Teachers blame their indifferent instruction on being overburdened. Still, chapter seven reveals the presence of gender politics there as well, most evident in the dismissal of sexual harassment. Orenstein claims that the hidden curriculum at Audubon teaches boys that they can get away with harming girls and women at school because nothing is done to change that type of behavior.

Chapters eight and nine highlight the differences in self-esteem and sense of respect of the African-American girls in comparison to the white girls at Weston. Consistent with previous research, Orenstein observed that African-American girls have higher overall self-esteem and take pride in their strength of character. They are more likely to engage in discussions, seek attention, and challenge their teachers and, due to this, are labeled as causing disciplinary problems. Despite their solid self-esteem, educational success for these African-American girls is blocked by poverty, racial bias, and inadequate teaching and counseling.

Without the academic opportunities that privilege white girls or the self-esteem of black girls, Latina girls are portrayed as being the most at risk. In chapter ten, Orenstein characterizes Latina girls as being oppressed by the constraints of femininity and victimized by gangs, boys, and the hidden curriculum. Latinas, claims Orenstein, are defined in terms of their perceived sexual vulnerability and often resort to abusive relationships and gangs to offer some form of affirmation.

Chapter eleven points out some concerns that are specific to the girls at Audubon due to their ethnicity, class, and background. Although many have the strength and the goals to succeed, these girls have more diversions and less guidance than the girls at Weston. Accomplishment for the girls at Audubon is linked to the perception of acting white and denial of pleasure–denial of friends, boys, and ethnicity.

The final section of the book describes in detail a particular gender-fair classroom and the new set of issues that are raised when teachers make overt efforts to change traditional classroom practices. This section then provides a number of activities that can be used by teachers of all levels. Orenstein contends that gender equity in the classroom must be more than an attempt to "add women and stir." Rather, the male-dominated curriculum must be challenged and reformed.

Orenstein's book has not gone without its criticism by scholars. Due to its accessibility and lack of theoretical perspective, it has been denounced as a nonacademic book. Although she does support her conclusions with theoretical and empirical sources, she fails to provide the reader with any sense of her own biases or her possibly intrusive role in these settings. More details of her experience as a researcher would have been helpful to readers in contextualizing the findings or planning their own fieldwork.

These criticisms do not take away from the book's utility however. The lifeless statistics from the AAUW report become personified as we come to know the emaciated "Becca" (who starves herself in order to avoid a woman's body and the victimization that comes with it), the invisible "Marta" (whose teachers fail to notice her flunking), the gifted "Suzy" (who believes that she "is too cute to be a lawyer"), the assertive "April" (whose confidence is pressed into disengaged silence), and the unresponsive teachers (who disregard sexual harassment as "boys being boys" and/or "blacks being blacks").

The forces that sculpt and, so often, negate the precarious confidence of girls in our society can be more deeply understood by examining the lives that are shaped by them. Orenstein makes an important contribution to the areas of gender and instructional communication by giving voice to the students in America's classrooms.

Tasha J. Souza
University of Washington

Edwards, A. D., & Westgate, D. P. G. (1994). *Investigating classroom talk* (2nd ed.). London: Falmer Press. 203 pp. $21.50.

Though the constitutive nature of language has been discussed by scholars for decades, of recent controversy is how much can be revealed through an analysis of language structure and how solid are the conclusions drawn from research based on discourse within a specific context. Tony Edwards and David Westgate from the School of Education at the University of Newcastle-upon-Tyne address these issues in their second edition of *Investigating Classroom Talk*. The volume is a detailed compilation of research in linguistics and socio-linguistics. The authors ground their work in the assumption that through a systematic examination of the complex layers of classroom talk (e.g., the surface features, linguistic structures, and assumptions behind the talk) researchers can further understand the complexities of language use. *Investigating Classroom Talk* progresses from theoretical to practical concerns of the classroom researcher. More specifically, it supplies a rationale for researching classroom talk, descriptions of classroom discourse, a list of potential problems that occur when conducting an analysis, various coding methods, ways of interpreting discursive sequences, and exemplar analyses.

Three propositions serve as the basis for this text. First is the absence of a metalanguage for describing teaching, due primarily to the lack of data in the form of naturally occurring discourse. The second underlying proposition is that no research is atheoretical. In this sense, classroom talk serves as evidence in support of a particular theory. Edwards and Westgate address the potentially problematic "observer's paradox," or the imposition of the researcher's own views upon the classroom environment. The authors discuss the representativeness of discourse and caution the researcher against conveying the "illusion of proof," which occurs when the data and interpretation become indistinguishable. Although Edwards and Westgate bring to light an important consideration in conducting research, they do not offer the reader possible ways to ensure emergent rather than imposed meaning when conducting research in the context of the classroom. Third, the text is based on the idea that researchers are obligated to make careful and principled choices at every stage of the research process–involving choice of method, data collection, and interpretation and analysis of the discourse.

Investigating Classroom Talk serves as a valuable handbook for speech communication researchers who may not be technically versed in the practices of linguistic or socio-linguistic inquiry. The glossary preceding the text is of great practical use. In addition, coded excerpts of discourse and corresponding field notes are presented throughout the text and provide the readers with templates for their own systematic research schedule. Chapter three is especially useful in that it provides the reader with practical guidelines for selecting, observing, recording, transcribing, systematically coding, and reporting data. Although the book serves as an excellent technical guide to one type of discourse analysis, an important consideration for readers is that Edwards and Westgate focus primarily on the development of a more reliable category schedule for systematic classroom observation. It has less to say about more interpretive approaches and about specific ways to improve instructional communication or language development.

In addition to its technical support, *Investigating Classroom Talk* offers the reader compelling research findings in the areas of developmental communication and classroom management. Taken together, the studies presented address the questions of "What do children traditionally learn to become successful pupils?" and "How do pupils achieve communicative competence once they enter the classroom?" In answer to these questions, the research reveals the classroom to be an environment run by one authority–the teacher. Pupils learn through the "silent language" (p. 101) of the classroom (e.g., sequencing, directness, intonation) what the teacher wants, how to answer, and what indirect statements are actually referring to. Pupils also learn indirectly that their own thoughts and ideas are secondary at best, since they spend more time trying to answer the teacher's questions in a standard and ritualized manner than posing their own thoughtful questions. Due to cultural and economic factors, children do not enter school at the same communicative level. Therefore, some pupils have more difficulty than others in acquiring classroom communicative competence. Those who do not possess the favored skills prior to entering school may not be able to acquire them once inside the classroom. Thus, unequal communicative rights are not only established but also maintained through classroom talk. Edwards and Westgate ultimately assert that language skills should not be viewed as "a static repertoire [pupils bring] in from the outside, but rather as skills constituted in the process of interaction, and in behavior validated or sanctioned [by the teacher] as it occurs" (p. 158).

Research also reveals that children have a much richer experience learning through talk with adults at home than learning through talk with the teacher in the classroom. The Bristol Project discovered children to be "compulsive and creative seekers after meaning" in their homes, but occupying a much less active role in the classroom (i.e., initiating fewer interactions, asking fewer questions, and taking fewer turns per interaction) (p. 166). Children are treated in their homes as collaborative partners, but are not viewed as such in the classroom due to three factors: (a) the large number of pupils inevitably directs classroom talk towards primarily management issues; (b) the highly structured nature of school curriculum leaves little room for negotiation between teacher and pupil; and (c) educators do not believe that dialogue significantly enhances classroom learning.

If teachers are to move toward a classroom that is more conducive to a collaborative negotiation of meaning between teacher and pupil, then communication scholars will need to generate research grounded in the more detailed, rigorous, and "precise" methodological approaches such as those presented in *Investigating Classroom Talk*. Although the authors advance as their main purpose "to draw together, from widely different research traditions" (p. 169), the book is limited to a socio-linguistics perspective that focuses primarily on structural analyses of classroom talk. The result is a text that is highly detailed and perhaps too technically oriented for many instructional communication scholars. The authors themselves mention in the final chapter that since the approaches discussed are so deeply rooted in socio-linguistics, classroom teachers themselves are unlikely to adopt these research methods, thus creating a stumbling block to increased classroom research. A less systematic (though equally

rigorous) approach than the one offered by Edwards and Westgate is urgently needed to supplement this important research in the area of classroom discourse analysis.

A linguistic-based approach to fostering communicative competence among children poses significant challenges to teachers–whose communicative activities are inarguably of primary importance to classroom life. *Investigating Classroom Talk* advocates a less sharply-defined boundary between the roles of teacher and researcher. However, the authors also acknowledge the practical limitations educators face, such as curriculum fragmentation, classroom time constraints, the traditional view of education as the mere transmission of knowledge, and various other challenges presented by a multicultural classroom. In addition to the ideas about classroom management generated by Edwards and Westgate, further classroom research in areas related to deeply held pedagogical and ideological assumptions–such as racism, commercialism, and technological determinism–will help to generate a metalanguage for teaching. Since language is an integral part of a child's educational experience, investigating classroom talk is an avenue in need of exploration by teachers as well as scholars across the disciplines.

Vanessa Elaine Greenwood
New York University

Noddings, N. (1992). *The challenge to care in schools: An alternative approach to education.* New York: Teachers College Press, Teachers College, Columbia University. 191 pp. $38.00 hard cover, $16.95 paperback.

At a time when all levels of education are reforming and restructuring, Nel Noddings proposes an alternative that would transform the structure, function, content, and pedagogy of our educational system. Instead of focusing exclusively on the intellectual development of the student, the schools would also emphasize developing healthy, competent, moral people. The content of the curriculum would shift from the liberal arts to "centers of care." Instead of the curriculum being taught in separate classes by separate teachers in different grade levels, teachers would teach an integrated curriculum to a group of students they would have over several years in a small school context. The outcome would be schools that valued a broader range of talents and abilities, including the skills, attitudes, and capacities traditionally associated with women.

The first five chapters provide a critique of the current focus and structure of American education, as well as an alternative that would focus on care and moral development. The next six chapters focus on the concept of a "center for care," including how it would be incorporated into the curriculum. The last chapter summarizes the shift in values embodied in this approach to education and addresses issues of teacher preparation, evaluation, and curriculum planning.

First, Noddings documents students' perceptions that adults in general and schools in particular do not care for or about them. Noddings maintains, "Intellectual development is important, but it cannot be the first priority of schools." (p. 10) Instead, the end goals of the schools must be radically transformed to produce more humane people.

Chapter two defines "caring" in its broadest sense and discusses the roles in caring relationships. Noddings describes the need for receptiveness and openness between the caregiver and the care receiver, a dynamic that reflects a transactional view of communication.

Noddings next critiques the emphasis on liberal education at both the high school and collegiate levels. She argues that a traditional liberal education is not the best education for anyone because it emphasizes only the rational and focuses on a limited range of intelligence, rather than encompassing the whole person and multiple talents. Second, the emphasis on the life of the mind leads students to believe that those in the professional arena are more valuable and worthy of more respect than those in vocational jobs. Finally, the liberal arts curriculum reflects activities, attitudes, and values culturally ascribed to males while those more often associated with females are neglected or entirely omitted. Thus the traditional liberal arts curriculum does not help to create moral, caring citizens, able and willing to invest themselves in goals larger than themselves.

In the fourth chapter, Noddings outlines an alternative nonhierarchical curriculum focused on six "centers of care:" care for self; care for those with whom one has close relationships; care for strangers and distant others; care for animals, plants, and the earth; care for human-made objects; and care for ideas. The moral dimension of the curriculum was included in a discussion of the "domain of acceptability," exploring what groups a person wishes to belong to, why, what must be done in order to be accepted, and the long-term impact of being part of the group. A careful, intentional discussion of this topic might help curb the growth in gangs and drugs as well as bring into question the values that prompt children to stigmatize others who get good grades as "nerds."

Copyright © 2003 EBSCO Publishing