the project while simultaneously veiling difference. In the classroom, ideas took divergent paths and difference was expected. In the students' appropriation of the essay/speech, they chose unity over diversity and used different strategies to effect cohesion. Strategies were (a) emotional appeal, (b) veiling contradictions, and (c) interdiscursive alliances.

Emotional appeal. In some cases, disarticulation of ideas from texts in the classroom, rearticulated in the speech, had emotional appeal. Ideas that added to the emotional appeal of the speech include D-13, "But we, as the United States of America, can make something so close that it would not only please this community, but possibly show Ohio that we are taking action," and E-17, "Not many wealthy people

enter our community." These ideas were linked to different texts and articulated in different sets of relations in the classroom. Early in the project, students watched a video on disparity of school funding in Ohio. The class discussed the video and also discussed the Building Project as a means of having a say about their new school. After these discussions, students wrote whether they wanted to continue with the project, in journals. They wrote such things as, "I want to make a difference," and "I want the future of Ohio to be wonderful." These sentiments were delinked from earlier classroom texts and articulated, anew, in Idea D-13 of Group B's speech. In delinking and relinking their ideas, they rearticulated reality as an imagined community that extended across the country. Similar delinking and relinking occurred in Idea E-17. In this case, the students plagiarized a line from a video on Sanders and linked it to the idea they were developing, that Sanders was corrupt. Stating that "not many people enter our community" pulls on the heartstrings and positions the school board in such a way that they cannot turn their backs on the youths. The students articulated their own relations with the school board by delinking an idea linked to different relations on the video.

Idea K-37, "We are doing something not many people would even attempt. Not many people would even try to share their options with the leaders of the school administration" was articulated in a different set of relations when Audrie first produced the idea in the classroom. Audrie, upset with the class for wasting time when she had been absent, used the idea to warn the students of the largesse of the speech: "When I see you are slacking off, it upsets me. Because this is not only going to reflect on you but it's going to reflect on us. There are not many students in this district to go to this board room and speak their mind." Proximal and distal forces operated for Audrie, and her worries were linked to relations the seventh graders were probably not aware of. The actual speech, which would occur as face-to-face interaction, was a proximal force. Audrie did not want to be embarrassed in front of her employers. The effectiveness of the speech, however, was tied to distal forces of Audrie's curriculum and how she rearticulated it in her classroom. Audrie would be judged by distal forces of standardization. The board would expect the students' presentation to cohere, and they would judge Audrie on its coherence. Thus, genre memory would operate for the board, too.

On the same day Audrie reprimanded the class for wasting time, Janet disarticulated Audrie's warning from the relations in which they were articulated and added this idea to her writing group's

master organizer: "Not many children would do this. *We want to be heard.*" Rearticulated, yet again, in the closing of the speech, the students created a set of relations which asked the board to take them seriously. Students used the same idea that Audrie produced, and they addressed the same board. They rearticulated a set of powerful relations by delinking the idea from Audrie's worries and the relations of those worries.

Veiling contradictions. The essay, as a product, bears only a few traces of conflict or contradiction. Three mechanisms of veiling contradictions are evident: (a) creating an illusion of cohesion through use of the word *we*, (b) collapsing difference, and (c) embedding contradiction with other details to mask its impact.

(a) Uses of the word *we* occur throughout the essay. In K-38, "We really care about our school," Group B speaks for all the seventh graders; however, the care they speak of was a surprise to Kylene (K-38) and not always true of all the Sanders community, including parents (B-3). While the seventh graders wrote, "We learned what the community wanted" (H-4), 60% of the student body was not surveyed (D-11). Focus Group B disarticulated differences of opinion in the classroom and rearticulated ideas as a united front.

(b) Veiling contradiction was achieved, also, by collapsing difference. In the following excerpt, the class is discussing the student body's response to the surveys. Paco does not believe the board will listen to "little kids":

Mariah: They [student body] wanted to know, uh, after [can't hear tape].

Jade: We don't know. That's a hard question. Did you hear that? They wanted to know what's going to happen after it goes to the school board. That's a hard question cause we don't know, we're hoping, obviously that we get some results, right? Okay, John.

John: The girls that me and [fellow student] did, they were all like, why should we fill this out . . . and me and [student] were standing there trying to tell them, but nobody'd listen: If, you see with your cooperation, you think it's important, then you've got to tell them, maybe we can get it, and they're uu-uu-uuu-uu-uu.

Paco: They [the school board] don't care about what we want.

Jade: Oh, I don't know.

Paco: Little kids.

Jade: Do you think that if we presented in a very organized fashion that they might listen at least?

Paco: [Shakes head no]

Jade: Are they expecting, are they expecting anybody from Sanders Middle School to say anything?

John: NO.

Jade: To, come down?

Paco: [can't hear tape]

Jade: I don't think they're going to expect to see us, so.

Gemini: Our school board sucks.

Student: [hard guffaw]

Jade: Gemini, you don't even know.

Gemini: Yes I do!

Paco was not the only SMS student who believed the board would not listen to "little kids." When Jade first introduced the project to students, one student asked, "Why are we going to do all this work if they're not going to listen to us?" According to John, this was also the immediate reaction of some of the student body when the seventh graders administered the surveys. Group B veiled the uncertainty students felt about the school board by collapsing diverse opinion. The issue, for the students, was their status as "kids." When Group B referred to themselves in the speech as children (what Paco didn't want to be viewed as), they used the term strategically, linking children to community dreams (D-11). They otherwise referred to themselves as people.

Idea G-21, "By creating a dream that can only be seen as a dream, we can provide new activities. More children will be enticed to stay," was also disarticulated from diverse opinions in the classroom. In this example, the class had been analyzing survey results. John argued that the school board needed to know about what kids wanted:

John: I think they [the school board] would have a vote for students because the teachers are just going to teach the students, but students got to have something they think they would go for if [cannot hear tape]. Kids are going to stop coming, but if you give them something to work for, [cannot hear tape].

Jade: [Smiling and almost cheering] Alright John! That's very . . .

Rocky: [claps]

Mariah: Well said.

Jade: That's very well said. That's odd. So do you think that would be the case here at Sanders?

Paco: [Shakes head no]

John: Yeah.

Jade: I don't know, I'm just asking.

John: I know I would come to school if . . .

Jade: So if you have something to shoot for you?

John: I work harder.

Jade: You work harder. . . . You might want to tell the school board that.

Many of the students were moved by John's words. Paco was not. He doubted that more activities would entice Sanders students to come to school. Yet Focus Group B disarticulated John's idea from the classroom and linked it to their explanation of Sanders' needs. By linking an unspoken problem of truancy (more people will be enticed to stay) to activities and a safe place, Group B had convincing content to add to the "dream" they were building.

(c) Contradiction was not fully veiled in the following example; instead, it was buried in other details to reduce its impact. The one result in the survey, which John noted was "big" when the class first tallied up the result, was that 83% of those surveyed did not want a new school; they wanted SMS remodeled. Focus Group B tucked this very political finding inside the introductory paragraph, separate from findings from the survey (paragraph H). They downplayed this political survey result yet further by stating that they couldn't have all they desired: "Although we want our school to be left alone, or turned into a historical landmark, we can't have everything we desire" (C-7 through 9). This was the diciest detail to convey to the board, and the students conveyed it by embedding it among other details.

Intertextual and interdiscursive alliances. Focus group B had several texts to choose from to write their speech. Some of the texts they linked together by recounting the order of activities in the classroom. In the section on the survey results, for instance, they did not link ideas across discourses; instead they recounted what the class did, the materials used in their buildings, and the results of the survey. The construction of the Sanders section, however, links texts and discourses. Corruption, flood plains, lack of wealth, gangs, and the future are linked. This is sophisticated writing. The students constructed a history, a cohesion of linked texts and discourses:

The west side is the oldest part of this city. It is a corrupted area. Flood plains are dangerous areas which makes it hard to build and renovate. A floodwall may soon be finished in our area. When it is completed, we can begin to make this a better place. More people will want to live in the area with no worry of floods. Not many wealthy people enter our community.

Our community was once safe by having a barrier formed by hopes of many citizens. Gangs started to infiltrate. The barrier of hope was saturated by gangs. In the battle between hope and fear, fear's winning.

By creating a dream that can only be seen as a dream, we can provide new activities. More children will be enticed to stay. We want our school to be a place where we can feel safe from outside violence. We have come up with some ideas that might bring our community together.

The history the students wrote was scaffolded by Audrie's graphic organizer. While they omitted mention of their families and needing a place to congregate, they used the flood plain (E-16), Sanders video (E-17), and place stories (F, G). They delinked what they'd learned about the flood wall from different texts used in Jade's classroom, understanding that its construction was necessary to economic growth in Sanders. The link to wealthy people not entering Sanders is their own link, taken from a different articulation in the Sanders video. They chose, also, to tell the story of Sanders as a story of gangs and lost hope, even though the Sanders video and the "place stories" the seventh graders wrote related diverse experiences of Sanders. Of the 57 place stories written by the three classes of seventh graders, only 4 actually discussed gang activity. Focus Group B linked paragraphs together cohesively by delinking texts and discourses from different articulated relations. Links between the flood wall, corruption, and violence flow "naturally," as though they were constructed together. One telling of history stood in for a number of possible histories, partly because Group B successfully linked texts and discourses and partly because the organizer provided the links.

Summary

Unifying and stratifying forces were positive forces in the seventh graders' writing. The seventh graders recontextualized many contexts, strategically linking and delinking ideas in order to effect a unity and rearticulate a reality in which they had a say in their lives. The essay/speech is a reality made up of a network of texts, discourses, and geographies. By comparison, the essay written for essay-writing's sake ("What the project meant to me") does not seem to live in relations. Life is sucked right out of it.

Dearticulating and rearticulating ideas from previous distributed relations enabled the seventh graders to play in the process of hegemony. Centripetal and centrifugal forces worked in tandem,

motivating the seventh graders to appropriate the essay/speech as more than a structure. As Paco said, "After all this work, I want the school board to know." The seventh graders had learned a lot and had much to tell the board. Their teachers paved the way. The essay was not written within the 2 weeks when "writing workshop" occurred. It was a rearticulation of many texts and relationships, which changed constantly as ideas were produced and consumed in this example of a game of social life.

DISCUSSION

Limitations

The findings from this research are influenced by a major limitation of the research design, a limitation which Grossberg (1992) cautioned can happen with analyses of power. Framing an event as both a practice and an effect means that the researcher works with at least two planes of social life: that which is concrete and that which is abstract. A major goal of articulating an event is to make concrete the many contexts engaged within it. I wanted to consider, for instance, not only visible forces in writing but invisible ones. As a researcher's explanations become more abstract, however, one risks moving too far away from observable data to explain how power operates at a concrete level. Grossberg explains, "The more abstract the description, the less it tells about the concrete articulations and their effects, about any specific context" (p. 61).

Mapping the production trajectory enabled an explanation of the specific contexts of the Building Project, but the method did not enable me to make many connections to more abstract contexts. Whereas I was able to demonstrate many of the contexts the seventh graders recontextualized via emotional appeal, veiling contradiction, and intertextual and interdiscursive alliances, I was able to make only a few connections between the visible context and the history of the essay in schools. That history is a major source of tension for teachers, but my data, as framed, had only one teaching connection to it: Audrie's relationship to the school board (as a language arts teacher). For students, I was able to make a connection between genre memory and history; however, this connection did not reveal tensions. I trust that the history of the essay in schools is more complex (and more tense) than this report reveals.

A second limitation to the research is the manner in which I framed the speech as an essay. Audrie taught the speech as an essay, and the students clearly had success in writing the speech/essay because of that instruction. However, a speech is surely not the same genre as a school essay, precisely because a speech gets distributed to people, and an essay often gets distributed to a teacher and, in some classrooms (including Audrie's), to peers. Students' changing knowledge about the audience to whom their speech would be distributed was a major force in their writing. I am not sure that similar articulations and rearticulations of contexts, which enabled the seventh graders to write so successfully, would have occurred if there had never been an intention to present the students' work to the school board. Hence, whereas I found that centripetal and centrifugal forces worked positively in the seventh graders' writing, via their strategies to unify diversity of opinion, it is possible these forces may not have come into play if the project had not been framed as one which would end in an address to the school board.

This second limitation presents an interesting implication, however. Audrie, who fretted over teaching essays, wanted to mail all 12 speeches to the school board when the speech was suppressed. In Audrie's view, the students wrote successful essays, and she wanted the board to read them. If, in fact, teachers are responsible for teaching essays and worry over this responsibility, research on hybridity (e.g., Gutierrez, Rymes, & Larson, 1995; Kamberelis, 2001; Leander, 1999) could be extended to include tactical hybridization of genres. Audrie and the seventh graders found success in this approach.

A final limitation to this research is that a focus on only one essay suggests that all essays were produced similarly. They were not. Other seventh graders used different strategies to make their ideas palatable to the school board. A cross-essay analysis would yield yet further results but is beyond the scope of this research.

CONCLUSIONS

Ideas in the students' essay lived in a social world. The players in that world affected the production of ideas and their consumption. Ideas never stopped in time and never solidified as singular meanings; they were always redistributed in further relations, as they were consumed. Students' thinking about their ideas in relation to others

involved them in processes of production, consumption, and distribution, simultaneously.

There was always a shifting compromise (Appadurai, 1986) in the production trajectory of writing, and the shift had to do with redistribution of ideas as students became engaged, day after day, in the project. Shifts in production/consumption were not coincidental; they involved students' own linking, delinking, and relinking of their ideas. Before ideas settled, for a time, as an essay, they had gone through numerous articulations and rearticulations. Whereas the students' changing view of their audience played a role in their shifting compromises, learning also played a role. Students were not merely producing a piece of writing over 8 weeks. They were learning about the school closure issue, about the structure and design of buildings, about the history of Sanders, and about the economy of Sanders and other Ohio communities. Learning had an effect on their writing. Their shifting compromises—both their attempts at cohesion and their diverse opinions and feelings—changed over time. Whereas in the beginning of the project, many students did not trust that the board would listen to “little kids,” by the end of the project, the scales tipped. Whether the board would listen to them was not the issue; the issue was that students had information to report. They were proud of their work, of what they learned. They had actual content to convey and expected the board to listen. This was a major shift, not only in their sense of the board, but in the relations they made and the reality they articulated.

The analysis of the students' essay sheds some light on the tensions of centrifugal and centripetal forces in the students' writing. Tensions in writing were a relational issue, an issue of distribution as well as consumption. Tensions engaged, historically, with expectations of the genres of the speech and essay. History of the school essay was represented in the graphic organizer. History of the speech occurred in conversations about the project but also in genre memory passed along in students' experiences of speeches, embedded in different genres. The centripetal and centrifugal forces that played in the seventh graders' writing were standardizing forces. Standardization is a lively process that includes forces of history, through people's expectations of a genre, and forces of striving—to make sense, to make known, to be known. These forces worked positively for the seventh graders.

Macro discussions of power and literacy usually explain damaging effects of literacy. In such discussions, students like those at Sanders rarely come out on top. While such critiques are eye-opening, they

often do not explain how or whether economically disadvantaged kids can succeed with school writing at school. This research suggests that learning essayist writing is not only possible but worthwhile and not contingent on knowing the right discourse. For the seventh graders, using the right discourse developed with writing itself. Writing was contingent on a classroom context in which time was devoted to students' uncertainty. Writing developed out of uncertainty, and certainty developed out of writing.

APPENDIX **Production Trajectory Map**

Idea Produced	Description of Use	Description of Distribution
A (1) Superintendent, members of the school board	T: 1/20/p. 18: Margi asks sts if they believe school will be replaced. Some "hope it will."	Margi situates sts in question of project: SB and decisions about SMS kids.
	T: 1/20/p. 20: Jade asks sts if School Board has been to SMS. Sts do not believe SB has been there.	Jade plants idea that school board may not have been inside the building they voted to replace. School Board is, at this point, an unknown entity to sts.
	T: 1/29/pp. 10-11: Talking about surveys. John: But we don't want the school board to vote for us, we want the community, students, teachers, staff.	SB relations to students remains uncertain; issues of representation. (Should SB represent sts?)
	T: 2/2/pp. 9-10: Talking about having distributed surveys to student body and teachers: Mariah: They wanted to know, after . . . Jade: . . . after it goes to SB? John: [talking about telling student body about SB] . . . you got to tell them. Paco: They don't care what we want. Jade: Oh, I don't know. Paco: Little kids	Distribution uncertain. Mariah expresses sts' care. John feels secure in voice; telling SB what SMS kids want, but frustrated that other student body does not have that confidence. Paco doubts SB cares and thinks the SB thinks of seventh graders as "little kids." Distribution of sts-SB relations precarious, uncertain, powerful, and powerless.
	T: 2/2/p. 12: Talking about what kids want: John: I think they should have a vote for students. . . . Students got to have something they think they would go for. Jade tells sts they should tell the SB that.	John resituates his interests in distribution of SB-sts relations. The resituating depends on SB knowing what kids want. The survey is thus important.

T: 2/3/pp. 10-12: Margi reviewing project to date: Margi: The school board, they don't have any control over how much money they've got . . . so you need to make an argument for what you want and it depends on the results of the survey. . . . What are some things you can get? You have to set some goals. Rocky: Repair the structure. Margi: . . . Good. So you can ask for that, and you should demand that. Jade: [changing subject] The board may not know how to get to Sanders. Zacharia: Well, we'll show them.

2/6/p. 7: Discussing what needs to get done with survey analysis: Paco: Then we have to bring all these reports to the board? Jade: . . . Paco: After all this work, I want the school board to know."

2/25/pp. 4-6: Jade introduces a graphic organizer, for beginning to draft speech, to sts: Jade: They need to know who you are, why are here . . . S: What is the board for? Jade: . . . Gemini: Where is the school board?

Margi situates sts' relations to SB in economic situation: there's not money available for sts to get all they want. They need to be strategic, and make demands on what they can get. This conversation lends to notion of having a say and this attitude is evident when Zacharia tells Jade, confidently, that they'll "show them" [the board] how to get to SMS.

Paco situates "work" in SB relations; he wants them to know what the class has done. It's as though this work SHOULD be distributed to others, that they should know what the SMS students did. Work is valued, and Paco resituates his position with a SB he has gone in and out of trusting.

In the speech, the sts need to make clear their relationship to the board. Who they are and why they're there will establish that relationship, will distribute student ideas to the SB. After so much discussion about the SB, a student returns to uncertainty about who they are. Gemini wants to know where they are. As speech nears, sense of distributed relations are not as sure as often expressed earlier.

(continued)

APPENDIX (continued)

Idea Produced	Description of Use	Description of Distribution
	2/27/pp. 8-9: Group A debating info to write down for speech: Gemini: She won't put down my idea. Rocky: Well you don't, I don't know how to put that . . . Gemini: You don't know how to put . . . Rocky: Put that in a more professional way.	Rocky's search for "the right register" indicates her knowledge of her position with the SB. Gemini does not consider register a problem, which suggests a simpatico with the SB that Rocky does not believe exists.
B (2) We are seventh graders from a middle school on the west side of [Crayton]. We understand we are not to mention names at this time,	M: SB form for citizens who want to speak. Margi shows Paco the form, tells him to think of a way to let SB know which school the speech refers to without saying school name. Paco signs the form, saying he won't say school name, and we send it to SB.	Paco accepts the logic behind the form by signing it. The logic is completely invisible to Margi and to Paco. Citizens cannot say names of schools when addressing the SB about schools. Paco and seventh graders become part of a set of distrustful SB-public relations.
(3) but we are highly concerned with our school's fate.	T: 2/2/pp. 9-10: Talking about distributing surveys to classrooms: Zacharia: They wanted to know results . . . Mariah: They wanted to know, after [it goes to the school board] T: 2/2/p. 13: Talk about distributing surveys to families: Mariah: My mom said it's about time someone did something about SMS. John: That's what my grandmother said. Rocky: [My mom], she said I don't want to hear about [can't hear]. Janet: That's what my mom said. Jade: your parents really said that? They don't care about the school?	"They" reported in this class discussion is the student body. Now they are implicated in the relations to the school board and they want to know what the board will do with the seventh graders' information. School issue gets distributed to families. There's difference of opinion, though, about what concerns community. Concern is not unified, nor is community.

(4) This is the one middle school that [Crayton] recommended to be replaced.	Recommendation made via six neighborhoods meeting over 6 months.	Decision was distributed among all of Crayton, via neighborhood groups. Recommendation accepted by SB.
C (5) We are in need of a better school.	<p>M: 1/21: Sts' positive/negative lists about video they watched on Ohio schools and on SMS (positive lists include larger lunch rooms, some stores, pretty atriums . . . ; negative lists include, cracks in walls, no locks on lockers).</p> <p>T: 1/21/p. 9: Discussion of video: S: We're getting cheated.</p> <p>M: 1/28: 29 items generated and listed on chalkboard, to be voted on to appear on survey.</p> <p>M: 1/29: The survey: T: 1/29/p. 4: Talk about the new survey. Jade: So this is our survey. This is what we're going to hand out to the students, to your parents, to your friends, to your grandparents . . .</p> <p>T: 2/5/p. 12: Sts and Jade are analyzing survey results: Tyrone: Are these [results for] students? Jade: Tyrone brings up a very good question. Do you think teachers' surveys are going to look the same, the same type of number for each thing? Tyrone: They's want, they would like counseling stuff, they won't want a pool.</p> <p>(6) We want our dreams to be built.</p>	<p>Through video and sts' lists of positives and negatives on video and also in SMS, sts situate their education with others in Ohio.</p> <p>One sts sees his schooling as different (and unfair) from others. Video distributes knowledge of inequity.</p> <p>List of items, not distributed yet; sts seem very bored with generating this list for survey.</p> <p>Now sts ideas (to be voted on by community members) have taken form. Not yet distributed, but seed planted.</p> <p>Tyrone's question situates differences in student and teacher interests. A "better school" may not be the same thing for teachers and students. A "better school" reveals difference when students talk about survey items and particular wants. "We" in the speech is not the same we of the distributed idea in discussions of survey results.</p>

(continued)

APPENDIX (continued)

Idea Produced	Description of Use	Description of Distribution
(7) Although we want our school to be left alone,	T: 2/6/p. 10: Class analyzing survey results from "community" (parents and relatives): Jade: Okay, remodel 83 and replace, only 31. St: That surprises me. Jade: Actually, it did surprise me with the community. Gemini: They don't want a new school. Jade: Right . . . so number 1, they wanted to remodel and number 2, update technology. Same exact things as students and teachers wanted, same as the community. John: So that's going to be a big thing. Jade: That's going to be big. . . .	One example, in essay and in classroom, where "we" is unified: students, teachers, and parents all want the school left alone. The "bigness" of this result is bigness in relation to the finding's distribution. The bigness was big enough that, when posted on large pie graphs in seventh graders' hallway, and the city superintendent saw the finding there, the speech was stopped immediately after her visit to SMS, where she was invited to see the seventh graders at work. Distribution beyond the classroom would be "big."
(8) or turned into a historical landmark,	M: Sanders history booklet. M: Sanders neighborhood planning book. Sts read history booklet day after writing "place stories." The booklet had historical landmarks such as a cemetery and a baseball field. Some sts read the neighborhood planning book while writing speeches. It too discussed landmarks, suggesting the two possible landmarks were schools in Sanders. The planning book opted for preservation of schools.	Never a discussion in whole class discussions, these ideas were taken from sts' reading of the two Sanders' texts. Sts' use of the idea of historical preservation indicates their claiming a past and a future, within long-lasting city/Sanders relations. They position themselves, past and present.
(9) we can't have everything we desire.	T: 2/3/pp. 10-12: Talking about what's feasible and what isn't, in what sts can get from SB: [After discussion of some "wants," swimming pool, and some "can gets," repair holes in walls]: Margi: Tell them what your dream is, and that will be what your model [building model] represents, so the person who does that part of the speech will tell the board, our model represents our dream. We know you can't give us that, but we do want this.	Once again, question is question of who the SB is. Who they are is who Crayton is. The SB works with a budget that's in the red; Margi attempts to help sts position themselves not only with people, but with an economic reality of Crayton Schools. Conversation is about what sts should demand, even within budgetary restraints. Distribution of idea is at once relational and economic.

C 5-9	T: 2/27/p. 13: Audrie recounts Paco's story about Inherit the Wind: A: . . . but you know, really, your into is what's going to make or break it, because you want to pull those people in. . . . It's in the first couple seconds they're going to decide whether or not they're going to listen . . .	
D (10) Over the winter, our class studied school issues and building designs.	[Occurs across project.]	
(11) We discovered what our community wanted for their children, as well as their dreams.	T: 1/29/p. St: What will happen if the punk eighth graders . . . What will happen if some punks . . . Say we give somebody the survey and they don't take it and they rip it up?	Sts' feeling for all of st body is not cohesive. Some sts didn't take the survey; one group of boys played basketball as their teacher filled out the survey.
	T: 2/6/p. 14 Jade: Right . . . attendance is a big problem. We'd have close to 600 [student surveys] if all were here. How many didn't take the survey? John: 245. Tyrone: 245 were gone? Jade: Well some refused to take it.	Sts ideas about community and what they want are not unified. Sts do not see student body as unified and only 59% of student body community is represented in the notion of "what community wanted."
(12) Let us be real, though. Dreams can't be fully completed. We do not have the technology to do so,	Interview with Paco: His imagination for the dream is a Disney-tech world that he doesn't see as possible.	

(continued)

APPENDIX (continued)

Idea Produced	Description of Use	Description of Distribution
(13) but we, as a part of the United States of America, can make something so close that it would not only please this community, but possibly show Ohio that we are taking action.	M: 1/21: Ohio schools video M: 1/26: Sts' written response to Census Data, Sanders History blurb, and Margi's question, Do you want to do the project? S: "I want to make a difference. I want the future of Ohio to be cool." S: "I think we should have a vote in this. Since we are the ones who its effected." S: "[The project] . . . its trying to make you help schools be better at raising materials for the schools and also that we as a community can help." S: "I wanna make a difference. I want the future of Ohio to be wonderful. . . . This is our future."	Both materials incite political interest in sts, to "make a difference" to larger community.
E (14) The west side is the oldest part of this city.	M: 2/4 Sanders history booklet	A detail in a book but not discussed in class. Sts used the info from the book.
(15) It is a corrupted area.	M: 2/3 Sts' "place stories," stories they wrote about living in Sanders. "trash everywhere" "ghetto" "trash" T: 2/27/p9B: Group B doing organizer for speech Shakir: I put, kids vandalize buildings. Joe: I think there's nothing to do here. Janet: He said, our area is known as the ghetto. Michelle: [laughs] Paco: We live in the ghetto. Joann: The ghetto [laughs] Paco: Broke down ghettos.	In classroom relations, can laugh at idea of "ghetto" but distributed to SB, the state of Sanders is made to sound seriously flawed.

(16) Flood plains are dangerous areas which makes it hard to build and renovate. A floodwall may soon be finished in our area. When it is completed, we can begin to make this a better place.

M: 1/26 Sanders neighborhood plan T: 1/26/p. 5 (Jade scripts my lesson; no recorders this day) Rocky: What land is worth. Zacharia: Zero. St: Everyone will want to live there. Paco: People think place is a rathole. St: No one will want to live here.

First introduction of floodwall and dispersal among class does not demonstrate understanding of relationship between life style and flow of goods in and out of Sanders. Sts situate the information into negative attitude about Sanders.

T: 2/3/ p. 13 Reminding sts of Sanders geography, before writing place stories: Margi: . . . So you've got this peninsula surrounded by a river. John: Flood plain! [read and discussed 1/26] Margi: . . . That's right, so there hasn't been building here, so that means there hasn't been money here. Or, that means there hasn't been much going into Sanders . . .

Resituating Sanders stories in development (and lack of development) issues.

T: 2/27/pp. 11-12 B: Audrie talks to Group B as they gather notes for their speech: Audrie: . . . the flood wall, if that is built, it's going to keep the flood out . . . Shakir: I had that written down here. Paco: Wait a minute, if we get flooded and we build a wall . . . it's still raining, wouldn't that just flood us anyway? Audrie: The problem is the river overflows. Paco: Oooohhhh. Audrie: . . . why do you think we want to put more money into this community? Paco: Like to get a good school. Audrie: Right, or just to make it a better place to live, right? We want nicer, cleaner places. Paco: We want the flood wall.

Sts have different understandings of floodwall and what it will do for Sanders. At this point, Paco sees significance of the floodwall to Sanders development.

(continued)

APPENDIX (continued)

Idea Produced	Description of Use	Description of Distribution
(17) More people will want to live in the area with no worry of floods. Not many wealthy people enter our community.	M: 2/4 Video on Sanders: (Changed opinion from 1/29.) Direct quote from video: "Not many wealthy people enter our community."	Previous articulations of floodwall (prior to speech writing) did not relate dispersal of goods and people to the flood wall. Focus Group B now linked issues, intertextually, as they were brought up in different texts in project (video, discussion, and Sanders neighborhood plan).
F (18) Our community was once safe by having a barrier formed by hopes of many citizens.	M: 2/3 57 Place Stories written by students across three classes. Most stories speak positively about Sanders. Two mention need for safety.	Place stories distributed to all three classes, as they're posted on bulletin board. Experience of Sanders is diverse. Focus Group B chose negative aspects to distribute to SB.
(19) Gangs started to infiltrate.	M: 2/3 57 Place Stories: Four stories mention violence and gangs.	Group B makes use of gangs, choosing to sensationalize Sanders experience OR highlight certain experiences above others.
(20) The barrier of hope was saturated by gangs. In the battle between hope and fear, fear's winning.	M: 2/3 Place Stories in Focus Class only: Topic analysis of place stories in focus class: Gangs, no peace; boring; community center and churches keep kids off street; community itself important; trash; change schools—clean, repair, and more fun; need safe place to go. Group B turns these experiences into a battle between hope and fear.	Argument is made more convincing, more necessary, when placed in community relations of speech.

<p>G (21) By creating a dream that can only be seen as a dream, we can provide new activities. More children will be enticed to stay.</p>	<p>M: 2/3 Place Stories: Sts want school to have more activities, more fun things to do.</p>	<p>Reararticulate several feelings written in place stories, in new distribution.</p>
	<p>T: 2/2/p. 12: Talking about surveys: John: I think they should have a vote for students . . . students got to have something they think that they would go for . . . kids are going to stop comin', but if you give them something to work for . . . Jade: Alright John! That's very . . . Rocky: [claps] Mariah: Well said. J: That's very well said. That's odd. So do you think that would be the case at Sanders? Paco: [shakes head no] John: YEAH. Jade: I don't know, I'm just asking. John: I know I would come to school if . . . Jade: So if you have something to shoot for . . . John: I work harder.</p>	<p>In distribution to SB, Paco reverses his earlier position, in classroom (2/2), when he did not believe new activities would get Sanders students to attend school. Belief/disbelief depends on material effects of distribution.</p>
<p>(22) We want our school to be a place where we can feel safe from outside violence.</p>	<p>M: 2/3 Place Stories</p>	
<p>(23) We have come up with some ideas that might bring our community together.</p>	<p>(Ideas written in next paragraph.)</p>	

APPENDIX (continued)

Idea Produced	Description of Use	Description of Distribution
H (24) Our class surveyed the entire school and our parents. We learned what the community wanted.	M: 59% of student body surveyed. Some absent and some present. Unknown percentage of parents, but not all students returned parent surveys. T: 2/2/p. 7: Talking about distributing surveys: Destiny: Nobody took it but Mr. —. Jade: The teacher took it but none of they guys took it. Isn't that interesting? Destiny: They were playing basketball. . . . Jade: Now, Mrs. — had her advisory in the gym, right? St: Half the gym. Jade: Now, Mrs. —, they all took it. Rocky: Except for one.	Distribution of survey wasn't as complete as stated in speech.
(25) We took these results and made dream schools. We made models of our schools. We used lots of materials to show details in what our school is interested in.	M: Model buildings	
(26) People want something new, fun, and safe.	M: 1/27 Ohio video discussion M: 2/3 Survey result discussion M: 2/3 5 place stories	Discussed in relation to each Material.

	(27) We would also like a swimming pool, football field with track, a computer lab, and nicer stores.	M: 1/21 Video of Ohio schools and wish lists Student wish lists: want swimming pool, computer labs, good cafeterias, stores inside schools. Stores aren't voted as a "community" interest on survey.	Focus B adds one more desire, to survey results. One group also built this desire into their model building. (It had a McDonalds on site.)
	(28) The schools that my classmates are holding are just a few of the schools our class designed.	6/1: speech The sts are not holding as many schools as intended. When speech suppressed, only two of four buildings the student body voted to go to the SB were left at the school.	No discussion of missing schools, missing representations, within this distributed mention of the model school representations.
I	(29) We need a gang free and drug free school.	Reiterated.	
	(30) We need something to do during and after school.	Reiterated.	
	(31) We need more activities.	Reiterated.	
	(32) We don't want a plain regular school like other middle schools. We want a better school,	M: 1/21: Video on Ohio schools ideas for different kinds of schools, some not plain and regular.	Came up in whole class discussion, filling in positive/negative charts about what they saw on video. Followed by a "wish list," what sts would want in a new school.

(continued)

APPENDIX (continued)

Idea Produced	Description of Use	Description of Distribution
(33) but we want it in the same neighborhood in the same area.	T: 1/20/p. 18: Introducing school closure issue to sts. Margi: . . . it's said that this school will be closed down and rebuilt over at the Chicago School site. But how many of you really think it's going to happen?	A question throughout project of whether the board would really close SMS. Had to pitch project within that possibility, too. Sts must have suspected they'd get used elsewhere, since the city no longer owned the Chicago School, which they intended to renovate.
J (34) Our families went to the school being replaced when they were little.	M: came up in interviews.	Used this idea to situate their interests in relations they felt were powerful.
(35) We want to go to the same school in the neighborhood where we live.	M: Result of community survey.	Distribute this result in speech; "big" finding from survey, tucked away in this final part of speech.
(36) We hope you keep us in thought.	A new idea; its use to position the board. Previously, many students felt the SB would not listen to them.	Positions board to take care of them.
K (37) We are doing something not many people would even attempt. Not many people would even try to share their options with the leaders of the school administration.	T: 2/27/p. 1 Audrie warning class of pressure of speaking to SB: Audrie: I know that I was a little upset with you yesterday, and lot of that comes out of the fact that this is really important work that you're doing. And when I see you are slacking off, it upsets me. Because this is not only going to reflect on you, but it's going to reflect on us. There are not many students in this school district to go to this board room and speak their mind. Okay, this is a REALLY important event . . .	Redistributed idea posed in a lecture, in a different set of relations with the SB. Again, they are positioned positively.

(38) We really care about our school.	M: across many surveys and discussions of surveys M: interview with Kylene, who was surprised that sts cared about school.	Findings in surveys. Surprised Kylene; she though sts didn't care.
(39) We are the community, we want to be heard, and we want our dreams to be heard.	Established themselves as "community" throughout speech. Wanting to be heard, came up in several discussions across project and again, 2/27/p. 7B: Group B organizer for speech Janet: Alright, we want to be heard. Not man children would do this . . . WE WANT TO BE HEARD. Michelle: Yeah, we WANT TO BE HEARD.	A constant question/desire. Could they be heard? Would they be heard? Always in relation to school board.

NOTE: SMS = Sanders Middle School; T = transcript; M = material; sts = unidentified students; S = unidentified student; SB = School Board; 1/20/pp. 3-6 = January 20, pages 3-6 (for example).

REFERENCES

- Appadurai, A. (1986). Introduction: Commodities and the politics of value. In A. Appadurai (Ed.), *The social life of things: Commodities in cultural perspective* (pp. 3-63). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Applebee, A. N. (1981). *Writing in the secondary school*. Urbana, IL: The National Council of Teachers of English.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Baynham, M. (1993). Code switching and mode switching: Community interpreters and mediators of literacy. In B. Street (Ed.), *Cross-cultural approaches to literacy* (pp. 294-314). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Davies, B. (1993). *Shards of glass: Children reading and writing beyond gendered identities*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Emig, J. (1971). *The composing process of twelfth-graders*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. London: Polity.
- Farr, M. (1993). Essayist literacy and other verbal performances. *Written Communication*, 10(1), 4-38.
- Fiore, K., & Elsasser, N. (1988). "Strangers no more": A liberatory literacy curriculum. In E. R. Kintgen, B. M. Kroll, & M. Rose (Eds.), *Perspectives on literacy* (pp. 286-281). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Foucault, M. (1972). *Archaeology of knowledge*. New York: Pantheon.
- Foucault, M. (1984). Docile bodies (from Discipline and Punish). In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *The Foucault reader* (pp. 239-256). New York: Pantheon. (Originally published in 1977)
- Freire, P. (1973). *Education for critical consciousness*. New York: Seabury.
- Gee, J. P. (1988). The legacies of literacy: From Plato to Freire through Harvey Graff. *Harvard Educational Review*, 58(2), 195-212.
- Gramsci, A. (1973). *Letters from prison*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Grossberg, L. (1992). *We gotta get outta this place: Popular conservatism and postmodern culture*. New York: Routledge.
- Gutierrez, K., Rymes, B., & Larson, J. (1995). Script, counterscript and underlife in the classroom: James Brown versus Brown v. Board of Education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 65(3), 445-471.
- Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life, and work in communities and classrooms*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kamberelis, G. (2001). Producing heteroglossic classroom (micro)cultures through hybrid discourse practice. *Linguistics and Education*, 12, 85-125.
- Kamberelis, G. (in press). The rhizome and the pack: Liminal literacy formations with political teeth. In K. M. Leander & M. Sheehy (Eds.), *Spatializing literacy research and practice*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Kamberelis, G., & de le Luna, L. (in press). Children's writing: How textual features, contextual forces, and textual politics co-emerge. In C. Bazerman & P. Prior (Eds.), *What writing does and how it does it: An introduction to the analysis of texts and textual practice*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

- Leander, K. M. (1999). "This is our freedom bus going home right now": Producing and hybridizing space-time contexts in pedagogical discourse. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 33(4), 637-679.
- Lensmire, T. J. (1994). *When children write: Critical re-visions of the writing workshop*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Miller, C. R. (1984). Genre as social action. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 70, 151-167.
- Milroy, J., & Milroy, L. (1985). *Authority in language: Investigating language prescription and standardisation*. New York: Routledge Kegan Paul.
- Miriage, T. V. (2001). Features of an interactive writing discourse: Conversational involvement, conventional knowledge, and internalization in "Morning Message." *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 34(2), 172-197.
- Morson, G. S., & Emerson, C. (1990). *Mikhail Bakhtin: Creation of a prosaics*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Rosenblatt, L. (1989). Writing and reading: The transactional theory. In Mason, J. (Ed.), *Reading and writing connections* (pp. 151-176). Needham, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. B. K. (1981). *Narrative, literacy and face in interethnic communication*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Shor, I. (1987). Monday morning fever: Critical literacy and the generative theme of work. In Shor, I. (Ed.), *Freire for the classroom* (pp. 104-122). Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Kook.
- Shuman, A. (1986). *Storytelling rights: The uses of oral and written texts by urban adolescents*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Street, B. V. (1993). Introduction: The new literacy studies. In B. V. Street (Ed.), *Cross-cultural approaches to literacy* (pp. 1-21). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stuckey, J. E. (1991). *The violence of literacy*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.
- Trimbur, J. (1990). Essayist literacy and the rhetoric of deproduction. *Rhetoric Review*, 9(1), 72-86.
- Wells, G. (1993). Reevaluating the IRF sequence: A proposal for the articulation of theories of activity and discourse for the analysis of teaching and learning in the classroom. *Linguistics and Education*, 5, 1-37.

Margaret Sheehy is an assistant professor of education in the Reading Department at the University at Albany, State University of New York. Her current research focuses on literacies as time/space practices. She is coeditor, with Kevin M. Leander, of the forthcoming collection, Spatializing Literacy Research and Practice (Peter Lang).