PERGAMON

Teaching and Teacher Education 16 (2000) 315–333

TEACHING AND TEACHER EDUCATION

www.elsevier.com/locate/tate

Judy constructs a genuine question: a case for interactional inclusion

Lesley A. Rex*

University of Michigan, 2022 School of Education, 610 E. University Avenue, Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1259, USA

Received 15 March 1999; received in revised form 12 July 1999; accepted 16 August 1999

Abstract

This case study offers teachers and teacher educators a sociocultural view of inclusion, showing how it was accomplished for a student who had long been segregated in special education classrooms. Judy, a student classified as learning disabled, participated and learned in collaboration with her peers in a diverse classroom environment. Through close analysis of segments of instructional discourse, the study illustrates how her general education teacher enacted "interactional inclusion". By making particular discourse moves, he supported the building of an inclusional culture that repositioned Judy and her classmates. She achieved social affiliation and academic success, without limiting other students' learning opportunities. The study provides guidelines for the implementation of classroom inclusive practices suggested by this profile; offers evidence of the benefits of this kind of research; and, argues for why we need more of it. © 2000 Published by Elsevier Science Ltd. All rights reserved.

Keywords: Special education; Inclusion; Teaching strategy

Only in a group, in which the student with special needs is able to build and maintain relationships, interact daily in language-rich settings, and feel secure, valued and a sense of belonging only then can it be said that he or she has been integrated. Everything else may, in its utmost consequence, be considered just a school arrangement (Tetler, 1998; p. 131).

Integration is not necessarily inclusion. As Tetler (1998) points out, physical placement in a classroom does not ensure social participation and acceptance. Nor is social tolerance equivalent to academic success. Integration becomes inclusion when classroom practices construct inclusive relationships within inquiring, problem-solving communities where learning is collaborative (e.g., Fullan, 1991; Thousand & Villa, 1991). Ainscow (1993) and others have argued that social interaction as a means of facilitating learning is central to teacher education programs supportive of inclusivity. While considerable scholarship has described what actualized integration should look like, there are few studies of classroom integration in action, and fewer research-based guidelines for teachers (Bos & Fletcher, 1997). Teachers, both beginning and experienced, who are grounded in the dominant traditional view of individualistic learning need to expand their perspectives to include an interactive social theory of learning. Such an expansion allows teachers to reframe what they mean

* Tel.: + 1-734-994-8305.

E-mail address: rex@umich.edu (L.A. Rex)

0742-051X/00/$ - see front matter © 2000 Published by Elsevier Science Ltd. All rights reserved.
PII: S0742-051X(99)00064-5

by "special needs" in their classrooms and to redefine the roles and the actions they take up as they teach.

This study is a case of inclusionary teaching. It profiles teacher moves through which integration was accomplished. The teacher whose practice is described taught a class of five students with special needs and 16 students designated variously as general, gifted and talented, or transitional English second language. The course, created as part of a state-funded school restructuring plan, and required for *all* entering ninth graders, offered a curriculum and pedagogy meant to build social community, appreciation for diversity, a culture of success, and practices supportive of academic competence.

The study is part of a larger ethnographic study of the course and the school undertaken over a three-year period. This smaller study focuses on how the teacher managed the interactions between himself, a ninth grade student with mild learning disabilities, and other students during a whole class instructional conversation. A close analysis of the interactional roles, relationships, and actions the teacher and the students took up provides a snapshot of a particular kind of inclusion — interactional inclusion — which is constructed through moment-to-moment discourse within more macro classroom discourse practices. This analysis was guided by the following three questions: How did the teacher's actions create opportunities for students frequently excluded to build academic literacy along with their classmates? How did a student with learning disabilities take up and act upon those opportunities? And, how was the student with disabilities positioned to be observed as a capable classroom member?

The perspective taken in this article stands on the shoulders of psychological theories on learning motivation, such as the self-determination theory of Deci and Ryan (1985). Self-determination theory stresses the importance for individual learners of a teaching approach that supports autonomy in an informational context, validates effectance-enhancing information (White, 1959), and acknowledges conflicting feelings. The theory posits that students need to be self-determining and competent while engaging in a genuinely challenging and contextually worthwhile activity, and that classrooms that promote self-determination facilitate intrinsic motivation and students' academic learning, particularly conceptual learning and creative thinking.

1. Related studies of classroom inclusion practices

Few studies exist that show inclusion of students with learning disabilities by describing interactions between students and their teacher. Of those we have, many document teacher direction or support through transmission of information (Mehan, 1979) often through sequenced discrete skill instruction (McDermott, 1993). This may, in part, be attributed to the predominant model of instruction, which has treated students with learning disabilities as individuals in need of attention by their teacher and classmates to compensate for their deficits, rather than as contributing, meaning-constructing members of a community. Most often, inclusion has meant intervention in individual cognition by providing individual students with supplementary curriculum or instruction (frequently with the aid of a paraeducator) to support individual performance (e.g., Tralli, Colombo, Deschler & Schumaker, 1996).

Conversely, this study applies a sociocultural lens to observe classroom discourse interactions. This lens is based on the assumption that cultural ways of perceiving, believing, acting and evaluating (Goodenough, 1981), and the social practices through which they are constructed and held in place, shape how teachers teach and how students learn. From this perspective, the teacher is assumed to be the primary sociocultural mediator of learning through the process of integrating the background experiences and cultural knowledge of students with disabilities into classroom curriculum and instructional activity (Keogh, Gallimore & Weisner, 1997). Bos and Fletcher (1997) surveyed sociocultural studies of classroom inclusion in five widely read journals in the field of learning disability published from 1900 through 1995. They found 26 sociocultural studies, only 16 of which were descriptive of classroom practices; teacher or student knowledge, attitudes and perceptions; and

teacher and student performance. The 16 studies' most frequent foci were instructional accommodations for students with learning disabilities, the effectiveness of various instructional strategies and grouping patterns (e.g., cooperative learning, peer tutoring and support, ability grouping), ways of monitoring and providing feedback on learning, and the importance of communicating with students on a personal level. Bos and Fletcher note that two aspects central to a sociocultural investigation of classroom inclusion were absent — information about (1) the content of the curriculum, and (2) the classroom discourse.

The few studies of inclusion that do inform us about classroom curriculum and the discourse through which it is learned are studies of individual inclusive classrooms (e.g., Gutierrez & Stone, 1997; Jordan, Lindsay & Stanovich, 1997; Rex & McEachen, 1999). For example, Jordan *et al*. (1997) studied nine teachers' interactions during academic lessons with students who were exceptional or at risk of academic failure. They found that all the teachers in their study, regardless of their teaching beliefs and methods, were able to engage students in higher-order thinking and in the construction of deeper understanding (p. 91). However, they observed that teachers with interactionist perspectives engaged in many more interactions with students, persisted more in constructing student understanding, and were more successful in cognitively engaging students than teachers with pathognomonic perspectives, and thus had a higher level of efficacy. Their study illustrates the importance of considering adaptive instruction at the microlevel of individual student–teacher interactions.

Elsewhere, Skrtic, Sailor and Gee (1996) have argued that general and special education studies assuming a social constructionist view of learning as meaning-making for both the individual and the group converge in studies about inclusionary practices. In these studies, the ways in which interactions between individuals constitute a classroom community were investigated through ethnographic and discourse analyses. Gutierrez and Stone (1997), for example, took a cultural–historical approach to study the interactions between a teacher and individual students with learning disabilities. They described how the social organization of instruction organized productive learning opportunities. Their discourse analyses revealed how the learning of a student with disabilities was constructed from the interactive intellectual resources of the individual and the group. Studies of other marginalized groups (e.g., English second language students) have applied ethnographic and discourse analytic methodologies to show the construction of learning communities. These studies described how mutually beneficial, reciprocal social relationships between classroom participants enhanced intellectual inquiry linked to academic performance (Green & Yeager, 1995; Kyratzis & Green, 1996; Santa Barbara Classroom Discourse Group, 1992a).

Interactional inclusion, as presented in this study, builds upon the contributions of these and other classroom researchers, with a different emphasis. Interactional inclusion emphasizes the contributions of the classroom teacher in creating the conditions of active participation of the student with learning disabilities through particular discourse practices. In their review of sociocultural research employing discourse analysis to investigate remedial and special education practices, Forman and McCormick (1995) pointed out the lack of such studies.

2. Inclusion as discursive construction of academic socioliterate practices

The concept of inclusionary practice upon which this study is based comes from scholarship about member-constructed classroom cultures as communicative and referential systems. Interactional sociolinguistic approaches (e.g., Gumperz, 1986) to studying a classroom's spoken and written discourse provide insights into relationships between particular ways of using language, occasions of its use, and social rules that create the conditions for learning. Studying what individual classroom members say or do, with whom, when and how they say or do it, under what conditions, for what individual and group purposes, and with what outcomes shows what the learning culture of that classroom is like from each member's point of view. Interactional sociolinguistic studies reveal how

individual members participate in learning the social and academic knowledge they need to become members of the group (Heath, 1983). They show the principles or rules for how individuals can proceed as members to participate in the "take up" (Edwards & Mercer, 1987) of academic learning opportunities (Santa Barbara Classroom Discourse Group, 1992a) to become academically literate (Cochran-Smith, 1984). Such studies show how participant actions and the rules that guide them are constituted by and, in turn, construct ways of perceiving, acting, believing and evaluating unique to that classroom (Green & Dixon, 1993).

Studying ways a new member is included in a classroom group, especially those who have no previous experience with or knowledge of the academic and social procedures for participating in the academic and social learning processes of that group, requires studying how they become members. That means observing what opportunities they are given to participate in the construction of academic activity, when and how they take up those opportunities, and how teachers and group members respond to their take up. It also means observing how previously excluded individuals perform as members on more than one occasion, and how the group reconfigures to include the new members in classroom activity (Rex, 1997a).

An opportunity for learning exists if it is recognized and taken up as such by the recipient and acted upon in a way that is acknowledged socially by the group (Alton-Lee & Nuthall, 1992; Meyers, 1993; Tuyay, Jennings & Dixon, 1995). What counts as an opportunity in one situation may not be regarded as such in another, which means opportunities for learning are context, time, content, and participant dependent and need to be observed as multiple occasions that are meaningfully linked over time. Locating opportunities for learning through interactive participation has been the focus of a growing number of ethnographic and discourse-based studies of classroom teaching and learning (e.g., Baker & Luke, 1991; Edwards & Mercer, 1987; Emihovich, 1989; Hicks, 1995; Marshall, 1992; Todd & Barnes, 1995). This kind of research focuses on participatory conditions constituted through language — especially discourse interactions supporting exchanges of teacher and learner roles (e.g., Brilliant-Mills, 1993; Floriani, 1993; Lin, 1993). Discursive interactions are central because classroom language (including the classroom's principles for proceeding and performing with language) is a resource needed by all classroom members to sustain participatory membership and learning (e.g., Borko & Eisenhart, 1989; Collins, 1986; Gee & Green, 1998; Gilmore, 1987; Moll, Diaz, Estrada & Lopes, 1992). Learning a classroom's language practices is especially critical for previously excluded students who have not had the opportunities afforded their more knowing classmates in other classrooms (Hymes, 1967). Students who are newly included must learn the discourse to become participatory members, to learn the required academic knowledge, and to display that learning according to acceptable performance expectations.

The challenge for students with learning disabilities may be thought of as learning academic *socioliteracy*. Theorized by Gee (1996), who built on the work of Wittgenstein, Bourdieu, Foucault, and Hacking as well as the aforementioned traditions of scholarship, socioliteracy is a co-constitutive view of language and literacy. Socioliteracy is socially acceptable "ways of being in the world" (in this case, in the classroom) or "forms of life" that are available in and through what Gee calls capital D Discourses (as distinct from small d discourses) that create social positions by serving as kinds of identity kits.

> "A Discourse is a socially accepted association among ways of using language, other symbolic expressions, and 'artifacts', of thinking, feeling, believing, valuing, and acting that can be used to identify oneself as a member of a socially meaningful group or 'social network', or to signal (that one is playing) a socially meaningful 'role'" (Gee, 1996; p. 131)

The academic practices students in this study were expected to "take up" reflected what the powerful members of the school (e.g., teachers and high achieving students) regarded as academic literacy. In order to become identified as a rightful, capable member of this classroom learning culture, students had to use language, act, and produce

artifacts that reflected the dominant ways of thinking, feeling, believing and acting. For students with learning disabilities and other students considered lower achieving to participate in classroom academic literacy-building, they were required to enter the (lower case d) discourse of the classroom — what Gee refers to as its "connected stretches of language that make sense" (Gee, 1996; p. 127).

3. The contexts of the investigation

3.1. Academic foundations for success

The academic foundations for success (AFS) class in this study, one of the first to be taught, was created to accomplish one of the restructuring goals of this demographically diverse high school. Stakeholders wanted more social integration to alleviate increasing animosity between student groups. They structured AFS to bring together students usually separated by ability grouping arrangements (i.e. tracking) into courses labeled as: learning disability (LD), general, English as a second language (ESL), and gifted and talented education (GATE). Using cooperative learning methods, and an inquiry process curriculum that emphasized multiple intelligences and valued personal history, AFS was also designed to help keep students in school. The curriculum's themes and activities focused on how to be a successful high school student.

In interviews collected during the six years before the course, teachers and students expressed a common belief. It was a belief held by the school faculty, by the curriculum planning committee (of students, teachers, parents, administrators, counselors and a district board member), and by the teachers who volunteered to teach AFS. They believed that the institutional, instructional, and student cultures of their high school positioned teachers and students in the roles of evaluators and sorters. Students assumed teachers were continually ranking their performances; and, within individual classrooms, students assumed their classmates judged their capability and stature on the basis of their actions.

The reconstitution of these roles and relationships was a challenge for this AFS classroom of 21 students with diverse school — assigned identities. Some identities imbued students with more power (i.e. two GATE) and others with less (i.e. five students with learning disabilities — three of these designated fluent English proficient English second language — and two others classified as limited English proficient). (Of the 12 general students, one was considered bilingual, and four were designated fluent English proficient English second language.) In interviews at the start of the course, these students, regardless of their institutional ranking (though lower ranking students often resented how they were positioned), assumed "higher performing" students "deserved" the right to assess their lower achieving classmates; and, they believed "lower performing" students should defer to and learn from their higher achieving peers.

The larger ethnographic study observed that such cultural assumptions were renegotiated over the semester of 45 ninety-minute class sessions. Teaching and learning practices were in keeping with those visible in successfully detracked (Oakes & Lipton, 1990,1992) and integrated classrooms (Skrtic *et al*., 1996). The curriculum and pedagogical methods supported rich learning experiences for students of both higher and lower status. They provided opportunities for interactive participatory learning (e.g., frequent paired, small and whole group cooperative learning) of "substantive" content knowledge — the understanding of big ideas (Bruner, 1986; Lampert, 1988; Reznick, 1987; Schifter, 1998) and inquiry skills (Nolan & Francis, 1992). Students drew upon their experiences and cultural knowledge (e.g., homework reading; the problems of the illegal immigrant). They were presented with activities they could value and take up as academically challenging (e.g., open-ended, personal, imaginative and inquiring). Their learning was both personally meaningful (e.g., telling their own stories) and academically purposeful (e.g., how to be a successful high school student). The teacher, an English teacher with 10 years experience, had long been a leader in multiple communities of practice (Palincsar, Magnusson, Marano, Ford & Brown, 1993,1997) in which he was committed to schooling that respected diversity. He was leader of the AFS committee, chair of his school's restructuring committee, and, while co-director of his local

writing and literature project site, had been on the committee that designed California's learning assessment (CLAS) competency tests of reading and writing.

3.2. *Constructing the socioliteracy of "genuine questions" through discourse*

Three interrelated dimensions of group discourse provide a lens for viewing how AFS students with learning disabilities, their classmates, and their teachers interactionally constructed particular academically socioliterate understandings. The first dimension involves learning the language of AFS's curriculum. Students with learning disabilities, along with their classmates, learned an academic code knowledge for reading school texts and writing about them, solving math problems, and discussing current events (Street, 1996). "Genuine questions" was an important part of this code, central to most of AFS's academic practices. Asking a genuine question meant asking about what one believed was important or useful to know or understand at that moment. For example, a way of reading academic texts was to keep a running log of one's genuine questions about the text's contents or ideas. One way of "notemaking" to accompany one's "notetaking" was to ask genuine questions to challenge or extend the information in one's notes. Solving math problems involved asking peer and teacher collaborators genuine questions about what was being requested in the problem and the significance of particular information or a particular step. Talking about current events, as will be observed more closely in the transcript analyses that follow, meant asking genuine questions linking one's own experience to the circumstances in the report. Most significantly, in order to write their investigative reports, the most extensive and complex extended literacy activity of the course, students devised a genuine question to serve as their research heuristic.

In the second discourse dimension of socioliteracy, students used language, like "genuine questioning", as the medium and means through which to build knowledge and become literate (Brilliant Mills, 1993; Santa Barbara Classroom Discourse Group, 1992a). Knowing the code meant more than knowing "that" it was important. Students used the code to become adept at "genuine questioning" — the "how" dimension of classroom discourse (Ryle, 1949). Knowing how to genuinely question meant acquiring the procedural knowledge necessary to perform competently within applicable contexts, at the appropriate moment, in the legitimate way. To acquire this knowledge students made multiple attempts in diverse situations while teachers mediated their participation (Lin, 1993). In the AFS classroom, four teachers (including a paraeducator and two student teacher interns) attempted daily to bring every student into classroom conversations. Teachers, in their roles as discourse gate keepers and social arbiters, shaped the contexts of the interactions so students could be socially recognized and acknowledged while exercising their voices in purposeful and strategic ways related to literacy-building. For example, when Lisa (a student for whom English was a second language) asked during a homework assignment activity why she should bother to do homework when she could simply ask any one of her many friends to give her theirs, the teacher pursued this topic with her. Lisa had followed the classroom norms for what counted as a genuine question and had asked it at an appropriate moment. The teacher acknowledged Lisa's question and sustained the interaction, viewing it as an opportunity to renegotiate this student's understanding and valuing of homework and the role it played in academic achievement.

Third, AFS teachers used discourse as both a medium and a means for constructing and reconstructing students' views of their own and their classmates' roles and capabilities. They engaged students in public conversations about their academic work in ways that acknowledged the academic viability of their experience. Students came to view their voicings as academically valid and as positioning them favorably within the power relationships of the classroom. For example, when Lisa "genuinely questioned" the value of doing rather than acquiring homework, she expressed her current view of this fundamental academic literacy, and in so doing positioned herself as a power holder with a particular understanding of what

counted as homework. Homework was a socioliteracy resource of another kind in her social "world" outside the classroom. She and her friends used homework as social currency to reinforce social ties and to manage dominant institutional academic expectations. As she engaged in AFS discourse activity, Lisa began to speak about homework differently to establish a different power position within the classroom. In the new role of "doer of homework", Lisa talked about how friends and family assisted her in "doing *her* homework".

As AFS members exercised these three interrelated discursive dimensions of classroom socioliteracy, they were exercising inclusion by mediating social and academic power through voicing, acknowledgment, and relationship building. Students' voicings of their meaningful understandings and valuings became part of the curriculum. They were integrated into the conventions and information that constituted school literacy. Their discourse practices also built networks of overlapping social partnerings and groupings to constitute a complex, complementary culture of social membership.

The relationship of two students, Judy and Andrea, illustrates an outcome of this integrated membership. On Halloween, they attended class dressed alike in oversized overalls, striped T-shirts, and pigtails. Entering the classroom giggling, their arms draped around each other, they described how, the night before on the telephone, they had managed to coordinate their outfits. Judy and Andrea's actions were fairly typical of adolescent female behavior within their school. That they had become friends after two months of learning academics together was not common. Since sixth grade, Andrea, identified as having particular gifts and talents, had been tracked into academic classes reserved for "gifted and talented" (GATE) students. Judy, identified as having learning disabilities since preschool, had spent her school years in general and special education classes and special programs. Until this class, their social and academic lives had remained separate and distinct. Now they shared co-teaching and learning roles and relationships in small group and whole class activities that reflected and extended a relationship that was evolving in other school and community settings.

4. Methods

For six years prior to the larger study, the researcher came to know the school during weekly visits as supervisor of student teachers. During the year of the study, the researcher was a participant–observer in the AFS classroom for the duration of the course. All events before, during and after each class were field noted and videotaped, and all the students and teachers were interviewed formally (at the beginning and end of the course) and informally throughout observation (Zaharlick & Green, 1991). The university researcher and the head classroom teacher worked together as co-researchers, conferring in the evolution of the study and collecting all teacher and student artifacts, including students' AFS performance products and institutional records of current and prior achievement. Two AFS students assisted in video data collection. The university researcher attended other AFS classes taught by the teacher and other teachers, classes in other disciplines, teacher meetings, and campus functions.

Spradley's (1980) ethnographic method and a variation of Green and Wallat's (1981) method of discourse analysis oriented the collection, transcription and analysis of data. Interpretive method (Erickson, 1986) guided emergent questions and theorization using multiple transcriptions (Ochs, 1979) of classroom activity to make visible academically literate discourse patterns meaningful to classroom members (Lin, 1993; Santa Barbara Classroom Discourse Group, 1992a). Folk terms, like "genuine questions", were analyzed for their semantic meanings (Spradley, 1980) and to observe emic ways of thinking. Daily academic activity was transcribed as discursive events to provide a particular intertextual (Bloome & Egan-Robertson, 1993; Santa Barbara Classroom Discourse Group, 1992b) and intercontextual (Floriani, 1993) representation of frequency, order, and meaningful relationship among particular academic events and students' capable performance. From these representations and their cultural meanings were made part–whole analyses of the particular discourse interactions in this study — i.e. specific teaching–learning events which established expectations for academic literacy and competent performance.

These part–whole analyses were informed by the transcription of 14 interrelated cycles of academic activity (i.e. chains of semantically and purposefully tied academic events; Green & Meyer, 1991). Within each cycle an analysis was conducted of the literate artifacts (e.g., homework, free writes, reports, worksheets) produced by students from the perspective of what was considered by teacher and students as more and as less capable performance. Patterns across the 14 cycles were also analyzed, describing routinized academic and procedural practices occurring throughout all of the cycles. Further analysis of these routines of practice (i.e. framing, instructing, constructing, reporting, and collecting) made visible the classroom's norms for social engagement and academic performance to achieve competence.

Telling interactions, like the subject of this study, were selected (Mitchell, 1984) from the videotaped recordings for microanalysis.[1] All of the telling cases were transcribed intonationally into message units (Gumperz, 1992) to represent the actions of individual actors as topically tied, meaningfully related sequences of interaction (Green & Wallat, 1981). By applying these methods, the telling case presented here will focus on the teacher's interactions with a particular student referred to in the study as Judy. Judy's interactions with her classmates and teacher will serve to "tell" us how the teacher created opportunities for her to participate, how Judy acted upon those opportunities, and how she became positioned to be observed as a capable classroom member.

5. Interactional inclusion: learning how to ask a genuine question

Judy had an extended history of intensive psychological and special services testing and interventions. She was described by the special education paraeducator in the AFS classroom as "emotionally learning disabled". Before entering school, Judy suffered from hearing problems and received sensory integration therapy to address poor motor skills and tactile defensiveness. She received speech and language services in first grade, began counseling during second grade (which had continued to the present), and was referred for testing by her third grade teachers because of her inconsistent academic progress and difficulties adjusting socially. Her scores on tests administered by the school psychologist were within a low normal range. When Judy entered ninth grade at age 16, her grade point average from junior high was 1.33, causing her mother to request she be tested for possible Attention Deficit Disorders. Judy reported persistent feelings of sadness, difficulties

[1] In this study, I am applying ethnographer Mitchell's conceptualization of a case study (1983, 1984). Mitchell argues for the validity of cases that "tell" heuristically, as distinct from other case study methodologies which proceed from the premise of "typicality". Mitchell states,

> "… we may characterize a case study as a detailed examination of an event (or series of related events) which the analyst believes exhibits (or exhibit) the operation of some identified general theoretic principle … A case study is essentially heuristic" (1983, p. 192).

> Mitchell quotes Eckstein (1975) in describing the particular purpose of the heuristic case.

> It is deliberately used to stimulate the imagination towards discerning important general problems and possible theoretic solutions …. Such studies … tie directly into theory building, and therefore are less concerned with overall concrete configurations than with potentially generalisable relations between aspects of them: they also tie into theory-building less passively and fortuitously than does disciplined-configurative study, because the potentially generalisable relations do not just turn up but are deliberately sought out (1983, p. 196).

The heuristic usefulness of the ethnographically constructed case lies in its serving as a site for making logical inferences that will illuminate formerly obscure aspects of general theory. In analyzing dynamic, invisible social processes, which exist because of and in relation to their contextual features, the case study allows the analyst to bring to bear the extensive knowledge known only to her as observer and documenter of the culture. The "telling case", (Mitchell, 1984) permits the analyst "to show how general regularities exist precisely when specific contextual circumstances are taken account of" (p. 239).

Another telling case study of interactional inclusion set in another classroom is available in Rex and McEachen (1999). This study provides eight telling interactional cases to theorize about the development of an inclusive teaching and learning culture over time through multiple interactional events.

concentrating and remembering, and her mind "wandering off" when she attempted schoolwork.

Judy's history of attention difficulties in previous classrooms suggested her occasions of successful engagement in the learning activity of AFS (documented in the ethnographic data) would be rich events to study. Two brief segments of Judy's engagement in whole group classroom interaction were selected. Within these brief interchanges Judy's teacher and her classmates positioned her to capably ask genuine questions. The segments occurred during a class discussion as part of a social studies notetaking–notemaking lesson on the eighth day of class. The lesson was the first instruction in critical thinking, and initiated an inquiry curriculum that would build and culminate at the end of the term in an original research project. These two segments occurred while the teacher was guiding the class through the instructional phase for understanding genuine questions, before they attempted to write them on their own for homework. He had already framed the activity, including an explanation of genuine questions. They had watched video clips about illegal immigration, school desegregation, breast cancer and Haitian political conditions culled from recently televised network news broadcasts. The teacher stopped the tape after each piece for students to write and share their genuine questions. First, he summarized the information and issues in each of the clips to prompt question writing; then, he called for student volunteers to present their questions. It is from this phase of voluntary student reporting the segments are taken.

In the transcriptions that follow see Fig. 1, we see the teacher framing the activity for the class in terms of the specific actions to be evaluated: "Let's just hear some of the questions that people came up with … just to hear some questions" (01). In saying these words, the teacher has given students the opportunity to position themselves in relation to the activity, to him and his expectations, and to their classmates.

The teacher asked for volunteers from the class to present the genuine questions they thought of. This was the fourth occurrence that day of a "reporting" routine. As he framed the activity, the teacher gave the purpose. That is, he delineated the

01	T	Let's just hear some of the questions that people came up with. Anybody have a question they'd be willing to read aloud? We're not gonna get into a debate or a discussion. Some of these are kind of controversial issues. But just to hear some questions.
02		(A student designated GATE raises her hand)
03	T	Yeah
04	A	I was wondering how many people were actually kept out, you know. Because they make it sound like so many people are coming across. I wonder how effectively the borders are currently working.
05	T	OK

Fig. 1. First segment #1 (01–05).

action parameters within which the class members would work. "We're not gonna get into a debate or discussion. Some of these are kind of controversial issues. But just to hear some questions" (01). By providing the purpose and framing the action that will occur, the teacher provided the expectations for performance by which student participants will be assessed.

The first volunteer to report was Andrea, who stated her genuine question as something she was wondering (04). The teacher's response was an "OK" (05). In making this brief response, the teacher confirmed that the student's question accomplished his expectations for the activity. In saying her question, Andrea gave a peer public model of what a genuine question should be. The other students in the class had an example of the expectations for this activity. This was more information from which they could determine how to position themselves.

At this point in the class interaction, Judy raised her hand and the teacher called on her (Fig. 2) (06–07).

06		(A student with learning disabilities raises her hand)
07	T	Yeah, Judy
08	J	Can I ask a question?
09	T	Sure

Fig. 2. First segment #2 (06–09).

Judy had read what she thought were the parameters and expectations of this activity, and she had positioned herself so that she was ready to enter the interaction and engage in performance. Judy's opening request of the teacher — "Can I ask a question?" (08) — may be read in several ways. It

can be viewed as a procedural check. Judy may have been asking "Is this what we are doing now? Are we telling everyone the genuine question we thought of?" She may also have been asking for permission to enter into the activity from the teacher as gatekeeper of the classroom's public space. Judy may have meant, "Can I say my question now? Is it all right for me, Judy, to have a turn?" In addition, Judy's request for participation may have been asking "Can a student with learning disabilities ask a question, or is this activity only for other kinds of students?" When the teacher said "Sure", he turned over the public space of the room and in so doing sent a message not only to Judy, but also to her classmates. Judy and students with learning disabilities do have a right to ask questions that are meaningful for them; they have a right to claim the public space of the room and the attention of their classmates. In this act, the teacher turned over the powerful space in the room to a student with learning disabilities, an act which authoritatively positioned her to participate.

In the next interaction, Judy asked her question (Fig. 3) (10).

10	J	OK. What about the immigrants? If they find you, and, like if you xxxx. If they find you on this side. . . and. . . and you're doing something illegal, or something, can they say go back? Can they put you like in a . . . what do they do? Can they put you in our jail? Or what do they do?
11	T	If you commit a crime in this country?
12	J	And you're not a United legal prisoner here, what do they say? Go back?

Fig. 3. First segment #3 (10–12).

Where previously the teacher had acknowledged another student's question with a simple OK, indicating that he had understood her question and that it had met his expectations, he responded differently to Judy's question. In an interview about the interaction, the teacher explained that he was not sure he had understood Judy's question. In order to be certain, using interrogative intonation, he restated what he thought was one of her propositions. His pitch rising at the end of the phrase, he asked, "If you commit a crime in this country?" (11). Judy responded to the teacher's question by treating it as the first part of a restatement of her question "If you commit a crime in this country… and you're not a United [States citizen] [a] legal prisoner here, what do they say? Go back?" (12).

In taking up and building upon the teacher's clarifying question, Judy's actions indicated her recognition that in this classroom with this teacher and these classmates this was a way of participating in the learning of academics. If the teacher (or classmate) does not understand what you are saying the first time you say it, he (or she) will say what he does understand so you can add on or restate what you meant.

In this interaction, the teacher acted in the role of listener who repeated back a part of the speaker's question to give her another opportunity to reconstruct it. By acting as listener, trying to understand the message of the speaker, the teacher provided a second opportunity for Judy to act as agent in articulating her own meaning. The message to the class was that this person knows what she wants to say, has something to say that serves the purpose of this activity, and needs assistance and a second opportunity to say it. Although this article focuses on the teacher's interactional style with a student with learning disabilities, analyses of other classroom interactions reveal the teacher similarly listening and responding to all the other students as they struggled with other learning challenges.

The teacher acknowledged Judy's question in ways meant to validate it as academically and socially meaningful (Fig. 4).

13	T	That's a good question. That would be a good question. I think they would . . . (to Lydia) Do you know the answer? What would they do? They would try them for the crime in this country?
14	L	Yeah. They do.
15	T	Yeah. If you've committed a crime. I have a friend who works in San Diego as a border patrolman, and a lot of people come here of course to work, you know. And they are here because you can make so much more money than you can over the border. So they come to the United States to work and find jobs. And a lot of times what he will do . . . they. . . it's almost like a game of tag because people will be coming and it's not like they are coming armed with guns and stuff, because most of them are not violent people. They are just looking for work. So they . . . when they catch them they just go "OK, you got me." and it almost sounds like a tag football game out there some nights.
16		(Lydia and students laughs) Because they have these scopes and the people get on the bus and they go back over the border and they just come back later on and try to . . .
17	L	(Interjects) They come back and do it again.

Fig. 4. First segment #4 (13–17).

The teacher's response to Judy's restatement of her question was "That's a good question." (13). In making this response, the teacher publicly confirmed the question and affirmed the questioner. His acknowledgement sent the message that a question can be valuable, even though it is haltingly articulated. Another student's question was "OK"; Judy's was "good." The teacher had shifted the expected response pattern predicted by school sorting practices. Studies of how teacher expectations are shaped by student sorting (Good & Brophy, 1987) document prevalent teacher beliefs that high achieving students' questions are good, lower achieving students responses are OK, and responses to academic questions by students with learning disabilities are often not even satisfactory.

In an act that reinforced the academic validity of the question, the teacher redirected the question to another student to see if she knew the answer: "Do you know the answer? What would they do? They would try them for the crime in this country?" (13). This student, a bilingual immigrant from Mexico, had previously spoken passionately and knowledgeably about the plight of illegal Mexican immigrants in California. She would later write her investigative report on ballot proposition 187, which called for public schools to be sites for identifying illegal immigrants.

In redirecting Judy's question to another student for an answer, the teacher changed the rules for the activity he originally framed — "Just to hear some questions" (01). He did so because he recognized and took up multiple opportunities, a practice he resorted to frequently in his teaching in order to bring the disparate social and academic students into contingent interaction. By asking another student to answer Judy's questions, he was constructing an interaction that linked what one student valued with what Judy thought important to ask about. One student would have an opportunity to provide personal information that would have academic credibility; Judy could experience being a capable genuine questioner; and, their peers could publicly recognize both as academically literate students. The teacher's action meant Judy had asked a question deserving of an answer, and she had asked it in a way that made sense to the class. The interaction was an opportunity to affirm Judy's knowledge of genuine questions, of the social protocol of engaging in academic activity, and of her capability to be a successful student.

However, the other student's response was limited to a simple affirmation "Yeah. They do." (14). As reported in a post-class session conversation, in the next moment, the teacher acted to diffuse what he read as a possible negative reading of Judy's question by the students in the room who were either themselves illegal immigrants or who had illegal immigrant friends or family members. He wanted to diffuse possible interpretations of Judy's question as more immigrant bashing, then part of the California Zeitgeist — that is, thinking of immigrants as engaging in illegal activity that drained California's resources. Such a perception would threaten the social compatibility of the Latino-American and Anglo-American student groups in the classroom, and jeopardize Judy's social position. Using another literate practice that was being established in the classroom — telling narratives of one's own experiences or of those close to you — the teacher built on the student's response by giving information he had learned from a friend who was a California–Mexico border patrol guard (15). His narrative confirmed the experiences of the classroom's Mexican immigrant families — that immigrants come to the United States to work, not to commit crimes.

This narrative way of providing information modeled and affirmed what counted as academic knowledge or answers, encouraged students to take up this practice, affirmed the personal knowledge and experiences of many of the students, and kept the interactional space open in response to Judy's question. The teacher's information was confirmed by the immigrant student who interjected to repeat the point he was making "They come back and do it again." (17). Together, a classmate and the teacher were building knowledge in answer to Judy's question so that the sensibilities of each were validated.

In this segment, class time and space had been given over to addressing something that a student with learning disabilities wondered about. The classroom's cultural rules about what counted as knowledge, what served as an opportunity to build

knowledge, and who had the right to provide that opportunity and to build it were being instantiated in and through the actions of the interactants. In this interactional segment, the teacher's mediation positioned Judy with classmates so that their sense of who they were in the world and what was important was accepted as valid and useful. Judy's capability was presented in and through her question so as to reconstruct a student identity that was probably different from the one she had usually built in other heterogeneous classrooms.

In the next interactional segment which occurred a short time later as other students reported their genuine questions about another news clip, Judy re-entered the public interaction, this time to clarify her understanding of a student's question. Whereas, in the first segment Judy's understanding of the academic literacy was publicly established because her question was confirmed by the teacher as doing the assignment correctly; in this segment, Judy positioned herself to take on the role of capable and deserving inquirer through her own actions as well as the teacher's.

18	T	What about the desegregation of classes? Did anyone write a question about that one?
19		(Jordan raises his hand)
20	T	Yeah, Jordan.
21	J	Were the classes created academically? Like on an academic basis? Or, just really . . . just for . . . like for the race. Not like how they did.
22	T	OK. So are they being separated by academic performance, or by racial line, or by something different? So, OK. Good question.
23		(Andrea raises her hand)
24	T	Yeah (He acknowledges her hand.)
25	A	My other question was is there a test for these classes.
26	T	OK. Yeah are these classes you have to pass a test to get into, or is it just sorted? Are people picked, or is it kids get to pick which classes they want to be in?

Fig. 5. Second segment #1 (18–26).

The teacher requested more student reporting by asking the class "What about the desegregation of classes? Did anyone write a question about that one?" (Fig. 5) (18). Another student (a fluent English proficient (FEP) English second language student who self identified as Asian) volunteered and stated his genuine question. He wanted to know on what basis the classes in the news report were segregated — by academic performance or by race (21). The teacher restated the student's question and confirmed that it was a "good question" (22). Another student (GATE) gave her question. She asked, "Is there a test for these classes?" (25). The teacher took up her question by elaborating on what he thought she was asking: "Yeah are these classes you have to pass a test to get into or is it just sorted? Are people picked, or is it kids get to pick which classes they want to be in?" (26).

By interpreting and elaborating on this question, the teacher also gave this student the time and attention which conferred authority on her interests and questioning knowledge. In this classroom, while traditionally excluded students' roles were reconstructed as part of the group of learners with rights to opportunities for learning, the teacher's actions did not reposition any of the other student groups into an oppositional or marginal role. Their interests and knowledge were not backgrounded while the students with disabilities' concerns were foregrounded. The curriculum, the methods through which students participated, and the patterns of discourse through which it was constructed provided frequent opportunities for students used to full participation to experience their capability.

After the teacher's elaboration of the student's question, Judy claimed the classroom floor to make a comment, "I always thought it was the teachers." (Fig. 6) (27). Not hearing her sufficiently to understand, the teacher said, "Huh" (28). Judy enlarged her comment as she repeated it: "I always thought the teachers decide who's in the classes" (29) thus implying the question, "Don't they?" In making her comment, Judy signaled that she had applied the circumstances in the video to her own situation, thus shifting the focus of the discussion from questions about the information in the video to a genuine question about how she had been sorted into particular classrooms.

27	J	I always thought it was the teachers.
28	T	Huh?
29	J	I always thought the teachers decide who's in the classes.
30	T	Uhuh. Yeah.
31	J	But there's too many. So how do they do something like require that we are all in this period?

Fig. 6. Second segment #2 (27–31).

In addition, Judy had been thinking about the teacher's response to Andrea's question. She realized that Jordan, Andrea and the teacher knew something about how students were distributed into classrooms that she did not. She stated the condition of her former knowledge — that teachers place students in particular classes. The teacher acknowledged her statement — "Uhuh. Yeah" (30) — which had the effect of validating her right to have that knowledge and to express the state of her knowing to the class, and left the public space open for her to continue. Judy continued by stating the understanding she had just realized, "But there's too many. So how do they do something like require that we are all in this period?" (31). Her question indicates that she is using inquiry thinking to sort out her own experience. Perhaps this is a question that had already occurred to her, or a situated response to the video information and her classmates' question, or both. Whatever the origins of Judy's question, of importance for this study is how the teacher responded to it. He was pleased that Judy had done exactly what he had hoped she might, and he affirmed her action. She had found a connection between the information in the video and her own experience, and she had used a genuine question as an inquiry link between them.

The three students' questions reflect different experiential knowledge and subjectivities about the school tracking issue raised by the television news clip. Jordan's question suggests he was curious about how race might be used as a criterion for sorting students into hierarchical achievement tracks. Andrea was interested in the measurement of academic achievement as the basis for sorting students. Her question indicates she assumed a meritocratic criterion for student tracking. Their questions were commensurate with their institutional identities and tracked positions. Jordan had been categorized as a general student, which prevented him from taking the academically challenging classes reserved for students designated GATE. In junior high school, Andrea was classified "gifted and talented", and since then had assumed enrollment in GATE classes. Judy had been pulled out of general classrooms to attend special classes since beginning school. She was curious about how she managed to be in a class with the current mix of students.

In the interaction, the teacher responded to Judy's newly acquired understanding and the genuine question it raised for her: "So how do they do something like require that we are all in this period?" (Fig. 7) (31). He confirmed her new understanding, "Yeah. Usually it's not the teachers." (32).

32	T	Yeah. Usually it's not the teachers. I know that in this high school I didn't get to pick all of you. I would have picked you if I had a chance, of course.
33		(Class laughs)

Fig. 7. Second segment #3 (32–33).

He teasingly claimed he would have picked all of the students for this class if he had been given the chance (32), to which the class responded with laughter. The playful claim lightened the tone of the discussion about a subject of serious interest to the students. However, the teacher did not let Judy's question go unaddressed. He gave her an answer (Fig. 8).

34 T But, you know. It's usually the computer who sorts things. But there are certain classes that are designated, as Jonathan said, by academic performance and things like that. So it seems to . . . people could say, "Well all the people who are slow readers got into this class." But if you went to a school and all the black students were in one class and all the white students were in another it would cause you to ask a question. "Well, what's going on here exactly. Like you said, who picked . . . who set this up this way, you know.
(raises voice & changes tone)
OK. What I'd like you to do is to keep this and keep thinking about. I'd like you to watch the news, and I want you to keep writing questions. Up on the board here is your homework. Your homework tonight is to continue writing questions. Watch the news this evening and keep going . . . here . . . we saw a few clips. This last one about Haiti was this morning.
OK.

Fig. 8. Second segment #4 (156–189).

The teacher explained that a computer sorted students, and there were certain classes for which admission was granted according to a record of academic performance. The implication from juxtaposing these two statements is that the computer assigns randomly unless programmed to assign particularly high achieving students to designated classes. In taking the time to answer Judy's question, this teacher reinforced the shifted focus from the video to the students' experience. In some academic settings this may be interpreted as diverging from the academic purpose of the lesson. For this

teacher, this was exactly what he had hoped would happen. This development reinforced his message to his students that being a student who was successful in high school meant finding ways to make the knowledge they were learning personally meaningful.

In a post-class interview, the teacher indicated how vigilantly he had monitored the development of the interaction. He was concerned his answer may have sounded too definitive. It may have invalidated Andrea and Jordan's questions, or closed down other student questioning about the possibility of the sorting procedures reinforcing social inequity through the permanent containment of students in separate and unequal learning conditions. Thinking quickly in the last few minutes remaining in the class, he attempted to open up the possibility of further questions by reinforcing what he viewed as questions people who consider the effects of sorting practices may ask. If one class has all the students who are slow at reading or is limited to a single race in a racially diverse school, "It would cause you to ask a question. "Well, what's going on here exactly?" (34). The teacher referred to what he implied the students had asked with their questions, "Like you said who picked, who set this up this way." (34).

The teacher's two interactional moves — first picking up Judy's comment, and then suggesting further questions — were meant to serve linked sociocultural and instructional purposes relevant to the students' experiences and potential questions. All the students in the class had experienced tracked classroom sorting. Similar to Jordan, Andrea, and Judy, their curiosity might now be piqued as to how they were sorted and who made those decisions. Judy's comment "I always thought it was the teachers [who made sorting decisions]" (29) indicated she was reflecting on the interactional information. She reported her previous understanding from her former experiences. Her comment gave the teacher the opportunity to provide information about how things were done in the high school, which was another of the goals of the course, and to affirm that Judy's prior understanding and emergent understanding were both valid topics for classroom conversation and academic activity.

In addition, the teacher's attempt to shift the focus away from his answer and to reinforce the validity of students' questions was meant to support the homework they would do that evening and their way of thinking about what successful students do. They were to watch the news and continue writing genuine questions. The homework assignment and the preceding report of genuine questions about the news clips were meant to teach the concept of genuine inquiry, which was tied to other goals for the class involving other kinds of academic activity. Genuine questions were the heuristics for critical thinking and problem solving, no matter what the topic or the academic subject matter or the kind of student you thought you were. To be a capable student meant asking questions about things into which you wanted or needed to inquire.

6. Discussion and implications

In her interview at the end of the course, Judy reported on the elements she liked best about the AFS class. Threaded through the reasons she gave for feeling comfortable and for learning were the themes of questioning and personal connectedness. Not only did Judy like the class and feel that she had learned academically; as her B- semester grade indicated, she satisfactorily completed most of the academic work. Judy's comments and her academic participation and achievement record document her inclusion.

> "I've always wanted a class where you could ask just any question, and you could be pretty positive that it would be answered; and this is one of those classes where it is; and I think that's needed."

> "I liked the investigation [project] because I was able to learn something totally that I had wondered about. I didn't really think that it would be something that I would learn about, 'cause I wonder a lot of things. And it was interesting, and I was glad to learn a lot about it."

> "In this class, the teachers were close to everybody. They talked to people … and in other

classes they just talked about the subject, not really [about] you or them, so that was really good to look forward to."

This analysis of Judy's successful inclusion demonstrates the contribution interactional research can make to the education of students with learning disabilities in general education classrooms while it provokes questions and raises sociocultural issues about inclusive instruction. The study has provided a keyhole view into inclusive classroom practices. It has revealed how interactional inclusion was accomplished for Judy during a single instructional event, and some of the sociocultural dimensions the teacher had to deal with to make it happen. This evidence, in combination with additional analyses of the AFS class data[2] strongly suggests that the teacher's choice of discourse methods contributed to classroom social reconstruction of previous perceptions of academic capability. Within a curriculum and instructional plan designed to promote student collaboration in problem solving, he mediated the social integration of students with mixed interests, values, and academic experiences, and he negotiated students' capable performances of academic socioliteracy.

In this classroom, conceptions of capability were socially redefined. Capability was not treated as natural ability, nor was it students' school ranking. Rather, beliefs about students' predispositions for learning and their academic capabilities were reconstrued when some of the experiences that led to the formation of those beliefs were used for different purposes. For example, when Judy had asked genuine questions in previous classrooms, they had probably served to indicate her lack of understanding and her learning deficiency. In AFS, genuine questions signaled academic inquiry. They exhibited and reinforced current socioliterate capability.

Students' capabilities expressed as former understandings and experiences of schooling were not only central to the curriculum. The reconstruction of those capabilities through discourse moves was a fundamental part of instructional activity. As observed in the earlier analysis, during academic instruction, Judy was positioned or reinforced in positioning herself to suit the social as well as the academic situation; she was asked to speak from her personal history and from her desire to understand or to know more; and, the discourse she used (modeled by the teacher and other adept members) became the topic and the frame for further classroom instructional activity.

Judy's case shows us the importance of the teacher's role of interactional gatekeeper and sociocultural mediator in this process. The teacher mediated the construction of rules and procedures for classroom social and academic membership. Furthermore, her case shows us the particular dimensions of gatekeeping and mediating. It is not sufficient to provide students with learning disabilities with the interactional space to participate, to entice them into that space, and to affirm what they do there. Actions need to be taken to integrate the sociocultural content presented by students during interactions, so that the values and interests of all the students (for example, GATE or immigrant) are not dismissed or diminished. In addition, it is not sufficient to affirm students' experiences and interests; they need to be relevantly included and built upon during academic activity.

Another study is needed to describe the curriculum that supported the teacher in his roles of interactional gatekeeper and sociocultural mediator, and the school restructuring that made the course and curriculum possible. Most likely, without such curriculum this teacher could not have as successfully exercised the pedagogical options he did. Nonetheless, the analysis of the two instructional segments and their ethnographic contextualizing data provide an informative profile for teachers and teacher educators that suggests guidelines for how to make inclusion work. These guidelines are summarized in Table 1.

Given these conditions, the teacher as the gatekeeper for those who can speak and the mediator for those whose knowledge counts will be in a position more amenable to making the following moves summarized in Table 2.

To change and sustain classroom teachers' practices so they are more inclusive, an alignment between contextualizing and interactional actions is necessary. Interactional inclusionary practices are

[2] Some of the other analyses of AFS classroom discourse and teaching and learning practices can be found in Rex (1995–1997)

Table 1

Contextualizing conditions contributing to classroom interactional inclusion
• Support the purpose and academic value of the course with a critical mass of participatory stakeholders (i.e. members of the administration, faculty, student body, families, district personnel, and school board).
• Maintain a consistency of approach across the entire course, so that compatible, purposeful performance goals determine instructional activity.
• Create a community of practice amongst colleagues to support the teacher in making continual alterations to curriculum and pedagogy.
• Match teacher's personal beliefs about learning disability and inclusion to the goals, curriculum, and practices of the course.
• Educate teachers to assume that a co-constitutive relationship exists between individual performance and the social culture of the classroom.
• Educate teachers to understand how teaching and learning are constituted in and through classroom talk and interaction.
• Educate teachers to assume that all students can and should participate in all the classroom's instructional activity.

Table 2

Teacher gatekeeping and mediational moves forwarding interactional inclusion
• Select materials meaningful to students to raise issues underlying power inequities in students' schooling experience.
• Provide explicit explanations of the purpose and the expectations for the range of acceptable performances at the beginning of each activity.
• Adapt responses to students in keeping with larger goals for student learning, even though they might compromise the immediate or stated objective of the task.
• Take on the roles of listener and learner to understand how to adjust one's approach and articulate one's next response.
• Validate student performance attempts by scaffolding the form in ways that give them academic credibility.
• Redirect students to take on the role of teacher when their knowledge can inform other students.
• Make discourse response moves on the basis of integrated and compatible goals and purposes for students in the course (e.g., social integration, power redistribution, inclusion, inquiry thinking, personal meaning-making, and experience of academic capability).
• Validate students' personal knowledge and experiences as academically viable by including them purposefully in lesson activity.
• Based upon knowledge of one's students' histories and affiliations, act to avert possible social tensions between social factions.
• Provide formerly excluded students with public interactional space for their interests to be addressed.
• Recognize student achievement by signaling the meaningful and informing relationship of a current performance to the student's previous performances or to other students' performances.
• Apply humor and story telling to establish an interactional footing with one's students.
• When one's interactions with students fail to construct the knowledge they need to accomplish a task, assume responsibility and make another attempt.

compromised in settings whose cultures they do not suit. In addition, knowing *that* teachers need to make particular moves is insufficient unless we know *how* they are accomplished and what they accomplish, paying special attention to the complex, sociocultural issues that shape the *how* in the contexts in which teachers find themselves teaching. Otherwise, only teachers who have already performed or observed these moves will have the procedural knowledge (Ryle, 1949) necessary to enact them. Asking less experienced teachers to make these moves will have limited effects unless we also show them examples of how they were made in contexts applicable to their own.

What I am calling Judy's case is actually Judy–the teacher–Lydia–Jordan–Andrea's case. By describing how inclusion is the positively purposeful interrelationship between multiple voices, speaking from diverse backgrounds, values and interests, this study calls for further studies of the

that and the *how* of social affiliation. Many studies have documented the social and academic disparities that exist in classrooms and the tensions they initiate and often exacerbate. Those tensions have been shown to be important contributing factors in constraining and undermining student learning. The voices in which individual students speak, the knowledge they bring forward, and the academic literacy they engage are socioculturally shaped choices central to their learning. Their choices depend upon, construct, and are constituted through social power relationships during sequences of interaction. We have observed how the teacher assisted Judy and her classmates in achieving momentary affiliations (Ellsworth, 1989). Chains of such affiliations, when acknowledged by the interactants and onlookers as positively purposeful, cohere to form the social web of an inclusionary learning culture.

Studies of how inclusionary cultures are built through the assumption of social roles and relationships are fundamental to academic classroom inclusion. When Judy said she had "learned a lot", she also said she had "wondered a lot", and "talked a lot." Judy's "learning a lot" meant her academic performances had been accepted by her teacher and classmates as well as meeting her own view of learning. Not only did Judy feel included and perform successfully, more importantly, we saw how everyone involved played a part in her feeling and performing that way. Through the kinds of discourse experiences in which she participated, she had built social relationships with all her classmates, not only with Andrea. They shared a common regard and participation structure for wondering, learning, and talking in particular ways, one of which was asking genuine questions as a way of inquiring. The teacher mediated this common regard and structure so that they came to count as one of the criteria for evaluating being an effective student in their classroom. Defining and describing Judy's individual capable performance this way — as her enactment of teacher-assisted membership in a learning culture with its own academic practices — argues for an additional way of thinking about the responsibilities of classroom teachers and the schooling practices upon which their actions rely. It argues for interactional inclusion.

References

Ainscow, M. (1993). Teacher education as a strategy for developing inclusive schools. In R. Slee, *Is there a desk with my name on it*? (pp. 201–218). Washington, DC: Falmer Press.

Alton-Lee, A., & Nuthall, G. (1992). Children's learning in classrooms: Challenges to developing a methodology to explain "opportunity to learn". *Journal of Classroom Interaction*, *27*(2), 1–7.

Baker, C., & Luke, A. (1991). *Towards a critical sociology of reading pedagogy*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Bloome, D., & Egan-Robertson, A. (1993). The Social construction of intertextuality in classroom reading & writing lessons. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *28*(4), 305–333.

Borko, H., & Eisenhart, M. (1989). Reading ability groups as literacy communities. In D. Bloome, *Classrooms and literacy* (pp. 107–134). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Bos, C., & Fletcher, T. (1997). Sociocultural considerations in learning disabilities inclusion research: Knowledge gaps and future directions. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice*, *12*(2), 92–99.

Brilliant-Mills, H. (1993). Becoming a mathematician: Building a situational definition of mathematics. *Linguistics and Education*, *5*(3 & 4), 301–334.

Bruner, J. (1986). *Actual minds, possible worlds*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Cochran-Smith, M. (1984). *The making of a reader*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Collins, J. (1986). Differential treatment in reading instruction. In J. Cook-Gumperz, *The social construction of literacy*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Deci, E. & Ryan, R. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum Press.

Edwards, D., & Mercer, N. (1987). *Common knowledge: The development of understanding in the classroom*. New York: Falmer Press.

Ellsworth, E. (1989). Why doesn't this feel empowering? Working through the repressive myths of critical pedagogy. *Harvard Educational Review*, *59*(3), 297–324.

Emihovich, C. (1989). *Locating learning: Ethnographic perspectives on classroom research*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Erickson, F. (1986). Qualitative methods in research on teaching. In M. Wittrock, *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed.) (pp. 119–161). New York: MacMillan.

Floriani, A. (1993). Negotiating what counts: Roles and relationships, texts and contexts, content and meaning. *Linguistics and Education*, *5*(3&4), 241–274.

Forman, E. A., & McCormick, D. E. (1995). Discourse analysis, a sociocultural perspective. *Remedial and Special Education*, *16*(3), 150–158.

Fullan, M. G. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change*. London: Cassell.

Gee, J. (1996) *Social Linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses*, London: Taylor and Francis.

Gee, J., & Green, J. (1998). Discourse analysis, learning, and social practice: A methodological study. *Review of Research in Education*, *23*, 119–170.

Gilmore, P. (1987). Sulking, stepping and tracking: The effects of attitude assessment on access to literacy. In D. Bloome, *Literacy and schooling* (pp. 98–120). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Good, T. L., & Brophy. J. E. (1987). *Looking in classrooms*. New York: Harper and Row.

Goodenough, W. H. (1981). *Culture, language, and society*. Menlo Park: CA: Cummings.

Green, J. L., & Dixon, D. (1993). Introduction to talking knowledge into being: Discursive and social practices in classrooms. *Linguistics and Education*, *5*(3&4), 231–240.

Green, J. L., & Meyer, L. A. (1991). The embeddedness of reading in classroom life: Reading as a situated process. In C. Baker, & A. Luke, *Towards a critical sociology of reading pedagogy* (pp. 141–160). Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Green, J. L., & Wallat, C. (1981). Mapping instructional conversations — a sociolinguistic ethnography. In J. L. Green, & C. Wallat, *Ethnography and language in educational settings*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Green, J. L., & Yeager, B. (1995). Constructing literate communities: Language and inquiry in bilingual classrooms. In J. Murray, *Celebrating difference, confronting literacies: Conference papers, Australia reading association* (pp. 97–111). Sydney, AU.

Gumperz, J. (1986). Interactional linguistics in the study of schooling. In J. Cook-Gumperz, *The social construction of literacy* (pp. 45–68). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Gumperz, J. (1992). Contextualization and understanding. In A. Duranti, & C. Goodwin, *Rethinking context* (pp. 229–252). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Gutierrez, K., & Stone, L. (1997). A cultural–historical view of learning and learning disabilities: Participating in a community of learners. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice*, *12*(2), 123–131.

Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life, and work in communities and classrooms*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hicks, D. (1995). Discourse, learning and teaching. In M. Apple, *Review of research in education*, Vol. 21 (pp. 49–95). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Hymes, D. (1967). Models of the interaction of language and social setting. *Journal of Social Issues*, *23*(2), 8–28.

Jordan, A., Lindsay, L., & Stanovich, P. (1997). Classroom teachers' instructional interactions with students who are exceptional, at risk, and typically achieving. *Remedial and Special Education*, *18*(2), 82–93.

Keogh, B., Gallimore, R., & Weisner, T. (1997). A Sociocultural perspective on learning and learning disabilities. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice*, *12*(2), 107–113.

Kyratzis, A., & Green, J. L. (1996). Jointly constructed narratives in classrooms: Co-construction of friendship and community through language. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *13*(1), 17–37.

Lampert, M. (1988). The teacher's role in reinventing the meaning of mathematics knowing in the classroom. In M. J. Behr, C. B. Lacampagne, & M. M. Wheeler, *Proceedings of the 10th annual meeting of the North American chapter of the international group for the psychology of mathematics education*. Dekalb, IL: North Illinois University.

Lin, L. (1993). Language of and in the classroom: Constructing the patterns of social life. *Linguistics and Education*, *5*(3 & 4), 367–410.

Marshall, H. H. (1992). Seeing, redefining, and supporting student learning. In H. H. Marshall, *Redefining student learning* (pp. 1–32). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

McDermott, R. (1993). The acquisition of a child by a learning disability. In S. Chiklin, & J. Lave, *Understanding practice: Perspectives on activity and context* (pp. 269–305). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning lessons*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Meyers, J. (1993). The social contexts of school and personal literacy. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *27*(4), 296–333.

Mitchell, J. C. (1983). Case and situation analysis. *Sociological Review*, *31*(2), 187–211.

Mitchell, J. C. (1984). Typicality and the case study. In R. F. Ellen, *Ethnographic research: A guide to general conduct* (pp. 238–241). New York: Academic Press.

Moll, L., Diaz, S., Estrada, E., & Lopes, L. (1992). Making contexts: The social construction of lessons in two languages. In M. Saravia-Shore, & S. Arvizu, *Cross-cultural literacy, ethnographies of communication in multiethnic classrooms* (pp. 339–366). New York: Garland Publishing.

Nolan, J., & Francis, P. (1992). Changing perspectives in curriculum and instruction. In C. Glickman, *Supervision in transition* (pp. 44–60). Alexandra, VA: ASCD.

Oakes, J., & Lipton, M. (1990). *Making the best of schools*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Oakes, J., & Lipton, M. (1992). Detracking schools: Early lessons from the field. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *73*(6), 448–454.

Ochs, E. (1979). Transcription as theory. In E. Ochs, & B. Schieffelin, *Developmental pragmatics* (pp. 43–72). New York: Academic Press.

Palincsar, A., Magnusson, S. J., Marano, N., Ford, D., & Brown, N. (1993). Designing a community of practice: Principles and practices of the GIsML community. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *14*(1), 5–19.

Palincsar, A., Magnusson, S.J., Marano, N., Ford, D., & Brown, N. (1997). *Design principles informing and emerging from a community of practice*. Paper presented at the annual conference of the American educational research association, Chicago, Ill, March.

Rex, L.A. (1995). *Part–whole relationships: What a "telling case" can make visible*. Presentation for the research assembly of the conference of the national council of teachers of English, San Diego, CA, November

Rex, L.A. (1996). *"Something like that once happened to me": Making high school academic literacies personal and collaborative*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American educational research association, New York, NY, April.

Rex, L.A. (1997a). *Making a case: A study of classroom construction of academic literacy*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of California, Santa Barbara.

Rex, L.A. (1997b). *Judy learns to ask a "genuine question": A "learning disabled" student co-constructs classroom discussion with her "gifted," "general," and "ESL" classmates*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the national reading conference, Scottsdale, AR, December.

Rex, L. & McEacnen (1999). "If anything is odd, inappropriate, confusing, or boring, it's probably important": The Emergence of inclusive academic literacy through English classroom discussion. *Research in the Teaching of English*, *34*, 66–130.

Reznick, L. (1987). *Education and learning to think*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Ryle, G. (1949). *The concept of mind*. London: Hutchinson of London.

Santa Barbara Classroom Discourse Group (1992a). Constructing literacy in classrooms: Literate action as social accomplishment. In H. H. Marshall, *Redefining student learning* (pp. 119–150). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Santa Barbara Classroom Discourse Group (1992b). Do you see what we see? The referential and intertextual nature of classroom life. *Journal of Classroom Interaction, 27*(1), 29–36.

Schifter, D. (1998). Teaching to the big ideas. In M. Solomon, *The diagnostic teacher: New directions in professional development*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Skrtic, T., Sailor, W., & Gee, K. (1996). Voice, collaboration, and inclusion; democratic themes in educational and social reform initiatives. *Remedial and Special Education*, *17*(3), 142–157.

Spradley, J.P. (1980). *Participant observation*. New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston.

Street, B. (1996). Academic literacies. In D. Baker, J. Clay, & C. Fox, *Challenging ways of knowing, In English, maths, and science* (pp. 101-134). Washington DC: Falmer Press.

Tetler, S. (1998). Group inclusion as a stepping stone to full inclusion. *International Journal of Educational Research*, *29*, 131–141.

Thousand, J. S., & Villa, R. A. (1991). Accommodating for greater student variance. In M. Ainscow, *Effective schools for all*. London: Fulton.

Todd, F., & Barnes, D. (1995). *Communication and learning revisited*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Publishers.

Tralli, R., Colombo, B., Deschler, D., & Schumaker, J. (1996). The strategies intervention model: A model for supported inclusion at the secondary level. *Remedial and Special Education*, *17*(4), 204–216, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Tuyay, S., Jennings, L., & Dixon, C. (1995). Classroom discourse and opportunities to learn: An ethnographic study of knowledge construction in a bilingual third grade classroom. *Discourse Processes*, *19*(1), 75–110.

White, R. W. (1959). Motivation reconsidered: The concept of competence. *Psychological Review*, *66*, 297–333.

Zaharlick, A., & Green, J. (1991). Ethnographic research. In J. Jensen, J. Flood, D. Lapp, & J. R. Squire, *Handbook of research on teaching the English language arts*. New York: Macmillan.