

MCGILL UNIVERSITY

SUCCESS AND FAILURE IN FIRST GRADE:
A SOCIOLOGICAL ACCOUNT OF TEACHERS' PERSPECTIVES AND PRACTICE
IN A PUBLIC SCHOOL IN BRAZIL

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

MARIA HELENA DEGANI VEIT

MONTREAL, P.Q.

1990

of the ...

... ..

... ..
Perspective and

... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..

The
... ..
... ..

... ..

Rua Coronel ... 354 ...
904 20 Porto Alegre, P. Brasil

Signature of
in Paragraph 2.

ABSTRACT

This dissertation seeks to explore the teacher's perspectives and practices which play a role in the literacy process. The qualitative method is used in the examination of four first-grade classes in a school serving a slum population in Port-au-Prince, Haiti.

The concepts "classification" and "frame" of educational knowledge (Bernstein, 1977), the "process" of social stratification" in the classroom (Hup and Green, 1976), and the "we-they-relationships" (Chut, 1971) are used in the analysis. Participant and non-participant observations demonstrated the presence of political, and economic extra-school factors which interfered with effective teaching. Nevertheless, pupils with a long career in the first grade as well as first-time students became literate during 130 school days.

Factors influencing the success of literacy teaching were: (a) the teachers' competence; (b) their belief in education as essential to the improvement of the standard of living of slum-dwellers; (c) the establishment of a "we-relationship" where the teachers assume responsibility for the learning of each pupil and reject the rigid categorization of scholastic failure.

RESUME

Le projet de l'alphabétisation des adultes est une politique publique de développement qui est le résultat de la prise de conscience de l'importance de l'éducation pour le développement. L'alphabétisation des adultes est une politique qui vise à améliorer les conditions de vie des adultes en leur permettant d'accéder à l'éducation et de participer à la vie sociale et économique. L'alphabétisation des adultes est une politique qui vise à améliorer les conditions de vie des adultes en leur permettant d'accéder à l'éducation et de participer à la vie sociale et économique.

Le concept de "l'alphabétisation des adultes" est défini comme "un processus éducatif qui vise à améliorer les conditions de vie des adultes en leur permettant d'accéder à l'éducation et de participer à la vie sociale et économique". Le concept de "l'alphabétisation des adultes" est défini comme "un processus éducatif qui vise à améliorer les conditions de vie des adultes en leur permettant d'accéder à l'éducation et de participer à la vie sociale et économique". L'observation participante et l'observation non participante ont démontré la présence de facteurs politiques et économiques extra-scolaires qui ont été un obstacle pour un enseignement efficace. Néanmoins, des élèves qui sont restés longtemps en première ainsi que des étudiants débutants ont été alphabétisés en 80 jours scolaires.

Se sont constitués comme facteurs de succès dans l'alphabétisation: a) la compétence du professeur; b) sa foi en l'éducation comme facteur d'amélioration des conditions du défavorisé; c) l'établissement d'une "relation consociative" où les enseignants assument la responsabilité de l'apprentissage de chaque élève et rejettent la catégorisation rigide de l'échec scolaire.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

[illegible]

It is important to note that the apartment is located in a well-maintained building with high-quality finishes and furnishings. The apartment is fully furnished and includes a full kitchen, living area, and two bedrooms. The location is ideal for those looking for a long-term rental in a safe and convenient neighborhood.

In general, I would like to thank all of the people in my family who contributed to the completion of this dissertation. However, to my father, I think someone special way:

I thank in particular Professor Prudence Bains of Zoology and Professor Tom Eichen of the Faculty of Education for their advice.

Jure de Mello Mansour, an ex-student, who assisted in test administration and evaluation, and collection of secondary data in the school, accomplished with precision and dedication the difficult task of transcribing most of my interviews with teachers.

Dr. Angela Maria Brasil Pinaggio and Dr. Arabela Campos Oliven, who read Chapters I, V, VI, VIII and IX, offered valuable suggestions which clarified the text.

Tereze Thonus patiently undertook the exhaustive task of editing the English text with the competence of a native speaker with a degree in linguistics.

Finally, Helera Gomes typed the dissertation in preliminary and final versions.

Many colleagues and students provided constant support.
My thanks to them all.

Last but not least, my sincere appreciation to the four anonymous teachers who served as informants in this study. Without them this dissertation would not have been possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	i
Resume	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Chapter I - Introduction	1
Brazil in Education	3
Illiteracy in Brazil: Urban, Rural	5
Regional Differences	6
Chapter II - Theoretical Framework	12
Actors and Ideology	12
Curriculum, Pedagogy, and Evaluation	15
Social Stratification within the Classroom	19
On Constraints	21
Teaching Ideologies in the Brazilian Context	23
Chapter III - On Method	26
Selection of the School Setting in the Context	27
of Rio Grande do Sul	27
Data Collection	32
Participant Observation	33
Interviewing Teachers	35
Interviewing Pupils, Parents, and School	38
Staff Members	38
Measuring Classroom Outcomes	40
The Reading Test	40
The Spelling Test	41
Quantitative and Qualitative Data	42
Chapter IV - The Context: The School and the	44
Neighbourhood	44
School Characteristics	44
Efforts to Improve Promotion Rates in First Grade	48
The School and Its Environs	51
Conclusion	60
Chapter V - The Classrooms - Actors and Outcomes	63
Outcomes in the Four First-grade Classrooms	63

Rates of Promotion to Second Grade	66
Reading and Spelling Scores	67
The Final Ranking of Collective Scores	68
The Actors	69
The Teachers	69
The Teachers' Commitment to Teaching Literacy	70
The Teachers' Prior Success at Teaching Literacy	70
Pupils' Characteristics	71
Expectations and Predictions	71
Summary	71
Chapter VI - The School and the Profession:	76
Constraints on the Teachers' Practice	76
The School through the Eyes of the Teacher	76
Educational Principles	86
School Administration	89
School Support Services	93
Other Constraints	100
The Profession	106
Conclusion	111
Chapter VII - The Art of Teaching	114
The First-grade Curriculum in the Late Thirties and Early Eighties	114
On Curriculum Breadth and Content Priorities	116
Teaching and Evaluating Literacy	121
Teacher A	121
Teacher B	125
Teacher C	130
Teacher D	137
The Social Order in the Classroom	146
Class A	146
Class B	147
Class C	151
Class D	151

Teacher of Literacy	155
Teacher A	155
Teacher B	156
Teacher C	157
Teacher D	157
Chapter III - Academic Stratification in the Classroom	161
Contemporary and Long-Range	165
Class A	165
Class B	167
Class C	167
Class D	168
Fluidity within and between the layers	180
Class A	180
Class B	184
Class C	187
Class D	190
Ranges of Academic Stratification	198
Conclusion	200
Chapter IX - External Influences on the Literacy Process and Pupils' School Careers	202
Outside School Factors and Attainment of Literacy	202
Understanding Patterns in Pupils' School Careers	210
Persistence in School: Was There a Teacher's Effect?	210
Chapter X - Conclusion	220
Appendix	230
Bibliography	235

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The first part of this study is devoted to a description and a presentation of the context in which the study is carried out. The second part is devoted to a description of the teaching practice in the first grade of primary school, and the third part is devoted to a description of the teacher's role in the classroom. The fourth part is devoted to a description of the teacher's role in the classroom.

The introduction of the study is situated in the context of a research project which has been selected and analyzed. There are no comparable studies of the structure of practice used by first-grade teachers of lower-class students in Brazil. The data demonstrate the interplay among student characteristics - including their individual personalities and socio-economic backgrounds, teachers, and the school environment. The teachers' role often entails overcoming the dual challenge of impoverished social conditions of the students, and bureaucratic constraints on teaching practice. The data suggest that more often than not, teachers are able to win the battle for first grade literacy against these odds, at least the final war for long-run educational success in later years. But at the level studied here, teachers "can make a difference."

In this recent period Brazil experienced the transition from military rule towards the development of democratic institutions. In 1987, a new National Constituent Assembly was instituted and on October 5, 1988 the new constitution was promulgated. The legislative branch had its powers returned and was given new responsibilities in financial-economic matters; as well, new individual, collective and social rights affecting education were enshrined. From the text of the new

1992 1993 1994 1995 1996 1997 1998 1999 2000 2001 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016 2017 2018 2019 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024 2025 2026 2027 2028 2029 2030 2031 2032 2033 2034 2035 2036 2037 2038 2039 2040 2041 2042 2043 2044 2045 2046 2047 2048 2049 2050 2051 2052 2053 2054 2055 2056 2057 2058 2059 2060 2061 2062 2063 2064 2065 2066 2067 2068 2069 2070 2071 2072 2073 2074 2075 2076 2077 2078 2079 2080 2081 2082 2083 2084 2085 2086 2087 2088 2089 2090 2091 2092 2093 2094 2095 2096 2097 2098 2099 2100 2101 2102 2103 2104 2105 2106 2107 2108 2109 2110 2111 2112 2113 2114 2115 2116 2117 2118 2119 2120 2121 2122 2123 2124 2125 2126 2127 2128 2129 2130 2131 2132 2133 2134 2135 2136 2137 2138 2139 2140 2141 2142 2143 2144 2145 2146 2147 2148 2149 2150 2151 2152 2153 2154 2155 2156 2157 2158 2159 2160 2161 2162 2163 2164 2165 2166 2167 2168 2169 2170 2171 2172 2173 2174 2175 2176 2177 2178 2179 2180 2181 2182 2183 2184 2185 2186 2187 2188 2189 2190 2191 2192 2193 2194 2195 2196 2197 2198 2199 2200 2201 2202 2203 2204 2205 2206 2207 2208 2209 2210 2211 2212 2213 2214 2215 2216 2217 2218 2219 2220 2221 2222 2223 2224 2225 2226 2227 2228 2229 2230 2231 2232 2233 2234 2235 2236 2237 2238 2239 2240 2241 2242 2243 2244 2245 2246 2247 2248 2249 2250 2251 2252 2253 2254 2255 2256 2257 2258 2259 2260 2261 2262 2263 2264 2265 2266 2267 2268 2269 2270 2271 2272 2273 2274 2275 2276 2277 2278 2279 2280 2281 2282 2283 2284 2285 2286 2287 2288 2289 2290 2291 2292 2293 2294 2295 2296 2297 2298 2299 2300 2301 2302 2303 2304 2305 2306 2307 2308 2309 2310 2311 2312 2313 2314 2315 2316 2317 2318 2319 2320 2321 2322 2323 2324 2325 2326 2327 2328 2329 2330 2331 2332 2333 2334 2335 2336 2337 2338 2339 2340 2341 2342 2343 2344 2345 2346 2347 2348 2349 2350 2351 2352 2353 2354 2355 2356 2357 2358 2359 2360 2361 2362 2363 2364 2365 2366 2367 2368 2369 2370 2371 2372 2373 2374 2375 2376 2377 2378 2379 2380 2381 2382 2383 2384 2385 2386 2387 2388 2389 2390 2391 2392 2393 2394 2395 2396 2397 2398 2399 2400 2401 2402 2403 2404 2405 2406 2407 2408 2409 2410 2411 2412 2413 2414 2415 2416 2417 2418 2419 2420 2421 2422 2423 2424 2425 2426 2427 2428 2429 2430 2431 2432 2433 2434 2435 2436 2437 2438 2439 2440 2441 2442 2443 2444 2445 2446 2447 2448 2449 2450 2451 2452 2453 2454 2455 2456 2457 2458 2459 2460 2461 2462 2463 2464 2465 2466 2467 2468 2469 2470 2471 2472 2473 2474 2475 2476 2477 2478 2479 2480 2481 2482 2483 2484 2485 2486 2487 2488 2489 2490 2491 2492 2493 2494 2495 2496 2497 2498 2499 2500 2501 2502 2503 2504 2505 2506 2507 2508 2509 2510 2511 2512 2513 2514 2515 2516 2517 2518 2519 2520 2521 2522 2523 2524 2525 2526 2527 2528 2529 2530 2531 2532 2533 2534 2535 2536 2537 2538 2539 2540 2541 2542 2543 2544 2545 2546 2547 2548 2549 2550 2551 2552 2553 2554 2555 2556 2557 2558 2559 2560 2561 2562 2563 2564 2565 2566 2567 2568 2569 2570 2571 2572 2573 2574 2575 2576 2577 2578 2579 2580 2581 2582 2583 2584 2585 2586 2587 2588 2589 2590 2591 2592 2593 2594 2595 2596 2597 2598 2599 2600 2601 2602 2603 2604 2605 2606 2607 2608 2609 2610 2611 2612 2613 2614 2615 2616 2617 2618 2619 2620 2621 2622 2623 2624 2625 2626 2627 2628 2629 2630 2631 2632 2633 2634 2635 2636 2637 2638 2639 2640 2641 2642 2643 2644 2645 2646 2647 2648 2649 2650 2651 2652 2653 2654 2655 2656 2657 2658 2659 2660 2661 2662 2663 2664 2665 2666 2667 2668 2669 2670 2671 2672 2673 2674 2675 2676 2677 2678 2679 2680 2681 2682 2683 2684 2685 2686 2687 2688 2689 2690 2691 2692 2693 2694 2695 2696 2697 2698 2699 2700 2701 2702 2703 2704 2705 2706 2707 2708 2709 2710 2711 2712 2713 2714 2715 2716 2717 2718 2719 2720 2721 2722 2723 2724 2725 2726 2727 2728 2729 2730 2731 2732 2733 2734 2735 2736 2737 2738 2739 2740 2741 2742 2743 2744 2745 2746 2747 2748 2749 2750 2751 2752 2753 2754 2755 2756 2757 2758 2759 2760 2761 2762 2763 2764 2765 2766 2767 2768 2769 2770 2771 2772 2773 2774 2775 2776 2777 2778 2779 2780 2781 2782 2783 2784 2785 2786 2787 2788 2789 2790 2791 2792 2793 2794 2795 2796 2797 2798 2799 2800 2801 2802 2803 2804 2805 2806 2807 2808 2809 2810

$\frac{1}{2} \times \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{4}$

[illegible]

Chapter 11 focuses on the importance of the family in the lives of the four 14-year-olds who participate in the study. The family is a classroom piece of socialization for the children, and the family is a primary learning center; she teaches, socializes, and provides for the child's needs. The study establishes values and norms of the street culture that the children learn within the first grade of life. The family is the first and best teacher.

Chapter IX has two purposes. First, it summarizes the findings of a group of pupils of a middle class public school in terms of their own and parents' occupation, which it then compares with the findings of the other groups. Second, it distinguishes those who could not read from those who could read in first grade by focusing on (a) intra-classroom factors, (b) extra-classroom factors, and (c) the grade experience on the subsequent year of the children. A concluding chapter summarizes the findings and offers insights gleaned from the research.

Brazilian Education

Before introducing the theoretical approach, the macro-sociological context of the study and the significance of the literary problem to be solved.

Selectivity in Brazilian behavior was apparent only after glancing at the various test situations.

having to do with the right to education. These have been shaped by changing political regimes.

Brazil, which began as a monarchy, declared its independence from Portugal in 1822 and became a republic in 1889. The revolution of 1930 put an end to the Old Republic, giving way to the short-lived New Republic. In 1937 Getulio Vargas inaugurated a dictatorship. Brazilian participation in the Second World War on the side of the Allies influenced the return to representative government. Elections were held in December of 1945, after which democratic institutions were reinstated. In 1964, President Joao Goulart was ousted from power; the military stopped the trend towards a feared left of centre government.

A new openness began at the end of the 1970's when U.S. President Jimmy Carter took up the banner of civil rights. The military regime, which had come to power in 1964, gave way to a period of transition to democracy, during which a president was elected by the National Congress on January 15, 1985. A new constitution was promulgated on October 5, 1988.

We turn to the analysis of the right to education, examining passages of the constitutions which correspond to each historical period. One hundred years after the first constitution had been signed by Emperor Pedro I, access to education was still very restricted. Up to 1924 "nothing had been done for the education of the Brazilian people." With the exception of one-fifth of the population of the state of Sao Paulo, Brazil was peopled "almost exclusively by illiterates" (Serva, in Ferrari, 1977: 101).

Brazilian society would soon enter a period of change; at the end of the 1920's a movement towards educational reform appeared. Anisio Teixeira - a student of John Dewey at Columbia University and one of the proponents of a new orientation for Brazilian education - described the movement as follows:

The process of making the state primary school

available to all was initiated in the 1920's, with the start of industrialization and consequent popular pressure to participate in the scarce opportunities for schooling offered by the nation.

In the face of public pressure for access to schooling, and the awakening of the consciousness that it was the duty of the State to offer it, a movement started in Sao Paulo which must be considered the first step towards the democratization of the primary school and the support of universal education (Teixeira, 1968:73, in Ferrari, 1977:104).

This movement - known as **The New School**, as opposed to the traditional school - culminated in the 1932 "Manifesto of the Pioneers of New Education," which influenced the constitution of 1934. The educators who were signatories to the manifesto fought to insert in the new constitutional text the idea of a public (non-sectarian), free, obligatory, coeducational school, open to all seven-to-fifteen-year-olds, or, at least, those "entrusted by their parents to the public school" (in Ferrari, 1977:105).

The constitution of 1934 includes an entire chapter entitled "On Education and Culture" (Chapter II, Title V, Articles 148-158). One of the most relevant paragraphs is quoted below:

Article 149 - Education is a right common to all and shall be provided by the family and by the government to serve both Brazilians and foreigners residing in the country, so as to propitiate having efficient factors for the moral and economic life of the nation, and to develop the consciousness of human solidarity in a Brazilian spirit.

In Article 150, free primary education and obligatory attendance were established. The right to such education was also extended to adults. Thus, in 1934, the right to education common to all and the corresponding duty of the state to provide it were made explicit - they had been only implicit in the imperial constitution of 1824.

In the 1937 constitution mandated by Getulio Vargas the

duty of the state in providing for education was maintained in Article 128. Access to public schools is assured to children and youth who lack the means to pay tuition at private institutions:

Article 129 - It is the duty of the nation, states and municipalities to assure children and youth who lack the resources needed for education in private institutions, the opportunity of receiving adequate education of their faculties, aptitudes and vocational abilities, through the creation of public institutions of learning at all levels.

The free and obligatory nature of primary education is also made explicit (Art. 130). One sees, however, that "the pre-vocational and professional training, directed at the economically less-favoured classes," is "the first duty of the state, in terms of education" (Art. 129).

The constitution of September 18, 1946, the beginning of a new democratic period in Brazil, confirmed the principles enunciated in 1934 of universal access to education and the obligatory nature of primary school. In 1946, however, the duty of the state to provide education became implicit, and free schooling became limited to "official primary education." that is to the public primary schools (Articles 166; 168, I and II).

The constitution of 1967, written under military rule, reaffirmed universal access to education. The 1967 and 1969 constitutions established free primary education at official educational institutions and extended compulsory education to the age of fourteen. The state, therefore, pledged itself to open public schools for eight consecutive years of study.

In addition, "each school system" - funded either by the state or the federal government - was to "obligatorily have services of educational assistance, assuring conditions for efficient schooling to needy pupils."

The major piece of federal legislation affecting primary schooling is Law 5692 of 1971, which superceded laws passed

in 1946 and 1961. Law 5692 passed by the National Congress reorganized education in Brazil. The new primary school, called "elementary school" in this work, extended to eight grades the possible six of the earlier 1961 legislation.

Article 17 of Law 5692 establishes that "the elementary school aims at the education of the child and the pre-adolescent, which will vary in content and method according to the developmental phase of the pupil." Subsequent articles establish the duration of elementary school as eight school years, obligatory from seven to fourteen years, and states that it is the responsibility of the municipalities to survey the school-age population and mobilize them for enrolment (Arts. 18 and 20).

Yet despite the rhetoric of the constitutional and legislative efforts dealing with education, Brazilian society has clearly not secured the right to elementary education for all its citizens. The availability and quality of educational resources vary according to the social position one has in society.

In the view of Georges Burdeau:

"The modern constitutions do not draw the contours of the existent social order, but of what structure the future society must attain." Its role "is precisely to indicate objectives, much more than to consecrate a state of fact" (in Britto, 1984:512).

Pontes de Miranda (1972, in Britto, 1984:520) comments incisively on the limitations of the texts of Brazilian constitutions:

Education can only be a right common to all if **there is** a sufficient number of schools and if **nobody** is excluded from them; thus, if there is "subjective public right" to education, and the State is able (to provide such an education), it must be accountable for doing so. If not, it would be deceiving the people with articles of Constitutions or laws...

These failures were seen in the high rates of illiteracy,

which in turn affected the opportunities to vote, and possibilities for reform for the Brazilian poor. Only in 1985 was the constitution amended giving to illiterates the right to vote. This previous exclusion from the political process made the lack of educational opportunities detrimental to prospects for political reform. Illiteracy, therefore, was doubly penalizing. It limited economic opportunity, while also preventing political mobilization and reform, through the electoral system.

Still, the recently-acquired right to vote by illiterates does not decrease the importance of literacy, which is a first step towards personal growth and greater opportunity. A large number of Brazilians have not even entered the domain of the printed word when education is already entering the computer age.

Illiteracy in Brazil: Urban, Rural, and Regional Differences

One study of Brazilian illiteracy (Ferrari, 1985) offers data relevant in the introduction of the problem of this thesis at a macrolevel. The work presents historical data of illiteracy in Brazil, showing the dimensions of the problem at the national level and the position of the state of Rio Grande do Sul in this context.

Illiteracy in Brazil is an enormous challenge to those who are truly interested in universal education. The most recent census, in 1980, defined as literate those who were capable of reading and writing a simple note. It reported that 25.5 percent of the population could not (Table 1 in Appendix).

Illiteracy was distributed among all age groups. It registered approximately 16 percent among those fifteen to nineteen, and twenty to twenty-four years old - the most literate age groups (Ferrari, 1985: 37-38). There were 32.7 million (or 31.9 percent) illiterate persons who were five

years of age or older (Table 2 in Appendix); of those, 11.7 million lived in urban areas and 17 million in rural areas.

Northeast Brazil, a region which has a dry climate and is economically the least developed, had the highest rate of illiteracy in the country - 46.3 percent. It was followed by the sparsely-populated North, for several decades still the zone of the Amazon jungle, with 30.6 percent. The Center-West, in part a continuation of the Amazon and location of the ecological reserve known as "O Pantanal" (The Swamp), registered a figure of 25.1 percent. The lowest rates of illiteracy occurred in the economically-developed Southeast and South - 16.1 and 15.1 respectively.

This thesis focuses on the process of becoming literate in the state of Rio Grande do Sul, which shared with Santa Catarina some of the lowest rates of illiteracy - 12.5 and 12.4 percent respectively.

Table 2 (Appendix) shows the trend of illiteracy in Brazil from 1872 to 1980 and two states which represent extreme positions as to illiteracy. Piaui, in the Northeast, had the fourth highest rate of illiteracy in 1980. The first three highest rates of illiteracy in the country were Alagoas (54.3), Maranhao (50.2), and Paraiba (49.7). In contrast, Rio Grande do Sul represented the third lowest illiteracy rate, as noted above (Ferrari, 1985:40).

One can observe the slow decline in illiteracy rates in Brazil as a whole from 1872 to 1980, and a concomitant rise in the absolute numbers of illiterates when analyzing the population five years of age or older. During the last decade, in which military bureaucrats developed a well-funded adult literacy program known as MOBRAI, there was still an increase of 2 million in the number of illiterates in relation to 1970. Rio Grande do Sul was one of the few states to register an absolute as well as relative decline in illiteracy to 1980.

Ferrari (1932:44), in an attempt to explain why Rio Grande do Sul showed a decline in illiteracy before São Paulo, the most economically developed state, did, points to non-Portuguese European immigration, beginning with the Germans in 1841. One might add that both São Paulo and Rio Grande do Sul were favoured by Italian immigration, but São Paulo during this century also attracted the migrant poor from the Northeast. In 1970, 17.2 percent of the population five and over of Rio Grande do Sul were illiterate.

Related to the illiteracy problem is the fact that many children aged five to fourteen are not in school. They amounted to 12.2 million - 5.3 million in urban areas, and 6.9 million in rural areas. In relative numbers they comprised 42.1 percent of this age group, 29.3 percent located in urban areas and 63.5 in rural areas. (See Table 3 in the Appendix).

Many of those children remaining in school have experienced failure, leading to a gap between grade level and chronological age. In the Brazilian educational system, seven-year-old children enrolled in the first grade are expected to be literate by the end of the school year, eight-year-old children are expected to successfully complete the second grade, and so on. Fourteen-year-olds are slated to finish all eight years of elementary school. Children who demonstrate such attainment at the specified age or earlier are considered to be keeping pace with the system. Children one year late are considered slightly behind, and children who lag two or more years in the system are considered very behind indeed.

Of almost 23 million children seven to fourteen years old, 67.1 percent attended school, but only 23.3 percent, or less than one-fourth of the Brazilian population in this age group, were enrolled in a grade level corresponding with his/her age, and was thus considered to be achieving as expected. In Rio Grande do Sul 36.4 percent of children seven

to fourteen were in school at an appropriate grade level. One notices, then, that Rio Grande do Sul is the state which in 1980 registered the least (though still unacceptably frequent) exclusion from school in the most literate region of Brazil. (Table 4 in Appendix).

Each year roughly 25 percent of elementary school students in Brazil could not be promoted, with 26.3 percent the rate in Rio Grande do Sul.

In the distribution of rates of promotion in the eight grades of elementary school, first graders consistently demonstrated the lowest percentage in the five instances shown in Table 5. The national rate for promotion was 67 percent, and only 60.6 percent in Rio Grande do Sul. (Table 5 in Appendix).

An additional problem in Brazilian education is caused by those who drop out, either for good or returning the following year. In 1980, 10.7 percent of first graders left school before the end of the year ("immediate dropouts"), while 27.6 percent of those who attended the whole year did not return in 1981 ("mediate dropouts") (Brasil, IBGE, 1984:311,313).

In short, access to the first grade is almost universal in Brazil, but persistence presents a problem for low-income families who earn the minimum monthly wage or less and live largely in the rural Northeast (Fletcher and Ribeiro, 1987:1,2).

Elementary enrollments are concentrated in the first two grades. Final enrollment attained 9.1 million for the first two grades of elementary school, whereas 10.2 million was the number of students enrolled in the other six grades put together (Table 5 in Appendix). First grade enrollment corresponded to almost 5.9 million pupils, or 30.3 percent, rather than the 12.5 one would expect, if enrollment were evenly distributed among the eight grades of elementary

school. The massive first-grade enrollment in comparison with that of other grades in Brazil as a whole, is explained by a high rate of nonpromotion at that level - 3 percent. Repetition of grades in elementary school is a general problem in Brazilian education. It overloads enrollment, leading to a decrease in the enrollment of new pupils and to a large number of overage children in school.

In this dissertation the process of literacy is studied to detect relevant processes at the microlevel which might support or hamper becoming literate in a large public school serving a lower-class population in Porto Alegre, Rio Grande do Sul. The focus of this study is on how promotion and failure were produced in four classrooms during the 1984 school year. Eighty-three lower-class pupils, who were enrolled in schools from 1979 to 1987, were studied in detail. Some were promoted, some failed, and some simply left school.

Student turnover in and of itself was a matter for investigation. Limits to the study were posed by the high horizontal mobility of this slum population in search of conditions for survival, which obligated many students to be transferred to other schools, sometimes going back to their location of origin; other students had to enter the job market and did not leave any information about why they no longer attended class. Limitations were also posed by the lack of organization of the educational system in a society which is unable or unwilling to offer the right to education to all of its citizens. With such a large number of children excluded from elementary education, it is impossible to tell how many spent some time in the school system, or none at all. Thus, one is unable to keep track of those who have been excluded from educational institutions. Not even the current status of those no longer attending the particular school studied is always knowable, as the last registration of a pupil who leaves the school refers to a transfer to another school.

The others are lost by the educational system and one can infer that they silently entered the formal or informal job market if they were lucky enough. They will re-appear in the 1990 census, more likely in the category which includes those "not attending school."

CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The thesis is about the problems faced by teachers in working with lower-class first grade pupils.

Burn (1973:266) points out that the focus of research must be on "why lower-class children often find it hard to master the apparently simple tasks that schools ask them to perform." Two research fronts, according to him, are: the effect of changes in the curriculum (in teaching styles or in the evaluation of students) on the performance of different groups of students; and "how teachers and students work together to produce school failure despite their best intentions to the contrary" (1973:182).

The lines of research just indicated, especially the second, influenced this investigation - the processes which yield success or failure in literacy, by teachers and pupils who are influenced by intra- and extra-classroom factors.

Actors and Ideology

The perspective of analysis in this thesis is based predominantly on Schutz's approach to phenomenology, which conceives "the individual as an actor in the social world defin(ing) the reality he encounters" (in Natanson, 1971: XXVIII):

When I encounter a man acting in the social world, I know that I must understand him as a human being, and this means that his actions mean something to him as well as to me, relate to his world as well as to mine, and are ultimately rooted in the interpretive scheme he has created for living his life. But this knowledge is itself taken for granted by me as well as by him; its being taken for granted by us is precisely the typification which makes intersubjectivity possible (in Natanson,

1971:XXV).

This recent orientation which originates in the actor's consciousness (in Natanson, 1971:XXV) is in contrast to functional and Marxist structuralism, in which the actor's role is reduced to a merely passive one. However, the perspective adopted here, while retaining the model of man as an active creator - characterized by his intentionality, - also retains from Marxist theory the stand that basic societal structures regulate or, at least, condition interindividual action and must be analyzed as objective dimension.

Sociological analyses of school inequalities experienced by lower-class children were initially shaped by Marxist themes. Yet slowly the importance of studying the role of culture, mediated by curriculum and pedagogy, emerged.

Thus, instead of Bowles' and Gintis's (1976) correspondence theory, or cruder forms, in which the economic base of production is considered to be the determinant of what schools do, a new conception arose. Social formations are seen "as being made up of a complex totality of economic, political and cultural/ideological practices... interrelated (and) jointly creat(ing) the conditions of existence for each other." The latter engendered studies of the curriculum and social relations in schools "as sets of ideological practices." (Apple and Weis, 1983:20-21).

Apple and Weis make the case for the importance of schools and actors - teachers and students - resisting the dominant ideological forms:

If education can be no more than an epiphenomenon tied directly to the requirements of an economy, then little can be done within education itself. It is a totally determined institution. However, if schools (and people) are not passive mirrors of an economy, but instead are active agents in the processes of reproduction and contestation of dominant social relations, then understanding what they do and acting upon them becomes of no small moment. For if schools are part of a "contested terrain," if they are part of a much

for performance of, and the level of, the activity or level of abstraction.

A teaching perspective, on the other hand, is defined as:

...A perspective on the actions a person takes in a particular situation. A perspective on what is thought and actions. It certainly includes the concept of the environment and the person's creates; ideas about what is in the environment and the individual's estimate of their resources to handle the situation; and projects, and what can be expected from the environment; a rational, rationalization of the situation; a specification of the kinds of action one may or ought to involve; a set of criteria to evaluate one's own and other's action; and finally, a set of consequent attitudes and actions which are employed to deal with the situation (Sharp and Green, 1974: 10).

Although the concept of teaching perspective includes thoughts and actions, the latter are distinguished from the former in the process of investigation. The process of teaching and evaluating is performed and observed in the classrooms is referred to in this study as teacher's "practices." The dimensions of the teacher's perspective and practices to be analyzed are presented in the following section.

Curriculum, Pedagogy and Evaluation

A first conceptual demarcation put forth is that of the three perspectives, practices and structures. These are based on Bernstein's (1971; 1974; 1977) concept of "classification" and "frame" for their potential in characterizing curriculum, pedagogy and evaluation.

The concept of "classification" refers to "the degree of boundary maintenance between contents" of a curriculum. The contents of subjects can be in open or enclosed relation to

each other. When there is strong boundary maintenance between contents, i.e., strong classification, the various contents are in closed relation to each other; they are "well insulated from each other." This is what one observes in a class where the pupils have a fixed period of time for reading, another for spelling, and yet another for mathematics. One may say that the curriculum of the class is strongly classified. On the other hand, a curriculum is weakly classified when the contents are in open relation to each other, or, "if there is reduced insulation between contents," or even when the boundaries between contents are blurred. Strong classification "reduces the power of the teacher over what he transmits, as he may not over-step the boundary between contents" (Bernstein, 1975: 87;88;90).

In addition to the degree of boundary strength, Bernstein (1975:86) points to the importance of studying the differential status accorded to each subject: a) comparing the amount of time dedicated to each subject; and b) observing which contents, from the point of view of the pupils, are compulsory or optional.

The concept of "frame" refers to the pedagogical relationship, to the teacher-pupil relationship, i.e., "to the degree of control teacher and pupil possess over the selection, organization, pacing and timing of the knowledge transmitted and received in the pedagogical relationship" (Bernstein, 1975:89). Pacing, or "the rate of expected learning," is

...implicitly based upon the middle-class socialization of the child. Middle-class family socialization of the child is a hidden subsidy, in the sense that it provides both a physical and psychological environment which immensely facilitates, in diverse ways, school learning. The middle-class child is oriented to learning almost anything....Where the school system is not subsidized by the home, the pupil often fails. In this way, even the pacing of educational knowledge is class based. It may well be that frame strength, as this refers to pacing, is a critical variable in the study of educability

(Bernstein, 1975:113).

Given the setting of this research and slum-dwelling, working-class pupils, a strong frame as to pacing, would represent grading the curriculum during the academic year according to the performance of the ablest group, thus implying explicit or disguised streaming of pupils. Bernstein left what he means by a weak frame in relation to pacing undefined; it might signify that the rate of the fastest pupils is not made a rigid standard by the teacher.

Classification and frame are characteristics that vary independently of one another. With these concepts, Bernstein provides a typology of educational codes in which the extreme cases are the collection code, characterized by strong classification and strong frame, and the integrated code, characterized by weak classification and weak frame. The codes "organize how authority and power are to be mediated throughout all aspects of the school encounter and experience" (Giroux, 1981:10).

The following quotations make explicit the presence of "hierarchical surveillance" in both the collection and integrated codes (Bernstein, 1975:98,122):

The stronger the classification and the framing, the more the educational relationship tends to be hierarchical and ritualized, the educand seen as ignorant, with little status and few rights....(these rights) used for... sustaining the motivation of pupils. Depending upon the strength of frames, knowledge is transmitted in a context where the teacher has maximal control or surveillance...

As these (classification and frame) weaken, so the socialization encourages more of the socialized to become visible, his uniqueness to be made manifest. Such socialization is deeply penetrating, more total as the surveillance becomes more invisible.

Bernstein's treatment of openness/closure of curriculum contents and authority in pedagogic relationships shows

similarities to Foucault's attention to institutions which discipline - "comparing, differentiating, hierarchizing, homogenizing and excluding" (1977:183). Bernstein often uses the concept of control but also mentions that of surveillance (1974:214; 1975:98,122; and above). The latter is frequent in Foucault (1977).

Foucault's work is used here to extend Bernstein's conception of "frame." The literacy process represents the curriculum content expected to be developed in 180 days, or in one academic year; here, we have two of Bernstein's elements of frame - "selection of contents" and "timing." The "pacing" of knowledge, or "the rate of expected learning," may vary from class to class and pupil to pupil; this rate depends, however, on (a) a certain distribution of pupils in space; (b) a more or less "exhaustive" use of time; (c) a certain hierarchical surveillance; and (d) a context of norms controlling activities where a punishment-gratification system is established (Foucault, 1977:146-47;154;175-76;182-83).

Social Stratification within the Classroom

Sharp and Green (1975:34) consider power crucial in the analysis of society, as do Bernstein and Foucault:

(O)ne can control others and bring sanctions to bear against others, irrespective of ...(one's) definition of reality...Although all forms of power may be sustained ultimately by force, at the lower level,...in stable situations, far more subtle forms of power may be in evidence.

This quotation calls attention to the teacher's power as a reality-definer of social order in her class. Our examination of pupils' identities in the culture of classrooms centers on the influence of the teacher-student relationship on pupils' performance. The establishment of friendly relationships favourable to performance will depend not only on constraints or facilitative elements encountered, as Sharp

and Green point out, but also on the teacher's concept of the role of education. Teacher's perspectives on education are essential elements in the establishment of intimate face-to-face relationships, though contingent upon such constraints as teacher-pupil ratio and school organization.

Sharp and Green hypothesize "a contemporary-consociate continuum" arising in classrooms, founding their contribution on Alfred Schutz's treatment of the face-to-face situation. Schutz (1964:23,29) describes the "we-relationship," in which two persons experience each other as consociates, in this way:

I experience a fellow-man directly if and when he shares with me a common sector of time and space....This temporal and spatial immediacy are essential characteristics of the face-to-face situation....

(I)n the face-to-face situation the conscious life of my fellow-man becomes accessible to me by a maximum of vivid indications. Since he is confronting me in person, the range of symptoms by which I apprehend his consciousness includes much more than what he is communicating to me purposefully. I observe his movements, gestures and facial expressions, I hear the intonation and the rhythm of his utterances....(M)y partner is given to me more vividly and, in a sense, more "directly" than I apprehend myself.

Schutz (1964:37) brings to our attention that "in face-to-face situations fellow-men are experienced on different levels of intimacy and in different degrees of directness," extending into the world of "mere contemporaries":

The gradations of experiential directness outside the face-to-face situation are characterized by a decrease in the wealth of symptoms by which I apprehend the Other and by the fact that the perspectives in which I experience the Other are progressively narrower....(I)mmediacy is lacking in my experience of mere contemporaries (1964:37,41).

For Sharp and Green (1975:120), though children in classrooms share space and time with the teacher, they become anonymous, as if remote in space and time in the Schutzian

conception,

...because the teacher's common-sense knowledge is no use to her in handling them, given her classroom management problem....While the consociate is known in a relatively complex and personal but generally unreflective way, certain children emerge as contemporaries because it is impossible to communicate with them.

Sharp and Green emphasize that "material and social constraints on the teacher" - not the teacher's consciousness - are the prime independent causal variables leading to anonymization of certain pupils.

Thus such pupils present themselves as strangers to the teacher's cognitive paradigms and routine practices in this context and this generates problems for the teacher which in her theoretical practice entails the need for non-common sense, reflective theoretical knowledge where the categories are drawn from 'esoteric' or abstract knowledge. This is an initial process in the reification of the child's identity as a social structural process and phenomenon in the classroom. The category tends to be hardened, the fit being more convincing to its user (the teacher) the more the child continues to feed back the appropriate behavioural cues....(T)he process of hardening in the child's identity is related to the degree to which extra-classroom audiences come to accept this reified definition of the child (Sharp and Green, 1975:120).

The authors explain that as long as parents and other teachers accept this reified or labelled definition of the child, "pressure is taken off the teacher and her management problem is reduced" (1975:120).

Sharp and Green posit the development of a process of social stratification within the classroom affected by the teacher's consciousness "embedded in a wide structure of material and social relationships." Hierarchical differentiation of the pupils arises "in order that the teacher may solve the problems she is confronted with and provide some legitimation for the allocation of her time and energies"; the pupils are not "merely passive 'objects'"

(1975:116). In this process of social differentiation the authors unveil four dimensions. The first one is based on Schutz's conception of "we- and they- relationships," previously discussed. The second concerns the child's fluidity, or mobility possibilities, within the classroom stratification system. The third concerns accommodation of deviant behavior. The fourth concerns the range of the differentiation/stratification in the class.

The first significant way in which the classrooms vary is in the likelihood of the children acquiring a reified identity and the possibility of the child having room to negotiate a satisfactory relationship with the teacher where intersubjectivity and a high level and intensity of interaction is a feature of their relationship....

(T)he second dimension of variability...concerns the degree of fluidity within the classroom and the possibility for the child to be socially mobile within the main layers of the stratification system we have identified....

Third, the potentialities for deviance within the classroom will vary from teacher to teacher....(T)he deviant child is the child whose mode of being in the classroom cannot be integrated into the teacher's common sense and practice and who presents the teacher with management problems in the maintenance of social order. It is suggested that the more elaborate the system of norms and rules which define acceptable pupil behaviour, the greater the possibility for pupils to transgress these institutionalized expectations and thus acquire a deviant status.

The fourth dimension of variability relates to what could be called the range of the stratification system or the distance between the lower and upper levels...associated with the degree of teacher surveillance and teacher directiveness over the pupils (Sharp and Green, 1975:129-130).

On Constraints

Social reality exerts especially strong structural

pressures on individuals at the bottom of the social ladder.

In specifying types of constraints on teachers, Sharp and Green speak of social and physical "extra-classroom" as well as "intra-classroom pressures." Social or symbolic constraints are: colleagues' vocabulary and rhetoric identifying the school ideology; expectations of colleagues, superiors, and parents; and "standards of 'good pedagogical practice'." Physical constraints include: "teacher-pupil ratio,...architecture and layout of the classrooms, the 'materials' therein, and other human and non-human resources at the teacher's disposal" (Sharp and Green, 1975:6;7;116;238-239).

The concept of "constraint," in this work, indicates aspects which may or may not be acknowledged by the teacher or the pupils, mainly in relation to macro-structural pressures.

The school belongs to the sphere of the state and is the place where students prepare to enter the work force; in the former sphere a democratic dynamic prevails, while in the latter, dominated by production, a non-equalitarian dynamic is manifest. Contradictory pressures exist within the state itself between the political sphere - based on democratic principles - and the bureaucratic mode of production. Certainly, regulations governing the teaching profession will be shown to have unintended consequences with regards to offering equal educational opportunity to disadvantaged children - based on hierarchical principles (Enquita, 1988: 164).

While cognizant of constraints, it is a central theme of this study that (rare) teachers do have the ability to overcome social determinants. A prime example of such teaching is the case of "Miss A," a very successful Grade One teacher in a Montreal lower-class district. This teacher's pupils in Canada not only learned to do well, but continued

to do better than peers in the same school who had other teachers. The researchers claimed to have traced the effects of Miss A well into occupational careers of her former students (Pedersen, Faucher, and Eaton, 1978). This study, though different in method, shares the same emphasis on the ability of committed teaching to overcome societal constraints.

Teaching Ideologies in the Brazilian Context

In this section, teaching ideologies - as they developed historically in Brazil - are presented. These ideologies are a backdrop against which the teacher's perspectives and practices may be compared. If Bernstein's (1975) concepts of classification and frame furnish elements for a formal comparison of the four classrooms, the various elements of pedagogy provide a concrete description of the contents of teaching which shaped the four teachers under examination.

The year of 1932 was marked by the publication of the **Manifesto of the Pioneers of the New School**, which brought controlled modernization to education.

The New School, as opposed to traditional pedagogues, was considered as

...conceiving learning as a process of individual acquisition, according to each pupil's intellectual and emotional conditions. The pupils are encouraged to learn by observing, doing research, questioning, working, constructing, thinking, and solving problematic situations which are presented to them, whether in an environment of...objects and practical actions, as in situations of social and moral sense, either real or symbolic (Lourenco Filho, in Di Giorgi, 1986:15-16).

In the traditional school, education was centered on the adult, on the intellect, and on knowledge; in the New School "the axis of the educational process changes to the child, to life, to activity" (Saviani, 1984:276).

The New School advocated, among other ideas, pupil-

centered teaching and modern methods, which have persisted into the present (Di Giorgi, 1988:6,63).

At the end of the 1950's, the problems of culture and education of the impoverished of Brazil were raised anew. The **Paulo Freire Movement for Adult Education** was the most significant of this period. In his effort to put theory into practice, Freire developed both a language of critique and a language of hope that together have proven successful in liberating the lives of generations of disenfranchised people.

Freire emphasizes pedagogical practices designed to create what he terms dialogical communication. His pedagogical structures are designed for liberation by providing individual and collective possibilities for reflection and action. Dialogical communication should prompt educators to draw upon the cultural capital of the oppressed in order to allow the oppressed to "read" the world in both immediate and wider contexts. For Freire, educators who ignore the cultural capital, language, and life-style of the oppressed practice a form of cultural invasion (McLaren, 1989:196).

However, the "technicist" trend in education, inaugurated with the coup d'etat in 1964, was dominant at the end of the 1960's and influenced Law 5692/1971, establishing "Directives and Bases for Elementary and Secondary Education." "Technicist" pedagogy was an attempt to increase the efficiency of the teacher's work, and stressed two themes: the operationalization of educational objectives and the mechanization of the teaching process. "The aim was planning education in order to endow it with a rational organization capable of minimizing subjective interference which could risk its efficiency" (Saviani, 1984:279). It did not, however, influence teachers' broad perspectives or their practice, though it did create a closer relationship between daily objectives and evaluation (Di Giorgi, 1986:63-64). Teachers and policy makers were reminded, concurrently with this technicist trend, that studies of Brazil's educational system continued to find that the basic function of education is the

reproduction of social conditions of inequality (Gavini, 1984:282-283).

A synthesis of a progressive ideology, building on models developed by Snyders (1977; and in Di Giorgi, 1986:20-21), Freire (1987) and others sees teachers are seen as representing a liberating potential, despite the pressures of cultural conformity. This dissertation is thus an addition to the long-standing debate as to whether schools - defined by a host of variables from teacher quality, administration, curriculum, support services - "can make a difference" in overcoming impediments of social structure for school achievement.

In this study, an attempt is made to detect the effect of teaching ideologies on the teachers' perspectives. An education for liberation does not assume that teaching is the main force for social change. The transformation of society implies many tasks - great and small - but the teacher may be one of its agents.

CHAPTER III

ON METHOD

This dissertation is a case study of four Grade One classes in a state school serving the metropolitan region of Porto Alegre in Rio Grande do Sul in 1984. I opted for a large school offering all eight grades of elementary school as well as a great number of school support services to a population residing in a slum area. The school selected had a significant increase in first-grade enrollment in 1984, had teachers who tended to have an educational level higher than a normal-school diploma; offered a special program during the summer intending to improve promotion to the second grade; and also presented an open environment for research. The criteria for selecting the teachers to be investigated in this setting were experience teaching first grade and stability (length of service at a particular school).

The primary method is qualitative. But this was supplemented by descriptive statistics gained from school records and interviews. Participant observations and interviews with pupils, parents, and school staff were held over the entire one-year period of 1984, focusing mainly on the teacher's perspectives and practice within the classroom. Administrative, pedagogical, and other meetings like those of the Parent-Teacher Association were attended. Teachers' diaries and pupils' notebooks provided additional data. Secondary data collected in the school and in branches of the educational bureaucracy permitted a historical view of the problem of promotion/retention in first grade. Outcome measures of reading and writing were administered to complement those developed by the school.

Selection of the School Setting in the Context of Rio Grande do Sul

The criteria used in the selection of the school emerge from the aim of studying a school which enrolled a student population with characteristics similar to those of the educated majority in Rio Grande do Sul. In this process of specifying criteria, a school which offered better educational opportunities to lower-class pupils was selected. Though Rio Grande do Sul ranks high on educational indices when compared with other states, the problem of selectivity is indeed very serious.

In 1984, Rio Grande do Sul had a total regular elementary-school enrollment of 1,458,856. Of these, 322,392 or 22 percent were enrolled in the first grade (See Table 6 in the Appendix). Enrollment fell every grade after, decreasing drastically from the first to the second grade, where 16 percent of the pupils were enrolled.

Put another way: of a hundred pupils entering first grade in 1977, twenty-eight pupils remained until the eighth grade of elementary school, but only nineteen received their certificate in 1984 (Brasil, SE/SAE/INF, 1986:11).

This overview of elementary schools points to the problem that the government faces in guaranteeing schooling to the population of Rio Grande do Sul. This work is written in an attempt to unveil factors which influence this passage through school, focusing on the first grade, which is the most problematic according to a multiplicity of studies.

The criteria for selecting the school are specified in the discussion below.

Four types of schools existed: federal, state, municipal, and private. More than two-thirds of the pupils attending first grade in Rio Grande do Sul, or 222,385, did so in urban areas. The state school system but had the highest urban enrollment, or 115,126 pupils. This amounted

to 35 percent of all first-grade pupils in the state, and more than half of urban first graders in Rio Grande do Sul.

The high concentration of first graders in urban areas and in the urban state system justified the selection of an urban state elementary school. In addition to its large enrollment, the state system operates schools in every municipality of Rio Grande do Sul, so that generalizations might be made to other schools.

Private schools served 34,379 first graders in 1984, highly concentrated in urban areas, and were administrated by different congregations. The federal school system is not significant in terms of elementary enrollment, registering only 264 first graders. The general first-grade promotion rate in Rio Grande do Sul reached 68 percent in 1984: 71 percent in urban and 59 percent in rural areas (Table 6 in Appendix).

The lower class is predominantly served by public schools - state or municipal - and state schools presented better rates of promotion than the municipal ones.

Porto Alegre, the capital city of Rio Grande do Sul - the location of the school selected - registered 37,778 first graders in 1984, almost all of whom studied at institutions in the urban area. Urban state schools enrolled 27,793 pupils, or 73.6 percent of the first graders in Porto Alegre.

The promotion rate in first grade in Porto Alegre was 72 percent, slightly higher than that of the urban total for the whole state (71 percent), and even higher than that of the state as a whole (68 percent). Considering only the urban state schools, the promotion rate for Porto Alegre was lower than that for Rio Grande do Sul, perhaps due to contingents of rural migrants on the outskirts of the city of Porto Alegre, who made up the slum population served by the state schools there. Porto Alegre is the richest and most powerful of the fourteen municipalities constituting this metropolitan

region. Still it is important to note that approximately two-thirds, or the economically active population of the metropolitan area earned less than \$400 in 1970.

The teachers in Rio Grande do Sul vary in their level of schooling from elementary school to university, with 38,635 out of 39,120 having completed a four-year education degree at the university level. When the four best schools are compared as to this level of schooling, the state school registered the proportion of 60 percent. In Porto Alegre itself the state school had as many as 73 percent of teachers with university degrees, a very high proportion (see Table 1 in Appendix). The four state school teachers studied in this dissertation had completed normal school, a high school which gives specialized training for teaching from kindergarten to fourth grade. In addition to this, one of them had a university education degree and the other three were studying for a degree.

Our concern is to focus on schools which provided the best opportunities possible to lower class pupils.

Since expectations about pupils' persistence in school might be considered higher in schools which offer grades one to eight, the school selected would need to offer all eight grades of elementary school. Such schools comprised fifty seven percent of the best state schools. Another advantage in this type of school is that one can follow pupils in their school career during consecutive years. Students who remained, transferred or dropped out, and those who were promoted or failed over the years can be followed up (see Table 8 in Appendix).

In the process of selecting one of these schools during 1983, it was assumed that the better schools tended to be located in Porto Alegre, which is the seat of the State Secretariat of Education.

In 1982, there were 96 schools enrolling first graders supervised by the First Delegation of Education. These schools were classified according to the concentration of students with lower income within the school and the rates of promotion in first grade. A family income of nine thousand cruzeiros per person during 1982 would be classified as being at the lowest income level (SUT/DEF, 1981). (**Banco Central do Brasil**, 20 (August 1984):218,342). Of the fifty-one schools with lower promotion rates (less than 70 percent), twenty-five were schools which presented a higher concentration of lower-income students (80 percent or more). These data confirm the importance of socioeconomic level in the explanation of educational achievement, in the first grades of elementary school (Schiefelbein and Simmons, 1980:55,62; Rocha, 1983:61; Wolff, 1978:86). However, the fact that a few schools enrolling mainly lower-income students had promotion rates of 70 percent or above points to factors within the schools themselves, such as remedial and other support in services.

The next step was the selection of the specific school from among elementary schools served by the best-qualified teachers and concentrating lower-income pupils. Twelve elementary schools offered grades one to eight and had low-income pupils who constituted at least 80 percent of the student body (See Table 9 in Appendix).

Five large schools were selected with the highest proportions of lower-income pupils and the lowest rates of promotion - Schools 1,2,3,5 and 7. All of them had a significant number of first-grade classes - six to ten.

In order to complete the school selection process, information about the teachers that would be teaching first grade in 1984 was needed. Observations and interviews were developed with such an intent in Schools 1,2,3,5 and 7, and involved nineteen visits, or thirty-three hours of interviews. In each school, the principal (in one case, an assistant

principal) was interviewed first.

Of the forty-one teachers working with first graders in the schools in 1983, forty were interviewed. The stability of the teachers in each school needed to be examined because this factor would be crucial in the selection of teachers and, as a consequence, the school. Another purpose of the interviews was to obtain, in advance, permission to observe teachers' classes. As a result of the observations and interviews, three schools were eliminated because of a recent increase in class background of students (School 3), high teacher turnover (School 7), and proximity to rural areas (School 1).

There are four reasons why School 2 was finally selected rather than School 5. School 2 had smaller class sizes, better qualified teachers, a remedial summer school program, and a more receptive attitude to this research effort.

The criteria for selecting the teachers whose work would be observed were competence teaching first grade and stability of employment in that particular school.

The first teacher (Teacher A) was teaching first grade for the fourteenth time in 1984. She had been requested by the school administration to attend a course directly related with teaching repeaters, which took place from June 1983 to June 1984. As part of her studies, she was expected to apply a new methodology to a class made up of fifteen children who had been enrolled in the first grade between three and five times up to and including 1984. The teacher received information about the literacy method in 1983, and during the first six months of 1984 had biweekly meetings with her professors. The pupils were tested and a control group formed in the school with the second most experienced teacher of first graders who had been at the school for three years and seven at other institutions. The quasi-experimental setting found in the school led to the selection of a second teacher

(Teacher B) for observation. She was as committed to teaching first grade as was Teacher A, and I could observe her practice independently of the influence of a course directed towards the improvement of literacy work with repeating pupils. These two classes, which had a lower teacher-pupil ratio than the average found at the school, were expected to offer fewer constraints on teachers' classroom work. On the other hand, I was also interested in observing a normal-sized class of repeaters, which that year averaged twenty-five pupils.

The second most stable teacher at the school, Teacher C, was also selected; apart from experience with other grades, in 1984 she was teaching first-grade students for the third time. Finally, a normal-sized class of presumed first-time first graders was included so that literacy work with new pupils could also be observed. Teacher D selected was teaching first grade for the sixth time in 1984.

These four classrooms, with high and low teacher-pupil ratios, were not organized especially for this dissertation, but were encountered naturally in the school selected. They constituted an opportunity to observe the influence of this factor "at the heart of the teacher's problematic...(and) frequently overlooked as the major contribution to teachers' professional problems" (Dale, 1977:49).

The school counsellor had high expectations concerning the class of first-time first graders (Class D). Class C was considered to be the second best. Classes A and B, composed of pupils who had repeated first grade more times, were considered problematic.

Data Collection

This dissertation uses a qualitative ethnographic approach, involving observations in the field and interviews

with the various actors. In addition quantitative data on the pupils and the classes are presented in tabular form, to complement these observations. These observations were organized with the aid of the concepts elucidated by Bernstein and others, described in the previous chapter.

Participant Observation

Any classroom ethnography must consider the relevance of the amount of "time spent with teachers and children in their schools" (Sharp and Green, 1975:230). Observations at the school were initiated in November 1983, four months before entering the classrooms. To justify the amount of time spent observing each class, I clearly stated my interest in studying the process of teaching/learning literacy in first grade, and justified the inconvenience of having an observer in the classroom by citing the scarcity of research specific to Brazilian educational settings. The four teachers agreed to participate and collaborated by giving all information which was requested.

I was present on the first day of class because I wanted to compare the different approaches used in the four classes from the very beginning. The observations were continued during the first, second and beginning of the third marking period. I started on alternate days; after that, I observed each class for one week, that is, five consecutive days of classwork. Class A was observed fourteen days, corresponding to thirty-five hours; Class B, fifteen days, or thirty-two hours; I was present in Class C for twelve days, which totalled forty hours of classwork; and in Class D for thirty-three hours over a period of fourteen days. Participant observation added up to sixty days, totalling 140 hours.

In each class the time allotted to each subject was recorded, identifying the importance given to teaching

literacy in relation to other subjects. Considering "frame," observations were made to establish the degree of control the teacher had in the selection of contents, in addition to the organization, sequencing, pacing and timing of the knowledge transmitted. Here "pacing" was a category that deserved special attention: whether the teacher defined different "appropriate" rates of learning in her class or insisted on only one. In addition, the ranking of students in the class, the flexibility of that rank and the forms of reward and punishment were examined.

When asked about the pupils' reaction to having an observer present, Teachers A, B and C considered their response typical: "The children easily accepted the observer...I don't know if it was because I also accepted you naturally," said Teacher A. Teacher B considered it "a positive incentive to have someone, besides ourselves, to whom they (the pupils) meant a lot." Teacher C commented: "The only unusual reaction was that they demanded a lot from you...they went to you for any little thing, didn't they?" Teacher D also considered the observer to be well-accepted by the pupils but referred to an atypical day on which the pupils did not behave well, which happened to be the day she had returned from her leave of absence.

The central theme of the classroom observations was the exploration of the teacher-pupil interaction. Other foci of observation were intra- and extra-classroom constraints/facilitative elements influencing the teacher's practice and classroom outcomes. These include time, space, teacher-pupil ratio, compulsory attendance, degree of class homogeneity (as to age and social class), resources, parents' cooperation with homework, insulation versus cooperation among teachers (and among these and the school supervisor, counsellor, and principal), and pressure from colleagues and the school "ethos" to observe conventional practices.

Interviewing Teachers

There were some aspects of the teachers' practice which were scarcely visible; as Jackson (1968:115) points out:

...(I)t is not only what the practitioner says that is revealing. His way of saying it and even the things he leaves unsaid often contain clues to the nature of his experience. Consequently, talk is necessary, particularly talk about the professional aspects of life in the classroom.

Interviews with the four first-grade teachers revolved around the following topics:

(a) Pupil's characteristics:

the teachers' expectations of their conditions for literacy in March, the beginning of the school year;
their abilities in October;
observed changes in each student;
expectations considering outcomes;
principal problems encountered in teaching and their solutions;
the typical pupil;
pupils considered extreme types.

(b) The first-grade curriculum:

objectives;
most important content and other obligatory contents (in order of importance);
optional contents;
the ideal curriculum;
basis of content selection, organization and sequencing;
relevance of curriculum to personal development and future life.

(c) The literacy process:

organization of the process in the particular classroom;
stages;
sequencing of literacy patterns;
duration of drilling;
activities at school and at home; individual, group work, and whole-class work;
parents' assistance with homework;
school opportunities aiding in the process;

planning; timetable;
strategies for dealing with "faster" pupils.

(d) Evaluation:

what being literate means;
how evaluation of reading and writing is handled;
explanation of pupil's progress/lack of progress;
moments of satisfaction/frustration teaching first grade.

(e) Teacher's biography:

the decision to enter the teaching profession and the choice made to deal with literacy;
aspects of the teacher's when she was a first grader;
preparatory courses taken for the exercise of the profession - at the high school, specialization, undergraduate and graduate levels;
teaching practice, inquiring about what it confirmed, negated, or added to the preparation offered in the different education courses taken.

(f) Social order in the classroom:

values and norms guiding the pupils' conduct in a particular classroom; their objectives;
incidence of deviance and its consequences, and solutions offered by the teacher;
seating arrangements;
teacher tutoring of pupils and peer tutoring;
which pupils were more frequently observed by the teacher.

(g) Social relationships within the school:

philosophical tenets;
common pedagogy;
main constraints and facilitative elements encountered in developing classwork;
social relationships among all teachers and among first-grade teachers in particular (sharing of experience);
expectations of the school support services in their influence on classwork;
authority relationships in the school;
teacher-pupil relationships in the classroom and the school as a whole;
staff expectations of the teachers' work;
solutions to administrative problems: allocation of human resources by the educational bureaucracy;
indication/selection of the grade and type of pupils to be taught;
teachers' absences;

the "ideal" school and the "ideal class"; comparison of the school and the class being analyzed with the "ideal"; profile of the first-grade teacher.

- (h) Relationship with the community surrounding the school, parent-teacher relationships and the teachers' perspectives on education and social structure.

The interviews were tape-recorded with the teachers' consent. The fact that they occurred after classroom observations permitted me to check the views and constructs which emerged.

Interviews with Teachers A, B, and C began during the first three days of October; Teacher D was first interviewed on October 25, having recently returned from a five-week leave of absence during the third marking period. Teachers C and D had their last interview on December 27, 1984, the last day of review classes for those pupils who had not been promoted. Teacher A was also interviewed during the vacation period, in January 1985, as was Teacher B; the latter was also seen in April 1985, when she was working in a state school serving middle-class pupils. Interviews with teachers A and C lasted approximately eleven and half hours, that is, five and six meetings respectively. Four meetings were held with Teacher D; total time spent was nearly nine hours. Teacher B was interviewed seven times, totalling approximately fifteen hours. Notes taken during these forty-seven hours were handwritten, and used to check the typewritten transcriptions of the tape recordings as well as for immediate and ready manipulation of data.

At the end of August a questionnaire was distributed to teachers which inquired about personal data such as sex, age, and marital status; residence; parents' and husband's occupation, income and educational level; degrees taken and being taken; teaching practice, specifying number of years in each grade of elementary school and technical and administrative posts held in education; public/private schools

where they had been employed; and, finally, hours of work per week (Mello, 1981).

Interviewing Pupils, Parents and School Staff Members

Following the battery of classroom observations in Classes A, B, C and D, I proceeded to listen to each pupil's reading, which took place in the month of September. The four classes were asked to read a text used by Class A, which facilitated a comparative evaluation, in this case with the class considered to be making the most progress. The reading was taped in a separate room and the pupils who wanted to could listen to the tape immediately afterwards.

The pupils' interviews were preceded by a request that each one draw a picture of his/her family. This drawing would assist in the introduction of the topics of the interview, which began with the question, "Who lives in your house?" The questions introduced a topic that could develop into a conversation (see questionnaire in Appendix I). Answers were hand-written and recorded at the same time, which became routine in this investigation. Each interview took between forty minutes and one hour. Seventy pupils were interviewed, fifteen in Class A, fourteen in Class B, twenty-four in Class C, and seventeen in Class D. The bulk of the pupils' interviews were held during September and October.

Parents' interviews started the last week of classes, on December 10. Classes ended on December 12 and were followed by review classes for the nonpromoted, which lasted until December 27. Those parents who did not attend their interview during this period could still be met when report cards were handed out during the last days of 1984 or early 1985. Of twenty-seven parents, twenty-three mothers and four fathers were interviewed.

Parents of the brother-sister pairs were included,

bringing the total of children whose parents were interviewed to thirty. Parents of eight of the eleven nonpromoted pupils were interviewed. The pupils whose parents were interviewed were: 3, 8, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15 (Class A); 17, 18, 20, 21, 25, 28 (Class B); 32, 34, 43, 44, 47, 48, 51, 53 (Class C); 60, 61, 55, 66, 70, 71, 73, 74, 80 (Class D). The interviews lasted from twenty-five minutes to one hour (see questionnaire in Appendix II).

From January 9-31, 1985, a third set of interviews was held with the principal, assistant principals, the teacher supervisor, the school counsellor, and with the mother who was president of the Parent-Teacher Association. The interviews with the principal and the teacher supervisor were on two consecutive days, lasting four hours and forty minutes and four hours and ten minutes respectively. The others lasted between one hour and fifteen minutes and three hours and ten minutes. The topics included: school history and philosophy; administrative functions; organization of curriculum and evaluation; staff relationships - main problems and solutions; factors facilitating and constraining teaching practice at the school in general and in the first grade specifically; school support services in 1984; authority relationships in the school; allocation of human resources; evaluation of teachers; profile of the ideal first-grade teacher; the typical pupil, and his/her educational and occupational future; relationships with parents; relationships with other institutions which serve the community; parents' expectations of the school; how school influences pupils' future occupations; other factors influencing their future occupations; constraints on classroom work coming from society; and how the present research was viewed by the school.

Measuring Classroom Outcomes

Several outcome measures were used: grades, and whether or not pupils were promoted; attendance during the school year; and the results of the evaluations prepared by teachers and given at the end of the school year (see Tables 48 to 51, in Appendix). Two other measures of outcome administered were a reading and a spelling test for first graders in Porto Alegre written by Vania M.M. Rasche and by myself (See Veit, Maria Helena Degani and Rasche, Vania Maria Moreira. "Desenvolvimento de Habilidades Cognitivas para a Leitura e Escrita." *Educação e Realidade* 7 (September - December 1982:83-84), for a brief description of the research in first-grade classes in peripheral areas of Porto Alegre for which the two measuring instruments were constructed.) The tests were given during the last week of November, 1984. Each test was given two times over four consecutive days, immediately before the school evaluations. The spelling test was administered before the reading test. They are described below.

The Reading Test

This test was constructed according to the standards and arrangements presented in *The Bookmark Reading Program*, published by Harcourt Brace Jovanovich (1970). Adapted to the linguistic processes of Portuguese, the test incorporated the spoken vocabulary of first graders collected in six schools in Porto Alegre which enroll lower-class children.

The twelve aspects of the reading test are as follows:

1. Visual discrimination: letters in words
2. Relation between capital and lower-case letters
3. Sound-symbol correspondence
4. Symbol-sound correspondence

5. Visual discrimination: words
6. Visual discrimination: sentences
7. Visual memory: words
8. Visual memory: sentences
9. Comprehension of sentences
10. Relation between spoken word and written form
11. Specific meaning assigned to words
12. Reading comprehension: short story

The test was standardized with a random sample of state schools; students were in the ninth month of the literacy process in November 1976.

The measures of split-half reliability revealed Kendall's tau correlation value of .528($n=202$) and Spearman's rho value of .696($n=202$), both significant at a level better than .0001. Kendall's tau coefficients were calculated measuring the homogeneity, or the internal consistency, of the test. The results of this test are: dimensions 11, 12 and 4 presented the highest coefficients (.68; .66 and .55); these were followed by dimensions 9,5,2,1 and 6 (.46; .39; .37; .35; and .31); dimensions 3,8,10 and 7 presented the lowest coefficients (.29; .29; .26; and .22); and were significant at better than .00001. The validity of the test was verified by submitting it to state teachers working in supervisory posts at the State Secretariat of Education, who were familiar with the objectives of first grade.

The Spelling Test

The spelling test was adapted from Bisol et al.'s "orthographic scale" constructed for adults with a sample from Porto Alegre (See Bisol, Leda; Scarton, Gilberto; Wiedemann, Lyrís; and Degani, Maria Helena. *Interferência de Uma Segunda Língua na Aprendizagem da Escrita*. Porto Alegre, MOBRAL, 1975). The thousand words of the scale were reduced to 600:

those considered by six judges to belong to the vocabulary of seven- to ten-year-old children, the age range which is most common in the first grade. Twelve lists of fifty words each were administered to all first graders in Porto Alegre, in 192 schools, in November of 1975, when the children were in the ninth month of the literacy process. The tests for which data were lacking and those performed by repeaters were discarded. Of the remainder, every other one was retained in the sample, so that 4,361 tests were scored.

An analysis of variance demonstrated no interaction effect between the list of words and pupils' socioeconomic level, nor between list and sex. Thus, since all lists could be used for testing, I selected the list which: a) had a lower standard deviation in relation to the mean; and b) had a higher number of words (nineteen) spoken by children six to seven years old.

Quantitative and Qualitative Data

Data presented in the tables in the text and the Appendix provide a rather comprehensive portrait of each of the eighty-three first grade pupils in the four classes. There are fifty-six tables in all; while a few are presented in the text most are presented in the Appendix. These data include the educational experiences of the pupils prior to 1984, and after. This is important because it shows the actual composition of the four classes. Class D was assumed (erroneously, it turned out not) to be made up only of first-time first graders, Class C of first time repeaters, and Classes A and B of multiple repeaters.

Other tables provide detailed information concerning the social and family background of each of the pupils, their achievements during 1984, and their subsequent academic careers after 1984: whether students persisted in school, and

with what results; whether they transferred to other schools; whether they dropped out of school with no reasons given for their departure. Many tables in the Appendix are constructed at the level of specific pupils; those in the text are generally aggregate tables, focusing on differences among the four classes.

This dissertation does not purport to trace the full story of each of the eighty-three pupils, though the data presented in the tables in the Appendix do permit a full description of the major variables for each.

However, the descriptions of the classroom observations will tend to focus on representative experiences of specific pupils, as these serve to illustrate more general findings. The record of observations and verbatim interviews, combined with the tabular presentation of qualitative and quantitative data for each student and aggregated to each class, sustain and enhance each other (Babbie, 1975: 219,494). The variety of methods, instruments, and measures used in this study, we hope, will produce a more refined understanding of the processes through which teachers, pupils, and extra-classroom factors interact to produce success or failure for first-grade students.

CHAPTER IV

THE CONTEXT: THE SCHOOL AND THE NEIGHBOURHOOD

School Characteristics

In this chapter the characteristics of both the school and the community served by it are described. The objective is to bring to light relevant developments since 1944 in both contexts, leading to a better understanding of the environment of the pupils in first grade in 1984, the year of the field study.

The school was created in 1944, and functioned in a house on what today is a main avenue. The imposing old brick building where it is situated today was built in 1960 in an open area close to its first location on the outskirts of the city. Numerous newcomers raised their dwellings around the school, every year drawing closer to the building. In 1982, a second brick building was constructed to meet both demographic pressures and a restructuring of educational services which sought to enhance access to school.

During the first forty years of the school, the number of classes in the institution increased five times: the eight classes distributed among five grades in 1945, became thirty-four in 1986, distributed among the eight grades of elementary school, plus another nine in educational programs offered to other age groups - those younger than seven and over fourteen years old.

One measure of school efficiency, a kind of input-output, is the proportion of first-grade versus fifth-grade classes - the lower this proportion, the better the flow of pupils in the school is. From 1945 to 1952 one observes a regular and increasing deterioration of the proportion: from four to one,

growing to eleven to one. In the decade preceding the 1964 **coup d'etat** (1953-1963) this ratio had improved but not steadily, demonstrating peaks of nine to one and seven to one in 1956 and 1960, respectively, falling to six and three first-grade classes to one fifth grade. (The year of 1958 was atypical because of a new pattern of enrollment, due to the opening of many schools by the state administration.) The years **post-coup d'etat** (1964-1971) show proportions varying between five first-grade classes to one fifth grade, and three to one. After 1971 the proportions become more balanced and remain consistently around between two or three first-grade classes to one fifth grade until 1983. From 1984 until 1986 one observes a slight deterioration of the input-output rate (four to one or around it). (See Table 10 in Appendix).

With the steady expansion of primary enrollments, it is worth noting that disenchantment in state schools was brought on by the failure of a large teacher's association to obtain higher salaries; this was conducive to lowering the quality of services. Moreover, disenchantment with the schools themselves followed. In this particular school one can observe the deterioration of services after internal elections to choose a principal were established. The elected principal maintained petty privileges for teachers in exchange for "political favors."

There were periodic attempts to extend schooling to age groups younger and older than the target population. Kindergarten level three, considered a preparation for the first grade of elementary school, has been offered since 1956, with one or two classes at the school. An examination of the kindergarten to first-grade proportions is discouraging; in 1984, there was one kindergarten class to eight first-grade classes. Kindergarten levels one and two, on the other hand, have been offered only sporadically. A temporary program for children between three and six years of age was in existence

from 1979 to 1981. It was called Class of Pre-School Education and Nutrition (CEAPE), for children with low body weight.

The low expenditure on "pre-school education," offered to those under age seven in Brazil, had already been denounced in the early 1940's and long waiting-lists for enrollment were criticized (Nina, 1942:77,79). The fact that pre-school education is currently scarce or nonexistent in the schools serving the poor adds to the problem of promoting literacy.

Another attempt at reform was the setting up of "special education classes." Teachers of first graders may use ambiguous criteria in the definition of the child as "exceptional" or "educable mentally deficient" (Schneider, 1974. See Chapter VIII for the teacher's definition of Pupil 47 as a case for a special class due to inappropriate behavior.) Before 1983, pupils completing the "special education class" passed to first grade, where the teaching of reading and writing would take place. In 1984, this class was restructured, and in 1985 the special education class was extended to a three year program, the second and third developing literacy. Pupils considered to be educable mentally deficient can pass to the second grade of elementary school if they become literate during these three years.

Table 11, in Appendix, shows initial enrollment at the elementary school and special classes, highlighting retention during the 1980's. During this period overall retention in elementary school varied from 25 to 34 percent and repeaters comprised 32 to 58 percent of first grade enrollment.

The long term student benefits of avoiding failure in first grade can be seen in a review of the career of the twenty-five pupils who completed elementary school in 1984. Of these, twelve were retained during elementary school. One-third failed the fifth grade and another third the second or third grades; none of the twelve students were retained in

first grade. In other words, first graders who fail will usually not finish elementary school, tending to leave school before reaching the eighth grade.

The school under analysis is a large one. As early as 1954 the school reached a relatively high level of enrollment, never falling below a thousand pupils.

The largest number of first grade classes at the school was registered in 1957, with nineteen. The total of first-grade classes after 1969 varied from ten to twelve classes, moving up to another peak in 1984 - sixteen first-grade classes. Why was there such a large enrollment that year?

A major reason was the availability of teaching staff. Over the years there was a decreasing percentage of teachers actually in charge of classes. From 88 percent in 1945, the rate fell to 62 forty years later, in 1985. The lowest rates of teachers actually teaching were registered in 1969 (55 percent) and in 1964, 1981 and 1984 (56 percent). These data, which demonstrate that a low percentage of teachers were, in fact, performing their proper role, was the main contextual feature leading the principal to open first-grade enrollment twice. In 1984, the school employed four supervisors, six counsellors, three psychologists, three librarians, ten teachers in other technical functions, and fifteen in administrative functions, thus totalling forty-one teachers in functions other than teaching. The school had also hired two educational specialists, one performing a technical and the other an administrative function, and ten civil servants working as janitors. Of the ninety-three teachers, sixty-two were part-time, working one shift or twenty hours per week; twenty worked two shifts or forty hours per week; and the others worked either twelve or thirty-two hours per week.

Thus, the decision made in March 1984 to enroll about a hundred pupils more put four teachers back to work in the classroom. The other forty-one remained in their previous

positions. The decision to expand enrollment in 1984 demonstrates the fact that the school system was under-serving the demand for education on the part of the local residents.

It is also possible that the act of carrying out this research may have played a role. The investigator may have been looked upon as representing the communities' interests and favoring more openings in first grade, since contacts with the schools were made before and during the registration period, when "waiting-lists" were hanging on the walls.

Efforts to Improve Promotion Rates in First Grade

The high rates of promotion in first grade in the school being studied are related to an educational reform which demanded a major effort from teachers in Rio Grande do Sul; its objective was improving the fit between age and prescribed school grade.

Rates of promotion/retention are indicators of the quality of educational services. Table 12, in Appendix, shows the computation of two very similar rates of promotion: the first, which excludes pupils who attended the whole year and did not take their final examinations from the computation of failures in first grade; and the second, which considers the pupils absent from the final examinations as having failed first grade. The latter is a stricter (lower) measure. The school adopted the first measure, which slightly increased the rate of promotion.

Before 1958, in the state schools of Rio Grande do Sul, first-grade pupils were classified as new and repeaters for the purpose of class organization, and both groups were divided into three other categories according to mastery of reading and writing: a) those who had not mastered the initial difficulties of reading and writing; b) those who had mastered them in part; and c) those who had nearly succeeded

in becoming literate. In such cases failure in learning was explained by characteristics such as immaturity, physical or mental deficiency, social and/or emotional maladaptation as well as poor attendance.

These criteria reflect a bio-psychological view of learning, in which the child and the home environment are to blame for failure in school. They denote the strong influence of the movement for the "New School" in Brazil, in which M.B. Lourenço Filho represents the extreme psychologist version, reducing the school to technical-pedagogical concerns (Di Giorgi, 1986:59).

In 1958, the state bureaucracy initiated a reform of primary teaching in an attempt to implement new teaching programs with a new method of evaluating learning to substitute for the promotion/retention one, in which students who were retained repeated exactly the same course during the following school year. The new program aimed at a **fuller homogenization** of classes according to psychological characteristics of the children. The two criteria were age and the child's readiness for reading. The reform intended, *ipso facto*, "to eliminate retention and avoid dropping out" (SEC, CPOE, 1958:71-72). There would be two types of classes: the regular ones, composed of pupils of the corresponding age - seven years in first grade, for instance; and the "recuperation classes" (the term is used because it is a literal translation from the Portuguese "recuperação"), with overaged children, composed of pupils who were older than seven in first grade, whether new or repeaters. The teachers of the latter were encouraged to work on more than one core curriculum during the school year to approximate the fit between age and the core curriculum of the prescribed grade, "recovering the time lost."

In 1959, the reform was implemented in the school being analyzed. Table 12 reveals an increase in rates of promotion:

from 41 in 1959, to 65 percent in 1969 (considering as failing those pupils who did not take their final examinations). The highest rate of promotion in first grade in the school was in 1969. Both types of classes - whether composed of overaged pupils or not - significantly improved their performance over ten years, but "recuperation classes" with overaged pupils had better results than regular ones. The rate for 1984 was 58 percent.

Table 12 shows improvement in the rate of teacher turnover. In 1949, 1954, 1959 and 1980 we see the highest teacher turnover rates, with half or more of the classes with two or more teachers during the school year. From 1981 on, turnover drops, though one still finds classes with more than two teachers.

Non-absenteeism of teachers during the school year has been usually considered a main factor of promotion in first grade. But an analysis of 142 classes over thirteen years yielded ambiguous results. We found that 79 percent of classes with the highest rates of promotion (75-100 percent) were taught by stable teachers, those who taught the whole year, while 31 percent of classes with the lowest rates of promotion (0-24 percent) were also taught by such teachers. It appeared that stability during the year is an important factor associated with professionalism, but is not a necessary or sufficient condition for promotion in first grade.

Teacher's formal qualifications may play a role in effectiveness. In contrast to the rural municipal schools in which 48 percent of teachers had only elementary-school preparation or less, all twenty teachers who taught first grade at the institution under study in 1984 had completed normal school - the minimum training required for teaching. Seven had also earned university degrees in education and six were in the process of doing so. Among the four teachers in this study, only A had completed university; B,C,D were still

studying. All four were tenured. Their promotion rates for 1984 ranged from 75 percent for Teacher C to 93 percent for Teacher A (See Table 13 in Appendix).

The last line of Table 12 shows rates of promotion corresponding to a program offering extra work for retained first-grade pupils during summer vacations. From 1979 to 1985, the Secretariat of Education, intending to improve promotion in first grade, organized a Program of Compensatory Education for children not enrolled in kindergarten, and a Program of Therapeutic Review for those who had attended first grade but had not been promoted. These programs operated in thirteen schools in Porto Alegre which presented lower rates of promotion and had larger enrollments of lower-income pupils; they also distributed free meals. In the school studied, these programs generally provided two classes at the kindergarten level and one for retained first graders. But their effect was marginal.

In terms of the teachers' individual promotion rates it must be said that: (a) The seven classes with better 1984 promotion rates were those being taught by the more experienced first-grade teachers at the school. (b) Of those teaching first grade in 1984 and previously, five teachers had their best rate of promotion in 1984; and the four teachers under investigation had their second best rate that year. This suggests a possible Hawthorne effect: the first-grade teachers, knowing about the research being carried out, reacted to it with more effort.

The School and Its Environs

This section calls attention to two concomitant processes: the construction of shanties around the brick school built in 1960, and the eventual deterioration of the school building, surrounding fences, and resulting problems

of security.

The growth of shanty towns ("vilas de malocas") has been faster than the growth of the city of Porto Alegre itself: between 1961 and 1972 the proportion of slum dwellers increased from 3.9 percent to 19.7 (Brasil, IBGE, 1981:207).

In 1984, a newspaper headline announced that 250,000 people lived in such "vilas." The great majority had come twenty or thirty years previously, having been forced to leave the countryside due to the modernization of agriculture, and were looking for medical service in the cities (Zero Hora, May 5, 1984:38). From 1973 to 1977 the slum neighbourhood studied here grew from 359 to 479 units near the big brick building housing the school (Brasil, IBGE, 1981:213-214; 242;245).

Shanty homes are fragile wooden dwellings, built by the resident himself or with help from members of the family and acquaintances ("mutirao"). There is little running water, and almost no satisfactory toilet facilities, drainage and sewers, or garbage collection. In 1970, the concentration of persons per residence in the city of Porto Alegre was the same as that of the "vilas," but this statistic is misleading as the slum home usually has only one or two rooms (Brasil, IBGE, 1981:207-208).

Poverty is widespread. In 1980, census data showed that 34.2 percent of Brazilian workers earned the minimum wage, and, in 1982, research by the Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics (IBGE) reported 40.85 percent, the increase having been caused by economic recession. In March 1984, residents of some slums in Porto Alegre asked for the creation of "work fronts" in exchange for food. In May of the same year the Minister of Labor, Murilo Macedo, announced that there were three million unemployed in Brazil - approximately one-fifth of its economically active population. The solution to the crisis, in his opinion, was moving in the opposite direction: from recession towards economic growth (Zero Hora,

May 19, 1984:30). An analysis showed that the situation of Porto Alegre in 1984 was even worse than the situation of the state of Rio Grande do Sul as a whole, due to the decentralization of industry in the metropolitan area (Zero Hora, March 31, 1985:32).

Relating the growth of population settlements on the outskirts of Porto Alegre to the school being studied, one observes that the construction of the big school building, in 1960, represented the government's response to the high demand for educational services.

The President of the PTA, who had her sons and daughters enrolled in the school since 1966, referred to increasing problems in the school due to the drop in the socioeconomic level of the families living in the area:

See, there has been a big change...I think mostly...due to the "vila" around the school; in the beginning here next door there was a playground for children.

I think that the standard of living of the people was a little different...(They were) poor people but not like the majority today. Almost eighty percent of our children or maybe more are, indeed, of a very poor level, aren't they?

So I think that, in this sense, it (the school) became a little bit worse. Problems have multiplied for the principal, for teachers...everyone!

When asked directly about the neighbourhood, the parents in general answered: "I get along well with the neighbours"; "no complaints"; "I like here more than the place where I used to live"; or a laconic "I like it" - the most frequent answer. Two mothers stated that they liked the neighbourhood but that they kept their children at home. Two others, who had moved outside the area, stated that it was not a good environment - there were "marginals," and that "at night you have a good chance of being robbed or killed."

The principal said that the area from which the children

came encompasses two nuclei of shanty homes and that the closest nucleus was considered the most dangerous one in Porto Alegre. On March 24, 1984, the shanty town appeared in a city newspaper as having been besieged by the police; on April 2, 1984, two battalions of the Military Brigade took over the area in order to capture two thieves (*Zero Hora*, pages 37 and 39 on the respective dates). This news led me investigate the pupils' experiences with living so close to urban violence and crime.

All but a few of the pupils interviewed demonstrated insecurity in relation to the place where they lived. Of a total of sixty-nine, thirty stated that the "vila" was dangerous, twelve stated that it was dangerous at night, twelve stated that sometimes it was dangerous, and six pointed to danger a little farther from their dwelling. Only one answered "don't know." They talked about marijuana users and glue sniffers, thieves hiding from the police - one gave their names and spoke about police surveying the slum area from helicopters. Most of them knew of cases of people who had been killed.

About the dangers of the slum to outsiders, one of Teacher B's pupils said:

There are glue sniffers and marijuana users. They rob grocery stores. If you go there (in the slum area), when you turn your back they slit your purse and take all your money.

The same boy said that I should not go the slum because "they know who the outsiders are."

About the actions of the police, one of Teacher A's pupils said:

Almost every day the police go by then (at the exact moment) there are no "marginals." Once in a while some police wagons go by. If there are "marginals" they pick them up. Whoever is with the "marginal," they pick up, too. My father was arrested about five times because he used to fight in the street.

But if the police represent a danger, the slum dwellers do not even view their own neighbours as safe. Two girls, Teacher C's pupils, told about the dangers of the neighbourhood to insiders:

It's dangerous. One week, a man wanted to break in, entering there...inside our house. I called Father and he ran away. They kidnap children and kill them. The thief kidnaps and kills. During the day they also steal. Night and day they do it. I was getting ready to come to school.

The threat of such killing seems to be a parental strategy to keep girls at home. They are far more protected than boys.

It's dangerous. There are lots of robbers. They stole my mother's lycra pants. Nothing else. At night it is more dangerous. When we go to the grocery store they steal money and even kill us.

One boy, Teacher C's pupil, said that it was dangerous only when thieves were running away from the police, coming "up here" from their hiding-places down the hill, and he pointed out that two of his classmates, a boy and a girl, lived very close to the thieves' dens. This information led me to focus on these two children's point of view about security. They said that it was **not** dangerous to live in the area. The girl told me:

I live on a lot of property and we have lots of flowers. It's not dangerous there. There are no thieves. It is not dangerous at night. The police pass close to the house: arrest the thieves. At home we've never had a robbery.

Her cousin answered:

It is not dangerous. At night nobody is in the area. My mother works and comes home late. She gets off the bus up there and there is nobody (no thieves) around.

This information gathered from children "living closer to thieves" leads one to believe that their definition of security is different from that of those living a little

farther away: as long as they themselves are not robbed, the area is not dangerous.

Being the thieves' neighbours, however, does not give ipso facto protection. Another boy, again Teacher C's pupil, stated:

It's dangerous (to live here). Now there are not so many shots. Now the policemen come more often. When I lived down there they were stealing. They took my brother's pants. And I saw one leaving my home with a sack. He was carrying a gun.

Eight children stated that where they lived was not dangerous. Of these, two lived on well-lit city streets, and three were younger children whose parents perhaps chose to hide the facts. Another two cases were discussed above, those of children living closer to thieves. One represented a case of the double standard in bringing up boys.

It is not dangerous. I can walk at night. Yesterday I even went to the grocery store for my aunt.

This double standard emphasizing male courage is seen even when the boys confirm the fact that where they live is dangerous. One boy added: "There are people who are afraid of everything." Walking in the area at night was the best way to show one was a man.

The poor slum conditions of the neighbouring shanties affected the school itself, including the possible impact of administrators. Certainly, the role of the principal, as leader of the school, was seen as important in determining the environment of the school. Teacher A said the first principal that she met when she came to teach at the school had administered the school for thirteen years when she retired in 1969. These years were "the golden days at this school." She was succeeded by the teacher who had been her assistant, "also an excellent administrator." Both Teacher A and the President of the PTA provided evidence of her extreme dedication to the pupils. She was prone to fill many

different roles, even that of a nurse. She stayed until 1976 but was obliged to leave because the new Statute of the Teaching Profession, Law 6672, 1971, required an academic specialization in school administration at the undergraduate level, according to prescriptions of the educational reform of 1971. But the person with the desired training who succeeded her, however "cultivated and good to the teachers," proved to be "a failure" as an administrator.

In Teacher A's view:

The school became a mess. It was totally destroyed. Parents were afraid to send their children to the school and the exodus of good pupils began.

That principal "let things happen" in spite of her awareness that some acts of vandalism had been committed by pupils enrolled at the school.

After two years, in 1979, this principal was replaced by a teacher employed at the school, who had more authority than her predecessor, but who was not able to face such adverse conditions and reorganize the school. In 1983, a new principal arrived at the school - the only man to occupy such a position. He recalled those days as follows:

When I arrived here in June of 1983, the school had many problems...and yet the majority of them are still with us. But the main problems then were related to safety because there were no fences around the school...There was no demarcation. So the community lived together with the teachers and pupils. There were people (who were not associated with the school) all around us. They invaded the place. And how could we control them? They played games. Played with balls in every corner. And threw rocks (at the windows). It was a mess. In addition to this, (the schoolyard) was the crossroads (of the community) because the bus stop was right in front of the school and people made two or three paths through the schoolyard: one for cars, another for...This was the most serious problem and in relation to this we had many robberies. A lot. Nine robberies...in (19)83 there were nine robberies at the school, weren't there?

The principal reported that after a girl was sexually assaulted inside the school, teachers and parents called for a general meeting with representatives from the Secretariat of Education, on October 15, 1983, Teacher's Day. It was decided that fences around the school would be built. Safety was restored in 1984 after the fences went up, and two policemen provided by the State Government guarded the school during the whole school day. Thus, the school returned, at least in one sense, to the old good days: school personnel and pupils could work calmly in the recently-enclosed schoolyard.

The parents interviewed in December 1984 and January 1985 - three fathers and twenty-four mothers - all agreed that the construction of fences represented safety. One mother stated that the children used to go home during recess and now they stayed at school, which avoided "many problems," and concluded: "At least when the children are in the school they are safe." There was a slight increase in the rate of first-grade promotion from 49 in 1983 to 58 percent in 1984, but the precise role of enhanced safety in this improvement is unclear.

While a school's success in educating students is not a clear function of the quality of the school buildings, there is a point beyond which physical deterioration should not occur. The year of 1984 had a long rainy season - May to July - which was a complicating factor to those working at or attending the school. The twenty-four-year-old greyish brick building was in urgent need of renovation. For many years the state school buildings had not been taken care of, and principals of these institutions had spent hours in waiting rooms of the state building maintenance department. (Only recently, in 1987, when two opposing parties were administering the state government and the city of Porto Alegre did the population see the former spending money on

repairs and construction of new classrooms and buildings. The two parties were competing for votes in the 1988 mayoral elections.)

On May 26, 1984, *Zero Hora* published details of damages to and consequences of the rain for the school: twelve out of twenty-two classrooms had flooded; the roof and some ceilings were in ruins; a corridor full of water blocked five classrooms and the children had to be sent home. There were problems with gutters and pipes and lack of glass in the windows. Part of the recently-built fences around the schoolyard had been destroyed by rain, and the school, ironically, was without drinking water. This school was not the only one in peril: there were eleven more in the south of the city and five on the islands in extremely bad shape (*Zero Hora*, June 21, 1984:28).

In 1984, the principal obtained the construction of the fences, the repair of the roof, of electrical wiring and windowpanes. His aim the following year was the renovation of the ceiling and the painting of the walls. He confessed to not being satisfied with school furnishings and distressed about lack of school supplies (pencils, notebooks, chalk, etc).

Much remained to be done, and the principal concluded that minimum material standards were still not being met at the school.

The teacher (in 1984) was far from having ideal conditions in the classroom: windows in precarious condition, desks in precarious condition...chairs ...walls badly in need of paint; an audio-visual service with almost nothing to offer her...

Did parents feel the school their children attended was as lacking in comfort as the principal described? The parents interviewed were emphatic that the fences had brought security to the children. Perhaps this circumstance, plus the repairs made to the building, had an influence on the positive answers

given. Two-thirds of the twenty-seven parents considered the school a good one. The reasons given were: the child had "a good teacher," "good care"; "the kids worked hard," "got milk." One mother mentioned the newly-acquired telephone, saying that the school was improving more and more. A sister raising her younger brother said: "nothing is lacking at the school: he was promoted, there is theatre, recess, and a meal." Another mother defended the teachers against "disrespectful pupils," calling these "marginals" and added: "the teacher is not paid to be insulted."

Two mothers of children who were doing very well at school said that there were negative aspects:

Here (in the school) there are a lot of things that I would like there not to be, but it's nobody's fault in particular. It (the school) was open, everybody came in, now it is closed. They could make a vegetable garden which would provide vegetables for school meals. All the teachers are excellent! They cannot do any more than they have already.

The second mother, however, was more critical:

I would like the school to be better organized. It rains a lot inside the classrooms. In the winter, they send pupils home and ask them not to come if it rains a lot.

The lack of criticism from the community also means that the parents preferred to emphasize the positive aspects of the school rather than the negative ones. Silence about the negative aspects is a strategy of parents who do not have the chance to select a school for their children nor opportunity to make significant changes. Their only alternative is to move to another neighbourhood, as public schools are allocated to a fixed geographical area.

Conclusion

This chapter has reviewed the school and environs. We

noted the increased enrollment in first grade in 1984 which indicated demographic pressure for educational opportunities.

Many school characteristics can affect first grade teaching. The low quality of educational services was observed in a school which had only about 60 percent of its teachers doing classroom teaching. All others, more than 40 percent, were in technical pedagogical and administrative functions.

Other school factors affecting rates of promotion in first grade may include the quality of school administrators and reform efforts such as the 1958 state and the 1971 national educational reforms. However, evidence from a sample of 146 classes over a period of four decades showed that a factor such as the teachers' degree of stability, instructing the same class for the whole school year, did not always explain promotion/retention in first grade.

In 1984 the rate of promotion in first grade showed improvement, being the third highest in the forty-year series considered, and the highest noted during the eighties. The school under analysis, in contrast to the poorly-supplied rural municipal ones, had abundant human resources, all qualified with at least normal school. But, the 58 percent attained, however, was still inferior to the rates for the city of Porto Alegre and the state of Rio Grande do Sul.

Ecological factors outside the school also affect educational success. The growing number of slum dwellings built around the school by newly-arrived inhabitants, unemployment and violence, represent constraints upon teachers in the context of classrooms. At the beginning of 1984 teachers and pupils felt insecure at the school. In the analysis of the children's consciousness of danger in their own homes, only eight out of sixty-nine said that the area where they lived was not dangerous. During the 1984 year the school was "retaken" from "invaders" who lived in the slum.

Through the building of a fence, the school again became a safe place for faculty and students.

CHAPTER V

THE CLASSROOMS - ACTORS AND OUTCOMES

In the opening section of this chapter, aggregate data are used to compare and rank the four first-grade classes in terms of their collective success at teaching/learning literacy during the 1984 school year. Three outcome measures are used: rates of promotion to second grade, average reading scores and average spelling scores on tests administered independently by the investigator at the end of the 1984 school year. Two methods of calculating each of these measures are provided and the theoretical implications discussed. The four classes are then ranked and designated as A, B, C and D for the purpose of comparisons and analysis throughout the rest of the dissertation. The second section of the chapter then introduces the actors involved - the teachers and pupils - and examines the individual background characteristics they brought, in varying combinations, to the four classes at the start of the 1984 school year.

Outcomes in the Four First-grade Classrooms

The comparative success of the four first grade classes at teaching/learning literacy was evaluated using aggregate data and three measures of success: rates of promotion to second grade, average reading scores and average spelling scores. Each of these measures involved calculating a "class average," and a decision therefore about how to define and calculate the denominator. As indicated in the previous chapter, the results of two methods are presented. The first method defines total enrollment as final enrollment - the number of pupils still attending class at the end of the

TABLE 18
SUMMARY OF FACTORS MOST PROBABLY ASSOCIATED WITH
FAILURE IN FIRST GRADE

	Class A	Class B	Class C	Class D
Predominant age	10 or more	9 or more	9 or more	8 or more
Non-white	25%	67%	41%	24%
Poor health	19%	7%	4%	4%
Repeated first grade 3 or 4 times before 1984	37%	27%	7%	8%
Family instability	25%	53%	41%	36%
Parents' low level of schooling *	6%	20%	22%	24%
Unemployed father or NA	0%	13%	15%	20%
Low level of income per family member **	43%	53%	63%	48%

Sources: Tables 15 to 17.

* Illiterate or first grade.

** Corresponding to 25 percent or less of the minimum wage.

TABLE 19
 PROMOTION AND NONPROMOTION, LEAVING SCHOOL AND TRANSFER
 OF PUPILS IN EACH OF FOUR FIRST-GRADE CLASSES
 1 9 8 4

	Class A	Class B	Class C	Class D			Total
				Repeaters	New Pupils	Total	
Promoted	14	11	18	8	4	12	55
Nonpromoted	1	1	6	2	1	3	11
Left the school	-	3	1	3	3	6	10
Transferred to another school	1	-	2	-	3	3	6
Transferred to kindergarten	-	-	-	-	1	1	1
Total enrollment	16	15	27	13	12	25	83
Promotion rates							
Excluding those who transferred and left the school	93	92	75	80	80	80	83
Excluding those who transferred	93	73	72	62	50	57	72

Sources: Tables 48 to 51, in Appendix.

school year - thus excluding pupils who left school whether by transferring or dropping out. In effect, this method defines success in a way that absolves the teacher of any responsibility for keeping children from dropping out of school. The second method, by contrast, holds teachers partly accountable for their "success" or "failure" at keeping children in school by excluding transfers BUT NOT DROPOUTS from the measure of total enrollment. (The second method thus excludes from total enrollment only those who transferred to other schools, but INCLUDES those who left school during 1984 without communicating the reason for their departure to school authorities. This makes for a larger denominator, and a lower rate of success). While the results of both methods of calculating each of the three measures of success are presented, the theoretical implications of the second method are preferred. The final ranking of the four classes thus reflects a theoretical and principled decision to hold teachers accountable for their failure to keep pupils in school as well as for their success with those who stay.

Rates of Promotion to Second Grade

Table 19 presents the differential rates of promotion to second grade for the four classes, calculated in the two ways described above. Classes A, B, and C were composed of pupils repeating the first grade (often for more than the first time), while Class D included a roughly equal number of repeaters and new pupils. In order to facilitate comparisons between new pupils and repeaters Table 19 (and many later tables) include this breakdown for Class D.

Using the second and preferred method of calculation, Class A presented clearly the best outcome of the four classes observed with 93 percent promoted, followed by Class B (73 percent) and Class C (72 percent) and trailed by Class D (57

percent).

Reading and Spelling Scores

Reading and spelling tests were administered independently by the investigator just before the end of the school year. Only pupils still at school at the end of the year took the tests (15 in Class A, 12 in Class B, 24 in Class C, and 15 in Class D, adding up to a total of sixty-six of the eighty-three original pupils). Detailed results are reported in Tables 20, 21, 22 and 23 in the Appendix of Tables. Again, the **average** reading and spelling scores for each class as a whole could be calculated in two ways: by excluding or including school dropouts in the denominator. Table 22 summarizes the average reading and spelling scores for the four classes calculated both ways.

Using the first method of calculation, average reading scores for the four classes are high and fall into a narrow range (from 86 to 93 percent), while average spelling scores are much lower, also falling into a relatively narrow range (from 36.5 to 49.5 percent). The high reading scores represent the low value placed on the reading comprehension section of the test, while the low scores on the spelling test have to do with difficulties in spelling peculiar to the Portuguese language and not just to problems in reading the words dictated. Nonetheless, Classes A and B clearly outperformed Classes C and D on measures of both reading and spelling.

Using the second method of calculation, the four classes range more widely in average scores for the reading and spelling. Class A and Class D rank as the most and least successful in terms of average reading scores. Spelling scores continued to provide a tougher measure of literacy. And on this measure, the four first-grade classes ranked in

the same order as on rates of promotion to the second grade.

The Final Ranking of Collective Success

The four first-grade classes were ranked and designed as Classes A, B, C and D for the purpose of comparisons and analysis throughout the rest of the dissertation. This ranking represents their collective success as measured by rates of promotion to second grade (a school-based evaluation of literacy) and by average spelling scores (the tougher of two independent measures of literacy), as described in Table 22. Class A, and D also rank as the best and worst on average reading scores. Because children who left school are taken into account in the three measures of collective class success, the rank order defines success in first grade not only in terms of achieving literacy but also in terms of staying in school.

The Actors

This section introduces the actors - the four teachers and eighty-three pupils in Classes A, B, C and D - and examines the individual background characteristics they brought, in varying combinations, to the four classes at the start of the 1984 school year. Presentation of this descriptive background material will focus first on similarities and differences in the teachers' experience and commitment to teaching literacy, and second on the characteristics of pupils most likely to present a hindrance to the teaching/learning process. This discussion of the initial inputs to the teaching/learning literacy process will serve to address some of the questions that might otherwise arise regarding the individual participants and the nature of their distribution among the four classes. The following

chapter will extend this background discussion by focusing on the facilitative and/or constraining inputs provided by the school itself.

The Teachers

The teachers were selected for study on the basis of their teaching experience, their experience with teaching first grade and the length of time they had spent at the particular school studied. Teachers A, B, C and D had taught for 26, 12, 15 and 7 years respectively; they were teaching first grade for the 14th, 10th, 3rd and 6th times; and they had spent 20, 4, 9 and 5 years at this school.

All were married women with children, and all but one (B) of their families depended on their salaries for support. All had begun their careers by participating in a public competition for grade school teachers (kindergarten through grade four) and had a twenty-two-hour work week. Their salaries differed in accordance with the state's Teacher's Professional Statute which instituted a career plan linking salaries to level of education (six levels), years of service and merit (five classes). Teacher A had the highest salary - due to her university degree (level six education), years of experience, and record of merit; she had also acquired a second position as a high school mathematics teacher for which she qualified in public competition following completion of an undergraduate degree in the subject. The lower salaries of Teachers B, C and D reflected their normal school education (pedagogical training at the high school level which qualified as level one education) and their lesser years of experience. Teacher B had the lowest salary because she had taken a leave of absence to accompany her husband on his travels and had taught at private rather than state schools during this time. The low wages set for entry level teachers (a source of

widespread activism during 1984) and the 35 percent salary increase set by statute for teachers acquiring an undergraduate degree provided a doubly strong incentive for further education. During 1984, Teachers B, C and D were all still taking undergraduate coursework. And all were decidedly fighting to maintain their standard of living and, if possible, to further the upward mobility they had each already achieved on becoming a teacher.

The Teachers' Commitment to Teaching Literacy

Teacher A reported that her decision to become a teacher had been influenced by her family, as she had many relatives who were teachers; Teacher A's mother herself had been a teacher's aide. After finishing elementary school, she had begun teaching at a parochial school, where she had learned to teach literacy by the alphabetic method. She confided: "I myself learned by this method, and for this reason teaching literacy was not difficult." In the mornings, she had taught the strong pupils who had a good chance of becoming literate by the end of the school year, and in the afternoons new pupils who had difficulty even learning the alphabet, "who learned only the vowels." She had worked for one year as a clerk and saved money to support her studies in the capital city, and applied for admission to one of the best normal schools in Porto Alegre. She was at the top of her class in both elementary school and normal school and was invited to do her student teaching in the same normal school, and to continue teaching there for two more years after graduating. Having married, she moved and went to teach at a school near the one under analysis for two years, where pupils had a similar social background to those she would later work with. In 1965, having passed special qualifying examinations, she was hired as a state primary teacher, and sent to work at the

school under analysis. She began to work there during its "golden years." She was highly regarded both as a teacher and as a human being by pupils, parents, colleagues and the administrative staff. She was what one might consider an outstanding teacher; in her own words, she had reached the highest level in the teaching profession, i.e., being in a classroom.

Teacher A had taught all grades of elementary school, beginning with the fifth grade, and moving to fourth, third, second and first. Her preference for first grade, since 1973, mainly represented a response to demands of the school. Even so if she had her own way she would select the first grade again, because she had had enormous experience at this level. In addition, she was learning new method of teaching literacy, and there was a great demand for first-grade teachers at the school. She concluded: "I was always open to study. If I had to teach another grade I would adjust to it easily."

When teaching the first grade in 1973, she began to realize the importance of the first time she had taught it, five years before she had finished normal school. Her early professional life, in her teens, represented a sort of learning-by-doing education. During that first experience in teaching literacy, Teacher A recalled the method by which she herself had learned to read and write; her own experience of becoming literate gave her elements for teaching. She also referred to the strong influence of an experienced teacher who had oriented her during her first experience teaching first grade, performing what today corresponds to the roles of the educational counsellor and teacher supervisor.

Teacher B entered normal school not because she had consciously chosen to be a teacher but because she was in a school in which normal school was one of the curricula offered at the high-school level; her oldest sister had also taken normal school. While taking her teacher training she taught

literacy to adults at night, but this was apparently not a meaningful experience, as she could recall nothing significant about it. Her student teaching in the second grade at the end of normal school had been a negative experience, and in 1984 she would still refuse to teach this grade. Restless pupils with difficulties in reading and writing had been placed in one large class and turned over to her. She had felt unable to deal with all their problems and, what made matters worse, had to have her lessons observed from different points of view - teaching method, teacher-pupil relationships, etc. The worst mark left on her was the loss of a pupil who died:

That really shocked me. And that's why I get along so well with my pupils. Maybe it is for this reason that I worry about them. Maybe a psychiatrist would tell me this. As I lost one, I want to take advantage of my time with the others, because I have the impression that when I say goodbye to them at the end of the year, I am not going to see them anymore! And it's true. I'm really not going to see them anymore!

Teacher B's statement revolved around two themes: the way she aimed at professional competence and her commitment to justice. Her growth in professional competence took place in the various locations where she worked, accompanying her husband in his job transfers. The first time she was assigned a class after her student teaching, it was "first grade nobody wanted," children who were considered to belong in a special education class.

I did a dictation with them (the first day of class), and I noticed that they had written nothing. Nothing! Of course, they knew nothing. I became desperate. "What am I going to do with these children?" I didn't know anything! I didn't know how to begin teaching someone! I had learned nothing at normal school, except of lot of nonsense which was worth nothing.

At the end of this first day of class, Teacher B asked a teacher who was experienced with such children for help. She was advised "to follow a primer." She did not even know

what that meant. During that year the children "learned nothing," which means they did not become literate. The following year she was assigned an excellent class which had had a good teacher ("as competent as Teacher A"), who needed to leave the class. The most relevant thing said by Teacher B was: "I had to take over a class considered to be 'wonderful'." This time help came from an exceptionally dedicated and competent colleague who invited Teacher B to observe her own lessons. "From then on I've always had first grades."

She moved to different towns in another southern state, where settlements had been specially constructed by the enterprise for which her husband worked.

There, I learned to work, to give classes, everything I know today. I began working with first grades. Every year before classes started, there were free courses for teachers on literacy, mathematics, with teachers hired in Sao Paulo and Rio de Janeiro. There, we as a group, lived for pupils, and were willing to improve our teaching more and more. I made progress. I did so many good things with those children ... One time the children of the engineers (the elite class) were entrusted to me. This might mean that I was already competent in my profession. It was very much of a sacrifice to work at that school - too many hours of work!

She commented on the differences between her experience in these schools and those in the school under analysis:

What can I say? The teacher was dedicated to the school, she fell in love with her work. Everything was there in the school, available to the teachers, organized. I was trained in an environment where the teacher's energies were really in demand.

We got prepared to start classes in March as if for the birth of a child, all excited to see the pupils' faces. And (we took) course after course to improve our teaching.

There was no such thing as a day off during the week. We worked all day long, and on Saturdays, too.

The school was part of our life; it was our family.

She was not familiar with any school in Porto Alegre when she decided to work at the school under analysis. Our target school was going through its worst period, with an authoritarian principal who had shut the door in the parents' faces. Teachers and principal had lost respect for each other, verbally attacking each other and making negative comments about the pupils and their families in front of the children. There were no fences around the school, no windowpanes, no water in the pipes. Teacher B selected this school because there was a bus linking the school to her house. She had been made very welcome by the vice-principal, as for a long time no teacher had arrived to start working at the school. When she announced that she loved teaching first grade, everyone gazed at her in astonishment. A colleague answered: "This is because you don't know what teaching first grade in this school is like!" Teacher B concluded: "My first day at school I realized that I was considered odd. You see that they were already not willing to teach first grade. Just as at other schools, I received a 'first grade nobody wanted'." In 1985, she was transferred to another state school which approximated the pattern of schools in which she had taught in the other southern state. It was a school which enrolled middle-class students. Teacher B concluded that her preference for first grade came "naturally":

I began to fall in love with my work; I discovered at the end of each school year that it was a glory for me when I saw a pupil reading...I became more and more interested every year. First grade had to be mine. I get involved with the pupils and that's it. Whatever class I have (new pupils, repeaters) I know I am going to offer them a positive experience.

Teacher C had entered the profession "as a vocation." She enjoyed teaching small children, but preferred

kindergarten over first grade. She had a positive reason for teaching first grade in 1984 - the principal had invited her to do so, as there was a dearth of teachers in the first grade. There were also reasons for her not teaching kindergarten; she was told expenses would have to come out of her own pocket for the preparation of the classroom and another teacher was being sent by the Delegation of Education for this type of class. She concluded that "she wanted" to teach first grade in 1984. She intended to leave the school in 1985 because she felt she was considered "an agitator."

During fifteen years of teaching, Teacher C had taught kindergarten (four years), first grade (three years), third grade (six years) and fourth grade (two years). She had been a principal at a municipal school for one year. She said she had not had a good preparation at the normal school for any of the primary grades. Her student teaching had been at the third-grade level and she had worked without any supervision, creating the teaching method herself. In relation to Teacher A and B, she was much less experienced in the first grade, and had poorer preparation. She followed no models whatsoever, at least not consciously. She came from a school which she considered far more problematic than the one being analyzed.

Teacher D had entered normal school and became a teacher because in her town there was no other option, and her parents would not permit her to cross the river to study in Porto Alegre every day. She preferred to teach the first and fourth grades. She had taught first grade in her student teaching, which had been a very good experience. She had also taught fourth grade and had good results:

See! I like the teaching profession. When I started I didn't know that I liked it, but finally I accepted myself as a teacher. Maybe this is because I got along very well in my student teaching, I felt very well in the teaching profession. I always got along well with pupils.

She indicated that she would remain at the school only

if she got a special education class but she did not mention the increase in salary associated with it. Instead, she spoke only of principled interests:

I want to teach a special-ed class because I like to help others, and I think that it is in this environment (a special -education class) that I am going to be able to help most, because it is the most discriminatory environment in our society. I want to show that we have to make them equal because they are equal to other human beings.

The Teachers' Prior Success At Teaching Literacy

Table 14 in the Appendix presents the experience of the four teachers teaching first grade in the school. Teacher A taught classes predominantly of repeaters, where promotion rates varied between 50 and 100 percent; when she did teach classes composed of new pupils the rates fell in a smaller range - between 74 and 88 percent. After 1981, the year in which she got a second remunerated teaching position, her promotion rates reached between 88 and 100 percent, with no distinction between new students or repeaters. Having a second position as a teaching supervisor and secretary of the PTA gave more time at school and relaxed economic strictures surrounding a person who had the highest salary in her family. Teacher A, by the way, never had a zero percent promotion rate.

Teacher B had taught predominantly repeaters at this school. When she arrived there in August 1981, she had been assigned a class of new pupils which had not worked well with the first teacher in charge that year - the pupils had even kicked their previous teacher. She reported on her experience as follows:

Their first reaction was to hate me, because I began to impose order, I began to want organization to be able to work. I slowly got through to them, teaching them to value themselves,

to pray, to sing. I brought toys, I played with them, I gave them lots of affection. I spent a lot of time with them on the playground because they learned nothing (of the first-grade curriculum). You should see the experiments I did, attempting to teach them to write their names! I-va-nir. Imagine! I let them work with pencils, but not with letters, always free work. I planned a schedule with relaxation first because they arrived with rigid muscles, breathing exercises...After that, I usually gave them more systematic exercise then lighter exercise: story-telling, playing house. One day playing house, the other playing out on the playground. When we played house, I acted as the mother playing with her children. Nobody ever came to my class to ask what I was doing. You are the only one who knows about it!

It is important to note a zero promotion rate in first grade can indicate diverse experiences. Teacher B's decision to give students meaningful first experiences with scissors, books, pencil and paper was more than "an experiment"; it was clearly the right thing to do, a way of building up the children's self-respect. It can be seen as a first step to literacy and promotion, completed in the following years.

In her 1981 class, Teacher B was forced to see the ugly face of poverty, and stricken by it, opted for work preliminary to literacy: "The children, had nothing of their own, and fought over a toothpaste box. Their balls were plastic bags full of garbage." The extreme cases which had so affected her were: a boy drinking from a rusty dirty pipe, leaking sewage; another playing with the teeth of a dog which had recently died; a pupil whose mother had been stabbed by his father in front of him; a girl who had abandoned school after the shock of attempted rape. In the following years she had the highest rates of promotion of the four teachers - between 87 and 100 percent.

According to Teacher B, a newly-arrived teacher was almost always thrown into first-grade classes without having had any experience at that level and had to learn to teach literacy at the children's expense without any supervision.

Unquestionably, this was Teacher C's case, and this has been a common practice in state schools for quite some time. The principal assumes that teacher training at a normal school is adequate, and assigns classes based on enrollment. The creation of the position of teaching supervisor was done so that these professionals would give permanent assistance to teachers, mainly to those who were inexperienced at a certain grade level. Teacher B affirmed that such assistance was not available at that school. She had demanded special treatment for first-grade classes, suggesting a course in literacy for those teachers teaching first grade for the first time, and close supervision by a professional with a good deal of experience in literacy work. She concluded: "For me the one to blame for low promotion rates is not the pupil - in his poverty or misery - nor the school, but a badly-prepared teacher."

Teacher C taught first grade intermittently, and had good rates of promotion with repeaters - 75 and 83 percent. She would not describe her first teaching experience in first grade in 1978, but summarized it laconically: "It was bad."

Before that, Teacher C had not had any experience whatsoever teaching literacy.

In 1985, Teacher C was given a class of first-time first graders and she again attained, as in 1978, a zero promotion rate. This reflects, in part, the lack of a relevant approach to teaching literacy. The second time she failed with pupils who were considered to have chances for success.

Teacher D taught only classes of "new" pupils. The 1984 class was considered as such because pupils were attending first grade for the first time at the school being studied. Teacher D attained rates of promotion between zero and 88 percent. She did not comment on her zero rate in 1982. During that year she had been on a leave of absence from May to July.

Teachers A and B were among a group of teachers at the school who had attained one hundred percent promotion in their first-grade classes. Teacher A had had such a result in 1981; Teacher B, in 1982. In 1984 Teachers A and B attained 93 and 92 percent, while Teachers C and D attained 75 and 80, respectively (Table 14). In the school records, "dropouts" were not considered cases of failure; the rates of promotion above were calculated only on the basis of final enrollment figures, i.e., eliminating dropouts from the computation - which inflates those rates (as observed previously in the section on outcomes in 1984).

Pupils' Characteristics

There were eighty-three pupils who started out the 1984 school year in the four first-grade classes studied. Tables 15, 16 and 17 (in the Appendix of Tables) report in detail a number of their individual background characteristics and show how these were distributed across the four classes. These characteristics include gender, ethnic group, health, religion, prior school enrollment, family type and family stability, parents' schooling, mothers' occupation, fathers' occupation, income, number of children in the family, and whether or not the child lives in a declared slum dwelling. The following characteristics are selected for comment as ones that might disadvantage a child's first-grade achievement.

While 62 percent of the pupils were white, 37 percent were non-white. While 37 percent of the pupils were rated in good health, 41 percent were in fair health (this included children with problems of lice, mange or tooth decay) and 7 percent were in poor health.

While the majority of children had one parent who had completed either second or third grade (20 percent), fourth to eighth grade (53 percent) or high school (5 percent), a

significant number (20 percent) did not have an effectively literate parent to influence or support the process of becoming literate. Some of these parents were illiterate (10 percent); others (10 percent) had attended first grade but, on the basis of interviews with their children, were not considered literate.

Most pupils came from large and poor families: two-thirds of the families had four or more children, and 53 percent earned one-fourth of the minimum wage per person or less; 7 percent of the fathers were unemployed while 61 percent of the mothers were employed. Many pupils (43 percent) were self-declared "slum dwellers" and this is certainly an underestimate; it was difficult to verify whether pupils lived inside or outside the slum since their addresses did not distinguish slum housing from the low-quality and good housing scattered on the border of the slum.

In the context of customary images of slum life, it is striking that so many pupils (61 percent) came from stable families (families with the same constitution as at the time of the pupil's birth); fifty-one children had been raised by their parents since birth. Nonetheless, 39 percent of the pupils came from unstable families.

The pupils who entered the four first-grade classes were older than first graders in Rio Grande do Sul and Porto Alegre more generally (where the median and modal age for first-grade enrollment in 1984 was seven years old). And they were older even than the set of all first graders at the school being studied (where the modal age was seven, but the median age was eight years old). The modal and median age for the eighty-three pupils studied here was nine years old.

In part, these age disparities reflected their condition as slum dwellers - the disruptions that accompanied migration to the city, the poor educational opportunities normally available to the children which lead to drop out and/or repeat

the same grade. In this context, it is significant that only 17 percent of the pupils studied were entering first grade in 1984 for the first time; 29 percent were repeating first grade for the first time, 35 percent for the second time, and 17 percent for the third or fourth time. Some pupils had also had other kinds of prior school experience: 12 percent had attended kindergarten, while 7 percent had attended a special-education class. As an input to the learning process, prior school experience can, of course, be viewed in two ways: as advance preparation, or as advance stigmatization.

Expectations and Predictions

At the start of the 1984 school year, the teachers and other school staff developed expectations and predictions of how well the four classes would do in teaching/learning literacy. These expectations expressed their knowledge of each other, their assumptions about the likely impact of class size and the social characteristics of pupils on the teaching/learning of literacy, and their awareness of how these characteristics were distributed among the four classes (see Table 18 for a summary view of these distributions by class).

Class A was considered a difficult class at the school because it concentrated those who had repeated the first grade over a number of years. In fact, 37 percent of its pupils were taking first grade for the fourth or fifth time in 1984; as may be expected, this class had the oldest pupils, with the majority of children ten years old or older. These pupils with an accumulated experience of failure most probably were lacking in motivation, had been stigmatized as non-learners, and were those who would predictably be leaving school before the eighth grade for paid work. An analysis of home characteristics for Class A, however, showed the best indices

of the four classes under analysis: all fathers were employed and only one child had illiterate parents. It also had the lowest family instability. All of this suggested that the previous failure of these children might have been related to school factors.

Class B was "the control group" in a previous research project in which Class A was the experimental group. In fact, it could be considered as such only in terms of the concentration of pupils repeating first grade in 1984 for the fourth or fifth time (comprising 27 percent of enrollment). This "control" group had the highest concentration of both family instability (53 percent) and non-white population (67 percent). (Family instability was evenly distributed among whites and non-whites.) According to these two factors Class A stood in stark contrast to Class B. Class B also had three cases of children with both parents not knowing how to read or write. Teacher B pointed out that she had spontaneously volunteered to teach such a class "composed of problems," as the supervisor from the Delegation of education had termed it. Both groups though considered the most difficult ones to teach were welcomed by their teachers. The low number of pupils in both classes, fifteen, was demanded by those researchers who planned the experiment for this variable was considered a determinant in the teacher's practice. From the teacher's perspective, home stability was considered an important ingredient for success at school and from this point of view, pupils in Class A had greater probability of success than those in Class B. Teacher B's evaluation of her class in March 1984 in comparison to Class A revealed that hers, in fact, was at a disadvantage.

Considering the pupils' characteristics, Class D, in contrast to Classes A and B, presented several indices expected to favour promotion: it enrolled the youngest students, concentrated more whites, healthier pupils, and

fewer repeaters. It also had the second lowest concentration of family instability. Six of the children, however, had illiterate parents, and five had an unemployed father or lived only with the mother; these six children could be considered as having lower probability of success in first grade. The class was considered to be constituted only of new first-grade pupils but the children's past life at other schools was ignored. Students had also scored high on the ABC Test and, for these reasons, it was looked upon as the best of the four classes in the present study. Class C was composed of twenty-five children in March, as was Class D and all other first grades, except for Classes A and B. Two-thirds of the pupils, or eighteen children, were enrolled in first grade for the second time (Table 15 in Appendix), and, of these, seven children had just initiated the literacy process the previous year (Table 42, in Appendix). This class had an intermediate position as to expectations of promotion.

In summary, the school staff expected a good performance of Class D because it enrolled new pupils in first grade (in fact, it was a mixed group of new pupils and repeaters), and because of students' good scores on the ABC Test; Teacher D was also considered competent. Of Class A, concentrating those with a longer career of failure in first grade, the school community expected a difficult but almost certain success, since Teacher A was considered outstanding and was taking a special course on teaching literacy to this type of child. Teacher B had received a more difficult group of pupils according to family characteristics and years repeating, but she was very experienced in first-grade classes and was also expected to win the literacy battle. Teacher C had received a "normal" class of repeaters. It was her third year teaching first grade and she was considered dedicated; good results were also expected of her class. At that time - March 1934 -

I also expected good results from all classes considering the

teachers' performance as evaluated by colleagues, and feared that I had selected only those teachers likely to succeed.

A look at the pupils' characteristics shows that those of Class A indicated that the failures in first grade, before 1984, was most probably due to problems in the school, since family characteristics were reasonably adequate. The composition of Class B as well as that of Class C, pointed to a wider range of factors in the explanation of failure before that year. Class D added to the picture a factor not present in the other three classes: change of residence as a consequence of migration in times of high unemployment.

Summary

Rates of promotion to second grade, and average reading and spelling scores on independently administered tests were used to define and rank the relative success of four first-grade classes at teaching/learning literacy during the 1984 school year. Two methods of calculating these aggregate measures of success were presented and discussed. The method INCLUDING pupils who left school (but excluding transfer students) in the denominator was chosen BECAUSE it measures success in a way that holds teachers partially accountable for their failure to keep children in school as well as for their success in teaching literacy to those who stay. On the basis of consistent rankings for rates of promotion to second grade and average spelling scores, the classes were ranked and designated as A, B, C and D for the purpose of comparisons and analysis throughout the rest of the dissertation. Classes A and D also ranked as the most and least successful on average reading scores.

The individual background characteristics of the four teachers and eighty-three pupils were then presented to introduce the actors involved, to review factors thought to

facilitate or hinder the teaching/learning literacy process, and to document the expectations and predictions that teachers and school staff developed on the basis of these characteristics and their distribution among the four classes. These informal predictions developed among the adult participants in the study at the start of the 1984 school year did not, as shall be explored, match the actual outcomes.

CHAPTER VI

THE SCHOOL AND THE PROFESSION: CONSTRAINTS ON THE TEACHERS' PRACTICE

This chapter focuses on the background and context that the school and the statutes governing the teaching practice provided for the teaching-learning-literacy process. The first half of the chapter provides the perspectives of the teachers themselves on the aspects of the school they felt facilitated or hindered their work. The second half of the chapter presents a broader analysis of how the structuring of teachers' professional careers itself contributed less visibly to the difficulties teachers faced at school and in their classes.

The School through the Eyes of the Teacher

Educational Principles

The teachers were not supported in their practice by a clearly stated school philosophy, by a set of shared values held in common, nor even by joint agreement with one another about their objectives for first grade pupils.

Teacher A described the school philosophy as one based on principles of respect for individual freedom and the talents and problems of slum children. She thought that first-grade teachers shared a common orientation in their daily practice: developing pupils' competence and creativity in communication and expression.

Teacher B, when asked about the philosophical principles of the school, answered:

My goodness! What a difficult question! How can I answer that - once I asked the principal if the teacher's professional competence interested him and he answered that it didn't, that the only

that he wanted to let teachers to do their own thing, but in the end, with the pay I don't know. But personally he brought it from home, because in relation to the pupil there was nothing.

When asked whether there were shared values regarding education in the school, Teacher B stated that there was a consensus manifested in common objectives:

The teachers there were in conflict with each other and with pupils. They were always worried about moving to another school closer to their homes, and "education" was lost among more immediate objectives, which had nothing to do with it.

Teacher B considered that the other first-grade teachers shared her desire to help pupils to become literate. She thought, however, that her colleagues also emphasized details such as beautiful penmanship and neat notebooks, which she saw as desirable but not always possible, considering the students' plight.

Asked about the philosophical principles of the school, Teacher C said that the institution "should focus on the pupil" but that in this school "difficult situations were ignored," so that the school administration could "look good in the eyes of the authorities." The main principle would be "a greater integration of community, school, and pupil, searching for the common good." On the other hand, she thought that there was no consensus about what education meant - not all of her colleagues had been well-prepared for their positions, as only some were taking undergraduate degrees in education. She felt that all the school really required was that "the pupils were disciplined and did not bother the offices by being noisy, even if they were simply participating enthusiastically in a learning activity." There was competition among teachers as to who could best control pupils, and there was a mortal fear of teaching first-grade classes. She agreed with the others that pupils' competence

in literacy was the first and foremost teaching objective.

Teacher E indicated that the main principle in the school philosophy - and the main content of education in institutions was "operation of school work and the self-teaching of students." But he pointed out the fact that this orientation was expected of teachers but not practiced by the school administration - which, for example, did nothing when pupils ran around the schoolyard all morning without teacher supervision. He insisted that there were no shared values about what education meant or about how to educate. Meetings were held simply to request teachers' adherence to timetable or to complain about pupils' behaviour. Asked if there were shared values in the practice of first-grade teachers in the school, Teacher D answered that she did not know, but she thought that "it depended on each teacher." She considered it important to "do things the best way possible, to be in harmony with my own conscience and with others," and that part of the teachers' responsibility at the school should be "to develop these qualities and also encourage constructive criticism, organization and self-control."

There was, in other words, no evidence of a philosophy in this public school, and no formal statement of principles guiding teaching practice.

Teacher A answered the questions about the philosophical principles of the school most clearly, but these were her own views. As Teacher B said, every teacher had his/her own philosophy; even the meaning of "education" - which she herself did not make explicit - was unclear and "dissolved among teachers' more immediate objectives." Teachers C and D described the school philosophy as centered around the pupils' needs, but were quick to add that "in fact the school administration did not practice it" (Teacher D) and "having a good image at the Delegation of Education counted more to the administration than the children's needs" (Teacher C).

Teacher C and D also agreed that there was a lack of clarity about what education meant.

Teachers A, B and C shared the objective of making children competent in reading and writing, believing the other teacher also did. Teacher D, however, preferred to answer only for herself: her objective was to do her best and to be in harmony with her own conscience and with others. She justified her own frequent absenteeism by comparing herself with an administration which also did not enter the school around the pupils' needs.

School Administration

The teachers also did not feel supported by the school administration, which consisted of a principal who dealt with matters external to the school (mainly contacts with the educational bureaucracy about personnel problems and with the state building maintenance department about repairs to the physical plant) and the two assistant principals (one each shift) who dealt with everyday problems inside the school.

When asked about her expectations of the school administration, Teacher A replied: "Solving the main problems in the school and real involvement in everything related to education." In her opinion, the school was organized "democratically with a lot of conflicts":

The teacher in an environment such as ours is very, very agitated, because she has nothing. She doesn't become satisfied, she doesn't become fulfilled; she goes into the classroom, and there are no resources. She sees her pupils poorly dressed, dirty, with lice, with mange. She is an anxious teacher and it's very easy for her to argue with colleagues, or the principal.

Teacher A almost always kept her opinion of the school staff to herself, but did express her total disappointment when asked about shared values in the school. She said that the image of a school as a "sanctuary of education" had been

complete / accredited by the Ministry of Education. The assistant principals in permitting the bookmaker to sell tickets for the "animal lottery," a semi-legal game of chance, when a woman bookmaker peddled the ticket at her classroom door in front of her pupils, Teacher A also spoke to her pupils about obeying laws, and, with the president of the parent-teacher association, spoke to the two assistant principals forbidding the activity. The only change was to hide the activity from the pupils' eyes by transferring the buying and selling to the teachers' room in the second building. The same teachers continued to participate along with one of the assistant principals.

I, myself, and other colleagues who do not participate in this "gambling" find it depressing. A pupil who already deals with wrong-doing and deception in his own family comes to school and sees more. We have to have law and order at school if we ever expect to have it in the society as a whole.

The bookmaker was the mother of students who had already left the school and who had been in jail various times for dealing marijuana, "as all the 'vila' knew and as the newspapers had reported."

My fear is that through this contact with the school she deals marijuana. We had doped-up pupils in our classrooms: I had one fourteen-year old girl in the first grade...One day, she was caught smoking marijuana behind the school.

I didn't use to care about all these things; but now I think a teacher should be able to recognize the smell of marijuana and the behaviour of people who use drugs.

She concluded:

These facts lead me to lose respect for the authority of the school administration...they occupy a position, and earn their salaries, but they aren't really educators.

While Teacher A felt that the principal was often away,

the principal of the school. It is a very good school, but the principal is not very good. He is not very good at his job, but he is a very good person. He is a very good person, but he is not very good at his job. He is a very good person, but he is not very good at his job. He is a very good person, but he is not very good at his job.

As a result of the principal's poor management, the school is in a very poor state. The principal is not very good at his job, but he is a very good person. He is a very good person, but he is not very good at his job. He is a very good person, but he is not very good at his job. He is a very good person, but he is not very good at his job.

He stated that the principal did not know the description of the assistant principals were, asserting: "Maybe they are there in order for the principal to be absent a lot; if they have any particular responsibilities none of us teachers know about them."

When asked about what she expected of the school administration, Teacher C answered, "an active voice":

When the school administration is successful, everything works: support services, classrooms, everything. It is a kind of model and whenever the model fails, then, everyone tries to be in charge, everyone yells, everyone "does," everyone "undoes," see? Because here, in this school, there are about five principals (the principal, the two assistants, a school counsellor, and a shift coordinator).

I think that the principal has good intentions but as he is not at school very often those who assist him adapt (decisions) to their way of being, give their interpretation, their way, based on the little information they have.

Teacher C said that the shift coordinator influenced the assistant principals' decisions by "putting ideas in their heads."

But when the assistant principals give an interpretation everyone does what they want...thus, the administration is working well. There have been no complaints about the school to the Delegation of Education.

The conflict between teachers and principal was mentioned various times by Teacher C, when talking about the principal's flaws - "they (the teachers) are always talking about them, and telling me" - or when she considered him the most

... "I am not a teacher," he said. "I am a student of the school." He said that he had been in the school for a long time and that he had learned a lot from the teachers. He said that he had learned to be a teacher and that he had learned to be a student. He said that he had learned to be a person and that he had learned to be a citizen. He said that he had learned to be a human being and that he had learned to be a member of the community. He said that he had learned to be a person who was responsible and that he had learned to be a person who was honest. He said that he had learned to be a person who was kind and that he had learned to be a person who was brave. He said that he had learned to be a person who was free and that he had learned to be a person who was equal. He said that he had learned to be a person who was just and that he had learned to be a person who was fair. He said that he had learned to be a person who was good and that he had learned to be a person who was great. He said that he had learned to be a person who was wise and that he had learned to be a person who was strong. He said that he had learned to be a person who was true and that he had learned to be a person who was brave. He said that he had learned to be a person who was free and that he had learned to be a person who was equal. He said that he had learned to be a person who was just and that he had learned to be a person who was fair. He said that he had learned to be a person who was good and that he had learned to be a person who was great. He said that he had learned to be a person who was wise and that he had learned to be a person who was strong. He said that he had learned to be a person who was true and that he had learned to be a person who was brave.

Teacher C's critical examination, however, of the school was rooted in a general anti-authoritarian and anti-bureaucratic perspective. "Here, we do what they want. All of us (the teachers) are like sheep."

When asked about the school administration, Teacher D answered:

I think that this school administration has delegated too much. It's correct to delegate responsibility, but it has been given to people who are incompetent.

The principal is a good person but is compliant - very soft. The school administration is weak because anybody can influence him...As he is often away from the school they (the assistant principal) administer more than he does. And then the big arguments inside the school start. I would do exactly the opposite: let the assistants go to meetings or to buy things.

I do not see any democracy. As a matter of fact, a person must know what democracy is, first, to act on it, right? I think that the great majority (of teachers) are under authoritarian rule, but others receive more laissez-faire treatment.

While Teacher A defined the school administration as "democratic with a lot of conflict," Teachers B and C saw it as authoritarian. Teacher D found it authoritarian for the majority and laissez-faire for others:

Some people arrive whenever they want, leave whenever they want, do whatever they want. If they

want to teach, they don't, they don't want to read magazines, think about fashion and don't want to work, they don't, etc."

School Support Services

In terms of technical-pedagogical assistance to pupils and teachers, the school had three services available to the eight grades of elementary school: educational counselling, teacher supervision, and "multimedia," which includes the school library and audiovisual services. How did the four teachers evaluate the services offered at this school?

Educational counselling was seen to offer support for discipline problems faced by teachers; it was also involved with aptitude testing and parent-student conflicts which interfered with school work. Teacher A did not ask the counselling service to intervene when disciplining her pupils:

If you speak with the pupil by himself, I think that you reach that child more easily. Sometimes things are not dealt with in confidence and you see the problems of your pupil being aired with everyone. I forgive the child, but of love, so he can see me as a friend and correct himself. The counselling service was used by many teachers as a threat in order to change the pupils' behaviour.

Teacher B, however, considered counselling to be one of the better services in the school and the counsellor in charge of the first grade to be very helpful. Teacher C thought that the educational counselling service should work with the first grade as it did with the fourth grade on: arranging group discussions with pupils for forty-five minutes a week working towards the integration of difficult pupils, leading children to share their problems, or checking up on pupils' reading.

Teacher D, like Teacher A, did not need the educational counselling service to solve discipline problems in her class, but suggested that as "the counsellor for first graders does nothing in the school," she should meet the whole class once

a week for an hour, and contact parents about their children's progress. In her opinion, the service had a negative image. "It threatens the child with 'if your father does not come you are going to be suspended'. And the child gets beaten when he is sent home." He also pointed to the parent's problem of getting permission to leave work to go to school and talk with the counsellor. "Counselling should be defined as orientation for pupils and not as disciplining pupils: in general, first-grade teachers do not have discipline problems."

The **teacher supervision service** had the following responsibilities: (a) giving assistance in curriculum planning and in writing pupil evaluations; (b) introducing new teaching techniques; and (c) monitoring pupils' attendance. Teacher A said that the first-grade teachers always did what was expected of them by this service but that the person in charge did not have any classroom experience, so her advice could not be accepted unreservedly. Teachers B, C and D agreed that the supervision service did not fulfill its expected role. Teacher B extended her comments to all three supervisors she had had at the school: "No one advised the teachers on anything."

Two other services, the **school library** and the **audiovisual center**, were offered to first-grade classes. Each class had one scheduled thirty-minute period per week supervised by the teacher in charge of the library.

Teacher A expected the school library to have storybooks full of illustrations with very simple texts, the sort not available to the children at home, "to develop a taste for reading." The library, unfortunately, had only one or two of these in sharp contrast to schools serving higher status student populations. From the audiovisual center, Teacher A expected pictures for oral composition, material for counting, and also mimeograph paper for evaluations. She said that this

... had been ...
In 1984, even with a teacher in charge, it was being run only
in order to be able to tell them that the ...

Teacher B said that the librarian wanted to be a ...
job; he gave a "story hour" to the pupils when he ...
As she was taking an undergraduate degree and had also been
in the hospital, however, she had been absent frequently and
the library was often closed. Teacher B said that for all
practical purposes the audiovisual center did not exist for
her, as she worked in the morning shift and the center was
open only in the afternoon.

Teacher C expected the librarians to offer story hours
once a week as scheduled; in fact, she had had fewer than ten
the entire school year. She evaluated the audiovisual center
positively in spite of the fact that she always had to
mimeograph the exercises she needed herself. One positive
point was that the center distributed notebooks and pencils
to pupils at a minimal cost or free of charge.

Working in the mornings as did Teacher B, Teacher D
complained that the library was closed and that the story hour
was not offered regularly. She thought that this activity
should be planned according to needs of the class, not
according to the librarians' availability. Concerning the
audiovisual center, closed in the mornings, she complained
that it was even difficult to find the keys to open it.

In addition to the four services discussed above, the
first-grade teachers who worked mornings - Teachers B and D
- had two thirty-minute **physical education** classes a week,
given by a specialized teacher. The afternoon teachers felt
that their lack of physical education classes penalized their
students. **Religion** classes to instruct students on the main
Roman Catholic feasts were planned by a supervisor, who
assumed this task as part of her religious duty.

A **health center** operating at the school served not only

... "He told you to take them, to make them comfortable, ... and have them rest up, because you got interested in them, went there, ... to the doctor, took the pupils and talked with them. ... the same thing with other pupils." Teacher B had a good impression of the dentist's personality, but questioned his treatment:

Very caring. You take the child in and he extract what should be extracted. Of course, I don't know... he did not do anything else - just pulled the teeth and that's it.

Teacher C never asked for assistance from the psychology service. When discussing the medical service she said she wished that the children's needs would be better met but she perceived that the doctor worried more about his own image than about the pupils' illnesses. "He only hands medicine to parents, worrying that the occurrence of any problem with its distribution to children would be reported in a newspaper." She had no contact with the dentist, who came during a different shift, but said that he had been criticized by the grandmother of one of the students, which had been reported in the press.

Teacher D had sent three pupils to the psychology and remedial education service because they presented problems of omission of sounds, stuttering, and prehension, respectively. The first got worse, the second only began treatment, and the third was sent back to class to be helped by his teacher. She stated: "In short, they did nothing for anybody in my class." Teacher D criticized the health service in the same way that Teacher C had: the children were full of lice and there was medicine at the school which was **not** being distributed. She demanded that the doctor have a fixed schedule - day and hour - to attend the children. The teacher should also know the schedule to be able to inform a father or mother of when to bring children to see him. She also said that if the parents could not come to get the medicine because they would lose

ask you, what is the philosophy of this school?"

Teacher C also thought that the school meal was very bad, dirty, and served in very small portions. Leftovers were put together and served to the last students to eat, thus "saving work." Teacher D also found the lunch "shameful"; sometimes, she said, a serving amounted to "two drops in the bottom of a cup." She also indicated that it should be thicker and distributed at the right time. She complained: "Sometimes there was no water or cooking gas, there was no meal that day, and we were not notified."

Thus, in practice, school support services did not give real support to teachers and pupils in their daily activities. Although the theoretical "availability" of these services enhanced the prestige of the school. Teacher D was the most openly critical, stating that none of the varied services examined fulfilled her expectations. Teacher C found the distribution of notebooks and pencils very helpful, but criticized all other services. Teacher B evaluated positively the counsellor who worked with the first grade as well as offering qualified praise for the librarian. Teachers B and D, working in the mornings, were positive about regularly-offered physical education classes. Teacher A, though avoiding harsh and direct criticisms of any sort, spoke of unfulfilled expectations, but condoned the behaviour of the school administration, due to the difficult problems it faced in administering such a big school: "Here whatever is needed, is a lot!"

Comparing the school to her ideal, Teacher A thought that all services were deficient or ill-defined, and that the only aspect in which the school approximated the ideal was in offering opportunities for altruism and self-denial. Despite her desire for a better-organized school, Teacher B found that the school did offer conditions for innovative and highly productive work, since neither parents, teacher supervision

service, nor the school administration interfered in the teachers' practice. Here, different pedagogical perspectives explain Teacher A and B's antithetical points of view. Teacher B worked at the school as if she were "on an island," valuing total freedom in daily practice; Teacher A compared the functioning of this school in 1984 with better times when teachers and children in public schools had many facilities available. Teachers C and D, as Teacher A, emphasized constraints on their daily work.

Other Constraints

In discussing the background factors that, from their own perspectives, constrained or facilitated their practice, the teachers brought up the pedagogic challenges specific to first-grade teaching, the problems created when other teachers were absent, and the specific problems presented by poverty.

A major difficulty in the school was, first of all, getting teachers to agree to teach first grade, a problem mentioned by Teachers A and C. Teacher C stated that her colleagues avoided first-grade classes "like the plague" (she herself preferred to teach kindergarten, while the other three taught first grade nearly exclusively). Teacher A explained this avoidance as follows:

I think that the difficulty, whether we want to admit it or not, is that the teacher is being evaluated. The teacher who teaches first grade clearly shows what she accomplished that year, though it does not depend only on her own work. The pupils haven't had another teacher before. This is a difficult thing for teachers without experience to accept, because they are going to show their inexperience...and lack of ability, which is going to be improved with practice, right?

Thus, the first grade teacher is someone who accepts the challenge of having her practice evaluated since whether pupils become literate is a clear-cut result which anybody -

colleagues or parents - can observe.

A common administrative policy in schools has been to allocate first-grade classes to newcomers who do not dare refuse them. For an inexperienced teacher, the curriculum of the normal school at which she studied, and the conditions under which she did her student teaching become critical resources. Unfortunately, student teaching is usually not done at the first-grade level. For this reason, schools should ideally provide (a) efficient teaching supervision to offer orientation in the process of teaching literacy, and (b) periodic meetings of first-grade teachers in order to solve common problems. In reality, teachers worked nearly in isolation, at least in the school being studied.

Teacher A had taught first grade in a very well-organized private school even before taking her teachers' training, and said her own courses at the normal school had covered "what was considered most difficult to teach" - literacy and the fourth grade. But she felt that the training offered by normal schools did not give a firm foundation in curriculum content and method. Teachers C and D (former classmates) considered their normal school training to be adequate. While Teacher B also criticized the superficial treatment of literacy offered when she was in training, she thought that the curriculum content was no great problem, because it was "static." The real problem for inexperienced teachers, in her opinion, concerned the process of conducting a class under totally new circumstances, the psychological factors in the class: "One child responds this way, another in another way. What should I do with them? And what about the one who does not respond?" When asked what the normal school and her student teaching had not offered in terms of preparation, she answered:

Flexibility! Student-teachers aren't flexible; they practice teaching with children who learn under "normal" conditions, and then go to schools where the conditions are totally different, knowing that

they have to attain equally positive results...the normal school, due to the very age and maturity of the target population (in their teens) will never provide the flexibility needed.

The normal school gave a lot of emphasis to planning and drawing posters, evaluating the more superficial aspects of teaching.

Summing up, the lack of both appropriate training in normal schools and orientation from experienced school supervisors or colleagues led the teaching of first grade to be looked on by some "with terror." Those who did agree to teach it were setting themselves up to be viewed as incompetent. In addition, teaching first grade is very demanding on the imagination, energies and health of teachers, according to Teacher A:

In order for children to become literate, the teacher needs to work with each pupil individually. The first-grade teacher does not have the right to sit down at her desk in the classroom: she must go from one desk to another looking to see if the work is well-organized, and make corrections.

Teacher A also brought up a third point: the teachers' availability to the demands of her role, assuming responsibility and not letting anything interfere with her work:

You have to sacrifice family matters so your school work goes well, because your work is important to your family. Because this is how you support your family, you cannot put your work last anyway. Both pupil and teacher have to be conscious of their responsibilities to follow schedules, because the teacher is not being watched by anybody. If she does not have this consciousness she can use that period for...You know? Consciousness in the sense of responsibility...This is very important and serves as an example for the pupil.

She mentioned the case of a teacher "taking life easy" at school as a negative influence on one of her own pupils' aspirations to a future career in the profession, and how she turned the girl's attention to more committed teachers as models for her future role in society.

Teacher A defined the role of teacher positively in terms of availability and responsibility, qualities which she herself possessed. Teachers C and D, instead, focused on the issue of the teachers' presence or absences from work. Teacher C, who was rarely absent, complained about events which interfered with her daily practice:

In this school we lack teachers who are present and actually in the classroom (teaching). They fall back on other teachers and I think that's exploitation. I always, always, always, have to work with others' pupils in my room (even from three absent teachers).

At the beginning of the school day one teacher came around "passing out" pupils. One hour later another one appeared at the door. Teacher C concluded: "They didn't want to teach." Teacher C felt her work was held in high regard by her colleagues, but found it unfair that other teachers were unaware of the impact of their absences on their students and other teachers. The only reason pupils did not spend the whole day outside on the playground was because she taught them, Teacher C reported. And, in fact, many pupils escaped even before being placed in another room for the day.

Teacher D, with the lowest attendance of any teacher, also complained about having to teach the pupils of absent teachers:

There is no motivation at this school, specially among the first-grade teachers; we feel a certain discrimination from other teachers - as if we didn't know anything. You hear: "Gee! You're courageous! Teaching first grade you kill yourself the whole year!" Things like that.

You have to tend to pupils from other classes who are at a completely different level (in literacy) every day. You have to stay with them because there is no one else. You feel compelled to take them, because - poor kids! They don't need to hear "no." But when you take them you interfere with curriculum development in your own class.

Teachers A and B had small rooms with seating for only sixteen

children and did not have to face the situation of having to care for pupils from other classes.

The teachers also discussed the constraint posed by the poverty of their pupils' families. "Pupils mirror their teachers, but outcomes depend not only on the teacher but also on the pupils," stated teacher A. She pointed to pupils' physical and mental maturity, and warned:

The teacher is a researcher, an eternal researcher, because each pupil is a special case. Every year, the child is different; he/she changes because social problems change from one period to another. If she (the teacher) does not observe each individual child she'll do a lot of good things but she'll fail to do her best.

More than twenty years before, Teacher A had transferred from a school attended by middle-class pupils to this area, and had observed a tremendous difference in the material resources available. By 1984, poverty had become outrageous; children were desperate to get a meal at school. She considered the children's health - physical, mental and emotional - as much a necessary condition for learning as the daily meal, which was either scarce or completely absent.

Teacher C found that constraints on her practice came from the low income of the pupils' families, resulting in chronic hunger, sickness, and slowness in learning. She complained that decisions about the curriculum were dictated from above and had little to do with children's life experiences and parents that lacked interest in their children's learning. She was also against having to fill out a multiplicity of forms - "paperwork."

Teacher D saw her decision to work at this particular school as the main turning point in her career.

Because here I saw difficulties everywhere. Before then I had never worked with so many children who were deprived of food, affection...everything, you see? Broken homes, promiscuity, these things you know about.

She also complained about the absence of school supplies.

They do not bring the supplies they need - pencil, eraser, and notebook. But to what extent must the teacher be responsible for school supplies? I think that's not right. They are children who are not taken care of by their fathers or mothers - they throw down their schoolbags when they get home and pick them up the next day to go to school - whatever supplies they get, they end up losing.

And she was very critical of the pupils' families. She considered parents as solely responsible for pupils' attendance even though she was often absent herself. And when asked about their poverty, she focused on the distribution of school meals: "This makes a teacher more conscious of giving more to the children who need more. You must help these children every way you can."

Teacher D resented demands made on her to take on the responsibilities of parents, social workers, and psychologists, as well as teach in cold, wet, dirty rooms. She felt that the school should think first about the pupil and then about bureaucratic services: "The pupil is the least important here."

Teacher B had previously worked at a very privileged school which served children of civil servants in a secluded area of the country:

There, every February, the teachers attended a course, free of charge. The economic crisis had not arrived there. We had everything we needed. Here, we don't, but even so my work has not suffered. In relation to my work the crisis has had no effect; and I could say that, because I came from a school full of resources and am now working at one having nothing. But I went on working in the same way. Remember what I've already said to you: people use crutches, excuses, but the biggest problem is that teachers lack good will. Whenever I ask for something here, I get it, borrowing coloured pencils, etc. Of course, it is not the same thing as before.

Our school is really poor. Thank God that I have had the opportunity to work with these kids!

There are enough teachers but a comparative lack of interest in the pupils.

The Profession

Some of the constraints identified by teachers - particularly those having to do with lack of support from the school administration, the impact of other teachers' absence, and the failure of educational services - had wider structural origins less obvious to teachers as the sources of their troubles.

The rights and obligations of teachers employed by the state are codified in the Statute of the Public Teaching Profession of Rio Grande do Sul, Law 6672/1974. Resulting from a long series of teachers' struggles to raise their professional status (Scomazzon, 1986:11), the Statute regulates the recruitment and selection of teachers through public competitions, special qualifying examinations, nomination and years of service. Though the teacher is submitted to a two-year- probationary practice in order to have his/her nomination confirmed, there were no recorded cases of candidates being eliminated on the basis of any of the five criteria: morality, discipline, attendance, dedication, and efficiency.

The law lays a strong emphasis on salaries keeping pace with the improving level of education of teachers, and also values years of service. The teacher is promoted on the basis of merit, that is:

...according to faithful fulfillment of his/her duties, and of efficiency in the exercise of the office, as well as the continuous updating and improvement of the performance of his/her activities, evaluated according to an entire collection of objective data (Art. 29, in Scomazzon, 1986:26).

Other rights for teachers working in schools are: (a)

earlier retirement than other professions - twenty-five years of work for women and thirty for men; (b) a pension based on the value of the last monthly salary earned; (c) longer vacations (sixty days) per year, and (d) twenty-two-hour week that can be extended, in some cases, to forty-four. (Reduced to twenty and forty hours, respectively, after December 24, 1985.) These advantages protect a profession composed predominantly of women working at school four hours a day, mornings or afternoons and being at home or taking undergraduate courses during the other shift.

The beginning teacher enters at one of six levels according to his/her level education. Teachers with normal school (pedagogical training at the high-school level) enter at level one; those having already completed an undergraduate education degree enter at level five, or are promoted to that level after completing undergraduate work if they entered at level one. Teachers who have taken graduate courses related to the profession enter at level six, or are promoted at a later date. The 8th percent salary increase for a teacher who has entered at level one and then completes an undergraduate degree in education provides a very strong incentive for continued education. More than 30,000 out of the 48,601 state teachers teaching in elementary schools in Rio Grande do Sul held university diplomas in education in 1984 (See Table 7 in Appendix). About 15,000 teachers in the year of 1984 had normal school training, all of them teaching up to the fourth grade. Many were taking undergraduate majors in education, and others were waiting for this opportunity. The analysis of teachers in this dissertation includes one (Teacher A) of the 30,000 who had already reached level five in the career plan, and three of the 15,000 who were in the process. The four teachers had entered the state educational system upon completion of normal school.

The law is extremely "generous" concerning remunerated

leaves to the teachers, one of which is the "leave for professional qualification" to attend professional training, improvement and specialization courses. Other such leaves are given for: (a) medical treatment; (b) medical treatment of a family member; (c) pregnancy; (d) marriage or mourning. There is a type of leave known as an "award" given every ten years as an incentive to those teachers who have asked for very few "legal" leaves.

Thus, it is clear that the law created promotion possibilities for the entire profession, but also an Achilles' heel for school administrators due to the many opportunities given to teacher to demand leaves.

State schools offering grades one to eight develop two types of curricula - the "curriculum by activities" and the "curriculum by subject area." The "curriculum by activities," in 1984, in the school under study, was offered to grades one to three, and the "curriculum by subject area" in the following grades. According to Resolution 8/1971 of the Federal Council of Education the former emphasizes pupils' experiences in the process of learning to "gradually attain the systematization of knowledge"; the latter integrates specific related subject areas, evenly balancing the pupils' experiences with systematic knowledge.

There were a variety of incentives for teaching the subject curriculum and disincentives, therefore, for teaching the activities curriculum. Those teaching the subject curriculum could expect to spend fewer hours in the classroom and higher pay (because salaries were geared to education and an undergraduate degree was required). While teachers who completed an undergraduate degree still had to qualify for subject curriculum teaching positions through public competition, informal arrangements with the principal provided a "back door" to the less demanding and higher paid subject curriculum teaching positions.

Thus, completion of an undergraduate degree almost immediately led to teaching duties in accordance with the teacher's interests, a possible decrease in work load (which depended on the principal's decision) and, after some time, an increase in salary. Those who had not yet attained this level felt pressure to do so and were entitled to leaves on exam days while taking undergraduate courses. Another more desirable career choice also promoted movement away from teaching the early grades or activities curriculum. Undergraduate education courses such as teaching supervision and school guidance, preferred by those who had taken normal school, brought the same 85 percent increase in salary as an undergraduate degree and represented a way out of classroom work. This shift from teaching the early grades to working as teaching supervisors or counsellors could also be done by agreement with the principal and justified on the grounds that the state government did not run public competitions to fill openings in school support services.

Thus, in the context of this school, classroom teaching came to be defined as too demanding work while jobs other than teaching or those with reduced teaching loads were viewed as privileged. The only way teachers of the early grades could reduce their workload was through medical absences, and it was expected that teachers working as counsellors, teaching supervisors and secretaries would substitute for missing teachers. Teacher C stated:

This is the rule: teachers working in support services have to leave their offices to teach pupils when someone is absent. It comes for the Delegation of Education.

One must remember that in 1984 the institution under study had forty-one teachers working outside the classroom, with fifty-two in charge of forty-four classes. Teachers who could have been teaching the curriculum by activities were not only working as teaching supervisors and counsellors, but also as

librarians, dietitians, and secretaries. But the principal did not enforce the regulation nor did he require it of teachers to make up for the days they missed by giving lessons on Saturdays. Teacher C stated:

On the contrary, I am asked to teach absent teachers' pupils. Not making up for the classes themselves is a problem of professional consciousness and, mainly, a problem of school authority. This coming year teachers as a group are going to agree that nobody is going to teach anyone else's pupils, to avoid setting precedents.

Teacher D also observed:

The school administration insists that we (the first-grade teachers) teach each other's pupils (when colleagues are absent). They keep on saying there is nobody to teach when the school is full of **people** who can. Nobody wants to teach: that's the truth.

In this context, there was even less interest in the content of learning. Teacher D stated: "The school (administration) has as its sole interest that pupils be inside classrooms, but no interest **whatsoever** in if they are learning." This was confirmed by Teacher C: "What is important is not what the teacher does in the classroom but that he comes to school so that everything works as planned."

The school principal who had to arbitrate and distribute duties and privileges, was in an unenviable position due to the teachers' tendency to avoid classroom work. As governmentally appointed officials under a newly democratic regime, principals were seen as representatives of a government responsible for teachers' low salaries. To attain some legitimacy under such circumstances, the new principal had to maintain a precarious balance between the privileged and less privileged groups. At the first administrative meeting, at the start of the school year, he insisted on the necessity of having so many teachers working in support services "for the good of the school." Under pressure from above to enroll all children who were on the waiting-lists

learned by entrance to first grade, he attempted to negotiate with the Delegation of Education to get as many new teachers as new first-grade classes. In this way, he could maintain the precarious balance and not threaten any of those in the support services with the loss of their cherished positions. Promises of more personnel were not fulfilled; staff from the Delegation of Education came to the school to demonstrate that the institution was not entitled to any more teachers. The principal was obliged to ask teachers in the privileged functions, even those who had not yet completed their two-year practicum, to return to the classroom.

A system of privileges was built into the school to compensate for teachers' low pay and to keep them at the school. Dissatisfaction with the whole setting led teachers to be absent whenever they could get away with it under the terms of the statute. The forty-one teachers working in the support services were the main source of support for the principal. Teachers in charge of classes pointed to the school administration as the main cause of the many problems affecting their daily practice, but failed to notice the influence of forces outside the school. The inefficiency of support services, including school administration, must be understood as a result of complex pressures upon a profession looking for advantages other than adequate pay.

Conclusion

The school did not have a common set of explicit principles guiding the teachers' practice; the pupil as "the focus of the school" was the tenet used to legitimize educational services that were not truly supportive of classroom work. Though teachers had different opinions of the school administration, there was general uneasiness about a principal who spent most of the working day outside school,

dealing with the principal, and even the principal himself, and delegating full decision-making power. This interfered with teaching and learning. In the past, teachers were given full responsibility for their classrooms. But, in the principal's attitude, the school principal was going to care for the children. In absent teacher, a large number of teachers were not able to take on the role of one of ninety-three deteriorated position of children and acquired right, retreated from school taking full of teachers thus manifesting a gap between the "paper" and the "focus" principle and their full decision and practice.

In addition to lack of true support from the school services and administration, the main constraint in first grade teaching had to do with: the inappropriateness of their training in normal school and supervision on the job, the impact of other teachers' absences from work.

Some constraints arose from the "tatito" that of the career plan for teachers. By recording education and providing for "leave for professional qualification," the Statute created the possibility of having many teachers on leave. This became the Achilles' heel of school administrators who had to solve problems arising from teachers' absences from class. At the same time, the growing rates of inflation during the eighties - from 100 percent in 1982, to 211 in 1983, and 224 in 1984 - were diminishing the buying power of salaries, and concessions of salary incentives leading to upward mobility in the teachers' profession were being postponed by the state government. Concomitant developments in the political scene towards democracy, via the organization of the teachers' associations fighting for their acquired rights and semiannual salary raises. In the context of the school the completion of an undergraduate degree represented an escape from a full teaching load or a jump out of teaching to school support services. Disorientation with

problems within the institution led teachers to absenteeism and/or leaving to teach at other schools. The teachers named the school administration as the sole origin of the school's problems, but failed to notice these structural sources of trouble.

CHAPTER VII

THE ART OF TEACHING

This chapter begins the descriptive analysis of the events which transpired in the four classrooms under discussion, with emphasis on the perspectives of the practices of the four teachers.

Basil Bernstein's concepts of "classification" and "frame" (1975), and Foucault's "disciplinary power" (1977) were used as heuristic devices when observing and describing the practices in each class, but they were not sufficient to provide a complete explanation of the four cases. Contrary to what is implied, for example, in Foucault's metaphor of school as prison, one finds in the four teachers' outlook deep concern for the children's learning and social improvement.

We can generalize the teachers' perspectives, conceptualized according to Sharp and Green (1975). Teacher A most closely approximates the characteristics of progressive pedagogy as synthesized by Snyders (1977), leading the children of the lower class to success in school. Teacher B, on the whole, follows the conception of the New School. Teacher C represents a traditional type of teacher. All of them are strongly committed to the profession. The fourth teacher was divided between her teaching duties and classwork at the university; she demonstrated characteristics of both the New School and traditional pedagogy.

The First-grade Curriculum in the Late Thirties
and Early Eighties

The core curriculum of the first grade of elementary education has traditionally been the technical mastery of reading and writing a simple text, and of basic arithmetic.

The primary school curriculum includes seven subjects

presented fifty years ago in the following order: mathematics, Portuguese, social studies, values and civics, science, drawing and applied arts, and music (*Revista do Ensino*, December 1939:285). This curriculum was introduced in 1939 and its objectives have essentially not been changed since.

Values and civics to be taught from the first to the third grade included: (a) love for family; (b) obedience, which meant participation in class activities as opposed to passivity and constrained silence; (c) generosity; (d) truthfulness; (e) order, observing the proper times for sleeping, waking up, playing and studying; (f) respect for the rights of others; (g) good manners; and (h) responsibility for the maintenance of health and individual safety. The Portuguese program, which is the focus of this research, was based on general and specific objectives which considered language to be instrumental in social communication as well as moral education. Students were to acquire mastery of the initial mechanics of **reading**, skills in silent reading and oral reading, a capacity to represent letters in isolation or in words, skills in using punctuation. At the end of the first year, students should be able to compose two consecutive sentences about a subject related to their experience, and write the name and address of the school. The organization and sequence of the lesson was left up to the teacher. Insofar as methods of instruction are concerned, teachers were advised to create an environment with much stimulating reading material. The pupils themselves should write their own primer and the teacher should employ many individual and collective games to present lesson material, practice, and review. Composition should be almost exclusively oral, originating in situations of interest to children and in connection with their other activities. The teacher should let the child speak, respecting his/her "spontaneity of expression, originality of thought and personal feelings"

(Revista do Ensino, December 1939:294;298;301;308).

In this curriculum one sees both the influence of the traditional and the New School, emphasizing both content and method. When observing the four classes during the 1984 school year, it became clear that: (a) the objectives of the curricula set forth by the 1939 decree were imbedded in the teachers' practices; (b) teaching of Portuguese literacy was given precedence over the teaching of other subjects and (c) there was much variation among teachers in how they taught literacy skills.

On Curriculum Breadth and Content Priorities

The four teachers all emphasized that the primary objective of instruction in the first grade was to transform the illiterate to literate by the end of the academic year. Their aim was to teach two of the three R's - reading and writing; arithmetic was given less emphasis at the school.

Teacher A considered "everything relevant" in the first-grade curriculum and ranked the subjects as follows: first, communication and expression, second, mathematics, "because many (pupils) do not complete elementary school and these two subjects are the skills that they will need to survive"; in third place civics, social studies, religious education, physical education and the arts.

Teacher B, after "reading and writing," ranked reasoning; creativity; counting; social sciences ("aspects that refer to their world"); natural sciences ("experiences close to them"); and religion ("love and comprehension").

Teacher C put the subjects in the following order of importance: reading and writing, mathematics, social studies and natural sciences. She did not teach religion, as she felt she did not have the ability to do so.

Teacher D, after "reading and writing," considered

hygiene; religion in third place ("to develop a little humanity in them since they don't know how to make friends"); and mathematics in fourth. Teacher D left mathematics for the second semester, explaining that to this subject her pupils brought a good deal of experience dealing with money, working as shoeshine boys and buying groceries for the family.

While only Teacher A referred to the whole curriculum as relevant, all teachers viewed reading and writing as the main subject matter. Teachers A, B and C put mathematics in second place; Teacher D ranked hygiene second and mathematics fourth after religion. Teacher B was the only one to refer to the development of high level cognitive skills as an objective of instruction.

As described earlier, the grade one curriculum was to be structured by "activity," according to government regulation. In 1975 (**Conselho Federal de Educaçao**, Parecer No. 4833), this concept was defined as follows:

Activity, as a curricular category, is a form of organization which utilizes the needs, problems and interests of the pupils as the basis for selection, orientation and evaluation of the experiences of learning - needs, interests and problems which must originate in the areas of personal life, in immediate personal relations, in social and civic relations and in economic relations, which are the sources of selection.

The defined curriculum established as a national directive the openness of subjects integrated into an activity. Teacher A applied the principles of this curriculum, integrating contents around one activity. For instance, when practising the phoneme s (as in "sapo," Table 24 in Appendix) she introduced the word "sapata," which is a familiar children's game and involves counting from one to ten. The children played the game inside the classroom, writing the numbers on the floor as well as the word "sapata." They suggested other words which begin with s and did different writing exercises practising the syllabic patterns,

"sa, se, si, so, su." In this way Teacher A used the game as the interesting activity commanding the selection and organization of contents: reading and writing, mathematics and physical education. Contents were weakly classified in the Bernstein sense (1975).

Teachers A and B insisted on the idea of a weaker classification of contents ("globalization"). Teacher A used activities within the classroom, jumping rope, for instance, as well as many games in the schoolyard which were linked to the literacy process. Teacher B talked with her pupils, connecting the children's experiences communicated to her through oral expression or drawings with her teaching of literacy. Teachers C and D followed the traditional way of separating contents; Teacher D reached the extreme of leaving arithmetic to be taught during the second semester.

Turning from an examination of openness/closure of contents, one may ask how the curriculum was framed. A curriculum is weakly framed in Basil Bernstein's conceptualization when "staff and pupils" have some control of the selection of subject matter (1975:84). In the case of pupils attending first-grade classes, one can observe if the teachers considered the pupils' experiences in such selection. Let us, first, examine if the teachers or their representatives participated in defining the scope of instruction. In fact, at the beginning of the 1980's the Delegation of Education summoned teachers with training in the various subject areas to meet and define the topics to be dealt with in the first to fifth grades. Teacher A had participated in the group on mathematics. She considered all subjects and topics in the school curricula to be obligatory for the children, and saw that it was her responsibility to teach them. In contrast, Teacher B considered the core curriculum to be too demanding and, thus, to be a menu from which to choose. She discarded topics she decided were not

meaningful to the children. In this sense, her own judgment of the relevance of lesson topics was more important to her than that of the prescriptions of the Delegation. Teachers C and D also adapted the curricula to their classes. Teacher D noted in this connection that "(the curriculum) comes from above as does everything else, constructed by persons on committees who don't know our classrooms, who wouldn't have the right to give an opinion since, in some cases, they have never taught a class." In both Teacher C and D's understanding, the curriculum was strongly framed. For Teacher A, the curriculum selection was weakly framed, since she had participated in designing it. Teacher B felt free to transform the minimum contents coming from the Delegation of Education, considering this change as part of her role as a teacher; she did not refer to the list of contents selected by the educational bureaucracy as an imposition from above.

Was the curriculum content weakly framed, however, considering pupils? Was the pupils' everyday life taken into consideration in the selection of contents? Here we are guided by Paulo Freire, whose method of teaching literacy centers on the pupils' vocabulary, ideas and values. In this context, key-words utilized by each teacher in the presentation of sound-symbol correspondences were examined in terms of their significance to lower-class children.

Teachers A, B and D utilized primers to broaden the children's reading experience. I observed, however, that Teacher A provided a selection of words at the beginning of the school year (March-May), which used terms more relevant to pupils' lives than the ones in the primer. She used words indicating members of the family, instead of those referring to animals, when practising the consonants *v*, *m*, and *p*: "vovó," "mamae" and "papai" (Grandma, Mommy and Daddy) instead of "vaca," "macaco" and "pata" (cow, monkey and duck). "Bola" and "faca" (ball and knife), rather than "baleia" and "fada"

(whale and fairy) were key-words for the consonants b and f. She used every opportunity to show concern, making sure that the pupils understood her own speech. When introducing a new word she used it in different contexts, and employed synonyms to make it significant to them.

Teacher B called attention to the limited experience of these children and its consequence in the development of the curriculum. She talked a great deal with the children: "I have to see what places they have already visited (outside the slum). I have pupils who have never left the slum. And I don't know up to what point books can help to expand their horizons." She saw the need of beginning from the children's world "here and now," and then enriching their experience and, in this way, their vocabulary. For instance, "art gallery" would be meaningful only if students had been to see one. She criticized sixth-grade classes at the school, where the pupils could locate foreign countries on the map but did not know where Brazil was. Teacher B also discussed the difficulties children dwelling in the slum had in transforming the spoken language into writing, "because when they have to write differently from the way they speak, the meaning changes for them."

Teacher C was also aware of her own speech in good communication with the children, and reported that many times her criterion for selecting lesson topics was meaningfulness to the pupils; the key-words should refer to their experience.

Though Teacher D did not talk about the problem of communication with the lower classes due to differences of speech and experience between teachers and pupils. She always corrected a mispronounced word immediately which, at times, exposed the pupil to ridicule.

Thus, considering pupils, one can say that the curriculum selection was weakly framed, as most of their teachers took their experience and vocabulary into consideration in the

process of teaching literacy.

Teaching and Evaluating Literacy

The four teachers worked independently of one another; they had no time to exchange ideas about classwork. The only task they performed as a group was the selection of lesson topics, which included planning what was to be covered during each marking period. This did not always follow the few guidelines established by the school.

Teacher A

In Class A, instruction in the elements of reading was in phases. The first involved the child's adaptation to the class, to the teacher, and to the school. Teacher A said that "the class is not the same ever when one pupil is new"; it must adjust itself to the new pupil in the same way the arriving child must adjust him/herself to the class. Teacher A's work of preparing her class to welcome Pupil 7 during the second semester showed what acceptance of the recently-arrived child meant to her.

The second phase focused on developing readiness for literacy, during which the children were evaluated on their attention, visual and auditory discrimination, in preparation for the process of teaching literacy which was the third phase.

Literacy begins with the presentation of vowels, one by one...vowels in capital and lower-case letters, giving the sound and relating it with an object which has that vowel sound...auditory discrimination of the sound at the beginning, at the end, or in the middle of a word...visual discrimination too.

Having learned the vowels, there comes the moment of joining two vowels to form the sound of one syllable or even the name of something; for

instance, the word "eu" (I). I always use concrete elements first before beginning reading and writing.

Then, we go to words, presenting the first consonant which generally is the **v** because (in the Portuguese language) one can form short words like "ovo" (egg), "uva" (grape), referring to things that everybody knows and can easily master. Also "Eva" and "Ivo", the (proper names of hypothetical) little friends. I also presents action: "viu" (see), "vai" (goes), "vive" (lives). In a few days they can make sentences with vowels and the letter.

And, from then on, the process is always the same, changing the consonant, leaving the most difficult ones - **lh**, **nh** and **ch** for the second semester, and at the end of the year **pr**, **pl**, **bl**... But the child masters the process (of reading syllables) right at the beginning... You see that teaching literacy is not magic.

From April to July consonants were taught at a rate of four to six per month. Teacher A worked three days with the consonant **v** and vowels, before presenting the next consonant. October was the month in which she presented the greatest number of patterns; she taught seventeen and completed presentation of consonants and consonantal groups. She provided considerable repetition of the same pattern in different situations - games, oral and written activities - in order for the pupils to master literacy.

Reading was emphasized above all; less attention was paid to writing. Words and texts appeared everywhere in class, in the usual places - blackboard, posters, on the walls - but also on signs hanging on pupils' backs or written with chalk on the floor. She summarized the method as follows:

The accent is on reading. Once children have a good command of reading, writing comes automatically. But it is not rigid. If you feel the pupil wants to write as well he can but he is not forced to.

The method just described was based on Dorman and Huino, who consider that writing is a more difficult task than is reading specially for children with psychomotor problems.

1

Teacher A had learned this method the previous year in an in-service training course for first-grade teachers while working with classes of repeaters. Teacher A felt that reading is in fact easier than writing, "since ninety percent of the children (and not only the low learners) were capable of reading a text correctly but missed the words they had read when doing a dictation."

On the third day of class she led the pupils to identify what they could read from a newspaper. Although this investigator's observations showed that the children were already writing from March 27 on (the ninth day of class), the emphasis on reading was maintained. Teacher A stated:

In the beginning reading was everything; after that I worked in a parallel way with reading and writing. My pupils were able to do it. Others take almost two years to become literate using this method.

Teacher A taught language arts at the beginning of the school day and after recess, every other day, she taught arithmetic or social studies, integrating these subjects with teaching literacy skills. Physical education also came after recess and, finally, homework was assigned - "not a great deal"-but enough to make the student's family aware of the schoolwork.

Teacher A informed the pupils of the criteria for evaluation she used so that they could improve their performance. She put special emphasis on the auditory and visual discrimination of sounds. There were few days before September on which she did not listen to each pupil's reading, to be certain of each child's mastery of the patterns she had presented. After September, each pupil asked a classmate to listen to his/her reading; this freed Teacher A to work more closely with weaker pupils. "But," she added, "you have to continue to listen to the reading of those who are doing well, because they still need the teacher's encouragement."

Many of the written tasks were corrected on the blackboard but Teacher A looked at the exercises (copied in notebooks), whether homework or classwork, to be certain they were correct. If the pupil did not finish the homework she asked him/her to do it in class.

The first-grade teacher never has the right to sit at her desk in the classroom. In order to be a good teacher she has to walk around checking students' penmanship, seeing if their work is organized, etc.

At the beginning of the academic year she evaluated pupils on the basis of dictations of five or ten words but she did not assign grades. Only when the child felt confident in succeeding were the dictations graded. Any error was completely erased and the correct form written by the teacher in its place, to avoid memorization of both forms:

I work to prevent children's negative criticism of one another. They are aware of the others' mistakes but also know that someone who today is behind is going to improve and tomorrow may get a better grade.

For Teacher A speed was important, but the task also had to be well-done, the symbols legibly written, or otherwise erased. She always explained that neatness was a requirement they could carry over into their lives. Nevertheless, Teacher A stimulated the pupil to put something of himself in the work done, valuing "creativity." As she stated:

I am constantly trying to know if (a child) did it in the right way, always. First graders like having their work seen by the teacher. Sometimes they don't trust their classmate's correction. They trust the teacher's. I always corrected Pupil 10's work because someone else could have made fun of his mistakes, and I wanted to avoid this; pupils respected each other.

There was only one case of **nonpromotion**, Pupil 10. Teacher A explained:

That child didn't react to the wonderful method that worked with the rest of the class. I observed in his drawings that he paid a lot of attention to

detail and, so, he might be reached by a method which gives details, like the alphabetic. Even today he says: "f-a - fa." He moves from the detail to the whole. He reads letter by letter and yet hasn't totally mastered the process yet. He says "f - a - fea." I tell him, "You have to say only the sound f and the a." So, in one way or another, with experience, you (the teacher) reach the pupil. You have to feel the pupil, to observe how he works best...visually or by auditory means. The teacher is a researcher, an eternal researcher...every year a child is different. Today he (Pupil 10) does the same tasks the others do, but at a slower pace. His classmates are happy for him when he reads correctly, which is important to him.

Teacher A began to apply this method with Pupil 10 on August 29, the 11th day of class. As he was not able to keep up with the rest of the class by December, Teacher A helped him understand that he needed more time to learn the basics of literacy.

Teacher B

Teacher B contrasted her teaching with the "typical" approach when children sit in rows copying from the blackboard with their mouths shut. The teacher did not ask how the pupil solved the problem. If the exercise is correct, the "typical" teacher puts a check in the notebook and **that is all**. "I am totally against this!" said Teacher B.

Teacher B gave a great deal of importance to knowing the child's needs:

...how he is, the difficulties he has, how he expresses himself through words and drawings, through everything he does. The pupil comes and presents the work to me. During games I know who pays attention. I know the one I need to tell the same thing to four times, who begins to work quickly and who doesn't. I think that the preparatory period is a moment of encounter between teacher and pupil, becoming prepared for more serious work.

The first marking period was the most difficult, "because

it seems that the repeater has never failed before. . . . the beginning (or learning) of my way of doing it. . . . it is something new for him." Teacher B contrasted her teaching method with the way the students' previous first grade teachers had usually worked:

I perceive that the pupils are accustomed to the teacher putting words on the blackboard, reading for them; they copy and that copy stays there, dead in the notebook. Nobody (the teacher) asks: "Come here, show me this; which drawing would you do for this word?" Or: "Choose one word and draw." "Choose" is the most difficult thing; they are not accustomed to choosing anything. So it is the most difficult period. After that pupils know they are going to have the opportunity to choose other times, and the work just flows.

The second marking period went "a little better" and the third and fourth were the best - "the pupil talks to you when before he was ashamed; he speaks even more than necessary; he becomes your friend."

The process of teaching literacy used by Teacher B was based on the **Metodo Misto de Alfabetização** (Silva et al., no date), known as the "Method of the Little Bee." A story, seven chapters in length, was told to the children, in which the sounds of the Portuguese language were associated with the letters of the alphabet. A sound was presented on a poster with the respective letter and a drawing of an animal or object whose concept initiated with that sound in cursive script.

Teacher B maintained the sequencing of the sounds followed in the **Metodo Misto**. After the vowels - a, u, i, e, o, and the vocalic groups - au, ai, oi, ui she introduced the first consonant, v, which was associated with the word "vagalume" (firefly)", and worked for nine days with the sound v. The consonants were taught at a rate of two to five per month up to July. From August to October (the third marking period and beginning of the fourth) the number of new patterns increased, the peak being in August with thirteen new sounds.

Teacher B evaluated the positive aspects of her method as follows:

To me this method is not only auditory; it is even physical, because at the moment I say the sound and the child says the sound to me, he moves a part of his body, tongue, teeth, throat, mouth, lips, facial expression, doesn't he? So I say that it (the method) is more physical than auditory. This is the way I found to show the pupil: "When I say a word I move something in myself."

If I only said the sound like this "sss," maybe someone would not hear. But if I go there and ask how he makes this sound, which part of his mouth the sound touches, the teeth, the throat...Don't you think it is easier for him? Feeling the origin of the sound, how it's produced, it's impossible to ignore it and not relate it to the symbol.

She also emphasized the importance of the "colourful, beautiful and exciting" classroom posters presenting the symbols to children who have had poor visual written experiences at home: "They don't even look at books, or newspapers!" Thus, she used the children's awareness of their own bodies when enunciating the sound, enticed by colourful drawings with the sound-symbol correspondence. The teacher did not read a syllable ("va," for instance); the child read the sound v and joined it with vowel a, forming it ("va").

I put together the physical expression of the sound, the hearing of the sound, the visualization of the sound (the letter) and the formation of a thousand words which contain the sound. They tell me (the words), I never suggest the words to them. Even American words such as "Spectreman", from television, appeared. They found the syllable "tre" in that word. And I did not throw the word out because it was English and not Portuguese. I wrote it down on the blackboard. The child brought it to me.

I introduced the sound v; then we worked this sound, plus vowels, in every word we could: "uva" (grape), "ave" (bird); "ovo" (egg), or in actions like "voa" (flies), "viu" (saw). They never put together letters we had not previously seen. Being in school for so many years this is interesting,

because they must know other letters!

She was aware of the interference of pupils' absences as well as her own in the process of becoming literate:

If I am absent when a new symbol is to be given, I interrupt the sequence. Why do I come to class hoarse and sick? Because I cannot interrupt this work which is mine and theirs. How am I going to ask someone to come and give the symbol *v* to them?

Teacher B left a detailed lesson plan to be taught by a colleague when she needed to be absent, so that the children would feel secure. Many times, however, nobody gave that class and the pupils were distributed among the other first-grade classes. When Teacher B returned, it was difficult to win back their attention. The pupils told her that the other teachers had not wanted them and they had played in the schoolyard.

During the first period of every day Teacher B presented a new topic: a symbol, an arithmetic problem, or a review of symbols. She always provided opportunities for reading in the way the child wanted, whether sitting or standing up, from the blackboard or his/her notebook, to the teacher, or to a classmate. After this, games and homework and other activities were assigned. The homework had a part chosen by the child. Her pupils, along with Teacher A's, did not receive any help with their homework from parents.

Teacher B was critical of the quantification of human potential in general, and the ABC Test as the method of organizing classes of new pupils at the school, more specifically:

A test shows me where the child is at that exact moment and not the potential that the child is going to develop. There are children with very low scores (on the ABC Test) who become literate. Why? Because they have potential that the test doesn't show.

Teacher B brought up the case of pupil 23, the girl considered by the psychology service as being five years old

mentally, as evidence of the low predictive power of tests. Pupil 23, who was given the chance to continue attending Class B, "was reading and writing better than anybody else." Teacher B had the same position against quantification of pupils' performance and favoured daily observation:

What does it mean that this child got seventy percent on the dictation? The naked number says nothing. What interests me is **why** he made those mistakes. Was it because he didn't hear or because he didn't recognize the syllables?

I have to see the pupil's performance as a whole, how he naturally is at his daily work. I think a descriptive evaluation is better than a grade which says nothing.

She found it very difficult to detect if the "weaker pupils" - such as pupil 27 had or had not mastered a certain symbol. They could write the **v** in the word "vaca" (cow) correctly because they had memorized it but they missed the same symbol in the word "vaga-lume" (firefly). She placed greater emphasis on the teacher's daily individual observation of reading and writing than on the final evaluation.

I know each one's difficulties because I listen to their reading all the time. I know him better than he knows himself. I even know which word he is going to miss on the composition. It is not anything planned, it is even unconscious. It is part of all that process of looking at the pupil, seeing what he's doing, learning what he didn't learn, what he needs to learn most...And I rarely make a mistake (in my evaluation of pupils).

For Teacher B, speed was not important, but the correct completion of a task was; and she had a special way of attaining this goal:

I do not correct the pupils' notebooks. I make the pupils identify their own mistakes. And I think that when I do this I lead them to pay more attention when they do a task. I do not write with my pen over their writing. No. I show them that the letter is not written according to the pattern, that they have to erase it and do it again. If I corrected them, they wouldn't even see the mistake; they would only see my crossing out, not knowing

what it was. The way I correct tasks takes longer but...(it is more efficient).

It is tiring. They correct themselves from the blackboard, the primer, wherever the word appears. I am there to help. If they write it correctly the second time I tell them "right!" as if it were the first time, even the third time. And for them it has the same value. It is a sacred, marvellous thing for them (to receive the teacher's praise).

Teacher B paid a good deal of attention to extremely quiet pupils: "The type like pupil 23 who in the beginning did not react...That made me desperate!" In contrast to Teacher A, who resorted to a second approach to teach literacy to pupil 10, Teacher B did not attempt to reach pupils 24 and 27 in a similar way; both remained illiterate (see Chapter VIII).

Teacher C

Language arts instruction in Class C was divided into two phases, the first of which was termed "readiness." Teacher C never specified readiness for what. She acknowledged that these children were "somehow underprivileged being unprepared for reading and writing.

Teacher A emphasized developing skills of reading and oral comprehension first, using a variety of activities. Teacher B worked with the enunciation of sounds associated with a story in which characters appeared on colourful posters. Teacher C, in contrast, used a conventional approach. Small cards with drawings of animals, toys or other objects that were significant to the child were employed. The drawings represented words beginning with the sound being taught, and presenting the capital and lower-case letters. She made use of individual reading, as did Teachers A and B, but also asked students to read aloud as a class. This practice was criticized by Teacher B. Teacher C's pupils spent most of their time copying from the blackboard or from

mimeographed pages and Teacher C spent much of her time maintaining order in class. While Teacher A used a primer and supplementary reading, and Teacher B used different primers with those students who finished their school work more quickly than others, Teacher C boasted about not using "any book and following a 'transformist' methodology." Every day her pupils had a "read and copy" exercise, the text of which needed to be studied at home in preparation for a dictation the following day.

She claimed to work according to the children's needs and their change in behaviour:

I never teach a new word if the previous one has not been picked up. And if it has not really been picked up, I go back, doing extra exercises, until they've got it. I always go back to the key-word (which introduces a symbol).

If I don't teach all the patterns I'm supposed to for one marking period, I go on teaching them in the following one. I reviewed the material using another way of introducing (the sounds) in June when I was able to get through to a few pupils. I prefer to go slower (than the other first-grade teachers) and get something. In any (of the four) marking period(s) I gave all the topics, anyway.

I teach words with the same sound which only change spelling all together in order for students to visualize them; for instance, those with **ch**, and **x**, or **z** and **s** with the sound **z**, working fifteen days with the more difficult ones.

In June Teacher C presented a series of review classes, in an attempt to bring those who were behind in the process up to the level of the rest of the class. She worked seven to fifteen days with the syllabic patterns, depending on their degree of difficulty. From one new pattern in April, two in May, three in June and July, six in August and September, seven in October, she jumped to twenty in November, in order to get through all of the patterns.

Teacher C, like her colleagues Teachers A and B, taught reading as soon as the children arrived at school each day,

though new sounds were not presented systematically during the first period. She did not worry about other curriculum subjects such as arithmetic, if she did not have time to teach them. Nor did she attempt to integrate these subjects of instruction. A minimum of homework was given merely reading the text taught in class every day. She did not want parents to assist the children in doing their homework. Teacher C was afraid parents might spell out each letter ("t - a: ta") instead of reading the syllabic pattern all at once ("ta"), thus confusing the child.

Teacher C thought a minimum of tests should be given. She said she evaluated reading on a daily basis: "individually and often with the class as a whole which saved time." She informed a child about how he/she was doing, immediately after listening to his/her reading, and classmates also became aware of such results, and criticized one another. Teacher C encouraged students to compete for her approval: "They listen to their classmates' reading and if any child has difficulties, they insist on saying: 'Tomorrow I will be prepared'." Teacher C corrected the written exercises on the blackboard, drawing the pupils' attention to words that they had more difficulty writing correctly. From time to time Teacher C collected the pupils' notebooks and did a "total check-up," to ascertain what had not been done properly correctly. She did not grade notebooks, however, but put only a check on each page to avoid parents' complaints. "If I put 'very good' in a notebook and the child does not read, the parents could see it as a contradiction." She justified this practice of showing only that she had "read" the notebook as unbiased, and it avoided hurting a child who was "doing badly." But she gave dictations almost daily, and these were individually corrected: "I grade them and give the results immediately to each pupil. This is the way to make parents conscious of their child's standing in literacy."

Teacher C was challenged by a regular-sized class of twenty-seven where there were both rapid and slow learners:

There is only one of us (teachers)! I ask those who seem to lack interest to hurry a little: "You are taking a long time!" I don't force anything on those who are slow by nature. Instead of copying from the blackboard, they copy from a mimeographed piece of paper and follow their own pace.

Although Teacher C valued each pupil according to his/her possibilities, observation showed that the group which was able to follow the teacher's presentation "went ahead," and the others remained "stationary." She explained:

I am not going to hold back the majority for the sake of a minority. I feel satisfied that I helped the majority, eliminating those who could interfere with their promotion.

Nonpromotion awaited pupils 38, 43, 44, 45, 51 and 58 at the end of 1984. The last five students were considered as performing very poorly in March. On May 16 only three boys had their reading listened to by the teacher. One of them was pupil 44. The teacher listened to his reading with extreme patience while the rest of the class walked around and talked at the tops of their voice. In October, Teacher C evaluated them as being unable to read, having decided they would have to repeat the year.

On May 31 Teacher C gave out report cards to students' parents. Pupil 44's parents were informed that he was not keeping up with the class. Pupil 43's mother heard that the girl had mastered the vowels, vowel groups and the consonant *v* but not *d*, or *l* (which had been taught early in the month). Pupils 45 and 51 were not evaluated because their parents did not attend the meeting with the teacher. Pupils 38 and 58, who eventually failed, were reported as doing well. By May Teacher C saw these six pupils, 37, 43, 44, 45, 51 and 52, as "stuck," adding that they needed extra help in the mornings, which she had already arranged with another teacher.

Excluding the case of pupil 37, who was promoted, and pupil 52, who transferred, the other four were to be retained in first grade again in 1984.

On June 12 Teacher C listened to the reading of fourteen pupils including pupils 33, 39, 44, 51 and 58, all of whom had been considered very weak in March, although at this point pupil 58 had not yet been labelled as "stuck." Teacher C did not listen to pupils 42, 43, 45 and 49 (also considered "very weak"), nor to one other "weak" pupil and another three considered "good." Pupil 38 was absent. Thus, she listened to the majority of those keeping up with the class and to half of those not doing so. In the distribution of her time, she favoured those who read well.

From June 18-27, a period of seven days, Teacher C reviewed the consonants v, d, m, l, c, in an attempt to help those who were not keeping up with the class come up to the level of those who were. On July 3, Teacher C informed me she had done the review, but said that she had not gotten anywhere with those pupils she had evaluated as "stuck" - 43, 44, 45, and 51. Only pupils 39, 42 and 49 had improved. Pupil 38 apparently continued to do well and nothing was said about pupils 33 and 58.

On July 18 all pupils had their reading listened to by Teacher C. Pupils 39 and 49 were keeping up with their classmates, and pupils 33 and 42 were being brought up to that level. The teacher took a long time teaching them while listening to their reading, helping these two children identify the sounds. Four situations could be identified as to mastery of reading in this class: those who had mastered all patterns; those who needed some help in recognizing certain sounds; those who made a habit of guessing; and those who did not read but also did not guess. Considering those who would fail in December, pupil 38 was in the first group, as he read well; pupil 44 was in the second group, as he read

with difficulty; pupil 51 guessed at words and pupils 43 and 45 did not read. The latter was the only child who was not given the opportunity to read, and Teacher C explained: "She would not read because, indeed, she can't read." Pupil 58 was absent that day.

On August 29th pupils 43, 44, 45, 51 and 58 did not have their reading listened to. Those being brought up to the level of the rest of the class on July 18 - pupils 33, 39, 42, and 49 - were in the group of fifteen who received the teacher's individual attention when reading. The teacher seemed to have abandoned hope for the five children who would fail. On September 3rd their reading was not listened to again. Only pupil 38 continued to be called on to read individually. Although Teacher C did not listen to the reading of the others who would not be promoted, she did correct the dictations of the whole group. On August 30th pupil 38 scored 35 percent, pupil 51 received a mark of 5 percent and pupils 43, 44, 45, and 58's dictations were not marked "to avoid humiliating them." Their grades corresponded to "zero" while the mode for the class was 85 percent. Nevertheless, two children who would be promoted at the end of the year had scored 45 percent, writing nine words out of twenty correctly.

I proposed to Teacher C that a lesson be recorded in which she presented the students with a text containing all fifteen consonants taught at the end of August. All pupils except pupils 43, 44, 45, 51 and 58 were called to read.

Perhaps this was done to maximize class performance. Afterwards, I listened to the reading of these pupils, as well as to pupil 38. Teacher C gave me a second text containing only six consonants (v, d, l, m, p, and r) and a third alternative text with three consonants (v,d, and l). Pupil 38 read first the easiest text and then the more difficult one, both of them quite well. Pupils 44, 51 and 58 read the

second text, and pupils 43 and 45 the easiest one. When I interviewed pupil 58's father at home, he reported that his daughter had complained.

"The teacher doesn't pay attention to me; she teaches the others but not me." We are not there, we don't know if it really is this way. She blames the teacher and for this reason she is going to study in "X" (a town in the interior of Rio Grande do Sul where her grandmother lived). If she is promoted (to the second grade) there, we will end up thinking that the problem was the teacher or that she didn't obey! I don't know. We know that she has interest in learning. The problem is that she doesn't read: she doesn't know the letters and doesn't know how to put them together to form the least little word. I hope she succeeds because she is intelligent enough but just needs a chance.

In December at the end of the school year, I interviewed the parents of the other children who failed in 1984, except the parents of pupil 45. Pupil 38's mother confirmed that Teacher C had given him extra help as was observed. However, pupil 51's mother preferred the teacher he had had the previous year better, because "Teacher C paid less attention to him." Teacher C paid more attention to those who knew more and let the others just sit there, including her son. Only pupil 44's mother attributed her child's failure to his lack of interest in studying. Teacher C explained pupil 38's nonpromotion as a result of "too much physical effort, working at night." Of the other five who failed, Teacher C said:

I didn't...I didn't get through to them. I think they should be in a class where readiness is developed. I think that theirs is not a problem of intelligence, but of readiness and maturity.

Yes, because you have...I don't like to use the expression "very bad"...You have pupils who...go...ahead, pupils who...need a bit of help and pupils who get stuck.

Teacher C considered the possible solution of putting those who "got stuck" in one group, and those who "went ahead" in another group, with each group taught by a different

teacher. She even offered to work with the weakest ones, returning to their initial difficulties in literacy in order to help them master all patterns. Teacher C concluded in December:

In big groups you cannot give students individual attention. It's impossible. I initiated (the process of literacy) three times. If I didn't get through to them it's because they really got stuck.

Teacher D

Although Teacher D attended only 56 percent of her classes, eight repeaters and four new pupils successfully completed the first grade. Literacy instruction began only in April. Teacher D did not teach arithmetic until the second semester, however, thus leaving more time for language arts instruction during the first semester. While Teachers A and B had taught 30 and 27 letter patterns, respectively and Teacher C 15, Teacher D's pupils had learned 29. In September, when she was absent, only three patterns were taught versus six to eight in the other three classes. Upon her return in October, she taught an additional eighteen patterns, thus completing the syllabus.

Teacher D did not give any lessons in reading readiness. "Why spend three months preparing to read and write?" In addition, Teacher D paid little attention to following the timetable for teaching the syllabus: "If I can, I go ahead, if I cannot, I stay." She also innovated on the sequence of patterns taught in the primers and developed her own:

I make use of a primer, because I am of the opinion that students become stimulated when they have their own books, but I didn't completely follow the sequence in the primer. (For example) I gave the consonant v earlier. And I utilize various primers and exercises which I've written. The ideal is to prepare a primer according to the class's needs.

Nevertheless, Teacher D , in contrast to the other three teachers, considered a strict daily timetable very important to put her pupils' lives in order:

I have a set time for reading, and reading comprehension (from seven-thirty) to nine o'clock. Then I let them go to the bathroom, activities call for a lot of attention. Then, they do activities such as writing sentences, syllable separation, dictation, giving names to drawings, things like this.

After recess (during the second semester) we always have arithmetic until ten past eleven. At ten past eleven I put the homework on the blackboard. And I do it in order so that they have a sense of organization in life. I even require that all exercises be numbered in their notebooks. Have you noticed?

By the end of October the daily reading was being accompanied by classwork involving oral and written comprehension. At home they read and copied the reading from the primer, doing other exercises in their books, such as naming the drawing, filling in blanks, and ordering words in a sentence. But according to Teacher D, most parents did not give any help in homework and some complained about it.

Teacher D criticized the use of the ABC Test as the criterion for organizing classes of new pupils for first grade, as did Teacher B. In Teacher D's opinion, the test measures readiness for reading and writing which the child could develop during the school year. It stigmatized those children who received low scores. Her class, which had obtained between thirteen and sixteen points out of twenty-four, was evaluated on May 14 as heterogeneous in terms of learning/ability.

Teacher D referred to the various criteria that the school used in the organization of first-grade classes - age, attendance/nonattendance at kindergarten, and scores on the ABC Test. She preferred to observe the children, in order to teach according to the difficulties of each child. Children

should be classified by the teacher into three groups - weak, medium, and strong; in this way she would be working in an intermediate manner between the usual "same content for the whole class" as well as meeting individual needs. In this format "fast learners" could help "slow" ones and at some point during the year she would be able to have a more homogeneous class. She pointed out that classes which had scored low on the ABC Test had worked with readiness for literacy for a whole year: "Nobody can spend a full year on preparation, without learning anything!" She concluded: "The child should be observed in his/her entirety through informal conversation." During the literacy process she favoured "progress" evaluation - "from the time the pupil enters first grade until the last day of class." She did not favour handing in a report card to parents at the end of each marking period: "Parents should be called in for conferences so they become aware of their children's progress, so that they can help them, and in December the final report would be handed in." But she evaluated the pupils each marking period (as was the practice at the school) preparing the tests herself.

I always try to evaluate the pupils by taking everything into consideration: attitudes, habits, attendance, homework, relationships, way of speaking. Evaluation for me is continuous though for the school it's the grade that counts. You have to develop the pupil as a whole person. I begin with literacy and then work other areas.

When asked if reading was listened to in groups or individually Teacher D answered: "It is collective." She meant in chorus. The pupils were expected to read every single word copied from the blackboard or from the primer. Some pupils were called on to read certain words while copying to make sure they were, in fact, reading. Of the twelve days observed, nine were typical. The other three were: the first day of class, a parent-teacher conference day on which grade reports were handed out, and a test day for the second marking

period. Of nine more typical days one was used for listening to each pupil's reading. Teacher D, when interviewed at the end of November, confirmed that collective reading was listened to every day and that since the beginning of that month she had been calling each one to her desk to read, in preparation for oral reading during the final examinations in December. Sometimes they read sentences, or sometimes the whole text was read. She evaluated the class as follows:

I have a lot of "syllabic reading" in the classroom. They read "bo - ne - ca" (doll). I don't know how they are going to do on the exam. They haven't picked up the mechanics and rhythm of reading yet, but I believe they will if they practice every day.

When the students finished the primer, they were supplied with texts copied from the blackboard, which were then corrected by the teacher and assigned for at-home reading. She also used mimeographed texts for the same purpose, and brought different primers for five pupils who learned more rapidly.

Teacher D informed me that she corrected all written tasks individually, though some of them were also done on the blackboard "because they don't know to do it by themselves yet." She corrected the notebooks once a week and, in contrast to Teacher B, who expected her pupils to show the notebooks to her, Teacher D stated: "You don't need to ask the teacher to see your work; if I don't watch out I'll end up correcting everything!" She often ended up doing so, however, taking a pen and writing corrections over the students' mistakes. An examination of exercise notebooks in July, August, October and November showed that dictations of ten words or a similar exercise ("give names to drawings") were given once a week. Only occasionally (the second week of August, the fourth of October and November) were dictations given more than once a week. In November, Teacher D announced that a dictation of twenty words would be given every Friday.

When discussing speed and perfection in doing a task, Teacher D made it very clear that, first of all, she demanded that the pupils read and understand what was expected of them, and then they could write. The "slow learners" (pupils 62, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74) who wrote without reading first had to erase their written work, read with the teacher, and then rewrite it. When writing the task, perfection meant "writing in an organized way with margins and spaces and numbering the exercises."

At the end of the first marking period (May) pupil 70 was singled out as the only pupil not being able to read and write words. The other five "slow learners" - pupils 62, 71, 72, 73 and 74 - were able to do so "in part." Teacher D recommended that parents give dictations at home when she distributed the report cards at the end of the marking period. The parents of pupils 70 and 71 did not attend this first meeting, however.

Data from classroom observations on June 19th showed that pupil 70 was considered slow, while the other two girls retained in first grade - pupils 71 and 74 - had achieved good standing in class by then. On this particular day, Teacher D gave an "easy" dictation, letting children look at a mimeographed sheet where the first eight patterns to be evaluated were indicated with all specifications: the key-word with each illustration, related syllables, and capital and lower-case letters. This was a clever way to give a dictation, as it reminded them of how to search the primer for patterns they had not totally mastered. She gave additional help to pupils 62 and 72, at that time eight and seven years old, respectively.

As a thirteen-year old pupil 67 was not able to write a single word of the dictation, Teacher D asked: "Do you know what happens to pupils who miss words on a dictation?" She threatened him with failure and after a while insisted: "I

don't understand why you don't make any effort. That really bothers me!" The teenager began to cry. The teacher seemed to be unaware of pupil 67's life prior to 1984. He had had anything but an easy life; he had already been sent fourteen times to FEBEM (State Foundation for the Welfare of Children), had escaped five times and was about to be arrested and escape again in August.

On the test given in July, pupil 67 copied from his older classmate while pupil 62 also copied from one of the best girls. Teacher D reported that pupil 62 often did not work in class, cried a lot and left the most difficult exercises to do at home with his mother's assistance. Though pupil 62 received special help both at school and at home, he reacted in a similar way to pupil 67 in a testing situation.

The data collected in the interviews with Teacher D highlights what had been observed. On November 22, Teacher D reported the special treatment given to three boys:

I help the pupil whenever he needs it. The pupils are already used to it. When I say "I am going to explain it on the blackboard for pupil X," only he pays attention to it. I give a (reading and writing) activity to all of them and individual work using mimeographed sheets to those in the front row - pupils 62, 72 and 73, more specifically the first two. I explained to the class: "These three have to be close to me because the teacher has to be on top of them to make them learn, but you learn easily and don't need it."

In fact, Teacher D gave special assistance to the three boys as reported above, but the other pupils did not constitute a homogeneous group of faster learners. Evaluations from the first marking periods - May and July - showed that pupil 70 was not doing well, and was the one with most learning problems. There were also indications that pupils 71 and 74, the other two girls, were not doing well either. The three girls, however, were not defined as being in need of special assistance. On June 17th, Teacher D scolded pupil 74, saying: "You don't do anything right."

One week later the girl left school for seventy-one days. In an interview on November 22nd, Teacher D indicated that pupil 74 could have become literate but had not because of her (pupil's) absences: "Who can rescue a child who is absent so much?" On the whole both teacher and pupil had the same low percent of class attendance (56 and 55 respectively).

It is interesting to compare the outcomes for sibling pairs in Class D: pupil 70 (Rose) and her brother pupil 61 (Marcelo), and pupil 71 (Luciana) and her brother pupil 66 (Pedro). The two boys were promoted, the two girls were not. Rose was enrolled in school before Marcelo, slightly before the age prescribed for enrollment in first grade. Luciana was enrolled in the same year as Pedro, one year later than the law requires. In 1984, Rose was attending first grade for the fourth time and was retained for the second time; the other years the child left school before the end of the year and did not take her final examinations. The other three children were enrolled for the third time and had not attended school for an entire year before 1984.

Marcelo and Rose's family had moved four times since the children's birth, in search of a better standard of living. It was a stable family and the two children were the youngest. Their unemployed father, a mason, was interviewed; his wife and one daughter were employed as maids. The father had only completed the first grade and could not read well. He expected Marcelo and Rose would stay in school until the eighth grade and that they would begin earning some money and have steady jobs by the time they were fourteen years old. The boy wanted to be a mason, but the girl did not know what she wanted to be.

The father explained his daughter's failure in 1984 as follows: "They were sent home many times because the teacher was absent," and added that one of his daughters had never been retained in any grade. Rose said that they always moved

to another place before the end of the school year, which was confirmed in Marcelo's interview. In 1987, he was attending third grade for the second time, and Rose had left school after retention in first grade again. In 1984, the school doctor had diagnosed her as being malnourished. Teacher D accused the parents of not being interested in their children's education and not coming to receive the results of evaluations. Marcelo and Rose had a similar rate of school attendance -83 and 82 percent, respectively.

The different outcomes between brother and sister in Pedro and Luciana's case may be attributable to the way they were treated at home. Luciana's mother, raising four children alone, relied on her help. Pedro was the only son and both had an older and a younger sister. Lucia reported:

I clean the house in the morning, I wash clothes (by hand), I cook...I know how to cook rice. I wash my mother's clothes. I have to take care of my youngest sister. One boy broke the door latch and took my youngest sister to the bushes. My mother spanked my oldest sister for it. My big sister does nothing at home. Mother said that she is going to take me to work with her to help with the cleaning.

Pedro attended 91 percent of the days, and Luciana 82. Luciana indicated that her absences from classes were due to health problems ("pain in the belly and in the throat"). On the other hand, Teacher D reported that Luciana's mother indicated that the girl had to take care of her youngest sister. This information was given to explain this child's failure, making the mother in part responsible for it.

Luciana and Pedro had moved twice from the interior of Rio Grande do Sul to the capital city. Their mother expected that the children would attend school until the eighth grade; that Luciana, at thirteen, and Pedro, at twelve, would be earning some money; and that the girl at fifteen and the boy at sixteen would have steady jobs. Pedro wanted to be a sheriff and Luciana wanted to be a teacher and a cleaner: "In

the mornings I will be a teacher and in the afternoons, I will work like my mother, cleaning corridors." Pedro and Luciana attended the same school in 1985. Pedro was retained in second grade and transferred to another school, and Luciana died while repeating first grade during 1985.

The poor performance of Rose and Luciana was due to extremely difficult family situations - working mothers who were the breadwinners, and absent or unemployed fathers.

It is important to note that while Classes A and B registered one nonpromoted boy each and Class C an equal number of boys and girls (six in all), in Class D all of the students who failed were girls. Those who were not promoted (Rose and Luciana) were indeed "poor" learners. So too were pupils 62 and 72, the boys selected for intensive help. The question then becomes: why did Teacher D select the two "slow" boys and not the two slow girls in need of "extra work." Four explanations can be advanced: (a) because she thought girls usually do better, she decided the boys needed more help; (b) Teacher D leaned towards working with boys, perhaps manifesting a subconscious gender bias; (c) the boys' were the youngest, and younger children received more assistance; or (d) the boys parents showed more interest in their school performance, over their daughters. There is insufficient data to verify the first. The second explanation has some weak evidence which supports it. During two of the three years she had taught first grade at the school, Teacher D showed a higher rate of promotion of boys compared to the other teachers. The third explanation also has some support - pupils 62 and 72 were the youngest of those who remained in school until December, and were given more attention. The brothers were younger than their sisters who failed. Explanation (d) has considerable support: the boys who were specially assisted had families in close contact with the teacher who worked with their children at home. In order of

importance, then, the evidence shows that family involvement and pupils' age and sex were the most important factors. The family's involvement depended on having available tutors at home, whether siblings or parents. Such factors explain Teacher D's selection of pupils in need of more assistance.

The Social Order in the Classroom

In this section we focus not on the formal educational factors associated with reading and promotion, but with issues of classroom atmosphere, discipline, and "hidden curriculum" issues.

Class A

Observations in Class A revealed a group of happy children who had developed good relationships with each other. This web of relationships was actively constructed by Teacher A. She was always there before class started to communicate the importance of one more day of schooling. The children fed upon this certainty.

Her classroom was seen by the school staff as the last resort for educating an "insolent" pupil. Teacher A confessed: "Sometimes it takes ages before a student settles down, but I don't try to force things, just patiently wait for a tomorrow that always comes." Respect for her pupils was shown in the way she developed the value of time. Teacher A considered that letting tardiness go by without correction would be an encouragement to others not to be on time the following day.

We agree about timing for everything we do. There is a time for play, a time to talk, but also a time to work which must be respected. And a child, even a very young one, understands that. However, the younger the child is, the shorter the periods of time dedicated to one particular task must be. Otherwise, activities become monotonous

and indiscipline is actually created.

Teacher A emphasized that the importance of punctuality as fulfillment of a social contract facilitating collective task is contingent upon the presence of all of the participants. Whenever pupils were late, she reminded them of her expectations. Teacher A considered pupils 6, 15, and 16 to be the only students who repeatedly misbehaved; pupil 16 was also marked absent many times. Pupil 15 had been seeing a psychiatrist before 1984.

In Class A seating was mainly the pupil's decision. Teacher A stated:

I give plenty of freedom of choice, because it is sad to have to sit in a place where you don't feel comfortable. And this can occur in a classroom without the teacher perceiving it. If a child sits next to a classmate who is nasty to him or who ruins his school supplies, tomorrow he has hope of avoiding such a situation, sitting in a different seat. This is a good escape. And the pupil can solve his own problem.

Some assigned seating was done for the benefit of pupils in need of more help from the teacher. Pupil 7 had been enrolled in kindergarten for three years, and in 1984 had been attending other two first-grade classes but had not adjusted well. Though he arrived in Class A during the second semester, he made rapid progress toward becoming literate. Pupil 10 required intensive teaching. School psychologists' evaluations indicated that his mental age corresponded to five and a half years old, and he did not learn to read and write all patterns. Both pupils 7 and 10 sat close to their teacher.

Class B

Teacher B was opposed to authoritarianism in the classroom, permitted freedom of expression, and used this as a strategy to better understand pupils' interests.

Inattention was a sign that she had to change her teaching approach in order to "reach" the child. She added, "I prefer a disobedient pupil to one who agrees with everything." In this sense, disobedience was considered very positive, as it brought out children's personality traits.

Teacher B considered tardiness during the first period to be a special problem because pupils missed "the most important part of their literacy lesson." When a student was late for class she usually inquired about the circumstances, for example:

First I talked with the child who had come late, to find out why he was late, if for instance, there was someone sick in the family. I asked the child to arrive on time. Sometimes, I asked to talk with the mother to ask what time he woke up. After I had listened to everybody who wanted to speak to me, I demanded attention from them.

The pupil learns only if he looks at me, if he participates, if he hears me, if he listens to me, and I speak very slowly. Whenever I am explaining anything, I stop anyone who moves.

I begin by demanding attention, but when the children's eyes start to gleam, I am sure that I have reached them, that they are listening to me for fun. They are motivated.

She insisted that silence was necessary even after the pupils had finished the task because concentration was essential for work:

It is not that story of: "Shut up because I don't want to hear your voice," but "you are going to be quiet now because otherwise you'll disturb your classmates who are still working!"

Teacher B encouraged students to participate in monitoring the behaviour of others, and reported that the children often scolded each other for not coming to class, arriving late, for talking during lessons, and messy work.

When asked about deviation from classroom norms Teacher B mentioned aggressive behaviour (pupils 19, 25, 28, 29, and

30), and absences and incomplete tasks (pupils 24 and 27). Given her approach to pupils, pupil 19 was soon won over and began to work well; pupils 25, 28 and 29 kept up with the group, and pupil 27 was "reached" late in the school year. The cases of pupil 30, who left school during the first semester, and pupil 24, who left just before examinations were taken, were extremely disappointing to Teacher B.

Teacher B referred to different concepts of order in the school; though she considered Teacher A a good teacher, she thought she relied on stricter discipline in the class. Teacher B also said she had heard "lots of yelling" from some other colleagues and gave examples: "You are dumb; you are lazy; you don't copy; you never learn; why do you come to school, anyway?" She conceded, however, that in general teachers tended to respect the children's individuality.

In Class A pupils chose a new place to sit every day with limited freedom for pupils 7 and 10; in Class B, the pupil could choose between having a fixed or a movable seat; those who decided to change their seats had to respect their classmates' assigned seats. Teacher B said that if she assigned students' seats, the children would feel that being put close to the teacher indicated preferential treatment and that this would hurt their feelings.

Class C

Of the four studied, Teacher C came closest to what may be considered the "traditional" teacher. She considered her class as the most disorganized she had ever had, referring specially to the competition between boys and girls. The boys called the girls "dumb" and felt that the teacher protected them. Teacher C stated:

The boys are so chauvinistic! Poor things!
They have been raised like that since they were very young. The girls cannot talk among themselves as

the boys do. The boys always criticize the girls. She said she always had the worst classes in the school, with pupils with disinterested parents. She had eight children with behaviour problems that year: pupils 39, 42, 46, 47, 48, 51, 56 and 57, all boys. Pupil 47 disturbed the group because he did not get along well with his classmates, only with the teacher: "They isolate those they don't like, they hit them, they criticize them...They run around the classroom, annoying each other." Conflict among the boys reached the point of physical aggression. "I maintain order with reinforcement," Teacher C remarked. "I use more positive reinforcement (rather than negative) to show them the importance of studying. Negative reinforcement is based on threats. A repressive stare or a 'Keep quiet!' doesn't work." However, a student who accomplished nothing before recess was punished by having to stay in after having received several threats. Playing with a toy was punished by taking the toy away and not returning it. Tardiness was not a problem in Teacher C's class, and occurred only at the end of the school year with two boys.

Teacher C often relied on raising her voice to get the pupils' attention, but never humiliated a child; peer tutoring was not a feature of her class:

When I present a new point, I interrupt all conversation. I ask for silence. I speak louder to get their attention. But when the faster ones finish their work they start talking.

She felt that disobedience was normal, as the child heard: "Sit down! Do your work!" every day, but considered most of the pupils in her class to be "sweet." She paid more attention to those who misbehaved and those who "got stuck."

In Class C, pupils' seating was done on the basis of sex. This was an unintended consequence of how the teacher wanted children to enter the classroom. Girls coming into the classroom in "the proper way" - walking slowly and silently -

had the privilege of entering first, and could always select "better places" than boys who came running noisily in from the schoolyard. It seems that the boys did not understand that this was the norm. Teacher C's seating arrangement favoured the girls for the entire year, which encouraged competition between the sexes.

Class D

Teacher D defined a "disciplined class" as one which performs the tasks assigned by the teacher, "a responsible class" as one which listens and works at the right times:

I discipline by putting the students on a timetable: time for eating, going to the toilet, playing, working. In the beginning they worked half an hour, then stopped ten minutes; gradually, I shortened the play periods. By the end of the school year they almost didn't need breaks. Everything in life is a question of discipline, organization...

In fact, there was a lot of work going on, little talk and no fights in class. Pupils only got up from their seats to borrow a pencil or eraser.

About cases of disobedience she said: "The children are very smart. They try to get out of line, but I make them obey." There were no cases of insolence in this class. Teacher D considered tardiness unpleasant, because she had to start the class over - "the prayer, the date, both important events in the children's lives at school." Parents received a note to come to school and talk with the teacher when children were late often. Pupils 61 and 70, brother and sister, and pupil 72 had come up to one hour late on ten non-consecutive days. Teacher D tried to make them conscious of the importance of arriving on time though their parents had not contacted the teacher.

Teacher D used various types of rewards to encourage her pupils, specially the "slow learners." She praised the whole

class, showing students a notebook with good penmanship, promising a box of coloured pencils or a storybook to the best among the slow learners (pupils 62, 70, 71, 72 and 81). When she rewarded a task well done, she emphasized that all pupils were able "to do the same." She favoured rewarding pupils, because they should be responsible for themselves: "Nobody cared about their learning at home." She punished a pupil for not having done the homework, making him work during recess. She threatened pupils who did not complete tasks in class with loss of recess. Peer tutoring also occurred spontaneously in Class D; the slow learners were often aided by their classmates.

Teacher D reported that inattention was a great problem in her class, mainly among the "slower pupils." She did not permit pupils to use disparaging nicknames in class, so as to foster "respect and love" for classmates. However, she herself called pupils by nicknames which made reference to their physical appearance, when kidding around informally.

In Teacher D's class, there were three boys sitting in the front row, in assigned seats. These were "the slowest" ones - pupils 62, 72 and 73. All other students could choose the seats "where they felt best." It was easier "to check their work," according to the teacher. Teacher D explained to the class: "You learn more rapidly, so you don't need to sit so close." The three girls who were retained in first grade were not put near the teacher.

Seating placement was therefore varied in the four classes. In Class B the children were completely free to select their seats. In Classes A and D, desks closest to the teacher were allocated to those in greatest need of help. In Class D, three boys were selected for special placement and three girls - retained in the first grade in 1984 - were neglected. In Class C, though girls sat in better locations in the classroom, location closer to the teacher did not by

itself imply special treatment.

Teachers' Ideologies

The present section examines each teacher's views on the relevance of the curriculum offered to the social conditions of the slum dwellers in the school, how they understand literacy as an instructional objective, their explanations of promotion/failure in first grade and their belief about what constitutes effective teaching.

Teacher A

Teacher A put special emphasis on pupils' and parents' "conscientization," and did not rule out university studies for the few children who could overcome all the obstacles encountered by the Brazilian poor.

We know that nothing is ideal. I question myself about the validity of restricting the curriculum adapting (meaning, "restricting") it to their (the slum dwellers') reality...because there are children who are going to continue studying and if we restrict the curriculum to their poor environment...I think that they'll become even poorer, don't you? I cannot doubt that in this environment there are children with great potential...I cannot see them as poor, weak, incapable. Not at all! I believe in this child, in the child who is poor...because I see, too, children who come from families with many resources who do not do well in school. I always put myself in the role of mother: God forbid that my daughters be enrolled in such a restricted school -not given the opportunity to develop their potential. So I treat them as if they were my children. Always wanting the very best for them. Now, if they don't do well it's for personal reasons, not because I didn't teach them.

Acquiring the basics of literacy was the main objective of first grade:

Reading with good pronunciation...good

intonation, and interpreting more than reading, saying what was read...giving details, citing characters...actions of characters...location in time and space with all those events described in the text. Being literate means reading and writing correctly...within a range of average to good. The literate pupil is not always excellent.

When explaining Class A's promotion rate, Teacher A invoked **conscientization** of the importance of becoming literate, confidence in going ahead!

I had to communicate to them that they couldn't go on repeating first grade anymore. It was time to...learn...that they had to become literate to survive in life...that their lives depend on this. It was very difficult to win these children over from apathy...from disbelief.

Teacher A also made the children's families conscious that "their child was not always going to be a failure," and that they should change their thinking. She also created many experiences in the classroom that afforded even weak students with opportunities to succeed. Greater confidence was the result. Another important factor in her success in teaching literacy was that the teacher always knew what the pupil was doing and how he/she perceived the patterns. Having a class with fifteen children facilitated working in such a way, with individual observation of reading and writing.

Pupil 10 was the only case of failure. Teacher A explained:

I really don't know how to explain his great difficulty in learning. I could detect immaturity for literacy and lack of attention. When talking with his mother, I didn't find out anything that could explain his bad body position when doing physical exercise. He hadn't had any disease - polio, for instance - which could have affected him. In other respects, he's fine...he's gentle, and mature in certain areas of his personality. I'm sure that this coming year he's going to be an excellent pupil.

She concluded, however, that sometimes the teacher was influenced by "the hopeless environment of the school."

Nevertheless, this was not the case in her practice.

Teacher A had a realistic view of educational opportunities open to children living in the slum. The youngest of the group of repeaters she was teaching in 1984 "will possibly finish elementary school. but the others will not make it. Many stop studying in either the third or fourth grades or at the very latest, in the eighth grade; when they finish elementary school they are already in their late teens, and are expected to get a job. If they have actually completed all eight grades, they will probably work at a supermarket or as maids." She once had a pupil who became a plastic surgeon but he, like other pupils in the school who finished university, began attending first grade at the right age, and did not repeat it.

Parents see the school as preparation for work since all jobs require educational credentials, whether elementary, high school or university level. "The attainment of an elementary-school certificate or even completing a few grades already represents some upward mobility," Teacher A noted since parents are often illiterate.

Teacher A recognized that the weight of the social structure, acting through the family environments of her lower and working class students, posed the main challenge to the teacher. To transform an illiterate child "who does not know how to use pencil and paper, is badly-fed and clothed, undisciplined, wandering up and down in the street" into a literate one, the profile of the effective first-grade teacher, according to Teacher A, should be: knowledgeable, patient, responsible and above all, a friend of little children. "She should also be a good athlete because she needs to walk about five kilometers a day in the classroom"; she cannot sit behind her desk or she will not be able to facilitate her pupils' daily progress. Teacher A had a positive view of education, and thought it made for a

more egalitarian society from both the economic and cultural points of view:

In addition to giving people the opportunity to earn better wages, education is a human right, and it humanizes. Also, the educated person knows his/her rights and is able to scream about them; the ignorant person is suffocated.

Teacher B

Teacher B defined the classroom as an experimental situation with many types of children, different materials for each learning problem, books to stimulate creativity, thought, projects: "a place where the pupil searches for answers through his own experience, and where the need to learn springs from the child instead of being imposed by the teacher."

The classroom should have space for activities and freedom of movement, be open to the schoolyard, and have basic materials and supplies either already provided, or created by teacher and pupils when needed. Parents should also be open enough to accept an untraditional, unconventional form of education where creativity should be the "mainspring." Though Teacher B acknowledged the many problems at the school where she worked, she believed that it offered an opportunity for "innovative and highly productive work," since neither parents nor school staff interfered in the teacher's work.

Teacher B felt as deep a responsibility for her pupils' education as if they were members of her family:

The first-grade teacher feels the obligation - I do, at least - to act as if they were my own children who I must prepare to live in the world, and I have to prepare them in the best way possible...My God! Because nobody else is going to do anything for them. I think I'm mistaken in thinking like this but we have been taught since normal school that first grade is basic and that if you don't learn how to read and write well, you won't do well in the following grades. This is a

big responsibility. You have to prepare the pupil perfectly in order for the second-grade teacher to work on more advanced material.

In contrast to Teacher A, who recognized humanistic aims of education, Teacher B stressed the instrumental function of education to the point of seeing this as the only factor which could account for the boys who left her class during the academic year:

Why did pupils 30 and 26 leave the school? Because they wanted to have jobs. And what was I teaching them? Teaching them to work? No. When were they going to see the effects of my teaching? When they became adults and had jobs. Was it (my teaching) of interest to these pupils? No. They wanted something of immediate value. So in a school like this (for slum dwellers) there should be more immediate preparation for work, like teaching a kid to shine a shoe, as well as teaching him to read and write.

Concerning the factors that produce student failure Teacher B stated:

To me, the pupil is the least and the teacher the most guilty. It's not the system. It is me, me. I'm not the system, not a part of it. I am I. So, I'm guilty whenever I'm not interested in the pupil, I'm guilty and that's that. The major responsibility for failure rests on the teacher, I think. And you can think that I'm pleasing the government (in stating this), or that I'm in favour of making teaching a sort of priesthood and the teacher's going to die poor. The pupil isn't responsible for the teacher's low salary and the teacher can't neglect the pupil in order to "get back" at the government. The pupil is an innocent victim in all of this.

Teacher B thought that lack of competent and conscientious teaching occurs frequently in state schools, but not in private ones. In the former, there are no adverse consequences: "I can do what I want, I don't have limits, nobody pays any attention!" This climate of *laissez-faire* offers opportunity to those whose professional practice is less principled: "It is a question of character. A teacher

who wants to work will work no matter where she is. So, I think more should be demanded of the teacher," she concluded.

Teacher B explained her success with eleven pupils out of fifteen on the basis of the teaching method she used. She also employed "conscientization" as a strategy in teaching literacy in order to increase the pupils' motivation:

I aim at two things with these children: I make them value themselves, because when they arrive at school they're very down on themselves, they think that they deserve everything (bad) that happens to them because that's the way things are. I make them aware of the necessity of reading - as an agreement - they make an agreement with me and I make one with them. They aren't conscious of why they come to school. If you ask them why, they answer "to learn," or it was because their mother told them to go to school, because everybody else does. Nothing is said about what they're going to do here. They come and that's all! If there is no agreement between pupil and teacher, they won't understand why they're here, and think that it's only entertainment.

Teacher B realized that she was not able to "reach everybody," that is, to motivate them to become literate. On the other hand, she did not attempt to dissuade pupils from leaving school. This was born of a deep respect for human beings and their individual differences, and a certain uneasiness when faced with the reality of a different social class. The teacher realized that she was not able to define what was best for any pupil in his/her particular circumstances. She appealed to the children's freedom of choice, making an agreement with them, and making them aware of the importance of school. She was successful in "reaching" pupil 27 only at the end of the year. Pupil 24 worked well whenever she was close to him and taught in a very directive way. In pupil 30's case, Teacher B relied on the counselling service, which she hoped would provide a solution to the problem of his attendance at school, but the situation was "incompetently handled," and the pupil left. Pupil 26 also

departed, not having attended many classes during the first marking period of 1984; Teacher B thought that the reasons for his abandoning the school were not only financial, but psychological: "Since he cried a lot in class he'll feel more secure at home." She concluded by stating: "They had other objectives - to them studying had no meaning whatsoever." She did her best in the context of school and, in fact, had an "acute perception" of what was happening in the pupil's family. Though she was convinced of the importance of the family context, she developed a policy of non-interference with the family.

She reflected on why she had limited herself to doing the best she could for these children at the classroom level, without interfering in decisions at home:

I don't know which is stronger: the education students receive at school or at home. I don't know if we can call either one "education": let's suppose we can. School shows them a reality which is not theirs. The teacher comes from a world totally different from theirs; she can know their squalor, but it's one thing to know it and another to live it. They know this. And knowing it, they discover that nothing the teacher says works in their world and because of this, they simply reject the teacher. I can educate them to live in my world. I don't know how to educate them to survive in theirs.

She accused the privileged class of the fallacy of improving the standard of living for the less privileged populations through schooling alone. Basic socio-economic change had to accompany school reform, and "the school would affect 'deprived communities' only if they stopped being deprived. Change the economic situation, offering everyone the opportunity to live with dignity, and education will change." The social structure, to Teacher B, was clearly the most important force affecting the future occupations of her pupils.

Education itself didn't "affect" the unequal distribution

of income. In the schools for the poor, which are free of charge, parents have to accept what is given, and teachers do not feel responsible for their pupils: "They know that the community cannot demand accountability." Private schools, in contrast, are accountable to pupils' parents: "Parents pay and are respected for this."

In her critical pessimistic view of the relationship between education and society, Teacher B stated that not even a teacher's conscious work was able to influence children's future life or make a real difference. All teachers should have the same professional orientation and respect for human dignity: "But we know that this is not the case" and the pupil also switches from one teacher to another "losing the positive qualities he developed with a good one." To be able to work with such children, the first-grade teacher must "be very open, not authoritarian, know the work to be done as well as each child individually; look for new ideas, learn from pupils what really interests them and discover the way to reach them by developing their creativity. In addition, the teacher should respect her students as human beings."

Teacher C

For Teacher C, teaching included far more than just instructing pupils; she favoured the egalitarian principle, valuing each pupil according to his/her own contribution, independently of level of intelligence or appropriateness of behaviour. In this context, she referred to two boys in her class: pupil 47, who was promoted, and pupil 44, who was retained in first grade. She stated that the latter appreciated music, a trait which she valued. Indeed, she was deeply committed to her pupils, and demonstrated this in her attendance rate - 93 percent - second only to Teacher A's. This represents very good attendance considering that she was

taking an undergraduate degree and was entitled to be absent on examination days. Teachers B and D, who also were taking undergraduate degrees, had registered class attendance rates of 77 and 56 percent respectively.

When her pupils finished the first grade, Teacher C expected them to be prepared - with at least some social skills - "to face other groups (classes?) in the future, to conduct themselves with respect for others." In addition to learning the three R's thoroughly, Teacher C thought that the school should also prepare pupils for a useful occupation, which she noted was not done. For this reason the curriculum was "irrelevant" to children who were already struggling to earn a living or would soon be.

Teacher C was able to attain promotion rate of 72 percent, which was almost that attained by Teacher B - 73 percent - although she had twelve more pupils. At different moments during the interview she manifested concern about her results: "At the end of the year I always ask myself why I didn't get better results with the other pupils," or "Where did I go wrong?" At one point, she concluded: "I didn't do more because I couldn't - I was never favoured in the distribution of classes - but other teachers couldn't have done any better."

When asked about why so many students failed the first grade, she said:

In my opinion, teachers, the school administration, the state, which doesn't provide school supplies or meals, and the community, which in its complacency doesn't exercise control, letting the responsibility for learning fall on the school and not being interested in seeing how it works; all of them are guilty.

She specifically criticized the policy which led the school to form four extra classes in 1984, on top of the existing twelve, "knowing that there weren't enough teachers to go around." This would contribute to more failure, she assured

me.

She pointed out other constraints arising from the fact that many times pupils belonging to two or even three other absent teachers were put in her class:

On these days you are doing your own work and the others' work at the same time. So you don't get (to teach your pupils properly) and you get discouraged. I would like for there to be more teachers who are conscious of their professional obligation and don't neglect their pupils, because this would not only be good for their work and their colleagues' work but would also decrease retention in first grade - which is one of the most serious problems.

Teacher C respected a principle of "not forcing anything on pupils who are slow by nature." A child in her class was completely free to follow his/her own "rhythm of learning." She justified not listening to everybody's reading - an important aspect in her practice - as follows: "When I know that the pupil can't read, I don't invite him to come to my table for individual reading because the pupil gets upset." She said that she had followed this principle since the time when a child had told her: "It's no use calling on me, I don't know how to read."

Although Teacher C thought that with large groups one could not assist pupils individually, she had tutored pupil 39, who had a problem with diction, individually, as well as pupils 33 and 38, who were doing relatively well but stopped learning.

About the future of these children, some of whom were already working as shoeshine boys, Teacher C foresaw "early employment and exploitation"; they would collect bus tickets, do odd jobs or join the ranks of thieves "until socialism comes to Brazil..." Like Teacher B, she saw the limits of educational reform in a highly stratified society. The exploitation would continue.

According to Teacher C, the function of the school for

some parents was to guarantee the children's future occupational success; for others it was having a place where the children could be left and taken care of while they went to work. She also referred to a third category of parents who demanded that their children go to school and become literate, and complained that these parents did not see that their children were not mature enough to learn. Teacher C saw as an important development the growth of schools integrated into the community and supported in part by parents living in the neighbourhood. The parents should realize that the problems of the school were theirs to solve together with teachers and the school administration; "the school is for their children." They should not think that all problems must be solved by the government: "If we think like that the roof will fall in on us, since the government is not worried about education. Problems are up to us to solve, too!"

I called Teacher C's attention to the fact that her pupils had remained in the school for the entire year, and had had good attendance rates. She replied: "I have the impression that if the teacher is not absent, she helps the children form the habit of coming to class." Though she saw teachers working towards social reproduction, causing the impoverished pupils to be even more "marginalized," she also thought that the school could contribute to upward mobility for a few. This hope for a positive influence of education on the children's lives led Teacher C to contact parents whenever a pupil did not come to class. She had had only one pupil who dropped out and, with the exception of those who transferred, outstanding rates of attendance - the best of the four classes analyzed here. Parents confirmed the teacher's interest in their children by pointing out that while demanding that the children be present, she was always at work herself. This may be the main reason why five of the six nonpromoted pupils did not leave the school though their

reading was not monitored from September on.

Teacher D

Teacher D wanted a firm school administration which would give equal treatment in the distribution of services and good students among teachers: "A teacher who is discriminated against doesn't have any desire to work!" When asked to describe how she taught her pupils, Teacher D said:

You have to find means, ways, methods which match their life experiences to "awaken" these children, to make them responsible for their own learning, because nobody controls them at home. Also, you have to consider their individual differences. They are not equal. I dedicate myself more to the development of the apathetic child because the active child already has the possibility of learning.

At the end of the first grade Teacher D expected her pupils to be able to read and write, have developed social skills and some habits of good hygiene. Being literate, to her, meant not only being able to read and write, but comprehension, and the ability to transfer learning to other situations: "If children are able to read and understand what they read, they can master any subject."

Teacher D also criticized the emphasis on children developing psycho-motor skills as a prerequisite for teaching literacy. In her opinion, teachers did not even know what this actually meant, what the goal of such training was, or when to stop:

They work "to develop psychomotor skills" with pencil and paper. Have you seen this? This is like any other thing brought to Brazil - it comes from above, isn't analyzed and is injected into the schools. The teacher doesn't know it in depth and begins to apply it because it's "fashionable."

Teacher D explained promotion in her class in terms of

the children's mental ability, reasoning, interest and dedication to learning. "They learn, and do it very well, given their background!" She placed the greatest responsibility for failure on the teacher, "because she selects the method and puts effort into developing it. First, you must get to know the pupil and after that you select the method or methods that work." She put the childrens' class attendance at almost the same level of importance in the learning process. Commenting on teacher's effort, Teacher D referred to the negative effects of a study disseminated among her colleagues, which had concluded that if a mother was not well-fed during her pregnancy and her child also suffered from similar malnutrition during the first two years of life, learning would be impaired. Believing in these conclusions, teachers put little effort into their work "because the children, indeed, were not going to respond well, coming as they did from a poor environment." On the contrary, Teacher D insisted that they came "eager" to learning reading and writing.

But in contrast to Teacher C, she did not feel personally responsible if her students failed.

I know I give everything I can so they can learn and develop. They didn't become literate because they needed another type of assistance that I could not give them. I get frustrated if I have to teach other teachers' pupils or have to divide classes according to the pupils' progress in learning in the middle of the year.

When asked about the children's future, Teacher D said she had heard that they wanted to be doctors or classroom teachers or physical education teachers, which she thought to be unrealistic aspirations given the present state of educational institutions. These children even lacked money to buy a book; thus, she foresaw as their future occupations ("if they have the opportunity to work") the "simplest" ones: masons, carpenters, supermarket workers or, at the most, bus

drivers.

Teacher D thought that the pupils' parents saw formal education as a ladder for upward mobility, though she thought that existing schooling would be of little help to these children. Learning only to read and write wouldn't provide them with great opportunities: "They can learn to read and write and be shoeshine boys for the rest of their lives."

Teacher D affirmed that school, family and the structure of society as a whole collaborated in the child's future success or failure in society. She laconically stated that education was an agent of social reproduction: "It is like a funnel: only those who can afford to study get to finish. Society imposes limitations on education." She meant that most of the population gets poured in the school but only those who can afford to remain eventually come out the other end.

CHAPTER VIII

ACADEMIC STRATIFICATION IN THE CLASSROOM

This chapter focuses on the process of stratification within each classroom, and the possible consequences for the pupils' performance in the first grade. Levels of social differentiation arise in classrooms "in order that the teacher may solve the problems she is confronted with and provide some legitimation for the allocation of her time and energies" (Sharp and Green, 1975: 116-117). These levels are constructed with the active participation of the pupil and with the teacher as the main definer of the situation. The effects of these definitions may be hard to predict. The definition of a pupil as a learning problem is not always detrimental to his/her performance in that class. Teachers may offer their scarce energies in favour of those who learn at a slow pace, or may elect to focus on those who can learn more rapidly.

Teachers A and B had smaller classes than their colleagues, but they had students who had repeated the first grade more times and were more difficult to teach according to the teachers. However, an examination of the number of years pupils repeated first grade prior to 1984 revealed that the differences between the classes were much smaller than what the teachers had thought.

The process of stratification is presented according to three dimensions identified by Sharp and Green (1975: 129-130) applied to the Brazilian context. They are (a) the consociate- contemporary (or we-they) continuum; (b) the fluidity within and between layers; and (c) the range of stratification. These three dimensions allow us to organize the experiences within the classroom, and identify linkages with effective teaching and becoming literate.

Contemporaries and Consociates

In this section, attention is called to the issue of inter-subjectivity as a crucial aspect of education and, thus, of becoming literate.

Schutz's (1967) treatment of the transition from direct to indirect social experience focuses on the "we-relationship" and the "they-relationship." As "pure types", they are two poles "between which stretches a continuous series of experiences." At one extreme of the continuum the human being is seen as a consociate, known in terms of his/her unique characteristics, while at the other he/she arises as a contemporary, "more remote and appropriated in consciousness via typifications." As seen earlier, physical remoteness in time and space of an object characterizes anonymization. Was there a process of anonymization of pupils in the teacher's consciousness? What were the consequences for the pupils' performance during the first grade?

The following discussion is based on what was observed in each classroom in the first semester of 1984, and on an in-depth interview with each teacher towards the end of the school year. The social experience of each class of pupils with their respective teacher varied with the number of school days in which that teacher made herself available to pupils for face-to-face contact. Even in the ideal circumstance in which the teacher is **daily** present for the class encounter, the development of a we-relationship shared with consociates is contingent upon intra- and extra-classroom constraints. The teacher's positive view of the importance of education for the pupils' future lives is an important ingredient in a constructive teacher-pupil we-relationship.

Class A

Teacher A experienced the transition from direct to indirect social experience with her class on a daily basis. Her pupils were welcomed in a friendly, firm manner. She was available to them every minute of the school day. This class situation can be defined as a world of consociates organized around work and play; silent when the task was reading, writing or another learning activity, and noisy when the children had a period of play included in their schedule.

Three pupils illustrate how the teacher sought to integrate all children into the learning group.

Pupil 15. I also know him from other years. Last year he even attended my class for several days. Misbehaviour was his major problem at school, in addition to not learning. A very serious problem of conduct...Aggression, ill-breeding...He even hit his teacher's hand when he was in the special-education class.

He was in the special-education class...before he attended the first grade ...Last year, close to the end, he was sent to a special center which deals with these serious school problems. He underwent a series of exams and tests. This year he was referred to my class by that center, to be taught because he lives in this neighbourhood. He reacted very well to my teaching. He goes on being hyperactive. This is a characteristic that will only go away with time. He does not stop moving but he listens to me. And...he is an excellent student. I think that he is one of the best...he is one of the most secure in reading and writing...I only observe some difficulties in mathematics.

Pupil 15, in fact, was a well-behaved, hard-working boy when he was in Teacher A's class, getting the third highest score on the spelling test. This was a victory for Teacher A.

Pupil 13, a girl adopted by her father's wife, was a problem pupil for another reason:

Pupil 13 also came from a "special class." I spoke with (the remedial educator). In my opinion

pupil 13's problems are emotional. She is very intelligent. But she had a severe emotional blockage and still has it...She is getting over it due to the maturity that she is acquiring with the understanding of life that she is building.

Her mother is her adoptive mother. Her (biological) mother abandoned her at this lady's door. She was a few days old. One week. She is the only girl. Her adoptive mother has only boys. She is the daughter of the man who raises her. Her (adoptive) mother knows the whole story and has a problem accepting her. Up to a certain point this is understandable.

Teacher A, knowing the stigma faced by this pupil, took the girl's part attempting to act upon the family situation and improve her self-image.

But this year, at the beginning of the year I had a long conversation with her mother. She asked me about pupil 13 and made it clear that she did not have hope as to her progress in school. Then, I showed exactly the opposite, that the girl was doing very well...that she had every possibility of learning to read and write and that she (the mother) should give her support. I emphasized her role as a mother. For me she is the real mother, isn't she?

Teacher A did not let a chance to help her students improve go by and, in this case, both she and the mother collaborated in attempting to solve the pupil's problems.

One of these days she (pupil 13) took home a little pair of scissors. She said to her mother that she had found them under her desk. And her mother brought it back to replace it because it probably belonged to someone in the morning class (working in the same room). And, in fact, it belongs to the morning class. Thus her mother acts positively towards her...she made the girl bring back the object, didn't she?

I try to correct without a big fuss, see? Reservedly. But I do not let anything go by...I do not refrain from correcting the situation. I cannot let it feed something that is wrong, can I?...The day will come when she can perceive that she should not be this way.

We have to guide and correct...because if we

let it go by it (the situation)...only becomes worse.

The third case, pupil 10, was the only one from Teacher A's class who failed the first grade.

Pupil 10 also came from the special-education class. And he was the only pupil in the class who gave me no indication of academic achievement. He showed nothing productive. He had not grown nor achieved anything at all. He is a quiet child. Maybe excessively so. Who knows? A very affectionate child, very dear...He is a boy who I can classify as having good manners considering our environment. He is gentle with classmates, with the teacher. But for pupil 10, the method I used with the class was of no worth; he did not assimilate anything.

I decided to change the method I was using with pupil 10. I observed his personal characteristics. He was a boy who really observes detail. He draws very well. So I decided to try the alphabetic method. One begins with the letters, afterwards, the student makes the connection. And he reacted to it. I work alone with pupil 10. A time will come in which, if I am able, as I want to, pupil 10 will learn how to read and write.

Thus, Teacher A did not abandon the pupil because of his lack of achievement. On the contrary, she gave him even more attention, putting special effort into teaching him how to read and write.

The cases displayed here demonstrate that Teacher A developed a "we-relationship" even with those pupils who had attended the special-education classes in which those with severe learning problems are placed. Teacher A entered the pupils' worlds identifying herself with the pupil's interests, never abandoning her role as an educator. The pupils' frustration was her own; the pupil's success was her aim. She corrected the pupil's errors by disapproving of the actions, but not the actor.

In all cases examined, Teacher A did not relate with her pupils according to a rigid categorization of their abilities.

Her most problematic cases were pupil 13 and pupil 10, but she kept up hope of improvement.

Class B

Teacher B, though a highly competent professional offering her pupils all her available time, did not achieve the degree of consociality with all her pupils as did Teacher A. Let us examine pupils 30, 27, and 24, who "wasted" the school year, and how they appear in the teacher's perspective.

Pupil 30 is a ...is a child who I did not make friends with. And I don't know why because this boy had the greatest pleasure in working when he came to class. This is what I can not understand. He was willing to participate in class. He participated. He worked on everything that was assigned. He asked. He wanted to know more. But when he was absent, he disappeared for one week. And when he came back, he worked very well, until the day he decided that he would not come any more. Then nothing that was done could change the situation.

The intervention of the school counsellor with his mother "with suggestions which were too idealistic" did not change the situation in any way:

Pupil 30 does not submit to anybody. At this age (eleven years old) he even dominates his mother. What he says is law to her. Her husband abandoned the home. She values pupil 30 a lot because she says that he is the only son who helps her when she needs it. He is the only one who stopped studying to earn money to support the family. So she values him very much. I think that unconsciously his mother inculcated the obligation to continue bringing home more money. And I think that if he came back to school, I think that he would feel that he was doing the same thing that his father had done abandoning his mother and so he decided: "I will not abandon her."

Teacher B did not, at this time, comment on her own absences from class, in this after-the-fact explanation of the pupil's decision to leave school. Pupil 30 left at the end of August, having been absent a total of forty-eight days.

The teacher had been absent thirty-two days (five to seven days per month). To be in class is the *conditio sine qua non* for the development of a we-relationship. Teacher B's absences were not conducive to developing such a relationship.

Another enigma for Teacher B was pupil 27:

Pupil 27 has such creativity! In addition to this, he is very quick at reasoning! And why doesn't this child learn how to read? His memory fails and he does not relate. Some words he does relate, others he does not. This is what bothers me. His problem is emotional. It is a family problem. His mother is always after him; not because she cares about the child, but to avoid problems with her husband. She is young. She gives the impression that she has other interests besides her son.

Pupil 27 registered perfect attendance for the first quarter of the year, but began to be absent during the end of May - three times. Through May his teacher had been absent thirteen school days. This means that the teacher's absenteeism preceded the pupil's. On the other hand, the efforts of Teacher B must have kept pupil 27's attendance rate relatively high - 74 percent.

Teacher B pointed to another enigma:

Pupil 24 is a close friend of pupil 27. And what pupil 27 does, pupil 24 does, too. The mothers attempted to separate them but they did not succeed. They had been friends since 1980, before I started at this school. For some reason they have always been in the same class.

I was able to check on this information and confirmed it. The two children entered school in 1982 and were classmates until 1984. Pupil 27 failed in 1984 and was transferred to another school. Pupil 24 left the school during 1982; in 1983 he attended the school; in 1984 he left before December but returned and was promoted in 1985.

The teacher continued:

So, if one does not come to school, neither does the other. See, they plan it. "Today we are not going to class", and neither one goes. Now

pupil 24 learns more than pupil 27. Maybe he does not have as much creativity as pupil 27. But pupil 24 can remember letters, is able to perform a dictation, he puts effort into performing his schoolwork. Pupil 27 cannot. He starts. His work is always half-finished. But they are both in the same boat. Only one is more active and the other lazier.

The energy of Teacher B was not enough to keep these pupils working steadily towards the objective of becoming literate.

Pupil 21, a boy, is one of the children with whom Teacher B developed a steady we-relationship.

Pupil 21 I met when I arrived at school in 1981. He attended my class for a few days and after that he went to another, I do not remember why. Last year I found pupil 21 in another teacher's class.

This year I found him on my class roll and I talked with his previous teacher about his performance. She told me: "He is a lovely boy but learned nothing"; but now he is my best student, the most responsible. He is a little man, he works, he has his own money, he realizes the value of his money...He earns money, he shows me; he puts it in his socks and walks with it inside his socks.

Ten other pupils not discussed above approximated the consociate pole of the continuum illustrated by pupil 21; pupil 26, who left the school earlier, will be discussed below. Pupils 26, 30, 27 and 24, in that order, are cases which show a transition from the contemporary towards the consociate pole of the continuum.

Class C

Teacher C, compared with Teachers A and B, had not had much experience teaching first grade, only two years. But she had taught the third and fourth grades as well as kindergarten. In contrast to A and B, she had a class of normal size - twenty-seven pupils. They were not considered

"slow learners" like Teacher A and B's students. She and Teacher B were both taking undergraduate degrees in education but unlike Teacher B, Teacher C taught nearly every day, being absent only thirteen days (7 percent of the school year).

In general, she said much less about her children's school life than the other three teachers. In this class one can observe in a very explicit way what Sharp and Green (1975: 120) refer to as the anonymization process. I will examine six cases of nonpromotion and one of a pupil who left the school.

Teacher C described pupil 45, a girl who was not promoted, as follows:

See! She has never participated in class. Always being aggressive with her classmates, giving orders. Her mother hardly comes to school, but I have the impression that the girl is the leader at home. She controls everything. When she arrives here at class involved in everything but learning.

Pupils 43 and 58, two girls, were described more succinctly:

This one (pupil 43) from the beginning, has never kept up with the work...even during the readiness period...even the cutting and pasting. Nothing...

This one (pupil 58) cheats, she copies everything from the other classmates. She does not read or write. She repeats everything the others tell her.

Turning to the two boys who were nonpromoted, Teacher C stated:

Pupil 44 has a very serious diction problem. I think it comes from home. Auditory and visual memory were lacking with him.

Pupil 51 never kept up with the class.

As was shown in the preceding chapter, these pupils remained in her class, but received less of the teacher's attention when compared with other children.

Pupil 56 came to Teacher C's class without being on her class roll, but she accepted him as a member of the class.

He left at the end of the first semester. The teacher said this about him: "Dropped out." Asked to describe his performance in class, she answered: "Extremely bad from the very beginning, at everything: discipline, learning, everything. He was being brought up by his stepmother."

On the other hand, about pupil 32, an adopted girl, Teacher C said: "Excellent from the beginning." About pupil 35: "She has been a very good pupil from the beginning. I think that pupil 35 was never absent from class. A cute girl!" About pupil 36: "A good pupil from the beginning. He reads and writes." Of pupil 48, also a boy: "Excellent...from the beginning!" Class observations showed that she dedicated a period of time every day to listening to these pupils read. Pupils 33, 38 and 39 received special attention but Teacher C stopped listening to those she regarded as making little progress.

By the beginning of October the status of only one pupil, pupil 38, was ambiguous in so far as promotion was concerned.

Pupil 38 works. He sells newspapers. He has been very slow, from the beginning. He reads but writes with difficulty. It is tiredness. He comes here tired. But even so he does everything I ask him to do. Then, I wanted to see if I could help him a little more so he would not fail. I cannot let him repeat the first grade.

Though she had developed an intimate relationship with this boy, and was willing to dedicate special time to help him learn, she did not succeed.

Class D

Teacher D's class was composed of new pupils and repeaters. She had a lot to say about each pupil. She had been absent from class more often than Teacher B. However, she had not shown awareness of how much her absences influenced her pupils. Teacher D was absent from class 44

177

percent of the school days. Let us examine how the three girls who failed were portrayed by their teacher.

Pupil 74 (a new pupil in the first grade) started off relatively well. Her parents also did not live together and she lives with her father. Her mother visited her two or three times. She asked to see the girl and she wanted to see the girl and I let her. Sometimes she brought school supplies to the girl.

Since the beginning of the year her father has been unemployed. So when the children eat I give her two or three portions. She was away from school for about fifty days. I thought that she had dropped out. Her father's explanation was that he had to sell his house here in order to buy food, because he could not get a job. Now he lives in someone's house. And the girl returned to school. Her father is still unemployed.

In regard to pupil 71 Teacher D said:

Pupil 71 (sister of pupil 66) has a very serious problem in relation to her father...When I speak about fathers she is the first to yell: "I don't have a father, my father abandoned me, my mother said that I do not have a father, I come only from her." I say: "No, you were born from both of their love, even though he has gone; he has problems with your mother, but loves you." Pupil 71: "He doesn't because he does not visit me, he doesn't, because he never comes to see me." This is the type of thing that the mother has put in the child's head.

She is often absent because her mother makes this child take care of the other siblings so that they can come to class. So today when I gave out the report cards, I told her mother that she should not be unfair to her daughter, treating her this way.

In relation to pupil 70 Teacher D pointed out:

Pupil 70 is pupil 61's sister. I'll tell you the same thing as I told you about her brother. I don't know the parents, the parents are not interested in these children's learning. This is a very weak pupil, very weak! This girl needs individual attention. She inverts letters. She does not form syllables, see? Very inattentive, mostly because she's not understanding anything in

the classroom. I have the impression that she is very weak, a very weak child physically. I don't know if she is undernourished or if she was sick when she was younger. She's hungry. She always asks for seconds, always.

These three girls approached anonymization. Teacher D recognized the need for individual attention in the case of pupil 70, but she did not offer it to the girl, at least to the extent she did to other pupils. Teacher D blames truancy for the failure of pupil 71, the absences being the family's fault. In fact, this girl attended 82 percent of the classes and her attendance became worse after the teacher's conversation with her mother. Pupil 74, by comparison, was absent 45 percent of the school year. In none of the three cases, however, was anything effective done as Teacher A did with pupils 10 and 13.

One girl, pupil 83, was transferred by Teacher D to kindergarten during the second quarter of the year. Teacher D felt that this girl had not adapted to the class because of her age and she was referred to the counselling service for further evaluation:

I even have pupils who are fourteen years old. So she couldn't keep up with the class because she had not even attended kindergarten and did not even know how to hold a pencil well, so she could not keep up with the class at all. The counselling service verified that she was too immature for first grade. So they placed her in kindergarten, and now she is doing well in kindergarten.

Two boys received special attention from the teacher on each school day that was observed. One could say that the teacher developed a we-relationship with them. The boys were pupil 62, who had taken kindergarten three times and had previously been enrolled in the first grade but not completed it, and pupil 72, a new student in first grade who had not taken kindergarten.

Pupil 62 received the most attention from Teacher D. He sat in the first row, and she worked intensively with this

boy, not only teaching him to read and write but improving his relationship with his classmates:

A pupil who is much too dependent on his mother and, as a consequence, on his teacher too. Very easily upset, very emotional. He cried in the classroom. He used to cry about everything. So I thought I would refer him to the counselling service. His mother even asked me to do it because she thought that he needed psychological help. But I wanted to see if we could solve the problem, just teacher and mother. And I encouraged her to give him some space, just a little. Not let him be so dependent on her. Doing homework, for instance, he only used to do it when she was with him. She chose the clothes he put on after his bath. I said: "Give him some space, a little bit, slowly."

Well, today I think he is proud that he does not cry any more, and he has a very good relationship with his classmates. I think he is going to be promoted because he is getting good grades. I cannot say for sure, can I? He does not have that fear of everything he used to, nor is he so dependent on his mother and teacher. He does his work alone in class and at home. So I think that he is doing very well.

About pupil 72, the teacher noted:

He is an excessively slow child, with prehension problems. I referred this boy to a psychologist at the counselling service for evaluation. Then the psychologist referred him to the remedial-education teacher who told me that she did not work with this problem. So I worked with him.

Teacher D described the exercises she did with pupil 72 and those recommended by her to his mother, who cooperated with her.

And today, if I don't pay attention to it, he still uses his left hand to support his right when he writes...But one cannot perform a miracle in this case. He has a very fragile hand, the hand of a very fragile child, see?

This child received enough of the teacher's attention during the year to pass the literacy tests given in December.

One notices a deep concern for the pupils' education in

these two last cases. She took for granted that these boys needed attention in order to succeed. The fact that five children left the school and one shifted to an afternoon class, as well as the failure of the three girls reported, had to do with the teacher's absences. Frequent absences suggested to parents that identification with the pupils and concern for their success was lacking.

Fluidity within and between the Layers

Fluidity is the second dimension of classroom interaction to be examined. Teachers were asked to evaluate their students at the beginning of the school year, (conditions for literacy), in March, and again at the end of the year, in October (progress in literacy). Three or four ranks, or layers, were identified by teachers for the former, and up to six ranks, or layers, for the latter. For each student one can derive a measure of change over the year. Fluidity within layers denotes a stability in rank; fluidity upwards denotes a student whose October evaluation was higher than that of March; fluidity downwards denotes the reverse. Pupils were also asked their own opinions about whether they could read and whether they thought they would be promoted, and their assessments of their classmates. The data which describes this fluidity within and between layers, and pupils' opinions, is presented in Tables 27 and 28; these tables are based on the comprehensive tables 52 to 55 in the Appendix. Again, we present the patterns for each class.

Class A

Teacher A identified six students with "good" conditions, nine with "weak," and one with "very weak" conditions for progress in March.

TABLE 27
NUMBER OF PUPILS IN EACH OF OUR FIRST-GRADE CLASSES AS TO CONDITIONS AND DEGREE
OF PROGRESS IN LITERACY
MARCH AND OCTOBER, 1984

	Class A	Class B	Class C	Class D
Teacher's evaluation				
Conditions for literacy (March)				
Very good	-	-	5	-
Good	6	4	5	15
Weak	9	5	5	6
Very weak	1	6	12	4
Percentage of pupils classified as having very weak conditions for literacy	6	40	44	16
Total	16	15	27	25
Degree of progress in literacy (October)				
Very high	-	-	4	-
High	8	6	12	5
Medium	6	6	3	8
Low	1	1	-	3
Very low	-	-	-	1
None	-	-	5	-
Percentage of pupils classified as having low or very low progress literacy	7	8	21	24
Total *	15	13	24	17

Sources: Tables 52 to 55, in Appendix.

- * The total excludes those pupils (14) attending only the first three periods of the school year (see footnotes to Table 28). From a total of 83 in March, 69 were registered in October.

TABLE 24
FLUIDITY IN THE SOCIAL STRATIFICATION SYSTEM IN EACH OF FOUR FIRST-GRADE CLASSES
MARCH AND OCTOBER 1984 *

		Class A		Class B		Class C		Class D	
		Pupil's Identification	Total	Pupil's Identification	Total	Pupil's Identification	Total	Pupil's Identification	Total
Teacher's evaluation (March and October)									
Fluidity within layers									
Conditions for	Degree of								
<u>Literacy</u>	<u>progress</u>								
Very good	Very high		-		- 34, 10, 55		3		-
Good	High	2, 3, 9, 12, 15	5 21, 29		1 35, 36, 4, 47		4	59, 60, 65, 75, 80	5
Weak	Medium	1, 5, 7, 8, 14, 16	6 25, 31		2 39(MP), 41		2	62, 63, 64	3
Very weak	Low	10(MP)	1		-		-	70(MP)	1
	Total		12		4		9		9
	Percentage		81		31		38		53
Fluidity between layers									
Fluidity upwards									
Conditions for	Degree of								
<u>Literacy</u>	<u>progress</u>								
Weak	High(1)	4, 6, 13	3 17, 28		2 37, 40, 50		3		-
Very weak	Medium(1)		18 22, 23		3 33		1	72	1
Very weak	High(2)		19, 20		2 39, 42, 49		3		-
Very weak	Very high(3)		-		- 47		1		-
	Total		3		7		8		1
	Percentage		20		54		33		6
Fluidity downwards									
Conditions for	Degree of								
<u>Literacy</u>	<u>progress</u>								
Very good	High(1)		-		- 32, 46		2		-
Good	Medium(1)		- 24(LS)		1		-	61, 66, 68(LS), 69(LS)	4
Good	Low(2)		- 27(MP)		1		-	73, 74(MP)	2
Very weak	Very low(1)		-		-		-	71(MP)	1
Very weak	None(2)		-		-		-		-
	Total		-		2	43(MP), 44(MP), 45(MP), 51(MP), 53(MP)	5		-
	Percentage		0		15		29		7
									41

Sources: Tables 52 to 55, in Appendix.

- * Meaning of the codes: LS - left school, MP - nonpromoted. The number, 1, 2, 3 in parentheses, indicate the levels which a pupil moved upwards or downwards in the teacher's evaluation from March to October.
- ** Excluding Pupil 11, transferred to another school before October 16.
- *** Excluding Pupils 26 and 30 who left the school before October 16.
- + Excluding Pupils 52 and 53, transferred, and Pupil 56 who left the school on or before October 16.
- ** Excluding the pupils transferred - 76, 77, 78, 79, and 83, and those who left the school - 67, 81, and 82, before October 16.

When asked about how her class performed as a group over the course of the year, teacher A observed:

The whole class changed for the better. Everything! It really changed for the better. Behaviour, relationships among the students, learning itself. The class made progress.

All but one pupil (pupil 10) became literate by the end of the school year. All pupils who were considered "good" in March, except for one who transferred to another school, made good progress. Pupils who were "weak" at the beginning of the school year could read and write well by the end of the school year (December), making medium progress (six out of nine cases). Pupil 10, who in March had not demonstrated much progress was by October considered able to be promoted to the next grade with the stipulation that the student do extra work during the summer vacation. Pupil 7, who enrolled only in September was also promoted.

What is noticeable is that three children - pupils 4, 6 and 13 - considered weak in March, showed outstanding progress by October. Pupil 4 had difficulty in enunciating sounds. But pupil 13 demonstrated "fabulous growth." The three are cases of upward fluidity between layers of academic stratification defined by the teacher.

Almost all pupils felt that they could read by the end of the year. Only one girl who demonstrated medium progress who was attending the first grade for the fifth time in 1984 (pupil 8), and pupil 10 answered "a little" to this question. These pupils' self-assurance, a problematic aspect in their school lives for three to five years, was outstanding. Only two of the pupils felt that they would not be promoted: pupil 10 and pupil 16, a boy with a poor attendance record, who in fact was promoted. Two others answered "don't know" to this question. All others felt that they would be promoted. Those five pupils who did not answer "yes" to these two questions (if they could read or would be promoted) were classified as

having weak or very weak conditions for literacy in March. The fact that only one was nonpromoted again shows that no reification occurred as to the learning capacity of these children; the teacher worked with the pupil to improve his/her initial "weak" conditions.

In the view of the pupils, the strongest candidates for failure were pupils 7, 8, 10 and 16; pupil 10 was identified by twelve of his classmates as not being able to read well. In fact, only pupil 10 failed. Pupil 7 came to Class A only in September, and pupils 3 and 16 had a poor attendance record (72 and 74 percent). This shows the immediacy of the pupils' evaluation of their peers - not capturing the teachers' expectation about their classmates, but rather grasping the daily accomplishments of their peers, mainly the teacher's assertion about the importance of class attendance in being able to read.

Class B

Teacher B identified the same three levels indicated by Teacher A as to the pupils' prognosis for success - good, weak and very weak conditions for literacy. The frequencies in this case were four, five and six, respectively. Teacher B felt that her pupils were weaker than her colleagues'. Nevertheless, when asked about the performance of her class, Teacher B felt that all her pupils had improved:

And how they improved, my God! To me, their improvement was a hundred percent. And you see **how** they recognize that they have improved: X (pupil 21) told me: "Thank God, I finally passed."

Teacher B pointed to the moment pupil 27 began to understand the importance of schoolwork:

Now, now, now, I see pupil 27's progress. During the school year I did not see any, not anything at all. In December he came and told me: "Gee, Mrs. B, I wasted the whole year, I did not study the whole year." That was the moment he

became conscious of what he had done. He perceived that he had wasted the whole year and from that moment on he changed. He does not miss one day of the review classes. He comes, he wants to learn, he is interested in everything, he acts in a completely different way than he did during the year, when he was not conscious of the value of studying.

Excluding pupils 26 and 30, who left the school before the fourth marking period of the school year, there was fluidity within the layers defined by the teacher in March and October. What is most striking about Class B (Table 28) is the substantial numbers with fluidity upward during the year. Pupils 17, 18, 22, 23 and 28, who had weak or very weak conditions in March, improved as did pupils 19 and 20. Teacher B described pupils 23's improvement in her class as follows:

I observed her during the first week, the second...I actually saw that she was so: reserved, did not participate, talk, or play, see? She...she was this way. Sad, very sad, skinny and discouraged. Even her writing was insecure. Then, I asked if pupil 23 had been evaluated (by the psychology service). She had not and I referred her...and I went to find out the results. The psychologist called to give me pupil 23's results: she was actually a five-year-old mentally...and she should be attending a special-education class. But in my room, she had already made some progress, hadn't she? She had...progressed a little bit in relation to what she had done the previous year. So pupil 23 would stay in my class. And you see...I think that...pupil 23...pupil 23 was the main surprise; she was the biggest surprise I had this year.

Pupils 24 and 27, in contrast, slipped during the school year. Both began the school year with good prospects for literacy and slipped to a medium and a low level, respectively.

I thought that pupil 24 and pupil 27 would become literate, without a doubt. It was a great surprise for me when I saw that they could not keep up with the class.

They improve along with their good humor and creativity...they talked a lot, and good vocabulary, played, but nothing happened.

I felt that pupils 22 and 23 were so lively, and still are today, but all this energy has not been channelled into schoolwork. See Class A: that potential they have, not directed to become literate but to playing, to games, football, fishing...everything except studying. That is the whole problem.

Pupil 22, the only one who was not promoted among those who attended school the entire year, was evaluated by the teacher in December as having improved - changing his attitude towards schoolwork. He was transferred and his subsequent progress in school is unknown, but Teacher B asserted that pupil 22 knew all simple syllables, and that in the coming year he would certainly improve. In addition to him the only ones who stayed in the first grade were those "who dropped out of school." Thus, pupil 26, who left in May, and pupils 30 and 24, leaving respectively in August and November, represented actual losses from Teacher B's point of view.

Nevertheless, pupil 24 became literate during the following year. Pupil 30 left the school for good. Pupil 26, though enrolled until 1987, continued to fail. These pupils attended the first grade for the fifth and fourth time, respectively, in 1984.

Eleven pupils said that they could read, with two answering "a little" when asked about it. This, in fact, shows the development of self-assurance even in the cases of pupil 24, who left school and of pupil 27, who was retained in first grade. However, asked whether they would be promoted in December, seven pupils answered "don't know." The answers were distributed among pupils of high, medium and low standing according to the teacher's evaluation of their work. This shows less certainty of success compared with Class A. Students' views of their classmates were more pessimistic: only six pupils out of thirteen were considered (by at least

three classmates) to be candidate for promotion, or eleven out of fifteen in class A. The seven candidate picked by classmates for failure in class B included 18 pupils who answered "don't know" about their own possibility of being promoted. In class B there was nearly a consensus between the pupil and his/her classmates about who could be and who could not be promoted. However, only one child (pupil 1) failed.

Four candidates for failure did not attend classes regularly - pupils 21, 23, 24 and 25. The pupils were conscious of the importance of attending classes. The other three whose failure was predicted attended school approximately 90 percent of the academic year - pupils 13, 15 and 28. The observations during the first semester suggest that the classmates evaluated those pupils according to their participation in class activities or misbehaviour.

In conclusion, the pupils in Class A had higher expectations of becoming literate by December than those in Class B. In both classes, and to a greater extent in Class B, there was less fluidity in pupils' performance from the pupils' point of view than that of their respective teachers. In the students' evaluations what counted were class attendance, participation in class activities, specially for Class A, and grades on dictations combined with good manners.

Class C

Teacher C classified her pupils as very good, good, weak and very weak prospects for becoming literate. The frequencies are respectively five, five, five, and twelve. When asked about the progress her class had made by September, Teacher C said.

Pupils 31, 43, 58, 44 and 45 (three girls and two boys) will not pass. They are going into the first grade (the following year). It is useless with them.

Now, I hesitate to say, about pupil 41 and pupil 42. Now they are average. With the review classes they will be promoted, won't they?

Asked about two who were no longer attending class, pupil 43 transferred to another school in October and pupil 44 who left school in July, Teacher C stated: "These two do not have any chance...of coming back any more."

In June, the teacher made an effort to reach the pupils not keeping up with the class, giving lessons which presented the syllabic patterns previously studied - the vowels and the consonants v, d, l, m, and c. She worked for seven consecutive school days repeating these patterns with the whole class. According to her, three pupils benefitted from these activities: "I went all the way back and taught it again, and pupils 39, 42 and 49 improved." These activities, however, were not sufficient to revert the situation of the five pupils considered to be very weak. She did not make efforts to reach these children in the way Teacher A did (with pupils 7, 10 and 13).

Summing up, nine pupils attained progress corresponding to the conditions "seen" by the teacher in March. In eight cases the pupils attained a higher level than that attributed in March, with pupil 47 making remarkable progress from the lowest position in March to highest position in December. In two cases pupils slipped one level from the teacher's initial categorization; and five children were reified as non-learners. This shows both the possibility of the teacher as a reality-definer and also the fact that some pupils managed to progress, without having the teacher's initial assessment serve as an impediment.

Five students who eventually failed in Class C had answered "yes" or "a little" about their ability to read. Four who said they read "a little" in fact failed. Only one of the whole class (promoted) predicted she would fail the year. Four of the five children who Teacher C expected to

He answered "don't know" about the possibility of being promoted. This was mere zoning thinking, since it was September. Teacher C stopped listening to their individual reading in a hurry. She concentrated her efforts on the three about whom she was undecided. Two of the "lost cases," answering "don't know," however, kept their hopes up that they would pass "if they made an effort at it" (pupils 45 and 30). Of the twenty-four pupils in Class C, fifteen were indicated as promotable by at least three peers. The five children who did not receive the teacher's attention were the most visible candidates for retention in first grade.

Others very frequently cited as not being able to read well were pupils 33 and 38, whose progress teacher C had difficulty predicting, and pupil 42. Here we must first understand why pupils with good progress in literacy in October were evaluated by their peers as candidates for failure. Pupils 33, 37, 42 and 49 had made good progress, coming from a "very weak" or "weak" position in March. Only pupils 42 and 49 had had their "very weak" position raised to "good" during the review lessons in June. This demonstrates the importance of early success in being well-considered by classmates. Improvements along the way were disregarded and the first impression maintained. Classmates noticed the early definition of each pupil's possibilities by the teacher, without observing any change for the better indicated by the teacher at a later date. Why should that be?

In Class C, attendance was outstanding, with the exception of the three pupils who transferred or left the school. It seems that the maintenance of the teacher's first evaluation as indicating the degree of progress in literacy was possible via only one main aspect of the teacher's practice: through the results obtained in the frequent grading of dictations. The results were available to the whole class. This might explain why classmates did not notice

the improvement indicated by the teacher, and why the pupils were misled in their evaluations of their peers' progress.

Turning to factors which most likely influenced Teacher C's evaluation of a pupil's conditions for literacy, one important factor was whether the child had initiated any progress during the previous year. Of the seven children who had been given kindergarten curriculum in Grade One the previous year, five were considered as having "very weak" conditions for literacy in 1984. But pupils 55 and 36 were considered to have "good" prospects; this might have been due to extra help they received at home from mother or siblings.

The consequences of being labelled as weak were more clear-cut in this class than in Class B or in Class D. In the second semester Teacher C was actually fostering negative outcomes and the times I went to her class for interviews, neglected pupils asked me to listen to their efforts at reading. Pupil 43's mother, who was twenty-seven years old and had another child in the fifth grade, was aware of the neglect experienced by her daughter, a white girl in fair health, attending first grade for the second time. When asked what changes she would like to see at the school, she answered:

I would like her to receive more attention. She is despised in class. She is already dumb...I would like her to sit in the first row. The teacher pays more attention to the children sitting in the first row. She doesn't receive attention in class. She has been abandoned.

Class D

Teacher D identified three levels in her class as to the pupils' conditions for literacy, as did Teachers A and B: good, weak and very weak. The frequencies were fifteen, six, and four respectively.

Teacher D considered as losses the three repeaters,

pupils '0, '1 and '4, analyzed in the last section as being close to anonymization - but she asserted that the following year these girls should not be put in a special-education class. This would be a big mistake. In the last two cases, the pupils' absences from class were the main reason for failure, and in all cases retention in the first grade was "the family's fault." Teacher D had decided to offer them extra individual work at home or school, but she limited herself to demanding full attendance at class from pupils and from those parents who came to school to pick up report cards at the end of the third marking period.

Teacher D did not seem to consider herself accountable for, or consider as losses the pupils who left the school without officially notifying her of the reason why they had left. Pupils 67, 68 and 69, three of the oldest children, who were classified as having good prospects and demonstrated progress, left the school.

Pupil 67 (a thirteen-year-old boy) was that one apprehended by FEBEM (State Foundation for the Welfare of Children), that one who you even visited at home.

He never came back to school. He did come to the schoolyard once. He came to the classroom door looking dressed and groomed, and when I welcomed him he said: "But I am not going in." I let him go. The children tell me that he runs around the slum with a bunch of kids.

Pupil 68, a fourteen-year old working child, had not left the school yet when I interviewed both teacher and pupil. He left on November 1st when the teacher intended to be working on the review of syllabic patterns. Teacher D said in the interview:

Today (October 25), I handed out report cards and warned him that he cannot miss any more classes, because then he is not going to be able to keep up.

Two weeks after this warning, Teacher D would be finished her university coursework, and intended to review material and offer extra help to those students evidencing lower

achievement. At this point pupil 63 left school, not returning in 1984.

In attempting to understand pupil 63's departure and looking at the teacher's diary, one notices that: (a) the teacher presented twenty new syllabic patterns to the whole class during the seven days pupil 63 attended class after his teachers' warning; (b) these twenty syllabic patterns were learned by only those attending classes regularly; (c) comparing himself with his classmates who were doing relatively well, pupil 63 sensed he was not keeping up. Discouraged, he left. The teacher, intending to finish the lesson topics quickly so as to initiate the review period, did not offer encouragement to him. In fact, he had been in class only eighteen days during the second semester and was overwhelmed.

Pupil 69 left on October 23. She missed classes during the month Teacher D was student teaching in order to complete her undergraduate degree.

Pupil 69 is a twelve-year-old girl who...I found out from her mother, when handing out the report cards for the second marking period, that she was a girl who had been expelled from another school for misbehaviour.

I told her mother that she behaves well in my class, that she learns very well, has beautiful penmanship, a well-kept notebook and she always comes to class. I don't know what is happening now with her because the whole week she gets on the bus here in front of the school and then goes downtown.

One of her classmates told me that she goes downtown to beg mainly for bread. But she or her mother do not appear to be so miserable! I think that there must be another problem. This is a case for a social worker, isn't it? It would be a case for a social worker.

In addition to five pupils who left without offering a formal explanation to the school, three others - two girls and one boy - transferred to other schools. At no time did

Teacher D relate her own absence of concern about dropping children out of her class during the same period or after (Pupils 1, 2, 3, 4, 11 and 12 who left the 12 pupils, 13 and 18 who transferred to another school; and pupil 19 who changed class and unit within the same school). At no time does one see the teacher's effort in getting the pupils back to class as in the cases of pupils 1 and 11 (taught by Teacher A). One is led to conclude that if the dropouts were not welcomed by Teacher D, at least they were not considered problematic. Moreover, the occurrence of transfers, and of other cases of leaving school was independent of the teacher's evaluation of their readiness for literacy in April.

Of fifteen pupils with good prospects for literacy, six were not attending class when the school year ended, four slipped downwards and five remained at the level assigned in March. Just one boy - pupil 72 - went up one level. Pupil 72 had "very weak" prospects for literacy, but Teacher D assisted him and he was eventually promoted. The other two labelled "very weak" ended the school year without making significant progress. The teacher did not offer extra work in the afternoons to these or other weak prospects as she had planned to do when interviewed in October. In pupil 72's case, there was cooperation of mother and teacher in his progress.

Twelve of the seventeen pupils interviewed felt that they could read. The five who answered "a little" evaluated themselves realistically; three were those retained in the first grade in December, one left the school and one slipped downwards in Teacher D's and his own evaluation. Two of the students who were not promoted did not think they would succeed.

What deserves mention in this class in comparison to the others is the realistic appraisal of their progress made by the children. This reveals the visibility of the evaluation

... and ... to the pupils ... shared knowledge between teacher and pupils about teacher performance did not, however, change the teacher's practice towards the pupils which might have changed the outcome.

From pupils' point of view, twelve of the seventeen pupils interviewed were strong candidates for failure. Only five of the fifteen who remained at school the entire year, were clearly seen as likely to be promoted by at least three of their classmates. Thus, the stratification of achievement was much less fluid from the pupils' point of view than the teacher's. Only outstanding pupils were viewed by the whole class as promotable. The clues most visible to pupils about how well a peer was doing in class were his/her absences and the teacher's grading, mainly on dictations. The normative expectation was failure.

In summary, Class A was the only one in which pupils moved only upwards. In Classes B, C, and D, movement upwards gradually decreased with only one case in Class D.

Teachers C and D, on the other hand, attained the highest rates of movement downwards (29 and 41 percent). Teacher D's likely had to do with her absences from class. Her main interest was outside the class, outside first grade in general. She was concerned with finishing her undergraduate degree.

It is significant that pupils were always more pessimistic in their evaluation of their peers' chances for promotion than were the teachers. Lack of consistent class attendance, misbehaviour, lack of attention from the teacher, and need for extra daily help were decisive factors in classmates' definitions of promotable pupils. Classes A and C had proportionally more pupils cited as being able to succeed (percentages being 80% and 71%, respectively) compared to Classes B and D (with 46 and 41 percent). Teacher B developed a "hidden pedagogy," which meant marking notebooks

in the case of
third time. The first time a pupil was evaluated by the teacher
and then the second time. The third time was the final
daily assessment. The teacher was expected to refer pupils to
classes to meet / 100.

The expectation of the teacher was that the teacher would
of the teacher's attention, to the teacher's attention, to the
class and to the teacher's attention, to the teacher's attention,
taught. This attitude was evident in the teacher's attitude
all pupils in class A. The teacher's attitude was that the
attendance was at times the teacher's attention, to the teacher's
come and they were assigned a pupil to the teacher's attention,
to teach them, or even when the teacher's attention, to the teacher's
left to themselves without the teacher's attention, to the teacher's
they were entitled.

Was there an influence of the teacher's attitude on
on future status attribution by classmates? When there were
occurrences provoked changes in the pupil's status as
evaluated by their peers.

Systematic examination was based on the following
conditions for literacy evaluated in March 1971: (a) teacher
number of times a pupil was evaluated by the teacher, (b) teacher
reading or spelling well in October 1971 (Appendix 1, Table 1);
Appendix); attendance (Tables 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100); descriptions of pupils by teacher; and (c) location of the
classroom.

The main factors influencing peer status attribution of a pupil
and indicating low performance were: (a) low class attendance;
class attendance; (b) misbehaviour; (c) lack of attention to the
the teacher; and (d) need for extra help.

First, considering class attendance, the pupil attended
classes less frequently than their classmates and this was
taken as an indicator of low progress in literacy by peers.
Pupil 7 began attending class A only in September, 1971, after

transferred from another class, and was receiving extra help in the mornings along with pupil 10. The whole class welcomed him and encouraged his success. Pupil 8 registered the lowest attendance in the class, being absent during the rainy winter days, not having another dry set of clothes to change into. Pupils 22 and 24 in Class B had lower rates of attendance, as well as pupil 68 in Class D.

Pupil 68 had been evaluated as having good conditions for literacy at the beginning of the school year; he demonstrated medium status in literacy by August when evaluated by Teacher D, and low status in his peers' evaluation. He left Class D in November. One begins to understand his lack of progress in school and his poor attendance during the second semester after hearing his explanation. As he himself puts it, the broader societal context foiled his plan:

I decided to come to school to learn how to read, and after that go to work at a store...doing any kind of work. One customer told me that studying is good, it should come before work. Mother also said that studying is good. At home father is the only one who knows how to read. My customer works in X (an important organization). One week after he spoke to me, I came to school looking for an opening...but there was only going to be space for me at the beginning of the next school year.

I was absent from school (in 1984) because my father was unemployed. I had to earn some money working (as a shoeshine boy). Now my father got a job and a married sister is also working, so I can come back.

The teacher could not keep the boy in school the entire year as the economic recession was imposing on the pupil the role of a breadwinner, but she was not even able to encourage him to stay when unemployment in his family was no longer a problem.

Thus, the children were aware of the importance of class attendance and of learning outcomes resulting from their

TABLE 30
 RANGE OF SOCIAL STRATIFICATION IN LITERACY AS MEASURED BY THE READING AND SPELLING
 TESTS IN EACH OF FOUR FIRST-GRADE CLASSES
 DECEMBER, 1984

	Class A	Class B	Class C	Class D
Reading Test				
Highest score	99	97	99	100
Lowest score	79	73	56	60
Scores: 90 percent or above				
Total	10	8	13	10
Percentage	67	62	54	59
Spelling Test				
Highest score	76	72	80	78
Lowest score	0	10	0	0
Scores: 50 percent or above				
Total	8	6	9	6
Percentage	53	46	38	35
Scores: 10 percent or below				
Total	1	2	5	3
Percentage	7	15	21	18
T o t a l *	15	12	24	15

Sources: Tables 48 to 51, in Appendix.

* The total of pupils who took both tests was 66.

absences.

Second, the pupil's daily behaviour in class was sometimes associated with lack of progress in literacy. Such badly-behaved pupils as 6 and 13 from Class A and 28 from Class B were evaluated by some of their peers as reading well and by others as not, though on dictations they were considered as good spellers in a large number; it is highly probable that some peers might have confused the teacher's correction of such conduct with indication of low performance in literacy rather than indication of discipline problems.

There were nine pupils who received a higher status from the classmates' ranking than the teacher's evaluation in October. All but one had weak or very weak conditions for literacy in March as evaluated by the teachers, but had good attendance records (86 to 100 percent) and adequate conduct. In the three cases in Class A and one in Class C - pupil 35, "the cute girl who never missed a class" - the warm relationship between pupil and teacher led classmates to overestimate the cognitive potential of the students.

Range of Academic Stratification

In this section attention is drawn to the congruence between the range of academic stratification from the teacher's perspective, and the range of marks attained by the class on the reading and spelling tests. Table 30 presents the students' test scores in reading and writing. In reading, the highest scores in the four classes were 97 percent to 100, and the lowest, 56 to 79, meaning that even those retained in the first grade still scored above 50 percent. These results also show that pupil 10 in Class A, the boy with learning problems, scored well in reading, close to pupil 8, who was promoted. This serves to indicate Teacher A's competence in and dedication to teaching. Pupil 44 in Class C (Table 50 in

Appendix) received the lowest score of all the children who remained in school the whole year. The other pupils in Classes B, C and D who were not promoted scored from 60 to 82, meaning that all pupils were somehow learning how to read.

Considering those attaining 90 percent or above on the reading test and 50 percent or above on the spelling test, Class A attained the highest proportion of high scores (Table 30). On the reading test the order of classes was A, B, D, C and on the spelling test A, B, C, D. Conversely Class C had the greatest concentration of low scores, five pupils, followed by Class D with three pupils, Class B with two children and Class A with one. These results, objective measures of students' achievement, may well also be owed in some part to the differential inputs of the respective teachers, with A's pupils doing best.

The mean reading scores, however, may be too high to be discriminating and, thus, can not be easily correlated with the teacher's predictions of students' success. The results of the spelling test given in the end of November were highly consistent with the teacher's evaluations of students' progress in October, though there were some exceptions. The levels on the spelling test were: high, including scores 50 percent or above; average, from 11 to 49 percent; and low, 10 percent or lower. In Class A, one pupil (8) evaluated as making average progress in October attained a high score on the spelling test in December; the opposite occurred with another (pupil 9). In Class B two children had better results on the spelling test (pupils 23 and 25) and two worse (pupils 19 and 29) than their teachers predicted. In Class C seven pupils classified as good in October attained only an average score on the spelling test (pupils 35, 40, 42, 49, 50, 54 and 57). In Class D, pupil 61, evaluated as having made only average progress in literacy by the teacher attained a high score on the spelling test, and pupil 73, who showed little

progress attained an average score. These fifteen cases represent discrepancies between the teacher's evaluation in October and the results of the spelling test; the other fifty-one cases were consistent (Tables 48 to 55 in Appendix).

Conclusion

An examination of a hypothesized continuous series of face-to-face contacts between the "we-relationship" and the "they-relationship," when all possible cases of reification were analyzed, showed that there was the establishment of good communication between teacher and individual pupils in Class A; none of the pupils left the class during the school year. Two moved away from the area but returned, influenced by their teacher's commitment to her work. The one pupil who was retained in first grade was not reified. Thus, relationships with all pupils approximated the positive pole of the continuum. In Class B, two boys were observed as being close to anonymization, the negative pole, and two others as having some communication with the teacher. Of these four, three left the class during the year and one was retained in first grade; the teacher considered them "four losses." The other pupils were cases of we-relationships or approximated it. In Class C, I observed a process of anonymization with six children, five of whom were retained in first grade and one left school. One pupil of those developing a we-relationship with the teacher was retained in first grade. In Class D, there were six cases of attrition and three transfers to other schools. Some of these cases could very possibly have been influenced by the teacher's frequent absences (44 percent). She was not able to prevent the childrens' dropping out of school, because she herself was not committed to daily attendance. Three girls who were retained in first grade were close to anonymization and two consociates became literate as

a consequence of the teacher's special effort in teaching them.

The cases discussed in this chapter point to the importance of regular encounters between pupil and teacher as well as the teacher's confidence that her efforts in the classroom would bring success. The reading test showed that even those who were not promoted were learning how to read despite adverse circumstances. The teacher's daily presence was a main factor in pupils remaining in school during the whole year.

CHAPTER IX

EXTERNAL INFLUENCES ON THE LITERACY PROCESS AND PUPILS' SCHOOL CAREERS

This chapter moves beyond the focus on achieving literacy in 1984 alone. We will compare pupils who became literate in 1984 and remained in the school until March 1987 (representing those who succeeded), with those who were retained in the first grade in 1984 (representing those who failed). The analysis, comparing the two groups, attempts to show structural factors impinging upon the pupil's success or failure in first grade, which means attainment or non-attainment of literacy, as well as longer term success.

Outside School Factors and Attainment of Literacy

In this section, an attempt is made to infer relevant outside school factors for promotion/retention in the first grade of elementary school. To this effect, the profiles of two groups selected from the eighty-three pupils are compared: thirteen pupils who were promoted in 1984, 1985, and 1986, being enrolled in the fourth grade in 1987, (a most successful group) and eleven pupils who were retained in 1984, and, thus, who remained in school for the entire year. Of the eleven retained in 1984, only five remained in the same school during the following years. Because of the small subsamples involved, the associations described below remain suggestive.

The two groups - long term successful pupils and those who failed first-grade - were comparable as to school career before 1984. All but one of the twenty-four children were repeaters; the new pupil was retained that year. The successful children had a slightly longer stay in school previous to 1984 - three repeated first grade twice rather than once.

Some students had progress impeded because they had to contribute earnings to the family. Pupil 38 in Class C who was twelve years old in March 1984, said he was the breadwinner and did not help with housework: "I only give money to my mother, and I keep a little for myself." He worked selling newspapers, and turned over four-fifths of his earnings to his mother. Teacher C reported that a teacher saw him washing cars at night. Pupil 71, a ten-year old girl in Class D, was obliged to take care of her younger sister while her mother, the only breadwinner in the family, went to work. Both pupils were retained in the first grade, and their teachers attributed this fact to too many responsibilities at home which conflicted with schoolwork or even with class attendance (pupil 71). Pupil 17, a boy who was almost eleven years old, had well-defined male responsibilities: cutting wood for the stove, carrying water home, and cleaning the outside bathroom. Pupil 36, an eight-year-old boy, had to go to the grocery store. All other boys and girls talked about doing different types of housework such as washing, cleaning and other tasks, traditionally defined as "women's work." Most children helped out with regular chores; however, this did not interfere with school attendance.

An examination of Table 31, which continues the profiles of the two groups, reveals that promoted pupils enjoyed better health than those retained in first grade in 1984. Pupils classified as having good health were also those with good hygiene. The fair health category included students in good health but who had problems of hygiene, such as lice and tooth decay. Pupils who were promoted were either in good health or fair health. In the group of retained pupils only one was in good health; all the others were in fair or poor health. The two retained pupils with poor health were pupil 10 in Class A, who was diagnosed as being "mentally deficient: a large gap between his mental and chronological age," and pupil

2-

TABLE 31
TOTAL AND PERCENTAGE OF PUPILS PROMOTED FROM 1984 TO 1986
VERSUS PUPILS WHO FAILED IN 1984, ACCORDING
TO RELEVANT CHARACTERISTICS

	Total		Percentage	
	Promoted	Nonpromoted	Promoted	Nonpromoted
Pupil's health				
Good	6	1	46	9
Fair	7	7	54	64
Poor	-	2	-	18
NA	-	1	-	9
Parents' schooling *				
High school	1	-	7.7	-
4th to 6th grade	7	4	54	36.5
2nd to 3rd grade	3	4	23	36.5
1st grade	1	-	7.7	-
Illiterate	1	3	7.7	27
Mother's schooling				
4th to 6th grade	6	4	46	37
2nd to 3rd grade	3	3	23	27
1st grade	2	1	15	9
Illiterate	1	3	8	27
NA	1	-	8	-
Father's schooling				
High school	1	-	8	-
5th grade	3	3	23	27.3
3rd grade	3	3	23	27.3
1st grade	3	-	23	-
Illiterate	1	2	8	18.1
NA	2	3	15	27.3
Mother's occupation				
Employed	7	8	54	73
Homemaker	5	2	38	18
NA	1	1	8	9
Father's occupation				
Employed	11	8	85	73
Unemployed	-	2	-	18
Retired	1	-	7.5	-
NA	1	1	7.5	9
Income per dependent (in minimum wages)				
1.05	-	1	-	9
.26 to .50	1	5	8	45.5
.04 to .25	10	5	77	45.5
NA	2	-	15	-

TABLE 31
Continued

	Total		Percentage	
	Promoted	Nonpromoted	Promoted	Nonpromoted
Family type				
Conjugal nuclear family	9	6	69	55
Nuclear family	3	3	23	27
Non-declared parents	1	2	8	18
Stable families	9	7	69	64
Number of children				
1	1	1	8	9
2 to 3	2	6	15	55
4 to 6	7	4	54	36
7 to 9	3	-	23	-
Birth order				
1st	2	6	15	55
2nd	1	4	8	36
3rd or later	10	1	77	9
Siblings with more schooling				
5	1	-	8	-
4	2	-	15.3	-
3	3	1	23	9
2	3	-	23	-
1	-	3	-	27
0	2	6	15.3	55
NA	2	1	15.3	9
Slum dwelling				
No	4	4	31	36.5
Yes	4	4	31	36.5
NA	5	3	38	27
T o t a l	13	11	100	100

Source: Table 56, in Appendix.

* Computed according to the highest level of schooling, considering both parents.

79 in Class D, who was malnourished and infested with lice. In fact, except for these two children, the pupils' problems were due to their poor standard of living combined with inefficient medical and dental care at the school. The teachers complained about the problems, but socially-defined professional barriers blocked them from acting.

Parents' education is a relevant factor explaining promotion/retention in first grade. The fact that someone at home can read and write means that the child has a "significant other" accompanying his acquisition of the written language. This may represent not only having models at home but also the possibility of being helped when facing difficulty in reading.

Data about parents' schooling were culled from the records in the school where the child was enrolled. Parents who had only begun the first grade were classified as "illiterate" as in the interviews their children declared that they could not read. The computation of parents' schooling considered, in the first place, the highest grade level attained either by mother or father and then the grade level attained by mother and father separately.

The children who were promoted to second grade had at least one parent with more schooling than those retained in first grade: 61.7 percent of the promoted pupils and only 36.5 of those retained had parents who interrupted their education at any point between fourth and tenth grades. One also observes that the promoted pupils had fewer illiterate parents or parents who only began first grade than those who were retained. Comparing the effect of mothers' schooling separately from the fathers', one notices that the promoted pupils had mothers and fathers with slightly better schooling than those who were retained.

The importance of parents' schooling is most obvious when the teacher considers a child to be working at a slow pace.

In this situation, the mother's schooling may be more relevant to the literacy process because of the attribution of her role: taking care of children, educating them, and maintaining contact with the school. Considering the group of pupils retained in first grade, we note the cases of pupil 5, a boy raised only by his mother, and pupil 11, a girl raised by her father, who received no help at home as their parents were illiterate; pupil 51 had an illiterate mother and received "help" from his "third-grade" father who "did the homework assigned to him"; both of pupil 10's parents were illiterate, and she played school with a "second-grade" sister who gave her dictations. The last two cases did not constitute real assistance in the literacy process. On the other hand, pupil 27, 44, 45, 58 and 71, who had mothers with educational levels between the second and fifth grades were helped "sometimes" or "a little" with their homework. Only two "fifth-grade" mothers - those of pupils 10 and 41 - did not help their children, who ended up working on their homework alone.

The two groups of pupils had both had, to a large extent, stable families since birth. If one includes both conjugal nuclear families and nuclear families, the rates were as high as 92 percent for the promoted students, and 82 percent for those retained. This suggests, contrary to what might be expected, that school success in first grade is not related to family type. Only the mothers of two girls (pupils 34 and 43) had new companions. Pupil 34 was promoted and pupil 43 retained. Of the three children with parents not mentioned on their birth certificates, one living with adoptive parents - pupil 32 - was promoted, and the two living with their mothers only - pupils 38 and 71 - were retained.

An analysis of the eight families classified "unstable" in the year of 1984 (family-type code other than "1" - table 56) suggests that when the family had only one parent in charge of the offspring without any help from other adult

relatives there was retention - pupils 33, 41, and 44. On the other hand, when other adult relatives - grandparents, siblings, or mother's companion - completed the family group, promotion was the result as in the cases of pupils 33, 34 and 37. Thus, a family with both parents, or at least one more adult in addition to the "single" parent, is associated with promotion in the first grade. The only exception was pupil 43, mentioned above.

Maternal employment played a perhaps surprising role. In the group of promoted pupils more mothers were homemakers, taking care of children at home, at a rate of 38 percent versus 13 percent in the group of retained pupils. The fact that some mothers could stay home with their children implied: (a) some stable earning - either working father or sibling; (b) a larger number of children - six to nine in four cases.

As a result, monthly income was **higher** in the group of retained pupils! This higher income had to do with higher incidence of female employment and fewer children in the family. This last factor probably also indicated younger families.

One interesting factor not included in the original data but compiled from children's reports was pupil's birth order. Promotion was clearly associated with later birth order, eldest children failed most. Perhaps birth order represented the possibility or impossibility of alternative tutoring in literacy at home, which could compensate for the mother's illiteracy or employment. Younger children could get help from older siblings. Pupils 38, 43, and 58 were second in their families and had siblings living away, or in first grade at school; pupil 71, also second, stated that she was helped by her third-grade sister but had to take care of a younger sister. Pupil 70, the fourth in her family, had siblings in the first and second grades and played "school," doing dictations with her sister (above). All these pupils failed

TABLE 32
PUPILS' CAREERS IN SCHOOL IN FOUR FIRST-GRADE CLASSES FROM 1984 TO 1987

	Total							Percentage						
	Class	Class	Class	Class D			Total	Class	Class	Class	Class D			Total
	A	B	C	Repeat ers	New Pupils	Total		A	B	C	Repeat ers	New Pupils	Total	
Pupils who persisted at the school														
Promoted every school year	3	2	6	2	-	2	13	19	13	22	15	-	8	16
Nonpromoted once or twice	5	5	8	4	3	7	25	31	33	30	31	25	28	30
Total	8	7	14	6	3	9	38	50	47	52	46	25	36	46
Pupils who left the school and returned	-	3	-	1	-	1	4	-	20	-	7.8	-	4	5
Pupils who transferred to other schools	3	1	9	1	5	6	19	19	7	33	7.8	42	24	23
Pupils who left the school returned and left again	-	-	-	2	1	3	3	-	-	-	15	8	12	4
Pupils who left the school														
Without failing	4	3	2	1	2	3	12	25	20	7.5	7.8	17	12	14
After failing	1	1	2	1	1	2	6	6	7	7.5	7.8	8	8	7
Deceased pupil	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	7.8	-	4	1
T o t a l	16	15	27	13	12	25	83	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Sources: Tables 37 to 39, in Appendix.

first grade. Pupils 17, 33, 37 and 59, who were promoted, talked about being systematically helped with their homework by their sisters.

Understanding Patterns in Pupils' School Careers

This section follows-up the eighty-three pupils in this study from 1984, 1985, 1986 to 1987. The study analyzes continuance at or departure from the target school, asking if one can detect a teacher's effect during these years and the patterns of the pupils' school careers during this time period.

Persistence in School: Was There a Teacher's Effect?

Table 32 summarizes the post-1984 careers of the 83 pupils for each class.

Persistence in school was approximately 50 percent for Classes A, B, and C; this may represent greater success in Class A, since the average age was ten years old, one year more than in Classes B and C. The lowest rate of persistence, 36 percent, was in Class D, which had a higher proportion of those who had recently moved to the neighbourhood. While in each of Classes A, B, and C there were five children who had attended other schools, in Class D, eleven of the thirteen repeaters had also attended other schools; and four had migrated from municipalities far from Porto Alegre, with two from towns in the metropolitan area. At this critical moment in their lives the absences of Teacher D were certainly not an incentive to their staying in the area, in contrast to Teacher A's commitment to teaching, which helped maintain children at school.

Transfers were higher in Class C after 1984, and in Class D during 1984 (Table 38 in Appendix), revealing the importance

of the teacher's commitment to her class demonstrated by her daily attendance, reducing leaves to which she was "entitled" to a minimum. The overall percentages in those classes were 33 and 24 percent, respectively (Table 32).

The highest rates of children leaving school without experiencing failure after 1984 occurred in Classes A and B - 25 and 20 percent (Table 32). Thus, a high quality of the teacher-student relationship alone may be insufficient to guarantee persistence at school; conversely, a "they-relationship" may influence an earlier "flight" from school. Maintenance of school "order" might also lead to the pupil's removal from school by teachers in charge of "discipline," as was the case of pupil 15.

Only six students left the school after a failure. This may represent discouragement with educational services - pupils 16, 31, 57, and 70 -or the search for better educational opportunities elsewhere - pupils 58 and 83.

It seems that (unlike the case for attaining literacy) there was little clear independent effect of teachers on persistence - approximately half of the pupils enrolled in three classes - A, B and C - persisted in school until 1987 (Table 32) while the fourth - Class D - attained only 36 percent. Concerning this lower rate of persistence in Class D, it must be said that the many new pupils lowered the class persistence rate, as only 25 percent of these persisted (Table 32). The lower rate of new pupils persisting in school until 1987 might have been, to a considerable extent, a result of negligence at school; Teacher D's low class attendance in 1984 cannot be overlooked. These factors most likely influenced the decision of (nine out of the twelve) new pupils to seek better educational opportunities or enter the job market.

Thus it is not clear whether any long lasting effects of grade one teacher in 1984 continued, with the exception of negative effects of Teacher D. The high persistence rate of

Teacher C's successful pupils (Table 56 in Appendix) was unexpected. Non-school factors such as those described earlier, and subsequent teacher effects after 1984, may have been more important.

This section focuses on long term outcomes to 1987, examining all eighty-three pupils, without specification as to class effects from 1984.

The first category to be investigated in Table 32 is persistence in school from March 1984 to March 1987. Only thirty-eight of the eighty-three pupils in the study, or 46 percent of the whole group, remained at the school. Only thirteen pupils or 16 percent, were promoted every school year. Thus, one-third of those remaining in school to 1987 were promoted every school year from 1984 on, and two-thirds or 25 pupils were retained once in the first, second or third grade. Thus, retention in and of itself was not associated with leaving school.

Consider of pupil 38, a twelve-year-old boy who attended Class C in 1984, and persisted in school through 1987 despite failure. He was enrolled at a little school close to his house in 1982. His comments on that school were: "There, they didn't teach me anything: the teacher put things on the blackboard and didn't say what was written there. I flunked because of my teacher." In 1983, he entered the school being analyzed, but was retained again. In 1984, he attended Teacher C's class, and received special attention and extra help, because she was conscious that her pupil was the breadwinner in a home where the father was absent. He initiated the process of literacy in 1984, scoring twelve on the spelling test but was promoted only in 1985 at the age of fourteen after four long years at school. In 1986, he was transferred to the evening elementary school, and successfully completed second grade. In March 1987, he was attending a third-grade class in the same evening program, where the

accelerated curriculum made it possible for him to complete the fourth grade by the end of the year.

Nineteen pupils, or 23 percent of the group, transferred to other schools. Seven transfers occurred in 1984 (Table 38 in Appendix) when the children were enrolled in first grade, three transferred after failing in the first grade, and two, after retention in second grade. The remaining seven left for other schools without being retained (from 1984 to 1987) and after completing the literacy process.

Transfers took place due to change of residence as in pupil 51's case, but also due to a search for new and better educational opportunities at a school close to home, as in the cases of pupils 10 and 27. The three instances occurred immediately after retention. In three cases - pupils 48, 50, and 54 - there was a period of time before transfer, during which the child did not attend the school.

A third relevant aspect of Table 32 refers to pupils leaving school, without supplying any information about whether they were going to enroll at another institution or not. These occurrences amounted to 21 percent of the sample, totalling eighteen cases. Twelve left without failing (from 1984 to 1987), six after failing.

One such case, pupil 58, was linked with her family's dissatisfaction with the school. Her father stated that he doubted that her second retention in first grade, in 1984, had been the girl's own fault. As he put it:

The first time (she flunked) maybe it was her lack of interest. She did not take it seriously. That's very normal. This second time I don't know if it was her or the teacher's lack of interest.

The father also told of his daughter's observations showing the teacher was at fault:

She told me: "The teacher spends all her time with the others. She takes a long time to get where I am sitting. She has little interest in me." More or less, we (the parents) began to think that there

was something wrong.

Pupil 58's older sister had been sent to live with relatives in their hometown to take advantage of better educational opportunities which, in fact, had resulted in her success. Thus, the family probably opted for another school for pupil 58. This conclusion may also be based on the fact that both parents had completed primary school and strongly valued formal schooling.

Pupil 83, after enrolling in first grade in 1984 and attending Class D until May, was sent back to kindergarten. In 1985, she attended first grade but failed. In an obvious attempt to rescue the eight-year-old child from conditions certain to lead to an unsuccessful career, the girl was taken out of the school, without even asking for an official transfer. She probably was sent to another school; her mother had finished high school, and the father, fifth grade.

Pupil 16, a boy who was retained in second grade in 1985, did not depend on an official transfer from the school to enroll in another; he could document the successful completion of first grade in Class A by presenting his 1984 report card. One cannot know if, in fact, this eleven-year-old boy enrolled at another school. His father had completed fifth grade, but his mother was illiterate.

Pupil 31 had failed to appear at his final second-grade examinations in 1985. In 1986, he was transferred to the evening elementary school since he was already fifteen years old, and was over the age limit for day classes. He was enrolled in a class corresponding to the second grade, which he had already taken. This mistaken placement might have been one of the reasons for his exit from the school in May, so as not to waste time repeating what he had already learned when he needed to earn a living for himself and his family. Both parents were illiterate.

Pupil 57 left the school in 1986 when he was ten years

old, just before taking his final examinations in third grade. This boy also had a successful second-grade report card which he could use to enroll at another school. He had had one retention at this school and left, perhaps, because he feared a second. His parents had completed the fourth grade of elementary school.

In the six cases of pupils leaving the school after retention, some may have avoided this school but not schooling in general, pupils 58 and 83 who were offspring of parents with a higher level of education; others simply dropped out.

We note twelve pupils who left the school but had not been retained since 1984: (a) five pupils who left school while attending first grade in 1984 and (b) seven pupils who left after having completed first grade. Of the former, three stayed in school for a short while in 1984. Another pupil, 30, only eleven years old left because of pressure to support his family. The fifth, pupil 69, left after two failures at this school; at the age of twelve she became a beggar. All five children left school as illiterate (Tables 34 to 36 in Appendix).

The remaining seven children left school having mastered reading and writing. Pupils 12 and 14, brother and sister, left when they were around thirteen years old. In 1984, both were working while still at school - she as a babysister and he helping his father. Their mother expected they would stay in school, through the fifth or sixth grade.

Pupil 13 left school when she was twelve years old. She had been retained in first grade for four years. While attending second grade, her adoptive mother cancelled her school enrollment. "I want her to finish the second or third grade, because I've already given her the opportunity but the company she keeps at school is not very good."

Pupil 15 attended first grade for one year in a town in the Porto Alegre area, and for four years at a special-

education center and at the school under study His mother said the following during the interview:

This year it was great. This teacher (Teacher A) was wonderful. I want him to go ahead...to complete the eighth grade. The more the better...He likes studying...I think he will get there...to the university.

She wanted her son to be a "medical doctor." But these aspirations were snuffed out by the teacher in charge of discipline who did not permit this eleven-year-old boy to enroll the following year due to "misbehaviour."

These seven children were between ten and fourteen years old. All of them were literate, and two reached the third grade, but did not complete it. It is not known if they returned to school. In the case of pupil 15, the school was the agency which actively conspired against the pupil. The school denied pupil 15 the right to an education because it had been humbly requested by a father who did not know that it was his right even if his child was defined as "undisciplined." Phone calls to schools in the vicinity showed that he had not enrolled at any of them.

The school, directly or indirectly, acted to repel some students, and parents under severe economic pressure also acted to pull children away from school. Only in one case did an adoptive mother, who was in fact the stepmother, cancel enrollment; all other children left without explanation. The school was not equipped to facilitate their persistence in school: attempts to stop the exodus from the school, such as Teacher A's, were in short supply.

Seven pupils (Table 32) left the school and returned - some to leave again. Pupil 24 left school in 1984 for the second time during his third year in first grade. This time he quit because his grandmother, with whom he went to live towards the end of the school year, decided he should stop attending that year; but in 1985 he returned to school and became literate. In March 1987 he was attending third grade.

Pupil 25 could also have been in third grade in 1987: she was promoted to the second grade in 1984 but stayed out of school in 1985; in 1986, she was again enrolled in first grade, and was promoted to the second grade twice!

Pupil 26 represents a case in which the violence of the slum, a broken home, and a highly uncommitted series of teachers led the boy to the longest registered retention in first grade - from March 1981 to March 1987. Towards the end of that year, when he was twelve years old, he left, having already joined a gang of "street boys."

Pupil 65 attended kindergarten for one year and first grade for one month in his hometown; having moved to Porto Alegre, he attended first grade again for eight months, becoming literate but not taking his final exams. In 1984, he repeated the first grade and was promoted to the second, which he left in May 1985; during 1986, he attended second grade, was promoted and began the third grade in March 1987.

Pupils 24 and 65, the two boys attending third grade in March 1987, and pupil 25 - the strange case of a girl attending second grade after successfully completing the first grade twice - represent cases of persistence in school. Pupil 26 also persisted, before leaving school sometime in 1987. Pupils 67, 68 and 80, who had returned to school, left it again.

Pupil 67 was thirteen years old in 1984, and stayed in first grade until August. As I intended to find out why he and other children were often absent, I went to visit his house with the school counsellor, a well-known person in the area. Upon our arrival pupil 67 hid from us and we were informed by his mother's companion that she had enrolled the boy in school twice but "these kids want only this...the street." Pupil 66, who went along to show us where the children's houses were, commented: "He was afraid, thinking that it was the FEBEM (State Foundation for the Welfare of

Children) coming after him." Picking up on this clue, I contacted this institution, which informed me that a boy with this name had been detained fourteen times. I did not see his picture at FEBEM but this information confirms pupil 66's comment, and makes pupil 67's hiding at our arrival understandable. In 1983, he began the evening literacy program, but left in August.

Pupil 68 was enrolled in the school under study in 1981, but moved to another school closer to his home; he was expelled by his teacher one month before the end of the year because he had fought with a classmate who offended his mother. He said his teacher "didn't even know which end was up, and was always yelling." He went to work during 1982 and 1983, when he was advised by a "prestigious man" to go back to school. As previously mentioned, he left school in 1984 and was not able to learn how to read and write due to his own absences and those of Teacher D. In 1985, he was transferred to the evening elementary school and placed in second grade where literacy is a prerequisite. He failed, as one might expect. His illiteracy must have gone unnoticed, or he would have been transferred to the adult literacy program. He did not return to school in 1986.

Pupil 80 entered school at the age of eleven in 1984; although she did very well in school (100 percent and 64 percent respectively on the reading and spelling tests) she wanted to leave school even then. She did so in September 1985, while in the second grade; in 1986 she attended the third grade in the evening elementary school, leaving again in May.

Pupil 80, a good student who left school after becoming literate, was obliged to support herself. The two boys - pupils 67 and 68 - had tried to attend school but the institution had not given them a fighting chance. They left illiterate; in contrast, the girl (pupil 80) was attending

third grade.

Taking school careers as a whole (Tables 33 to 39 in Appendix), the most common pattern observed from 1984 to 1987 is that of a child attending only the school under study - twenty-five cases out of eighty-three, or 30 percent of the total. These children entered this school for the first time and remained there until March 1987. The second most frequent pattern corresponds to a child who entered another school (eleven cases) or two other schools (pupils 60 and 61) before attending this one, where they remained; thirteen cases, or 16 percent, are found in this category.

In all, 46 percent of the eighty-three pupils were still attending the school in 1987, and 23 percent had transferred to other schools. If we hope for the best for those transferred, 69 percent persisted in school through March 1987.

Many of these students had been in grade one prior to 1984. The majority of these persisting to 1987 also were non-promoted once or twice. This micro-sociological analysis of the classroom level complements, and elucidates, the data on national illiteracy and educational failure cited earlier.

CHAPTER X

CONCLUSION

This thesis has argued that pupils' success and failure in first grade have to be considered in a dual social context - that of the school and the society at large. The four first-grade teachers in the investigated school work under severe constraints: lack of physical security (regained later that year), and badly-fed children - some of whom were already earning their living and coming to class tired.

The conceptual framework dealt with phenomena at the micro- and macro-levels, focusing on actors and social structure. The teachers' perspectives and practice were examined according to theories of social and cultural reproduction but departed from them as well, on the basis of the development of pedagogies in the Brazilian context. Relatively conservative - the traditional and new schools - and more radical liberating pedagogies, which aimed at a more just social order, served as additional frameworks.

In the school under study, administrative and technical-pedagogical services were not directly involved in supporting classwork. Macrostructural features combined with school characteristics fomented a climate of dissatisfaction within the school. The principal and his assistants were branded the sources of all evil.

An understanding of the school conflicts led to the examination of both the economic and political context and the organization of the teaching career. Teachers' salaries, as well as those of other salaried workers, were being devalued by a growing inflation (224 percent, in 1984); these economic constraints in a period of political openness strengthened the drive for career mobility and sustained the demand that salaries be updated semi-annually by the state

government. The school principals - nominated by the state secretary of education - were in a weak leadership position before the teachers due to successive postponements of salary incentives by the state government, which they represented.

The incentives to professional qualification and upward career mobility -built into the teacher's statute - established rights without regulating under which conditions they could be fulfilled. A decision to take an undergraduate course entitled teachers to leaves of absence on examination days. Graduation entitled them to either teach a certain subject in grades five to eight, generally with fewer hours of work per week, or to perform out-of classroom functions. This, as a result, decreased the number of teachers teaching the more poorly paid and demanding first to fourth grades.

Inappropriate preparation in normal schools and absence of close supervision of the literacy process in the school also explained the high turn-over of first-grade teachers. But attention was drawn to the different demands of teaching versus other administrative and pedagogical functions in the school. Numerous persons in the latter positions clung to them as "acquired rights" and even refused to substitute for absent teachers. In the first grade this meant that teachers were encumbered by the school administration, within the seating limits of their rooms, to also teach pupils of absent colleagues. This was Teacher C's case; Teachers A and B had small rooms, and Teacher D either was absent or did not accept others' pupils.

Thus, absences from work during teacher-education courses ironically worked against the regular offering of educational services, and nothing was done to resolve such a contradiction. The proclaimed principle "the pupil as the focus of the school" was mere rhetoric to legitimize mock school support services. Each first-grade teacher had her own conception of education and minimal supervision of

classwork. Pupils of absent teachers were undertaught in crowded classes or went home untaught.

The parents of the students, mere observers, did not interfere in the schooling process. This did not mean that families ignored how teachers performed their roles; on the contrary, parents were able to identify the quality of the teacher's effort in making their child literate. In the first grade the criterion of evaluation was particularly evident: any literate parent could tell if his/her child was able to read. Some parents harboured hidden conflict with the child's teacher when detecting the anonymization of the pupil in class.

A qualitative analysis of input-output, comparing teachers' and pupils' characteristics in March with outcomes in December, showed that Classes A and B, which enrolled fifteen pupils each, had the following results: Class A performed better than Class B; Classes C and D, of normal size (twenty-five pupils), presented results which ran contrary to expectations: Class D had worse results than Class C. Relative to outcomes, those students leaving school during the year were also considered in part the teacher's and/or the school system's responsibility and, thus, as cases of nonpromotion. Students who transferred were deleted from such statistics.

In summary, the four teachers attained the goal of teaching literacy despite difficult odds. Teachers A and C had pupils who remained in school during the entire year. The effect of the teacher's daily presence on pupils' permanence in school was independent of teacher's experience and class size. Considering both aspects of outcomes - pupils' permanence in school and becoming literate - Class A demonstrated better results, followed by Classes B and C. Class D came last. In terms of successful permanence in school during the initial elementary grades, the "traditional" Class C attained the best results.

Three situations were emphasized in this investigation. (a) that of "repeat repeaters" - considered more difficult but successfully taught - in smaller classes (fifteen pupils) by competent and very experienced first-grade teachers (A and B); (b) a class of first-time repeaters, often crowded with absent teachers' pupils, taught by an assiduous but less-experienced teacher in terms of literacy (Teacher C), where almost three-fourths of a total of twenty-seven pupils were promoted; (c) first-time first-grade slum dwellers who became literate in just one school year, even when their teacher (D) reported to class less than 60 percent of school days.

The four teachers relied upon psychological and sociological concepts when referring to their teaching practice. Although they showed superficial knowledge of theoretical perspectives explaining learning and the role of education in society, they presented persuasive explanations of the flow of events in the process of teaching literacy and the motives of their practice. The teachers' reports during the last quarter were congruent with observations made during the first semester.

Perspectives on the role of schooling varied among the teachers and influenced their actions. Teacher A maintained that an elementary-school certificate, or even only the more attainable initial grades, represented upward mobility relative to the status of illiterate parents. Teacher A therefore dedicated herself to the maximum to achieve the pupils' literacy.

In contrast to Teacher A, the more radical Teacher B argued that the economic structure should be changed first in order for slum dwellers to be educated, or otherwise mere social reproduction would occur. In her opinion, not even a teacher who was conscious of her work would be able to influence the children's future life, because such pupils switched from one teacher to another, thus losing the positive

qualities they had developed with a competent one.

In fact, Teacher B saw the existence of two totally different worlds -hers and her pupils': "I can educate them to live in my world. I don't know how to educate them to survive in theirs." Teacher B worked with the pupil without the parents' interference and also did not interfere in the family's projects. While she felt it was up to the family to decide if the child should attend school the whole year or not, Teacher B still worked as hard as Teacher A with all those who stayed the full year.

Teacher C, also more radicalized, foresaw for her pupils either early employment and exploitation, or their entering the ranks of thieves "until socialism comes to Brazil." She recognized that public schools often marginalize children, but believed that schooling contributed to the betterment of the children's lives and to upward mobility. Teacher C contacted families to attempt to change decisions to transfer and to find out why a pupil had been absent from class.

For Teacher D, her pupils had unrealistic aspirations concerning future occupations; if they had the chance to get a job, they would be employed in the lowest-prestige occupations, since schooling was of little help in terms of upward mobility. Pupils would become literate and would leave the school "to be shoeshine boys for the rest of their lives." School was an agency of social reproduction: only those pupils who did not work eventually would climb to a higher occupational stratum.

Thus, comparing ideas of a liberating pedagogy versus social and cultural reproduction, Teacher A's teaching perspective and practice favoured social change through liberating the actors' consciousness, leading them to fight for their rights. Teachers B,C and D had a more pessimistic view of education as basically reproducing social structure, even while making literates out of illiterates.

Sharp and Green's treatment of Schutz's "we and they-relationships" in the context of a classroom helped to conceptualize the teacher-pupil encounters and consequences for the literacy process. In the we-relationship the teacher multiplies the child's opportunities for learning, making the accomplishment of the literacy process during the school year highly probable. Pupils' anonymization - due to constraints on the teacher's work and /or lack of belief in education as capable of improving the children's quality of life and status - led to class attrition and/or nonpromotion.

The pupils' progress attained by the end of the school year depended primarily on the teachers' belief in the positive role of education and their subsequent practice rather than on expectations based on evaluations made at the beginning of the year.

If the teacher stopped working on the particular difficulties of a child, the child did not become literate. Being anonymous then meant that the teacher perceived that a pupil was not keeping up with the class in terms of mastering the patterns taught and stopped careful daily observation and the teaching of reading and writing which would guarantee success; it also meant maintaining distance from families who had decided to remove their children from the school. The child did not become literate after he/she stopped attending classes, and the teacher did not attempt to bring him/her back, or when he/she attended classes, and the teacher - overburdened with many pupils - was not able to offer individual help.

Every day inside the classroom, in each activity the pupil performed, he/she tended to be evaluated by the teacher. The good/bad result of the evaluation was open/closed to classmates. In this way children learned to categorize competence, which led to acceptance of social hierarchies. Classes varied (a) as to number of layers constituted by

pupils of similar status; (b) as to the range of the stratification, or the distance between the upper and lower levels; and (c) the degree of fluidity within the classroom or the possibility for the child to be socially mobile within the main layers of the stratification system. The smaller classes became more homogeneous at the end of the school year.

With regard to curriculum, in 1984 one observed that the objectives set forth for language in 1939 were by now embedded in the teachers practice. Language had precedence over other curriculum contents, but the ideal was to develop all other subjects, mainly mathematics, due to the fact that at any moment older pupils could leave school to get a job.

For three teachers (B,C and D) the curriculum was considered too much for one academic year. They suggested its development in two years with the same teacher, leaving digraphs and consonantal groups to be taught in the second year.

Earlier curricular reform, imposed from above, restructured the educational system, and set forth a broad definition of curriculum by activities. Some teachers developed a weakly-classified curriculum - a game as the unit integrating different subject matter - and others a strongly-classified curriculum - each subject given during a different period of the timetable. Indeed the same teacher could develop activities which could be considered appropriate to a traditional (strongly classified), or a new (weakly classified) organization of contents.

At the beginning of the 1980's, pedagogic experts in each field of knowledge defined the curriculum contents for Porto Alegre. This process was hidden from those who did not participate in it and the curriculum was judged by teachers to have been defined by bureaucratic decisions made outside the school. Only one (Teacher C) attempted to completely follow such guidelines; only in this case was the curriculum

strongly framed. The other teachers "read" guidelines as suggestions and not as prescriptions. On the other hand, the actual curriculum as developed by the four teachers in the study took into consideration the significance of words for pupils, showing that in relation to students it was weakly framed.

Basil Bernstein's typology of educational codes - collection and integrates - correspond to the traditional/new school dichotomy, seeing education as cultural reproduction. To think about Brazilian education today one needs to add further practical elaborations concerning liberating pedagogy. In the context of the classroom, pupils promoted were those who had been constantly observed. The competent teacher watched the pupils' performance as a whole at their daily work. The seeing of everything in the we-relationship permitted pupils with a history of failure in school to become literate.

Possible implications of the findings for teaching lower-class pupils may be summarized as follows:

Numbers of pupils must be reduced whenever feasible to increase the quality of the teacher's assistance in the literacy process. Such a measure makes continuous individual observation of the process possible and will attract more professionals to this initial level of elementary-school teaching.

The routine of teaching only those who keep up with the class pace should be definitely banished from schools. All pupils must be taught and different strategies developed. Concerning those who cannot keep up with the rest of the class, preferably the teacher - during another shift or even during the same shift - should offer extra help. Tutors working in cooperation with the teacher - at school or at home - are important in assisting the process, be they teachers or pupils' relatives; during the second semester pupils can read

to each other, which does not dismiss the teacher from daily listening to individual reading.

The organization of classes should consider the pupils' previous experience in the literacy process and age. The option for reorganizing classes during the year according to pacing in the literacy process should take into consideration the impact on pupils of changing classmates and teacher. The initial teacher, preferably, should maintain contact with all pupils - teaching religion, for instance, in the other group.

The decision not to teach literacy to first-time first graders who have never used a pencil could result in a two-year process of literacy as teachers have suggested. Big schools such as the one investigated should be served by a teaching supervisor with class experience in literacy, being able to act as the teacher-supervisor of normal school students' practicums, counselling and assisting the teachers lacking experience in literacy with her classwork. A personnel plan should substitute the "here and now" distribution of leaves of absence with a range of solutions.

This dissertation, like most pieces of research, raises more questions than it answers. We have suggested that teachers "can make a difference." While the four teachers studied here differed among themselves in experience, practice, and teaching perspectives, they all did seem to be reasonably successful in teaching literacy. The engaged commitment of teacher A might be seen as a model.

These questions might be addressed more fully in the future through further research, flowing from the limitations of this study. Participant observations could be shifted into the homes and neighbourhoods of the slum dwelling children, rather than focused in the classroom. A particular area of inquiry would focus on the educational and cognitive atmosphere of the home environment, and roles of significant others on this environment, as they relate to the process of

literacy.

Similarly, a longitudinal approach might try to follow up some of the eighty-three pupils studied in 1984 to see, in detail, how their lives were affected by their experience in 1984 - if at all. This would permit a greater appreciation of the interaction between social structure and educational institutions in affecting outcomes early on in the schooling process.

APPENDIX I

INTERVIEW WITH THE FIRST-GRADE PUPIL

1. Who lives in your house (name, relationship, age occupation)?
2. Tell me about your house.
3. Do you do chores at home? What do you know how to do?
4. Is there someone at home with you when you are at home? Who?
5. Do you do your homework yourself, or does someone help you with it?
6. How much homework do you have?
7. Who do you play with when you're not at school?
8. What do you do on Sundays? Do you go to Mass?
9. Have you already studied at another school? Where?
10. What were your teachers' names?
11. Did you like them?
12. Was there one who was very angry?
13. How about your teacher this year? Do you like her?
14. Does she like you? How do you know?
15. What does she do when a pupil disobeys?
16. And how about you? If you have disobeyed, what happened?
17. Is first grade difficult for you, or are you doing okay?
18. Can you read what the teacher has already taught?
19. Who are the other children who can read well in your class?
20. Who can't read well in your class?
21. Why can't they read well?
22. Who always spells well in your class?
23. Do you think you're going to pass to the second grade?
24. Who else in your class do you think will pass?
25. Tell me the things you do during recess.
26. Is where you live dangerous?
27. What kind of job would you like?

APPENDIX II
INTERVIEW WITH PARENTS

1. How long has your family lived in Porto Alegre?
2. Where was your son/daughter born?
3. How many times has your family moved since your son/daughter was born?
4. Has your son/daughter lived with both his/her parents since birth?
5. How many people currently live at your house (specifying the relationships each one has to the child)?
6. Do you think your son/daughter is a good, average, or poor student?
7. What educational level do you expect your son/daughter to attain?
8. What do you want your son/daughter to be when he/she grows up?
9. Why did you decide to send your son/daughter to school?
10. How do you consider your son/daughter's school? What would you like for the school to have or not to have?
11. How many years has your son/daughter been at school?
12. Did he/she attend kindergarten? How many years?
13. Is this the first time he/she is attending first grade?
14. How many times has he/she failed the first grade? Why did he/she fail?
15. Do you remember the name(s) of your son/daughter's previous teacher(s)?
16. Do you have other children at school? Did any of them repeat the first grade?
17. How should the teacher work with those students who have greater difficulty in learning how to read?
18. Are you involved with school activities? When?
19. How do you find out about your son/daughter's progress?
20. How much does your child tell you about what goes on at school?

21. How does your son/daughter do his/her homework? Does anyone help him/her with reading or arithmetic? If so, who?
22. Has your son/daughter been absent from school? How many days? Why?
23. Do you think you son/daughter will pass to the second grade? Why or why not?
24. What does he/she tell you about recess? Does he/she complain about any of his/her classmates?
25. Do you like living in this neighbourhood?
26. Is there anyone in your family who likes to read? What do they usually read?
27. Is there anything else that you would like to add about your son/daughter, his/her teacher, or the school?

TABLE 1
 ILLITERACY AMONG PERSONS 10 YEARS OLD OR OLDER ACCORDING
 TO GREAT REGIONS, SOUTHERN STATES, AND BRAZIL
 1980

	Persons 10 years old or older		
	Illiterates	Total	Percentage of Illiterates
North	1,206,227	3,945,114	30.6
Northeast	11,274,192	24,368,669	46.3
Center-West	1,356,621	5,409,427	25.1
Southeast	6,371,604	39,652,896	16.1
South	2,184,504	14,428,246	15.1
Paraná	1,082,108	5,610,876	19.3
Santa Catarina	337,554	2,719,447	12.4
Rio Grande do Sul	764,842	6,097,923	12.5
Brazil	22,393,295	87,805,265	25.5

Sources: IBGE, *Censo Demográfico* - 1980; adapted from Ferrari, 1985,
 p.40, table 4.

TABLE 2
ILLITERACY TRENDS IN TWO POLAR STATES,
PIAUÍ AND RIO GRANDE DO SUL, AND IN BRAZIL, AMONG PERSONS 5 YEARS OLD OR OLDER
1872 - 1980

	1872	1890	1920	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980
Piauí — Northeast								
Persons 5 years old or older	176,419	224,180	518,368	674,588	860,074	1,029,828	1,382,462	1,781,448
Illiterate persons	148,643	197,653	445,426	544,982	673,666	745,197	934,465	1,007,521
Percentage of illiterates	84.3	88.2	85.9	80.7	78.3	72.3	67.5	56.6
Rio Grande do Sul — South								
Persons 5 years old or older	411,729	749,966	1,837,057	2,801,125	3,488,824	4,575,755	5,809,440	6,903,381
Illiterate persons	316,326	522,972	989,115	1,271,076	1,438,037	1,368,103	1,352,168	1,186,951
Percentage of illiterates	76.8	69.7	53.8	45.3	41.2	29.8	23.2	17.2
Brazil								
Persons 5 years old or older	8,854,774	12,212,125	26,042,442	34,796,665	43,573,517	58,997,981	79,327,231	102,579,006
Illiterate persons	7,290,293	10,091,566	18,549,085	21,295,490	24,907,696	27,578,971	30,718,597	32,731,347
Percentage of illiterates	82.3	82.6	71.2	61.1	57.1	46.7	38.7	31.9

Sources: MINISTÉRIO DA AGRICULTURA, INDÚSTRIA E COMÉRCIO, *Recenseamento Geral do Brasil* - 1920, for years 1872, 1890, and 1920.

IBGE, *Censo Demográfico*, for 1940, 1950, 1960, 1970 and 1980; adapted from Ferrari, 1985, p.43, table 5.

TABLE 3
TOTAL AND PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN BETWEEN 5 AND 14 YEARS OF AGE NOT
ATTENDING SCHOOL, AS TO LOCATION AND AGE — BRAZIL
1 9 8 0

Age	Children Not Attending School					
	Urban		Rural		Total	
	Total	Percentage*	Total	Percentage*	Total	Percentage*
5	1,443,811	76.7	1,084,443	90.1	2,528,254	81.9
6	1,136,616	62.5	996,950	86.7	2,133,566	71.9
7	615,110	33.3	802,270	70.3	1,417,380	47.4
8	346,529	19.2	655,064	59.5	1,001,593	34.5
9	254,287	14.3	547,007	52.6	801,294	28.4
10	249,643	13.5	563,928	49.8	813,571	27.3
11	228,796	12.9	497,924	48.2	726,720	25.9
12	274,731	15.1	552,837	51.9	827,568	28.7
13	327,170	18.4	555,869	56.8	883,039	32.0
14	460,990	24.8	621,586	63.6	1,082,576	38.2
5 to 6	2,580,427	69.7	2,081,393	88.4	4,661,820	77.0
7 to 14	2,757,256	19.0	4,796,485	56.6	7,553,741	33.0
Total	5,337,683	29.3	6,877,878	63.5	12,215,561	42.1

Sources: IBGE, *Censo Demográfico* — 1980; adapted from Ferrari, 1985, p.46, table 6.

* Percentage of children not attending school in relation to the total population for each age group.

TABLE 4
AGE-GRADE RELATIONSHIP AND SCHOOL ATTENDANCE AMONG CHILDREN 7 TO 14 YEARS OF AGE
IN THE SOUTHERN STATES, IN SOUTH BRAZIL, AND IN BRAZIL
1980

Age-Grade Relationship and School Attendance	Paraná		Santa Catarina		Rio Grande do Sul		South Brazil		Brazil	
	Total	Percentage	Total	Percentage	Total	Percentage	Total	Percentage	Total	Percentage
Children certainly not behind *	407,902	25.7	256,923	35.6	483,396	36.4	1,148,221	31.6	5,343,274	23.3
Children slightly behind **	301,176	19.0	142,033	19.7	266,777	20.1	709,986	19.5	3,718,341	16.2
Children strongly behind ***	420,980	26.4	139,096	19.2	311,789	23.5	871,865	24.0	6,366,449	27.6
Children attending school	1,130,058	71.1	538,052	74.5	1,061,962	80.0	2,730,072	75.0	15,428,064	67.1
Children not attending school	458,366	28.9	184,282	25.5	265,160	20.0	907,808	25.0	7,553,741	32.9
Total	1,588,424	100.0	722,334	100.0	1,327,122	100.0	3,637,880	100.0	22,981,805	100.0

Sources: IBGE, Censo Demográfico — 1980; adapted from Ferrari, 1987, table 6.

- * Certainly not behind seven- to fourteen-year-old children, respectively in the first, second, third, . . . eighth grade.
- ** Slightly behind eight- to fifteen-year-old children, respectively in the first, second, third, . . . eighth grade.
- *** Strongly behind: nine-year-old children in the first grade; ten-year-old children in the first or second grade; eleven-year-old children in the first, second or third grade; . . . fourteen-year-old children in the first, second, third, fourth, fifth or sixth grade.

TABLE 5

FINAL ENROLLMENT (NOVEMBER 30) AND PROMOTION RATES IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS IN THE
SOUTHERN STATES, IN SOUTH BRAZIL, AND IN BRAZIL

1980

Grade	Paraná		Santa Catarina		Pio Grande do Sul		South Brazil		Brazil	
	Final Enrollment	Promotion Rates	Final Enrollment	Promotion Rates	Final Enrollment	Promotion Rates	Final Enrollment	Promotion Rates	Final Enrollment	Promotion Rates
First	297,436	68.7	139,553	76.4	277,892	60.6	714,881	67.0	5,877,905	67.0
Second	209,411	85.6	109,278	87.5	194,505	81.3	513,194	84.4	3,256,921	76.8
Third	185,694	88.1	94,069	91.8	175,609	82.8	455,372	86.8	2,660,705	80.5
Fourth	147,213	92.1	90,679	88.5	161,538	79.4	399,430	86.1	2,105,090	84.9
Fifth	114,021	75.9	53,096	95.9	140,596	69.1	307,713	76.2	1,868,454	71.2
Sixth	90,647	79.2	46,954	97.0	112,488	70.9	250,089	78.8	1,444,543	76.0
Seventh	67,979	83.0	41,206	96.0	93,078	74.1	202,263	81.6	1,172,894	79.1
Eighth	54,089	89.8	43,982	83.5	78,392	81.2	176,543	84.3	988,110	85.1
Total	1,166,490	81.1	618,817	87.5	1,234,098	73.7	3,019,405	79.4	19,384,642*	75.2

Source. Sinopse Estatística da Educação Básica: 1981, 1982, 1983, 6, MEC, 1984, pp. 42 and 44.

* This total includes students of all age groups enrolled on November 30, 1980, in the eight grades of elementary school.

TABLE 6
TOTAL ENROLLMENT, NUMBER OF TRANSFERS, NUMBER OF DROPOUTS, FINAL ENROLLMENT, NUMBER
OF PROMOTED PUPILS, DROPOUT AND PROMOTION RATES IN FIRST GRADE BY
ADMINISTRATIVE FUNDING AGENCY AND LOCATION — PORTO ALEGRE (POA),
AND RIO GRANDE DO SUL (RS)

1984

Administrative Funding Agency / Location	Total Enrollment	Transfers	Dropouts	Final Enrollment	Promoted Pupils	Dropout Rate*	Promotion Rate **
Urban federal							
POA	25	-	-	25	22	-	88
RS	25	-	-	25	22	-	88
Rural federal							
POA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
RS	239	6	46	187	73	19	39
Urban state							
POA	27,793	2,484	7,607	22,702	15,301	9	67
RS	115,126	9,839	9,389	95,898	68,346	8	71
Rural state							
POA	78	3	20	55	38	26	69
RS	16,636	1,364	1,080	14,192	9,566	6	67
Urban municipal							
POA	2,267	136	151	1,980	1,253	7	63
RS	74,356	6,601	8,423	59,332	38,255	11	64
Rural municipal							
POA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
RS	81,631	6,967	6,816	67,848	39,156	8	58
Urban private							
POA	7,615	328	290	6,997	6,220	4	89
RS	32,878	1,700	1,644	29,534	24,892	5	84
Rural private							
POA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
RS	1,501	108	56	1,337	878	4	66
Urban Total							
POA	37,700	2,948	3,048	31,704	22,796	8	72
RS	222,385	18,140	19,456	184,789	131,525	9	71
Rural Total							
POA	78	3	20	55	38	26	69
RS	100,007	8,445	7,998	83,564	49,673	8	59
Total							
POA	37,778	2,954	3,068	31,759	22,834	8	72
RS	322,392	26,585	27,454	268,353	181,198	9	68

Source SE/SAE/IMF

* Calculated over total enrollment.

** Calculated over final enrollment.

TABLE 7
LEVEL OF SCHOOLING OF ELEMENTARY-SCHOOL TEACHERS,
ACCORDING TO THE ADMINISTRATIVE FUNDING AGENCY, AND LOCATION —
PORTO ALEGRE (POA), AND RIO GRANDE DO SUL (RS)
1 9 8 4

Level of Schooling		Administrative Funding Agency								Urban Total	Total
		Federal		State		Municipal		Private			
		Urban	Total	Urban	Total	Urban	Total	Urban	Total		
Elementary school											
Finished grades 1-7	POA	-	-	3	3	-	-	1	1	4	4
	RS	-	3	49	154	209	3,614	23	41	281	3,812
Finished grade 8	POA	1	1	12	13	-	-	13	13	26	27
	RS	1	8	265	556	727	5,108	164	200	1,157	5,872
High school											
Without normal school diploma	POA	1	1	111	111	3	3	147	147	262	262
	RS	1	4	2,009	2,415	942	3,080	947	1,009	3,899	6,508
Normal school diploma	POA	3	3	1,857	1,865	133	133	739	739	2,732	2,740
	RS	3	11	11,873	14,919	6,007	11,598	3,373	3,569	21,256	30,097
University											
Without education degree	POA	6	6	41	41	1	1	43	43	91	91
	RS	6	6	341	359	35	53	136	138	518	556
Education degree	POA	50	50	5,483	5,490	319	319	1,198	1,198	7,050	7,057
	RS	50	50	27,968	30,158	2,329	3,154	5,120	5,235	35,464	38,635
Total	POA	61	61	7,507	7,523	456	456	2,141	2,141	10,165	10,181
	RS	61	82	42,505	48,601	10,249	26,607	9,760	10,190	62,575	85,480
Percentage of teachers with											
Normal school diploma	POA	5	5	25	25	29	29	35	35	27	27
	RS	5	13	28	31	59	44	35	35	34	35
Education degree	POA	82	82	73	73	70	70	56	56	69	69
	RS	82	61	66	62	23	12	52	51	57	45

Source: SE/SAE/INF.

TABLE 8
NUMBER OF SCHOOLS WITH ONE TEACHER OR MORE AND GRADE LEVELS OFFERED,
ACCORDING TO THE ADMINISTRATIVE FUNDING AGENCY AND LOCATION - PORTO
ALEGRE (POA), AND RIO GRANDE DO SUL (RS)

1 9 8 4

		Administrative Funding Agency								Urban Total	Total
		Federal		State		Municipal		Private			
		Urban	Total	Urban	Total	Urban	Total	Urban	Total		
One-teacher school											
First to fourth grade	POA	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	1
	RS	-	-	4	230	35	5,476	1	45	40	5,751
First to fifth grade	POA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	RS	-	-	1	27	3	790	1	17	5	834
Schools with more than one teacher											
First to fourth grade	POA	-	-	59	60	2	2	15	15	76	77
	RS	-	8	425	830	579	2,797	99	122	1,103	3,757
First to fifth grade	POA	-	-	33	33	3	3	2	2	38	38
	RS	-	-	243	745	214	1,408	25	58	482	2,211
Fifth to eighth grade	POA	1	1	4	4	-	-	2	2	7	7
	RS	1	1	129	133	2	3	56	63	190	200
First to eighth grade	POA	1	1	128	129	8	8	60	60	197	198
	RS	1	1	845	1,061	119	264	303	321	1,268	1,647
Total	POA	2	2	225	227	13	13	79	79	319	321
	RS	2	10	1,647	3,026	952	10,738	487	626	3,088	14,400

Source: SE/SAE/INF.

TABLE 9
STATE SCHOOLS ADMINISTEPED BY THE FIRST DELEGATION OF EDUCATION WHICH OFFERED THE EIGHT
GRADES OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL AND HAD A HIGH PERCENTAGE OF LOWER-INCOME PUPILS
(80 PERCENT OR MORE)
1 9 8 3

	S c h o o l s											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Rate of lower-income pupils in the school *	99	96	95	93	92	90	89	83	83	82	81	80
First-grade promotion rates *	43	54	57	70	52	68	41	64	67	77	74	68
Initial kindergarten enrollment												
Level one	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Level two	-	-	-	-	-	50	25	-	-	-	22	23
Level three	-	51	48	-	-	50	25	-	-	53	27	27
Initial first-grade enrollment	289	280	175	159	182	242	163	95	192	65	52	133
Initial school enrollment	1,266	1,195	879	574	891	1599	834	643	738	534	783	788
Number of kindergarten classes	-	2	2	-	-	4	2	-	-	2	2	2
Number of first-grade classes												
Morning shift	-	10	7	1	7	4	4	-	4	-	-	5
Afternoon shift	8	-	-	5	-	5	2	4	4	3	2	-
Number of teachers in the school	70	92	79	37	70	101	51	48	65	57	66	97

Source: SE/13 DE/GFI, April, 1983.

* Data collected in 1982 from the same source.

TABLE 10
GROWTH OF A PUBLIC SCHOOL SERVING LOWER-CLASS PUPILS. NUMBER OF KINDERGARTEN, SPECIAL-EDUCATION AND
ELEMENTARY-SCHOOL CLASSES. NUMBER OF CLASSES IN OTHER EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS. NUMBER OF
CLASSES PER SHIFT,
1945-1986

	1945	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963
Kindergarten																			
Level one	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	2	2	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Level two	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	-	1	1	1
Level three	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	4	2	2	2	1	1	1
Special education	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Elementary school																			
First grade	4	4	5	5	8	8	11	11	11	13	16	18	19	7	13	14	13	13	12
Second grade	1	2	2	2	3	5	6	8	5	6	8	7	8	9	8	7	7	7	6
Third grade	1	1	1	1	1	3	5	4	5	5	7	7	7	6	7	5	8	7	6
Fourth grade	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	3	4	4	5	6	6	5	7	5	3	5
Fifth grade	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	3	2	3	7	3	2	4	2	2
Sixth grade	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Seventh grade	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Eighth grade	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CEAPE *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Adult literacy **	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Adult elementary school (non graded) ***	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	8	9	10	10	14	20	26	29	28	32	39	41	47	38	39	58	39	34	33
Number of classes per shift																			
Morning	8	9	10	10	7	8	10	12	14	16	16	15	17	16	17	18	18	18	17
Intermediate *	-	-	-	-	-	5	8	7	-	-	8	11	14	11	6	-	8	-	-
Afternoon	-	-	-	-	7	7	8	10	14	16	15	15	16	11	16	19	13	16	16
Late afternoon	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
Evening	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	8	9	10	10	14	20	26	29	28	32	39	41	47	38	39	38	39	34	33

TABLE 10
Continued

	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986
Kindergarten																							
Level one	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Level two	-	1	1	1	-	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Level three	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2
Special education	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	-	1	1	1	1	2	2	3
Elementary school																							
First grade	14	13	15	15	13	11	10	12	10	11	10	10	11	11	12	12	12	11	10	10	16	11	10
Second grade	5	7	8	10	10	6	7	7	8	7	8	7	6	6	5	6	6	6	6	5	5	6	6
Third grade	6	5	8	7	8	7	6	6	7	7	7	7	7	7	5	6	6	6	5	6	5	5	4
Fourth grade	6	7	7	8	6	5	4	5	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	5	4	5	6	4	5	4	5
Fifth grade	3	4	3	4	3	3	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	4	4	5	5	4	3	3
Sixth grade	1	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	3	4	2	2	3
Seventh grade	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	2	1	2
Eighth grade	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	1	1	1
CEAPE *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-
Adult literacy **	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
Adult elementary school (non-grades)***	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	3
Total	37	40	45	46	42	34	33	35	37	37	37	36	36	39	37	36	35	38	39	41	44	40	43
Number of classes per shift																							
Morning	17	17	16	17	17	12	16	18	18	18	NA	18	18	20	20	18	18	23	20	22	22	18	22
Intermediate +	3	6	10	9	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Afternoon	15	15	14	15	19	17	17	17	19	19	NA	18	18	19	17	18	17	15	19	19	22	19	17
Late afternoon	2	2	5	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Evening	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	4	4
Total	37	40	45	46	42	34	33	35	37	37	37	36	36	39	37	36	35	38	39	41	44	40	43

Sources School records, 1945-1973, SE/SAE/INF, 1974, SE/14 DE/GFI, 1975-1986.

* "Classe de Educação e Alimentação do Pré-Escolar" (Class of Pre-School Education and Nutrition).

** This program is known as "MOBRAL" - "Movimento Brasileiro de Alfabetização" (Brazilian Movement for Literacy). In 1986 this foundation changed its name to "EDUCAR" (Educate).

*** This type of course is known as "Programa de Educação Integrada" (Program of Integrated Education).

+ A shift taught from eleven a.m. to two p.m.; the other shifts were from eight to eleven a.m., and from two to five p.m.

TABLE 11

NET INITIAL ENROLLMENT, NUMBER OF REPEATERS, AND PERCENTAGE OF REPEATERS
IN SPECIAL EDUCATION AND IN EACH GRADE OF THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL *
1980 - 1986

	Special Education	First Grade	Second Grade	Third Grade	Fourth Grade	Fifth Grade	Sixth Grade	Seventh Grade	Eighth Grade	Total	Percentage of First Grade Repeaters in the School
1980											
Initial enrollment	16	330	189	187	124	140				986	
Number of repeaters	NA	147	33	47	8	26				261	
Percentage of repeaters	NA	45	17	25	6	19				26	15
1981											
Initial enrollment	16	294	169	162	147	135	82			1,005	
Number of repeaters	9	133	31	32	30	38	4			277	
Percentage of repeaters	56	45	18	20	20	28	5			28	13
1982											
Initial enrollment	16	300	189	150	165	151	89	52		1,112	
Number of repeaters	16	175	58	28	41	47	12	1		378	
Percentage of repeaters	100	58	31	19	25	31	13	2		34	16
1983											
Initial enrollment	16	271	164	168	122	159	92	64	38	1,094	
Number of repeaters	16	136	27	44	19	26	7	3	-	278	
Percentage of repeaters	100	50	16	26	16	16	8	5	-	25	12
1984											
Initial enrollment	32	373	152	155	151	129	72	66	28	1,158	
Number of repeaters	25	120	21	37	35	53	12	14	1	318	
Percentage of repeaters	78	32	14	24	23	41	17	21	4	27	10
1985											
Initial enrollment	29	313	182	159	139	90	59	42	35	1,048	
Number of repeaters	29	171	8	32	48	37	12	9	-	346	
Percentage of repeaters	100	55	4	20	35	41	20	21	-	33	16
1986											
Initial enrollment	34	270	187	141	175	89	89	52	33	1,070	
Number of repeaters	22	124	45	20	33	18	10	11	3	286	
Percentage of repeaters	65	46	24	14	19	20	11	21	9	27	12

Source: SE/14 DE/GFI, April, 1980 to 1986.

* Transfers and canceled enrollment were excluded.

TABLE 12
THE FIRST GRADE
1945 - 1986

	1945	1949	1954	1959	1964	1969	1974	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986
Number of first-grade teachers	6	13	21	21	17	14	12	17	16	13	11	11	20	12	13
Number of first-grade classes	4	8	13	13	14	11	10	12	12	11	10	10	16	11	10
Number of dissolved first-grade classes*	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	1	-
Number of classes with only one teacher during the school year	2	3	5	6	10	7	8	7	6	8	8	8	12	8	7
Number of classes with two teachers during the school year	2	-	7	3	3	4	2	3	4	3	1	1	2	1	3
Number of classes with three or more teachers during the school year	-	5	1	4	-	-	-	1	2	-	1	-	1	1	-
Minimum number of pupils per class as to total enrollment	58	30	35	22	22	21	30	27	26	19	24	27	15	26	26
Maximum number of pupils per class as to total enrollment	77	44	43	36	39	32	44	38	36	34	37	34	31	38	16
Total enrollment	204	270	489	406	424	311	326	364	366	312	297	271	382	316	268
Number of transfers and dropouts	58	72	108	91	73	64	66	93	112	83	84	58	69	91	39
Number of transfers	NA	NA	NA	NA	18	28	28	45	38	26	25	14	26	20	17
Number of dropouts	NA	NA	NA	NA	55	36	38	48	74	57	58	44	43	71	22
Final enrollment	146	198	381	315	351	247	260	271	254	229	213	213	313	225	229
Number of promoted pupils	NA	108	192	131	162	169	166	129	122	131	114	104	186	129	130
Dropout rate as to total enrollment	NA	NA	NA	NA	13	12	12	13	20	18	20	16	11	22	8
Promotion rate as to final enrollment															
	**	NA	55	50	42	46	68	64	48	56	57	54	49	59	57
	***	NA	54	50	41	45	65	63	46	49	57	50	49	58	NA
	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	5	5	-	4	-

Sources: School records, and SE/SAE/INF for the 1986 data.

* Classes whose pupils were redistributed during the school year.

** Promotion rates considering as dropouts those pupils who did not take their final examinations.

*** Promotion rates considering as failing those pupils who did not take their final examinations.

* Promotion rates in a program during the summer vacation offered by personnel from the First Delegation of Education or contracted by it. The numbers of promoted pupils were 7, 10, 11 and 8 in the years of 1980/81, 1982/83, 1983/84 and 1985/86.

TABLE 13
THE FIRST-GRADE TEACHERS AS TO THEIR LEVEL OF SCHOOLING AND TERMS OF EMPLOYMENT,
THE FIRST-GRADE CLASSES AS TO COMPOSITION AND DROPOUT/PROMOTION RATES
1 9 8 4

Teacher	Level of Schooling *		Terms of Employment **	Class	Class Composition ***	Dropout Rate	Promotion Rate **
	Normal School	University					
1	X	-	T	1	N	8	86
2	X	/	T	2	N	7	67
3	X	-	C				
4	X	X	T	3	N	8	63
5	X	X	T	4	N	30	61
			C				
6	X	-	T				
7	X	/	T	5	N	7	65
8	X	-	C	6	R	11	83
9 T C	X	/	T	7	R	4	75
10	X	X	T	8	R	-	***
11 T A	X	X	T	9	R	-	93
			C				
12 T B	X	/	T	10	R	18	92
13	X	-	C	11	N	4	100
14	X	-	C	12	N	8	-
15 T D	X	/	T	13	PR	25	80
16	X	X	T	14	PR *	6	-
			T				
17	X	XX	T				
			C				
18	X	X	T				
			T				
19	X	/	T	15	PR*	22	37
20	X	-	C	16	PR*	11	35

- * Degree completed is indicated by an X, study in progress is indicated by a slash (/).
- ** The teacher could have been tenured (T), or contracted (C), or both.
- *** This column indicates if the class was formed of new pupils in the first grade (N), of repeaters (R), or if repeaters predominated (PR).
- * Class classified as being constituted predominantly of repeaters (PR) according to the pupils' age more than half of the pupils were eight years old or older.
- ** Inflated promotion rate, because pupils not taking their final examinations were not considered as having failed
- *** Class dissolved in August

TABLE 14
THE TEACHERS SELECTED AND THEIR FIRST-GRADE CLASSES
1973 - 1985

Teachers	Year	Class Composition*	Total Enrollment			Transfers			Dropouts			Dropout Rate	Final Enrollment			Promoted Pupils			Promotion Rates		
			M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T		M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
A	1973	NA	NA	NA	34	-	-	-	NA	NA	8	24	14	12	26	5	8	13	36	67	50
	1974	NA	NA	NA	33	-	-	-	NA	NA	6	18	11	16	27	6	10	16	55	62	59
	1975	NA	19	17	36	2	1	3	-	2	2	6	17	14	31	13	8	21	76	57	68
	1976	PR	18	15	33	-	-	-	4	2	6	18	14	13	27	7	9	16	50	69	59
	1977	R	19	14	33	3	-	3	6	2	8	24	10	12	22	5	7	12	50	58	55
	1978	N	18	15	33	3	3	6	-	-	-	-	15	12	27	12	8	20	80	67	74
	1979	Y	16	12	28	1	-	1	4	3	7	25	11	9	20	6	9	15	55	100	75
	1980	R	19	10	29	1	-	1	3	2	5	17	15	8	23	10	4	14	67	50	61
	1981	R	11	17	28	2	2	4	1	2	3	11	8	13	21	8	13	21	100	100	100
	1983	N	13	17	30	1	-	1	2	1	3	10	10	16	26	8	15	23	80	94	88
	1984	R	9	7	16	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	9	6	15	8	6	14	89	100	93
B	1981	N	10	9	19	1	-	1	5	3	8	42	4	6	10	-	-	-	-	-	-
	1982	PR	16	21	37	2	3	5	3	4	7	19	11	14	25	11	14	25	100	100	100
	1983	R	9	18	27	-	1	1	2	1	3	11	7	16	23	5	15	20	71	94	87
	1984	R	10	5	15	-	-	-	3	-	3	20	7	5	12	6	5	11	86	100	92
C	1978	N	23	16	39	2	1	3	4	-	4	10	17	15	32	-	-	-	-	-	-
	1982	PR	19	9	28	-	-	-	4	1	5	18	15	8	23	12	7	19	80	88	83
	1984	R	15	12	27	2	-	2	1	-	1	4	12	12	24	9	9	18	75	75	75
	1985	N	24	10	34	3	-	3	4	2	6	18	17	8	25	-	-	-	-	-	-
D	1980	N	17	19	36	1	5	6	-	1	1	3	16	13	29	12	12	24	75	92	83
	1981	N	15	13	28	-	2	2	1	-	1	4	14	11	25	13	9	22	93	82	88
	1982	N	11	14	25	1	1	2	6	2	8	32	4	11	15	-	-	-	-	-	-
	1984	PR	12	13	25	1	3	4	4	2	6	24	7	8	15	7	5	12	100	62	80

Source: School records.

- * This column indicates if the first-grade class was composed of new pupils (N), of repeaters (R) or if repeaters predominated (PR)

TABLE 15
PUPILS' CHARACTERISTICS IN EACH OF FOUR FIRST-GRADE CLASSES
1 9 8 4

Pupils' Characteristics	Number							Percentage						
	Class A	Class B	Class C	Class D			Total	Class A	Class B	Class C	Class D			Total
				Repeaters	New Pupils	Total					Repeaters	New Pupils	Total	
Sex														
Male	9	10	15	7	5	12	46	56	67	56	54	42	48	55
Female	7	5	12	6	7	13	37	44	33	44	46	58	52	45
Ethnic group														
White	12	5	16	11	7	18	51	75	33	59	85	59	72	62
Non-white	4	10	11	2	4	6	31	25	67	41	15	33	24	37
NA	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	8	4	1
Health														
Good	9	6	11	3	2	5	31	56	40	41	23	16	20	37
Fair	2	6	13	8	5	13	34	12.5	40	48	61	42	52	41
Poor	3	1	1	1	-	1	6	19	7	4	8	-	4	7
NA	2	2	2	1	5	6	12	12.5	13	7	8	42	24	15
Religion														
Roman Catholic	16	14	24	12	10	22	76	100	93	89	92	84	88	92
Other	-	1	3	1	1	2	6	-	7	11	8	8	8	7
NA	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	8	4	1
Enrollment in school before 1984														
Kindergarten	5	1	2	2	-	2	10	31	7	7	15	-	8	12
Special education	5	-	1	-	-	-	6	31	-	4	-	-	-	7
First grade — number of years														
0	1	-	1	-	12	12	14	6.25	-	4	-	100	48	17
1	-	2	18	4	-	4	24	-	13	67	31	-	16	29
2	9	9	5	6	-	6	29	56.25	60	18	46	-	24	35
3	5	3	2	2	-	2	12	31.25	20	7	15	-	8	15
4	1	1	-	-	-	-	2	6.25	7	-	-	-	-	2
NA	-	-	1	1	-	1	2	-	-	4	8	-	4	2
T o t a l	16	15	27	13	12	25	83	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Sources: Tables 40 to 43, in Appendix.

TABLE 16
PUPILS' FAMILY TYPE AT TIME OF BIRTH AND
IN 1984 IN EACH OF FOUR FIRST-GRADE CLASSES

Pupil's Family Type	Class A	Class B	Class C	Class D			Total
				Repeaters	New pupils	Total	
Conjugal nuclear family (CNF)*							
Same constitution as at time of birth (1)	10	3	13	8	7	15	41
Mother only (2)	-	2	1	1	-	1	4
Mother and stepfather (5)	1	1	3	-	1	1	6
Nuclear family (NF)**							
Same constitution as at time of birth (1)	2	4	3	1	-	1	10
Mother only (2)	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
Father only (3)	-	1	1	-	1	1	3
Father and stepmother (4)	2	-	1	-	-	-	3
Mother and stepfather (5)	-	1	1	-	-	-	2
Relatives as parents' substitutes (8)	-	-	-	-	1	1	1
No declaration of one or both parents (NCP)***							
Mother only (2)	-	-	1	3	-	3	4
Mother and stepfather (5)	-	1	1	-	1	1	3
Father and adoptive mother (6)	1	-	-	-	1	1	2
Adoptive parents (7)	-	-	2	-	-	-	2
Relatives as parents' substitutes (8)	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
Number of stable families +	12	7	16	9	7	16	51
Total number of families	16	15	27	13	12	25	83
Percentage of stable families	75	47	59	69	58	64	61

Sources: Tables 44 to 47, in Appendix

- * Parents married at time of birth
- ** Parents married or not married at time of birth — both names declared on the child's birth certificate
- *** Parents not married at time of birth
- + Families with the same constitution as at time of birth

TABLE 17
SOCIODECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PUPILS' FAMILIES IN EACH OF FOUR FIRST-GRADE CLASSES
1984

	Number						Percentage							
	Class A	Class B	Class C	Class D			Total	Total	Class A	Class B	Class C	Class D		
				Repeaters	New Pupils	Total						Repeaters	New Pupils	Total
Parents' schooling *														
High school	2	-	1	-	1	1	4	13	-	4	-	8	4	5
4th to 8th grade	9	9	12	8	6	14	44	56	60	45	61	50	56	53
2nd to 3rd grade	4	3	6	1	3	4	17	25	20	22	8	25	16	20
1st grade	1	2	3	-	2	2	8	6	13	11	-	17	8	10
Illiteracy	-	1	3	4	-	4	8	-	7	11	31	-	16	10
NA	-	-	2	-	-	-	2	-	-	7	-	-	-	2
Mother's occupation														
Homemaker	6	6	9	3	4	7	28	37.5	40	33	23	33	28	34
Employed	10	8	17	10	6	16	51	62.5	53	63	77	50	64	61
Unemployed	-	1	-	-	1	1	2	-	7	-	-	8.5	4	2.5
NA	-	-	1	-	1	1	2	-	-	4	-	8.5	4	2.5
Father's occupation														
Employed	16	13	22	9	11	20	71	100	87	81	69	92	80	86
Unemployed	-	2	1	2	1	3	6	-	13	4	15.5	8	12	7
Retired	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	4	-	-	-	1
NA	-	-	3	2	-	2	5	-	-	11	15.5	-	8	6
Income per dependent (in minimum wages)														
1.05	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	8	4	1
.51 to .75	3	1	-	1	3	4	8	19	7	-	8	25	16	10
.26 to .50	2	1	7	4	3	7	17	12.5	7	26	31	25	28	20
.04 to .25	7	8	15	8	4	12	42	43.5	53	56	61	34	48	51
None	-	-	2	-	-	-	2	-	-	7	-	-	-	2
NA	4	5	3	-	1	1	13	25	33	11	-	8	4	16
Number of children in the family														
1	1	-	2	-	2	2	5	6	-	7.5	-	17	8	6
2 to 3	6	4	9	-	4	4	23	37.5	27	33	-	33	16	28
4 to 6	6	9	14	7	4	11	40	37.5	60	52	54	33	44	48
7 to 10	3	2	2	6	2	8	15	19	13	7.5	46	17	32	18
Declared slum dwelling	7	8	9	7	5	12	36	44	53	33	54	42	48	43
Total	16	15	27	13	12	25	83	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Sources: Tables 44 to 47 in Appendix.

* Highest level of schooling, considering both parents.

TABLE 12
COMPARATIVE RESULTS IN THE READING TEST: AVERAGE SCORES OBTAINED IN
EACH OF FOUR CLASS GRADE CLASSES

Parts of the Reading Test	Score	Average Scores *				Total
		Class A	Class B	Class C	Class D	
1 Visual discrimination letters in words	10	9	9	9	9	8.75
2 Relation between capital and lower-case letters	10	10	10	9	9	9.5
3 Sound-symbol correspondence	10	10	10	9	9	9.5
4 Symbol-sound correspondence	10	9	8	8	9	8.25
5 Visual discrimination words	10	9	10	9	9	9.25
6 Visual discrimination sentences	5	5	4	4	4	4.25
7 Visual memory words	5	5	5	5	5	5
8 Visual memory sentences	5		5	5	5	5
9 Comprehension of sentences	5			4	4	4.5
10 Relation between spoken word and written form	10	10	10	10	9	9.75
11 Specific meaning assigned to words	10	8	8	7	7	7.5
12 Reading comprehension short story	10	8	9	8	8	8.25
Total	120	12	13	86	37	89.5

* The total number of pupils taking the test were 15 in Class A, 12 in Class B, 24 in Class C, 15 in Class D, totaling 66.

TABLE 21
COMPARATIVE RESULTS ON THE SPELLING TEST SCORES AND PERCENTAGES OBTAINED
BY EACH OF FOUR FIRST-GRADE CLASSES

Words	Scores					Percentages*				
	Class A	Class B	Class C	Class D	Total	Class A	Class B	Class C	Class D	Total
balcão	9	7	8	8	32	60	58	33	53	48
trazer	5	6	8	5	24	33	50	33	33	36
atenção	2	2	1	1	6	13	17	4	7	9
secar	4	3	5	6	23	27	67	21	40	35
minuto	9	3	13	9	40	60	75	54	60	61
recheiar	3	3	2	2	10	20	25	8	13	15
poder	10	8	11	7	36	67	67	46	47	55
varinha	9	7	9	8	33	60	58	38	53	50
enxada	3	4	3	3	13	20	33	12	20	20
lado	13	11	19	12	55	87	92	79	80	83
vender	8	10	7	7	32	53	83	29	47	48
beleza	13	5	18	8	45	87	50	75	53	68
feiticeira	3	2	4	1	10	20	17	17	7	15
chapêu	13	4	6	8	31	87	33	25	53	47
desejar	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
preto	11	8	16	10	45	73	67	67	67	68
semente	2	6	4	9	21	13	50	17	60	32
alma	12	8	13	8	41	80	67	54	53	62
divertir	2	4	6	2	14	13	33	25	13	21
composição	1	0	0	0	1	7	0	0	0	2
ser	0	9	10	8	27	0	75	42	53	41
querer	9	7	10	7	33	60	58	42	47	50
quilo	10	5	11	8	34	67	42	46	53	52
ter	13	9	16	11	49	87	75	67	73	74
altura	12	5	15	9	41	80	42	62	60	62
inverno	6	8	4	4	22	40	67	17	27	33
louro	10	10	14	8	42	67	83	58	53	64
saiu	12	11	20	9	52	80	92	83	60	79
metro	6	6	16	8	36	40	50	67	53	55
vazio	11	6	11	8	36	73	50	46	53	55
mando	6	2	9	4	21	40	67	38	27	41
elefante	9	4	7	5	25	60	33	29	33	38
distância	1	1	1	1	4	7	8	4	7	6
dente	11	7	8	8	34	73	58	33	53	52
selo	5	10	11	6	32	33	83	46	40	48
escrever	10	6	10	4	30	67	50	42	27	45
branco	9	4	7	4	24	60	33	29	27	36
reza	11	5	7	6	29	73	42	29	40	44
febre	9	5	9	7	30	60	42	38	47	45
saber	11	7	14	10	42	73	58	58	67	64
reporta	2	2	2	0	6	13	17	8	0	9
ordem	4	5	5	3	17	27	50	21	20	27
camisa	3	7	2	6	18	20	58	8	40	27
futuro	11	8	11	10	40	73	67	46	67	61
máquina	8	5	13	5	31	53	42	54	27	52
foco	11	5	16	11	43	73	50	67	73	67
agradece	3	2	2	4	11	20	17	8	27	17
bando	8	2	5	4	19	53	17	21	27	29
cortado	8	7	12	5	32	53	58	50	33	48
reparte	5	6	7	3	21	33	50	29	20	32

* The total number of pupils taking the test were: 15 in Class A, 12 in Class B, 14 in Class C, 15 in Class D, totaling 66.

TABLE 22
 AVERAGE SCORES OBTAINED ON THE READING AND SPELLING
 TESTS BY EACH OF FOUR FIRST-GRADE CLASSES

	Class A	Class B	Class C	Class D
Considering final enrollment*				
Reading test	92	93	86	87
Spelling test	49	49.5	36.5	40
Considering total enrollment minus transfers **				
Reading test	92	74	83	59
Spelling test	49	40	35	27

Source: Table 20.

* The computation excludes from total enrollment (the denominator) transferred pupils plus those who left the school.

** The computation excludes from total enrollment (the denominator) only transferred pupils.

TABLE 23
COMPARATIVE RESULTS ON THE SPELLING TEST — HIGH, MEDIUM OR LOW SCORE
PERCENTAGE * OBTAINED BY EACH OF FOUR FIRST-GRADE CLASSES

Words	Total Rate	High				Medium				Low			
		Class A	Class B	Class C	Class D	Class A	Class B	Class C	Class D	Class A	Class B	Class C	Class D
lado	83	x	x	x	x								
riu	79	x	x	x					x				
ter	74	x	x	x	x								
beleza	68	x		x		x			x				
preto	68	x	x	x	x								
roco	67	x		x	x	x							
louro	64	x	x					x	x				
saber	64	x			x	x	x						
alma	62	x	x					x	x				
altura	62	x					x	x	x				
minuto	61		x			x		x	x				
futuro	61	x	x		x			x					
poder	55	x	x					x	x				
metro	55			x		x	x		x				
vazio	55	x					x	x	x				
quilo	52	x					x	x	x				
dente	52	x					x		x			x	
máquina	52					x	x	x					x
varinha	50					x	x	x	x				
querer	50					x	x	x	x				
balcao	48					x	x		x			x	
vender	48		x			x			x			x	
selo	48		x					x	x	x			
cortado	48					x	x	x					x
chapêu	47	x							x		x	x	
escrever	45	x					x	x					x
febre	45					x	x	x	x				
reza	44	x					x		x			x	
ser	41		x					x	x	x			
mando	41		x			x		x					x
elefante	38					x					x	x	x
trazer	36						x			x		x	x
branco	36					x					x	x	x
secar	35		x						x	x		x	
inverno	33		x			x						x	x
semente	32						x		x	x		x	
reparte	32						x			x		x	x
bando	29					x					x	x	x
ordem	27						x			x		x	x
camisa	27						x		x	x		x	
divertir	21									x	x	x	x
enxada	20									x	x	x	x
agradece	17									x	x	x	x
recheir	15									x	x	x	x
feiticeira	15									x	x	x	x
atenção	9									x	x	x	x
importa	9									x	x	x	x
distância	6									x	x	x	x
composição	2									x	x	x	x
desejar	0									x	x	x	x
Total		18	15	7	6	14	21	18	23	18	14	25	21

* Low corresponds to 0-33 percent, medium, 34-36 percent, and high, 67-100.

TABLE 24
PORTUGUESE KEY-WORDS TAUGHT IN EACH OF FOUR FIRST-GRADE CLASSES
ACCORDING TO VARIOUS SYLLABIC PATTERNS

1 9 8 4

		Class A	Class B	Class C	Class D
1. Patterns CV or CVv or CvV or CVvN					
b*	/b/	bola	(ball)	bule**	(coffepot)
c (before a,o,u)*	/k/	camelo**	(camel)	caraco**++	(snail)
c (before e,i)*	/s/	cebola	(onion)	circo**	(circus)
c (before a,o,u, intervocalic)*	/s/	onça**	(Brazilian wildcat)	palhaco	(clown)
d*	/d/	dedo	(finger)	dália**	(dahlia)
f*	/f/	faca	(knife)	faca**	(knife)
g (before a,o,u)	/g/	gato**	(cat)	gato**	(cat)
g (before e,i)	/z/	girafa**	(giraffe)	girafa	(giraffe)
h	/h/	homem	(man)	harpa**++	(harp)
j*	/j/	janela	(window)	jacaré**	(alligator)
l*	/l/	luva	(glove)	lobo**	(wolf)
m*	/m/	mamãe	(mommy)	minhoca**	(earthworm)
n*	/n/	navio**	(ship)	nenem**++	(baby)
p*	/p/	papai	(daddy)	pipa**	(kite)
q	/kwa/, /kwo/	taquara**	(bamboo)	quadro	(picture)
r*	/R/	rato**	(rat)	rato**	(rat)
r (intervocalic)*	/r/	barata**	(cockroach)	girafa	(giraffe)
s*	/s/	sapo**	(toad)	sapo**	(toad)
s (intervocalic)*	/z/	guisado	(hash)	casaco**	(coat)
t*	/t/	tatu**	(armadillo)	torre**++	(tower)
v*	/v/	vovô	(grandma)	vaga-lume**	(firefly)
x*	/š/	xarope**	(syrup)	Xaveco**	(Xaveco)
x (intervocalic)	/ks/	taxi**	(taxicab)	-	-
x (before e,i, intervocalic)	/s/	trouxe**	(brought)	-	-
x (intervocalic)	/z/	exame**	(examination)	-	-
z*	/z/	zebu	(zebu)	zebra**	(zebra)
2. Pattern CV (digraphs)					
ch*	/š/	cachorro**++	(dog)	chave	(key)
lh (intervocalic)	/j/	abelha**	(bee)	abelha**	(bee)
nh (intervocalic)*	/ñ/	galinha**	(hen)	aranha	(spider)
rr (intervocalic)	/R/	barraca**	(tent)	jarra**	(pitcher)
ss (intervocalic)	/s/	pássaro**	(bird)	pássaro**	(bird)
gu (before e,i)	/g/	foguete**	(rocket)	guerreiro	(warrior)
qu (before e,i)*	/k/	periquito**	(parakeet)	quilo	(kilo)
				chaleira	(kettle)
				coelho	(rabbit)
				ninho	(nest)
				ferradura	(horseshoe)
				osso	(bone)
				foguete	(rocket)
				quero-quero	(Brazilian lapwing)
				chave	(key)
				abelha**	(bee)
				galinha**	(hen)
				garrafa**	(bottle)
				pássaro**	(bird)
				guitarra**	(guitar)
				queijo**++	(cheese)

TABLE 24
Continued

		Class A	Class B	Class C	Class D
3. Patterns VC or CVC					
l (final)*	/l/	sol** (sun)	caracol** (snail)	alto (high)	alfinete** (pin)
m (final)*	/m/	pomba** (pigeon)	limpa*** (clean)	emoadá (meat pie)	pomba (pigeon)
n (final)*	/n/	pintinho** (chick)	anjo (angel)	onça (Brazilian wildcat)	anzol** (fishhook)
r (final)*	/R/	árvore** (tree)	urso** (bear)	árvore (tree)	árvore** (tree)
s (final)*	/s/	esquilo** (squirrel)	esquilo (squirrel)	escova (brush)	escova** (brush)
x (final)	/s/	sexta-feira** (Friday)	-	-	-
z (final)	/z/	luz** (light)	rapaz (boy)	faz (does)	dez** (ten)
4. Pattern C ₁ C ₂ V					
C ₂ = /r/					
br*	C ₁ = /b/	braco** (arm)	brinquedo (toy)	braco (arm)	braco** (arm)
cr*	C ₁ = /c/	criança** (child)	criança (child)	cravo (carnation)	cravo** (carnation)
dr	C ₁ = /d/	padrinho** (godfather)	padrinho (godfather, madrinha godmother)	pedra (rock)	madrinha** (godmother)
fr	C ₁ = /f/	frutas (fruit)	fraco** (weak)	frade (monk)	fronha** (pillowcase)
gr*	C ₁ = /g/	grilo** (cricket)	gravura (picture)	grato (grateful)	grade** (grate)
pr*	C ₁ = /p/	prateleira** (shelf)	primavera (spring)	praia** (beach)	primavera (spring)
tr*	C ₁ = /t/	trigo (wheat)	trabalho (work)	trapo (rag)	trigo** (wheat)
vr	C ₁ = /v/	livro** (book)	livro (book)	lavro (plough)	livro** (book)
C ₂ = /l/					
bl	C ₁ = /b/	blusa** (blouse)	bloco+ (writing pad, carnival group)	blusa (blouse)	blusa** (blouse)
cl	C ₁ = /c/	classe (desk)	claro+ (clear)	NA	classe (desk)
fl	C ₁ = /f/	flores** (flowers)	flauta** (flute)	flecha (arrow)	flauta**++ (flute)
gl	C ₁ = /g/	globo** (globe)	globo+ (globe)	NA	globo** (globe)
pl	C ₁ = /p/	placa** (number plate)	placa+ (number plate)	placa (number plate)	placa** (number plate)
tl	C ₁ = /t/	atleta (athlete)	atleta+ (athlete)	NA	atleta (athlete)
vl	C ₁ = /v/	Vladimir (Vladimir)	-	-	-
Total of patterns		55	50	48	50
Total of words		55	51	44	50
Total of NA		-	-	4	-
Total of key-words in the Primers		38	20	NA	43

- * Syllabic patterns which were part of the spelling test, totaling 32.
- ** Key-word indicated in the primer used in each class.
- *** First word in pupils' notebooks, not necessarily a key-word.
- + Pattern probably taught by another teacher, not indicated in Teacher B's records.
- ++ Syllable more complex than the specified patterns.

TABLE 75
PAGE 2 AND CONTINUING IN THE LITERACY PROCESS - SCHEDULE OF PARTICIPATION OF
PARENTS AND GUARDIANS IN EACH OF FOUR FIRST-GRADE CLASSES
1984

Month	School Days		Class A	Class B	Class C	School Days		Class D
	Month	Day				Month	Day	
March	12	12	12 vocalic groups					
April	19	21	19 vocalic groups	19 vocalic groups	19 vocalic groups	18	18 vocalic groups	
May	12	53	12 c (before a o u ai)	12 c (before a o u)	12 c (before a o u)	44	44 c (before a o u ai)	
June	20	33	20 c (before a o u ai)	20 c (before a o u)	20 c (before a o u)	69	69 c (before a o u ai)	
July	17	90	17 c (before a o u)	17 c (before a o u)	17 c (before a o u)	88	88 c (before a o u ai)	
August	23	113	23 c (before a o u)	23 c (before a o u)	23 c (before a o u)	111	111 c (before a o u ai)	

TABLE 25
Continued

Months	School Days		Class A	Class B	Class C	School Days		Class D
	Monthly	Cumulative				Monthly	Cumulative	
September	18	131	ch c br cr dr fr gr pr	lh a (final) ch c (before a, i) c qu (before a, i) q = /kwa/, /kwo/	z a = /s/ cr (intervocalic) r (intervocalic) qu (before a, i) c (before a, i)	18	129	b s (intervocalic) ch
October	21	152	tr vr h qu (before a, i) s (intervocalic) bl cl pl gl pl tl vl z (final) a = /hs/ = /s/ = /z/ a (final) = /s/	s (final) pr cr tr vr bl cl pl gl pl tl vl	r (final) ch lh s (final) ss (intervocalic) r s (intervocalic)	21	152	pr br dr fr gr tr vr cr qu (before a, i) q = /kwa/, /kwo/ fl bl cl gl pl tl qu (before a, i) z (final)
November	20	172		dr br gr fr qu (before a, i)	a (final) a (final) br cr pr fr gr dr vr tr z (final) sh l (final) qu (before a, i) bl cl pl gl pl tl	20	172	
December	8	180				8	180	
Total of consonants			55	50	48			50

- * The bracket indicates that two or more consonants or consonantal groups were taught on the same school day
- ** Vocalic groups also
- *** Literacy process initiated again
- Patterns appearing in the children's notebooks but not in teacher B's records, totaling eleven

TABLE 26
PACING AND SEQUENCING IN THE LITERACY PROCESS — SCHEDULE
OF PRESENTATION OF CONSONANTS IN EACH
OF FOUR FIRST-GRADE CLASSES

1 9 8 4

Months	School Days	Class A	Class B	Class C	School Days	Class D
March	12	1	-	-	-	-
April	19	4	2	1	18	2
May	22	6	5	2	26	4
March-May	53	11	7	3	-	6
June	20	5	3	3	25	6
July	17	5	4	3	19	8
August	23	9	13	6	23	9
June-August	60	19	20	12	-	23
September	18	8	7	6	18	3
October	21	17	11	7	23	18
November	20	-	5	20	20	-
September-November	59	25	23	33	-	21
December	8	-	-	-	8	-
T o a l	180	55	50	48	180	50

Source: Table 25.

TABLE 29
CONGRUENCE AND INCONGRUENCE OF STATUS ACCORDING TO TEACHER AND CLASSMATES' ATTRIBUTION IN
EACH OF FOUR FIRST-GRADE CLASSES
OCTOBER, 1984

		Class A		Class B		Class C		Class D		
		Pupil's Identification	Total	Pupil's Identification	Total	Pupil's Identification	Total	Pupil's Identification	Total	Total
Congruence of status										
Very high			-		-	34,47,48,55	4		-	
High		2,3,4,9,12,15	6	17,19,20,21,29	5	32,36,46	3	60,65,75,80	4	
Medium		16	1	23,25,31	3	33,38,41	3	61,63,66,69	4	
Low		10	1	27	1		-	70,73,74	3	
Very low			-		-		-	71	1	
Total			53		9		10		12	39
Percentage					69		42		71	57
Incongruence of status										
Type one										
Teacher's attribution	Classmates' attribution									
High	Medium	6,13	2	28	1	37,39,40,49,50,54,57	7	59	1	
Medium	Low	7,8	2	18,22,24	3		-	62,64,68,72	4	
High	Low		-		-	42	1		-	
Total			4		4		8		5	21
Percentage			27		31		33		29	30
Type two										
Teacher's attribution	Classmates' attribution									
High	Very high		-		-	35	1		-	
Medium	High	1,5,14	3		-		-		-	
None	Low		-		-	43,44,45,51,58	5		-	
Total			3		-		6		-	9
Percentage			20		0		25		0	13
Total			15		13		24		17	69

Sources: Tables 52 to 55, in Appendix.

TABLE 33
PUPILS' CAREER IN SCHOOL — CLASS A *
1980 - 1987

Pupil's Identification Number	Enrollment in Kindergarten, Special Education, and Initial Grades							
	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987
1			1	1	1	2	3	4
2			1	1	1	2	3	4
3		1** LS	1	1	1	2	3 T	4
4			1	1	1	2	3	3
5		K**	1	1;1	1	2	3	3
6			1	1	1	2	3	3
7		K***	K	K LS	1**;1;1	2	3	3
8	1	1	1;1	1	1	2	2	3
9		1** LS	1	1	1	2 T		
10	K***LS	K	1;SE	1	1 NP	T		
11			1	1	1 T			
12			1;SE;1	1	1	2	3 LS	
13		1;1;SE	1;1	1	1	2 CE		
14	1;1	1;SE	1	1	1	2 LS		
15+	1**	1;1	1;SE	SE T	1	E		
16	K***	K	1	1	1	2 NP	LS	

* Abbreviations: K - kindergarten;
SE - special education;
NP - nonpromoted;
CE - cancelled enrollment;
E - eliminated by the school;
LS - left school;
T - transfer to another school.

** Enrolled at another school.

*** CEAPE.

+ Attended kindergarten at another school, in 1979.

TABLE 34
PUPILS' CAREER IN SCHOOL — CLASS B *
1980 - 1987

Pupil's Identification Number	Enrollment in Kindergarten, Special Education, and Initial Grades							
	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987
17			1**	1	1;1	2	3	4
18			1	1	1	2	3	4
19				1	1;1	2	3	3
20				1	1;1	2	3	3
21			1	1;1	1	2	3	3
22			1	1	1	2	3	3
23		1**	1	1	1	2	2	3
24			1 LS	1;1	1 LS	1	2	3
25			1	1	1		1	2
26	K+ LS	1;1	1	1	1;1 LS	1 LS	1 NP	1
27			1	1;1	1 NP	T		
28			1**	1	1	2 LS		
29		1**	1 LS	1;1	1	LS		
30	1**	1	1 LS	1;1	1 LS			
31			1	1	1	2 LS	2*** LS	

- * Abbreviations: K - kindergarten;
NP - nonpromoted;
LS - left school;
T - transference to another school.
** Enrolled at another school.
*** Adult elementary school.
+ CEAPE.

TABLE 35
PUPILS' CAREER IN SCHOOL — CLASS C •
1980 - 1987

Pupil's Identification Number	Enrollment in Kindergarten, Special Education, and Initial Grades							
	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987
32				1	1	2	3	4
33				1	1	2	3	4
34				1	1	2	3	4
35				1	1	2	3	4
36			1, SE	SE, 1		2	3	4
37				1	1	2	3	4
38			1**	1	1	1	2***	3-4***
39				1	1	2	3	3
40				1	1	2	2	3
41			1**LS	1	1, 1	2	2	3
42				1	1	2	2	3
43				1	1	1	2	3
44		K**	1**	1	1	1	2	3
45				1	1	1	2	2
46			1	1, 1 LS	1	2	3 T	
47			K**	K; 1; 1	1	2	T	
48	1**	1**	1		1	2 LS	T	
49				1	1	2 T		
50		1; 1	1	1	1	LS T		
51				1	1 NP	T		
52			1	1, 1	1 T			
53					1 T			
54				1	1	2 LS	2 T	
55				1	1	2	3 LS	
56				1 LS	1 LS			
57				1	1	2	3 NP	LS
58				1	1 NP	LS		

* Abbreviations. K - kindergarten; SE - special education; NP - nonpromoted; LS - left school; T - transference to another school.
 ** Enrolled at another school.
 *** Adult elementary school.

TABLE 36
PUPILS' CAREER IN SCHOOL — CLASS D •
1980 - 1987

Pupil's Identification Number	Enrollment in Kindergarten, Special Education, and Initial Grades							
	1980**	1981**	1982**	1983**	1984	1985	1986	1987
59		1	1	1	1	2	3	4
60				1 T, 1	1	2	3	4
61			1 LS, 1 LS	1 LS	1	2	3 LS	3
62	K	K	K	1 LS	1	2	3	3
63				1	1	2	2	3
64					1, 1	2	2	3
65		K	1 LS	1 LS	1	2 LS	2	3
66			1 LS	1 LS	1	2 NP	T	
67					1 LS		1*** LS	
68		1 LS, 1 E			1 LS	2*** NP	LS	
69			1	1	1 LS			
70		1	1 LS, 1 LS	1 LS	1	1 NP	LS	
71			1 LS	1 LS	1	1 D		
72					1	2	3	1
73					1	2	2	3
74					1	1	2	3
75					1	2	3 T	
76					1 T			
77					1 T			
78					1 T			
79					1, 1	1	2 NP	T
80					1	2 LS	3*** LS	
81					1 LS			
82					1 LS			
83					1; K	1 NP	LS	

- Abbreviations K - kindergarten, LS - left school,
NP - nonprompted, T - transference to another school,
E - eliminated by the school, D - deceased.
** Enrolled at another school before 1984 (exceptions: Pupil 64, and Pupil 68, first enrollment).
*** Adult elementary school.

TABLE 31
PUPILS WHO PERSISTED AT THE SCHOOL
1984 - 1987

Pupils who Persisted at the School	Grade in March 1987	Class A	Class B	Class C	Class D		Total
					Repeaters	New Pupils	
Pupils who attended the school from 1984 to 1987							
Promoted every school year	Fourth	1	17	32	59		
		2	18	33	60		
		3*		34			
				35			
				36			
				37			13
Nonpromoted to fourth grade once	Third	4	19	19	61	12	
		5	20		62		
		6	21				
		7	22				12
Nonpromoted to third grade once	Third	8	23	40	63	73	
				41	64		
				42			8
Nonpromoted to second grade once	Third			38**		74	
				43			
				44			4
Nonpromoted to second grade once and third once	Second			45			1
Pupils who left the school and returned							
Left and attended second grade again	Third				65***		1
Left and attended first grade again	Third		24**				1
Non-enrolled one school year	Second		25***				1
Left twice and nonpromoted to second grade once	First		26*				1
Total		8	10	14	7	3	42

Sources: Tables 33 to 36, in Appendix.

- * In 1986, attended another school (third grade).
- ** Left the school in November 1984, almost promoted, returned, being in third grade in 1987
- *** In 1984, promoted to second grade, in 1985, stayed out of school, in 1986, attended first grade again, being promoted for the second time to second grade, in 1987, attended second grade
- * Left the school in May 1984, in 1985, returned and left again in May; in 1986, attended first grade for the entire school year, being nonpromoted, in 1987, attended first grade again, though only auditing it.
- ** In 1984, nonpromoted, in 1985, attended the regular first grade again, being promoted, in 1986, transferred to the adult non-graded elementary school — level one, successfully accomplishing what corresponds to the regular second grade, in 1987, continued in the same evening program — level two, it being possible for him to have completed what corresponds to regular third and fourth grades by the end of the year.
- *** Promoted to second grade in 1984, left the school in May 1985 while in second grade; in 1986, attended second grade again, being promoted, and attending third grade in 1987.

TABLE 38
PUPILS WHO TRANSFERRED TO OTHER SCHOOLS
1984 - 1987

Pupils Who Transferred to Other Schools	Last Successful Grade	Class A	Class B	Class C	Class D		Total
					Repeaters	New Pupils	
Pupils who transferred, not returning							
During third grade	Second			46		75	2
After promotion to third grade	Second			47			1
After nonpromotion to third grade	First				66		1
During second grade	First	9		48*, 49			3
After promotion to second grade	First			50**			1
After nonpromotion to second grade	None	10	27	51			3
During first grade	None	11		52		76	
				53		77	
Class and school transfers	First					78	6
Pupil who left the school, returned and transferred to another school	First					79+	1
	First			54***			1
Total		3	1	9	1	5	19

Sources: Tables 33 to 36, in Appendix.

- * Promoted to second grade in 1984, left the school in May 1985 while in second grade, and transferred in March 1986.
- ** Non-enrolled in school in 1985, stayed out of school until transferred
- *** Promoted to second grade in 1984, left the school in May 1985 while in second grade, in 1986, attended second grade again, and transferred in August.
- + Class and shift transferred in August 1984, and was retained in first grade; in 1985, attended first grade again, being promoted to second grade, in 1986, attended second grade but was retained, in March 1987, transferred to another school.

TABLE 19
PUPILS WHO LEFT THE SCHOOL
1984-1987

Pupils who Left the School	Last Successful Grade	Class A	Class B	Class C	Class D		Total
					Repeaters	New Pupils	
Pupils who left the school, returned and left again							
Without failing	First					80*	1
	None				67**		1
After failing the second grade	None				68***		1
Pupils who left the school without failing							
During third grade	Second	12		55			2
During second grade	First	13*	28				3
		14					3
After promotion to second grade	First	15**	29				2
During first grade	None		30	56	69	81	5
						82	5
Pupils who left the school after nonpromotion							
After nonpromotion to fourth grade	Second			57+			1
While repeating second grade	First		31***				1
After nonpromotion to third grade	First	16					1
After nonpromotion to second grade	None			58		83**	2
After two nonpromotions to second grade	None				70		1
Deceased while repeating first grade	None				71		1
Total		5	4	4	5	4	22

Sources Tables 33 to 36, in Appendix.

- * Cancelled enrollment.
- ** Enrollment not accepted by the inspector who functioned as a monitor of "undisciplined" pupils.
- *** Promoted to second grade in 1984; in 1985, when attending second grade, final examinations not taken; in 1986, transferred to the non-graded elementary school — level one, corresponding to regular second grade, leaving it in May, and not being enrolled in 1987.
- + Final examinations in third grade not taken — considered nonpromoted; left the school in 1987.
- ++ Left the school in August 1984 while in first grade; stayed out of school during 1985; in 1986, attended the adult literacy program, leaving it in August; in 1987, not enrolled at the school.
- +++ Left the school on November 1, 1984, in 1985 attended the non-graded elementary school, level one — corresponding to regular second grade, and failed it; since 1986 not enrolled at the school.
- Promoted to second grade in 1984; in September 1985, left the school while in second grade; in 1986, attended the non-graded elementary school — level two, corresponding to regular third and fourth grades, leaving it in May; not enrolled in 1987.
- Transferred to kindergarten in May 1984 by Teacher D; in 1985, nonpromoted to second grade; not enrolled at the school since 1986.

TABLE 40
PUPILS' CHARACTERISTICS AND THEIR SCHOOL CAREER BEFORE 1974 — CLASS A

Pupil's Identification Number	Sex	Age	Ethnic Group	Health	Religion **	School Career Before 1974						
						Kindergarten		Special Education		First Grade		
						Number of Years of	Number of Teachers	Number of Years of	Number of Teachers	Number of Years of	Number of Classes	Number of Teachers
1	F	9y 7m	B	Good	C	-	-	-	-	2	2	2
2	M	9y	W	Good	C	-	-	-	-	2	2	2
3	M	8y 9m	W	Fair	C	-	-	-	-	3+	3	3
4	F	9y 11m	W	Fair	C	-	-	-	-	2	2	3
5	F	10y 9m	B	Good	C	1+	1	-	-	2	3	3
6	M	10y 1m	W	Good	C	-	-	-	-	2	2	2
7	M	7y	W	NA	C	3	6	-	-	-	-	-
8	F	10y 10m	W	Good	C	-	-	-	-	4	5	4
9	M	9y 4m	W	Good	C	-	-	-	-	3+	3	4
10	M	9y 2m	W	Poor	C	2	2	2m	1	1 and 7m	2	3
11***	F	10y 5m	W	NA	C	-	-	-	-	2	2	2
12	M	10y 8m	W	Poor	C	-	-	1m	1	1 and 8m	3	4
13	F	10y 6m	W	Good	C	-	-	4m	1	2 and 5m	5	5
14	F	12y 2m	W	Poor	C	-	-	7m	1	3 and 2m	5	6
15	M	10y 8m	B	Good	C	1++	1	4m, 2m, 7m	2	2 and 5m+	4	5
16	M	9y 7m	B	Good	C	2	3	-	-	2	2	2

* W stands for white, and B, for black.

** C stands for Roman Catholic Church.

*** Indicated for the summer recuperation session, but did not attend

+ Attended another school for one year

++ Attended kindergarten in another school in 1979.

TABLE 41
PUPILS' CHARACTERISTICS AND THEIR SCHOOL CAREER BEFORE 1984 — CLASS B

Pupils Identification Number	Sex	Age	Ethnic Group	Health	Religion	School Career Before 1984					
						Kindergarten		Special Education		First Grade	
						Number of Years of Teachers	Number of Teachers	Number of Years of Teachers	Number of Teachers	Number of Years of Teachers	Number of Teachers
17	M	10y 11m	M	Fair	C	-	-	-	-	2+	2
18	M	8y 10m	W	Fair	C	-	-	-	-	2	2
19	F	10y 7m	B	Good	C	-	-	-	-	2	2
20	F	8y 6m	M	Good	C	-	-	-	-	1	1
21	M	12y 2m	M	Good	C	-	-	-	-	1	1
22	M	9y 8m	B	Fair	C	-	-	-	-	3	3
23	F	9y	B	Good	C	-	-	-	-	2	2
24	M	9y 5m	M	Fair	C	-	-	-	-	1+	3
25	F	9y 1m	B	Good	C	-	-	-	-	2	3
26	M	9y 3m	W	NA	C	1	1	-	-	2	2
27	M	8y 10m	M	Fair	C	-	-	-	-	3	4
28	F	9y 6m	B	Good	C	-	-	-	-	2	3
29***	M	9y 7m	W	Fair	P	-	-	-	-	2+	2
30	M	11y 1m	W	NA	C	-	-	-	-	3+	4
31	M	13y 7m	W	Poor	C	-	-	-	-	4+	5
										2	2

- W stands for white, M, for mulato, and B, for black.
- C stands for Roman Catholic Church, and P, for Pentecostal
- Indicated for the summer recuperation session, but did not attend.
- Attended another school for one year

TABLE 42
PUPILS' CHARACTERISTICS AND THEIR SCHOOL CAREER BEFORE 1984 — CLASS C

Pupil's Identification Number	Sex	Age	Ethnic Group	Health	Religion	School Career Before 1984						
						Kindergarten		Special Education		First Grade		
						Number of Years	Number of Teachers	Number of Years	Number of Teachers	Number of Years	Number of Classes	Number of Teachers
32	F	9y 7m	W	Good	C/P	-	-	-	-	1	1	1
33	F	9y 1m	W	Good	C	-	-	-	-	1	1a	1
34***	F	8y 5m	M	Fair	C	-	-	-	-	1	1	1
35	F	7y	M	Good	C	-	-	-	-	1	1a	1
36	M	8y 10m	W	Fair	C	-	-	3m; 4m	1	6m, 5m	2a	2
37	M	8y 2m	W	Good	C/E	-	-	-	-	1	1	1
38	M	12y 7m	W	Fair	C	-	-	-	-	2+	2	2
39	M	8y 5m	M	Fair	C	-	-	-	-	1	1	1
40	F	11y 10m	W	Good	C	-	-	-	-	1	1	1
41	F	9y 2m	W	NA	C	-	-	-	-	2+	2	2
42	M	8y 8m	B	Good	C	-	-	-	-	1	1a	1
43	F	9y	W	Fair	C	-	-	-	-	1	1	1
44	M	9y 2m	B	Fair	C	1+	1	-	-	2+	2a	2
45	F	9y 7m	W	Fair	C	-	-	-	-	1	1a	1
46	M	9y 5m	M	Fair	C	-	-	-	-	2	3	3
47	M	7y 9m	M	Fair	C	1 and 7m+	2	-	-	2m	2	2
48	M	12y 11m	W	Fair	C	-	-	-	-	3++	NA	NA
49	F	8y 7m	W	Good	C	-	-	-	-	1	1	1
50	F	10y 5m	B	Fair	C	-	-	-	-	3	4	6
51	M	8y 5m	W	Fair	C	-	-	-	-	1	1a	1
52	M	9y 5m	W	Poor	C	-	-	-	-	2	3	3
53	M	8y 9m	W	Fair	C	-	-	-	-	NA+++	NA	NA
54	M	8y 7m	W	Good	C	-	-	-	-	1	1	1
55	F	12y 6m	B	Good	C	-	-	-	-	1	1	1
56	M	9y 11m	W	NA	L	-	-	-	-	1	1	1
57	M	7y 11m	M	Good	C	-	-	-	-	1	1	1
58	F	7y 10m	M	Good	C	-	-	-	-	1	1	1

* W stands for white, M, for mulatto, and B, for black.

** C stands for Roman Catholic Church, E, for Evangelical; L, for Lutheran; and P, for Pentecostal.

*** Attended the summer recuperation session, but failed.

+ Attended another school for one year.

++ Attended another school for two years.

+++ Enrolled in 1984, transferred before interview

• Only initiated the process of literacy, in 1983

TABLE 43
PUPILS' CHARACTERISTICS AND THEIR SCHOOL CAREER BEFORE 1984 — CLASS 2

						School Career Before 1984						
Pupil's Identification Number	Sex	Age	Ethnic Group	Health	Religion **	Kindergarten		Special Education		First Grade		
						Number of Years	Number of Teachers	Number of Years	Number of Teachers	Number of Years	Number of Classes	Number of Teachers
59	F	11y	W	Fair	C	-	-	-	-	3***	NA	NA
60	F	8y 5m	W	Fair	C	-	-	-	-	1m***, 8m***	NA	NA
61	M	8y 3m	W	Fair	C	-	-	-	-	2***	NA	NA
62	M	8y 1m	M	Good	C	3***	NA	-	-	4m***	NA	NA
63	F	10y 1m	B	Good	C	-	-	-	-	1***	NA	NA
64	M	8y 8m	W	Fair	L	-	-	-	-	1	1	1
65	M	9y 4m	W	Fair	C	1***	2	-	-	1m***, 8m***	NA	NA
66	M	9y 5m	W	Fair	C	-	-	-	-	2***	NA	NA
67	M	13y 5m	W	Fair	C	-	-	-	-	NA	NA	NA
68	M	14y 3m	W	NA	C	-	-	-	-	1m; 7m***	2	2
69	F	11y 11m	W	Good	C	-	-	-	-	2***	NA	NA
70	F	9y 5m	W	Poor	C	-	-	-	-	3***	NA	NA
71	F	10y 5m	W	Fair	C	-	-	-	-	2***	NA	NA
72	M	7y 2m	W	Fair	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
73	M	8y 9m	B	Good	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
74	F	9y	I	NA	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
75	F	9y 9m	M	Fair	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
76	F	7y 1m	W	Fair	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
77	F	6y 6m	NA	Good	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
78	M	8y 3m	W	NA	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
79	M	8y 2m	M	NA	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
80	F	11y 5m	W	Fair	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
81	M	7y 11m	W	Fair	P	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
82	F	8y 6m	W	NA	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
83	F	6y 7m	W	NA	NA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

- * W stands for white, M, for mulato; B, for black; and I, for Brazilian Indian.
 ** C stands for Roman Catholic Church, L, for Lutheran, and P, for Pentecostal.
 *** Attended another school before 1984.

TABLE 44
CHARACTERISTICS OF PUPILS' FAMILIES — PARENTS' SCHOOLING, OCCUPATION, FAMILY INCOME, NUMBER OF DEPENDENTS,
INCOME PER DEPENDENT, FAMILY TYPE, NUMBER OF CHILDREN AND DWELLING
CLASS A

Pupil's Identification Number	Schooling [*]		Occupation **		Family Income ***	Number of Dependents	Income per Dependent	Family Type		Number of Children	Slum Dwelling
	Mother	Father	Mother	Father				At the Child's Birth+	In 1984++		
1	4th	3rd	Waitress	Carpenter, mason	.88	5	.18	CNF	1	3	Yes
2	4th	High-school: 2nd	Grocer	Grocer	1.36	7	.19	CNF	1	5	No
3	2nd	1st	Maid	Carpenter; painter	1.40	7	.20	CNF	1	6	No
4	3rd	Illiterate	Cleaner	Hodman	NA	11	NA	CNF	1	9	Yes
5	5th	5th (NA)	Cleaner	Gardener (Driver)	1.00	9	0.11	CNF	5	7	NA
6	Illiterate (NA)	5th	Cleaner (Homemaker)	Cleaner	NA	8	NA	NF	4	8	No
7	High school: incomplete	Elementary school: incomplete	Homemaker	Taxi-driver	2.80	4	.70	CNF	1	2	NA
8	1st	Illiterate	Cleaner	Hodman	NA	8	NA	CNF	1	6	Yes
9	NA (2nd)	3rd	NA (Homemaker)	Painter	1.58	3	.53	NF	4	1	Yes
10	5th	5th	Waitress	Bus inspector	1.92	4	.48	CNF	1	2	No
11	5th	5th	Homemaker	Trucker	2.10	8	.26	CNF	1	5	No
12	5th	Illiterate	Babysitter	Carpenter; mason; painter	.65	4	.16	CNF	1	2	Yes
13	3rd	5th	Homemaker	Locksmith	NA	8	NA	NOM	6	6	No
14	4th	Illiterate	Babysitter	Carpenter; mason; painter	.65	4	.16	CNF	1	2	Yes
15	2nd	Illiterate	Maid	Mason	2.80	4	.70	NF	1	2	NA
16	Illiterate	5th	Homemaker	Mason	.56	6	.09	NF	1	4	Yes

* Grade attended in school.

** Information about stepmother or stepfather, in parentheses.

*** Measured taking as unit the minimum salary, worth fifty-seven thousand, one hundred and twenty cruzeiros, from November 1983 up to April 1984, varying, in this period, between one hundred and nine dollars and eighty five cents, and forty-eight dollars and five cents. (Banco Central do Brasil 19 [November 1983] 304, 20 [August 1984] 218, 342).

+ CNF stands for conjugal nuclear family, NF stands for nuclear family, NOM stands for non declared parents in the birth certificate, specifying if mother (M) or father (F).

++ Meaning of the codes — 1: same constitution as in the child's birth; 2: only mother; 3: only father; 4: father and stepmother, 5: mother and stepfather; 6: father and adoptive mother, 7: adoptive parents; 8: relatives as parents' substitutes.

TABLE 45
CHARACTERISTICS OF PUPILS' FAMILIES — PARENTS' SCHOOLING, OCCUPATION, FAMILY INCOME, NUMBER OF DEPENDENTS,
INCOME PER DEPENDENT, FAMILY TYPE, NUMBER OF CHILDREN AND DWELLING
CLASS B

Pupil's Identification Number	Schooling **		Occupation **		Family Income ***	Number of Dependents	Income per Dependent	Family Type		Number of Children	Slum Dwelling
	Mother	Father	Mother	Father				At the Child's Birth**	In 1984***		
17	5th	Illiterate	Cleaner	Hodman	.96	7	.14	CNF	1	6	Yes
18	2nd	3rd	Homemaker	Carpenter	NA	6	NA	MF	1	4	NA
19	Illiterate	1st	Homemaker	Hodman	.51	5	.10	MF	3	2	No
20	3rd	7th	Babysitter	Message boy	1.05	2	.52	CNF	2	2	No
21	4th	5th	Cook	Mechanic	.84	7	.12	CNF	1	6	Yes
22	NA (Illiterate)	4th	NA (Homemaker)	Mechanic	NA	9	NA	NDM	8	6	NA
23	Illiterate	1st	Homemaker	Mason	1.05	6	.18	MF	1	5	Yes
24	4th	NA (4th)	Waitress	NA (Bus conductor unemployed)	.88	4	.22	MDP	5,8	2	NA
25	5th	5th	Dressmaker	Trucker	NA	8	NA	NF	1	5	No
26	5th	5th	Cleaner	Installer of blinds	.63	7	.09	MF	2	5	No
27	3rd	3rd	Homemaker	Shoemaker	1.75	5	.35	CNF	1	2	Yes
28	2nd	NA+ (NA)	Maid, unemployed	NA+ (Policeman)	.54	6	.09	NF	5	6	Yes
29	4th	NA (5th)	Cleaner	NA (Grocer)	NA	6	NA	CNF	5	4	Yes
30	4th	4th	Cleaner	Cabinet-maker	NA	12	NA	CNF	2	10	Yes
31	Illiterate	Illiterate	Homemaker	Hodman; unemployed	.88	9	.10	NF	1	8	Yes

* Grade attended in school.

** Information about stepmother or stepfather, in parentheses

*** Measured taking as unit the minimum salary, worth fifty-seven thousand, one hundred and twenty cruzeiros, from November 1983 up to April 1984, varying, in this period, between one hundred and nine dollars and eighty five cents, and forty-eight dollars and five cents. (Banco Central do Brasil) 19 [November 1983] 304; 20 [August 1984] 218,342).

+ Deceased.

++ CNF stands for conjugal nuclear family, NF stands for nuclear family, MDP stands for non declared parents in the birth certificate, specifying if mother (M) or father (F).

+++ Meaning of the codes - 1. same constitution as in the child's birth; 2. only mother; 3. only father; 4. father and stepmother; 5. mother and stepfather; 6. father and adoptive mother; 7. adoptive parents; 8. relatives as parents' substitutes.

TABLE 46
CHARACTERISTICS OF PUPILS' FAMILIES — PARENTS' SCHOOLING, OCCUPATION, FAMILY INCOME, NUMBER OF DEPENDENTS,
INCOME PER DEPENDENT, FAMILY TYPE, NUMBER OF CHILDREN AND DWELLING
CLASS C

Pupil's Identification Number	Schooling **		Occupation **		Family Income ***	Number of Dependents	Income per Dependent	Family Type		Number of Children	Slum Dwelling
	Mother	Father	Mother	Father				At the Child's Birth...	In 1984...		
32	1st	1st	Cleaner	Retired	.38	3	.13	NCP	7	1	NA
33	NA	5th	NA	Porter	.52	12	.04	MF	3	5	No
34	2nd	2nd (NA)	Cleaner	Modena (Subway-light replacer)	.79	5	.16	CNF	5	3	NA
35	5th	1st	Homemaker	Mason	1.05	6	.18	CNF	1	4	Yes
36	5th	5th	Homemaker	Mason	1.05	10	.10	MF	1	8	NA
37	Illiterate	NA	Homemaker	NA	NA	8	NA	CNF	2	7	NA
38	Illiterate	NA	Cleaner	NA	1.00	3	.33	NCP	2	2	NA
39	3rd	5th	Cleaner	Candy salesman	1.58	6	.26	CNF	1	5	NA
40	1st	NA	Homemaker	Painter, mason	1.14	6	.19	CNF	1	4	NA
41	5th	5th	Cleaner	Modena	.91	4	.23	CNF	1	2	NA
42	NA	NA	Teacher	Policeman	1.00	6	.17	CNF	1	4	No
43	5th	NA (5th)	Cleaner	NA	1.42	8	.18	MF	5	4	No
44	3rd	3rd	Cleaner	(Bus conductor) Gas station attendant	1.49	5	.30	CNF	1	3	No
45	2nd	Illiterate	Homemaker	Mason	1.40	8	.18	CNF	1	6	Yes
46	1st	Illiterate	Cleaner	Mason	.96	4	.24	CNF	1	2	Yes
47	NA (NA)	4th	NA (Commodities seller)	Doorman	1.40	3	.47	MF	4	1	No
48	1st	5th	Cleaner	Mason	1.40	5	.28	CNF	1	7	NA
49	8th	High school	Nurse's aid	Practical nurse	1.64	6	.28	CNF	1	3	NA
50	3rd	Illiterate	Homemaker	Mason	None	9	None	CNF	1	6	Yes
51	Illiterate	3rd	Cook	Matchman	2.10	5	.42	CNF	1	3	No
52	1st	3rd	Cleaner	Painter	NA	6	NA	MF	1	4	Yes
53	2nd	4th	Homemaker	Carpenter, unemployed	None	7	None	CNF	1	5	Yes
54	Illiterate	NA- (NA)	Cleaner	NA- (NA)	.56	5	.11	CNF	5	4	Yes
55	NA	NA (NA)	Cook	NA (Mason)	NA	7	NA	NCP	5	5	NA
56	4th	4th	Homemaker	Mason	1.75	8	.22	NCP	7	6	Yes
57	4th	4th (NA)	Nurse's aid	Painter (Painter)	.52	5	.10	CNF	5	4	Yes
58	5th	5th	Maid	Civil servant doorman	1.00	5	.20	MF	1	3	NA

* Grade attended in school

** Information about stepmother or stepfather, in parentheses

*** Measured taking as unit the minimum salary, worth fifty-seven thousand, one hundred and twenty cruzeiros, from November 1983 up to April 1984, varying, in this period, between one hundred and nine dollars and eighty five cents, and forty-eight dollars and five cents (Banco Central do Brasil 19 [November 1983] 304, 20 [August 1984] 218, 342)

~ Deceased

~ CNF stands for conjugal nuclear family, NF stands for nuclear family, NCP stands for non declared parents in the birth certificate, specifying if mother (M) or father (F)

*** Meaning of the codes — 1 same constitution as in the child's birth, 2: only mother, 3: only father, 4: father and stepmother, 5: mother and stepfather, 6: father and adoptive mother, 7: adoptive parents, 8: relatives as parents' substitutes

TABLE 47
CHARACTERISTICS OF PUPILS' FAMILIES — PARENTS' SCHOOLING, OCCUPATION, FAMILY INCOME, NUMBER OF DEPENDENTS,
INCOME PER DEPENDENT, FAMILY TYPE, NUMBER OF CHILDREN AND DWELLING
CLASS D

Pupil's Identification Number	Schooling **		Occupation **		Family Income ***	Number of Dependents	Income per Dependent	Family Type		Number of Children	Still Dwelling
	Mother	Father	Mother	Father				At the Child's Birth**	In 1984***		
59	6th	3rd	Leather Artisan	Carpenter	1 58	10	.16	CNF	1	6	No
60	1st	5th	Homemaker	Mason	3 29	11	.30	CNF	1	9	Yes
61	Illiterate	Illiterate	Cleaner	Mason; unemployed	1 58	7	.22	CNF	1	5	NA
62	5th	5th	Cleaner	Hodman	2 66	8	.33	NF	1	5	No
63	Illiterate	NA	Cleaner	NA	4 94	10	.49	CNF	2	9	NA
64	4th	4th	Cleaner	Carpenter	.46	8	.06	CNF	1	8	Yes
65	2nd	5th	Homemaker	Mechanic	2 63	9	.29	CNF	1	7	No
66	5th	NA	Cleaner	Rural worker	1 00	5	.20	NDF	2	4	Yes
67	Illiterate	NA	Cleaner	NA	.42	8	.05	NDF	2	7	Yes
68	2nd	3rd	Homemaker	Carpenter	6 50	11	.59	CNF	1	7	Yes
69	1st	8th	Seamstress	Bus conductor	1 75	7	.25	CNF	1	5	Yes
70	Illiterate	Illiterate	Cleaner	Mason; unemployed	1 58	7	.22	CNF	1	5	NA
71	5th	NA	Cleaner	Rural worker	1 00	5	.20	NDF	2	4	Yes
72	4th	3rd	Cleaner	Carpenter	1 92	9	.21	CNF	1	7	No
73	3rd + (NA)	2nd + (NA)	Homemaker + (Cleaner)	Hodman + (Baker)	.94	6	.16	NF	8	1;3	Yes
74	1st	NA	NA	Carpenter, hodman; unemployed	2 10	2	1 05	NF	3	1	Yes
75	1st	2nd	Homemaker	Mason	2 10	6	.35	CNF	1	4	Yes
76	2nd	1st	Cleaner unemployed	Mason	2 63	6	.44	CNF	1	4	NA
77	NA	5th	Maid	Painter	2 45	4	.61	CNF	1	2	NA
78	6th	NA (6th)	Homemaker	NA (Driver)	2 75	5	.55	NDF	5	3	NA
79	8th	NA (8th)	Cleaner	NA (Carpenter)	2 75	8	.34	CNF	5	6	NA
80	1st	Illiterate	Cleaner	Hodman	1 92	9	.21	CNF	1	6	Yes
81	4th	8th	Homemaker	Salesman	NA	9	NA	CNF	1	7	Yes
82	3rd	4th	Homemaker	Delivery man	1 05	5	.21	NDF	5	3	NA
83	High School	5th	Nurse's aid	Locksmith	2 63	4	.66	CNF	1	2	No

* Grade attended in school

** Information about stepmother or stepfather, in parentheses.

*** Measured taking as unit the minimum salary, worth fifty-seven thousand, one hundred and twenty cruzeiros, from November 1983 up to April 1984, varying, in this period, between one hundred and nine dollars and eighty five cents, and forty-eight dollars and five cents. (Banco Central do Brasil 19 [November 1983] 304, 20 [August 1984] 218, 342).

+ Deceased.

+ CNF stands for conjugal nuclear family, NF stands for nuclear family, NDF stands for non declared parents in the birth certificate, specifying if mother (M) or father (F).

+ Meaning of the codes — 1. same constitution as in the child's birth; 2. only mother; 3. only father; 4. father and stepmother, 5. mother and stepfather, 6. father and adoptive mother, 7. adoptive parents; 8. relatives as parents' substitutes.

TABLE 4B
PUPILS' FIRST-GRADE EVALUATIONS — SCHOOL ATTENDANCE,
TEST SCORES AND OFFICIAL GRADES IN CLASS A
1984

Pupil's Identification Number	School Attendance	Test Scores		Official Grades				Final Evaluation
		Reading	Spelling	Communication and Expression	Initiation to Sciences	Social Studies	Religion	
1	100	85	36	70	75	70	100	Promoted
2	97	99	76	95	80	90	100	Promoted
3	90	95	62	90	95	95	100	Promoted
4	83	93	54	80	85	70	100	Promoted
5	89	94	44	65	80	90	100	Promoted
6	93	96	72	85	70	85	100	Promoted
7	99	86	36	52	56	70	100	Promoted
8	72	80	52	65	55	70	100	Promoted
9	98	93	30	85	85	90	100	Promoted
10	97	79	0	31	33	50	100	Nonpromoted
11 *	19	-	-	-	-	-	-	Transferred
12	93	94	56	85	80	85	100	Promoted
13	94	91	52	70	65	80	100	Promoted
14	94	92	30	65	80	75	100	Promoted
15	97	91	68	80	60	70	100	Promoted
16	74	87	34	65	55	50	100	Promoted

* This pupil did not take the tests.

TABLE 49
PUPILS' FIRST-GRADE EVALUATIONS — SCHOOL ATTENDANCE,
TEST SCORES AND OFFICIAL GRADES IN CLASS F
1934

Pupil's Identification Number	School Attendance	Test Scores		Official Grades				Final Evaluation
		Reading	Spelling	Communication and Expression	Initiation to Sciences	Social Studies	Religion	
17	93	93	56	87	80	97	87	Promoted
18	92	88	30	75	70	92	90	Promoted
19	92	92	40	85	87	90	87	Promoted
20	93	97	68	85	85	92	87	Promoted
21	96	84	72	85	90	100	95	Promoted
22	78	95	40	72	85	100	95	Promoted
23	92	85	64	72	87	95	92	Promoted
24 *	65	-	04**	-	-	-	-	Left the school
25	58	96	56	80	80	35	85	Promoted
26 *	21	-	-	-	-	-	-	Left the school
27	74	73	10	39	50	46	70	Nonpromoted
28	89	91	72	75	82	75	77	Promoted
29	99	97	42	82	90	100	85	Promoted
30 *	37	-	-	-	-	-	-	Left the school
31	86	94	44	77	90	97	95	Promoted

- * Pupils marked with an asterisk did not take the tests.
- ** This pupil took only the second half of the spelling test

TABLE 50
PUPILS' FIRST-GRADE EVALUATIONS — SCHOOL ATTENDANCE,
TEST SCORES AND OFFICIAL GRADES IN CLASS C
1984

Pupil's Identification Number	School Attendance	Test Scores		Official Grades				Final Evaluation
		Reading	Spelling	Communication and Expression	Initiation to Sciences	Social Studies	Religion	
32	98	94	62	87	92	72	80	Promoted
33	96	85	32	64	67	70	70	Promoted
34	99	97	68	88	82	100	95	Promoted
35	99	94	46	85	85	100	100	Promoted
36	97	93	56	85	85	100	90	Promoted
37	98	92	64	80	90	100	90	Promoted
38	97	91	12	37	67	70	90	Nonpromoted
39	98	93	52	80	80	95	90	Promoted
40	96	83	38	67	75	57	90	Promoted
41	99	74	22	65	75	75	90	Promoted
42	99	73	40	63	70	92	90	Promoted
43	98	79	0	10	12	15	50	Nonpromoted
44	98	56	4	17	23	42	50	Nonpromoted
45	97	79	2	12	9	19	50	Nonpromoted
46	98	56	62	83	80	70	90	Promoted
47	93	99	80	94	90	95	95	Promoted
48	82	99	60	87	85	95	95	Promoted
49	96	83	40	76	77	100	95	Promoted
50	91	82	22	75	80	95	100	Promoted
51	86	61	02	9	12	16	50	Nonpromoted
52 *	45	-	-	-	-	-	-	Transferred
53 *	52	-	-	-	-	-	-	Transferred
54	98	95	28	79	91	95	95	Promoted
55	99	99	52	91	92	100	95	Promoted
56 *	40	-	-	-	-	-	-	Left the school
57	94	91	34	69	92	75	100	Promoted
58	94	82	0	16	24	17	50	Nonpromoted

* Pupils marked with an asterisk did not take the tests.

TABLE 51
PUPILS' FIRST-GRADE EVALUATIONS — SCHOOL ATTENDANCE,
TEST SCORES AND OFFICIAL GRADES IN CLASS D
1984

Pupil's Identification Number	School Attendance	Test Scores		Official Grades			Religion	Final Evaluation
		Reading	Spelling	Communication and Expression to Sciences	Initiation to Sciences	Social Studies		
59	96	97	74	97	100	97	100	Promoted
60	87	99	78	97	92	91	90	Promoted
61	83	93	50	67	80	80	87	Promoted
62	95	93	14	75	70	97	85	Promoted
63	91	92	42	75	95	75	80	Promoted
64	76	82	16	67	85	71	85	Promoted
65	98	99	76	97	97	100	100	Promoted
66	91	97	42	85	82	82	85	Promoted
67 *	39	-	-	-	-	-	-	Left the school
68 *	48	-	-	-	-	-	-	Left the school
69 *	64	-	-	-	-	-	-	Left the school
70	78	79	0	12	50	22	60	Nonpromoted
71	82	65	0	5	12	22	50	Nonpromoted
72	81	94	42	80	96	97	100	Promoted
73	80	89	28	55	62	50	70	Promoted
74	55	60	2	4	14	18	50	Nonpromoted
75	96	94	72	92	97	97	100	Promoted
76 *	43	-	-	-	-	-	-	Transferred
77 *	52	-	-	-	-	-	-	Transferred
78 *	12	-	-	-	-	-	-	Transferred
79 *	40	-	-	-	-	-	-	Class transference
80	92	100	64	95	90	90	92	Promoted
81 *	50	-	-	-	-	-	-	Left the school
82 *	17	-	-	-	-	-	-	Left the school
83	14	-	-	-	-	-	-	Transferred to kindergarten

* Pupils marked with an asterisk did not take the tests.

TABLE 52
TEACHER'S, PUPIL'S AND CLASSMATES'
EVALUATIONS OF THE LITERACY PROCESS
CLASS A

Pupil's Identification Number	Teacher's Evaluation		Pupil's Answer		Classmates' Indications That				Total of (1),(2), (3)	Pupil's Status
	Pupil's Conditions for Literacy	Pupil's Progress in Literacy	If He/She Could Read	If He/She Would Be Promoted	The Pupil Would Be Promoted (1)	The Pupil Spelled Well (2)	The Pupil Could Read Well (3)	The Pupil Could Not Read Well (4)		
1	Weak	Medium	Yes	Yes	7	5	5	1	17	High
2	Good	High	Yes	Yes	5	8	5	0	22	Highest
3	Good	High	Yes	Yes	5	5	5	0	15	High
4	Weak	High	Yes	Yes	6	6	5	0	17	High
5	Weak	Medium	Yes	DK	6	6	4	0	16	High
6	Weak	High	Yes	DK	3	5	5	3	13	Medium
7	Weak	Medium	Yes	Yes	1	0	0	1	1	Low
8	Weak	Medium	A little	Yes	0	1	0	4	1	Low
9	Good	High	Yes	Yes	5	5	6	0	16	High
10	Very weak	Low	A little	No	1	0	0	12	1	Lowest
11	Good	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
12	Good	High	Yes	Yes	6	9	5	0	20	High
13	Weak	High	Yes	Yes	3	5	3	2	11	Medium
14	Weak	Medium	Yes	Yes	4	7	6	0	17	High
15	Good	High	Yes	Yes	7	9	7	1	23	High
16	Weak	Medium	Yes	No	2	2	2	3	6	Medium

TABLE 53
TEACHER'S, PUPIL'S AND CLASSMATES'
EVALUATIONS OF THE LITERACY PROCESS
CLASS B

Pupil's Identification Number	Teacher's Evaluation		Pupil's Answer		Classmates' Indications That				Total of (1),(2), (3)	Pupil's Status
	Pupil's Conditions for Literacy	Pupil's Progress in Literacy	If He/She Could Read	If He/She Would Be Promoted	The Pupil Would Be Promoted (1)	The Pupil Spelled Well (2)	The Pupil Could Read Well (3)	The Pupil Could Not Read Well (4)		
17	Weak	High	Yes	Yes	5	5	6	0	16	High
18	Very weak	Medium	A little	DK	0	2	0	3	2	Low
19	Very weak	High	Yes	Yes	6	8	6	1	20	High
20	Very weak	High	Yes	Yes	6	9	8	0	23	High
21	Good	High	Yes	DK	9	12	13	0	34	Highest
22	Very weak	Medium	Yes	DK	0	2	0	3	2	Low
23	Very weak	Medium	Yes	DK	1	3	1	4	5	Medium
24	Good	Medium	Yes	Yes	0	1	1	8	2	Low
25	Weak	Medium	Yes	DK	1	2	1	6	4	Medium
26	Very weak	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
27	Good	Low	A little	DK	0	0	0	8	0	Lowest
28	Weak	High	Yes	DK	1	5	3	4	9	Medium
29	Good	High	Yes	Yes	7	8	11	1	26	High
30	Weak	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
31	Weak	Medium	Yes	Yes	3	5	5	0	13	Medium

TABLE 54
TEACHER'S, PUPIL'S AND CLASSMATES'
EVALUATIONS OF THE LITERACY PROCESS
CLASS C

Pupil's Identification Number	Teacher's Evaluation		Pupil's Answer		Classmates' Indications That				Total of (1),(2), (3)	Pupil's Status
	Pupil's Conditions for Literacy	Pupil's Progress in Literacy	If He/She Could Read	If He/She Would Be Promoted	The Pupil Would Be Promoted (1)	The Pupil Spelled Well (2)	The Pupil Could Read Well (3)	The Pupil Could Not Read Well (4)		
32	Very good	High	Yes	Yes	4	6	5	1	15	High
33	Very weak	Medium	Yes	No	2	1	2	9	5	Medium
34	Very good	Very high	Yes	Yes	6	8	7	0	21	Very high
35	Good	High	Yes	OK	8	7	9	1	24	Very high
36	Good	High	Yes	Yes	5	5	5	1	15	High
37	Weak	High	Yes	OK	2	2	2	2	6	Medium
38	Weak	Medium	A little	OK	5	3	1	11	9	Medium
39	Very weak	High	Yes	Yes	4	3	4	4	11	Medium
40	Weak	High	Yes	Yes	3	7	4	4	14	Medium
41	Weak	Medium	Yes	Yes	3	2	1	6	6	Medium
42	Very weak	High	Yes	Yes	1	1	1	10	3	Low
43	Very weak	None	Yes	OK	0	0	0	16	0	Lowest
44	Very weak	None	A little	Yes	0	0	0	12	0	Low
45	Very weak	None	Yes	OK	1	1	1	10	3	Low
46	Very good	High	Yes	Yes	4	6	5	1	15	High
47	Very weak	Very high	Yes	Yes	10	8	9	0	27	Very high
48	Very good	Very high	Yes	OK	9	8	14	0	31	Very high
49	Very weak	High	Yes	Yes	1	2	1	5	4	Medium
50	Weak	High	Yes	Yes	5	2	5	2	12	Medium
51	Very weak	None	A little	OK	0	0	0	5	0	Low
52	Very weak	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
53	Good	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
54	Good	High	Yes	Yes	3	6	5	2	14	Medium
55	Very good	Very high	Yes	Yes	13	18	19	0	50	Highest
56	Very weak	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
57	Good	High	Yes	Yes	5	2	3	3	10	Medium
58	Very weak	None	A little	OK	1	2	0	9	3	Low

TABLE 55
TEACHER'S, PUPIL'S AND CLASSMATES'
EVALUATIONS OF THE LITERACY PROCESS
CLASS D

[illegible]

TABLE 54
CHARACTERISTICS OF PUPILS PROMOTED FROM 1984 TO 1986 AND OF THOSE WHO FAILED IN 1984, AND
CHARACTERISTICS OF THEIR RESPECTIVE FAMILIES

Pupils Identifi- cation Number	Class in 1984	Sex	Age	Ethnic Group *	Health	Religion	Schooling ***		Occupation *		Family Income *	Number of Dependents	Income per Dependent	Family Type		Number of Children	Birth Order	Siblings with more schooling	Siblings with less schooling	Siblings with equal schooling
							Mother	Father	Mother	Father				At the Child's Birth	In 1984					
Pupils Who Were Promoted from 1984 until 1986																				
1	A	F	9y7m	B	Good	C	4th	3rd	Maidress	Carpenter, mason	80	5	18	CNF	1	3	3rd	2	Yes	
2	A	M	9y	M	Good	C	4th	High-school	Greco	Greco	1 36	7	19	CNF	1	5	5th	4	No	
3	A	M	8y8m	M	Fair	C	2nd	1st	Maid	Carpenter, painter	1 40	7	20	CNF	1	4	6th	5	No	
17	B	M	10y11m	M	Fair	C	5th	Illiterate	Cleaner	Homemaker	96	7	14	CNF	1	6	5th	2	Yes	
18	B	M	8y10m	M	Fair	C	2nd	3rd	Homemaker	Carpenter	NA	6	NA	MF	1	4	2nd	NA	NA	
32	C	F	9y7m	M	Good	C/F	1st	1st	Cleaner	Retired	38	3	13	NDF	2	1	Only	-	NA	
33	C	F	9y1m	M	Good	C	NA	5th	Porter	RA	52	12	04	MF	3	5	4th	3	No	
34	C	F	8y5m	M	Fair	C	2nd	2nd (NA)	Cleaner	Homemaker (Subway-light replacer)	79	5	16	CNF	5	3	1st	-	NA	
35	C	F	7y	M	Good	C	5th	1st	Homemaker	Mason	1 05	6	18	CNF	1	4	3rd	2	Yes	
36	C	M	8y10m	M	Fair	C	5th	5th	Homemaker	Mason	1 05	10	10	MF	1	8	4th	3	NA	
37	C	M	8y2m	M	Good	C/E	Illiterate	NA	Homemaker	NA	NA	6	NA	CNF	2	7	6th	NA	NA	
59	B	F	11y	M	Fair	C	6th	3rd	Leather artisan	Carpenter	1 58	18	16	CNF	1	6	4th	3	No	
60	B	F	8y5m	M	Fair	C	1st	5th	Homemaker	Mason	3 29	11	30	CNF	1	9	5th	4	Yes	
Pupils Who Failed in First Grade in 1984																				
16	A	M	9y2m	M	Poor	C	5th	5th	Maidress	Bus Inspector	1 92	4	48	CNF	1	2	1st	-	No	
27	B	M	8y10m	M	Fair	C	3rd	3rd	Homemaker	Shoemaker	1 75	5	35	CNF	1	2	1st	-	Yes	
38	C	M	12y7m	M	Fair	C	Illiterate	NA	Cleaner	NA	1 98	3	33	NDF	2	2	2nd	NA	NA	
43	C	F	9y	M	Fair	C	5th	NA (Sch)	Cleaner	NA	1 42	8	18	MF	5	4	2nd	1	No	
44	C	M	9y2m	B	Fair	C	3rd	3rd	Cleaner	(Bus conductor) Gas-station attendant	1 49	5	30	CNF	1	3	1st	-	No	
45	C	F	9y7m	B	Fair	C	2nd	Illiterate	Homemaker	Mason	1 40	6	18	CNF	1	6	1st	-	Yes	
51	C	M	8y5m	M	Fair	C	Illiterate	3rd	Cook; cleaner	Matchman	2 18	5	42	CNF	1	3	1st	-	No	
58	C	F	7y10m	M	Good	C	5th	5th	Maid	Civil-servant doorman	1 00	5	20	MF	1	3	2nd	1	NA	
70	B	F	9y5m	M	Poor	C	Illiterate	Illiterate	Cleaner	Mason unemployed	1 58	7	22	CNF	1	5	4th	3	NA	
71	B	F	10y5m	M	Fair	C	5th	NA	Cleaner	Rural worker	1 00	5	20	NDF	2	4	2nd	1	Yes	
74	B	F	9y	I	NA	C	1st	NA	NA	Carpenter;hodman unemployed	2 18	2	1.05	MF	3	1	1st	-	Yes	

Sources: Tables 40 to 47, in Appendix

- * M stands for white, M, for mulato, B, for black and I, for Brazilian Indian
- ** C stands for Roman Catholic Church, E, for Evangelical, and P, for Pentecostal
- *** Grade attended in school.

* Information about stepfather, in parentheses

** Measured taking as unit the minimum salary, worth fifty seven thousand, one hundred and twenty cruzireis, from November 1983 up to April 1984, varying, in this period, between one hundred and nine dollars and eighty five cents, and forty-eight dollars and five cents (Banco Central do Brasil 19 [November 1983] 304, 29 [August 1984] 218,342)

*** Meaning of the codes — CNF: conjugal nuclear family, NF: nuclear family, NDF: non declared parents in the birth certificate, specifying if mother (M) or father (F), 1: same constitution as in the child's birth, 2: only mother, 3: only father, 4: father and stepmother, 5: mother and stepfather, 6: father and adoptive mother, 7: adoptive parents, 8: relatives as parents' substituter

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Zemke, Robert. "The Teacher as a Person." *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, vol. 14, no. 1, 1982, pp. 1-11.
- Anderson, Richard B. "Social Structure and the Curriculum: Evidence from the National Longitudinal Study." *Curriculum Inquiry*, vol. 12, no. 1, 1982, pp. 1-11.
- Apple, Michael W. "Curriculum and Reproduction." *Curriculum Inquiry*, vol. 12, no. 1, 1982, pp. 1-11.
- Apple, Michael W. *Curriculum and Power*. Boston: Ark Paperbacks, 1981.
- Apple, Michael W. "El currículo y el estudio reciente de la educación." *Educación y Sociedad*, no. 4 (1981): 1-11.
- Apple, Michael W. "Facing the Complexity of Power: For a Parallelist Position." In *Critical Educational Studies*. The University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1981: 1-10. (Typewritten.)
- Apple, Michael W., and Weis, Lois. "Ideology and Practice in Schooling: A Political and Conceptual Introduction." In *Ideology and Practice in Schooling*, pp. 3-33. Edited by Michael W. Apple and Lois Weis. Philadelphia, Temple University Press, 1981.
- Babbie, Earl R. *The Practice of Social Research*. Belmont, California, Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1977.
- Baeta, Anna Maria Bianchini; Rocha, Any Dutra Coelho da; and Brandao, Jaia. "O fracasso escolar: o estado do conhecimento sobre evasão e repetência no ensino de 1 grau no Brasil (1971-1981)." *Em Aberto* 1 (May 1981): 1-6.
- Banco Central do Brasil 18 (November 1982); 20 (August 1984).
- Barakett, Joyce. "Social Typing in an Inner City School: A Case Study of Teachers' Knowledge of Their Pupils." *Research in Education* 26 (1981): 77-88.
- Barretto, Elba Siqueiro de Sa. "Professores de periferia: soluções simples para problemas complexos." *Cadernos de Pesquisa*, no. 14 (1975): 97-109.
- Barretto, Elba Siqueiro de Sa. "Bons e maus alunos e suas famílias, vistos pela professora de 1 grau." *Cadernos de Pesquisa*, no. 37 (1981): 84-89.

Castro, Maria L.; Maranhão, N.; Almeida, J. and Campos, M.H.M. "Influência da aprendizagem da língua e da escrita." *Revista de Linguagem* 10, n. 3, 1977, pp. 1-11.

Bernstein, Basil. *Class, Codes and Control: Theoretical studies towards a Sociology of Language*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1973. Vol. 1.

_____. *Class, Codes and Control: Applied studies towards a Sociology of Language*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1973. Vol. 2.

_____. "Sociology and the Sociology of Education: A Brief Account." In *Approaches to Sociology: An Introduction to Major Trends in British Sociology*, pp. 115-159. Edited By John Rex. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1974.

_____. *Class, Codes and Control: Towards a Theory of Educational Transmissions*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975. Vol. 3.

_____. "Codes, Modalities and the Process of Cultural Reproduction: A Model." In *Cultural and Economic Reproduction in Education: Essays on Class, Ideology and the State*, pp. 304-355. Edited by Michael W. Apple. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1982.

Bisoli, Leda; Slarton, G.; Wiedemann, L.; and Degani, M.H. *Interferência de uma segunda língua na aprendizagem da escrita*. Rio de Janeiro, MOBRAL; Porto Alegre, FURCA, 1975.

Boas, Heloisa Vilas. *Alfabetização: outras questões, outras histórias*. São Paulo: Editora Brasiliense, 1988.

Boqdan, Robert C., and Biklen, Sari Inopp. *Qualitative Research For Education: An Introduction to Theory and Methods*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1982.

Bolster, Arthur S., Jr. "Toward a More Effective Model of Research on Teaching." *Harvard Educational Review* 53 (August 1983): 294-308.

Bossert, Steven T. "Tasks, Group Management, and Teacher Control Behaviour: A Study of Classroom Organization and Teacher Style." *School Review* 85 (August 1977): 552-565.

Bowles, Samuel, and Gintis, Herbert. *Schooling in Capitalist America: Educational Reform and the Contradictions of Economic Life*. New York: Basic Books, 1976.

Brandão, Zaira; Baeta, Anna Maria Bianchini; and Rocha, Any Dutra Coelho da. Evasão e repetência no Brasil: a escola em questão. Rio de Janeiro: Achiamé, 1983.

Brasil. Ministério de Educação e Cultura. Serviço de Estatística da Educação e Cultura. Glossário de termos utilizados na estatística educacional, 1. Curitiba: SEC/MT; Rio de Janeiro: FENAME, 1981.

. Sinopse estatística da educação básica: 1979/1980. Brasília: 1983. Vol. 5.

. Sinopse estatística da educação básica: 1981/1982/1983. Brasília: 1984. Vol. 6.

. Sinopse estatística do ensino regular de 1 grau: 1984. Brasília: 1986.

Brasil. Secretaria de Planejamento da Presidência da República. IBGE. Condições de vida da população de baixa renda na região metropolitana de Porto Alegre. Rio de Janeiro: 1981.

. Anuário estatístico do Brasil: 1983. Rio de Janeiro: 1984. Vol. 44.

Britto, Luiz Navarro de. "A educação nos textos constitucionais." Revista Brasileira de Estudos Pedagógicos 65 (September-December 1984): 511-521.

Camargo, Dair Aily Franco de. "Um estudo quantitativo sobre a reprovação no curso primário." Cadernos de Pesquisa, no. 12 (1975): 3-18.

Campanhole, Adriano, and Campanhole, Hilton Lobo. Constituições do Brasil. São Paulo, Editora Atlas, 1981.

Cicourel, Aaron V., and Kitsuse, John I. The Educational Decision-makers: An Advanced Study in Sociology. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1963.

Coleman, James S.; Campbell, E.Q.; Hobson, C.J.; McPartland, J.; Mood, A.M.; Weinfeld, F.D. and York, R.L. Equality of Educational Opportunity. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

Conjuntura Econômica 39 (April 1985).

Cooper, Ian. "The Maintenance of Order and Use of Space in Primary School Buildings." British Journal of Sociology of Education 3 (1982): 267-279.

- CPERS, Comando Geral de Greve. "Comunicado no. 1." Porto Alegre, 23 April 1987.
- Cunha, Luiz Antonio. Educação e desenvolvimento social no Brasil. Rio de Janeiro: Francisco Alves, 1980.
- Cunha, Luiz Antonio. In "Mesa-redonda sobre o manifesto dos pioneiros da educação nova e o desenvolvimento da educação brasileira." Revista Brasileira de Estudos Pedagógicos 62 (May-August 1984): 426-456.
- Dale, Roger. "Implications of the Rediscovery of the Hidden Curriculum for the Sociology of Teaching." In Identity and Structure: Issues in the Sociology of Education, pp. 44-54. Edited by Denis Gleeson. Nafferton, Driffield: Nafferton Books, 1977.
- Davies, Brian. Social Control and Education. London: Methuen, 1976.
- _____. "The State of Schooling." Introduction to The State of Schooling, edited by Brian Davies. Educational Analysis 3 (1981): 1-22.
- Delamont, Sara. "Introduction." In Frontiers of Classroom Research, pp. 5-12. Edited by Gabriel Chanan and Sara Delamont. Slough: NFER Publishing Co., 1975.
- _____. Interaction in the Classroom. London: Methuen, 1976.
- _____. "All Too Familiar? A Decade of Classroom Research." Educational Analysis 3 (1981): 69-83.
- Delamont, Sara, and Atkinson, Paul. "The Two Traditions in Educational Ethnography: Sociology and Anthropology Compared." British Journal of Sociology of Education 1 (1980): 139-152.
- Delamont, Sara, and Hamilton, David. "Classroom Research: A Critique and a New Approach." In Explorations in Classroom Observation, pp. 3-20. Edited by Michael Stubbs and Sara Delamont. London: John Wiley, 1976.
- Denscombe, Martyn. "The 'Hidden Pedagogy' and its Implications for Teacher Training." British Journal of Sociology of Education 3 (1982): 249-265.
- Di Giorgi, Cristiano. Escola nova. Sao Paulo: Editora Atica, 1986.
- Dias, Jose Augusto. Ensino medio e estrutura socio-economica. Rio de Janeiro: INEP, IBGE 1967.

- Domingos, Ana Maria; Barradas, H.; Baimba, H.; and Neves, L.L. A teoria de Bernstein em sociologia da educação. Lisboa: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian, 1991.
- Dreeben, Robert. On What Is Learned in School. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1965.
- Duarte, Jissi. A cartilina da Mimí. São Paulo. IBRP, n. 1.
- Durkheim, Emile. Education and Sociology. New York: Free Press, 1961.
- . Moral Education: A Study in the Theory and Application of the Sociology of Education. New York: Free Press, 1961.
- . The Evolution of Educational Thought: Lectures on the Formation and Development of Secondary Education in France. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1977.
- Eggleston, John. The Sociology of the School Curriculum. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1977.
- Elchardus, Mark. "Class Structuration and Achievement Sociological Review 20 (1981): 417-444.
- Emmer, Edmund L., and Evertson, Carolyn M. "Synthesis of Research on Classroom Management." Educational Leadership 38 (January 1981): 342-347.
- Enquita, Mariano Fernandez. "Es tan fiero el leon como lo pintam? Reproduccion, contradiccion, estructura y actividad humana en la educacion." Educacion y Sociedad no. 4 (1985): 5-32.
- . "Entre la esperanza del cambio y el estigma de la reproduccion." Revista de Educacion, no. 286 (1988): 151-165.
- . Educação e teorias de resistencia." Educacao e Realidade 14 (January-June 1989): 3-15.
- Ferrari, Alceu R. "Analfabetismo no Brasil: tendencia secular e avanços recentes." Cadernos de Pesquisa, no. 52 (February 1985): 35-49.
- . "Escola e produção do analfabetismo no Brasil." Educacao e Realidade 12 (July-December 1987): 81-96.
- Ferrari, Nilva Irene Schütz. "Direito da criança a educação nas constituições do Brasil." Estudos juridicos 7, no. 20 (1977): 91-162.

Fletcher, Philip H. "Interdisciplinary Education in Brazil: A Review of the Principal Journals." *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 10 (1989): 1-10.

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1979.

Freire, Paulo. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Continuum Press, 1970.

Freire, Paulo. A importância do texto de ler: em três artigos que se completam. São Paulo: Contracultura, Editora Autores Associados, 1979.

Gatti, Bernadete A.; Lúcio, H.H.; Costa, H.L.; Kopit, M. and Almeida, R.M. "A reprovação no 1º ano do Ensino Fundamental: um estudo de caso." *Cadernos de Pesquisa*, no. 38 (1981): 1-13.

Gerth, H.H., and Mills, C. Wright. *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1946.

Giroux, Henry A. "Hegemony, Resistance, and the Paradox of Educational Reforms." *Interchange* 11 (1981): 5-10.

Good, Thomas L. "Teacher Expectations and Student Perceptions: A Decade of Research." *Educational Leadership* 38 (February 1981): 415-422.

Goodlad, John I. "What Some Schools and Classrooms Teach." *Educational Leadership* 40 (April 1983): 3-19.

Gouveia, Aparecida Joly. "A pesquisa educacional no Brasil." *Cadernos de Pesquisa*, no. 1 (1971): 1-18.

_____. "A escola, objeto de controvérsia." *Cadernos de Pesquisa*, no. 16 (1976): 15-19.

_____. "A pesquisa sobre educação no Brasil: de 1970 para cá." *Cadernos de Pesquisa*, no. 19 (1976): 75-79.

_____. "Orientações teórico-metodológicas da sociologia da educação no Brasil." *Cadernos de Pesquisa*, no. 25 (1985): 63-67.

Grace, Gerald. *Teachers, Ideology and Control: A Study in Urban Education*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1973.

Haes, Julian. "Conceptions of the Curriculum: Teachers and 'Truth'." *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 3 (1982): 57-76.

- Hammersley, Martyn. "Classroom Ethnography." Educational Analysis 1 (1980): 47-74.
- _____. "The Outsider's Advantage: A Reply to McNamara." British Educational Research Journal 7 (1981): 167-171.
- Henry Jules. "A Cross-Cultural Outline of Education." Current Anthropology 1 (July 1960): 267-305.
- Hextall, Ian. "Marking work." In Explorations in the Politics of School Knowledge, pp. 65-74. Edited by Geoff Whitty and Michael Young. Driffield: Nafferton Books, 1976.
- Hurn, Christopher J. The Limits and Possibilities of Schooling: An Introduction to the Sociology of Education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1978.
- Izquierdo, Carlos Munoz. "Considerações para determinar as prioridades da pesquisa educacional na America Latina." Cadernos de Pesquisa, no. 5 (1972): 3-18.
- Jackson, Philip W. Life in Classroom. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.
- Jardim, Ilza Rodrigues; Werle, F.O.C.; Costa, M.C.V.; Gschwenter, E.L.S.; Justo, E.B.; Requia, I.R.; Pellegrini, M.Z. and Lovatel, T.H. Ensino de 1 e 2 graus: estrutura e funcionamento. Porto Alegre: Sagra, 1985.
- Jencks, Christopher, et.al. Inequality. New York: Basic Books, 1972.
- Karabel, Jerome, and Halsey, A.H., eds. Power and Ideology in Education. New York, Oxford University Press, 1977.
- Keddie, Nell, ed. Pinker, Tailor...The Myth of Cultural Deprivation. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1973.
- Kramer, Sonia, and Andre, Marli Eliza D.A. "Alfabetização: um estudo sobre professores das camadas populares." Revista Brasileira de Estudos Pedagogicos 65 (September-December 1984): 523-537.
- Lawton, Denis. Social Change, Educational Theory and Curriculum Planning. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1973.
- _____. Class, Culture and the Curriculum. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975.

- Leacock, Eleanor. 1938. "The Teacher as a Person." *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 10: 1-10.
- Leconte, Margaret. 1977. "The Teacher as a Person: A Review of Educational Research." *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 9: 1-10.
- Lewis, Oscar. "The Culture of the Teacher." *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 10: 1-10.
- Lunn, Joan. 1977. "The Teacher as a Person: A Review of Educational Research." *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 9: 1-10.
- Magister, C. 1977. "The Teacher as a Person: A Review of Educational Research." *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 9: 1-10.
- Manifesto dos Pioneiros da Pedagogia. *Revista Brasileira de Estudos Pedagógicos* 10: 1-10.
- McCall, George J., and Simmons, J. L., eds. 1978. *Participant Observation: A Text and Reader*. Boston, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1978.
- McDermott, R. P. "Social Relations as Contexts for Learning in School." *Harvard Educational Review* 41: 1-10.
- McIntyre, D. I. "Systematic Observation of Classroom Activities." *Educational Analysis* 10: 1-10.
- McLaren, Peter. "Paulo Freire e o pos-moderno." *Educação e Realidade* 12 (January-June 1987): 1-10.
- _____. Life in Schools: An Introduction to Critical Pedagogy in the Foundations of Education. New York: Longman, 1989.
- McNamara, David R. "The Outsider's Arrogance: The Failure of Participant Observers to Understand Classroom Events." British Educational Research Journal 10 (1980): 1-10.
- Mello, Guilomar Namo de. "A prática docente no ensino de 1º grau. Do amor, acusação e bom senso à competência técnica e vontade política." Ph.D. dissertation, Pontifícia Universidade Católica, São Paulo, 1981.
- _____. Magisterio de 1º grau: da competência técnica ao compromisso político. São Paulo: Autores Ás, 1982.

- _____. "Pesquisa educacional, politicas governamentais e o ensino de 1 grau." Cadernos de Pesquisa, no. 53 (May 1985): 25-31.
- Mello, Guiomar Namo de; Maia, Eny Marisa; and Britto, Vera Maria Vedovelo. "As atuais condicoes de formacao do professor de 1: algumas reflexoes e hipoteses de investigacao." Cadernos de Pesquisa, no. 45 (1983): 71-78.
- Mouzelis, Nicos P. Organisation and Bureaucracy: An Analysis of Modern Theories. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1967.
- Muniz, Mirta. Rendir montanas y amasar estrellas. La Habana: Editora Abril de la UJC, 1986.
- Nina, Celina Airlie. "Um seculo de jardim de infancia." Revista do Ensino do Estado do Rio Grande do Sul 3 (June 1912): 74-88.
- Ott, Margot Bertoluci. "Tendências ideologicas no ensino de 1º grau." Ph.D. dissertation, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, 1983.
- Perdersen, Eigil; Faucher, Therèse Annette; and Eaton, William W. "A New Perspective on the Effects of First-grade Teachers on Children's Subsequent Adult Status." Harvard Educational Review 48 (February 1978): 1-31.
- Pollard, Andrew. "A Model of Classroom Coping Strategies." British Journal of Sociology of Education 3 (1982): 19-37.
- Poppovic, Ana Maria. "A escola, a criança culturalmente marginalizada e a comunidade." Cadernos de Pesquisa, no. 30 (1979): 51-55.
- Poppovic, Ana Maria; Esposito, Yara Lúcia; and Cruz, Léa Maria Chagas. "Marginalização cultural: uma metodologia para seu estudo." Cadernos de Pesquisa, no. 7 (1973): 5-34.
- Portes, Alejandro, and Walton, John. Labor, Class, and the International System. New York: Academic Press, 1981.
- Programa de Linguagem. Revista do Ensino do Estado do Rio Grande do Sul 1 (December 1939): 293-310.
- Programa de Matematica. Revista do Ensino do Estado do Rio Grande do Sul 1 (December 1939): 284-292.

Programa de Moral e Civismo. Revista do Ensino do Estado do Rio Grande do Sul 2 (January 1940): 66-69.

Purkey, Stewart C., and Smith, Marshall S. "Too Soon to Cheer? Synthesis of Research on Effective Schools." Educational Leadership 40 (December 1982): 64-69.

Rasche, Vânia Maria Moreira. "The Discarded Children: The Creation of a Class of Misfits Amongst the Poor in Brazilian Schools. A Case Study of First Grade. Review of Doctoral Dissertation, Michigan, USA, Michigan University, 1979. Em Aberto 1 (May 1982): 19-23.

Rasche, Vânia Maria Moreira, and Kude, Vera Maria Moreira. "Pigmálio na sala de aula: quinze anos sobre as expectativas do professor." Cadernos de Pesquisa, no. 57 (1986): 61-70.

Reforma do ensino: novas diretrizes e bases da educação nacional. Rio de Janeiro: Grafica Auriverde, 1979.

Rio Grande do Sul. Secretaria da Educação. Plano Estadual de Educação: 1982-1985. Porto Alegre: 1982.

Rio Grande do Sul. Secretaria da Educação. Unidade de Informática. Relatório de atividades: Projeto Operação Linguagem - 1975-1979. Porto Alegre: 1979.

Rio Grande do Sul. Secretaria da Educação. Unidade de Pesquisa, Supervisão e Orientação Educacionais. Diretrizes curriculares ensino do 1º grau: educação geral - currículo por atividades. Porto Alegre: n.d.

Rio Grande do Sul. Secretaria de Educação e Cultura. Boletim do Centro de Pesquisas e Orientação Educacionais: 1947. Porto Alegre.

_____. Boletim do Centro de Pesquisas e Orientação Educacionais: 1954-1957. Porto Alegre.

_____. Boletim do Centro de Pesquisas e Orientação Educacionais: 1956-1957. Porto Alegre.

_____. Boletim do Centro de Pesquisas e Orientação Educacionais: Ano de 1958. Porto Alegre.

_____. Boletim do Centro de Pesquisas e Orientação Educacionais: e de Execução Especializada: Anos de 1963-1966. Porto Alegre, 1970.

Rio Grande do Sul. Secretaria de Educação e Cultura. Unidade de Informática. Fluxo escolar do ensino regular de primeiro e segundo graus no Rio Grande do Sul. Porto Alegre, 1986.

Rist, Ray C. "Student Social Class and Teacher Expectations: The Self-Fulfilling Prophecy in Ghetto Education." Harvard Educational Review 40 (August 1970): 411-451.

Rocha, Any Dutra Coelho da. "Contribuição das revisões de pesquisa internacionais ao tema evasão e repetência no 1 grau." Cadernos de Pesquisa, no. 45 (1983): 57-65.

Rosenthal, Robert, and Jacobsen, Lenora. Pygmalion in the Classroom: Teacher Expectation and Pupils' Intellectual Development. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.

Rutter, Michael; Maughan, B.; Mortimore, P.; Cusston, J.; and Smith, A. Fifteen Thousand Hours. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1979.

Saviani, Dermeval. "A filosofia da educação no Brasil e sua veiculação pela Revista Brasileira de Estudos Pedagógicos." Revista Brasileira de Estudos Pedagógicos 65 (May-August 1984): 273-290.

Schiefelbein, Ernesto. "Repeating: An Overlooked Problem of Latin American Education." Comparative Education Review 19 (October, 1975): 468-487.

Schiefelbein, Ernesto, and Farrel, Joseph P. "Selectivity and Survival in the Schools of Chile." Comparative Education Review 22 (June, 1978): 326-341.

Schiefelbein, Ernesto, and Simmons, John. "Os determinantes do desempenho escolar: uma revisão de pesquisas nos países em desenvolvimento." Cadernos de Pesquisa, no. 35 (1980): 53-71.

Schneider, Dorith. "'Alunos excepcionais': um estudo de caso de desvio". In Desvio e divergência: uma crítica da patologia social, pp. 52-81. Organized by Gilberto Velho. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar Editores, 1974.

Schutz, Alfred. The Phenomenology of the Social World. Chicago: Northwestern University Press, 1967.

_____. Collected Papers I: The Problem of Social Reality. Edited and introduced by Maurice Natanson. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1971.

- _____. Collected Papers II: Studies in Social Theory. Edited and introduced by Arvid Brodersen. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1964.
- Scomazzon, Valdacyr S. Estatuto do magisterio publico do Rio Grande do Sul. Porto Alegre: Sergio Antonio Fabris Editor, 1986.
- Sharp, Rachel. "Self-Contained Ethnography or a Science of Phenomenal Forms and Inner Relations." Journal of Education 164 (1982): 48-63.
- Sharp, Rachel, and Green, Anthony. Education and Social Control: A Study in Progressive Primary Education. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975.
- Shor, Ira, and Freire, Paulo. Medo e ousadia: o cotidiano do professor. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1987.
- Silva, Almira s. Brasil da; Pinheiro, Lucia Marques; and Cardoso, Risoleta Ferreira. Metodo misto de alfabetizacao. Sao Paulo: Companhia Editora Nacional, n.d.
- Silva, Tomaz Tadeu da. "Distribuição de conhecimento escolar e reprodução social." Educação e Realidade 13 (January-June 1988): 3-16.
- Snyders, Georges. Escola, classe e luta de classes. Lisboa: Moraes Editores, 1977.
- Solari, Aldo E. "La desigualdad educacional en America Latina." Revista Latinoamericana de Estudios Educativos 10 (1980): 1-56.
- Spindler, George Dearborn, ed. Educational and Cultural Process: Toward an Anthropology of Education. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1974.
- Spindler, George, ed. Doing the Ethnography of Schooling: Educational Anthropology in Action. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1982.
- The Bookmark Reading Program. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1970.
- Tyler, Ralph W. "The Contribution of 'A Study of Schooling' to Educational Research." Educational Leadership 40 (April 1983): 33-34.

Veit, Maria Helena Degani. "Two Conceptions Concerning Social Sciences: Schutz and Garfinkel Compared." Montreal, McGill University, August 1978: 1-45. (Typewritten.)

... "Is Ranking a Fair Game? Proposal for a Theoretical Framework to Guide the Participant Observer's Gaze in a Classroom." Montreal, McGill University, 1979: 1-39. (Typewritten.)

... "Debates in the Sociology of Education." Montreal, McGill University, April 1980: 1-75. (Typewritten.)

Veit, Maria Helena Degani, and Rasche, Vania Maria Moreira. "Desenvolvimento de habilidades cognitivas para a leitura e escrita." Educação e Realidade 7 (September-December 1982): 83-84.

Wexler, Philip. "Body and Soul: Sources of Social Change and Strategies of Education." British Journal of Sociology of Education 2 (1981): 247-263.

... "Structure, Text and Subject: A Critical Sociology of School Knowledge." In Cultural and Economic Reproduction in Education: Essays on Class, Ideology and The State, pp. 275-303. Edited by Michael W. Apple. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1982.

Wolff, Lawrence. "O primeiro ano de ensino primário em Porto Alegre, 1967: um estudo preliminar com implicações para a política educacional." Porto Alegre, 1969. (Mimeographed.)

... "Um estudo das causas de reprovação no primeiro ano das escolas primárias no Rio Grande do Sul e suas implicações para a política e pesquisa educacionais." Educação e Realidade 3 (January 1978): 67-105.

Woods, Peter. "Strategies in Teaching and Learning." In Teacher Strategies: Explorations in the Sociology of the School, pp. 18-33. Edited by Peter Woods. London: Croom Helm, 1980.

Young, Michael F.D., ed. Knowledge and Control. London: Collier Macmillan, 1971.

Young, Michael, and Whitty, Geoff, eds. Society State and Schooling: Readings on the Possibilities for Radical Education. London: Falmer Press, 1977.

Zero Hora (Porto Alegre), 14, 24, 27 March; 2, 26 April; 1, 5, 19, 22, 26 May; 21, 30 June; 8, 11 July 1984; 31 March 1985; 17 May 1989.