"If Anything Is Odd, Inappropriate, Confusing, or Boring, It's Probably Important":

The Emergence of Inclusive Academic Literacy through English Classroom Discussion Practices

LESLEY A. REX
University of Michigan

DAVID MCEACHEN
Santa Barbara (CA) High School

In this study we describe the role of class discussion and a teacher's particular discourse moves in the development of an inclusive learning culture in a high school English literature course with a rigorous academic curriculum. The course included previously tracked gifted and talented (GATE) and general students, together for the first time. The analysis of eight segments of classroom interaction over the first 21 instructional days reveals a relationship among constructing a social culture, acquiring an inquiry-based reading approach, and transforming students' identities. The study focuses on how, given the asymmetry of academic knowledge and status between the GATE and nonGATE students, the teacher discursively transformed both groups' understandings of what counted as being a reader while negotiating their collaboration. Inclusion is depicted as a tenuous classroom cultural norm with which all students sustain a risky relationship as they learn new discursive ways of making knowledge.

> *If teaching and learning are not orchestrated to facilitate students' entry into the domains of conversation that constitute a curriculum, we will have changed the labels but not the substance of education.*
>
> —Applebee, 1996, p. 101

At the end of their year together studying a literature curriculum designed for gifted and talented students, Kora and Maralyn felt theirs had been a substantive learning experience:

> I value most from this class the great animated discussions we had. It taught me how to develop my opinions and my ideas about something. Also, many of the ideas during discussions were very sophisticated so it showed me how far you can reach, no limit

to your age. It was the teacher's attitude, the students' attitudes, and the air of thinking literary problems through together. The excitement in everyone of learning and thinking. [Kora, a student with a history of general College Preparatory English classes]

What I will take and value most from this class is the resurrection of my incentive to learn. Last year many teachers and classes left me unchallenged and uninterested, but this class has helped me remember what I do well and would like to improve upon. [Maralyn, a student with a history of gifted and talented (GATE) English classes]

These two students found success through transformative discussions in a classroom distinguished by discourses that called for and supported rigorous reading and writing practices. Kora, a student unfamiliar with gifted and talented curriculum, grew in her academic literacy and confidence, and Maralyn, a bored and disaffected student from gifted and talented classes, rekindled her intellectual curiosity. The interactional ethnographic (Castenheira, in press) study reported here investigated the why and how of Kora and Maralyn's experience.

The report emerged from a joint effort by the authors to study Dave McEachen's English Literature classroom and from discoveries that continue to affect Dave's practice and Lesley's research. In this article, I, Lesley, take the lead to write about particular elements of Dave's teaching. I do so from my stance as co-researcher and classroom participant-observer and from the assumption that through discourse students and teachers can act upon powerful social and institutional conditions by co-constructing new expectations.

Study Focus and Questions

In their large-scale study of classroom instructional discourse in 112 eighth- and ninth-grade English classes, Nystrand and his colleagues (1997) reported on pervasive monologic rather than dialogic organization and the consistent contrast between tracked and untracked conditions. As an example of their preferred but rarely observed dialogic style, they profiled Mr. Kramer, a teacher whose approach bore remarkable similarities to Dave's. Like Dave, Mr. Kramer began by modeling a way of reading and stating exactly what was expected, practices that encouraged critical reflection by foregrounding the text as what Nystrand et al. call a *thinking device*. Nystrand et al. argue that at the heart of the respectful reciprocity in Mr. Kramer's classroom was a method of culture building that established a code of behavioral rules or norms to guide group interaction (see Yalom, 1995, cited in Nystrand et al.). Nystrand et al. conclude that it was the teacher's proactive decentering of his voice in the early weeks of the class and his focus on culture building and group maintenance activities that was instrumental in establishing a dialogic classroom. This strategy established the teacher's right to make evaluative commentary without setting him up as the authority who owns the knowledge produced in the classroom. In this study, by analyzing Dave's discourse moves over the first three weeks, we describe how contextually and emergently he decentered his voice and foregrounded individual student voices in the building of an inclusive literate classroom culture.

These descriptions are based upon previous analyses of ethnographic data (Rex, 1997a; Rex, Green, & Dixon, 1997) that led to the following three interrelated assertions about the experiences of students in Dave's classroom. First, those students institutionally designated gifted and talented (GATE) had extensive experience with GATE literacy practices before entering English Literature; some nonGATE students had experienced a range of GATE classrooms from *de facto* tracked to inclusive; and at least two nonGATE students had little if any previous experience with English GATE discourse practices. Second, the mix of GATE and nonGATE histories in this class positioned students differently to acquire knowledges and values about what counts as rigorous academic English literacy. And third, in this classroom, over time students were repositioned as individual learners and as group members to acquire new social and academic understandings.

It was not within the design of the original study to determine whether classroom discussions were the leading factor in students' academic accomplishments. However, because the majority of class time was taken up by teacher-led discussions of the readings or of related texts, for this study we investigated *how* teacher and students' discussion interactions may have contributed to students' repositioning. We looked for repositionings guided by four interrelated questions: (1) What counted as academic literacy in this classroom? (2) How from the first moments of class did the teacher's actions initiate and respond to students' discourse acts and so provide particular opportunities for constructing the what and the how of rigorous academic English literacy (Ryle, 1949)? (3) How did students take up and reconstruct opportunities for their own learning and for their teacher's further participation (Alton-Lee & Nuthall, 1992; Lerner, 1995; Tuyay, Jennings, & Dixon, 1995)? and, (4) What was the relationship between the teacher's actions of handing over and the students' actions of taking up and the building of academic literacy (Rex, 1994)?

A sociocultural perspective guided our application of these questions during retrospective data analyses so as to foreground issues relevant to detracking and inclusion.

Conceptual Background

Detracking and Inclusion, a Key Distinction

In research on tracking, *detracking* is most often characterized as making changes in institutional sorting structures that provide students with physical access to classrooms previously reserved for select groups (Oakes, 1985). By that definition the English program in this high school was detracked. Students could self-select at any point into any of the GATE designated English classes. However, we wish to make an important distinction between detracking and *inclusion* as inclusion is currently being conceptualized. Our data revealed that while all English classes in this school were physically detracked, only some were experienced as or regarded by students as detracked.

Other classrooms were *de facto* tracked, primarily for two reasons. One reason was that students from other tracks re-experienced failure in their attempts to understand or accomplish the academic tasks expected in those classrooms supporting the dominant perception that these students were incapable of performing well in those settings. A second reason was that students chose not to enroll in classes where conditions would not provide opportunities for them to learn, leaving the classrooms solely inhabited by their original populations. In contrast, based upon knowledge from family and peer cultures, students did choose classrooms, like the one in this study, where they believed they could be successful. These classes we call inclusive.

We are applying the concept of inclusion originated by scholars who study the integration of students with disabilities into general classrooms (see discussion of this issue in Grant, 1997). The term inclusive is being used more broadly by scholars in the United Kingdom and the United States to mean successful participation by all students in the generation of greater educational options (see for example Ainscow, 1993; Skrtic, Sailor, & Gee, 1996; Slee, 1993, 1997). The arguments made by these and other scholars interested in integrating all currently differentially sorted students call for a reconceptualization of why and how successful classroom integration can be achieved (see Bos & Fletcher, 1997; Forman & McCormick, 1995; Keogh, Gallimore, & Weisner, 1997).

In particular, this study is informed by researchers who conceptualize access and inclusion as realized in and through classroom interaction. Although there are few naturalistic studies of classroom inclusion realized through discourse, a few have established the approach as usefully informing. Gutierrez and Stone (1997), for example, took a cultural-historical approach to study classroom 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. Jordan, Lindsay, and Stanovich (1997) studied nine teachers' interactions with students who were exceptional or at risk of academic failure. They observed how teachers who saw themselves as instrumental in effective inclusion engaged in academic interactions. Their study found that teachers, in the way they talked with students, challenged them to extend their thinking compared to teachers who held contrasting views. Jordan et al. show how sequences of interactional discourse between teachers and at risk students can positively affect their cognitive engagement and performance. 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 describe how mutually beneficial, reciprocal social relationships among classroom participants enhanced intellectual inquiry linked to academic performance (Green & Yeager, 1995; Kyratzis & Green, 1996; Santa Barbara Classroom Discourse Group, 1992a).

Analytical Framework

In my analysis of Dave's teaching, I interrelated three theoretical perspectives to construe what constitutes literacy knowledge, how through discourse it is constructed, and how through the construction of literacy knowledge perceptions of appropriate situated performance are made.Through these three lenses I observed how inclusion may be thought of as the renegotiation through interactional discourse of asymmetrical power relationships.

What Counts as Academic Knowledge?

Applebee (1996) articulates a vision for English curriculum as classroom conversation—as *knowledge-in-action*, rather than the traditional view of English subject matter knowledge as *knowledge-out-of-context*. This view of English knowledge is predicated on aVygotskian (1978) negotiation between individual minds and the social and cultural traditions within which they are constituted and which they, in turn, reconstitute. For Applebee, literate traditions are "culturally constituted tools" for understanding and reforming the world:

> In acquiring these tools, students are learning to participate in a variety of socially constituted traditions of meaning-making that are valued in cultures of which they are a part. These traditions include not just concepts and associated vocabulary, but also rhetorical structures, the patterns of action, that are part of any tradition of meaning-making. They include characteristic ways of reaching consensus and expressing disagreement, of formulating arguments, of providing evidence, as well as characteristic genres for organizing thought and conversational action. In mastering such traditions, students learn not only to operate with them, but also how to change them. (p.9)

Other literacy scholars have contributed to the study of language arts classrooms as ecological and ideological cultures. They have argued that there are no unified, prespecifiable practices that count always and only as academic reading and writing (e.g., Baker & Luke, 1991; Barton, 1994; McHoul, 1991). Rather, there are readings- and writings-in-a-classroom that continually and actively reconstitute language arts subject matter (e.g., Heap, 1991; Lin, 1993; Santa Barbara Classroom Discourse Group, 1992a). What counts as literate academic English knowledge is under continual historical and local reconstitution as knowledge is brought to, acted upon, and reconstructed in classrooms.

Who decides what counts as knowledge and how it comes to count is at the center of determining whether teaching and learning practices supporting inclusion and rigor are efficacious. A way of thinking about the competing diverse views of what counts as knowledge in a classroom and the asymmetry

between various knowers was forwarded by Heap (1985), who pointed out that

> what counts as knowledge is dependent upon the purpose for which it matters . . . and that dependency is assured by the distribution of recognized rights and obligations to decide and enforce what counts as knowledge in the setting where orientation to that purpose is obligatory or rewarding. (p. 248)

Whoever in a classroom has the right to decide the purpose to which knowledge is put and the kind of knowledge that may be applied holds the power to decide inclusion and exclusion.

Knowledge is subject matter knowledge if it is adequate to carry on some academic activity, some literate purpose. The need for subject matter knowledge during a classroom discussion is quite practical, as classroom members need it in order to act literately. When members act, the macro knowledge from the past that members of a culture may count as the subject matter of English language arts, as well as the microversions of that knowledge brought by teachers into classrooms, are transformed as teachers and students respond to their own purposes and methods of knowing, knowledge-building, and knowledge-evaluating (Heap, 1985).

Student Access to Academic Knowledge through Discourse

For students to gain access to this academic English knowledge-building process, they are required to enter the academic discourse of the group within which they will use it (Gutierrez, 1995). Whole class discussion interaction is the crucible of social as well as academic inclusion. Like subject matter knowledge, the rules for what counts as discussion discourse knowledge are also situated within the culture of the classroom. Three interrelated dimensions of this discourse knowledge are particularly pertinent to this study.

First, classroom English discourse is a kind of academic code knowledge whose dominant purpose and application is the learning of academic literacies. For example, in this English Literature classroom, in order to appear academically literate, students had to know what it means to make a case, to make cases for all their readings in and through all their writings and speakings about texts, and to be able to speak about their own and others' case-making performances. Because literate knowledge building occurs during group discourse, teacher mediation is required for students to have occasions to employ purposefully and thus learn the code.

Second, discourse for learning English subject matter can also be viewed as participation contexts and as procedural language, as the medium and means of learning and knowledge building. In order to take up learning opportunities, students need to understand how to read, enter into, and make sense of the constantly evolving interactional contexts or frames (Goffman, 1974; Tannen, 1993) of knowledge construction. Reading the purpose of any given interaction is essential to entering into it. For example, in order to ask an appropriate question, provide a useful

answer, or make a relevant comment, a student must have read the purpose of the preceding discourse action (Mehan, 1979).

Third, discourse is also a medium and a means for constructing a view of the self in relation to others. For example, academic language is the means and medium for positioning oneself within power relationships and having the opportunity to perform as one thinks appropriate (Bakhtin, 1981). Students' actions in learning academic English literacy occur at the level of identity, selfhood, and personality. What counts as knowledge, whose voices may be heard, and what version of self may be brought forward determines what students say, write, and read, how they do so, and how they feel about themselves when they do. There is a principled rationality to students' reading and writing acts. They act in keeping with how they perceive their role and relationship with their interactant and onlooker(s). They act to meet not only the normed practices of the group but also to negotiate the power relationships between themselves and those who evaluate their actions. Becoming an effective academic reader and writer means learning in each situated moment which procedural definitions of reading and writing satisfy the criteria for accomplishment and choosing which way of meeting those criteria satisfies one's view of oneself in relation to others (Heap, 1991; Ivanic, 1994; Street, 1996).

The teacher's role is to mediate the classroom's social procedures and academic performances in order to facilitate student understanding of language arts subject matter. The subject matter as culture, tradition, and a discipline needs to be characterized purposefully for students so they can engage it within evolving contexts of understanding. The teacher must make particular accommodations in what counts as curriculum to take advantage of each interactional moment and the potential contexts for student understanding and performance they provide. In order for students to perform appropriately, the teacher needs to mediate opportunities for explicit clarification as to the nature of the tensions between the constraints and the opportunities of their agency as readers and writers. Such clarification is built over time, over multiple interactions, to give participants experience in experimenting with solving the problems that arise within these tensions (Green, 1991).

Academic literacy when viewed from this perspective means to become conversant in and facile with the conventions and the ingredients that constitute school literacy as constructed in the classroom, that surround it, and that are used at particular moments in particular situations calling for it. Academic reading and writing is knowing how to engage with and construct texts strategically and procedurally within particular interactional contexts. Given this view, the teacher as mediator for inclusion provides multiple opportunities for students to exercise particular voices in purposeful and strategic ways in and through multiple knowledge-

building events so that students can observe their contribution to what counts as literate knowledge.

Teaching and Learning as Interactional Handing Over and Taking Up

Observing how the teacher mediates academic and social inclusion is tied to a view of teaching and learning that originates in the work of Bruner (1983), Goffman (1967), and conversation analysis (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974). Bruner used the terms *hand over* and *take up* to describe how children come to take control of the process of learning to talk under the scaffolded instruction of adult caretakers. At strategic points throughout the learning process, the instructor hands over control to the child who takes it up to perform independently. The learner internalizes external knowledge as a tool for conscious control (Bruner, 1985). The relation of power and control to the creation of joint understandings, as Edwards and Mercer (1987) point out, is both problematic and of great importance. In classrooms students do not simply reinvent the existing culture within symmetrical power relationships. Learning is a socialization process (Corsaro & Miller, 1992) deeply embedded in asymmetrical communicative interactions. Successful learning is fostered when asymmetry of power relations is recognized and capitalized upon.

Studies of interactive talk that negotiates power relationships between teachers and students during instructional activity help to reveal the moment-to-moment handing over and taking up processes. For example, Lerner's (1995) study of turn design and the organization of participation in instructional activities illustrates how the organization of activities into sequences of discourse actions shapes participation. By describing in detail what some aspects of instructional activity consisted of as actual courses of action (actual sequences of talk-in-interaction), Lerner shows how opportunities for take up were initiated and acted upon. As participants made meaningful various opportunities to participate though their actions, they thereby organized themselves; and as they organized, official and peer teachers handed over the frames of understanding for action and students took up and acted within those frames.

Method

Context of the Investigation

What GATE and NonGATE Represent

For the purposes of this study, it is useful to have focal students Maralyn and Kora represent the embodiment of different identity kits (Gee, 1991), discourses (Gee, 1996; Muspratt, Luke, & Freebody, 1997), and associated academic capital (Lanksheer & McLaren, 1993) that students shape and are shaped by in two academic tracks. Maralyn was an institutionally designated GATE student who as a sophomore was taking a junior level class, and Kora was a junior general College Preparatory student. Though both were European Americans from college educated families, when they entered the classroom site of

this study, Maralyn and Kora embodied two historically constructed school discourses that spoke through them and that positioned them differently in relation to English curriculum and instructional practices. Maralyn embodied a dominant academic discourse (Gee, 1996; 1991) that had historically been privileged over Kora's and that predisposed her to have fewer conflicts than Kora with the secondary discourse curriculum in this course. Following this line of thinking, when Kora and Maralyn shared the same academic discursive space, the disequillibrium between their discursive practices should have served to marginalize Kora and to reinforce unequal power relationships between the two groups they represented. This study has been written because that condition did not occur. Rather, social and academic relationships were renegotiated as what counted as academic discourse practices was socially reconstituted. That both GATE and nonGATE students learned to be more academically sophisticated readers and writers and that they did so together in this classroom makes it an appropriate context for exploring how these transformations occurred.

In two previous studies from the same data corpus, I described the evolution of both GATE and nonGATE students' written discourse (e.g., reading quizzes and essays) over the first thirty days of the course (Rex, 1997b; Rex, Green, & Dixon, 1997). A textual analysis of Kora's quizzes and essays delineated how her discourse evolved from failing to successful as measured according to the class's academic expectations. The analyses depict a classroom discourse community in which both groups of students experienced academic success within a range of overlapping performance. (See Table 1.)

In this study I limit my descriptions to the first few weeks of the course to explore the emergent relationship between the building of a way of knowing as a particular reading approach, the constructing of a social culture, and the beginnings of transformation of students' reading identities. Before presenting my descriptive analyses, I provide a brief snapshot of what it meant in the socioculture of the school to be a GATE and a general College Preparatory student. Then, my descriptive analyses of eight segments of classroom discussion serve as telling cases (Mitchell, 1983) addressing how local academic literacy and identity were renegotiated.

What It Means to Be GATE and General

The site of the study was the original high school in a district of approximately 180,000 inhabitants; two other high schools were added in the 1960's. Historically the district was a generationally stable, European American, middle-class community with a small Mexican American population. Beginning in the early 1980's, the demographics shifted dramatically, as did the transience of the population. Escalating land values and increasing desirability of the area resulted in a more polarized shift in population to those who could afford to live there and those whose work was tied to these residents. There occurred a substantial increase in num-

TABLE 1
GATE English Literature Students

	INSTITUTIONAL CLASSIFICATION	GATE CLASSES COMPLETED	GRADE 1ST ACADEMIC QUARTER
1	GATE	all English	A
2		all English	A
3		all English	A
4		all English	A
5		all English	A
6		all English	A
7		all English	A
8		all English	A-
9		all English	A-
10		all English	B+
11		all English	B
12		all English	B
13		all English	B
14	(10th grade St)	all English	B
15		all English	B
16		all English	B-
17		all English	C
1	NonGATE	none	B
2		none	C+
3		other than English	B+
4		other than English	B+
5		other than English	C
6		some English	A-
7		some English	A-
8		some English	B
9		some English	B-
10		some English	B-

bers of students from families below the poverty line for whom English was a second language. The year of the study, the district identified 55% or 1,126 of the school's 1,950 students as members of ethnic minority groups, mostly Hispanic American, and 440 students or 22% as Limited English Proficient. The students who entered the school came from junior high and middle schools in which 50-75% of students qualified for free or reduced lunch under AFDC guidelines.

These statistics provide the context for understanding the sociocultural dimensions of the school's academic tracking system at the time of the study. Students were sorted into Special Education, English Second Language (ESL), College Preparatory, and Gifted and Talented (GATE) tracks. It was not unusual for students to be given one of these institutional identities as early as kindergarten. They were GATE identified through three methods (usually at the urging of the student or the student's parents): appropriate GATE examination score, teacher nomination, or demonstration of exceptional talent such as winning a poetry competition. General students were college prep students by default. Little permeability existed across tracks. Once identified, students tended to be sorted into designated classes for the duration of their schooling.

Researchers from the fields of detracking (Oakes, 1985; Rosenbaum, 1979; Wheelock, 1992), learning disabilities (Brantlinger, 1997; Ruiz & Figueroa, 1995; Skrtic, 1991), multiculturalism (Delpit, 1995; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Moll & Greenberg, 1990; Ruiz, 1995), critical pedagogy (Shor, 1992, 1987) and critical literacy (Gee, 1991; Lankshear & McLaren, 1993; Muspratt, Luke, & Freebody, 1997), among many others, have documented the effects of educational sorting practices. Of particular interest to this study is how these researchers have shown students to

have learned different academic practices due to differential access to what counts as academic practices. While GATE students were acting like GATE students, general students were learning how to be high-achieving general students.

Maralyn's learned academic practices from her GATE junior high and ninth-grade English classrooms were considerably different from Kora's, consistent with Nystrand et al.'s report (1997). Maralyn experienced years of enriched academic curriculum and instruction in elementary and middle school characterized by creative and critical thinking and extensive reading and writing opportunities that she exercised in integrated project-based activities requiring a high level of independence and responsibility. Her father and mother, both college graduates (her father with a post-graduate degree) took an active interest in Maralyn's education. Her mother had always been a regular participant in her nightly homework.

Kora's experience had been with classmates whose home literacy practices often differed from school literacy practices and who had limited familiarity with Standard English. Her classmates' academic performances spread across a wide range, with hers often at the top. Compared to Maralyn's curriculum, Kora's called upon her to read shorter, less demanding texts, to engage in academic activity of briefer duration that exercised lower order knowledge retrieval and reporting. Opportunities for writing about or discussing texts were limited, and inquiry was rare. For several years while her mother was still a single working parent before she remarried, Kora worked on her homework alone. Considerable attention in her courses was directed to managing and correcting what was viewed as nonstandard or outside the range of acceptable behavior or academic performance.

Of the 21 ninth-grade English classes taught at their high school the year of the study, six were designated for GATE students. The students in the six GATE classes were almost all European American from upper-middle-class or professional-class families, two-thirds of whom had been designated GATE since elementary school. Their curriculum was characterized by reading numerous and lengthy texts from the traditional literary canon, engaging in regular analytical classroom discussions, and writing literary analysis essays.

Education was valued by the larger community, so most students tended to remain in school and go on to higher education—76% the year of the study. For three prior years, the combined drop out rate for the district's three high schools was 6.4% or 111 students. However, a polarity existed between two groups of students who matriculated. One group went on to the local city college with its state-wide recognition for ESL, remedial, and learning disability programs that prepared students for Associate of Arts degrees or for transitioning into four year colleges. Students in the other group were admitted to four-year institutions, some of them Ivy League. That year, 40% of the school's seniors took the SAT test

and averaged verbal scores of 480. When Kora spoke about her academic preparation in her College Prep English classes, she voiced the common awareness among students and teachers. Her A grades for English represented something quite different from her GATE peers' A's in terms of academic capital. She was convinced she would not be admitted to the college of her choice if she stayed in the College Prep track.

In her junior year Kora and 26 other students chose the classroom selected for this study: GATE English Literature, the only one taught by this teacher. (Five English Literature classes were scheduled, three of which were GATE.) Seventeen students were female and 10 male. All but two students were of European American descent. Two female students (Patricia and Angela, whose parents were college educators) self-identified as Mexican American. All were juniors except for one sophomore. Twenty were GATE-designated; eight were not officially GATE; five had taken other GATE English classes; three had taken GATE classes other than English; and two, one of whom was Kora, had never attended a GATE class. Like Kora, Mary, her female nonGATE counterpart, was European American.

At the time of the study, Dave had taught English for thirty years, the last fifteen at this high school. A European American with an M.A. in English, he was the only faculty member in his department qualified to teach A. P. English for Community College credit. Each term, in addition to GATE and General English classes, he also taught Basic Skills, a remedial course for 9-12th-grade students who had failed the high school English competency exam required for graduation and who were mostly English Second Language students. He was a 13-year fellow of his local writing and literature project, an affiliate of the National Writing Project. He had served on district-wide committees to align the high schools' English curriculum, tutored privately, and conducted workshops in preparation for the S.A.T.

Student Acknowledgement of Inclusive Achievement

The study's data corpus included end-of-term GATE and nonGATE students' survey assessments of the year-long course. Nearly every one of the twenty-seven students acknowledged without prompting how much they had learned about the subject matter, credited Dave for helping them to learn, and identified class discussions as the most valuable arena of their learning. (See Figure 1.) Kora, like Mary, earned a satisfactory grade in the course, went on to do well in 12th grade A. P. English, and, after graduation, attended a four-year university.

GATE and nonGATE students alike asserted that as individual learners they had benefited from the actions of the group and from Dave's pedagogy. They had formed a community that shared intellectual and literate practices. Their talk suggested that their classroom was a social network within a learning culture that supported a literate ecology. Their assertions that they

GATE Students:

- "In this class every student played an equal role of learning and participating in some way when that student has something to say. The class is like a school of fish—all swimming along at a pace but sometimes in different directions." JP
- "I find it most helpful for me when Mr. McEachen guides the class along a comprehensive discussion, with virtually all the people contributing to the discussion." JM
- "Most helpful to me in this class are the discussions and the way Mr. McEachen has challenged me to rise up another level in my study of English." LB
- "Mr. McEachen does a great job of helping a student go through the process of finding an answer instead of showing them the way directly there. What I will take with me from this class that I value most are the reading and learning skills that Mr. McEachen has taught me as well as added discipline to work through a vigorous class step-by-step. I have also gained a better sense of writing a clear, concise and well formulated paper and had a great time interacting with my peers. The rules in here are don't talk when others are talking, be respectful of others' comments, contribute to a safe atmosphere for sharing ideas." BK
- "What I will take and value most from this class is the resurrection of my incentive to learn. Last year many teachers and classes left me unchallenged and uninterested, but this class has helped me remember what I do well and would like to improve upon." MR

NonGATE Students

- "I know that I did my best and could've gotten an A. I learned more vocabulary and how to improve my writing." BC
- "What I will take with me from this class is the ability to interpret literature more efficiently and accurately, self confidence that I can handle more advanced English classes later." EL
- "I'll take knowledge on a wider range of literature, and how to put what I feel about it into organized papers." LM
- "I'll take with me a deep sense of knowledge about the literature we have read." JB
- "I value most from this class the great animated discussions we had. It taught me how to develop my opinions and my ideas about something. Also, many of the ideas during discussions were very sophisticated so it showed me how far you can reach, no limit to your age. It was the teacher's attitude, the students' attitudes, and the 'air' of thinking literary problems through together. The excitement in everyone of learning and thinking. The people don't only worry about grades but learning—which is very different. This class is really intelligent and all of the people here are going to go on to be [a] really great part of society. A good metaphor for the class would be 'your favorite grandpa' for this class is really happy, full of knowledge and lots of character. Something you really love to be around." KM

Figure 1. Student Comments from End of the Year Surveys

had learned were borne out by their individual records of achievement. According to classroom performance measures such as reading quizzes, in-class timed writings, and persuasive essays, by the first grading period all students' reading and writing was within the range that counted at that time as competent. Over the year-long course, as the rubrics establishing competence became more demanding, both GATE and nonGATE students' grades stayed within an overlapping A to C range. Kora and Mary completed the course with a B and C+ respectively. A comparative analysis of GATE and nonGATE assessment artifacts from early and late in the course corroborated that, among other academic elements, students progressed in what counted as appropriate diction, rhetorical execution, depth of analysis, reasoning, and application of textual evidence.

Toward Leveling the Playing Field: Constituting Membership in an Intellectual Ecology

In GATE English Literature all literate work—which is to say ways of reading, writing, talking, and thinking about text—proceeded from a conceptual point of reference (Wertsch, 1991) signified by the class motto. On the fifth day of class, Dave introduced the motto—"If anything is odd, inappropriate, confusing or boring, it's probably important." While students wrote the words (centrally placed on the front chalk board) on the covers of their reading journals, Dave explained the vagaries of reading as a sense-making process the mind adeptly self-sabotages. In seeking excuses to avoid the hard work of figuring out meaning, he argued, the mind dismisses troubling passages as odd, inappropriate, confusing, or boring, shifting the burden of responsibility to the text, and thus releasing the reader from the responsibilities of readership. To deal with this state of affairs, he framed for the students a vision of the kind of class they would become. They would create an environment whose conditions would 1) acknowledge that all readers are plagued by these mental distractions, 2) support all members in making meaningful readings, and 3) choose the textual passages that they regard as odd, inappropriate, confusing, or boring as the sites to be mined for meaning.

Invoked as the jumping-off place for students' daily reading logs, frequent reading quizzes, in-class writings, essays, and class discussions, the motto became, as indicated in students' end-of-year testimonials, "the state of being comfortable inside a sign-sharing community" (Jennings & Purves, 1991, p. 3). Their attitudes, awareness, and prior experiences were central elements of their community's literacy practices. Guided by the motto, members took up a set of practices that they used during literacy events. These practices represented different literacies that were situated in social relations and symbolic systems that the class members used for communicating and representing their various meanings to each other within their literate ecology (Barton, 1994).

The motto established a benchmark of not knowing from which

GATE students as well as their general classmates had to proceed to successfully demonstrate literacy. To say that all students had to begin by representing their reading in a condition of ignorance and confusion is in one sense to level the playing field. It sends the message that they must all begin from the discomfort of not knowing and move to more comfortable knowing. To do so they must build together commonly held understandings of literacy knowledge and performance, what Bruner (1986) has called the constructed "right versions" of a culture of knowing (p. 99).

However, there is another sense in which the field is more difficult to level. Those students who have had little experience with particular kinds of literacy practices are at a disadvantage compared to those who have had such opportunities. These practices call for developing a reading from a confusing piece of text by using preferred spoken and written discourse genres. Even though having to construct their own reading rather than figure out the teacher's interpretation was new for most GATE students, in interviews they reported that reading and writing in this class was not much different from what they had done in other classes. The general students, on the other hand, reported little to no experience with discussions that sorted out meanings of texts or with writing essays that argued for a particular reading.

Analysis of the first weeks of class discussions show that, as expected, GATE students were the first to take up discursive practices by entering into public interactions with their teacher. They quickly took up the challenge of bringing previous literacy experiences to bear in constructing a new version of socioliteracy that in many ways was familiar. Successful members of a privileged academic group, they interpreted the membership they were taking on in this classroom as the continuation, maintenance, and reinvigoration of prior learning. Accordingly, they quickly engaged in what they regarded as purposeful rigor.

The general students' challenge was far greater. Their goal was to become socioliterate (Gee, 1996), that is, to become socially acceptable with their GATE peers while they were jointly constructing a GATE literate ecology. To do so they had to make socially acceptable associations among ways of using language, other symbolic expressions, and artifacts; and of thinking, feeling, believing, valuing, and acting. Only after they had made acceptable associations would they be identified as members—as playing a meaningful role in the social network that defined what counted as literate practice.

Dave's challenge was to manage and mediate between these two positions to build a learning community for *all* students. He was pivotal in the daily, lived negotiations of membership and learning (Edwards & Mercer, 1987; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Todd & Barnes, 1995; Wells, 1987; Wertsch, 1991). Since detailed representations are necessary to show the complex relationships between academic and social literacy building and space is limited, I focus on

only the beginnings of Dave's role in these negotiations. The descriptive analysis looks at how through his talk he began the negotiation process that played out over time to mediate the learning of more knowledgeable students and to include their less knowledgeable classmates (John-Steiner, Panofsky, & Smith, 1994).

Roles and Relationships of the Co-researchers

For seven years prior to the year of the study, in my role as supervisor of English student teachers, I had observed hundreds of GATE and College Preparatory class sessions at the high school. Each year I had worked with Dave in supervising student teachers placed in his classroom. The year before I had conducted a pilot study in his Advanced Placement English course where I observed an essay writing cycle of activity and conducted four student writer case studies. In addition, we had been co-fellows in a summer literature project affiliated with our writing project. As co-researcher, Dave had his own questions, principally about the efficacy of his teaching methods. Our talks about how the research project could serve both of our interests shaped our initial orienting questions and project design and continued to influence evolving questions related to data collection and analysis.

Data Collection and Selection

I lived in the GATE English Literature classroom for the first 31 days of the year-long course as an observer/participant, keeping field notes and videotaping with two cameras and multiple microphones and interviewing students. Dave and I collected all teacher- or student-written artifacts, as well as students' institutional records of prior and later achievement. Throughout the remainder of the course, in addition to telephone calls in the evenings, lunch meetings, and between class conversations with Dave whenever I was on campus (which was often several days each week), I re-entered the classroom weekly to take fieldnotes, sometimes to videotape, to observe current cultural patterns, to collect artifacts Dave had accumulated, and to interact with students. On these occasions I collected new data to represent the evolving culture as well as data I had targeted to inform patterns emerging from my interpretive analyses (Erickson, 1986) of already collected data. To test emergent assertions I interviewed or surveyed particular students and focused on events relevant to those assertions. The interviews continued several years beyond the course. For example, I interviewed Kora on the telephone when she was a university sophomore English major.

Of particular relevance to this study is the focal interest I took in comparing GATE and nonGATE student achievement. As I became aware there were nonGATE students in the class who had no experience in other GATE classrooms, I sought them out to interview and to observe while continuing to observe and interview the other students comparatively and record the interactive patterns of the classroom. In addition, as nonGATE students became

accomplished in GATE literacy practices over time, I selected data whose analysis could make visible what constituted their accomplishments in relation to GATE students' achievements. These analyses eventually led to an interest in how Dave's discursive gatekeeping actions may have played a part in the patterns of what I was coming to theorize, in light of other data analyses, as inclusivity, and finally to the selection of eight telling discourse segments.

I selected each segment for what its analysis could tell about the interrelated construction of making-a-case reading literacy, repositioning of teacher and students, and roles and power relationships among interactants. I previewed all videotaped interactions and transcribed more than thirty interactions for the original larger study. The eight segments in this study reflect my concern for brevity and for a composite representation of classroom interactional style, which continued to evolve and sustain throughout the length of the course, even as students left and joined at the semester.

Data Transcription and Analysis

The focus of my data analysis was to discern what in the culture of this classroom was meaningful to members, to make visible how those meanings had become commonly held by the group through the interaction of individual meanings, and to explore how common meanings shaped particular interactional engagements for individuals. I applied multiple methods to achieve these understandings.

Informed by Spradley's (1980) methods, I analyzed the language, actions, and artifacts of the classroom as symbolic embodiments of cultural meaning. I conducted domain and semantic analyses of most of what members said, how they acted, and what they produced to look for patterns and themes for what counted in this classroom. For example, "making a case" was the dominant way of reading and writing and "full credit" referred to the final method of evaluating that reading and writing. Each member needed to understand and act upon the common meanings of these and many other indigenous terms in order to participate.

In addition to analyzing all the written artifacts produced during the first 31 days, including two class sets of student essays employing making-a-case literacy, I analyzed texts of members' spoken discourse. I transcribed (Ochs, 1979) the discourse into texts using a method that takes *event* as the main unit of analysis to represent multiple individual meanings co-existing and transforming at the same time and within the same place (Green & Dixon, 1993; Green & Wallat, 1981). My texts of classroom events, such as the first reading lesson on the first day of class, also represented the uses to which members put language on specific occasions to give voice to and express the particular convergence of their histories, material conditions, dialects, and agency (Bloome & Bailey, 1992). By transcribing the discursive actions of which events were comprised, I was able to represent shifting landscapes of

complementary, unrelated, contradictory, and conflicting meanings in sequences of interactants' discourse moves.

These event landscapes are construed as subunits of embedded temporal and sociocultural texts. Within each event are subevents (such as the making of a case for a reading subevent that occurred during the timed writing discussion event on day 21). Subevents are composed of sequences of phases which, in turn, are comprised of segments of interactions. This multilevel micro-representation of discourse actions as related interactive strings can make visible the various meanings located within and across a single event and how those particular meanings become contexts for and shape each other. After transcribing the classroom events dedicated to making-a-case literacy, I selected interactional segments during which Dave's and students' repositionings, roles, and power relationships were under construction. I could then read across these telling texts to theorize patterned representations of the classroom's socioliterate ecology.

To get to the point at which I believed I could validly provide a descriptive representation of the classroom's intellectual ecology and related literacy practices, I needed multiple sources of contextualizing data. To obtain these, I analyzed all occasions on which Dave and the students talked about the class motto. I also mapped the classroom's fourteen interrelated cycles of literate activity (Green & Meyer, 1991) to make visible the interactional spaces (Heras, 1993) and the interactions of literate events tied in sequences of activity which established expectations for reading and writing using making-a-case literacy. Within each cycle I analyzed the literate artifacts (e.g., quizzes, timed writings, essays, reading log entries, and poems) produced by students from the perspective of what was considered by Dave and students as more and as less capable performance (i.e., meeting the current range of expectations for making-a-case performance). In addition, I analyzed patterns across the fourteen cycles, describing routinized academic and procedural practices occurring throughout eleven of the fourteen cycles. My analyses of these routines of practice (i.e., explaining, modeling, practicing, stamping, presenting) made visible the rules for social engagement and academic performance to achieve situated competence (Rex, 1997b). See Appendix A for a description of the domains of analysis and the questions driving them.

These analyses provided 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 literate events. The representations and their cultural meanings provided a grounding from which I made part-whole analyses of particular discourse interactions.

I intonationally transcribed the eight telling interactions (Mitchell, 1984) from the videotaped recordings into message units (Gumperz, 1992). This method of transcription represents the

actions of individual actors as topically tied sequences of interaction (Green & Wallat, 1981). It reveals both individual and inter-individuals' discourse actions in meaningful relation to each other. To conserve space and enhance readability, message unit transcripts have been rewritten for this article. A sample of an original message unit transcript for Table 11 is available in Appendix B.

Triangulation

In addition to establishing reflexive intertextual checks for validity, Dave and the students were involved in the analytic process. Dave assessed my retrospective interpretations of his pedagogical moves and the meanings of particular discourse actions that I retroactively brought to his attention. On three occasions, I presented my cumulative transcriptions and analyses to the whole class for their feedback (e.g., my analysis of the day 21 segment). After observing particularly salient classroom interactions, I asked student interactants and overhearers what they thought had been said and what had occurred. During interviews off- and on-campus with individual students, I checked my interpretations of events, patterns, meanings, and beliefs.

Taken together, these interrelated methods of data collection, selection, transcription, analysis, and triangulation provided a multifaceted representation of the literacy construction visible in the discourse practices in this GATE English Literature classroom. The following Results section profiles the classroom's first weeks as an emergent inclusive learning culture.

Results

On the twenty-first day of the class during a substantively engaged (Nystrand & Gamoran, 1992) class discussion (the "so what" timed writing event), some of the students entered the interaction on the floor of the classroom to make a case for their reading to a classmate. This was the first time students had taken the initiative to make a case for a reading during a class discussion, the first time they acted to initiate and sustain a context for understanding that constructed purposeful knowledge-in-action. I take this subevent and its meaning in the life of the classroom's literate ecology and socioculture as a point of reference for focusing my description of seven telling cases. I am guided in my descriptions within and across the cases by the four questions I listed at the beginning of this article, which I have also used as an organizational structure for presenting the descriptions in four sections.

The first section addresses what counted as academic literacy in this classroom by describing the class's academic socioliteracy of making a case. The explanation is followed with an analysis of the sequence of interactions that comprised day 21's making of a case to make visible one dimension of the socioliterate ecology members had constructed over the first three weeks of the class. I describe what students were able to do on the twenty-first day and the questions their actions raise about what Dave had made available during previous class discussions. In the second section I analyze an interaction from the first day of the course, focusing

on how from the first moments of class Dave initiated and responded to students' discourse acts. The analysis shows how he provided particular opportunities for constructing the what and the how of rigorous academic English literacy. In the third section two analyses of segments on days two and four make visible how students took up and reconstructed opportunities for their own learning and for Dave's further participation. Finally, in section four the relationship between Dave's actions of handing over, the students' actions of taking up, and the building of academic literacy are displayed in analyses of interactional segments on days seven and sixteen.

Defining Academic Literacy in Dave's Classroom

Making a Case

Making a case emerged as the dominant literacy—that is to say, the way of reading, writing, and talking about texts—in this classroom. Dave viewed case-making as an important traditional English academic literacy that could only be acquired by doing. During every reading discussion and related writing activity, he expected students to make cases. To make a case they had to organize worlds of knowledge gathered from the reading according to a particular logic of principled relationships they developed (Bruner, 1986; Edwards & Mercer, 1987). They formed a hypothesis that related a claim to a piece of evidence and pieces of evidence to each other in a convincing chain. For example, if a student found while reading the text a section that seemed odd, confusing, inappropriate, or boring, he or she would generate a hypothesis as to why that might be. The hypothesis would have to be directly related to the specific section of troublesome text. Next, the student would formulate a claim (a thesis) in response to the hypothesis. This claim would have to be related to another piece of text that seemed to provide evidence for the claim. The reader would then be required to find other pieces of related textual evidence with sufficient explanation of their relevance and arrange them in an order that built a persuasive case for the claim. Finally, students were expected to ask themselves *So what?* about the case they had made: What is the significance of this particular reading in the larger context of the whole text and other readings that have been made of the text?

This progression constructed a way of thinking about readings and about texts and complementary spoken, read, and written literacy practices. The series of thinking steps was accompanied by social and academic actions that formed a practice and through this practice, a pattern of literate thinking, a set of literate practices, and particular types of literate artifacts. For example, students made reading claims that were challenged in interactions; they developed arguments using textual evidence that had to be properly cited; and they wrote papers that integrated, among other elements, theses, textual evidence, formal citation, and "so what" significance.

Day 21: Students Correct a Classmate's Reading of Text

The following transcription segment provides a view of the negotiation between Dave and GATE students as they took up the role of teacher and enacted case-making. Their public challenge of classmate Bobby's hypothesis about Chaucer's *Prioress's Tale* and Dave's handing over the case-making, while reserving his right to facilitate or ask guiding questions, indicated that students had become socioliterate in making a case. Until this moment Dave had on most occasions directed discussion by using leading questions, and redirecting student responses, thereby structuring the direction of the discussion. On day 21 GATE students applied the socioliteracy rules of their class to take over the discussion, and nonGATE students joined the takeover by contributing evidence. In doing so the participants manifested and confirmed social protocols and viable readings, as well as the academic practice and the way of thinking they embodied.

The segment of class discussion in which the shift occurs (see Table 2) took place during a cycle of activity Dave had initiated on day 15 when the class had begun reading a rhyming translation of Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*. The cycle continued for 17 days until the 32nd day of instruction. Earlier in the discussion event that day the class had considered ways in which Chaucer's *Prioress's Tale* can be said to implicitly express Chaucer's views on anti-Semitism. This discussion built upon cases students had written the previous day (day 20) on whether or not the *Prioress's Tale* showed Chaucer to be anti-Semitic. Several students had alluded to rhyme scheme in their written cases. Three days earlier (day 18) the class had discussed ways rhyme scheme might suggest a reading for a text. The shift segment began when GATE student Bobby responded with his hypothesis to Dave's question: "How do we know when an author is giving his point of view if it is not explicitly stated?"

In keeping with the class motto, Bobby (BE) had been looking for odd, inappropriate, confusing, or boring places in the text. He found what he thought was a change in rhyme scheme. He hypothesized that the change might be a possible signal by the author. "Well, in the *Prioress' Tale* there, I found some lines that just don't rhyme at all." Dave provided Bobby with an interlinear text translation of the tale so he could test his hypothesis by seeing how it was written in Middle English. Initiating the making of a case against Bobby's hypothesis, Lia (GATE, LL) jumped into the conversation, followed by both GATE and nonGATE class members who attested that the whole tale had a different rhyme scheme, not just those few lines. Dave identified the rhyming pattern as rhyme royal. At this point he handed over the floor of the classroom to a student who took up the role of knowledgeable other (Vygotsky, 1978) and explained the royal rhyme scheme. Now that he and his classmates could recognize rhyme royal, student Fredo (GATE, FR) brought the class's attention back to Bobby's claim by asking again for the lines Bobby identified (line 1).

In a series of claims, counter-claims, and accompanying evidence that followed, Bobby's classmates made their case to convince him that his hypothesis could not stand. Roberta (GATE, RJ) pointed out that bier and dear rhymed (6); and, Lia (LL) argued that the rhyme scheme was consistent throughout the whole tale (8). When Bobby maintained, "No it doesn't" (9), Lia countered with "Yes it does" (10), and nonGATE and GATE students provided a wide assortment of end rhymes as evidence (11), evidence that Dave confirmed (12). Lia reasserted her claim (13), which Bobby acknowledged, then resisted (16). Dave confirmed the counterclaim (17), a bevy of students provided more evidence (18), and Bobby, having read the rhyme scheme evidence he had been offered, accepted their counter claim (21).

During this interaction GATE and nonGATE students, led by Lia, became teachers for Bobby and onlooking classmates. At this stage, a month into the course, the nonGATE students were participating as both contributors and learners, not yet as initiators of cases. The discourse actions of their GATE case-making peer scaffolded their evidence-supplying performances. How did Lia become a teacher and her nonGATE and GATE classmates become emergent teachers? The string of interactions can be read as a sequence of their positionings and voicings within power relationships with their teacher and peers. How and when were the rules negotiated to sanction their taking up such power positions for sounding these voices? They interrupted their teacher and challenged their classmate. They claimed the floor—the powerful social space for public knowledge construction—and thereby claimed the right to speak and the authority of their knowledge. How and why did this public social space become the students', in which to bring forward the knowledge they thought important? The students' actions demonstrated they knew how a literate reading of a text was supposed to be conducted in this classroom; Dave's responses confirmed that the students were following the social and intellectual discourse procedures he expected.

Developing an Inclusive Culture: Day 1: First Reading Instruction Lesson

On the first day of class, Dave led the students in their first reading of the class's text (an opening section of *Beowulf*). He explained that reading would be done in a particular way he would show them, a way they would practice collaboratively throughout the term; then, he led them in a close reading of the text at the level of word. As Dave and the students talked, their discourse pattern may be viewed as a deconstruction of the IRE—initiation, response, and evaluation (Cazden, 1988; Mehan, 1985) sequence. IRE patterns serve to establish the teacher's authority over what counts as knowledge and as contexts of understanding(Wells, 1993. The teacher is able to keep a continual check on students' understandings to ensure that various concepts, information, and terms of reference are jointly understood to meet the teacher's frame

TABLE 2

Day 21: Students Correct a Classmate's Reading of Text

	MAKING A CASE	TEACHER	STUDENT(S)
1	St returns class to BE's claim		FR (GATE): Which line? (*Referring to class text*)
2			LR (GATE): Which line?
3	T authorizes return to claim	(*Looks at class text*) Which line were you referring to on 192?	
4	St reasserts evidence for claim		(*BE looks at class text*) BE: Uhh, 192, the second and the first three sentences. (*Sts look at page 192*)
5	T examines evidence	(*Reads aloud from class text*) Still laid this innocent child upon his bier.	
6	St provides evidence for counterclaim		RJ (NonGATE): It's bier dear.
7	T confirms counter evidence	Well, bier rhymes with dear. Said and spread are pretty close.	
8	St provides more counter evidence and reasserts counter claim		LL: Said and spread, it goes, it goes the same, it goes throughout, throughout the thing it goes abab bcc throughout the whole thing.
9	St refutes claim		BE: No it doesn't.
10	St asserts counter claim Sts provide counter evidence from text		LL: Yes, it does. Sts around LL: Spill, still; head, spread; doesn't it abab?
11			
12	T confirms counter evidence	Spread, head, spill, still. That's pretty regular for this rhyme royal.	
13	St reasserts claim		LL: Yes 'cause abab.
14	St recognizes the counter claim version		BE: Head to spread, doesn't it? (*Shakes his head and smiles at St in back row)*
15	T reconfirms Sts version	Said, spread, and head rhyme as far as I can tell.	
16	St accepts the counter version with reservation		BE: It does. . . but the other words?

Continued on next page

TABLE 2, CONTINUED

Day 21: Students Correct a Classmate's Reading of Text

	MAKING A CASE	TEACHER	STUDENT(S)
17	T affirms counter version	I don't know. I think it's pretty close.	
18	Sts provide more evidence from text for their version	(*T looks at the Sts around LL*)	NonGATE & GATE Sts around LL: It does the same thing throughout the whole tale and on the one right next to it and the other page.
19			The whole tale has it. That's the only rhyme that goes throughout the whole thing.
20	T confirms the Sts evidence	Yes, over and over and over. Right. (*To BE*) I don't see anything different personally.	
21	St accepts counter version		BE: (*Smiling*) Yeah. That's the only one I noticed. I just knew it was different.
22	T affirms value of activity	Oh. Oh I see, and now you see they're all like that. So that was useful wasn't it?	

of understanding. By altering the IRE pattern, Dave acted on his intention to expand the intersubjective frame of understanding. Rather than asking a question, getting a response, then providing an evaluation, in each interaction Dave fit his discourse actions to the evolving situated contexts—frames of mutual understanding and purposeful contexts of use—as they transformed over the course of the discussion.

In the initial interactions he responded to students' responses with brief affirmations and either made no additions, provided additional information, or asked a question. Student responses, most often single words or brief phrases, came quickly. Dave's evaluation act was coupled with an act of elaboration when he wanted to add more information to the student's answer. For example, after a student's concise response ("a conclusion drawn from something") to his question ("What is an inference?"), Dave stated his evaluative assessment of the response ("Yes. Well put.") and restated with elaboration: "It's a conclusion drawn from something that you've read or seen. Given this information from reading, whatever, these are conclusions that might reasonably be drawn."

In other IRE sequences the teacher's evaluation act was terse. An example of this is seen in the interaction reported in Table 3. After reading a portion of text, he asked another question that initiated another sequence: "If

we were going to attempt to infer some values, some cultural values of these people, what might be some that we could infer from that sentence?" (1). Student JM responded with "That you, that you are a good person if you are brave" (2). Dave confirmed with only one word "bravery" (3), providing time and space for other students to enter the floor to voice their answers. Since they all talked at once and were unintelligible, Dave asked "And what" (5) requesting a coherent response. A single student voice responded: "Soldiers are looked upon as heroes" (6).

In this interaction, students established that many of them could and would answer the kinds of questions Dave was asking, implying that they understood the concept of inference he wanted them to practice as well as how to address the concept (Ryle, 1949). In addition, Dave and students conducted their first negotiation for floor space. Procedural rules for participation were enacted: Though they did not have to

TABLE 3
Day 1: First Reading Instruction Lesson

	TEACHER	STUDENT(S)
1	If we were going to attempt to infer some values, some cultural values of these people, what might be some	
2	that we could infer from that sentence?	JM: That you, that you are a good person if you are brave.
3	Bravery.	
4		(*Many students respond simultaneously*)
5	And what?	
6		XX: Soldiers are looked upon as heroes.
7	Yes, the soldiers are the heroes of this culture. You, maybe, already said that. Right. That's true.	
8	Alright, anything else? What does it mean wisely open-handed in peace, protected in war? What is that expression open-handed?	
9		RJ: Exposed. (*Turns open palm toward ceiling)*
10	Open-handed could be exposed	
11		XX: Willing.
12	Willing.	
13		XX: Giving.
14	Giving.	

raise their hands, students should not call out answers all at once. When they did, the teacher would request a single voice, with the understanding that others may have had the same answer or other equally satisfactory responses to his question ("You, may be, already said that" [7]).

Another version of the IRE sequence followed. Dave read a specific word in the text and asked its meaning ("What is that expression open-handed?" [8]). In quick succession students responded with single word answers that Dave repeated before asking the meaning of its antonym "tight-fisted" (15). Again students provided quick single word responses that provided confirmation. In this instance Dave's questions and responses implied that the meanings of the terms were available to all students in the room. Having ascertained that they were, he could ask a comprehension question based on an understanding of the terms in the context of the text: "How could they be protected in war if they are wisely open-handed in peace?" (27)

The next series of interactions (see Table 4) represent an even greater deviation from the IRE pattern, reflecting how what may at first appear to be a generic pattern of initiations and responses is actually a moment-by-moment series of discourse acts in response to what interactants believe is the context (Floriani, 1993). The response the student gave ("Positive" [26]) to Dave's question ("How is this generosity looked upon?" [25]) elicited a question after what appears to be by now Dave's typical confirming response—restatement of the student's answer ("Positive" [27]). Dave reread the phrase from the text ("Protected in war") and asked "How could they be protected in war if they are wisely open-handed in peace?" (27) Dave's action signaled that he was not satisfied with the student's answer of "Positive." He wanted to probe for further interpretations.

Dave's manner of probing without signaling dissatisfaction with the student's interpretation was the first occasion of a patterned practice that continued throughout the class. Not once did he explicitly tell a student his or her reading was incorrect. Every reading was acknowledged. As in this case, when Dave wanted to explore the interpretation further or elicit other interpretations, he asked clarifying or probing questions. On day 21, when students challenged their classmate's reading of the text, he gave them a wide berth to do so. Since the first day he had established that he would not directly deny or confront a student's textual reading. Instead, the class understood that he would provide opportunities for students to re-examine their interpretations.

In the next interaction (see Table 5) between Dave and student BE (who is Bobby, the student who asked the question that initiated the chain of interactions on day 21), another interactive profile was constructed. Dave probed for further elaboration of "Positive." Bobby responded, "If they have a strong army" (29) to which Dave added his own interpretation: "And if you are friendly with each other, they come to your help" (30). He also added "Maybe"

TABLE 4
Day 1: First Reading Instruction Lesson (cont.)

	TEACHER	STUDENT(S)
15	What does it mean the opposite of open-handed might be tight-fisted? If someone's tight-fisted, what does that mean?	
16		XX: They're cruel.
17	Cruel.	XX: Anger. *(Inaudible)*
18	What does tight mean?	
19		XX: Stingy.
20	Stingy. Well it means stingy. Tight-fisted. Don't be so tight-fisted. Give a little. Right. That's an idiom. In our language tight-fisted means stingy.	
21	OK, so if tight-fisted means stingy, what might open-handed mean?	
22		XX: Giving.
23	Giving.	XX: Generous.
24	Generous.	*(Inaudible)*
25	OK, so young men built the future wisely open-handed in peace. How is this generosity looked upon? Wisely open-handed in peace seems	
26		AE: Positive.
27	Positive. Protected in war. How could they be protected in war if they are wisely open-handed in peace?	
28		(*Students talk*)
29		BE: If they have a strong army.
30	And if you are friendly with each other, they come to your help. Maybe	

(30), which had the effect of keeping the interpretation open for more or different versions. Bobby jumped in to enlarge upon his initial answer that Dave interrupted: "If they have a strong army, they have a strong military position, so that they are protected from, from people striking back at them. So they can afford to (*inaudible*) peace" (31). Even though Bobby's interpretation differed from his, Dave confirmed it (32).

In this discourse action the teacher was subordinating the dominant authority of his reading to the student's reading. Dave had intended for students to read what could be inferred about the young men in Beowulf's culture from the reference to them as "open-handed in peace." His reading focused

TABLE 5
Day 1: First Reading Instruction Lesson (cont.)

	TEACHER	STUDENT(S)
31		BE: If they have a strong army, they have a strong military position, so that they are protected from. . . from people striking back at them. So they can afford to *(inaudible)* peace
32	Right. A position of strength.	
33		BE: Yeah.
34	Right. So warriors earn their fame, and wealth is shaped with a sword. So if you want to be a hero in this culture, do you write music?	
35		*(A chorus of no's)*
36	No. (*Chuckle*) You swing a sword very well and very bravely.	
37		XX: Does that mean also that they plundered?
38	This is a plundering bunch, that's true. So they were, they were loyal to one another, but to the neighboring group they were hell on wheels.	
39	They were not friendly(*Chuckle*)	(*Chuckles*)
40	On chariots, they didn't use chariots. OK. Now, I'd like you to get in groups of three and just, you can use a learning log for this, just a page in the learning log to write down other cultural values that can be inferred from the rest of this page.	

on his interpretation of the young men's generosity as a way of building good relations among them. However, he did not offer that reading as definitive (e.g., "maybe"). When Bobby focused his interpretation on another portion of text, the phrase "protected in war," Dave encouraged him to build his interpretation by confirming it twice ("Right. A position of strength. Right" [32 & 34]).

That the teacher gave the student's interpretation primacy signals meaningful aspects of what counts as knowledge, power relationships, and social reading practices in this classroom as already under construction on the first day. Reading as a knowledge-in-action construct is not only inferential, it is interpretive, and it is interpretive at the point of word. The life world of the text is interpretable through understanding word meanings. In order to read in this classroom, students need to examine meanings of texts by examining the role of words within the context

of text in providing understandings of the cultures and characters in the text.

In terms of authority of interpretations, when students made a reading on the basis of word meanings, if they were understanding the correct usage of the word within the sentence, then their interpretation of the significance of the word in understanding the world of the text was to be honored. By honoring Bobby's reading, Dave sent a message to all of the students in the classroom that their interpretations count as much as his if they follow the same strategy for obtaining them.

In addition, students in this first lesson constructed with their teacher the social patterns and rules for whole group participation in a reading. The reading lesson was initiated by reading from the common text and focusing on the meanings of particular words in the text. (With all eyes focused on their texts, everyone appeared to be reading along and participating as silent or active interactants.) Students were able to interact in response to teacher questions, to ask their own questions, to provide answers, or to elaborate on answers. By the end of this brief reading lesson, students had engaged with their teacher in a kind of reading practice that they would exercise repeatedly and consistently throughout their year-long course. Thus, the range of acceptable social and academic reading acts had already been introduced. Knowledge-in-action, the making and remaking of understandings of demanding material, was underway.

Reconstructing Opportunities for Participation

Day 2: Co-constructing Group Meaning of Homework Reading

On the second day the discourse pattern built on the expectations for reading constructed on the first day and introduced the first experiments with two practices necessary to making-a-case for a reading: (1) a close reading of text to form and test a hypothesis, and (2) determining what counts as the amount and kind of information necessary and sufficient to test a hypothesis and to form a related thesis (see Table 6).

The discursive segment is taken from the class's *Beowulf* homework discussion event. Students had been reporting the inferences they had made from particular lines of text. Dave read additional lines and called for further inferences. In response to a student's remark that "It was good that religion" (4), Dave asked, "What religion does that sound like?" (5) By asking the question he was providing the opportunity for students to practice forming a hypothesis about the significance of lines of text, the first step in case-making. Students responded with the answer he had hoped for, "Christianity" (6 & 7). When he confirmed their response, Roberta (RJ), a GATE student, challenged with information she had read in the *Beowulf* introduction: "But it said in the introduction that it could have originally been a pagan tale" (9). First, Dave acknowledged the possibility of the student's point by giving a historical interpretation (that the text

TABLE 6
Day 2: Co-constructing Group Meaning of Homework Reading

	TEACHER	STUDENT(S)
1	Well, let's uhm think about some of these things that we came up with from the, from page 24. Maybe if I just kind of read lines we can kind of remember some of the things we thought of. Why don't we start on line 26.I think we've talked about the first part already, so we're on page 24 line 26. (*Reads*) When his time was come the old king died still strong but called to the lord's hands. What could we say now?	
2		BE: Died in battle or (*4 or five students talk at once*)
3	Old.	
4		BE: Yeah. It was good that religion. Lord
5	The. . . yeah, into the lord's hands. What religion does that sound like?	
6		XX1: Christianity.
7		XX2: Christianity.
8	It sounds like Christianity.	
9		RJ: But it said in the introduction that it could originally have been a pagan tale and *(inaudible)*
10	It. . . and its possible that a Christian monk may have added, fixed it, made it right (*Chuckle*) instead of such a pagan story.	

was manipulated by a monk), then he dismissed this view by invoking academic authority, "though that actually is not widely believed now" (11). Then, he returned to the text.

Dave's discourse moves sent the message that seemingly authoritative interpretations from outside the text were not reliable and would not count as an authoritative interpretation of texts in this classroom. In and through his discourse actions, he was beginning to build the classroom understanding that as readers they would construct their own authority for textual readings. He read on (see Table 7), asking students questions to elicit their comprehension of the events in the story, saying, "Who had requested these obsequies?" (11) and "What are obsequies?" (13), until he asked them to draw a conclusion: "Does that sound Christian?" (17). When he received no response from students, he gave his own answer: "Sounds pretty seafaring to be Christian" (19).

TABLE 7
Day 2: Co-constructing Group Meaning of Homework Reading (cont.)

	TEACHER	STUDENT(S)
11	That's possible, though that actually is not widely believed now, but his comrades carried him down to the shore, bore him as their leader had asked, their lord and companion, while words could move on his tongue. Who had requested these obsequies?	
12		(*Responses by 5 or 6 students*)
13	He did. What are obsequies?	
14		(*Responses by 5 or 6 students*)
15	Burial ceremonies.	
16		(*Students talk among themselves*)
17	He had said what he wanted to have done to his body: to carry him down to the shore. Does that sound Christian?	
18		(*No response*)
19	Sounds pretty seafaring to be Christian. Shild's reign had been long. Who's Shild?	
20		XX1, XX2, & XX3: The king.
21	(*Reading*): This dead king he had ruled them well. There in the harbor was a ring proud fighting ship. Its timber icy waiting. And there they brought the beloved body of their ring-giving lord, and laid him near the mast.	
22		BE: (*Interrupts the T's reading aloud of text*) What do they mean by ring-giving?
23	What? Ring-giving? Ring-giving? Actually they did give rings, but it really is a metaphor for treasure-giving, generous, sharing.	
24		BE: What about ring-prowed?
25	Ring prowed? Ring prowed? Uhm. The prow of the boat is the front of it.	
26		BE: Yeah
27	Must of had rings on it somehow just for pulling it or something. I don't know. (*He replaces a student's damaged book)* OK. They laid it near the mast. What's the mast?	
28		(*Many students respond simultaneously*)

Having established a first possible reading of the text as reflecting a Christian culture, Dave next recited specific lines of text that evoked a reading of a pagan culture (21). After reciting the lines, he proceeded (see Table 8) and asked, "Still sounding Christian?" (32), which he followed with, "I don't remember where in the Bible it says when someone dies tie them to the mast; not tie them, but set them by the mast, and heap them with treasure. I don't think that's in there" (34).

He asked students to consider an alternative interpretation: "Where might

TABLE 8
Day 2: Co-constructing Group Meaning of Homework Reading (cont.)

	TEACHER	STUDENT(S)
30	The upright spar for the sail. (*Reads*): Next to that noble corpse they heaped up treasures, jeweled helmets, hooked swords, and coats of mail. What's mail?	
31		(*Many students respond simultaneously*)
32	It's interlocking rings of metal that, you know, (*he reads*) armor carried from the ends of the earth, no ship had ever sailed so brightly fitted, no king sent forth, more deeply mourned. Still sounding Christian?	
33		XX1, XX2, XX3: No
34	I don't remember where in the Bible it says when someone dies tie them to the mast. . . not tie them, but set them by the mast, and heap the ship with treasure. I don't think that's in there. Where might that tradition come from?	
35		JB: From *(inaudible)*
36	(*He reads more lines of text & questions)* So that's interesting. Is that Christian?	
37	Uhum.	RJ: No, I think it's Celtic because. . . uhm they believed that they go and it's kinda like a ship ride to the other world and it's like uhm in that Celtic *(inaudible)* for them *(inaudible)*
38		(*Members of class laugh*)
39	Yeah.	RJ: I'm serious. They go to the islands and learn things about their lives and themselves.
40	Very good, and these are people who. . . they are Anglo-Saxons.	

that tradition come from?" (34). A student mumbled a response that was too quiet for Dave to hear. He recited more text; he referred to earlier textual references, to the character they had not read about together; and he questioned why such mention was made. He continued to recite and question, directing students to think about the cultural habits and values of the characters, ending with, "Is that Christian?" (36). Roberta (GATE, RJ) answered immediately with, "No, I think its Celtic" (37) and explained why. Some of Roberta's classmates laughed at her answer, suggesting they did not believe it was plausible or that she was serious. Roberta responded quickly with, "I'm serious. They go to the islands and learn things about their lives and themselves" (39). Dave immediately confirmed and affirmed Roberta's response with,"Very good, and these are people who, they are Anglo-Saxons" (40).

When Roberta made her interpretation from the textual readings in response to Dave's question, she constructed the next step in making-a-case. She formulated a point or a thesis based on textual evidence. Through his discourse method, Dave had provided the interactional opportunity for Roberta to take this action. And in taking the action, in standing by it, and in having the action authoritatively confirmed by the teacher, Dave and Roberta had given the whole class the opportunity to observe that this is how one comes to form a thesis about one's reading of text.

During this interchange, Roberta shifted her position in regard to what counted as authoritative knowledge in reading a text and whose readings had authority. When she voiced her thesis, she exercised a different kind of literate practice that asked her to bring forward knowledge of her own to claim an authoritative reading of the text within the interaction with her teacher and her class members. Coming into the conversation, she believed knowledge gathered from authoritative texts carried more weight than student readings. By the end she had become repositioned as a member of a redefined power structure for what counted as knowledge and as being a reader. Everyone had observed that Roberta's way of reading, even though she was a GATE student, was inappropriate in this context and in need of transformation.

Day 4: Teacher and Students Answer Quiz Questions

On the fourth day of the course after a quiz on the homework reading, Dave initiated a discussion of the three quiz questions. The section of dialogue presented in Table 9 reveals how through the heuristic effect of one quiz question and the way Dave and students took up a discussion of answers to the question, another dimension of reading and of making-a-case was instantiated: Making-a-case is a process of reasoning from evidence. Also, this analysis reveals how a nonGATE student's inappropriate reading was dealt with. Alicia's (nonGATE, AM) question and subsequent inaccurate answer were not explicitly challenged; instead Dave and several GATE students constructed more appropriate responses. These served to

hold Alicia's place in the discussion until such time as she felt ready to re-enter, while demonstrating one way the reading might be done. Though Alicia declined the invitation to re-enter the discussion, she acknowledged the value of the demonstration.

The quiz question called for students to infer a character's role in the culture from the way he is written about in the text. Dave gave the quiz question, "So what was Ufrith's role?" (1) and Alicia queried the question with "What was it?" (2). Dave repeated the question "What was it?" (3) to which Alicia responded, "Oh, about a guy who told the story about things that he planned" (4), as though the question were a different one.

Despite Alicia's checking of the

TABLE 9
Day 4: Teacher and Students Answer Quiz Questions

	TEACHER	STUDENT(S)
1	Alright. Let's, let's talk about some of these things. So what was Unfirth's role?	
2		AM: What was it?
3	What was it?	
4		AM: Oh, about a guy who told the story about things that he planned.
5	He stands against	
6		JM: He kind of questions Beowulf. . . Beowulf's
7		XX: Power. JM: Power. . . power and bravery.
8	He does. He questions. . . that's right, yes. And, in fact, Brecca won the swimming event. Right.	
9		XX: Yeah but then Beowulf
10	But that's what Unfrith said	
11		BE: It was also to show that uh people were jealous of Beowulf and and his power, and he was questioning more Beowulf's wisdom, not his power.
12	Yes, though Brecca did say that uh that Beowulf was defeated. I mean, Unfrith said that Brecca beat Beowulf.	
13		BE: Yeah. Yeah
14	But that's true. Your other points are excellent. Right It makes him. . . doesn't it make him more real?	
15		Yeah

question, she answered as though the question were asking her to summarize what the text was saying about the character. Dave overlapped the end of her response with "He stands against" (5), at which point Jim (GATE, JM) and another student jumped in with an answer more aligned with the question as to the character's role (6). Unidentified student XX completed Jim's answer indicating each had been formulating a similar or related response (7). This pattern of not challenging inappropriate interpretations of what was being asked for, or an inappropriate response, was repeated throughout the course. Also repeated was the immediate follow-up with an interpretation that did serve the expectations of the reading and making-a-case process.

In keeping with the discourse rules, no one directly challenged Alicia's inappropriate interpretation of the question. Students offered another, appropriate response, Dave confirmed the answer (8), and he took it up with an elaborative link to an evidentiary textual reference. In this instance Bobby (BE) elaborated on Dave's response, and Dave accepted Bobby's interpretation with a "yes—though" (12) response structure. By doing so he first acknowledged Bobby's reading as viable and then challenged it with a textual reference, to which Bobby conceded acknowledgment (13). Shortly afterwards (see Table 10) Alicia (AM) acknowledged their answer (21) and turned down (with a smile and a head shake [23]) the opportunity to comment Dave provided her (22). Alicia reported that she now knew how her way of answering had been wrong, and she liked that Bobby had been both wrong and right at the same time.

In this classroom the practice of dual acknowledgment and challenge was a common response to interpretations by all students. In the beginning weeks of the class, GATE students' answers were challenged more often than nonGATE students' interpretations, but this pattern equalized after a few months as the nonGATE students increasingly were more appropriate in their take-up of practices. Interpretations, no matter who gave them or how original or interesting, were held as challengeable and expected to be queried as a way of building richer interpretations. This pattern is evident in the sequence reported in Table 10. After affirming Bobby's points as excellent, Dave built on the apparent contradiction in the interpretations by pointing out that such contradictions in character make Beowulf seem more real and the story more believable (20 & 22), again tying the interpretations back to the text to build another interpretation.

This interactional segment is typical of the discussions following the reading quizzes. In one sense the discussion quickly wandered from the original intent, which was to answer the quiz question. In another sense the discourse stayed very much on course since the objective was to provide all students (as immediate participants or as participant observers) with the opportunity to build readings for the text using the making-a-case process.

TABLE 10
Day 4: Teacher and Students Answer Quiz Questions (cont.)

	TEACHER	STUDENT(S)
16	That this is very powerful, and it makes the story more believable that there would be these jealous southern warriors who just couldn't believe Beowulf could be as good as he seems. . . he seems	
17		(*BE has his hand raised*)
18	Yes.	
19		BE: Also, uh it makes it more believable when he launches into the tale of the giant sea dragon.
20	Yes. It also gives Beowulf an opportunity to say what really happened so. . .	
21		AM: yeah
22	. . . and it's not as if he's only bragging. He's rebutting an accusation really, a denial of his power. So it, it has a very powerful dramatic affect, doesn't it? Let's us see more about Beowulf, get more of a rich sense of character development. Both of the other Danes, you know, Unfrith just being one, had the same character. Alright. Anything else? These are all good things. (*He looks at AR*) Alicia?	
23		(*AR smiles and shakes her head*)
24	Just basically that sums it up. OK. Alright. That's fine. That's basically it. What are some of Beowulf's unusual requests?	

Handing Over and Taking Academic Literacy

Day 7: The Teacher Affirms a Student's Question without Taking It Up

By the seventh day of the course, Dave talked less and students talked more. Noticeable changes were occurring in question-and-answer patterns on the floor of the classroom evidenced in Table 11 in which Dave called upon a student to bring her question forward. What is telling about this segment is the strong affirmation of the role of student questions as valuable in and of themselves, without attachment to answers. Conventionally, when an answer follows a question it assumes focal identity and gives the question an auxiliary role (Polanyi, 1958). An answer usually eclipses a question's significance, relegating it to subservient, secondary

status, and thus less worthy of attention. Dave distinguished the status of questions by addressing them separately from answers, and in so doing he validated their primacy for engaging in the so-what thinking and making-a-case reading that counted in this classroom. Not answers, but questions counted; rather than knowing, not knowing became the means for building intellectual currency. Dave's actions served to validate students who did not have a clear understanding of their reading and who could articulate the problematic in the form of a question.

In the classroom side talk that had occurred as Dave was responding to Lia's (GATE, LL) analogy, nonGATE student Rachel (RS) had begun to ask a question of another student. Dave had overheard Rachel and asked her to repeat it, "Rachel what were you going to say?" (1). His question served two functions: It acknowledged that what Rachel had been doing was appropriate even though not originally addressed to the whole class, and it brought Rachel's question to the floor of the classroom for public consideration. She asked, "Are we supposed to think somehow that Beowulf like he has a deeper understanding of everything?" (2). Her question was possible because it was built upon the previous interpretations of Beowulf's character and the so-what interpretations of his actions Dave and the students had talked into existence. Dave responded to Rachel's question by not answering it himself or redirecting it to the class for student answers. In saying "Maybe. That's an interesting point isn't it?" (3), he held back the answer and focused the group's attention on the question itself. Encouraged to continue by the affirmation, Rachel added a rationale for the thinking underlying her question, which in keeping with what counts in the class, was textually based: "Because everyone else, you know, all the common people might have thought that it was, you know, slaves that did it. But are we supposed to think that maybe he has deeper understanding?" (4). Dave responded with another serious affirmation: "Pretty good. Pretty good thinking. Just to raise the question shows some pretty good thinking there" (5). His response clarified that good questions come from "good thinking" and validated Rachel's thinking as a model of effective thinking/interpreting/reading to which the other students might aspire. His response also confirmed that raising a good, thoughtful question was sufficient to signal a significant intellectual and academic accomplishment in this classroom.

Dave corroborated these messages when next he said, "Had you thought about that question, Rosemary? I hadn't really" (5). He gave the reading a powerful compliment when he admitted that he, the more sophisticated reader, had not thought of that question. He was also doing something more when he questioned GATE student Rosemary about whether she had thought of that question. She responded, "Not really" (6). As a GATE student she did not come up with that question or with one similar. Another interaction has sent the message that a GATE student identity does not translate automati-

TABLE 11
Day 7: Teacher Affirms a Student Question without Taking It Up

	TEACHER	STUDENT(S)
1	Rachel what were you going to say?	
2		RS: Are we supposed to think somehow that Beowulf like he has a deeper understanding of everything?
3	Maybe. That's an interesting point isn't it	
4		RS: Because eveyone else, you know, all the common people might have thought that it was, you know, slaves that did it. But are we supposed to think that maybe he has deeper understanding?
5	Pretty good. Pretty good thinking. Just to raise the question shows some pretty good thinking there. Had you thought about that question Rosemary? I hadn't really.	
6		RJ: Not really.
7	No? Hmm, Matt what about you?	
8		MS: I hadn't thought about that one either
9	(*Teacher & students giggle*)	
10	Seriously, it shows, it suggests a greater depth of consciousness here that I think might be supported by other parts of the poem. That's very interesting.	
11		BE: So he might have taken the stance that if the dragon hadn't come out then it would have come out later? If it came out later he wouldn't have been there to handle it, and somebody else might have been there to handle it who wouldn't have been able to handle it.
12	Yeah.	

cally into intellectual power and facility. Once again Dave had separated students' performances from their institutional positions.

Dave's method for diffusing tense moments was to redirect attention through humor to safe targets. Interactions seven and eight illustrate one of the early performances of the style of humor he and students developed to diffuse momentary frame clashes between members' understandings. On this occasion Dave played it safe by choosing nonGATE student Matt, with whom as his S. A. T. tutor he already had a comfortable history of this style of banter. The interaction undercut any competitiveness that might

be inferred from his question to Rosemary: "Hmm, Matt what about you?" (7). Matt read the familiar contextual cues; he confessed, "I hadn't thought about that one either" (8). Dave and students giggled at Matt who smiled broadly to exhibit his pleasure in being the faux target.

Dave could now return attention to Rachel's contribution and reinforce his first affirmation of the quality of her question. He said, "Seriously, it shows, it suggests a greater depth of consciousness here that I think might be supported by other parts of the poem. That's very interesting" (10). Dave had built upon his original confirmation by referring to a criterion for good reading that had already been established—textual support for theses. Bobby acknowledged the validity of Rachel's insight into Beowulf's character by using it to speculate about another stance Beowulf might have taken (11). Dave's and Bobby's treatment of Rachel's question transformed it into a "hypothesis," arising from the type of question that is a worthy heuristic for initiating the pursuit of a thesis from which to make a case.

The teacher had signified a nonGATE student's point, then lightened the social signification, then, joined by a student, re-established its academic weight. The effect sent the message that nonGATE students' ideas carry intellectual clout and make a contribution to class learning. A context had been constructed for negotiating the asymmetry of power relationships between the institutional positions of teacher, GATE student, and nonGATE student. A participation structure for handing over and taking up had been enacted, explicitly identified, and validated.

Day 16(1): A Student Challenges the Teacher's Reading

By this point in the class, Dave and his students had established his role as ultimate authority about textual readings. However, this authority was mediated by Dave's assumption of other dimensions of his role. He also acted as a co-reader who, given the way readings were defined in this classroom as under continual construction, did not provide final definitive readings. Instead, a responsibility of his role was to question in order to keep readings open. In addition, he handed over his role of teacher to students who took it up to engage in making-a-case practices and to assume authority for their voicings of readings.

Table 12 displays a discourse segment on day 16 that shows how students exercised the power for their own readings that Dave had handed over during previous interactions. They challenged his reading of the text. The challenge began with Dave asking a textual question: "Who is this person?" (1). Bobby (GATE, BE) and Patricia (GATE, PB), one of the two Mexican American students in the class, responded respectively with "their guide" (2) and "their narrator" (3). Dave confirmed their responses, renamed the character, and elaborated: "Well, he's their host. He's the host. He is joined by these, he's in the tavern and these twenty-nine pilgrims come and he then sort of is the moderator through

TABLE 12
Day 16(1): Students Challenge the Teacher's Reading

	TEACHER	STUDENT(S)
1	So who is this person?	
2		BE: Their guide.
3		PB: Their narrator.
4	Well, he's their host. He's the host. He is joined by these, he's in the tavern and these twenty-nine pilgrims come and he then sort of is the moderator through this whole. He goes with them on this pilgrimage.	
5		RJ: Isn't there another host who is the actual host?
6	I don't think so.	
7		(*Many students respond*)
8	Well he's the host. He's the host	
9		JM: Would he describe himself as as a striking man with bright eyes?
10	(*He has been examining the text*) It says	
11		RS: Yeah and then he says I'm not very *(inaudible)* or something.
12	Oh wait. Where does it say that? (*He looks through the text in response to students*)	
13		RS: Near the end.
14		PB: The very last person. Well it would because on page thirty-four it says (*She reads*) There was a *(inaudible)* also known and they were calling him *(inaudible)*.
15	Yes. Right.	

this whole. He goes with them on this pilgrimage" (4). Roberta (GATE, RJ) questioned Dave's reading with, "Isn't there another host who is the actual host?" (5). Dave answered with a qualified negative: "I don't think so" (6), to which multiple student voices were heard challenging his answer (7). Dave responded by twice reasserting his answer, "Well he's the host. He's the host" (8).

Rather than provide textual evidence to support his reading, Dave relied upon his authority to make his point. However, the students who had come to understand how one is to make a case for a reading in the classroom and how their interpretations had authority if they could be supported with textual evidence, challenged his reading. Jerri (GATE, JM) began by

asking Dave, "Would he describe himself as as a striking man with bright eyes?" (9), to identify the location in the text of the host Dave is referring to. Dave had been reading the text and began to address Jerri and the class by saying, "It says" (10). However, he was cut off by Rachel (nonGATE, RS) who had recollected from her previous reading of the text another reference to support Roberta's (RJ) reading. She referred to the recollected section: "Yeah and then he says I'm not very xxxx or something" (11). Dave handed over the role of teacher to Rachel and her classmates when he next asked, "Oh wait. Where does it say that?" (12). Rachel looked for the section of text for him and the rest of the class whose body language (eyes on text or on speakers) suggested they were following the argument and referring to their texts to find the section. Rachel guided the search with "Near the end" (13). Patricia (GATE, PB) found the reference and jumped in to elaborate, adding another textual reference (14). Dave found the place in the text and encouraged the contribution with "Yes. Right" (15). At this point in the sequence of interactions, the whole class of students was engaged in the attempt to make a case to their teacher to prove the hypothesis the students held in common—that there are two hosts in this text, not a single host as he had read. Dave participated in their case building in the role of engaged learner.

Patricia (PB) (see Table 13) added textual evidence to build the case (16). When Dave, who had been reading along in the text, said "Ohhhhh" (17), he signaled that he had come to an understanding. However, Patricia (PB) was not willing to relinquish her voice and the argument. Overlapping her teacher's "Ohhhh," she said, "Now wait" (17) and kept her authoritative position. From it, she contributed more textual evidence (18). Dave acknowledged her position and asked for the exact location of her evidence in the text (19). Multiple student voices answered his question. (Four louder voices are audible on the tape [20]).

Dave found the reference and read it. He acknowledged as he read "OK. He's. OK. Alright" (23). Patricia (PB) continued to question him to forward her claim (24), and Dave jumped in as she was speaking to confirm that her claim had merit given the textual evidence. He articulated the claim the students had been making—that there is more than one host—by identifying who the two hosts were (25). He followed up his articulation with a question, as much to himself as to the students: "Does he go?" (26). His question served to rechallenge the reading that now he and the students were making. Multiple student voices responded (26). Dave answered his own question as he skimmed through the text "Well it does say the words of the host in between a couple of tales. It says the words of the host to, you know, a character" (27). He followed his answer and continued pursuit of textual evidence with, "Well, hmmm. Well" (27 & 29) as students talked among themselves.

By this point in the conversation, Dave had stepped down from his

TABLE 13
Day 16(1): Students Challenge the Teacher's Reading (cont.)

	TEACHER	STUDENT(S)
16		PB: and then he says (*She reads*) Riding and *(inaudible)* finally myself. And he doesn't include the host there, but when he's telling each one he says our host.
17	Ohhhhh.	Now wait.
18		After that he gives like a little thing about each person it says right here. (*She reads lines*) And then he says our host.
19	Where does he say our host?	
20		(*Many students give page numbers*) BE: Page forty-one. XX: Our host. JM:(*Reading*) He was a very striking man our host. MS:Yeah, forty-one. XX: Forty-one. JM: Marshall in a hall.
21	Oh uhh.	
22		BE: look at forty-one
23	OK. He's. OK. Alright.	
24		PB: But he's, isn't he talking about himself? It says right there. . . it says on page thirty-four. . . it says
25	Yeah I know. I think there's a host at the Tabbard Inn, and then he is the host. But that is not the person who goes with them on the trip.	
26	Does he go?	(*Many students answer*)
27	(*He searches the text*) Well it does say the words of the host in between a couple of tales. It says the words of the host to, you know, a character. . . Well, hmmmm.	
28		(*Students talk among themselves*)
29	Well.	
30		XX: Maybe it's a mouse.
31		XX: Maybe it's one of the horses.
32	It might be a horse named host. (*He continues searching the text*)	
33		Yeah *(laughing)*

gatekeeping role on the floor of the classroom to look for further evidence to either confirm or challenge the claim he had temporarily come to accept given the evidence students had provided. His act was a temporary and limited confirmation of the students' success in making their case and a challenge to its authority. He had not quite let go and admitted they had succeeded in providing a more convincing reading. He was still looking for the evidence that would convince him and thus also modeling for them the necessary extent of making a case.

As already observed on day 7, Dave used humor to managed tense moments during frame clashes involving exchanges of power. In this instance a student stepped onto the floor to make a humorous comment to Dave to defuse the seriousness of the moment. The student said, "Maybe it's a mouse" (30). Another student said, "Maybe it's one of the horses" (31). Dave responded in a light tone, "It might be a horse named host" (32), to which a student responded, "Yeah" (33) as s/he laughed.

Throughout the interchange Dave continued his search for textual evidence (see Table 14). He found more and reported, "OK. No, he went too. So the the first person narrator is not the host, that's true" (34). The teacher had admitted the students' reading was a more authoritative one than his given the textual evidence. Most of the students talked among themselves in response to Dave's admission. Bobby (BE) said loudly enough for the class to hear, "Wow you've been reading this for years and you never even xxxx" (36). Dave provided a reason for his less authoritative reading: "I haven't hon-

TABLE 14
Day 16(1): Students Challenge the Teacher's Reading (cont.)

	TEACHER	STUDENT(S)
34	OK. No, he went too. So the. . . the first person narrator is not the host, that's true.	
35		(*Students talk among themselves*)
36		BE: Wow you've been reading this for years and you never even *(inaudible)*
37	I haven't honestly thought about this for a while. Well, you know, you know uhm maybe it is Chaucer's voice because uhm after the Clerk's Tale there's Chaucer's envoy to the Clerk's Tale. . . there's the tale of Sir Topaz who says it's Chaucer's tale. So maybe that's, maybe it is Chaucer's voice. I hadn't thought about that. Alright.	

estly thought about this for a while" (37).

Immediately after acknowledging that his first reading had been eclipsed by the students' case, Dave extended his response to incorporate their new reading into forming a new hypothesis: "Maybe it is Chaucer's voice" (37). In so doing he began to rebuild his authority as a reader by giving a reason for his hypothesis that was tied to the text. Each of these actions followed the first steps in making-a-case thinking. By acting in this way, Dave was modeling the way in which hypotheses about the significances of readings can evolve from reading difficulties. This modeling provided a link to the class motto, "If anything is odd or inappropriate or confusing or boring, it is probably important." Dave moved from confusion about an aspect of the text to a hypothesis evolving from so-what thinking. Because he said he had not thought about this topic previously, students knew he was constructing this way of thinking in the moment. By rescuing his reading authority in this way, his actions sent the message that this kind of thinking is more powerful and more authoritative than any fixed reading one might make. As the role model for teaching in this classroom, he has indicated that the powerful position is not so much knowing *that*, but knowing *how* when knowing *that* is inadequate (Ryle, 1949). Students knew how to make a case, and he knew how to build on the understandings that were constructed from the case-building to expand to the next level of construction.

Day 16(2): Whole Group's Response to a Student's Display of Missing Cultural Knowledge

During a later interaction (see Table 15) another dimension of what counted as reading and being a reader in this classroom emerged: that particular kinds of cultural knowledge are necessary in order to understand textual terms, figures of speech, and allusions. The usefulness of cultural knowledge was foregrounded during the discussion when a student who lacked a particular kind of knowledge made herself visible.

Dave was contributing his reading to the students' interpretations of a character's limited financial resources when Kora (KM), a nonGATE student, added, "He had a herd of sheep though" (3). After she repeated her response at Dave's request, two students laughed and smirked. Their actions pointed to a clash in expectations for reading. They considered Kora's reading outside the range of expected performance. In response Dave took up Kora's point using a matter-of-fact tone: "Well, let's look at that. That's an analogy" (7). Mike (MS) (a nonGATE student with experience in a previous GATE English class) mocked Kora's response and reinforced his own status as a knowing student to nearby students by laughing as he said, "He had a herd of sheep" (8). In a serious tone, Bobby (BE) clarified with "He had a flock" (9), and in her defense Kora (KM) restated her reading, "Well he did have a herd of sheep" (10). Dave confirmed Bobby's contribution and affirmed Kora's reading with "We, we often say flock. But let's

look at that because that's a good point" (11), while in side talk a student said mockingly, "Flock" (11).

The students' mocking actions (which did not reappear during the remainder of the first thirty days of class) were a direct contradiction of the expectations for the culture of the classroom Dave had spelled out to the class on the first day. During his overview of the course, Dave had told them he wanted the classroom to be a place where everyone could take intellectual risks without danger of being mocked. The actions of the students indicate that not everyone in the class interpreted this incident as an occasion of failed intellectual risk-taking. The students who laughed considered their classmate's reading a display of missing knowledge they expected readers of the text to hold. When Dave called Kora's point a good one, he gave her response an affirmation with all the weight of his authority in an attempt to counter the students' disparaging remarks. Kora's "Is that wonderful" (12) was delivered in a droll tone as a disparaging comment about her lack of knowledge. She was having trouble and needed his assistance to "get through . . . these complicated analogies" (14).

Dave explained the Christian analogy to Kora and then recited lines from the text to illustrate what he meant. While he was reading aloud to the class, students sitting next to Kora helped out by providing explanations. Bobby (GATE BE) again came to Kora's aid. In his first response Bobby had attempted to counter the mocking of the few students; in his next one, in keeping with the established pattern, he deflected social attention from Kora's plight. By playfully taking up the role of the unknowing student to make light of it, he made Kora's lack of knowledge seem unimportant. Referring to a word in the portion of text Dave had just read, he asked, "What does shitten mean" (18), though, as Bobby later indicated to me, he was fully aware of its meaning. Dave smiled and without missing a beat provided a matter-of-fact definition.

As this encounter demonstrates, the rules for maintaining a culture in which students could show their lack of knowledge were still being negotiated on the sixteenth day of the class. Dave and some students were following the rules; other students had yet to sustain their practice. Further interactions to construct a commonly held view of how to respond to students lacking relevant cultural knowledge were necessary in order for the class to establish the goal set by the teacher. The next discourse segment shows how Dave, through his gatekeeping of the interactional space on the floor of the classroom, contributed to the cultural expectation that students' lack of particular kinds of knowledge useful for reading certain texts should be regarded by class members who have that knowledge as an opportunity to teach them. This expectation reinforced the premise that it is acceptable to admit publicly not knowing something that others might.

TABLE 15
Day 16(2): Whole Group Responses to a Student's Display of Missing Cultural Knowledge

	TEACHER	STUDENT(S)
1	Yes (*Said as he looks at Patricia*) If people didn't have money he gave them money.	
2	He wasn't just. . . and he didn't have much money himself.	PB: And he didn't have much money.
3		KM: He had a herd of sheep though.
4	What?	
5		KM: He had a herd of sheep.
6		(*Two students laugh and smirk*)
7	Well, let's look at that. That's an analogy.	
8		MS: He had a herd of sheep. (*Laughing*)
9		BE: He had a flock.
10		KM: It was. Well, he did have a herd of sheep.
11	We. . . we often say flock. But let's look at that because that's a good point.	XX: Flock (*Mocking*)
12		KM: Is that wonderful.
13	It's on thirty-two.	
14		KM: *(inaudible)* because I can't get through these complicated analogies.
15	OK. Well, within Christianity. . . the sheep are mentioned within Christianity. Lambs, the lamb of God. Jesus is the lamb of God. We are the sheep. The lord is my shepherd. I shall not want. I shall not lack for things. This . . . this is just a very. . . the language of sheep is very, you know (*He looks through his text*)	(*Students near KM talk to her.*)
16		LL: What page is that on?
17	Thirty-two. If you look at uhm the bottom four page lines [*He reads*] For if the priest be foul in whom we trust, no wonder that a common man should rust, and shame it is to see, let priests take stock, a shitten shepherd and a snowy flock.	
18		BE: What does shitten mean?
19		(*AR laughs*)
20	Shitten means, probably—It actually means defiled and dirty.	

Day 16(3): Teacher Redirects Student Question to Group and Requests Student Knowledge

In addition to revealing how Dave provided opportunities for individual student's cultural knowledge to be woven into the reading process, the analysis reported in Table 16 shows how a GATE student who had forgotten previously-known knowledge reconstructed it with Dave's and her classmates' assistance. During the interaction Dave reinforced the meaningful role of students' authentic questions, the value of the floor of the classroom as one place to ask those questions and to seek answers, and the responsibility of students to assume the role of teacher in providing knowledge for the shared group reading process. Performance capability includes being able to ask for, receive, and give assistance in constructing knowledge. Social knowledge building is a medium as well as a means and a goal of academically capable performance.

Later on, Dave overheard Kora asking her helpful neighbors a question about a term used in the text. "What is a rosary?" she whispered. Dave called out to Kora. "Ask us" (5), he said, directing her to bring the question to the floor of the classroom. After her last experience with publicly asking a question and of having her question mocked by some students, Kora could have understandably been reticent to make another attempt. However, she asked her question (6), and this time no one laughed. That Kora asked and that no students laughed shortly after the previous interaction suggests a possible development in the culture of the classroom toward the expressed goal. A student asked for a clarification of Kora's question (8) and took up the discourse pattern Dave had previously modeled. Attention was directed to what was being asked in and through the question, not to what the question may have indicated about the student who asked it. Is it rosary beads or the rosary Kora wanted explained? Patricia's question seemed to signal that she was sufficiently knowledgeable about the subject—she could distinguish between knowledge about the beads and knowledge of the prayer that is said with them—to take up the role of teacher.

Table 16 shows the rhythm of the interactions as Dave's actions brought Patricia's knowledge forward to address Kora's question. Dave began from the position of the teacher's role by explaining the configuration of the beads to Kora, interrupting himself to ask questions of Patricia and the class (9) to clarify his information. Many students, including Patricia, responded to his question. Dave, having interpreted Patricia's earlier question as an indication of her knowledge, acknowledged her answer and followed up quickly with another one (13). Patricia answered. Dave restated her answer—in so doing confirming it—and elaborated his explanation to Kora (15). Dave's actions sent the message that students had cultural knowledge that he did not and that it was valuable in this reading enterprise.

While Dave was elaborating Patricia's information to Kora, he stopped himself and asked Patricia,

TABLE 16
Day 16(3): Teacher Redirects Student Question to Group and Requests Student Knowledge

	TEACHER	STUDENT(S)
1	Love conquers all.	
2	Isn't that kind of a funny thing	(*KM talks to students sitting near her*)
3	Kora. Kora.	
4		(*KM stops talking and looks up at teacher*)
5	[*Directed to Kora*] Thanks. Ask us. What?	
6	OK	KM: What exactly is a rosary bead? I looked in the back. It says rosary beads are *(inaudible)*
7		XX: Ohhhhh.
8		PB: Rosary beads or rosary?
9	If you've seen a beaded necklace with a cross hanging down, and then every— [*Directed to Patricia*] Is it every tenth bead?	
10	*(He looks at students)*	*(Multiple student answers*)
11		XX: Every bead has a prayer
12		PB: Every bead you say a Hail Mary, and every bead between you say an Our Father
13	Right. But how many little beads are there between the big beads?	
14		PB: There are like eight or something.
15	[*Directed to Kora*] Eight. Then you say a Hail Mary for every little bead and Our Father for every big bead. Then you work, you just keep working. You just hold it as you go through and say— [*Directed to Patricia*] Can you say it? Can you say a Hail Mary for us?	PB: That's the whole way around. PB: You go through every
16	(*Teacher watches PB*)	PB: Hail Mary. Hail Mary full of grace the Lord is with thee blessed art thou among women and blessed is the fruit of thy womb Jesus. Holy Mary Mother of God pray for us sinners now and in the hour of our death.
17		(*Spontaneous student applause*)
18	OK. [*Directed to Kora*] That's one Hail Mary, and then you would say, and then you would say it again for the next bead. Say it eight times, and then you would say Our Father— [*Directed to Patricia*] Would you mind saying Our Father?	

"Can you say a Hail Mary for us? (15)" Patricia (PB) said the prayer for the class (16). Dave confirmed its accuracy and the class broke into spontaneous applause (17). Patricia, Dave, and the students in the class believed she had contributed accurate and useful information in response to Kora's question. Knowledge in the form of a cultural text had been exchanged. A kind of group learning had occurred in the passing of information; Dave had provided the opportunity for one student to bring forward from personal memory a cultural text—a Hail Mary—in response to another individual student's need to know. He had validated the knowledge with his full authority. This series of actions contributed to the making-a-case events explained from day 21. Dave brought forward a student's authentic question as the catalyst for other students' cultural knowledge about information useful in reading the text. He drew the knowledgeable student into the process of answering the question, stepping back to hand over the role of teacher to the student. The student took up the role and enacted it as was appropriate for this classroom.

In the analysis of this first half of the transcribed interaction, Dave was the gatekeeper and controlled the interactional space. He determined whose voice was heard on the classroom floor and when. Analysis of the second half of the sequence reveals how GATE student Patricia exerted authority and claimed her right to use the floor and the class to reconstruct her own understanding of knowledge she had temporarily forgotten, a right nonGATE student Kora could not yet act upon.

Field notes and videotapes indicate that over the first sixteen days of classroom interactions, no students engaged in public co-construction of a student text, whether from memory or as a new reading. The ensuing interaction sequence (see Table 16) affords an opportunity to see the first occasion of co-construction of a text as nonGATE and GATE students and Dave assist student Patricia in making the text of the Lord's Prayer. During that co-construction the participation patterns indicate for the first time a pattern of students repeatedly claiming the floor after interrupting the teacher. Also visible is Dave conceding the floor, relinquishing authority over the interactional space and the knowledge under construction, and, in so doing, confirming the students' power and the legitimacy of her position.

Dave asked Patricia if she would mind saying the "Our Father" portion of the rosary. In response, Patricia (PB) and Angela (AR), the second student in the class who was sitting next to her (and who also self-identified as Mexican American), laughed (19) (see Table 17). Such action has been identified before in studies of classroom interaction (Green, 1983) as signals of frame clashes between teacher and student expectations. Patricia and Angela did not expect Dave to request information from students when they had not offered it for presentation on the floor. Patricia had not introduced her knowledge of the Our Father as she had of the

TABLE 17

Day 16(3): Teacher Redirects Student Question to Group and Requests Student Knowledge (cont.)

	TEACHER	STUDENT(S)
19		(*PB and AR laugh*)
20		PB: You want me to say an Our Father?
21	Yeah. I'd love you to.	
22		PB: Our Father who art in heaven hallowed be thy name. Blessed art though among women and blessed
23		(*AR laughs*)
24		PB: (*To AR*) Right *(inaudible)*
25		AR: No
26		PB: No
27		PB: Wait I'm getting confused.
28	It sounded like you're starting the Lord's Prayer.	PB: Our Father
29		PB: That is the Our Father
30	(*T faces BE, AR & PB*)	BE: Yeah. Our Father who art in heaven hallowed be thy name
31		PB: Our Father who art in heaven hallowed be thy name
32		AR: Our Father who art in heaven *(inaudible)* (*Quietly to PB*)
33	Well that's the beginning of the Lords Prayer. Well I'm kind of curious, but anyway. Well. (*Laughs*)	PB: Wait a minute.
34		(*BE attempts a version of the prayer*)
35		PB: wait our father wait (*She turns to AR and reattempts the prayer*)
36		(*BE continues with prayer*)
37	Well, Patricia's going to work on this.	
38		PB: OK. I got it. I got it.
39	OK.	
40		PB: Our Father who art in heaven hallowed be thy name [*Laughs*]
41	Wait.	(*AR laughs*.)
42	Matt, Matt, listen.	(*PB listens to JB, BE & AR saying the prayer next to her*.)
43	(*T faces PB*)	PB: (*To JB, BE & AR*) No, but that's the end. (*To AR*) Is it?
44		JB: Yeah, it is.
45		(*Across the room three students say the end of the prayer to PB*) Pray for us sinners now and in the hour of our death.
46	(*Directed to the class*) Well, that's the Lord's Prayer. OK. Yeah, oh yeah that's the Lord's Prayer. OK, now wait, shsh (*Raises right hand palm forward*)	(*Many students attempt to recite the prayer*.)
47		(*Students quiet*)
48	A little cultural literacy has trans. . . is coming out here.	

Hail Mary. She questioned Dave to be sure she understood what she thought he was asking: "You want me to say Our Father (20)?" After Dave confirmed his request (21), Patricia began to recite the prayer (22). She got the first line right but mistakenly provided the second line from the Hail Mary prayer. Angela (a nonGATE student) laughed loudly (23), indicating another frame clash, this time in expectations for textual information (she had expected Patricia, a GATE student and a Catholic, to know this information). The occurrence of two frame clashes between interactant expectations during the first two interactions of this sequence indicates participants were not acting according to established norms for social and academic interaction. The actions they took as the interaction progressed were constructing, not repeating, interactional, procedural, and academic patterns that would become routinized.

GATE student Patricia's strategy of asking nonGATE student Angela to judge the accuracy or inaccuracy of her knowledge was a norm in the classroom. Over the first sixteen days students—regardless of institutional identity—had looked to each other to provide additional information and responses in side talk when they needed them. However, when Patricia took the interactional floor of the class in her next action by saying, "Wait, I'm getting confused" (27), she set a precedent. A GATE student was publicly indicating a lapse of memory and the need, as well as the right, for assistance from all class members in rebuilding it.

In their next actions Dave and Patricia vied for the floor (28-29). (In an interview Dave explained he had known when Patricia first mentioned the Our Father prayer that it was the Lord's Prayer, but had not offered that information to the class because he wanted her to provide it.) Patricia declined Dave's attempt to assist her with additional information by taking the floor back to tell him she already knew it was the Lord's Prayer (29). Bobby (BE) confirmed both the accuracy of Patricia's information and her right to the floor (30), and, through his silence Dave conceded the floor to both of them.

Patricia and Bobby vied for the floor as they both said the first line of the Lord's Prayer (30 & 31). Angela supported Patricia by repeating the first line quietly to her (32). Dave attempted to reclaim the floor and end Patricia's constructive process (37), but Patricia would not let him. She interrupted him with "Wait a minute" (33). Dave tried to keep the floor and assert his procedural strategy to change the interactional focus (33). This time Bobby interrupted him and took the floor by reciting a version of the prayer (34). During this interaction Angela and Bobby were actively constructing text with Patricia. Angela and Jackie remained off the floor in side talk. In contrast, Bobby established himself and his knowledge by speaking out on the floor along with Patricia and Dave.

In the next interactional unit Patricia interrupted Bobby to reclaim the floor, saying, "Wait. Our Father. Wait" (35), and the two shared the space

on the floor as they repeated the opening lines of the prayer. Dave made a final attempt to claim the floor and change the direction of the discourse. He interrupted Patricia and Bobby to make a closure statement to the class: "Well, Patricia is going to work on this" (37). Patricia (PB) did not accept his closure statement. She took the floor back by announcing she had figured out the prayer (38). Dave conceded to her (39) and handed over the floor, which she took up by reciting the first line of the prayer again (40).

The meaningfulness of Dave's concession becomes evident in the analysis of the subsequent interactional sequence. Patricia interrupted her recitation of the prayer after the first line by laughing (40). Angela joined her, and Dave claimed the floor with a demand for the class to "Wait" (41). "Wait" served as a signal to the class that he was exercising his authority to keep the floor open for Patricia to construct the text. When next he told a boy who was side talking, "Matt, Matt, listen" (42), he reinforced the demand. In so doing he was saying the interactional space was reserved only for students to construct the text with Patricia. This action represented another dimension of the earlier pattern to permit student questions to guide the discussion. His control over what to talk about was challenged and he met that challenge by handing over and protecting the interactional space for addressing what students, not he, initiated as the topic and purpose for group construction.

While not directly engaged in making a case, in taking over the floor of the discussion, Patricia rehearsed positioning herself for use in future case-making. In one sense, making a case means taking up a conceptual position (a thesis) by insinuating oneself into the conceptual frame of the listeners/readers and holding their attention while providing evidence and significance for that position so as to create a shared conceptual frame. Patricia demanded the floor, not to establish the authority of the text she was constructing (Dave had already provided that authorization) as much as to confirm her right to have the attention and the resources of the group. By granting Patricia the floor Dave and her classmates confirmed every student's future right to that position for instructional purposes. Case-makers need to feel authorized in their attempts to make cases. They need to believe that their teacher and classmates will bring their resources to bear in support of their efforts.

During the next interactions more students took to the floor to recite the prayer until the last line was completed (45). After they finished Dave took the floor to confirm that "Well that's the Lord's Prayer" (46). He repeated the confirmation when additional students joined the recitation of the prayer: "OK. Yeah, oh yeah that's the Lord's Prayer" until more than half the class was reciting the complete prayer. These actions were three confirmations of the students' successful co-construction of the text for and with Patricia. Facial expressions, body language, and comments of the class members indicated their valuing of what had occurred. For

the first time in the classroom, a student's bid to control the floor until she constructed something she believed important but that was not making a case for a textual reading was sanctioned by Dave. Even though, from Dave's point of view, the interaction did not appear potentially fruitful, he conceded control of the interaction and authority for what counted at that moment to a student. In so doing he provided the opportunity for her to make something meaningful. By insisting that other students respect her authority to sustain the interaction and by remaining silent or confirming student contributions, he sanctioned the students' co-construction of the text.

Thus, a new social and academic rule governing hand over and take up and what counted as academic knowledge about literary texts emerged during this segment of classroom talk. Students were thereafter able to claim the common interactional space to forward their own spontaneous academic needs as they arose during classroom interaction. They could claim the floor by interrupting Dave and other students. In fact, members could vie for the floor, which they often did because all students were expected to contribute to the construction. However, the information constructed by the group needed to inform the group's reading of the literary text as well as the needs of the initiating student. Student knowledge, when it contributed to the understanding of literary texts, was valuable. Student knowledge could be inaccurate and other students could participate in instructionally re-constructing it correctly. An instructional interaction was considered complete when the initiating student's needs had been met. Students would signal their new understandings and Dave would confirm. The negotiation of power relationships in terms of whose knowledge counted and who could speak when opened particular opportunities for students to be participants as questioners and as sources of information.

Discussion

Summary

The purpose of this study has been to observe the emergent relationship among building a way of knowing as a particular reading approach, constructing a social culture, and transforming students' reading identities. It is important to keep in mind that by the midpoint of the first semester all nonGATE students had achieved sufficient parity in the classroom's normative domains of academic performance. In other words, they had learned how to talk and write within the same performance range as their GATE classmates so as to meet the expectations for what counted as a literate reading in this classroom. The analyses of the eight interactional segments explored the role that initial class discussions may have played in this development.

Viewed as a collective, these analyses reveal that after 21 days, nonGATE students had yet to fully emerge as interactional players in the way some GATE students were making use of the public space of the classroom. Although other data indicate most became more active public discussants as the course

developed, some never did, remaining throughout the year, like a number of their GATE classmates, mainly side-talking participants in class discussions. For these students public exchanges provided the purpose, the occasions, and the relevance for their side talk and for other expressions of their literate performance. Public interactions catalyzed, coordinated, and confirmed what counted as meaningful activity. They were the forward momentum in constructing a common literate culture that became inclusionary.

Taken together, the eight interactional segments depict the complexity of emergent inclusion by showing the gradual and tenuous process of building an inclusionary culture through the moves of its interactants. They illustrate the knitting together of roles and relationships among individual interactants into group affiliation—the dynamic building of social membership that is at the heart of inclusion. And they reveal that an inclusionary social world exists only insofar as it includes members in the doing of some sort of shared, agreed-upon activity. Literate performance as a communal activity was idiosyncratically, contingently, and opportunely sewn together during experientially built occasions for affirmation, repair, query, contribution, rescue, and challenge of individual performance. Some members more than others held their classmates to their own emergent standards of literate authority and pedagogical achievement. However, Dave's discourse choices played the most dominant and important role in building a literate inclusive culture.

Table 18 displays a summary of the eight case analyses to depict the interactional profile of emergent inclusion Dave forwarded. The table locates the repositioning of Dave and students, their negotiated roles and power relationships, and the academic literacy knowledge negotiated during each of the eight interactional segments.

Implications

These micro descriptions allowed Dave and me to see each student's voice at each speaking as a representation of current estimates of social position and knowledge currency—the speaker's, the interactant with whom the speaker engaged, and the overhearing members who noted what had transpired. These individual estimations are flash points fundamental to the building of a culture—that is, they are the domain in which value-laden insight ignites. Ignited estimations during myriad individual interactions co-constitute the common expectations, or cultural standards, of the group by which members are measured. Over time, collectives of flash points within evolving interactional contexts shape the cultural profile of inclusion and exclusion by determining who is discursively included or excluded. Understanding inclusion and exclusion as culture building tied to literacy construction that evolves interactionally is critical to forwarding inclusive pedagogy for all students, especially in classrooms in which differential academic power plays a major role in class discussions.

An example from Nystrand (1997) will serve as an illustration. He lists nine

TABLE 18
An Eight-Case Interactional Profile of Emergent Inclusion in GATE English Literature

	DAY 1	DAY 2	DAY 4	DAY 7	DAY 16 (1)
INTERACTIONAL SEGMENT	Teacher leads reading of a class text and accepts all student readings.	Teacher leads class in close reading of text to form a hypothesis and determine information needed to make a claim.	Teacher and GATE students model meaning of a quiz question.	Teacher calls nonGATE student question to floor and establishes value of questions.	Student challenges teacher's reading, students find evidence to support his claim, and teacher acknowledges their case.
SEQUENCE OF INTERACTIONS	1. T concedes floor to Sts unique reading. 2. T gives St opportunity to elaborate on his reading. 3. T acknowledges St explanation.	1. T Q's to elicit St hypothesis. 2. GATE St answers from information in introduction. 3. T redirects Sts to text for hypothesis. 4. Same St offers her own thesis.	1. T requests answer to reading quiz question. 2. NonGATE student misinterprets question and gives unacceptable answer. 3. GATE students and T provide acceptable answers.	1. T redirects nonGATE St side Q to whole group. 2. T affirms Q as "good thinking." 3. T gets GATE St to acknowledge Q. 4. T and St transform Q into a hypothesis.	1. St questions T's answer to St Q. 2. St provides alternate reading. 3. Sts find evidence and make case for their reading. 4. T follows St evidence and case. 5. T admits Sts reading is more authoritative. 6. T turns St reading into a hypothesis.
REPOSITIONINGS OF TEACHER AND STUDENTS	Deconstruction of traditional IRE responses.	GATE students must engage in the process and read at the level of word to render their own readings.	NonGATE students need to learn new meanings for teacher questions.	NonGATE students have intellectual capability that can sometimes eclipse GATE students.	Students can teach the teacher. The teacher can learn from the students.

Continued on next page

TABLE 18, CONTINUED
An Eight-Case Interactional Profile of Emergent Inclusion in GATE English Literature

	DAY 1	DAY 2	DAY 4	DAY 7	DAY 16 (1)
NEGOTIATED ROLES AND POWER RELATIONSHIPS	Teacher will not provide a definitive reading of text.	GATE students need to learn what knowledge counts.	NonGATE students learn how to read from GATE student handling of questions. T will affirm and challenge all student readings.	Questioners are as powerful as knowers.	The teacher's authoritative readings are only as good as the evidence from which they are built.
NEGOTIATED ACADEMIC LITERACY KNOWLEDGE	Students produce readings of text at the level of word.	Student readings carry more weight than authoritative readings.	A case is constructed by reasoning from textual evidence.	Asking questions is important in constructing readings and cases for readings.	A reading is a hypothesis until a persuasive case has been made for it.

group norms that, if modeled by teachers and embraced by students, would enhance dialogic peer instruction in English classrooms: (1) Expression is honest and spontaneous; (2) Interaction among members is free; (3) Levels of personal involvement are high; (4) Members desire insight and change; (5) Self-disclosure is safe and highly valued; (6) Members take responsibility for the group's effectiveness; (7) Members consider the group important; (8) Communicating about material of relevance to the group as a whole takes priority over discussing outside material; and (9) Members consider each other their primary agents of help.

Each of these norms depends upon high stakes social negotiation among the students. An examination of the three operant terms in one of them, "Self-disclosure is safe and highly valued," reveals how complex, tenuous, and risky building such a norm can be. From a student's perspective self-disclosure requires considering which version of self is valued in each interactional context in which it is voiced. It requires trying out a voice as Roberta did, or bringing in reluctant voices, like Kora's, to be heard and responded to. Even disclosure, like self, is a culturally and contextually determined action. Roberta did not know that she was disclosing her inappropriate reading approach until she spoke out in response to Dave's question. Nor did Kora know when she volunteered her understanding of the priest's flock as a financial asset that it would be taken as a

disclosure of limited knowledge. That she suspected it might be safe to speak her knowledge is indicated by her act.

Self, disclosure, safe, and highly valued are cultural meanings under construction in each classroom, especially during the critical first weeks. To determine what is safe to do and when, students need to make a number of attempts to establish the public common meanings of those terms. When Kora spoke out it was one of her first attempts. When Bobbie spoke his hypothesis on day 21, he had had many public interactions on which to base his estimation that it was safe and highly valued to disclose the self he voiced. Lia, with far fewer public interactions, had learned the norm as well, but as overhearer and participant in this and prior classroom contexts. Nevertheless, she like her classmates was putting her self at risk to be challenged. What was meant by safe, and when did safe become safe for whom in this classroom? By the 21st day, was it safer for GATE students Bobbie and Lia than for nonGATE students Kora and Rachel? Was it safer for Rachel who had asked a thoughtful question than for Kora who had not?

The actions of students on day 21 did not mean the classroom had become a safe environment for self-disclosure for everyone. In fact, the classroom never became safe, if safe means that Dave and students could discontinue their vigilant reading of each interactional context because students no longer needed to distinguish which self to disclose in a way that seemed literate. An important implication of this study is that if the culture had become safe for Bobby and the other GATE students, it would no longer have been an inclusive culture-in-the-making. That the GATE students found it necessary to remain vigilant and accountable for their own and their classmates' social and literate acts, kept inclusion viable. Safety, like inclusion, was a product of invested human discourse interaction and required constant vigilance, definition, and maintenance.

This study has a number of implications for understanding what inclusionary classrooms are and how they can be realized:

Inclusion is student engagement in and around the building of a commonly accepted and practiced view of literate performance through the discourse practices of a classroom.

Inclusion means bringing students into discursive ways of making knowledge while they are talking them into being.

Inclusion is built one discursive interaction at a time and emerges as a tenuous cultural norm with which individual students sustain a risky relationship.

Teachers have the responsibility to establish and maintain the ground rules for building public discourse interactions that forward and sustain inclusion.

The more diametrical the power positions of student interactants and the more distant students are from the dominant literacy, the more vigilance and maintenance are required to in-

clude all students within a range of performance that counts as meaningful and valuable.

Inclusion, like trust, is visible in the artifacts and after effects of class members' discursive actions and can take a long time to build.

Preparing teachers to develop inclusionary classrooms will require a re-visioning of what is meant by curriculum, instruction, and assessment. Such re-visioning would background distinctions that treat the three as separate categories and foreground both their interconnected, contextually determined meaningfulness and the centrality of discourse in their existence. Teachers' assessments of their students' achievement in terms of the often contradictory language domains and agendas of externally imposed curricula, instructional practices, and criteria for evaluation would give way to a focus on the production of local knowledge, instruction, and assessment rubrics. Though guided by the language of external standards and frameworks for academic performance, they would retain a healthy interrogative stance toward it to suit local needs.

Teacher education supportive of inclusion would focus on preparing teachers to read strategically the social climates of their classrooms, to apply a principled set of practices that call for students to adopt a way of working with texts, to measure literate attainment as an evolving cultural phenomenon with its own contextually appropriate rules for assessment, and to see the power of discourse as the crucible within which knowledge and identity are created. GATE English Literature has shown that the kind of academic rigor that Dave sought to develop need not be sacrificed to the goal of inclusion and that inclusion can be achieved by shifting the focus from *what to know as an individual performer* to *how to know it as a member of a literate group.*

References

Ainscow, M. (1993). Teacher education as a strategy for developing inclusive schools. In R. Slee (Ed.) *Is there a desk with my name on it? The politics of integration* (pp. 201-218). New York: Falmer.

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.

Applebee, A. (1996). *Curriculum as conversation: Transforming traditions of teaching and learning.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

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

Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays by M. M. Bakhtin*. (M. Holquist, Ed.; C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Barton, D. (1994). *Literacy: An introduction to the ecology of written language.* Cambridge, U. K.: Blackwell.

Bloome, D., & Bailey, F. (1992). Studying language through events, particularity, intertextuality. In R. Beach, J. Green, M. Kamil, & T. Shanahan (Eds.), *Multidisciplinary perspectives on literacy research* (pp. 181-210). Urbana, IL: National Conference for Research in English and National Council of Teachers of English.

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

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.

Brantlinger, E. (1997). Using ideology: Cases of nonrecognition of the politics of research and practice in special education. *Review of Educational Research, 67*, 425-460.

Bruner, J. S. (1983). *Child's talk*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Bruner, J. S. (1985). Vygotsky: A historical and conceptual perspective. In J. V. Wertsch (Ed.), *Culture, communication, and cognition: Vygotskian perspectives* (pp. 21-34). New York: Cambridge University Press.

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

Castanheira, M., Crawford, T., Dixon, C., & Green, J. (in press). Interactional ethnography: An approach to studying the social construction of literate practices. In J. J. Cumming, C. M. Wyatt-Smith, J. Ryan, & S. M. Doig (Eds.), *Literacy-curriculum connections: Implications for theory and practice*. Commission paper to the Literacy Curriculum Interface: The Literacy Demands of the Curriculum in Post-Compulsory Schooling Project. Washington, D. C.: Department of Employment, Education, Training, and Youth Affairs and Griffith University.

Cazden, C. (1988). *Classroom discourse.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Corsaro, W. A., & Miller, P. J. (Eds.). (1992). *Interpretive approaches to children's socialization*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Delpit, L. (1995). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom*. New York: The New Press.

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

Erickson, F. (1986). Qualitative methods in research on teaching. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *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*, 241-274.

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

Gee, J. (1991). What is literacy? In C. Mitchell & K. Weiler (Eds.), *Rewriting literacy* (pp. 3-11). New York: Bergin and Garvey.

Gee, J. (1996). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses (2nd ed.)*. London: Taylor and Francis.

Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior.* New York: Pantheon.

Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis.* New York: Harper and Row.

Grant, C. (Ed.) (1997). *Review of Educational Research, 67*(4).

Green, B. (1991). Reading "readingS": Towards a postmodernist reading pedagogy. In C. Baker & A. Luke (Eds.), *Towards a critical sociology of reading pedagogy* (pp. 211-235). Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Green, J. L. (1983). Research on teaching as a linguistic process: A state of the art. In E. Gordon (Ed.), *Review of Research in Education, 10* (pp. 152-252). Washington, D. C.: American Educational Research Association.

Green, J. L., & Dixon, C. D. (1993). Introduction to talking knowledge into being: Discursive and social practices in classrooms. *Linguistics and Education, 5*, 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 (Eds.), *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 (Eds.), *Ethnography and language in educational settings* (pp. 161-205). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Green, J. L., & Yeager, B. (1995). Constructing literate communities: Language and inquiry in bilingual classrooms. In J. Murray, L. McDonald, S. Martin, T. Morley-Warner, & P. Widders (Eds.), *Celebrating difference, confronting literacies. Proceedings of the Australian Reading Association National Conference* (pp. 97-112). Sydney: Australian Reading Association.

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

Gutierrez, K. (1995). Unpackaging academic discourse. *Discourse Processes, 19*(1), 21-37.

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.

Heap, J. L. (1985). Discourse in the production of classroom knowledge: Reading lessons. *Curriculum Inquiry, 15*, 245-279.

Heap, J. L. (1991). A situated perspective on what counts as reading. In C. Baker & A. Luke (Eds.), *Towards a critical sociology of reading pedagogy* (pp. 103-140). Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Heras, A. (1993). The construction of understanding in a sixth-grade bilingual classroom. *Linguistics and Education, 5*, 275-300.

Ivanic, R. (1994). I is for interpersonal: Discoursal construction of writer identities and the teaching of writing. *Linguistics and Education, 6*, 3-15.

Jennings, E. M., & Purves, A. C. (Eds.). (1991). *Literate systems and individual lives: Perspectives on literacy and schooling.* New York: State University of New York Press.

John-Steiner, V., Panofsky, C. P., & Smith, L. W. (Eds.) (1994). *Sociocultural approaches to language and literacy: An interactionist perspective*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

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. (1997). Jointly constructed narratives in classrooms: Co-construction of friendship and community through language. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 13*(1), 17-37.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal, 32*, 465-491.

Lanksheer, C., & McLaren, P. (1993). *Critical literacy: Politics, praxis, and the postmodern*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lerner, G. (1995). Turn design and organization of participation in instructional activities. *Discourse Processes, 19*(1), 111-132.

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

McHoul, A. (1991). readingS. In C. Baker & A. Luke (Eds.), *Towards a critical sociology of reading pedagogy* (pp. 191-210). Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

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

Mehan, H. (1985). The structure of classroom discourse. In T. Van Dijk (Ed.), *Handbook of discourse analysis: Vol. 3. Discourse and dialogue* (pp. 119-131). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

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

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

Moll, L. C., & Greenberg, J. (1990). Creating zones of possibilities: Combining social contexts for instruction. In L. C. Moll (Ed.), *Vygotsky and education: Instructional implications and applications of sociohistorical psychology* (pp. 319-348). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Muspratt, S., Luke, A., & Freebody, P. (1997). *Constructing critical literacies: Teaching and learning textual practice*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Nystrand, M., with Gamoran, A., Kachur, R., & Pendergast, C. (1997). *Opening dialogue: Understanding the dynamics of language and learning in the English classroom*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Nystrand, M., & Gamoran, A. (1992). Student engagement: When recitation becomes conversation. In H. Waxman & H. Walberg (Eds.), *Contemporary research on teaching* (pp. 261-290). Berkeley, CA: McCutchen.

Oakes, J. (1985). *Keeping track: How schools structure inequality*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

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

Polanyi, M. (1958). *Personal knowledge: Towards a post-critical philosophy.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Rex, L. A. (1994). A social view of composing from insiders' perspectives: The roles and relationships of teachers and students. *Forty-third Yearbook of the National Reading Conference* (pp. 560-571). Chicago: The National Reading Conference.

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

Rex, L. A. (1997b, November). *Constructing language arts academic literacies through talk over time: Day to day shaping of what counts and what students take up.* Paper presented at the meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English, Detroit, MI.

Rex, L. A., Green, J. L., & Dixon, C. (1997). Making a case from evidence: Constructing opportunities for learning academic literacy practices. *Interpretations, 30*(2), 78-104.

Rosenbaum, J. E. (1979). *Making inequality: The hidden curriculum of high school tracking.* New York: Wiley.

Ruiz, N. (1995). The social construction of ability and disability: II. Optimal and at-risk lessons in a bilingual special education classroom. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 28*, 491-502.

Ruiz, N., & Figueroa, R. (1995). Learning-handicapped classrooms with Latino students: The Optimal Learning Environment (OLE) project. *Education and Urban Society, 27*, 463-483.

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

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking in conversation. *Language, 50*, 696-735.

Santa Barbara Classroom Discourse Group (1992a). Constructing literacy in classrooms: Literate action as social accomplishment. In H. H. Marshall (Ed.), *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.

Shor, I (Ed.). (1987). *Freire for the classroom. A sourcebook for liberatory teaching.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Shor, I. (1992). *Empowering education*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Skrtic, T. (1991). The special education paradox: Equity as the way to excellence. *Harvard Educational Review, 61*, 148-206.

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.

Slee, R. (1993). Inclusive learning initiatives: Educational policy lessons from the field. In R. Slee (Ed.), *Is there a desk with my name on it? The politics of integration* (pp. 185-200). Washington, D. C.: Falmer.

Slee, R. (Ed.) (1997).*International Journal of Inclusive Education, 1*(2).

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

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

Tannen, D. (1993). *Framing in discourse*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Todd, F., & Barnes, D. (1995).*Communication and learning revisited*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

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.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes* (M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, & E. Souberman, Eds.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wertsch, J.V. (1991). *Voices of the mind: A sociocultural approach to mediated action*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wells, G. (1987). Apprenticeship in literacy. *Interchange, 18*(5), 109-123.

Wells, G. (1993). Re-evaluating the IRF sequence: A proposal for the articulation of theories of activity and discourse for the analysis of teaching and learning in the classroom. *Linguistics and Education, 5*, 1-37.

Wheelock, A. (1992). *Crossing the tracks: How untracking can save America's schools.* New York: The New Press.

APPENDIX A: DATA ANALYSIS

Domains of analysis	*Questions guiding analysis of making-a-case literacy*	*Questions guiding analyses of class members' construction of making-a-case literacy*
Transcriptions of class motto discussions	What literacy practices emerge from discussions of the class motto?	How do class members act to instantiate the motto through literacy practices?
Mapping of cycles of literate activity (14 cycles)	During which classroom events and between which classroom members did making-a-case interactions occur?	What were the teacher and students doing during these events?
Analysis of literate artifacts within cycles of activity	Within what range of performance criteria was making-a-case literacy acceptable? What were the criteria?	What characterized students' making-a-case performances and the teacher's comments about them?
Analysis of patterns across 14 cycles of activity	What patterns of literacy-building and procedural practices emerged across the 14 cycles of classroom activity?	What patterns of members' participation recurred across the 14 cycles?
Analysis of routines of practice across 11 of the cycles of activity	What rules for academic engagement and social participation were under construction in this classroom?	How were the rules for social participation and academic engagement constructed by the class members?
Transcription of literacy events, subevents, and phases	On which occasions was making a case literacy being constructed?	How did class members build contexts for constructing making-a-case literacy?
Transcription of making-a-case interactions	What constituted making-a-case literacy?	In what ways did interactants serve as contexts for each other as they constructed making-a-case literacy?
Transcription of interactional segments	What dimensions of making-a-case literacy were constructed during particular discourse interactions?	How did class members construct dimensions of making-a-case literacy during discursive interactions?
Analysis of eight telling segments	How does each case represent making-a-case practices? What does the relationship among cases suggest about the emergence of making-a-case literacy learning?	In what ways does each case represent the teacher's and students' positionings, roles, and power relationships as they build making-a-case literacy?

Appendix B:
Day 7: Teacher Affirms a Student Question without Taking It Up

	Teacher	*Students(s)*
001	Rachel what were you going to say	
002		RS: are we supposed to think somehow that
003		Beowulf
004		like he has a deeper understanding of everything
005	maybe	
006	that's an interesting point isn't it	
007		RS: because eveyone else
008		you know all the common people
009		might have thought that it was
010		you know
011		slaves that did it
012		but are we supposed to think that maybe
013		he has deeper understanding
014	pretty good	
015	pretty good thinking	
016	just to raise the question shows some pretty good thinking there	
017	had you thought about that question Rosemary	
018	I hadn't really	
019		RJ: not really
020	no	
021	hmm	
022	Matt what about you	
023		MS: I hadn't thought about that one either
024	(T & students giggle)	
025	seriously	
026	it shows	
027	it suggests a greater depth of consciousness here	
028	that I think might be supported by other parts of the poem	
029	that's very interesting	
030		BE: so he might have taken the stance
031		that if the dragon hadn't come out then
032		it would have come out later
033		if it came out later he wouldn't have been there to handle it
034		and somebody else might have been there to handle it
035		who wouldn't have been able to handle it
036	yeah	