



EDUCATION 5210

Diverse Language Learners in Canadian Classrooms: Canadian Literature

Spring 2020: January 6th – April 4th

Online Delivery

Professor: Dr. Robert J. LeBlanc

Office: TH318-West

Phone: 403-329-2443 (office)

E-mail: robert.leblanc@uleth.ca

Office Hrs: Please feel free to email if you have any questions or would like to make an appointment to meet (on campus or on Skype).

Administrative Assistant: Ms. Margaret Beintema (TH323-West)

Phone: 403-329-2732 Fax: It's 2020, so... no

The course will be administered through Moodle. All relevant resources will be provided there:
<https://moodle.uleth.ca>

COURSE DESCRIPTION

This online course is part of the 5210 series of courses, in-depth studies of specific topics in and approaches to curriculum.

This graduate course is centrally about understanding contemporary Canadian children's literature, not as a stand-alone set of objects (a 'canon' with particular distinguishing features) but **as texts which are interactionally accomplished in Canadian classrooms amongst a range of students, teachers, materials, and other forces**: specific *literature* (with histories of interpretation), welcomed into specific *classrooms* (with histories of practice), using specific *interactional frames* (with histories of use and abuse), with specific *students* (with unique histories and readings of that text), facilitated by specific *teachers* (with their own histories of pedagogy and interpretation), all unfolding in *real time*. As you will discover very quickly, pinning down this object called 'Canadian literature' is an impossible task—the 'text' is never completed until it is read with actual people in a real context (much like a tree falling in the forest...). Our intent, then, is not to create a typology of features of something amorphous and shifting called 'Canadian literature', but rather to understand how 'Canadian literature' finds a place in classrooms amongst students and teachers.

The goal of this course, then, is to provide you with the tools to conduct **rigorous and detailed data analysis of Canadian classroom interactions with Canadian children's texts**—this will be particularly useful as you move into your Capstone or Thesis project and provide you one concrete heuristic (among the universe of possibilities) for both collecting and analyzing data. This course, consequently, will culminate in

a focused and intensive data analysis of an interactive reading of Canadian children’s literature with students.

This course is firmly set within a specific intellectual tradition—broadly captured under the banner of *sociocultural approaches to literacy* (Gutierrez, 2008; Perry, 2012), which encompass the linguistic anthropology of education (Wortham, 2008; Wortham & Rymes, 2003), interactional sociolinguistics (Rampton, 2017), and New Literacy Studies (Gee, 2015; Street, 1985). You will already have some background this tradition and its conceptual apparatus from my previous iteration of 5210—and where our collective last round of 5210 centered on the (necessary but laborious) academic work of the literature review, this iteration will zoom in on the academic work of **data analysis**, work which will serve you in good stead for your practicum and eventual capstone/thesis. Ultimately, my goal is to provide an orientation to what Goodwin (1994) calls a “professional vision”, a way of looking at the classroom with concepts, theoretical frameworks, and codes which enable you to categorize, understand, and contextualize ‘what is happening here’ beyond the familiar, and do so with some methodological rigor.

INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES

Upon completion of this course, it is expected that participants will be able to:

1. Increase their knowledge of students’ diverse literacies, with particular attention to diverse Canadian children’s literature and diverse responses to that literature
2. Articulate an understanding of the contemporary state of Canadian children’s literature
3. Analyze interactional data using one of several rigorous approaches
4. Demonstrate effective communication through proficient writing and speaking in online platforms (Moodle, FlipGrid, and others as appropriate).

COURSE TEXTS AND RESOURCES

The following resources are available from the University of Lethbridge Bookstore:

Pantaleo, S. (2008). *Exploring student response to contemporary picturebooks*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto.

Sipe, L. (2007). *Storytime: Young children’s literary understanding in the classroom*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Other readings/resources will be posted on Moodle. Should you want to explore any of these ideas further, see also the reference list accompanying this syllabus for a range of related readings. Robust critical surveys of the contemporary state of Canadian children’s literature include:

Donawa, W., & Fowler, L. C. (2013). *Reading Canada: Teaching Canadian fiction in secondary schools*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Edwards, G., & Saltman, J. (2010). *Picturing Canada: A history of Canadian children’s illustrated books and publishing*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

Galway, E. (2010). *From nursery rhymes to nationhood: Children’s literature and the construction of Canadian identity*. New York: Routledge.

Hudson, A., & Cooper, S.A. (Eds.). (2003). *Windows and words: A look at Canadian children’s literature in English*. Ottawa, ON: University of Ottawa Press.

We will also be using FlipGrid as a resource for this class.

A NOTE ON READINGS

This is a graduate-level class and in keeping with your status as graduate students and working professionals with a good deal of existing pedagogic knowledge, and in keeping with previous iterations of how we do class together, **we are going to read a great deal in this course**: each week, approximately 50-60 pages (some weeks much more, some weeks less). Do the assigned readings and be prepared to critically respond to those readings in some form most weeks. There is no other way to do grad school than to read your way into a tradition, and so we will read a good deal together.

We will be reading a wide range of pieces over the course of the semester, some in more detail than others. Let me strongly recommend that you print these readings out or use an appropriate PDF reader so that you can annotate them with some level of exuberance (that’s right—your annotations should be *screaming exuberance*). I have also included a rather robust list of readings at the conclusion of this syllabus—if you’re stuck for an idea or resources for your final paper, notably the framing portion, this is a good place to start. These resources equally provide some sense of the theoretical and methodological foundations for this class. For those of you who are truly ambitious and wish to dive headlong into this area, Street (1984), Cook-Gumperz (2006), and/or Heath (1983) are foundational in the field of New Literacy Studies, while Green & Wallat (1981), Green & Harker (1988) and Gumperz & Hymes (1972) provide the background for interactional sociolinguistics in educational settings.

Keep your eyes peeled for Weeks 4, 11, and 12 where the reading approaches or exceeds 100 pages. You’ll likely want to start on these readings well in advance.

EVALUATION

Assessment Overview

Your grade will be calculated from the following assessment framework:

What’s Canadian about Canadian Children’s Literature?	5%
Analytic Memo + Asking the Question	35%
Conversation Analysis Practice.....	10%
Data Analysis Proposal	10%
Data Analysis	40%

A. What’s Canadian about Canadian Children’s Literature? 5%

You will read the article “What’s Canadian about Canadian Children’s Literature?”, published in the journal *Canadian Children’s Literature*, which features a host of authors, scholars, and readers reflecting on this very question.

Using FlipGrid, you will respond in 4-5 minutes to this question yourself. You may quote one of the various authors featured throughout the article as a starting point or as a point of contention/disagreement. You may read a (small) portion from a Canadian children’s text to get you started. You may perform this as a liturgical dance. The world is your proverbial oyster, but please anchor your discussion (or liturgical dance) with reference to the text.

“What’s Canadian about Canadian children’s literature?”

DUE: January 12

B. Analytic Memo + Asking the Questions 35%

Five times this semester (see course calendar below), you will respond to **two discussion threads**: 1) a **written thread** that will respond to the weekly reading(s) in an **Analytic Memo** and 2) a **video thread** that will be for further questions and implications of the week’s material, which we are calling **Asking the Questions**. You are required to post two responses: the first to the readings thread on Moodle on Thursday, the second (via FlipGrid) about further questions and implications on Sunday. The first post should be between 500 and 700 words and should critically engage the week’s reading. Your second response, a video reply via FlipGrid, should be 3-5 minutes in length.

You will be organized into groups of 5 for this assignment. By Thursday at 6pm, each of you will post an Analytic Memo to Moodle. Analytic Memos are documents that researchers produce when reading or doing field work, and are used to help distill something so that it is easily retrievable and useable later (Birks, Chapman, and Francis, 2008). In the case of this class, your Analytic Memo should answer two key questions: **1) What are the core concepts of this reading?** and **2) How would these help me do research on children’s literature in a classroom?** At the outset, these questions will be largely theoretical, but as you complete your data collection, you will be able to articulate more and more how these concepts are specific to your research project (which is ultimately the point of the Analytic Memo).

One member of your group will serve as the Questioner for the week, and their job is to read through these Memos and post some questions to the group by Friday at midnight on FlipGrid which emerge out of their reading of the articles and the classmates’ written work. The rest of the group will respond to these questions via FlipGrid by Sunday at midnight.

Our **FlipGrid password for the semester is EDUC5210**.

DUE: Selected weeks throughout the semester: Thursday (Analytical Memo) by 6pm, Friday (FlipGrid questions by Questioner) by midnight, Sunday (FlipGrid response by everyone to Questioner) by midnight.

Posts: Summary of Analytic Memo + Asking the Questions

Thursday- All members post their Analytic Memos to their group on Moodle

Friday- One member of the group (Questioner) reads the Analytic Memos and posts several questions (Asking the Question) on FlipGrid

Sunday- All other members of the group respond to the Questioner on FlipGrid

C. Conversation Analysis Practice 10%

You will practice transcribing audio data. You will begin by completing this handy [Transcription Tutorial](#), which is the product of Emanuel Schegloff’s lab at UCLA, focusing on apprenticing people into the conventions of Conversation Analysis. This will give you some of the basics of symbolic notation for transcribing a range of features of talk. You may want to go over this tutorial more than once and I would highly (*highly*) encourage you to take notes while you do so.

Once you’ve completed the tutorial, you will **audio-record talk** between yourself and a willing interlocutor, and **complete a detailed transcription of one minute** of that interaction. The topic of the conversation is irrelevant (creating a shopping list, discussing a favorite movie, debating the merits of a transnational oil pipeline, etc.), but must involve at least two speakers who have multiple utterances each (that is, each of you talks more than once during those two minutes). You may have to record more than one minute of interaction talk to get this kind of back-and-forth exchange.

You are welcome to use whatever software you’d like for the transcription process (for example, using iTunes for the audio file and Word for the text), but I’m fond of [InqScribe](#), which allows you to upload the MP3 and type write into the software (with easy stopping, starting, slowing down and speeding up), all for free.

Upload your transcription into Word and submit to Moodle. Please include a page of **transcription conventions**, which indicate what your various notations mean.

DUE: February 16

D. Data Analysis (Proposal + Final Project) 10% + 40%

You will conduct a focused data analysis of an interactive reading of some piece of Canadian children’s literature with **at least two interlocutors** (a student and a student; a teacher and a student; a teacher and eight students all talking simultaneously, etc., though you’re welcome and encouraged to have more than two people in this interaction). To accomplish this task, you must first have some data to work with and here you have **two options**:

1. Audio record an interaction **between yourself and your student(s) in your teaching context**, interactively reading and talking about a piece of Canadian children’s literature. Because this is an inquiry into your own practice as a teacher, you are not required to go through ULeTh Human Research Subjects— however, you *may not share* this audio recording beyond your submission to class and *may not publish* or promote your findings. You will choose a contemporary Canadian children’s text (or a portion of a text), read it aloud with your students, and audio record either the interactive reading (stopping and talking with the students as the reading progresses) or the discussion afterwards. You do not have

to transcribe every line of interaction, but should transcribe all portions relevant to your analysis.

2. If you don't feel comfortable audio recording your own students (children, teens, or adults), you **may recruit other individuals** (friends, spouses, your own children, people who owe you money and are looking for a free way to pay you back) **to play the role of your students in this interaction**. This is not meant to be a scripted interaction, and so there should be some 'free' exchange between you the teacher and your (faux) 'class'.

You will begin by completing a **Data Analysis Proposal** (due February 9), outlining your intended research. Your proposal (approx. 1-2 pages) will include the following features:

- **Context—Where, When, Who, What** will be involved in this study?
- **Canadian Children's Literature**—Text you have chosen + author's name + a 100-word overview of content/plot
- **Sensitizing Concepts**—What theories are you drawing on to animate this research? What sensitizing concepts, ideas, frameworks are you bringing to this interaction? What preliminary codes might you have already?
- **References**—In APA format, all references used in proposal

Bullet points are accepted and encouraged for this Proposal. **Don't overthink this**. It's a page or two long. You are not committed to this Proposal for your final analysis, and should you find another book, context, or sensitizing concepts with which you'd like to engage when it comes to the final project, that is just fine. The purpose of this Proposal is just to get you thinking.

Looking for high-quality Canadian children's literature? Check [here](#), [here](#), [here](#), and [here](#), and/or check out Donawa & Fowler's book *Reading Canada*. If you're in Lethbridge, the Main and Crossings Branches have dedicated children's librarians, who would be *thrilled* to talk to you about your project.

The vision for this project is that you are to conduct your research in your classroom/site of inquiry and do your transcription in Weeks 7-9. This is by far the most labour-intensive part of the project, so having some running room should make this possible.

You will transcribe your interaction using some of the transcription conventions found in this course. **You do not have to transcribe the entire interaction** (which will likely go on for some time), but **only those sections relevant to your analysis**.

Listen to your data and read your transcript multiple times (this is often called "data immersion"). Take your time here, making notes and writing your own analytical memos as to what you have found or what stands out. What themes, core concepts, and patterns emerge? It is here that you will begin to start crafting your analysis.

For your **Data Analysis** final paper, you will include the following features, which will appear as distinct sub-headings in the document:

- **Title**

- **Introduction**—What is the specific issue you’re examining in this analysis (literary understandings, turn-taking, teacher authority, etc.?), and who has already written about this issue from whom you are drawing? Sensitizing concepts and theories?
- **Methodology**
 - **Context**—All data must be *anonymized* to remove any distinguishing features—no actual children’s names, school names, city names, etc.
 - **Data Collection**—How did you collect the data? How long? What book? How did the reading go down?
 - **Data Analysis**—Outline what you did by way of analysis
- **Findings**—What did you discover about the interaction by analyzing the data? This should be the bulk of your final paper.
- **References**—APA format
- **Appendix A: Transcription(s) of Interaction**—Include the full text(s) of any transcription you completed for your analysis

How will you analyze your interactions? That, in short, is **up to you** and we will have lots of examples of various ways you can look at interaction around text—Sipe, Pantaleo, Ochs, Green & Meyer, etc. **You may focus your analysis on any feature of the interaction**, which can include all kinds of sub-issues: turn-taking, children taking on different voices of characters, teacher’s establishing authority in their interpretation of the text, children describing what it means to be ‘Canadian’, students resisting the teacher’s interpretation (or that of their classmate), etcetera etcetera etcetera on infinitum. The hope is that the interactional text speaks the loudest in this analysis, so that you’re looking at *what is happening here* rather than imposing a set of concepts onto the data—**what does the data say?** However, for those of you truly stuck for what to do, let me recommend you use Sipe’s (2007) five categories for literary responses and apply them to your data. What do you find when you try to code using these (or some of these) frameworks? And is there anything that doesn’t fit? And if so, how might you describe those ‘remainder’ data?

We will also have several examples of data mapping available in this course, and you may wish to take advantage of those and include them as part of your sense-making and ultimately your analysis. Data mapping is super helpful (I can give you examples of my own work)—see particularly Green & Meyer for some ideas.

Your paper should be fully referenced using APA format. Plagiarism will be taken seriously: all quotes and ideas that are not your own must be fully referenced. If you are unsure about what counts as plagiarism, you are strongly encouraged to make use of the excellent resources on this topic at the University of Lethbridge Writing Center. I say again: don’t plagiarize.

Data Analysis Proposal

DUE: February 9

Data Analysis

DUE: April 4

GRADES

The Faculty of Education has a standardized grading schedule for graduate courses. This schedule will be used for determining final grades for graduate students in this course.

Numeric Value	Letter Grade	Grade Point
97 – 100	A+	4.00
93 – 96	A	4.00
90 – 92	A-	3.70
87 – 89	B+	3.30
83 – 86	B	3.00
80 – 82	B-	2.70
Note: Any course with a grade of less than B- cannot be considered for credit in the M.Ed. program.		
77 – 79	C+	2.30
73 – 76	C	2.00
70 – 72	C-	1.70
67 – 69	D+	1.30
63 – 66	D	1.00
<63	F	0.00

STUDENT CONDUCT

Students are subject to the student discipline policy for academic and non-academic offences in accordance with the University Calendar (www.uleth.ca/ross/academic-calendar/sgs)

Additionally, in the Faculty of Education graduate programs, students are required to adhere to the conduct expectations as stipulated in Faculty of Education policies, and the Standards of Practice/Conduct, Code of Ethics, and/or the Code of Professional Conduct for the field, as noted below.

ATA Code of Professional Conduct

<https://www.teachers.ab.ca/The-Teaching-Profession/ProfessionalConduct/Pages/default.aspx>

Standards of Professional Conduct for Master of Education Students:

<http://www.uleth.ca/graduate-studies/master-education/resources/beginning-your-program/professional-conduct>

You are expected to produce original work in this course for all assignments. All other materials and ideas used in class and in assignments must be properly acknowledged to give credit to the originator. This includes all resources whether consulted and/or quoted or copied from print resources, the Internet, other media, or personal consultations. Assistance with documentation is available through the University Library. If violations are suspected, students may be required to submit an electronic version of their work and the work may be subsequently subjected to author

detection processes.

ACCOMMODATIONS

If you have a disability, special learning needs, or a recent injury that requires academic accommodation to complete the required activities and/or assignments, please follow the procedures outlined in the University Calendar.

You are encouraged to contact the Accommodated Learning Centre (<http://www.uleth.ca/ross/accommodated-learning-centre/>) for guidance and assistance. Counselling Services (<http://www.uleth.ca/counselling/>) is another resource available to all students.

COURSE SCHEDULE: January 6 — April 4, 2020

Dates	Topic	Readings	Assignments
Week 1 Jan 6-12	Canadian Children's Literature—The State of the Field	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Edwards & Saltman—<i>Canadian cultural identity, Canadian cultural identities</i> • Various authors—<i>What's Canadian about Canadian children's literature?</i> <p>Recommended but not required</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bainbridge et al.—<i>Canadian children's literature: An Alberta survey</i> • Mackey—<i>Canadian young people and their reading worlds: Conditions of literature in contemporary Canada</i> 	* What's Canadian about Canadian Children's Literature? [Sunday—FlipGrid]
Week 2 Jan 13-19	Literary Knowledge as an Interactional Accomplishment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heath—<i>What no bedtime story means</i> • Bloome—<i>Necessary indeterminacy and the microethnographic study of reading as a social process</i> • Green & Meyer—<i>The embeddedness of reading in classroom life</i> <p>On Analytic Memoing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Birks, Chapman, and Francis—<i>Memoing in qualitative research</i> [7 pages] <p>Recommended but not required</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cazden & Beck—<i>Classroom discourse</i> • Cox—<i>Teaching qualitative research to practitioner researchers</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Analytic Memo [Thursday—Moodle] * Asking the Questions [Friday/Sunday—FlipGrid]
Week 3 Jan 20-26	Children's Literary Knowledge: A Theoretical Frame	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sipe—<i>Storytime</i> [pp. 1-84] 	
Week 4 Jan 27-Feb 2	Children's Literary Knowledge: An Applied Frame	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sipe—<i>Storytime</i> [pp. 84-249] 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Analytic Memo [Thursday—Moodle] * Asking the Questions [Friday/Sunday—FlipGrid]
Week 5	Transcribing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ochs—<i>Transcription as theory</i> 	*Data Analysis Proposal

Dates	Topic	Readings	Assignments
Feb 3-9	Interactional Literary Data: Organization and Ethics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sacks—<i>A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking conversation</i> 	[Sunday]
Week 6 Feb 10-16	Transcribing Interactional Literary Data: Practicalities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complete Transcription Tutorial 	* Conversation Transcription Practice [Sunday]
Week 7 Feb 17 - 23	Reading Break—No School		
Week 8 Feb 24- Mar 1	Choosing Resources for Canadian Classrooms: I	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bainbridge & Brenna—<i>Picture books and pedagogy</i> Watch The Place and Space for Canadian Children’s Literature in Our Lives and Libraries (2015 lecture at UBC) 	
Week 9 Mar 2 - 8	Choosing Resources for Canadian Classrooms: II	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Watch Reconciling Difficult Colonial Truths: Literature for Children and Youth (2016 lecture at UBC) Browse UBC’s Indigenous Children’s Literature library guide (especially sections “Featured Articles”, “Resource List of Indigenous Children’s Authors and Illustrators”, “Indigenous Children’s Literature Bibliographies”) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Analytic Memo [Thursday—Moodle] * Asking the Questions [Friday/Sunday—FlipGrid]
Week 10 Mar 9 – Mar 15	Analyzing Children’s Literary Data: Generating Conceptual Codes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thomas—<i>A general inductive approach for analyzing qualitative evaluation data</i> Sipe & Ghiso—<i>Developing conceptual categories in classroom descriptive research</i> Erickson—<i>Demystifying data construction and analysis</i> <p>Recommended but not required</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nowell, et al.—<i>Thematic analysis: Striving to meet the trustworthiness criteria</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Analytic Memo [Thursday—Moodle] * Asking the Questions [Friday/Sunday—FlipGrid]
Week 11 Mar 16 - 22	Conducting Read Aloud Research with Children’s Literature in Canadian Classrooms: I	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pantaleo— <i>Exploring Student Response to Contemporary Picturebooks</i> [pp. 1-105] 	

Dates	Topic	Readings	Assignments
Week 12 Mar 23-29	Conducting Read Aloud Research with Children’s Literature in Canadian Classrooms: II	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pantaleo—<i>Exploring Student Response to Contemporary Picturebooks</i> [pp. 106-217] 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Analytic Memo [Thursday—Moodle] * Asking the Questions [Friday/Sunday—FlipGrid]
Week 13 Mar 30 - April 4	“Writing Up” Your Findings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ryan- <i>Analyzing qualitative data and writing up your findings</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Classroom Data Analysis [April 4]

USEFUL SECONDARY LITERATURE

- Anderson, K.T., & Zuiker, S.J. (2010). Performative identity as a resource for classroom participation: Scientific Shane vs. Jimmy Neutron. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 9(2), 291-309.
- Arizpe, E., & Styles, M. (2015). *Children reading picturebooks: Interpreting visual texts*. New York: Routledge.
- Atwood, M. (2012). *Survival: A thematic guide to Canadian literature*. Toronto, ON: House of Anansi.
- Bainbridge, J., & Pantaleo, S. (1999). *Learning with literature in the Canadian elementary classroom*. Edmonton, AB: University of Alberta.
- Bainbridge, J., Carbonaro, M., & Green, N. (2005). Canadian children's literature: An Alberta survey. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 51(4), 311.
- Bainbridge, J. M., Pantaleo, S., & Ellis, M. (1999). Multicultural picture books: Perspectives from Canada. *The Social Studies*, 90(4), 183-188.
- Baker, C.D. (1992). Description and analysis in classroom talk and interaction. *The Journal of Classroom Interaction*, 27(2), 9-14.
- Bloome, D. (1985). Reading as a social process. *Language Arts*, 62(2), 134-142.
- Bloome, D. (1993). Necessary indeterminacy and the microethnographic study of reading as a social process. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 16(2), 98-111.
- Bloome, D., & Carter, S. (2014). Microethnographic discourse analysis. In P. Albers, T. Holbrook, & A.S. Flint (Eds.), *New methods of literacy research* (pp. 3-18). New York: Routledge.
- Bloome, D., Carter, S., & Brown, A.F. (2010). Studying literacy practices in classrooms using critical discourse analysis: From the bottom up. In sj Miller & D.E. Kirkland (Eds.), *Change matters: Critical essays on moving social justice research from theory to practice* (pp. 131-144). New York: Peter Lang.
- Bloome, D., Carter, S. P., Christian, B. M., Madrid, S., Otto, S., Shuart-Faris, N., & Smith, M. (2008). *On discourse analysis in classrooms: Approaches to language and literacy research*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Blommaert, J. (2005). *Discourse: A critical introduction*. Cambridge, UK: CUP.
- Blommaert, J., Smits, L., & Yacoubi, N. (2018). Context and its complications. *Tilburg Papers in Culture Studies*, #208.
- Bloome, D., & Robertson-Egan, A. (2004). The social construction of intertextuality in classroom reading and writing lessons. In N. Shuart-Faris & D. Bloome (Eds.), *Uses of intertextuality in classroom and educational research* (pp. 18-64). Greenwich, CON: Information Age.
- Brenna, B., Sun, S., & Liu, Y. (2017). Patterns in contemporary Canadian picture books: Radical change in action. *in education*, 23(2), 43-70.

- Bucholtz, M. & Hall, K. (2005). Identity and interaction: A sociocultural linguistic approach. *Discourse Studies*, 7(4-5), 585-614.
- Burke, A., Johnston, I., & Ward, A. (Eds.). (2017). *Challenging stories: Canadian literature for social justice in the classroom*. Toronto, ON: Canadian Scholars' Press.
- Burns, C., & Myhill, D. (2004). Interactive or inactive? A consideration of the nature of interaction in whole class teaching. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 34(1), 35-49.
- Campano, G., Ghiso, M.P., & Sanchez, L. (2013). "Nobody knows the... amount of a person": Elementary students critiquing dehumanization through organic critical literacies. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 48(1), 98-125.
- Candela, A. (1999). Students' power in classroom discourse. *Linguistics and Education*, 10(2), 139-163.
- Castanheira, M. L., Crawford, T., Dixon, C. N., & Green, J. L. (2000). Interactional ethnography: An approach to studying the social construction of literate practices. *Linguistics and Education*, 11(4), 353-400.
- Cazden, C.B. (2001). *Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Collin, R. (2011). Genre in discourse, discourse in genre: A new approach to the study of literate practice. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 44(1), 76-96.
- Collins, J. (1996). Socialization to text: Structure and contradiction in schooled literacy. In M. Silverstein & G. Urban (Eds.), *Natural histories of discourse* (pp. 203-228). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Cook-Gumperz, J. (Ed.). (2006). *The social construction of literacy*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Diehl, D., & MacFarland, D.A. (2012). Classroom ordering and the situational imperatives of routine and ritual. *Sociology of Education*, 85(4), 326-349.
- Dixon, C., & Green, J. (2005). Studying the discursive construction of texts in classrooms through institutional ethnography. In R. Beach, J. Green, M. Kamil, & T. Shanahan (Eds.), *Multidisciplinary perspectives on literacy research* (pp. 349-390). New York: Hampton Press.
- Edwards, A.D., & Westgate, D.P.G. (1994). *Investigating classroom talk* (2nd ed.). London: Falmer.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. New York: Psychology Press.
- Fairclough, N. (2013). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. New York: Routledge.
- Gee, J.P. (2010). *How to do discourse analysis: A toolkit*. New York: Routledge.
- Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of talk*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

- Green, J., Dixon, C., Lin, L., Floriani, A., Bradley, M., Paxton, S., & Mattern, C. (1994). Constructing literacy in classrooms: Literate action as social accomplishment. In R.B. Ruddell, M.R. Ruddell, & H. Singer (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (4th ed.) (pp. 124-154). Newark, NK: International Reading Association.
- Green, J.L., & Harker, J.O. (Eds.) (1988). *Multiple perspective analyses of classroom discourse*. New York: Praeger.
- Green, J.L., & Meyer, L. (1991). The embeddedness of reading in classroom life: Reading as a situated process. In C. Baker & A. Luke (Eds.), *Towards a critical sociology of reading pedagogy* (pp. 141-160). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.
- Green, J.L., & Wallat, C. (Eds.). (1981). *Ethnography and language in educational settings*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Guo, S. & Wong, L.(Eds). (2015). *Revisiting multiculturalism in Canada: Theories, policies and debates*. Boston, MA: Sense Publishers.
- Gutierrez, J., 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. (1982). What no bedtime story means: Narrative skills at home and school. *Language in Society*, 11(1), 49-76.
- Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life and work in communities and classrooms*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Heap, J. (1985). Discourse in the production of classroom knowledge: Reading lessons. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 15(3), 245-279.
- Heap, J.L. (1992). Seeing snubs: An introduction to sequential analysis of classroom interaction. *The Journal of Classroom Interaction*, 27(2), 23-28.
- Hymes, D.H., & Gumperz, J.J. (Eds.). (1972). *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Jacobs, K.E.B. (2016). The (untold) drama of the turning page: The role of page breaks in understanding picture books. *Children's Literature in Education*, 47(4), 357-373.
- Kamberelis, G. (2001). Producing heteroglossic classroom (micro)cultures through hybrid discourse practice. *Linguistics and Education*, 12(1), 85-125.
- Lefstein, A. (2010). Situating dialogue in classrooms. In K. Littleton & C. Howe (Eds.), *Educational dialogues: Understanding and promoting productive interaction* (pp. 170-191). London: Routledge.
- Low, D.E. (2012). "Spaces invested with content": Crossing the 'gaps' in comics with readers in schools. *Children's Literature in Education*, 43(4), 368-385.

- Low, D.E. (2017). Students contesting “colormuteness” through critical inquiries into comics. *English Journal*, 106(4), 19-28.
- Mackey, M. (2009). Canadian young people and their reading worlds: Conditions of literature in contemporary Canada. *Canadian Children's Literature*, 31(1), 78-99.
- Maybin, J. (2009). A broader view of language in school: Research from linguistic ethnography. *Children & Society*, 23(1), 70-78.
- Maybin, J. & Moss, G. (1993). Talk about texts: Reading as a social event. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 16(3), 138-147.
- McBean, K., & Johnston, I. (2018). Creating new meanings and understanding with postcolonial texts: Teaching ‘Purple Hibiscus’ in a Grade 10 classroom. *Language and Literacy*, 20(4), 78-92.
- McHoul, A. (1978). The organization of turns at formal talk in the classroom. *Lange Soc*, 7, 183-213.
- Moss, L. (Ed.). (2003). *Is Canada postcolonial?: Unsettling Canadian literature*. Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier Univ. Press.
- Nodelman, P. (2007). What's Canadian about Canadian children's literature? A compendium of answers to the question. *Canadian Children's Literature*, 23(3), 15-35.
- Ochs, E. (1979). Transcription as theory. In E. Ochs & B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *Developmental pragmatics* (pp. 43-72). New York: Academic Press.
- Pantaleo, S. (2004). The long, long way: Young children explore the fabula and syuzhet of *Shortcut*. *Children's Literature in Education*, 35(1), 1-20.
- Pantaleo, S. J. (2008). *Exploring student response to contemporary picturebooks*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- Pantaleo, S. (2007). Interthinking: Young children using language to think collectively during interactive read-alouds. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 34(6), 439-447.
- Pantaleo, S. (2011). Warning: A grade 7 student disrupts narrative boundaries. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 43(1), 39-67.
- Phipps, H. (2010). *Engaging with picture books: Exploring students' and teachers' experiences with literature and collaboration in immersion classrooms* (Doctoral dissertation, McGill University Library).
- Rampton, B. (2006). *Language in late modernity: Interaction in an urban school*. Cambridge, UK: CUP.
- Rampton, B. (2007). Linguistic ethnography, interactional sociolinguistics and the study of identities. *Working Papers in Urban Language & Literacies, Paper 47*, pp. 1-14.
- Rampton, B. (2013). Language, social categories, and interaction. *Tilburg Papers in Cultural Studies, Paper 47*, pp. 1-9.

- Rampton, B. (2017). *Crossing: Language and ethnicity among adolescents*. New York: Routledge.
- Rampton, B., Maybin, J., & Roberts, C. (2014). Methodological foundations in linguistic ethnography. *Tilburg Papers in Cultural Studies, Paper 102*, 1-24.
- Rampton, B. (2018). Goffman: Key concepts in exploration of the interaction order. *Working Papers in Urban Language & Literacies, Paper 239*.
- Rogers, R. (2014). Critical discourse analysis in literacy research. In P. Albers, T. Holbrook, & A.S. Flint (Eds.), *New methods in literacy research* (pp. 19-39). New York: Routledge.
- Rogers, R., Malancharuvil-Berkes, E., Mosley, M., Hui, D., & Joseph, G. O. G. (2005). Critical discourse analysis in education: A review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research, 75*(3), 365-416.
- Rymes, B. (2003). Relating word to world: Indexicality during literacy events. In S. Wortham & B. Rymes (Eds.), *Linguistic Anthropology of Education* (121-150). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Rymes, B. (2010). Classroom discourse analysis: A focus on communicative repertoires. In N. Hornberger & S. McKay (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language education* (pp. 528-546). Buffalo, NY: Multilingual Matters.
- Rymes, B. (2012). Recontextualizing YouTube: From macro–micro to mass-mediated communicative repertoires. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 43*(2), 214-227.
- Rymes, B. (2014). *Communicating beyond language: Everyday encounters with diversity*. New York: Routledge.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation, *Language 50*(4).
- Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Sipe, L.R. (1998). Learning the language of picturebooks. *Journal of Children's Literature, 24*(2), 66-75.
- Sipe, L. R., & Pantaleo, S. (2010). *Postmodern picturebooks: Play, parody, and self-referentiality*. New York: Routledge.
- Spring, E. (2018). "Without manifest, none of the book would have happened": Place, identity, and the positioning of Canadian adolescent readers as literary critics. *Children's Literature in Education, 49*(2), 101-118.
- St. Denis, V. (2011). Silencing Aboriginal curricular content and perspectives through multiculturalism: "There are other children here." *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies, 33*(4), 306–317.
- Street, B.V. (1984). *Literacy in theory and practice*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Strong-Wilson, T. (2008). Turtles all the way: Simulacra and resistance to simulacra in indigenous teachers' discussion of Indigenous children's literature. *Children's Literature in Education, 39*(1), 53-74.

- Strong-Wilson, T., Yoder, A., & Phipps, H. (2014). Going down the rabbit-hole: Teachers' engagements with 'dialectical images' in Canadian children's literature on social justice. *Changing English*, 21(1), 79-93.
- Wiltse, L. (2015). Mirrors and windows: Teaching and research reflections on Canadian Aboriginal children's literature. *Language and Literacy*, 17(2), 22-40.
- Wortham, S. (2001). *Narratives in action: A strategy for research and analysis*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Wortham, S. (2006). *Learning identity: The joint emergence of social identification and academic learning*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Wortham, S. (2008). Objectification of identity across events. *Linguistics and Education*, 19(3), 294-311.
- Wortham, S. (2008). Linguistic anthropology of education. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 37(1), 37-51.
- Wortham, S., & Reyes, A. (2015). *Discourse analysis beyond the speech event*. New York: Routledge.
- Wortham, S., & Rymes, B. (Eds.). (2003). *Linguistic anthropology of education*. Westport, CT: Praeger.