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Abstract

This dissertation traces the participation of three students across two instructional units during the teaching and learning of argumentation and argumentative writing. The data is drawn from an ethnographically informed study in a 9th and 10th grade English language arts class within a humanities course. The teacher foregrounded argumentative writing as a product of argumentation and taught argumentative elements (i.e., claim, evidence, warrant) progressively, co-constructing knowledge with her students. Using a micro-ethnographic discourse analysis, the researcher analyzed typical and telling events to trace students’ participation and triangulated with students’ written products and student and teacher interviews. The investigator found that both the teacher and the students understood argumentation as a set of social and relational practices, that they learned and deployed the language of argumentation, and that they created intertextual links as they developed arguments. The teacher provided learning opportunities through multiple levels of classroom activity. The focal teacher had two years to work toward deep understanding with her students. The findings help complicate argumentation as a social and relational process. The study suggests providing students opportunities for taking up and adapting argumentation in a range of ways that are sensitive to student identities and sensitive to an adaptation to a range of tasks opens up space for students and teachers to create arguments. More so, when argumentation is presented as a way of thinking—a
habit of mind—rather than a regime of textual discipline, it becomes another way to interact with others and gain deep understanding of academic content.
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Chapter 1
Introduction

This dissertation is about argumentation and argumentative writing in high school English language arts classrooms. Argumentation is an important communicative practice not just for school but also for all domains of life. Regardless of life after high school (work, post-secondary options, military, etc.) students will be asked to form claims supported by evidence and warrants. Argumentative writing is important because it is a communicative practice that students will use in their English language arts (ELA) classes, their content area classes, and after high school and college in a broad range of work, community, and other settings.

Although the teaching and learning of argumentative writing is important for doing well in school and beyond, it is rarely taught (Langer & Applebee, 1987; Newell, Bloome, Hirvela, & Marks, 2009); instead, high school writing instruction typically involves narratives, literary analysis, and persuasive essays. When argumentative writing is taught, it is constrained, with teachers and students working toward a written product utilizing traditional elements as a structure to replicate (Newell, Beach, Smith, & VanDerHeide, 2011) and/or working on argumentation in a contained, two-week unit (Newell, VanDerHeide, Marks, Bradley, Wynhoff Olsen, Ryu, Goff, & Weyand, 2013). Both a lack of teaching and when taught, a constrained manner of teaching inhibit students’ experiences with
argumentation, leaving students unprepared for complicated academic tasks (Graff, 2000). Given the relatively new prominence of the Common Core State Standards in United States public schools (National Governors, 2010), argumentation should become more of a presence in secondary schools. In fact, the Common Core State Standards state that argumentation is to be taught across grade levels and disciplines, beginning in kindergarten and advancing through the grade levels. This “requirement” via the Standards is giving argumentation and argumentative writing (the dominant mode mentioned in the Standards) a presence in schools, yet how school districts, teachers, and students will take it up is yet to be determined.

In this dissertation, argumentative writing refers to the composition of a particular kind of text: a written argument. Although argumentative writing is only one mode of argumentation and one mode of composing, it is the dominant mode analyzed in this dissertation because it was the dominant mode produced in the focal classroom. As I make use of argumentative writing, I also lean on the process of argumentation. The process of argumentation includes not only the cognitive and linguistic processes involved in composition, but also the complex social interactions and relationships that teachers have with their students during instruction. Taken together, argumentation can be viewed as a related set of practices; ways of engaging in the processes of producing an argument. This dissertation focuses on the practices of argumentation, how they are acquired, and in particular, the related complex social interactions among one particular set of students and their teachers while they produce argumentative essays.

Because the teaching and learning of argumentation involves social processes, a close examination of the social interactions and processes is required. How students and their
teachers interact and position themselves in the classroom influences their identities, knowledge construction, how they think of themselves as learners and as people, and the construction of “rationality.” This dissertation will focus on the social interactions among one particular classroom of students as well as students and their teacher as they enact argumentation and produce argumentative writing. The timing of such an investigation is important because argumentation and argumentative writing are an academic focus for secondary students, yet pedagogical books and the Common Core State Standards promote a narrow, formulaic description. As more and more students and teachers work with argumentation and produce argumentative essays, the field needs more illustrations of how students and their teachers co-construct argumentation and argumentative writing.

When studying the teaching of argumentation and to promulgate effective classroom practices, one must look at the whole, as well as the relationships between parts and the whole. How the teacher defines and offers learning opportunities for the study of argumentation is only a part; it is for this reason that I analyze how the teacher and her students enact argumentation and produce argumentative writing. How the teacher and her students interact with and create knowledge and writing together also offers a more complete picture of the whole. In this dissertation, I foreground the social interactions and social identities co-constructed within the study of argumentation and the production of argumentative writing. Further, the teaching and learning of argumentation and argumentative writing must be studied over time because what counts as argumentation and the instructional practices that support acquiring the practices and processes of argumentative writing evolve and build over time.
Therefore, this dissertation is an in-depth case study that examines these multiple dimensions of the teaching and learning of argumentation over time in order to better understand diverse consequences as well as the processes of teaching and learning argumentative writing. Although there have been a number of studies of argumentation and argumentative writing, to date none have explored argumentative writing across these multiple and complex dimensions. The research topic, broadly stated, is how we can understand the teaching and learning of argumentation as a socially constructed process. Specific research questions are listed later in this chapter.

The rest of this chapter presents the theoretical framework of the study, an overview of the study itself, the research questions, and a brief discussion of the limitations of the study.

**Theoretical Frame**

The set of theoretical constructs that guide this dissertation derive from both social constructionism (cf., Gergen, 2001) and social constructivism (cf., Vygotsky, 1978; Rogoff, 2003).

Theoretical Construct #1: *knowledge is not given; it is socially constructed.* As people act and react to one another, they build knowledge together (Bloome, Carter, Christian, Otto, & Shuart-Faris, 2005; Gergen, 2001); knowledge is a social construct (Rorty, 1979; Volosinov, 1973) with language at the center (Bruffee, 1986; Volosinov, 1973). As stated by Bruffee (1986):

A social constructionist position in any discipline assumes that entities we normally call reality, knowledge, thought, facts, selves, and so on are constructs generated by
communities of like-minded peers. Social construction understands reality, knowledge, thought, facts, texts, selves, and so on as community-generated and community-maintained linguistic entities—or, more broadly speaking, symbolic entities—that define or ‘constitute’ the communities that generate them. (Bruffee, 1986, p. 774)

One does not just receive or ingest knowledge; rather, one takes up or rejects meaning, negotiating understanding within relationships (Gergen, 2010) and social interactions (Dyson, 1997). What counts as knowledge is contextual and fluid; knowledge is co-constructed, negotiated, and evolving.

In this focal classroom, there is a social construction of what writing is and what argumentation is, situated at various points in time. Although neither is stagnant, the observed teacher Ms. Cook and her students build their understanding together, over time. As Ms. Cook and her students “make writing”, their interactions shape and reshape their understanding of how they write for and with one another as well as how they enact and produce argumentation.

Theoretical Construct #2: people’s identities are not given; rather they occur through social interactions. Social identities are co-constructed narratives (Leander, 2004; Sfard & Prusak, 2005): identities are social due to people’s interactions with others (Gee, 2001; Leander, 2004; Sfard & Prusak, 2005). While an individual may perform a particular identity, others will acknowledge it (or not) and reshape it, regardless of whether we accept or resist the identities. Gee (2001) offered a basic definition of identity pertinent to this study:

Being recognized as a certain ‘kind of person,’ in a given context, is what I mean here
by ‘identity.’ In this sense of the term, all people have multiple identities connected not to their ‘internal states’ but to their performances in society” (Gee, 2001, p. 99).

Identities are multiple. They may co-exist and overlap. Identities are also dynamic. When one learns, one is changed; therefore, one’s identity changes (Wortham, 2004). Identities shift to fit the needs of social groups and social situations.

Not only are identities individual, collective identities exist (Gee, 2001; Leander, 2004; Sfard & Prusak, 2005). In classrooms, identities play a critical role in both interacting and learning (Sfard & Prusak, 2005; Wortham, 2004; 2006). Regardless of intentions, what teachers and students do, say, and take up in classroom interactions impacts individual identities and the depth of academic learning (Bloome et al., 2005). Rather than consider students as individuals, we need to also consider “the rhythm and balance of the classroom” (Schultz, 2003), as changes in classroom participants will change not only the individual, but how the group functions as a whole. This was important in studying the humanities ELA classroom during grades 9 and 10. Who we are as a group shapes how learning opportunities are offered, taken up, reframed, and resisted (Wortham, 2006). Notably, the institution of school creates a structure to manage all the people within it; as a result, the identities of both teachers and students become constrained and are negotiated within the narrative of school. While in the institution, people may position themselves to match that of the ongoing social organization in the classrooms (Wortham, 2006).

Theoretical Construct #3: people acquire habits of mind that are situated in particular kinds of events and social practices. Habits of mind are particular intellectual strategies that are taught and acquired. In classrooms, teachers and students explicitly talk about habits of
mind, making them visible (i.e., think about what others may say regarding your topic while drafting a claim statement). Habits of mind may vary as teachers and students take them up and adjust them for their use; regardless, habits of mind become expected and accepted ways of doing within particular classes or groups of people. Habits of mind are shared, learned and public; therefore, they can be viewed as cultural phenomena.

Theoretical Construct #4: an individual’s cognitive processes are influenced from the outside, social environment. One cannot separate cognitive processes from the social; rather, the focus of study is on an individual’s choices and processes within the greater social context or field (Vygotsky, 1978; Wortham, 2004). Varying levels of social context (Bronfenbrenner, 1976) layer and occur simultaneously, impacting an individual’s discourse and processes (Bourdieu, 1993; Hanks, 2005). As Bruner (1996) noted:

Meaning making involves situating encounters with the world in their appropriate cultural contexts in order to know ‘what they are about.’ Although meanings are ‘in the mind,’ they have their origins and their significance in the culture in which they are created. It is this cultural situatedness of meanings that assures their negotiability and, ultimately, their communicability . . . . knowing and communicating are in their nature highly interdependent, indeed virtually inseparable: however much the individual may seem to operate on his or her own in carrying out the quest for meanings, nobody can do it unaided by the culture’s symbolic systems. It is culture that provides the tools for organizing and understanding our worlds in communicable ways. (Bruner, 1996, p. 161)
Theoretical Construct #5: *students’ activities must be regarded within their meaning system* (Rogoff, 2003). As Rogoff explained the cultural nature of human development, “People develop as participants in cultural communities. Their development can be understood only in light of the cultural practices and circumstances of their communities—which also change” (Rogoff, 2003, pp. 3-4). Situated as learners in classrooms, students make choices that reflect their understandings of their classroom context(s) as well as their positionings and roles within it.

Theoretical Construct #6: *students acquire knowledge by engaging in dialogue* (Vygotsky, 1978; Mercer, 2008). Learning occurs through social interactions mediated through dialogue over time (Mercer, 2008), sometimes creating intertextual links (Bloome & Egan-Robertson, 1993) and making visible the co-construction of knowledge. Offering a sociocultural perspective, Vygotsky (1978) foregrounded the zone of proximal development:

The distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers. (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 86)

When working within the ZPD, dialogic conversation and collaboration help a learner gain knowledge (Vygotsky). Vygotsky’s notion of private speech—which serves as a memory guide for students—also foregrounds dialogue as individuals “talk” through difficulties and hear their thoughts.
Criticizing Vygotsky’s ZPD as static, Mercer nonetheless makes use of the ZPD concept redefining it as the Intermental Development Zone (IDZ):

The notion of the IDZ focuses attention on how a learner progresses under guidance in an activity; but it does so in a way which is more dynamic, more interactive and more clearly related to the task-related talk of both teacher and learner” (Mercer, 2008, p. 10).

Through his frame of IDZ, Mercer claimed that teachers and students were creating knowledge together and were able to make meaningful connections through continued dialogue. Mercer concluded, “Dialogues with teachers, and with their fellows, enable students to consolidate and develop their understanding over time, so that they can build new understanding upon the foundations of past experience” (Mercer, 2008, p. 41).

**Overview**

This two-year study of argumentation and argumentative writing in a high school English language arts classroom is framed as a case study; and more specifically what Mitchell (1984) calls a telling case. Data collection began December 1, 2010, and ended on May 25, 2012. Observations began during the first unit focused on argumentative writing: 15 days in December 2010-January 2011, and then spanned units across the two school years. I observed eight times between January-March 2011, with a final observation in May 2011. I returned to the classroom for ten days in May 2012 to observe the sophomore capstone project: an argumentative essay and presentation on solutions to poverty.

My data corpus includes a range of sources over the two school years (2010-2012). I recorded full class sessions, peer group work time, and student presentations with video and audio recorders; I wrote field notes for each day observed. I also audio recorded student
interviews and teacher interviews. Next, I collected student work samples (peer review worksheets, in-progress drafts, final essays, and presentations) and teacher artifacts (assignment sheets and assorted handouts/.ppts). Table 1.1 presents the corpus of data organized by data source.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Video Recordings</th>
<th>Audio Recordings</th>
<th>Field notes</th>
<th>Student Interviews</th>
<th>Teacher Interviews</th>
<th>Student Work Samples</th>
<th>Teacher Artifacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ninth-grade (2010-2011)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenth-grade (2011-2012)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.1  Data Corpus

Focal participants include one ELA teacher (Ms. Cook) and her students: grades 9-10 humanities, during the ELA section. The 9th grade class had 43 students. The majority of those students returned for 10th grade, yet other students also added the course, for a total of 64 sophomores. Across both school years, Ms. Cook positioned her students as successful thinkers. Although the dissertation presents a broad view of Ms. Cook’s curriculum and curricular timing, the focus is on how the learning opportunities she offered shape the students’ participation with argumentation, with their peers, and with their teacher over two years. To illuminate the teaching and learning of argumentative writing practices over time, I specifically trace the participation of three case study students. A brief description of each
student follows. Kane identified as an African American male (survey data). He was popular, willing to draw attention to himself (field notes, 12/17/10), and a high achiever. Sue identified as a White female (survey data). She was less mainstream than Kane (preferring a bit of shock value in her responses), wrote within and outside of school (interview, 1/12/11), and typically did not meet small assignment deadlines (field notes, 12/17/10). Bob identified as a White male (survey). He called himself “a math guy,” (interview, 5/20/11) did not participate much verbally (field notes, 12/2/10), and focused on the structures and deadlines Ms. Cook provided (field notes, 12/17/10).

Below, I provide a detailed look at my data timelines as well as the data collected on each case study student (Tables 1.2, 1.3, and 1.4). I organized the timelines first by curricular units and then marked the data I had for each of my three case study students. The key for the codes in the data timetable is below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Key to Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>whole class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>small group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WK</td>
<td>Worksheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR</td>
<td>draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PrWk</td>
<td>peer worksheet commenting on draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>counter argument practice writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.ppt</td>
<td>PowerPoint slides</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first row on each data timeline (Table 1.2, Table 1.3, & Table 1.4) indicates verbal data (moments when the case study student spoke) and the second row on each table
indicates written data (written by the case study student or written comments about the
student’s written draft). In each column, markings indicate the specific data collected within
the verbal and/or written column. In both Table 1.2 and 1.3, I did student interviews rather
than observe the class; thereby, the dates of the unit and the dates of interviews are not
always a match.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade 9</th>
<th>Unit 1</th>
<th>12/1</th>
<th>12/2</th>
<th>12/6</th>
<th>12/7</th>
<th>12/9</th>
<th>12/10</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>12/14</th>
<th>12/15</th>
<th>12/16</th>
<th>12/17</th>
<th>1/3</th>
<th>1/5</th>
<th>1/6</th>
<th>1/7</th>
<th>1/12</th>
<th>1/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kane</td>
<td></td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>INT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kane's written texts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td></td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>INT</td>
<td>INT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue's written texts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob's written texts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.2  *All Tracer Students' Unit One: Work or Detroit Industry: Man and Machine.* 12/1/10-1/7/11
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade 9</th>
<th>Unit 2 2011</th>
<th>Unit 3 2011</th>
<th>Unit 4 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kane</td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>SG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kane’s written texts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DR PrWk Final essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>WC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue’s written texts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Final essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>WC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob’s written texts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.3  *All Tracer Students’ Units Two-Four. 1/18/11-5/20/11*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kane</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>INT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kane’s written texts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X DR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final essay .ppt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>INT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue’s written texts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X DR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final essay .ppt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bob</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>INT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob’s written texts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X DR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final essay .ppt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.4 All Tracer Students’ Final Unit: Solution to Poverty. 5/7/12-5/25/12
**Data Analysis**

The data analysis consisted of five steps:

1. I created data timelines for all observed dates. First, I made a general timeline of dates observed and data collected on that date. Next, I then divided the observations by curricular unit. Then, I recorded the types of data collected on each day for each of the four case study students.

2. I created an instructional unit chain (cf., VanDerHeide & Newell, 2013) for each observed unit. The instructional unit chains represent the curricular flow as well as provide a synopsis per class session.

3. I noted literacy events occurring within each session of the two focal units and made notes. I then selected typical and telling events (Mitchell, 1984). These events are the focus of the student narratives in this dissertation.

4. Using a micro-ethnographic discourse analysis (Bloome et al., 2005), I created transcriptions to represent typical and telling events. Some events were full class instructional conversations and others were conversations from peer review work time. For all, I parsed the talk into message units (Green & Wallat, 1981).

5. I triangulated multiple data sources. While I analyzed telling and typical events, I reviewed the written products (students’ in-progress/final class essays and teacher’s written assignment sheets) used and/or referenced during the event(s). I also indexed the teacher’s and case study students’ interviews, noting reoccurring patterns reported. As I analyzed the typical and telling events, I returned to the
indices to contextualize my understanding. I transcribed moments of talk pertinent to the typical and telling events.

Although my analytical steps may appear linear, they were recursive.

**Research Questions**

In an ethnographic study such as this one, the purpose of the research questions is to guide the inquiry (cf., Hammersly & Atkinson, 1983). In this dissertation, I have four main research questions:

1. How do teachers and students interactionally construct a manifest pedagogy\(^1\) for the teaching and learning of argumentation and argumentative writing?

2. How do teachers and students interactionally construct a deep understanding of academic content (in this case, a deeper understanding of humanities) through the teaching and learning of argumentation and argumentative writing?

3. What social identities and social relationships are constructed, over time, during the teaching and learning of argumentation and argumentative writing?

4. What are the habits of mind that students take up, acquire, and employ as they engage in the instructional activities and classroom interactions associated with the teaching and learning of argumentation and argumentative writing?

---

\(^1\) By “interactionally construct a manifest pedagogy” I foreground how students and students and their teachers engage in a live, organic construction of pedagogy: in essence, how they work together to create the evolving pedagogy for argumentation and argumentative writing in their classroom space. I foreground their interactions by paying attention to their talk and how they act and react to one another.
Limitations of the Study

My case study participants do not represent other high school students, schools, or teachers. While there may be instructional moves and curricular decisions that teachers can take from this study, the findings themselves are not generalizable. Further, the affordance and limitation of time is a significant aspect to keep in mind; the focal teacher had two years to create understanding and build relationships across and with text, yet many teachers are constrained to one unit or one school year when teaching argumentation and argumentative writing.

Definitions of Key Terms

Argumentation

*Argumentation* is a process: a set of social relationships mediated by text. Leaning heavily on the negotiated and local constructions in Flower et al. (2000), I consider argumentation a social process that promotes interaction, dialogue, and engagement (hooks, 2010).

As I conceptualize it, within schools argumentation involves traditional notions of text and literacy (reading and writing) yet is more complex. As a process, argumentation includes the ways in which students and teachers foreground and grapple with argument(s), interact with one another across varying social relationships, and work together as co-constructors of knowledge, building ideas together. Additionally, as indicated in the observed classroom, argumentation is not between a single reader and a single text; rather, social relationships and intertextuality are co-constructed and shape the writers and the essays.
Argumentative Writing

As I operationalize it, argumentative writing is a formal written product consisting of numerous argumentative elements (i.e., claim, warrant, evidence, counter-argument, & rebuttal). Argumentative writing is a product of the process of argumentation. Although argumentative writing is not the only production mode of argumentation, it is typically the one foregrounded in schools when argumentation is taught.

Literacy

My understanding of literacy is consistent with a New Literacy Studies approach, foregrounding literacy as a social practice (Heath, 1983; Street, 1984; Gee, 1989). Specifically, I draw on Street’s (1984) notion of autonomous literacy and ideological literacies. An autonomous view of literacy is constraining and restrictive; it is conceptualized as a one-size-fits-all, a priori approach to reading and writing that excludes those who do not meet expectations. An ideological view of literacies begins with an expansion of what is considered literacy. What one accounts or recognizes as literacies is dependent upon the social contexts of the user and the situation. An ideological view also centers individuals and their use of text instead of an unexamined text. Agency is within the individual and various talents are honored.

Literacy events, then, are visible interactive classroom practices surrounding text (Barton & Hamilton, 2000; Heath, 1983). In this dissertation I do not often use the term literacy event, nor do I foreground literacy practices; rather, I use typical and telling events (Mitchell, 1984) to focus my analysis. Regardless, what is salient is that my use
of the word *event* stems from my knowledge of literacy events and my conceptions of ideological literacies.

**Text**

Drawing heavily from a social notion of text, my definition of *text* aligns with the following:

A text is a product of textualizing . . . . The result of the textualizing experience can be a set of words, signs, representations, etc. But it might be other forms and products not usually associated with texts: architecture, rock formations, the stars in the sky, the wind, the ocean, emotion – these can all be texts, but their being texts depends on what people do. (Bloome & Egan-Robertson, 1993, p. 311)
Chapter 2

Review of Related Literature

The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) results reveal that students struggle when writing persuasive or argumentative essays (Graham & Perin, 2007; McCann, 1989) and the writing curricula at varying levels of schooling portray a lack of explicit teaching or time to process argumentation (Applebee & Langer, 2006; Graham & Perin, 2007; McCann, 1989; Newell et al., 2009). Students need to understand that argumentation surrounds them, and not in the manner which is displayed on American talk shows; however, such exposure to argumentation is likely not occurring in schools (Graff, 2000; Hollihan & Baaske, 2005). Graff (2000) stated, “I would bet that most American students go through their entire high school and college careers without ever witnessing a debate between any of their teachers, and debates among classmates are probably only slightly more frequent” (p. 58). The academy tends to stay separated by discipline and shelter students from any debate or argument; however, students need models of and practice with argumentation (Graff, 2000). The format behind argumentation allows students to understand that they can and should have an opinion, a claim, and they should back it up with evidence if they want to be truly understood and respected. Additionally, “nearly one third of high school graduates are not ready for the rigors of academic writing” (Newell et al., 2009, p. 2). Whether students lack
knowledge, models, or teachers do not offer instruction, argumentation and argumentative writing, when schooled, are deficient (Crowhurst, 1996; Graff, 2000; Wilkinson, 1996).

When standardized assessments tell a dire tale of students who lack knowledge the word “crisis” is tossed around, and committees are formed to produce solutions. However, orienting a research study to addressing a “crisis” can have the effect of flattening the conception of the field by focusing too much on addressing the problem and not problematizing how the “crisis” was representationally generated. Issues surrounding writing and literacy are complex, layered, and messy (cf., Carter, 2006; hooks, 1994); thus, this review of research eschews a “crisis” oriented review of research in favor of a review of research that maintains the complex, layered and messy nature of the field. As such, this review of research is organized around “thickening” (as opposed to flattening) the concept of argumentative writing.

I begin by presenting what might be considered a more traditionally oriented review of research focusing on major trends discussing definitions of argumentative writing. Then, I situate my dissertation within the research.

A Traditionally Oriented Review of Research on Argumentation and Argumentative Writing

Readers can find four basic kinds of scholarship on argumentation: scholarship that focuses on different models and definitions (Barnet & Beaudau, 2011; Lunsford, Ruszkiewicz, & Walters, 2010; Newell, Beach, Smith, & VanDerHeide, 2011; Toulmin, 1958), scholarship that focuses on evaluating students’ argumentative essays (Applebee,
Langer, & Mullis, 1986; McCann, 1989), scholarship that focuses on curricular needs (Graff, 2000; Kuhn, 2005; Langer & Applebee, 1987; Yeh, 1998a), and scholarship that focuses on teaching and approaches for argumentative writing (Anderson, Nguyen-Jahiel, McNurlen, Archodidou, Kim, Reznitskaya, Tillmanns, & Gilbert, 2001; Felton & Herko, 2004; Flower, Long, & Higgens, 2000; Gage, 1996; Hillocks, 2011; Lunsford et al., 2010; Lunsford, 2002), with recent standards (The Common Core State Standards) insisting upon how argumentation and argumentative writing should be taken up in high school classrooms (National Governors, 2010). Throughout this chapter, I made an effort to maintain the verbiage of scholars; by this I mean that if a scholar uses the term “argument” rather than argumentation or argumentative writing, I maintain that same use.

**Models of Argumentation and Argumentative Writing**

The first category of scholarship focuses on structural models of argumentation. Such scholarship deals with form and function, giving a name to a type of argument, explaining how it should look in writing, and then offering uses and audiences for said essay. In so doing, various definitions for argument emerge, working to detail what argument is and what it is not.

Andrews (2010), in considering argumentation at the higher education level, situated argument early within his text: “Most argument would hope to be persuasive, but not all persuasion is argumentative” (p. 39). Andrews built on Aristotle’s notion of rhetoric as “the art of persuasion” (p. 36), yet defines persuasion as an effect of an approach while argument and argumentation “describe the interventions and dialogues that make up human transactions” (p. 36). Hollihan and Baaske (2005) situate argument
as one of two “senses”: 1.) “Claims that people make,” and 2.) “Types of interactions in which people engage” (p. 6). They also consider purposes for argument within individual decision making and democratic decision making, making sure to connect argumentation with ethics and values (Hoolihan & Baaske). Hoolihan and Baaske also queried about argumentation and narrative: if people innately tell stories and there are arguments within stories, why have a separate genre for argumentation? Such questions resonate with Thomas Newkirk’s current work, as he situates “everything’s a narrative” and looks carefully at writerly moves (Newkirk, 2009). Hoolihan and Baaske also connect argument with human interactions:

Disagreements are typically expressed through arguments, and people argue to achieve at least three objectives in interpersonal interactions. First, people argue to make decisions . . . . Second, arguments provide a means to manage interpersonal conflicts and to preserve the possibility of successful and rewarding future social interactions. . . . Third, arguments are often about power in human relationships. (Hoolihan and Baaske, 2005, p. 277)

As people are innately social, argument (as situated by Hoolihan and Baaske), has a natural place within school; however, because of the conflictual nature of various argument types, argument and argumentation may not receive the attention called for in scholarship.

The types of argument recurrent in methods books include moves across formal argument (Barnet & Bedau, 2011), classical rhetoric (Lunsford et al., 2010), the Toulmin model (Toulmin 1958, 2001) Rogerian style (Lunsford et al., 2010), forensic arguments
(Hillocks, 2011) and arguments of fact, judgment, or policy (Hillocks, 2011). This scholarship emphasizes and names the needed argumentative elements per argument type and offers templates for how to write such an argumentative essay. In addition to the structural elements, scholars provide historical explanations for various types of argument (Lunsford et al., 2010) and strategies teachers may use when explaining these type of argument to students (Hillocks, 2011).

This scholarship on models of argumentative essays may be useful to teachers and students alike when tyring to define and understand argument. This scholarship may be particularly useful when seeking terminology to name parts of an argumentative essay. This scholarship is also helpful when looking for written models across argument types, particularly if teachers aim to teach students how to read argument as well as write argumentative essays.

**Evaluating Students’ Writing**

A second thread of scholarship related to argumentative writing examines evaluations of students’ performance on written essays. Within classrooms, how to evaluate essays varies among those who are influenced by process approaches (Atwell, 1998; Calkins, 1986; Emig, 1971; Graves, 1983) and those who are influenced by product emphasis (Applebee, 1981; Hillocks, 2002; Hillocks, 2005). With regard to assessing students’ written arguments specifically, this specific thread of evaluation scholarship breaks into two main sub-categories: writing for standardized assessments and writing in classrooms.
Writing for standardized assessments. Both the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) and ACT testing show general weakness in student writing of persuasive/argumentative essays (Applebee et al., 1986; Crowhurst, 1996; McCann, 1989; National Center for Education Statistics, 2012; Newell et al., 2009; Yeh, 1998a). Essays are evaluated according to how and if a writer uses a priori elements to meet his/her goals.

Writing in classrooms. As is the case when standardized writing assessments are evaluated, the dominating evaluation method for students’ writing in classrooms focuses on how/if students implement a priori elements of writing such as the Toulmin elements (i.e., claim, warrant, data, backing) (McCann, 1989; Toulmin, 1958).

McCann, taking up Toulmin’s elements, studied ninety-five students’ argumentative essays over three grade levels (6th, 9th, and 12th). McCann discovered that the students’ use of data and warrants was weak across the grades, yet “making claims and stating propositions” (McCann, 1989, p. 70) was strong overall. At all levels, students knew about argumentation, yet their lack of certain elements made a strong call for more instruction.

Newell, Marks, VanDerHeide, Hirvela, Sholl, Wynhoff Olsen, and Bradley (2012) studied argumentative writing in high school ELA classrooms. Using a standard measure to assess student writing across thirteen classrooms, they based their assessment on the Toulmin (1958) elements: claim, evidence, warrant, counter-argument, and rebuttal, and leaned on McCann’s (1989) work to develop a scoring guide. As indicated in the scoring guide, Newell at al. evaluated each element on a scale from 0-3, with
minimal consideration for coherence across the elements (i.e. Were counter-arguments written with regard to claim?). The scoring rubric used ignored basic conventions: grammar, spelling, and sentence style unless errors got in the way of understanding an essay. As Newell and his research team continued their study, their assessing methods evolved into a more nuanced process (Newell et al., 2013) yet still relied on analytic essay scoring. It is significant to note that essay scoring was only one aspect of the wider study.

With a dominant focus on structural elements within argumentative writing, there are questions on what it means to evaluate structure. How does one evaluate such use (Newell et al., 2012)? Is it enough to just look to see if Toulmin elements are used? How does one ensure how writers have defined or contextualized the elements (Lunsford, 2002)? Is it appropriate to utilizes rubrics a particular state uses for the standardized writing assessment and import into the classroom (Hillocks, 2005)? Is it significant to consider how students build relationships across argumentative elements (Yeh, 1998b)? If an evaluator uses Toulmin elements to assess students’ arguments, what is the relationship between what students write and how they were taught? Need there be one?

Regardless of how teachers and scholars choose to or are required to evaluate student writing, Huot and Williamson (2009) offer a reminder: “The simple truth of educational assessment is that what we choose to evaluate in our students’ performances will determine what they attend to in their approach to learning” (p. 334). Assessment, instruction, and learning are linked; as a result, the curricular needs toward argumentative writing both inform the field and impact how students take up argumentation in schools.
Curricular Needs for Argumentation and Argumentative Writing

Notions of argumentation and argumentative writing become challenged and nuanced when framed within classroom education. Thus, a third thread of scholarship focuses on curricular needs for teaching argumentation and argumentative writing. Scholars insist that schools need to offer students more opportunity to think and participate in written and oral argument (Felton & Herko, 2004; Graff, 2000; Langer and Applebee, 1987; Reznitskaya et al., 2007), yet why students should need exposure to argumentation and write argumentative essays is debatable and varies across scholarship.

One prominent educational purpose for teaching argumentative writing is teaching critical thinking (Hillocks, 2011), a significant skill impacting the success of high school students (Graff, 2000; Kuhn, 2005; Newell et al., 2012). Another is a connection to real-world experiences to the classroom because students can research and practice writing for specific audiences (Miller & Charney, 2008; Yeh, 1998a). Argument may also be taught for exploration (Lunsford et al., 2010), exposure (Yeh, 1998a), decision-making (Lunsford et al., 2010), meditation (Lunsford et al., 2010), and knowledge building (Kuhn, 2005).

Reznitskaya, Anderson, and Kuo (2007) maintain that teaching argumentation helps students utilize argument in their written work (Felton & Herko, 2004), something which NAEP studies have shown to be a struggle for most students at varying grade levels. Kuhn explains benefits of participating in argumentative discourse, oral and written as follows:
Argumentative discourse provides the individual with exposure to others’ ideas and perspectives. It also aids in the expression and development of one’s own ideas . . . . Engaging in argumentative discourse is thought to enhance individual thinking competencies by forcing normally covert, meta-level questions . . . out into the open. (Kuhn, 2005, pp. 114-5)

Additionally, Graff (2000) stated, “Argumentation is necessarily central to the life of the mind. If there is a common language underlying the babble of academic specializations and cultural differences, argumentation is it” (p. 64). Allowing students moments of complex interaction will heighten their understanding of how to make use of various perspectives.

Another purpose is that argumentation offers an approach to reasoning (Barnet & Bedau, 2011), a topic that is complicated when scholars study what counts as reasonable in particular classrooms (Wynhoff Olsen, Ryu, & Bloome, 2013). On a related topic, Reznitskaya et al.’s (2007) evidence from a quasi-experimental design insisted that teaching argumentation was needed because argumentation helps people “resolve controversies” (Reznitskaya et al., 2007, p. 450) and is found throughout people's lives. In like fashion, Lunsford and Ruszkiewicz (2001) adhere to the premise that “everything’s an argument”—argumentation is a part of human life, not just in writing. Considering the various perspectives within arguments will not only help students in school, but will help them with interpersonal communication across life experiences (Lunsford & Ruszkiewicz, 2001).
Throughout their study on writing within secondary school curriculum, Langer and Applebee (1987) used a case-study approach to observe and document work across disciplines. According to Langer and Applebee, “The greatest variety of reasoning operations occurred during essay writing, suggesting that this type of activity provided time for students to think most flexibly as they developed their ideas” (1987, p. 100). The import of writing, and writing across disciplines (Kuhn, 2005; Yeh, 1998), are both factors when considering argumentation and argumentative writing. Yeh (1998) shared that writing argumentation allows students to learn how to write for realistic purposes and audiences; Yeh also noted that explicit teaching (using heuristics) was helpful with minority students. In addition, Yeh cited Toulmin and specifically shared the following: “Toulmin recognized that what counts as reasons and connectors varies from discipline to discipline but he argued that well-formed arguments have the same basic components” (p. 1998, p. 59). As Yeh analyzed the development of claims and support throughout his study, Toulmin's model was a strong reminder that the argumentation structure can be utilized in all classes, quite a help for struggling writers who need models and consistency.

**Teaching Approaches for Argumentative Writing**

Specific teaching approaches for argumentative writing make use of the aforementioned models and structures of argument (i.e., formal arguments and arguments of policy), often with a prescribed approach or intervention model. In this review, I describe a range of interventions or considerations, with an attempt to not do much duplication of scholars.
Felton and Herko (2004) focused their work on connections between oral talk and written arguments with high school students, bridging the two modes with a writing workshop in their study of thirty-six students. In their study, Felton and Herko found that high school writers struggled in creating elaborated written arguments; however, when engaging in class discussions or debates, students made use of counter arguments, rebuttals, and engaged with one another in rich dialogue (Felton & Herko, 2004). As an intervention, Felton and Herko made transparent the structure of argument: position, claim, warrant, and data through the use of a direct lesson within a writer’s workshop. Students were then given time to research topics and later were assigned a position; however, they were not expected to work on their own or even develop counterarguments without help. In small groups, students wrote and debated. After allowing students time to discuss and critique one another’s oral debates, the written accounts of the debate were stronger. The time to talk with peers gave students counterarguments and helped them understand that qualifying a position does not mean the position is weak (Felton & Herko). Through a strategic orchestration of moves, Felton and Herko modeled for students how to develop an understanding of topic as well as how to engage with others to create an argument.

Graff and Birkenstein’s (2010) work They say, I say offers students templates to use when learning to write arguments and commentary on how to enter academic writing. An example of how to enter an academic conversation that one agrees with follows: “Those unfamiliar with this school of thought may be interested to know that it basically boils down to ______.” Taking on possible criticism for this format, Graff and
Birkenstein write, “The trouble is that many students will never learn on their own to make the key intellectual moves that our templates represent . . . . Consequently, we believe, students need to see these moves represented in the explicit ways that the templates provide” (2010, p. xxii). Focused on college writing, Graff and Birkenstein even devote a few chapters to rhetorical moves in the social sciences versus rhetorical moves in the sciences.

Hillocks (2011) made a similar move, yet addressed secondary teachers (grades 6-12) as his audience. In his book *Teaching Argument Writing, grades 6-12*, Hillocks directs teachers on how to help students write and evaluate arguments. In the book, Hillocks references personal teaching experiences, setting the stage for a teacher-friendly book replete with reproducible worksheets, appendices, and a study guide to encourage teacher collaboration. This book offers teachers a beginning point to understanding argument as it is typically taken up in schools.

Leaning on several of Hillocks’ works, McCann’s (2010) wrote a brief yet direct article for classroom teachers to use and consider when approaching secondary students with argumentation and argumentative writing. Offering his own experiences as a teacher, McCann asserted that secondary students are ready for the critical tasks within argumentation, yet they need two particular elements: 1.) Students need to “grapple with the kind of problems that resonate with them and that immerse them in the process of drawing conclusions”, and 2.) “The process of grappling with problems should include extended opportunities for students to interact with each other in purposeful ways” (McCann, 2010, p. 34). McCann provided a lesson example to illustrate how teachers
can provide powerful gateway activities, yet this particular lesson is not meant as an intervention; rather, McCann’s work drives home the notion that secondary students are capable. With frequent exposure and engaging tasks, their work with argumentation will deepen.

Beach and Doerr-Stevens (2009) offer on-line role playing activities as a way for students to engage with arguments. In so doing, they recognize a “rhetoric of significance” (p. 462) that students need to engage with school work, particularly with creating arguments, claiming that “students are more likely to perceive their writing as significant when they know that their arguments may lead to change or transformation in the status quo—that voicing their opinions may actually influence people’s beliefs, resulting in changes in the status quo” (Beach & Doerr-Stevens, 2009, p. 462). Through the use of online role-playing, a practice with which many students are familiar, students not only take on pertinent issues, but also connect with others and engage across modes. It is this collaborative creating and collaboratively working through various perspectives that helps students write and think about arguments.

One of the most well-known interventions within argument literature is collaborative reasoning (CR). CR is a specific teaching approach designed for teachers to offer students’ experiences in peer groups through a focus on dialogue and argument stratagems. CR promotes depth of student thinking through peer discussions rather than a traditional initiate-respond-evaluate (IRE) approach led by teachers (Anderson et al., 2001; Clark, Anderson, Kuo, Kim, Archodidou, & Nguyen-Jahiel, 2003). “The goal of CR is to promote students’ abilities to engage in reasoned argumentation” (Clark et al.,
Though students need “adequate time to think about their responses and grow accustomed to extended participation” (Clark et al., 2003, p. 184), when peers use and hear others using argument stratagems, the use of stratagems “snowballs” (Anderson et al., 2001). Anderson and colleagues assert that stratagems, “recurrent patterns,” (Anderson et al., 2001, p. 2) build an argument schema and organize thirteen stratagems into the following functions: “(a) managing the participation of classmates, (b) positioning in relation to a classmate’s argument, (c) acknowledging uncertainty, (d) extending the story world, (e) making arguments explicit, and (f) supporting arguments with evidence” (Anderson et al., 2001, p. 4).

Stratagems, then, are similar to habits mind, but none of the stratagems considered how students gain a deeper understanding of content; rather, they helped student engage in argumentation and argumentative writing through components in the Toulmin model. Framing lessons and units around replicating a context-independent structure, such as the Toulmin model, occurs widely in classrooms (Hillocks, 2011; Fulkerson, 1996; Newell et. Al, 2009) without regard to context or social relationships (Wynhoff Olsen et al., 2013).

**Contextualized approaches and considerations.** Three pieces of scholarship (Gage, 1996; Flower et al., 2000; Lunsford, 2002) situate argumentation as more contextualized. While all three scholars complexify notions of argument outside a realm of direct pedagogy or intervention models, it is significant to note that Flower’s work was done within a community center and Gage’s and Lunsford’s research was at the college
level. It is also significant that the timing of this work occurred across two previous decades without much interconnectedness or uptake in contextualized ways.

Flower et al. offer an analysis of human activity rather than artifacts in their book, *Learning to Rival* (Flower et al., 2000). Situating students as agentive and intelligent, Flower and colleagues showcase students’ work and learning as shared and negotiated. As Flower et al. use the term rival rather than argue, they set the tone that “wrestling with ideas” (Flower et al., 2000, p. 50) allows students to achieve negotiated meanings so they may “entertain multiple voices and shaping forces” (Flower et al., 2000, p. 75). The use of argument or rivaling is not, then, to win or proclaim one’s self as “right.”

With the frame of rivaling, Flower et al. support the students as thinkers and creators of knowledge. Students do not construct meaning in the same way nor is there one way to argue or rival; rather, Flower et al. helps us think through practices students construct while in the process of rivaling. While their work was situated in community centers, Flower et al. promote a “reflective self-consciousness . . . that lets students adapt in the best sense of liberal learning” (2000, p. 96).

In discussions surrounding teaching students to understand rivaling, Flower et al.’s key ideas include fluidity, pluralism, and a multivoiced experience; in short, students need and deserve to work with sensitive, meaningful topics with which they need to engage and understand as well make use of multiple perspectives. Flower et al. suggest that teachers explicitly teach students strategies of argumentation, yet not limit them to reproduce given structures.
In asking students to create rival hypotheses, we ask them to question the authority of assigned texts, to take established writers and thinkers to task . . . . Some students may just need to see that analysis is not equivalent to an attack, but in fact is a constructive move that builds on and pays homage to others’ ideas.

(Flower et al., 2000, p. 133)

This notion of explicit teaching with regard to the notion of rivaling parallels Gage’s (1996) call for clarity with and for teacher when considering how/what to teach:

Although to many *argument* is a useful and necessary term, to others it just isn’t nice . . . . Clearly, a distinction is in order . . . . Without such clarity, not only may students misperceive the task of learning to write arguments, but teachers and specialists in composition theory can make claims about one kind of argument that only really apply to another. (Gage, 1996, p. 4)

Gage continued by situating argumentative writing as “a process of inquiry” (p. 8) that requires “some sort of method of assessing reasons” (1996, p. 8). Having students attend to the topics and reasoning processes rather than a replication of a model “attempts to merge self-conscious classroom writing with what happens intuitively and spontaneously in argumentative situations outside classroom contexts” (Gage, 1996, pp. 12-13). This movement in and out of classroom contexts, albeit at the college level, makes Flower’s and Gage’s work a powerful pair of scholarship to think through. Both composition theorists suggest that argumentative and rivaling are complex notions guided by rules or accepted models rather than constrained by them. Indeed, both Gage and Flower seek to
situate students within the context of written composition yet give them agency and skills that will help them in out-of-school contexts as well.

Lunsford’s (2002) study also offers a complication to context-indepenent notions of teaching argument. Lunsford traced how classroom contexts impact students’ and teachers’ understandings of a Toulmin model at the college level. Through a reliance on interactions, Lunsford detailed how course instructors adapted Toulmin’s original model for written argumentation, noting that the “adaptations complicated the model rather than simplifying it. These adaptations also complicated any notion that the model could be treated as a fill-in-the-blank formula” (Lunsford, 2002, pp. 159-160). Lunsford’s findings also revealed that, “Participants in a community of practice will negotiate over any reified artifact, any writing model, as they attempt to use it” (p. 162). Argumentation via the Toulmin model, then, will be complicated when put to use in the classroom. It is this notion of complexity that this dissertation study aims to continue. Lunsford’s study, although significant to the field, is a one-of that needs further investigation.

Critiques

Fulkerson’s work offered a critique on how the Toulmin model was being used in college classrooms, reporting to scholars and teachers that the model’s “attractive potential” was not without flaws; rather, Fulkerson named the Toulmin model a “generative tool” to use analytically rather than a model to replicate: “That is, analysis of how actual arguments operate, using the model, might lead students to make important connections between ideas when constructing their own elaborated arguments”
(Fulkerson, 1996, p. 58). Fulkerson also made a call for more empirical research on how teachers were using Toulmin’s model.

Another form of critique or caution emerged from Nystrand and Graff’s (2001) work. Nystrand and Graff studied six 7th grade writers as they produced “‘hybrid’ texts—argumentative theses followed but not always supported by lists of facts” (p. 479). In so doing, their study cautions teachers to pay careful attention to not only instructional activities within a process of writing, but also to various competing factors that “sabotage” argument. Moments of talk as teachers instruct, task description, and comments written on essays all influence and play a role in how students take up argument in schools. Attending to one’s epistemological beliefs about argument is as critical as which instructional activities to offer students. The environment or ecology of a classroom is critical to how teachers and students engage with one another and how students produce written argument (Nystrand & Graff).

**Conclusion**

The extant research on argumentative writing frames notions and models of argumentation as significant for students’ educative aims, yet for the most part, situates argumentative writing as a skill rather than a process. While critiques exist (Fulkerson, 1996; Nystrand & Graff, 2001) pedagogical books and the current Common Core State Standards offer teachers ways to think about how arguments are structured, particularly with the Toulmin model. In a time when critical thinking is sought after and the Core Standards are being implemented, there is still a lack of attention to the processes and social relationships influencing the creation of argumentative essays. Outside of
pedagogical books, the research on the teaching and learning of argumentative writing has been of relatively short duration—typically a month or a unit of study—and has not provided an in-depth examination of what is enacted within the ecologies of classrooms over time (with exception to Nystrand and Graff). Rather, studies have taken argument to school by studying teachers’ instructional plans to analyze what teachers presumed to accomplish rather than what was enacted and lived in the classroom among teachers and students. It is also atypical for researchers to study how teachers and students construct definition of argumentation and argumentative writing or how teachers and students construct a manifest pedagogy.

With my study, I offer more than a structure and its components, what students find hard or what students “cannot” do until a particular age/grade; instead, I focus on the social identities and social relationships constructed over time during the teaching and learning of argumentation and argumentative writing. This dissertation presents an in-depth look at argumentation as a social and relational process, paying attention to the habits of mind students take up, acquire, and employ. In the focal classroom, teachers and students interactionally construct a deep understanding of academic content over time.

In this dissertation, I argue that situating argumentation as a social and relational process allows teachers to contextualize learning opportunities for their students and makes space for students to engage deeply in argumentation and argumentative writing. Through this case study, I offer insights into what argumentation can be when experienced organically in a high school classroom such as Ms. Cook’s. Rather than
reify a particular structure, offer an intervention, or attend directly to the Common Core State Standards, my focus is to represent what students and teachers are constructing together with argumentation and in the production of argumentative writing.
Chapter 3
Methodology

My methodology is guided by three guiding principles derived from microethnographic discourse analysis (Bloome et al., 2005). The first principle is that knowledge is socially constructed through language (Gergen, 2001). Classrooms are public and social, and the use of language (oral and written) makes visible the thinking and understanding of the group. The second principle is that people act and react to one another (Volosinov, 1973). These actions and reactions shape the language used (or silenced) and people’s identities in a given situation and context. As social beings, we define one another and this defining is done across people rather than within an individual. Identities are social, layered, shifting, and co-constructed (Gee, 2001; Sfard & Prusak, 2005). The third principle is that relationships are inherent (Gergen, 2001).

When looking at students and teachers in a classroom context, how they collaborate and/or resist one another influences who they are as learners as well as the work they produce (or not) (Wortham, 2006).

I used these principles to guide my analysis and answer the following four research questions:
(1) How do teachers and students interactionally construct a manifest pedagogy for the teaching and learning argumentation and argumentative writing?

(2) How do teachers and students interactionally construct a deep understanding of academic content (in this case, a deeper understanding of humanities) through the teaching and learning of argumentation and argumentative writing?

(3) What social identities and social relationships are constructed, over time, during the teaching and learning of argumentation and argumentative writing?

(4) What are the habits of mind that students take up, acquire, and employ as they engage in the instructional activities and classroom interactions associated with the teaching and learning of argumentation and argumentative writing?

In this chapter, I first explain how I selected my research site and my experiences with the teacher. Secondly, I described the school contexts: the high school and the course: humanities 9 & 10. Next, I outlined the details of the study and how I collected my data. Then, I detail how I analyzed the data to answer my research questions.
Site Selection

I conducted longitudinal research for two years (AY 2011-2012 and AY 2012 to 2013) in an English language arts (ELA) classroom at Center High School (a pseudonym, as are all names and places in this dissertation)\(^2\). I had met the teacher, Ms. Cook, the previous winter 2010 during a teacher study group (she and I were both participants: she, as a classroom teacher, and I, as a first year doctoral student who previously taught high school ELA).

Ms. Cook had a local reputation of excellence and maintained relationships with professors at the local university. As a part of a pilot study on argumentative writing in high school classrooms, I observed Ms. Cook teach during the final weeks of the Spring 2010 term. When I selected a classroom site for the larger project, I solicited Ms. Cook’s participation because she and I had already begun building a relationship. Additionally, I was struck with her professionalism, her knowledge of the field, her willingness to welcome me to her classroom, and the time she took to talk with me after class and after school. Ms. Cook explicitly framed her instruction around Andrea Lunsford’s “Everything’s an Argument,” (Lunsford & Ruszkiewicz, 2001; Lunsford et al., 2010).

\(^2\) Data collected for this article are located within a larger dataset: a larger collaborative research project on argumentative writing in high school English language arts (ELA) classrooms, supported by the Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education, through Grant 305A100786 The Ohio State University (George Newell, principal investigator). The opinions expressed within this article are those of the author and do not represent views of the Institute or the U.S. Department of Education. I also gratefully acknowledge the support of CVEDA (The Center for Video, Ethnography, and Discourse Analysis) housed at The Ohio State University, within the School of Teaching and Learning.
School Contexts

In the following section, I provide descriptions of Center High School and the 9th and 10th grade ELA classes.

Center High School

Center is an urban, public high school in the Midwest of the United States with an average population of 773 students. In the 2010-2011 school Report Card, the overall student attendance averaged 95.8% with a graduation rate of 94.1%. Center’s student population is diverse. In 2010-2011, the high school student demographics were 48.3% White and 51.2% students of color; 52.9% of students were economically disadvantaged and 10.2% limited English proficient. The district reports that Center High School represents 30-35 nationalities and the high school offers English as a second language (ESL) classes.

Center High School, one of twenty-four high schools in its city school district, is categorized as a neighborhood school, yet it is simultaneously and primarily a choice-lottery option with its district. As a result, students enroll at Center High School after attending a variety of middle schools in the district. According to both district and state reports, families choose Center High School because of its reputation for academic excellence, particularly college preparation for all students. Center High School students may enroll in Advanced Placement (AP) courses and attend various community universities and colleges through post-secondary options. On standardized state tests, Center High School students typically score above the state requirement in all areas:

3 These statistics come from the official state department of education web site; the specific url is withheld to maintain confidentiality of the specific school.
reading, writing, math, science and social studies. The high school has been rated “Excellent” by the state department of education. Additionally, Center High School offers students a variety of clubs and organizations, as well as athletic, drama, and music options, options not offered in all of the district’s high schools. Center High School also boasts of community involvement. In a 2012-2013 report, Center High School had the largest active Parent Teacher Association (PTA) among its district high schools, with a membership of 335 people.

**Humanities Classroom: Grades 9 & 10**

During the 2010-2011 school year, I observed a 9th grade ELA class and during the 2011-2012 school year, I observed a 10th grade ELA class. Both classes were situated within the district’s humanities course, assigning two teachers to the students and allowing students to earn an English and social studies credit. Because my observations focused on the ELA portion of humanities, for the remainder of this dissertation, I will refer to the classroom as an ELA class.

During the 9th grade year, two white, female teachers (Ms. Cook and Ms. T) instructed the course. During the 10th grade year, Ms. Cook returned and taught with social studies colleague Mr. D. The course was taught in the same second floor room over the two school years. Each year the humanities teachers divided instructional time so each had fifty-five minutes to teach his/her discipline daily. There were a few sessions when Ms. Cook used extra minutes, yet the divide between English class and social studies class was made explicit as the teachers shifted places (Ms. Cook would stop talking, sit at the desk, or leave the classroom while Ms. T or Mr. D would claim the floor
vocally and by standing in front of the class). Students remained in the classroom without a break for the one hundred and ten consecutive minutes and were encouraged to think across disciplines, using one class to help them understand the next. The teachers simultaneously referenced historical time periods, coordinating lessons across eras as suggested by state standards for social studies. The teachers did not co-teach simultaneously until the final unit the 10th grade year.

The student roster for both years was larger than a single-taught course in the high school because students earned dual credits, one in English and one in history, and because two teachers were assigned to the course each year. Forty-three students (63% female, 37% male; 51% white students, 49% students of color) enrolled for 9th grade humanities and sixty-four students (61% female, 39% male; 49% white students, 51% students of color) enrolled for 10th grade humanities. Students self-selected their enrollment, for which there were no requirements other than grade level. Although the majority of the 10th grade students had taken 9th grade humanities class, twenty-one new students added the course and became part of my research during their 10th grade year.

Data Collection

During the 2010-2012 school years I collected various types of data. From observations, I created digital video recordings and audio recordings, wrote field notes, and collected written artifacts: students’ in-process and final products and teacher assignment sheets. I also had informal conversations with the teacher and students and held formal teacher and student interviews. Table 3.1 provides an overview of the data corpus.
Observations

I observed a total of 34 class sessions over two school years: grades 9 and 10. All specific observation dates were selected after talking with Ms. Cook about her lesson plans and the school’s academic calendar. Table 3.2 indicates the classroom level (grade 9 or 10), unit dates, and number of observed days within each unit.

Curriculum observed. In Table 3.2, the column titled “Anchor Texts” indicates the texts explicitly referred to during the instructional unit. Once an anchor text was introduced in a unit, it became an anchor for the duration of the two school years and not just its particular unit. These texts were “anchors” to class discussions, references students made in their summative assignments, and to their deepening understanding of argumentative writing. Assignments listed in the “Summative Assignment” column all included formal essay writing except for the Socratic Seminar in the third unit observed. As suggested with this curricular choice, Ms. Cook privileged argumentative writing as the mode for students’ production of argumentation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Video Recordings</th>
<th>Audio Recordings</th>
<th>Field notes</th>
<th>Student Interviews</th>
<th>Teacher Interviews</th>
<th>Student Work Samples</th>
<th>Teacher Artifacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ninth-grade (2010-2011)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenth-grade (2011-2012)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1 Data Corpus
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom level</th>
<th>Unit Dates</th>
<th>Number of Observed Days</th>
<th>Anchor Texts</th>
<th>Summative Assignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 9th grade ELA   | December 2010-January 2011  | 15                      | *Work* by Ford Maddox Brown  
*Detroit Industry: Man and Machine* by Diego Rivera  
*Bartleby, the Scrivener* by Herman Melville  
*The Communist Manifesto* (excerpt) by Karl Marx | Argumentative essay (1st major essay of the school year) |
| 9th grade ELA   | January-March 2011          | 4                       | *The Turn of the Screw* by Henry James                                       | Argumentative essay using an interpretive lens |
| 9th grade ELA   | March 2011-April 2011       | 4                       | *The Merchant of Venice* by William Shakespeare                              | Full class Socratic seminar         |
| 9th grade ELA   | May 2011                    | 1                       | *A Tale of Two Cities* by Charles Dickens, *& Balzac and the Little Chinese Seamstress* by Dai Sijie | Multigenre final project          |
| 10th grade ELA  | April 2012-May 2012         | 8                       | *Solutions for Poverty*: multiple and varied texts                            | Argumentative essay & multimodal class presentation for capstone |

Table 3.2 *Observation Summary*

*9th grade.* My first block of observations occurred December 2010-January 2011, during a seventeen-day unit on argumentative writing—the first unit resulting in a formal, argumentative essay (2-3 pages). I observed fifteen days of the unit and observations occurred between 8:15am-9:10am. My next block of observations occurred once a week for four weeks from January-February 2011. Ms. Cook was still teaching argumentation, but she added the use of interpretive lenses as a tool to help students support an abstract claim. The third block of observations occurred four times between March-April 2011. I
lessened the regularity of my observations during this unit because Ms. Cook had a student teacher leading the class, yet the student teacher was not a focal participant in my study. During this third block I observed students participate in a full class Socratic Seminar, taking up verbal argument instead of writing a summative essay. The final block of observations during the 9th grade year was one observation at the end of May, two weeks prior to the end of the school year. During this session students worked on their plans for their class final, a multi-genre project.

10th grade. During the 2011-2012 school year, I stayed connected with Ms. Cook via phone, email, and text, informally discussing how she was building on students’ knowledge of argumentative writing. She invited me to return to her classroom to observe during the second semester. Given scheduling and IRB constraints, I returned in May 2012 for a final set of observations during the final unit of the school year: a social justice capstone assignment for all 10th grade students in the district. I observed for ten days, almost all consecutive. It was during this final unit that Ms. Cook and Mr. D, the two humanities teachers, chose to merge their classes and work side by side. The majority of my observations occurred during the full one hundred and ten minutes. Students were encouraged to collaborate with their peers and write a co-authored argumentative essay offering a solution to poverty. The culminating activity was then a multimodal presentation sharing their arguments with the full class.

Video & audio recordings. During observations, I used one video camera and 2-3 audio recorders. I placed the video camera in the back left corner of the room, as that allowed me to capture the teacher and many of the students. Given the number of
students in the classroom, I could not fit all in the camera’s frame. I placed audio recorders in various spots throughout the classroom: in the middle of the students on an empty desk, at the front on the teacher’s desk, and at a back or side computer table. I always had at least one audio recorder and at times used up to three. On days when I knew that students would break into small groups, I used extra audio recorders to capture two-three small groups of students. A few students requested not to sit near or with a recorder, so I was careful to ask their permission and remind them that they could decline a recorder at any time. During observations, I sat in the back of the classroom for whole-class instruction.

I observed students at two levels of scale: (1) a global pan of the class, taking in all students; and (2) a case study approach following four students each school year. Ms. Cook helped me select students who were typically responsive in class and who varied slightly in academic performance or confidence in writing. During each school year, I selected four case study students, two males and two females (Kane, Bob, Sue, Jane, & Jasmine—Jasmine replaced Jane part way through the project). Although observations focused on four students at a time, doing so was a trope for capturing what was occurring in the classroom as a whole framed by student participation. For this dissertation, I present narratives for three of these case study students.

When students broke into small peer work groups or partners, I sat with one of the four case study students. I audio-recorded the students I was with and placed either the audio or video recorder with other case study students during peer work time. Sometimes

---

4 The rationale for not including the case study findings related to students Jane or Jasmine is that I did not have data for both focal units for either student; however, I did have data for both focal units for Kane, Sue, and Bob.
students asked me to help them with an idea or look over an essay; however, for the majority of the time, I was not a vocal part of conversation or instruction. I did talk with students both before and after class and during down-time, yet I tried not to insert myself or ask too many clarifying questions during instruction. I always responded when spoken to directly.

**Field notes.** Whether I was observing full class or small group work, I wrote field notes. I wrote my field notes for three purposes: one, to allow myself in-time reactions and early analysis; two, to offer a general understanding of the lessons and uptake/resistance as I saw and heard it; three, to serve as a back-up in case video and/or audio failed. To accomplish these purposes, I arranged my field notes in three categories: descriptive, theoretical, and methodological (see Table 3.3 for a snapshot of my field notes from my first observation).
Table 3.3  *Field notes Snapshot, 12.1.10*

The descriptive column is a jot list of seating arrangements and classroom layout, order of student responses, scripted bits and summaries of talk, activities, topics, texts, and participant structures. I also put in time markings (either classroom clock time or video recording time) to help me navigate my notes and video/audio later. In the theoretical column I recorded ideas for analytic lenses or ideas/topics from literature on classrooms. In the methodological section I wrote notes about the technical aspects of the observations and recordings (i.e., labeling which audio recorder was near speakers, if view was obstructed). I also wrote myself a “to do” list in this column (i.e., get the handout from Ms. Cook and review this spot in the audio because it may be of help later). For the majority of my field notes, I wrote in the descriptive and methodological columns
while observing and wrote ideas in the theoretical column while reviewing field notes post-observations.

**Written artifacts.** During observations, I also collected written artifacts: students’ written artifacts (in-process and final copies) as well as Ms. Cook’s assignment sheets. I collected students’ written artifacts\(^5\) when they turned work in to Ms. Cook. When Ms. Cook collected assignments (in-process drafts or peer review worksheets) and final essays, I scanned the written artifacts and made a file for each student on my computer. I also collected Ms. Cook’s assignment sheets. Typically, Ms. Cook gave me an assignment sheet when she handed them out to students; however, because she was sometimes short on copies, I collected the sheets when Ms. Cook was able to print one for me. I also saved several of Ms. Cook’s PowerPoint presentations on my flash drive and organized them in a file on my computer.

**Interviews**

Across the two years, I formally interviewed Ms. Cook [three times during the first year and once during the second year] and 4 case study students [twice during the first year and once during the second year] per year. On days that I observed, Ms. Cook and I conversed informally about daily conversations about lesson goals, students’ progress, her expectations or frustrations, or about school in general. She often asked about the larger research study and how our findings were informing classroom practice.

---

\(^5\) Student essay writing, as conceptualized in this dissertation, consists of thoughts recorded onto the page that result in a written product of varying length and complexity. The format and content are contingent on the author’s choices and understandings; often, the selected genre reflects the assignment. Random writing activities such as note making, doodling, question/answer response, or simply putting pen to paper do not fit my conception of student essay writing. I perceive writing as a physical artifact reflecting a student’s thoughts and goals; for the students in the classroom studied, the final unit essays are all such products.
I also shared my experiences as a high school English teacher. I did not record the majority of these conversations, yet they helped us build our relationship and stay connected. The conversations also helped me keep Ms. Cook’s thoughts foregrounded as I worked to gain a more emic perspective of the classroom instruction.

**Teacher interviews.** I had four formal, recorded interviews with Ms. Cook during the 2010-2012 school years. Table 3.4 indicates the dates when each teacher interview occurred.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level Taught</th>
<th>Ms. Cook</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade 9</td>
<td>February 15, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 9</td>
<td>February 22, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 9</td>
<td>May 24, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 10</td>
<td>June 3, 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3.4 Teacher Interview Dates*

**9th grade.** I interviewed Ms. Cook three times during the 2010-2011 school year. First, I interviewed Ms. Cook after the first argumentative writing unit. I used a set of prepared questions to start our conversation (see Appendix A). We focused on her epistemologies, definitions, and pedagogy surrounding argumentation and argumentative writing as well as to discuss student progress, comparing their essays to her expectations. Secondly, I interviewed Ms. Cook in the middle of the subsequent unit. During this unit, she was extending students’ understanding of argumentation by teaching them how to use an interpretive lens with which to support their arguments. During this second interview...
I again had prepared questions (see Appendix B), particularly focusing in on types of instruction and topics of study since the first observed unit: particularly, how argumentative writing was continually used and recontextualized. For the third interview, my prepared questions (see Appendix C) focused our conversation on her teaching goals for the year and how/if they were met.

**10th grade.** During the 2011-2012 school year, I interviewed Ms. Cook once. This interview was an extended session held outside of the school day. We discussed the arc of Ms. Cook’s teaching goals for the two school years, grades 9 and 10, her understanding of argumentation over time, and why she believes Lunsford’s notion “Everything’s an argument” is a helpful way to position students as thinkers and teach them how to write. We also reviewed video data together and talked about her teaching objectives and how her students developed as writers over time. I used the questions in Appendix D as a guide to develop these more specific questions regarding her two-year teaching process.

**Student interviews.** I had two formal interviews with case study students during the 2010-2011 school year and one formal interview during the 2011-2012 school year. Table 3.5 indicates specific dates when each case study student was interviewed. The following two sub sections provide specific detail on interview protocol.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Kane</th>
<th>Sue</th>
<th>Bob</th>
<th>Jane</th>
<th>Jasmine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade 9</td>
<td>1/13/11</td>
<td>1/12/11</td>
<td>1/12/11</td>
<td>1/12/11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 9</td>
<td>5/20/11</td>
<td>5/24/11</td>
<td>5/20/11</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/24/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 10</td>
<td>5/24/12</td>
<td>5/24/12</td>
<td>5/25/12</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/25/12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(with Hudson)

Table 3.5  Student Interview Dates

9th grade. At the end of their first unit on argumentative writing, three team members from the larger study and I interviewed the four case study students: Kane, Sue, Bob, & Jane. I personally interviewed Kane. All researchers used a prepared list of questions (see Appendix E) that asked students to share how they think about themselves as writers, how they define and understand argumentative writing, and how they wrote their summative class essays on the paintings *Work* or *Detroit Industry: Man and Machine* (both paintings were discussed in class). Each interview was audio recorded. Most lasted about twenty minutes and were held in the school lunchroom.

I then interviewed the students at the end of the school year. I again interviewed Kane, Bob, and Sue; however, I switched my focus from Jane to Jasmine. Several months prior, Jasmine, due to her verbal participation in class, became a case study student instead of Jane, a student who was not only less talkative in full-class sessions, but absent on several of my observations. For this second interview I again had a prepared list of questions (see Appendix F), this time focusing on the arc of the school year and how the students used argumentative writing over time. I asked students to define argumentative writing, explain their essays on *The Turn of the Screw*, and talk
about whole-class conversations as well as small group work sessions. Interviews were held in the back of the classroom and were about ten-twelve minutes in length.

10th grade. I interviewed case study students Kane, Bob, Sue, and Jasmine. All four of the case study students from grade 9 worked with a partner for their final 10th grade essay and project; however, Bob’s partner Hudson had interest in sharing his process and being interviewed. Hudson transferred to Center from a different district high school for his 10th grade year, and I interviewed Hudson and Bob together, in a joint interview.

I had a prepared list of questions (see Appendix G) and the students and I talked about how they used argumentative writing over two school years. We also talked specifically about their final essay and projects arguing for a solution to poverty. All interviews occurred at the end of the final unit, which coincided with the end of the second observed school year. Interviews were held in the hallway and in the school’s orchestra room. Interview times ranged from fifteen to fifty minutes.

Analysis

In this ethnographically informed study, I analyzed data at various levels of scale. In an effort to contextualize my understanding of the data, I used Spradley’s (1979) notion of funneling: whole to part, part to whole. This notion served as a continual reminder to look across my data, across levels of scale, and work to gain an emic understanding. I also used a micro-ethnographic discourse analysis, as it allowed me to look in detail at what was happening in the classroom, specifically surrounding language and interactions between Ms. Cook and her students and among peers. This section will
provide specific detail on how I analyzed the various data points to answer my research questions.

My analysis consisted of five steps:

1. Data timelines
2. Instructional unit chains
3. Typical and telling events
4. Transcriptions
5. Triangulation

Although my analytical steps may appear linear, they were recursive and complex.

Data Timelines

I organized the curriculum Ms. Cook offered during the 2010-2012 school years by date, recording the type of data I had from each class sessions. Next, I divided the observations into curricular units. This division allowed me to have a visual of the duration of the units, specific dates observed, the summative assignment required, and the anchor texts foregrounded during the unit. Then, for each of the four case study students, I recorded the types of data I collected on each individual each day.

Creating these timelines helped me understand the whole to part and part to whole relationships because I had visual displays of where data were located within a unit, a school year, and the two school years. Also, these various data timelines allowed me to analyze Ms. Cook’s curriculum at a broad level of scale. Specifically, these data timelines helped me answer research question #1: How do teachers and students
interactionally construct a manifest pedagogy for the teaching and learning of argumentation and argumentative writing?

**Instructional Unit Chains**

Using the data timelines divided by unit, I created an instructional unit chain (cf., VanDerHeide & Newell, 2013). Each unit chain consisted of multiple class sessions; the chains make visible the curricular moves across sessions through to the summative assignment. In the unit chains, each session is represented with a session number and date. For each session, I listed curricular topic(s), assignments used/referenced, and/or participant structures.

As a type of backward mapping (cf., Green & Meyer, 1991), I began with an analysis of the final summative assignment (i.e., the first written essay) for each unit. Then, I worked backwards by reviewing video and audio recordings for each class session. I made notes on the learning opportunities Ms. Cook offered as well as the various participant structures used each day. I was particularly interested in the interactions between Ms. Cook and the students as well as among student peer groups as they worked toward the final summative product. I consistently looked backward and forward to attempt to create a unit instructional chain that presented what was enacted in the classroom.

A sample of an instructional chain, from the first observed unit, is shown in Figure 3.1. As shown in Figure 3.1, the visual of the instructional chain offers the unit at-a-glance and is a way to maintain a broader context of the curricular flow. These instructional unit chains allowed me to not only see the flow of instructional moves, but
also to consider the level of coherence per unit and review the timing of assignments and instructional opportunities within and across units.
Figure 3.1 Instructional Unit Chain for the First Argumentative Essay, Grade
By creating both the data timeline and the instructional unit chains, I was able to make visible the data and interactions occurring during observed sessions at various levels of scale. Using both as maps, I was also able to look across data timelines for anchors at a broad level, zoom in for a closer view via the instructional unit chains, and then review conversations and written artifacts with a micro-ethnographic discourse analysis. Working across levels of scale helped me maintain the part to whole and whole to part relationships because I could locate the larger context for specific data points.

After looking across all the instructional unit chains as well as my data timelines, I selected in-depth study on two instructional units: the first observed unit during the ninth-grade year and the final instructional unit during the tenth-grade year. The rationale for this selection follows in the next section. Analysis of the instructional unit chains helped me answer my first two research questions:

(1) How do teachers and students interactionally construct a manifest pedagogy for the teaching and learning of argumentation and argumentative writing?

(2) How do teachers and students interactionally construct a deep understanding of academic content (in this case, a deeper understanding of humanities) through the teaching and learning of argumentation and argumentative writing?

**Typical and Telling Events**

To analyze these two instructional units further, I reviewed the class sessions making up each unit. Each class session contained literacy events (i.e., teachers and students analyzing a painting; students’ reviewing a peer’s essay). From those events, I focused on students’ participation within the typical and telling events. It is within the
typical and telling events that I focused my analysis.

I am defining a typical event based on Mitchell’s (1984) description of a typical event in which something occurs with frequency and is reoccurring (i.e., In the focal classroom, the teacher typically requests that students “unpack” their ideas). Typical events are a statistical reference and are so noted after analyzing over time. I am defining a telling event based on Mitchell’s description of a “‘telling’ case in which the particular circumstances surrounding a case, serve to make previously obscure theoretical relationships suddenly apparent” (Mitchell, 1984, p. 239). Telling events are often made visible by one participant’s need to repair another’s talk or actions (i.e., In this classroom, we don’t do that. That makes visible some norms, expectations, or underlying cultural values within the ecology of that classroom).

I used my field notes as I viewed video recordings and listened to audio recordings to create the instructional chains and to select the typical and telling events. I found my field notes particularly helpful because I could not capture all students and Ms. Cook in each recording. My field notes offer a reminder of my “in-time” understanding. Using the notes as a guide and the recordings as another viewing, I was able to consider the conversations and events through multiple layers. I also used the theoretical column of my field notes as a type of fidelity check. As I reviewed recordings, I jotted down analytical and theoretical ideas. I then crosschecked what I wrote as I did my first analysis of my field notes to see how my perspective and ideas changed or remained the same. This was helpful as I worked across instructional units, class sessions, and school years because I analyzed at different times; at first, I analyzed after seeing a lesson but as I reviewed, the lessons built upon one another and offered a different view.
After selecting the typical and telling events, I returned to my data timelines organized by case study student. I had data for both instructional units on Kane, Sue, and Bob, yet I did not have this same dataset for Jane or Jasmine. Given the data collected, I selected three case study students [Kane, Sue, and Bob] as the tracer students for my dissertation. In my upcoming student narratives (found in Chapter 4), I present typical and telling events and analyze them so as to trace students’ participation during the first and the last instructional units.

The analysis of typical and telling events helped me answer three research questions:

(1) How do teachers and students interactionally construct a deep understanding of academic content (in this case, a deeper understanding of humanities) through the teaching and learning of argumentation and argumentative writing?

(2) What social identities and social relationships are constructed, over time, during the teaching and learning of argumentation and argumentative writing?

(3) What are the habits of mind that students take up, acquire, and employ as they engage in the instructional activities and classroom interactions associated with the teaching and learning of argumentation and argumentative writing?

Using a micro-ethnographic discourse analysis (cf., Bloome, et al., 2005), I created transcriptions from the typical and telling events as a (re)presentation. I parsed
the talk into message units (cf., Green & Wallat, 1981), choosing not to impose punctuation or capitalization; I did, however, capitalize proper nouns and the personal pronoun “I.” I bound conversations using prosody, body language, and the spoken words as well as paying attention to action and reactions within the talk. I also paid careful attention to pronominalization, as it guided me to a fuller understanding of the social identities and social relationships between Ms. Cook and her students. I analyzed the student and teacher talk within and across events.

For my transcripts, I adapted symbols from the Jefferson Transcription System (2004) and Bloome, Carter, Christian, Madrid, Otto, Shuart-Faris, & Smith (2008). The key to the transcription marks used throughout this dissertation follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcription Marks</th>
<th>Key to Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>↑</td>
<td>rising intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(#)</td>
<td>numbers in round brackets measure pauses in seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>line 1</td>
<td>overlap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>line 2</td>
<td>elongated vowel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL CAPS</td>
<td>word emphasized by the speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“words “</td>
<td>reading from written text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>voice, pitch or style change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>words</td>
<td>boundaries of a voice, pitch or style change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>unintelligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Codes for analyses used vary by transcript (i.e., IX = intertextuality, CON = continuous talk); as a result, each transcript used in Chapter 4 that contains analytic codes beyond
line number, speaker, and message unit is accompanied by a key. Additionally, I began each line number with a time marker, followed by the line number within the transcript (i.e., 3-1 means that the transcribed talk began during minute three of the conversation).

**Triangulation**

In effort to triangulate findings and explanations from my analysis of the telling and typical events, I triangulated multiple data sources. While I analyzed telling and typical events, I reviewed the written products used and/or referenced during the event(s). I looked across students’ written work and the verbal talk within the events; I did the same for Ms. Cook’s assignment sheets and PowerPoint slides. Thus, in generating an interpretation of what happened within a particular event, for example, when a telling event was situated within a peer review session, I analyzed the peer review worksheets for all in the group. In order to trace forward and back, I analyzed the previous written documents, if any, for that unit and analyzed the final essay. I was interested to learn how/if students’ talk, in full class instructional conversations as well as peer review groups, influenced their written work and made a linguistic appearance.

I followed a similar process with interviews. First, I indexed the teacher’s and case study students’ interviews. In so doing, I marked reoccurring patterns reported. Then, as I analyzed the typical and telling events, I returned to the indices to contextualize my understanding and triangulate my data. Finally, I transcribed moments of talk pertinent to the events and to my research questions and infused their words into my descriptions and analyses of the typical and telling events. Working across data as iterative elements helped me contextualize the artifacts, interviews, and events and gain a
more complete understanding the Ms. Cook’s learning opportunities and the students’ participation over time.

Table 3.6 indicates how I connected my data analysis and written artifacts to answer my research questions. Artifacts listed in the “artifacts” column are those that were foregrounded for each question; the list is not meant to be exhaustive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Data Analysis</th>
<th>Artifacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How do teachers and students interactionally construct a manifest pedagogy for the teaching and learning argumentation and argumentative writing?</td>
<td>Data timeline</td>
<td>Teacher assignment worksheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructional unit chains</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How do teachers and students interactionally construct a deep understanding of academic content (in this case, a deeper understanding of humanities) through the teaching and learning of argumentation and argumentative writing?</td>
<td>Data timeline</td>
<td>Teacher assignment worksheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructional unit chains</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transcription analysis: full class instructional conversations &amp; peer review conversations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What social identities and social relationships are constructed, over time, during the teaching and learning of argumentation and argumentative writing?</td>
<td>Transcription analysis: full class instructional conversations &amp; peer review conversations</td>
<td>Peer review sheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student and teacher interviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the habits of mind that students take up, acquire, and employ as they engage in the instructional activities and classroom interactions associated with the teaching and learning of argumentation and argumentative writing?</td>
<td>Transcription analysis: full class instructional conversations &amp; peer review conversations</td>
<td>Peer review sheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student interviews</td>
<td>In-progress drafts &amp; final essays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Final multi-modal presentations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.6  *Merger of Research Questions, Data Analysis, & Artifacts*
Through my various levels of data analysis, I hope to represent some of Ms. Cook’s instructional moves that helped engage students in deep understanding of argumentative writing as well deep understanding of their essay’s content topics. In Chapter 4, I trace students Kane’s, Sue’s, and Bob’s participation throughout the first and the final instructional unit.
Chapter 4

Findings

Chapter 4 reports findings of my analyses. To reiterate from Chapter 1, the purpose underlying this study is to represent how students and their teacher enact argumentation and argumentative writing in one high school ELA classroom. As such, the dissertation provides an in-depth look at how students and their teacher gain a deep understanding of argumentation and their content topics over time. In Chapter 1, I presented four research questions in support of the above purpose:

(1) How do teachers and students interactionally construct a manifest pedagogy for the teaching and learning of argumentation and argumentative writing?

(2) How do teachers and students interactionally construct a deep understanding of academic content (in this case, a deeper understanding of humanities) through the teaching and learning of argumentation and argumentative writing?

(3) What social identities and social relationships are constructed, over time, during the teaching and learning of argumentation and argumentative writing?

(4) What are the habits of mind that students take up, acquire, and employ as they engage in the instructional activities and classroom interactions
associated with the teaching and learning of argumentation and argumentative writing?

In Chapter 3, I explained the corpus of data and my methodology. Using a micro-ethnographic discourse analysis, I analyzed typical and telling events. While I used the full data corpus to contextualize my understanding of this classroom over two years, Chapter 4 will foreground events within two instructional units. The first unit was the first observed unit during the 9th grade year. Students wrote a formal argumentative essay on either Ford Maddox Brown’s painting *Work* or Diego Rivera’s *Detroit Industry: Man and Machine*. The second unit was the final observed unit during the 10th grade year. Students wrote an argumentative essay and gave a multimodal presentation for a capstone project: a solution to poverty.

I have organized this chapter into four sections. The first is the classroom context. In this section, I present Ms. Cook’s curricular choices, guiding philosophies, and typical teaching moves. I provide this section because of the reciprocal relationship between teaching and learning and the reciprocal relationships between teachers and students. This section on classroom context provides a base understanding for how Ms. Cook structured the curriculum, how she offered lessons, and how she positioned herself and her students. The next three sections are case studies of tracer students Kane, Sue, and Bob. With each of the three student narratives, I offer cases of students’ participation in class events during the teaching and learning of argumentative writing, specifically two instructional units enacting argumentation. In so doing, I am defining a case in a way that may be unusual: rather than work to understand an individual and his/her
experience in the classroom, I use the three tracer students to understand the nature of events within a shared classroom space. In brief, these are not cases of individuals; rather, with these narratives, I present a set of class events related to argumentation and argumentative writing on two paintings and one capstone project: a solution to poverty in Ms. Cook’s ELA, humanities classroom. The set of events chosen for each student represents a typical or telling case for that student’s life in the classroom; thereby, the tracer students move through the set of events defining classroom life.

I chose to offer three narratives because the three focal students offer at least three kinds of participation in the 9th and 10th grade ELA classroom as well as three different stances in enacting argumentation and producing argumentative writing. Specifically, Kane, Sue, and Bob offer three different stances toward completing assignments (or not), aligning (or not) with Ms. Cook’s timelines and structures, and enacting argumentation and argumentative writing. A brief description of each student follows. Kane identified as an African American male (survey data). He was popular, willing to draw attention to himself (field notes, 12/17/10), and a high achiever. Sue identified as a White female (survey data). She was less mainstream than Kane (preferring a bit of shock value in her responses), wrote within and outside of school (interview, 1/12/11), and typically did not meet small assignment deadlines (field notes, 12/17/10). Bob identified as a White male (survey data). He called himself “a math guy,” (interview, 5/22/11) did not participate much verbally (field notes, 12/2/10), and focused on the structures and deadlines Ms. Cook provided (field notes, 12/17,10).

Although I did study all three students during their ninth-grade and tenth-grade years, the specific data used within each narrative varies by student due to different kinds
of participation. Regardless, within all three student narratives\textsuperscript{6} I foreground key events and triangulate with interviews and written artifacts.

Finally, I share one way to conceptualize the teaching and learning of argumentative writing across the narratives as a set. As a set of three narratives, I offer a rich case that traces one teacher and three of her students through two instructional units over two instructional years. Looking across the instructional opportunities and participation, this chapter provides a nuanced understanding of how argumentation and argumentative writing were enacted. Although the three students do not represent all students in the class, Kane’s, Sue’s, and Bob’s participation across time, modes, and structures help us understand what it means for argumentation and intertextuality to anchor classroom events. In Chapter 5, I will discuss the significance of these findings in terms of the overall purpose.

Please note, the rationale for not including the case study findings related to Jane or Jasmine is that I did not have data for both focal units for either student; however, I did have data for both focal units for Kane, Sue, and Bob.

\textbf{Classroom Context}

Ms. Cook was the ELA teacher during both humanities 9 and humanities 10. Ms. Cook had a teaching license in the English/Language Arts content area and held both a Master’s in education and a National Board Certification. During the 2010-2012 school years, Ms. Cook was in her 13\textsuperscript{th} and 14\textsuperscript{th} years of teaching. She taught all of her years within her school district; she had a local reputation for excellence among her colleagues.

\textsuperscript{6} The data for case narratives of Jane and Jasmine provided background and helped confirm particular practices within my study.
and from the students. She had previously served as English department chair and was involved with professional development training for teachers in her district.

On a written survey Ms. Cook completed for the larger Argumentative Writing project (Newell et al., 2009), she explained that humanities 9 and humanities 10 were courses she chose to teach. She also taught AP Language to 11th graders. Ms. Cook categorized humanities as an advanced/honors track with students’ self-selecting enrollment. She also explained that, in her opinion, humanities students had higher achievement levels compared to the average student in the high school (survey data). Demographically, Ms. Cook self-identified as White and noted that 40% of her students in humanities identified as racial/ethnic minorities (survey data), with less than 2% of students as English language learners.

During Ms. Cook’s first six years of teaching, she organized her teaching of writing as separate genres requiring distinct writing structures; however, because of concerns wondering if she was truly preparing her students for life beyond her classroom (interview, 6/3/12), she sought a new way to approach the teaching of writing. As she was questioning her pedagogy and curricular decisions, she attended the 2004 National Council Teachers of English annual meeting. Specifically, Ms. Cook attended a session focused on teachers using Andrea Lunsford’s “Everything’s an Argument” in the classroom. In speaking about this workshop (interview, 6/3/12) Ms. Cook told me she was amazed; the ideas made sense. She then followed up by reading Lunsford’s book and began reshaping her curriculum. Specifically, Ms. Cook reported (interview, 2/22/11) that she stopped teaching her students how to read and write for distinctly different genres (i.e. narrative, persuasive, argumentative). Instead, Ms. Cook used
argumentation as a tool for thinking (interview, 2/22/11) and thinking about writing. She labeled herself a “Lunsford groupie” (field notes, 12/1/10).

When I began observations, Ms. Cook was in her seventh year of framing her teaching around the philosophy: Everything’s an Argument. It is important to note, however, that Ms. Cook did not insist that everything is presented in the form of an argumentative essay. Rather, argumentative essays are one mode of producing an argument. She taught with an expanded notion of text, considering traditional letter/print text, images, conversations, and ways of presenting oneself all as text to be read and carefully considered. For example, she shared that within print text, visual art, music, theatre, or clothing, the author/artist/person was arguing a claim; thereby, when teaching students how to talk about their ideas and write them, Ms. Cook believed that it was important to foreground the language of and processes within argumentation.

Ms. Cook taught with argumentation as her curricular anchor. Over the two observed school years (2011-2012), she required students to produce argumentation differently and in a myriad of modes. The following table explains the argumentative focus taught and assignment modes during the observed units. Within Table 4.1, I operationalized “argumentative focus” as the specific elements Ms. Cook taught and required students to use in their summative assignments for each unit. In the assignment mode column, I indicated if students were to work alone or with peers as well as the required mode (i.e. written essay, presentation) for the summative assignments.
As made visible in the table, Ms. Cook foregrounded claim and evidence across all units in humanities 9 and humanities 10. A comment Ms. Cook made in our first interview is helpful to consider when looking across her curriculum: When asked about her curricular sequencing, she commented that she made an attempt to “capture momentum” (interview, 2/15/11) as her students learned about argumentation. She explained that she wanted to harness her students understanding of argumentation and how to write argumentative essays. In effort to support students’ thinking and promote deep understanding, Ms. Cook used time to her advantage. She sequenced her lesson plans and units as progressive steps to a larger whole, in this case, a more complete understanding of argumentation and elements of argumentative essays (i.e., Toulmin’s model). Across the two school years, Ms. Cook privileged argumentative writing as a visible display of students’ thinking (instructional units 1, 2, & 5).
Instead of ‘make-an-assignment, teach-it, assess-it, and move-on’, Ms. Cook taught and retaught argumentation and argumentative elements (e. g., field notes, 12/1/10, 12/10/10, 5/8/12, & 5/18/12), as indicated in Table 4.1. This curricular sequencing allowed students to practice what they learned over time. It also allowed Ms. Cook to review and make adjustments with and for her students. She taught argumentative elements progressively, in small chunks, separated by time: time to learn the elements, time to use them, and time to consider what they offered for one’s argument.

During the first observational unit (December 2010-January 2011), Ms. Cook required students to make a claim and support it with textual evidence. Although students were used to close reading, this unit culminated in their first formal essay. As the three student narratives will illustrate, Ms. Cook’s teaching focused on helping students consider how to structure their ideas into a formal essay.

Beginning with the second observed unit (January-March 2011), Ms. Cook added additional elements for students to use and consider as they produced arguments. The first addition to claim and evidence was the addition of interpretive lenses. Specifically, Ms. Cook taught students five interpretive lenses: Marxism, Feminism, New Historicism, Freudianism, New Criticism, and Psychoanalytic theory (i.e., Freudian lens) (interview, 2/22/11 & 1/31/11 date). She required students to “choose one that they feel best or can be used to interpret” (interview, 2/22/11) Henry James’s novella: *The Turn of the Screw*. In the interview (2/22/11) and in class discussions (field notes, 1/31/11) Ms. Cook explained that the lenses provided students with another tool to use and consider when putting together an argument (interview, 2/22/11). She also shared that she was looking
to see “how well they [students] can support a claim with something that is very very abstract” (interview, 2/22/11).

Over the following three units, Ms. Cook added more argumentative elements, explicitly teaching and requiring students to consider and use counter arguments, rebuttal, and warrants. Her teaching emphasis the sophomore year focused on more explicit warrants and counter-arguments/rebuttal, which she called the “turn away and turn back” (field notes, 5/22/12). While attending carefully to claim/evidence remained critical, Ms. Cook taught the Toulmin claim (field notes, 5/8/12) as another way to think about text and another framework to consider when writing.

During the final unit, Ms. Cook taught with explicit reviews of counter-arguments and warrants. She offered this review through mini-lectures (e.g. field notes, 5/8/12), in-class practice writing counter arguments (e.g. field notes, 5/22/12 & student artifacts) and conversations with individuals/groups during class work time (e.g. field notes, 5/18/12 & video analysis, 5/23/12). When explaining her instructional modes, she shared, “I don’t give them busy work. It’s a waste of their time and mine, so I try and make sure that everything they do is deep and rich” (interview, 2/22/11).

Across all assignments, Ms. Cook situated argumentation and its evolving elements as portable tools students could transport out of the classroom to fit students’ curricular needs (interview 2/22/11). Ms. Cook’s curricular choices (see Table 4.1) and learning opportunities reflect an attitude toward argumentation that she shared in our first interview, “I think it [argumentation] helps them to think about how to write in other classes. It’s just, it’s transferable, it’s not just in English, it’s how do I write a, because if you think about it in science a hypothesis is an argument” (interview, 2/15/11). Looking
across my data corpus, it is Ms. Cook’s focus on how students could “think about how to write” (emphasis mine) that deserves attention because of its recurrence over time and because of its centrality to her instructional moves.

In the ELA section of humanities for grades 9 and 10, Ms. Cook was not interested in students completing tasks and doing school. Rather, she structured learning opportunities to promote thoughtful writers and thoughtful moments of interaction. Ms. Cook used the language of argumentation to accomplish this. Specifically, Ms. Cook offered specific linguistic structures (i.e., the ABCD claim and the Toulmin claim) to help her students make their thinking visible on a written essay. She spent days of full class instructional time allowing students time to share their ideas aloud and then revoiced their ideas into an argumentative linguistic structure. However, she did not expect her students to conform to an a priori structure or constrain their creativity. Rather, she took the time to name and use the argumentative elements to help her students enter the discourse of academic, argumentative writing as well as promote a shared vocabulary within the class community. Again, her ideas shared during our interview resonate: Ms. Cook wanted her students to think about “how to write,” a process that moved beyond her assignments and beyond school.

As Ms. Cook presented argumentation as a tool for students’ wider, “out of school” needs, she stated her desire for students to be “reasonable human beings” (interview, 2/15/11). As she stated in class (field notes, 12/7/10), whether students were

---

7 The ABCD claim format consists of the following:
- A = author’s name and title of the work
- B = abstract concept you are examining
- C = your commentary on B
- D = the rhetorical/literacy device used to develop B
going to graduate high school and attend college, enlist in the military, or go directly into the work force, she wanted them to be reasonable, human beings who would not be taken advantage of by others (field notes, 12/1/10). She remarked on knowing how to argue and knowing how to back up one’s claims with evidence and appear reasonable as a life skill (field notes, 12/7/10 & interview, 6/3/12).

During our first interview (2/15/11) she explained that her overarching goal for students was to see improvements first in their thinking and secondly, in their writing. To support their thinking and promote interaction (i.e. practice thinking aloud with others), Ms. Cook varied her learning opportunities and class activities. During my two years of observations, her typical teaching methods included mini-lectures (e.g. field notes, 12/6/10 & 5/8/12) accompanied by power points defining and illustrating argumentative elements (e.g. field notes, 12/10/10 & 5/18/12), modeling effective writing structures via sample essays (e.g. field notes, 1/3/11 & 5/15/12) offering students time for individual writing exercises (e.g. field notes, 12/7/10 & 5/22/12), coaching individual students and peer groups on their progress (e.g. field notes, 12/16/10 & 5/18/12), and offering time for peer group review sessions so students could collaborate on ideas and review one another’s essays (e.g. field notes, 12/17/10 & 5/23/12).

Ms. Cook’s assessment measures paralleled her focus of promoting both thinkers and writers. When asked to give an overall summary of how she evaluated the class’s argumentative essays, Ms. Cook responded,

Now the writing was the writing awesome? No, some of it was really good, some of it was just down right pedestrian, but I could see their thinking. I could see where they were going and what they wanted to say and the thinking always
comes first, you know the thinking comes and then the writing. (interview, 2/15/11)

As indicated in the above quote, Ms. C thought that the students’ quality of writing needed attention; however, Ms. C was pleased with her students’ thinking. In conversation with me (interview 2/15/11), in her talk to students (video analysis, 5/2/10), and in her written comments to students (student artifacts), Ms. Cook explicitly named the students as thinkers. Across both school years, Ms. Cook positioned her students as capable and smart. Ms. Cook was confident that she could work with her students to help their writing quality improve over time. An AP teacher as well as humanities teacher, Ms. Cook was well aware of rigid test formats and expected structures within written essays; however, she did not evaluate her 9th grade or 10th grade students according to those standards. Rather, she taught them argumentation with a goal of promoting thinking (field notes, 5/2/10).

During a typical day, Ms. Cook shared her own personal stories and invited student connections to ideas being discussed and texts being read; as a result, such stories (and other class conversations) became additional text to reference and use to anchor understanding (observed 7 times in a 15-day unit). I illustrate such a typical day through a description of an event from the second observed unit. During this unit, Ms. Cook was teaching various literary lenses. She offered the lenses as additional perspectives that students could apply in order to enrich their interpretations of Henry James’s novella, *The Turn of the Screw*. For their summative assignment, students were expected to select a lens, do a close reading of the novella, and write an argument.
I observed Ms. Cook’s teaching of the Psychoanalytic theory (1/31/11), specifically a mini-lecture on Freud’s concepts of ID, Ego, and Superego. As a way to help students understand these Freudian concepts, Ms. Cook made connections to her popular culture and her childhood. Specifically, she referenced Bugs Bunny cartoons, a television show called *My Strange Addictions*, and stories of children “melting down” in a grocery store—to which both her colleague and her students entered the conversation with personal anecdotes. As students added their own anecdotes, Ms. Cook made explicit connections to Freud’s concepts. Throughout the discussion, she linked personal experiences with theoretical ideas (field notes, 1/31/11). For the duration of the class, Ms. Cook and the students wove between on-task behavior and silliness, telling stories, making connections to the ID, Ego, and Superego, and laughing (field notes 1/31/11). A few times Ms. Cook spoke in an authoritative tone to calm the students and move forward in her lecture, yet laughter and personal connections pervaded. Students’ participation shifted between note making, storytelling, listening, and laughing.

It was also typical for Ms. Cook to encourage collaboration among students. For example, during the first observed unit the ninth grade year, students worked in peer review groups for six of the seventeen days. In our first interview (date) I asked Ms. Cook to share her purpose behind the peer review sessions. She explained the following:

With the number of kids in the class, I had to come up with a way that I could make sure that there were checks and balances or just little brief checks, you know, for me to go on and slow things down a little bit and have them reflect on what they’re doing rather than them waiting just for me to go through every single thing with them. (interview, 5/24/11)
There was a practical, management reason for the peer groups. When students worked with their peers, Ms. Cook was able to talk to and connect with students on individual levels. She used these moments to provide direct feedback (field notes, 5/24/11), particularly to those who did not verbally participate. As she shared with me in an interview, “Students can’t hide in peer groups. They have to participate” (interview, 5/24/11). Ms. Cook’s efforts to engage with her students personally and playfully, as well as the time taken to promote students’ collaboration, suggest that social relationships matter in this classroom; social relationships are a part of the participation.

Throughout Ms. Cook’s teaching, she praised her students for their ideas (field notes, 12/2/10 & 5/23/12) and offered them scaffolds via explicit strategies for structuring their essays. This was illustrated with the ABCD claim statement (field notes, 12/10/10) & Toulmin claim statements (field notes, 5/8/12)—both which I will explicate in a later section in this chapter. It is critical to note that although Ms. Cook was explicit with naming and structuring argumentative elements and offered writing frameworks and model essays, she did not require her students to mechanically use elements nor did she assess students on their understanding of these priori elements. Rather, she took the time to name and use the argumentative elements to promote a shared vocabulary and scaffolding. She did not expect students to write with all elements (claim, evidence, warrant, counter argument, rebuttal) during their freshman year, nor were required to write in an a priori manner at the end of sophomore year.

In Ms. Cook’s classroom, argumentation was neither presented nor enacted as a way to reproduce known understandings of literature, nor was it a way to structure one type of expected response into a formulaic argumentative essay. Rather, argumentation
was a way of being and a way of thinking and creating. Argumentation was a way for students and Ms. Cook to create and write across multiple texts, a way of structuring talk, and a way of interacting and building relationships with one another. Ms. Cook was not training her students to write in a prescribed manner nor did she position herself as the sole authority in the room; rather, student responses were encouraged and developed. Students were encouraged to create and Ms. Cook was a full participant in co-constructing argumentation with her students, shifting instruction to fit their needs in real time and making herself vulnerable alongside her students.

**Student Narratives**

This section of the chapter will illustrate the enactment of argumentation in grades 9 and 10 in this ELA, humanities classroom. I offer three narratives, each focused primarily on tracing students’ participation through a series of classroom events. I selected three students-Kane, Sue, and Bob—because each was successful in Ms. Cook’s class, yet their processes varied, offering nuanced ways to enact argumentation in this classroom. I also selected these three students because I collected data about their experiences across all observed units in 9th and 10th grade. I do not have data for all of the units for my other two case study students. Overall, as a set, these narratives make visible that Ms. Cook’s understanding of and knowledge of Kane’s, Sue’s, and Bob’s participation and needs indicate that various students can be successful in this classroom.

I structure each of the student narratives similarly. I begin with a brief explanation of how Ms. Cook described the student, how s/he identified her/himself, and typical ways of participating as observed in the classroom. Next, I move into descriptions of and analyses of events. I contextualize the descriptions of each event with Ms. Cook’s
curricular expectations and analyze transcripts from full class or peer group conversations as well as reported and observed data during that event. I also label each event as a typical or telling event, illustrating why it is significant for gaining an understanding of the students’ participation. I end each narrative with a review of salient points to describe the student’s participation in this classroom.

**Case study narrative #1: Kane.** Ms. Cook described Kane as a good writer and a good student (interview, 2/15/11). Kane was social and made his presence known by participating in full class instructional conversations (field notes, 12/1/10), singing during work time (field notes, 12/17/10), wearing holiday outfits (field notes, 12/17/10), mingling with a variety of peers before and after class (field notes, 12/2/10), and voicing enjoyment with ELA-related tasks (field notes, 12/1/10). Kane’s typical behavior suggested that he liked attention.

Academically motivated, Kane chose to enroll in 9th grade humanities “because it is good for college” (interview, 1/13/11) and because “English is a lot more fun when it’s a lot more challenging” (interview 1/13/11). When asked if he was going to enroll for 10th grade humanities, Kane responded, “I can’t miss this” (interview, 5/20/11). Though Kane was not always on task, he consistently performed the role of student and was acknowledged by Ms. Cook and his peers as successful. He shared that he was motivated to come to and achieve in school because of the social aspect and the future aspect (interview, 5/24/12); to explain this “future aspect,” he revealed an attitude that emanated throughout much of his participation during the two years: “Good work gets good results” (Interview, 5/24/12). As a part of the “social aspect,” Kane enjoyed working with his peers and also mentioned that listening to class discussions helps “to just kind of
get my thought process moving” (interview 1/13/11). During full class instruction, Kane explained that he typically shifted between roles of speaker and listener, depending on his level of understanding and his interest in the topic at the time (interview 1/13/11).

Kane also had interests in music, drama, and swimming. A member of the school’s swim team, Kane wore his team jacket weekly and claimed to “love” (interview 1/13/11) the sport. Swimming practice or meets kept him busy on weekdays until 6:00pm. Because he was often tired upon getting home, he commented (interview 1/13/11) that he did not like doing his humanities homework after swimming, though he did work on it when necessary; as a result, he worked hard to complete as much as possible during class (field notes, 12/15/10), during his school’s “academic assist”—a 30-minute period devoted to completing homework (interview 1/13/11) during the school day—or over winter break (audio analysis, 12/17/10).

**Organization of the narrative.** In this narrative, I represent Kane’s participation across events during the first instructional unit his ninth-grade year and the final instructional unit his tenth-grade year. Specifically, I focus my narrative descriptions on his process while writing the first argumentative essay in grade 9 and his work with his peer review partners Dana and Chad. I traced Kane’s participation during the first unit on argumentative writing with a focus on his construction of his claim statement. The representation of peer conversations were constructed by using the data from the video and audio analysis but they were also triangulated with detailed descriptions of full class instructional conversations, interviews, and Kane’s written artifacts across the two observed years (AY 2010-2011 & AY 2011-2012). My narrative for the final instructional unit is a textual analysis of the final project (essay and PowerPoint
presentation) his sophomore year. Due to an IRB constraint with Kane’s partner during his sophomore year, I do not make use of in-process events within this final unit as I do with his first unit and as I do with case study students Sue and Bob.

Tables 4.2 & 4.3 indicate the collected data that foreground Kane’s participation during both focal units. From that data, I selected typical and telling events to represent Kane’s participation. This narrative focuses on six events within three class sessions (12/13/10, 12/15/10, & 1/5/11) from the first unit and a textual analysis of Kane’s final essay and project from the final unit.

The first row on each table indicates verbal data (moments when Kane spoke) and the second row on each table indicates written data (written by Kane or written comments about Kane’s written draft). In each column, markings indicate the specific data within the verbal and/or written column.

The key for the data described in Table 4-2 and Table 4-3 is below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Key to Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WK</td>
<td>worksheet completed by focal student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>small peer group conversation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>whole class conversation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PrWk</td>
<td>worksheet completed by a peer on the focal student’s draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR</td>
<td>essay draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FE</td>
<td>final essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>counter argument practice writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VID</td>
<td>project video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT</td>
<td>interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 9</td>
<td>Unit 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kane</td>
<td>WC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kane’s written texts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2  *Kane’s Unit One: Work or Detroit Industry: Man and Machine. 12/1/10-1/7/11*
First instructional unit. Kane wrote his first essay claiming his interpretation of the artist, Ford Maddox Brown’s argument in the painting *Work* (Appendix H). The essay assignment can be found in Appendix I and Kane’s full essay is in Appendix A0. During this first unit, it was not the case that Kane had an idea, wrote a claim statement and set about to prove it with evidence; rather, he developed and redeveloped his claim and how to write his ideas throughout the unit.

During class session eight (12/13/10), Ms. Cook gave a full class review on claim statements using the ABCD claim format taught the previous day. The ABCD format is one that Ms. Cook modified from a colleague’s template for literature analysis and contains the following elements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>author’s name and title of the work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>abstract concept you are examining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>your commentary on B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>the rhetorical/literacy device used to develop B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4.1** *ABCD Claim Format*
During the review, Ms. Cook put a model text on the Smart Board and students labeled the parts. As they reviewed the parts in use, Ms. Cook asked the class to clarify what the devices were in D. The first three responses were inaudible, but this next transcript (re)presents how Ms. Cook and her students position one another and talk with one another. This is a typical event.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Transcription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8-1</td>
<td>Jasmine: well I put like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-2</td>
<td>ah for like the different um stories we analyzed and stuff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-3</td>
<td>I used like word choice and diction and then for paintings I did image choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-4</td>
<td>Ms. Cook: very good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-5</td>
<td>because aren’t they kind of they’re parallel right because the word choice in ah printed text can function the same way that images do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-6</td>
<td>Jasmine: yea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-7</td>
<td>Ms. Cook: in the painting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-8</td>
<td>very good, very creative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-9</td>
<td>Kane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-10</td>
<td>Kane: um I was I kind of agreeing with Jasmine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-11</td>
<td>like I would just think like an artist wouldn’t put something there like just for no reason like there’s always a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-12</td>
<td>Ms. Cook: thank you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-13</td>
<td>Kane: reason for everything</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-14</td>
<td>Ms. Cook: hold on I want to bottle that comment and sell it because I’ll tell you [laughter]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-15</td>
<td>unknown student: and sell it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-16</td>
<td>I like that</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transcript 4.1 12/13/10 minute 8

Analysis begins with Ms. Cook’s responses. Her positive evaluations (lines 8-4 & 8-8) to Jasmine were not only typical responses to Jasmine’s ideas (field notes, 12/2/10), but also typical ways of responding to students’ ideas in general (field notes, 12/1/10).
Ms. Cook was positive with her students, often honoring their ideas publicly as she did in this transcript. It was also typical for Ms. Cook to talk to her students and extend their ideas, as shown in line 8-5). This linguistic move suggests a conversation of equals. Ms. Cook was able to extend ideas and push her students further because of her belief that they were capable; they were thinkers (interview, 6/23/12).

During this conversation, the mood was light and work was accomplished (field notes, 12/13/10); this too, was typical. As Kane entered the conversation (line 8-10), he made a direct connection with Jasmine. This indicates that Kane was listening to Jasmine’s ideas and was building on them. In this classroom, students and Ms. Cook building on one another’s ideas and building knowledge together was typical (e.g. field notes, 12/2/10 & 12/9/10). Then, as Ms. Cook responded to Kane, the relaxed mood accelerated: students laughed, a student verbally called out with a positive evaluation of Ms. Cook (lines 8-15 & 8-16), and Ms. Cook gestured and performed her thrill (line 8-14) for Kane’s acknowledgment that there is a “reason for everything” (line 8-13). Ms. Cook also thanked Kane. This is interesting because instead of evaluate his idea, she thanked him for verbalizing an idea that she agreed with and wanted to get across to her students (audio analysis, 12/13/10).

Ms. Cook then gave students individual time to work on their own claim creations as she moved about the room, coaching students on their ideas. When she arrived to Kane’s desk, she asked him for his claim. Kane responded that he did not have one written down, but could share his ideas verbally. This next transcript is a representation of Kane’s response and his conversation with Ms. Cook.
As indicated in the transcript, Kane’s verbal explanation of his claim statement made visible that he had his idea and was working out the details of it. Although his verbal fillers (i.e., *um* and *like*) may suggest hesitation or hedging, it was typical for Kane to speak with the fillers. This may indicate that Kane often hedged while thinking aloud, yet I want to be clear that I do not find these fillers a sign of weakness; rather, Kane’s responses over time indicate that he was willing to think aloud and try on his ideas with others while he situated them for himself.

Kane’s verb tenses in this conversation are significant. As he began his explanation, he spoke in the future tense: “I want to say” (line 27-1). This tense fits with his explanation that he did not yet have a written claim statement, but he had been thinking about his ideas and what he wanted to say. There is a shift, however, after Ms.
Cook asked him about his devices (line 27-10). Kane responded with the past tense: “I said like/I did like” (lines 27-11 & 27-12). Such a shift suggests that Kane has thought about this, “said” this, “done” this, perhaps during the class review of devices and the ABCD claim earlier in the class session (12/13/10). Kane may not have had his written claim statement ready when Ms. Cook arrived at his desk, but he had been thinking about his ideas. This is compounded by Kane’s shift in verb tense within line 27-14: “and also like saying that like sometimes man can be kind of silly and be kind of dimwitted.” With this shift to the present tense, “saying that like sometimes,” Kane indicated that he was still in the process of thinking through his devices.

Throughout this conversation, Ms. Cook did not reprimand Kane for only having his ideas verbally; rather, her turns at talk provided praise (lines 27-6 & 27-16), a clarifying question (line 27-10), and encouragement to continue (line 27-13). Ms. Cook’s instruction for Kane to “just write that down” (line 27-8) suggests that at this point, Kane needed to get his ideas down on paper. It is likely that Ms. Cook was thinking ahead to her lesson plans for the next few days. During the next class session (12/14/10) she focused specifically on the language and structure of claim statements and assigned students to write their full introductory paragraphs for session ten (12/15/10). During session ten (1215/10), students worked in peer groups reviewing their claims and introductions. As a result, Kane needed his claim statement written down because the next day (12/14/10), he needed to expand that statement into a full introductory paragraph. It is also possible that Ms. Cook’s instruction to “just write that down” (line 27-8) reflects an attitude that Ms. Cook held about writing and shared in our first interview: “the thinking comes first and then the writing” (interview, 2/15/11). Kane’s
positive uptake “yea” (line 27-09) indicates either his willingness to take direction from Ms. Cook and/or his acknowledgement that it was time to put his ideas into writing.

Ms. Cook praised Kane before she moved on to the next student, indicating that at this point, Kane’s ideas fit the assignment. What was lacking in Ms. Cook’s evaluation was mention that Kane’s explanation of his devices did not match Ms. Cook’s written explanation of the D: “the rhetorical/literacy device used to develop B [the abstract concept being examined],” nor did it fit the previous class review of devices that Kane participated in twenty-one minutes before this conversation. Rather, Kane’s explanation of his claim and his D focused on specific details from the painting—a face engulfed in shadows, a dirt road, a dog wearing a sweater—rather than call the device(s) by name (i.e., irony or diction). Although Kane’s response may indicate a less sophisticated answer for some, my knowledge of the classroom and Ms. Cook’s evaluations indicates that while Ms. Cook offered specific elements (such as the ABCD claim) to help students enter the discourse of argumentative writing, students were free to internalize the structure and write as they saw fit for their own essays. Students did not have to use specific terms nor format their essays in an a-priori way; rather, their writing was to be a clear indication of their thinking. Ms. Cook’s positive acknowledgements of Kane’s ideas suggest that he was well on his way to a claim statement. At this point, Kane was meeting Ms. Cook’s expectations. This was typical positioning for Kane.

The next significant event for Kane’s participation and claim formation occurred during session 10 (12/15/10). In this event, as in the subsequent events, Kane worked with his peers in peer review sessions. Because Kane positioned peer work as significant to his writing process (interview 1/13/11), the next several paragraphs describe his
partners and their typical work habits as a way to contextualize Kane’s participation within this peer group.

Kane’s peer review group was a male/female/male triad: Kane, Dana, Chad. Kane verbally participated in class discussions, willingly drew attention to himself, and aligned his interests with Ms. Cook in peer group conversations and full class discussions. Dana did not participate in full class discussions unless requested, and often instigated off-task dialogue with her peers when in peer review groups. Chad did not verbally participate in class discussion nor did Ms. Cook call upon him. Compared to Kane and Dana, Chad talked the least during peer groups, yet he did participate in focused talk and off-task conversations.

During peer work time, it was typical for Dana, Kane, and Chad to talk about personal connections and experiences (field notes, 12/17/10). Conversation topics revealed that the three had a shared network of friends (field notes, 1/3/11), knew one another’s families (field notes, 1/3/11), and knew one another’s hobbies and involvement (or not) in school activities (field notes, 12/15/10). My review of their conversations indicated that Chad insisted upon using class time to complete assigned tasks (field notes, 1/3/11) while Kane and Dana were a bit more apt to hold off-topic conversations (field notes, 1/3/11). Additionally, it was typical for Kane and Dana to talk over Chad or have a private conversation (academic or personal).

In our first interview (1/13/11) I asked Kane about the on-task and off-task conversations, wondering how (if) the three students got their work done. His response indicated that for him, the off-task conversations made him more relaxed and thereby, productive:
like when we were talking like we um we could get our work done/like we would get pretty off-topic but then we’d realize that okay we need to/we need to get to work an then we’d just keep going off-topic but like we’d still be focused/like our minds would be focused on the work/so we would always get it done, so like yea . . . /because like also, that kind of talk like it helps me feel relaxed and like when I’m relaxed like that I can like think clearer/so I can/it actually helps me a lot better with my peer review and also my writing. (interview, 1/13/11)

As he noted, time spent working with his peers relaxed Kane. What I observed as off-task was, in Kane’s words, “off topic,” yet he found it helpful as a thinker and as a writer. Though he chose first person singular pronouns (I, me) when explaining the feeling of relaxation, he spoke in first person plural pronouns (we, our) stating, “we could get our work done” and “our minds would be focused on the work.” Though some may criticize Kane for speaking for his peers, it is significant to note that during peer review time, each student had a worksheet to complete; all three group members completed their worksheets. All three got their work done (field notes, 12/17/10). This notion of talking while getting work done is a dominating pattern in the peer review sessions for this Kane, Dana, and Chad.

During session 10 (12/15/10), Kane participated in the first of six peer review sessions during this unit. The task for the peer groups during session 10 (12/15/10) was to read and provide feedback on the introductions and thesis statements [typically called claim statements by Ms. Cook], with particular attention paid to how the claim statement was structured. In his trio, Kane read Dana’s essay, Chad read Kane’s, and Dana read Chad’s.
Ms. Cook led the class in finding and labeling the ABCD claim format in sample essays. First, they practiced as a full class with students and teacher discussing and students labeling what they found on the Smart Board. Then, students worked with one another’s drafts in peer review groups. As Kane worked with his partners Dana and Chad, he spoke aloud, voicing both what he was doing as well as what he wondered about Dana’s essay. Using a playful register and animated body language, Kane labeled Dana’s claim statement (Work Sample 4.1) with varied lines and squiggles: “A is gonna be wavy-lined B is gonna be dotted-lines C is gonna be underlined then D is gonna be jagged-line” (audio analysis, 12/15/10).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Written Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In Ford Maddox Brown’s <em>Work</em>, the laborers were portrayed as heroes, strong and determined, they were closed off from the rich in a pen usually used to hold animals, symbolizing that they were strong enough to break free from the social system but would not.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A = ——</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B = —— —— ——</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C = ——</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D = ———</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Translation: |
| In Ford Maddox Brown’s *Work*, the laborers were portrayed as heroes, strong and determined, they were closed off from the rich in a pen usually used to hold animals, symbolizing that they were strong enough to break free from the social system but would not. |

**Work Sample 4.1**  *Kane’s review of Dana’s written claim statement*
Kane’s playfulness may indicate that he was working to have fun with his assignment: a trait that fit his personality (field notes, 12/2/10). Kane’s playfulness may also indicate that he understood the ABCD elements and his task to label Dana’s claim. To support this notion, Kane did not question the ABCD elements while remarking how he would label them. Additionally, his response during the full class session during session eight (12/13/10) points to his understanding of the ABCD claim, at least the $D$ element. Kane’s subsequent conversation with Ms. Cook (12/13/10) also indicates that his ideas for his own claim statement were “good”; he was on track.

On the other hand, it possible that Kane’s playfulness was an attempt to draw attention away from his task because he was a bit unsure. The next bit of transcript occurred during the peer review session on 12/15/10, eleven minutes into the work time. Within the transcript, it seems that Kane needed some more time to discern Dana’s use of the ABCD elements, yet eventually was successful.

| 11-3  | *Kane*: where’s your B |
| 11-4  | *Dana*: I don’t know   |
| 11-5  | *Kane*: there’s        |
| 11-6  | is your B their strength|
| 11-7  | *Dana*: you find it    |
| 11-8  | I just wrote it        |
| 11-9  | you have to do all the hard work |
| 11-10 | *Kane*: this is actually pretty easy |

Transcript 4.3  
12/15/10 minute 11, part 1
As indicated in line 11-6, Kane questioned if “their strength” was the B, the abstract concept Dana was analyzing; however, in looking at what he wrote on the peer review worksheet (Work Sample 4.1), Kane marked “social system” as B. This discrepancy suggests that in a quick verbal exchange, Kane shifted his understanding. This exchange between Kane and Dana also suggests a tension between how Kane and Dana position themselves as peer reviewers and to this task. Dana’s response (line 11-4) to Kane’s question indicates both a lack of knowledge on her part as well as a lack of willingness to give him the answer. Though Dana wrote the claim statement, she positions the labeling of the ABCD elements as “the hard work” (line 11-9) that Kane is expected to do for her as the writer. This is particularly interesting given that Dana was peer reviewing Chad’s claim statement while having this conversation with Kane. It is possible, then, that Dana was alerting Kane to the fact that she held an expectation that peer reviewers help writers discern information and improve writing. Dana did the writing and gave it to Kane; it was now his responsibility to work with it. Fortunately for this peer set, Kane seemed to shift his approach and do the work, marking it “actually pretty easy” (line 11-10) as he continued. This dialogue also indicates again that Kane verbalized his thoughts. It is possible that his questions to Dana were rhetorical; he just needed to talk through his ideas to get to his understanding.

Kane continued vocalizing his thoughts as he moved to label the next element: C.
Kane made a slight shift as he verbalized his second question: “where’s C” (line 11-11) instead of “where’s your B” (line 11-3). Kane’s deletion of “your” is critical, indicating that his questions were directed to himself and his understanding rather than to Dana, who was not giving him answers (as indicated in lines 11-4, 11-7, & 11-8). This shift suggests that Kane was vocalizing aloud: a typical practice for him as he worked to put his ideas into writing.

The section on the peer review sheet in question during this excerpt is in Work Sample 4.2.
As indicated in the language of #2, Ms. Cook asked students to rewrite and label claim statements as well as write a statement if an element was missing. The ABCD elements were the topics of full class reviews (12/13/10 & 12/14/10) and individual work time (12/13/10), yet this transcript indicates that Dana was struggling to understand the format for these claim statements (line 11-12, 11-17, & 11-19). Through her series of questions, Dana sought help yet Kane did not provide her the information she needed to “get it.” Similarly, Chad appeared to struggle; however, the work he completed indicates otherwise. The review sheet Chad completed (12/15/10) for Kane’s writing is in Appendix K. The following work sample shows a snapshot of Kane’s handwritten introduction and Chad’s marking of the claim statement:
Translation: “I think I can save the British Empire from anything—except the British.” This quote by Ludwig Erhard tells that human beings are only capable of turning a perfectly acceptable place into one of terror. Although the British have ruined a great empire, they cannot take full blame for this for it is not just them that has obliterated the natural beauty of Earth, it is all of humanity. Considering the natural beauty of the Earth and the tension in the class system, Ford Maddox Brown painted Work [sic] to question the reliability of man, whether they could keep such a beautiful place as peaceful as it appears to be, or if one or more people will ruin it, through his image choice, Brown shows how he wants things to be, but he always has a hint of doubt.

Work Sample 4.3  Kane’s handwritten introduction on 12/15/10

As seen in Kane’s claim, he juxtaposed positive and negative perspectives. He began writing with a gerund phrase emphasizing a positive, “Considering the natural beauty”
yet used coordinating conjunction “and” to link it with “the tension,” wondering if “one or more people will ruin it,” and ended with the clause “he [Ford Maddox Brown] always has a hint of doubt.” While reviewing, Chad was able to find and label all the required elements. The completed peer review sheet (Appendix K) indicated that Chad found Kane’s writing successful. Chad wrote that he had an “understanding of Kane’s main point,” “he [Kane] provides a sort of map,” “it is carefully crafted,” and “I think he is going to talk about how the people where [sic] ruining the land in the painting, Work” (peer review sheet: introduction and thesis review).

Returning to the analysis of the transcript from 12/15/10, Chad did not offer explanations to Dana yet inserted himself in the conversation with “I’m trying” (line 11-20). The timing of this utterance seems to suggest that Chad was offering Dana support in her struggle, particularly given that Kane’s quick responses did not seem to do that. While Dana and Chad struggled, Kane simultaneously verbalized his thoughts, provided quick answers to Dana’s questions, and then announced he had completed his task (line 11-21). Through a series of questions that only he answered, Kane seemed talk himself through a deeper understanding of the claim structure, one he could understand and apply.

Kane’s claim statement remained the same for the following review session on 12/17/10 (session 12). This was not surprising given Chad’s positive evaluation of Kane’s claim; however, the assignment details required students to write an interpretive claim and use shared class text to support their claims. An examination of Kane’s draft indicated that he was not yet weaving the texts together. Rather, he wrote a paragraph about unreliability without explicit connections to advance his claim. Thus far, Kane was
not meeting the assignment requirements. A conversation Kane had with his peers and Ms. Cook may offer an explanation for this lack of change in his claim statement. During peer review work time, Ms. Cook stopped by Kane’s group to ask how they were doing. The following transcript represents an excerpt from their conversation, with Ms. Cook asking what the students were struggling with in their own essays:

In these first eight lines, Dana and Chad both attempted to explain their process to Ms. Cook. Their overlapping utterances suggest that both were eager to talk to her, possibly to get help. The timing of this session is important to note. This was the last workday before a two-week winter break and students would have one week to finish essays when they returned to school. As indicated in line 20-6, Dana expressed stress at the overlapping talk, and Kane acquiesced (line 20-8) and allowed Dana to talk to Ms. Cook first. Dana’s exchange with Ms. Cook follows:
Dana’s explanation revealed that she was out of ideas; Dana did not go into depth beyond this, nor did Ms. Cook ask about it. Rather, Ms. Cook’s response to Dana in line 20-12 indicated that the timing of the school year and the essay was likely the issue: “you guys are tired” (line 20-12). Such a response indicates that Ms. Cook was not putting the problem within Dana as a student or as a writer; rather, Dana needed a break in order to be productive later. With this topic proposed, Kane re-entered the conversation with his struggle.
Similar to Dana’s explanation, Kane did not specify what about the concept was causing him to struggle. Though Kane had a claim statement with all the elements, he just wasn’t “grasping it yet” (line 20-16). Kane had a start, yet his draft was not yet meeting assignment requirements because he needed time. Focusing on his use of “yet,” (line 20-16) refers back to his need for time, as expressed in line 20-14.

Ms. Cook’s response again emphasized the upcoming break, yet Kane shifted the purpose of said break. In talking with Dana, Ms. Cook suggested that the break would offer rest because students were “tired” (line 20-12) and not required “to do anything” (line 20-13) for her class. In talking with Kane, Ms. Cook stated that it was “good” to have a little break. Kane agreed and explained why: “I can just have some time just to really think about it” (line 20-22). As noted in the overlapping lines (lines 20-22 & 20-23), Ms. Cook and Kane were aligned. The break, albeit a time when students did not
have to do their assignments, would actually provide needed thinking time. At this, Dana re-entered the conversation:

| 20-25 Dana: are you really going to think about it though |
| 20-26 Kane: yea I actually am |
| 20-27 Ms. Cook: you always do |
| 20-28 it’ll be in the back of your mind |
| 20-29 Kane: yea like that’s exactly like |
| 20-30 I always do that like when sometimes like |
| 20-31 like a teacher last year she’d be like oh you’re going to write an essay about |
| THIS like in a week |
| 20-32 like that’s just right in the back of my mind thinking about it and so as soon as |
| you gives us that essay I just have all the ideas like already there |
| 20-33 Ms. Cook: yea definitely |
| 20-34 ‘cause that’s how I do it |

Transcript 4.8  12/17/10 minute 20, part 4

Dana’s question to Kane references a few ideas. First, by asking Kane this question, she may have been challenging Kane’s response, asking him if he was actually going to work over their break (20-25). Interestingly enough, she asked this in front of Ms. Cook, during this conversation and not later, after Ms. Cook walked away from the group.

Secondly, Dana may be referencing her own work ethic. Although she was one who met deadlines, she would not be working over break and was a bit incredulous that Kane was going to do so.

Throughout the rest of the exchange, Kane and Ms. Cook revealed their writing processes, which were again aligned. Most interesting is the juxtaposition of Ms. Cook’s constructions in lines 20-27 and 20-34. Beginning with “you always do” (line 20-27),
Ms. Cook asserts that she knew students, she knew thinkers, and she knew writers. She used the plural “you,” putting her students in with a group to which she was familiar. She followed this with an absolute: *always*. This gives insight into the way Ms. Cook structured this assignment; students worked on their essays for twelve sessions, then had two weeks of a break, and then returned for five sessions. Ms. Cook’s response (line 20-27) suggests that she knew students needed time to process. This also fit her notion of students as thinkers and then writers. In line 20-34, Ms. Cook shifted: “‘cause that’s how I do it.” Now using the first person “I,” she aligned herself with Kane and his experiences. In case it was not enough that writers and thinkers need time, Ms. Cook told Kane, Chad, and Dana, that she too needed time. She needed ideas to sit in the back of her mind before she could put them in writing. Returning to Kane’s words earlier in the transcript, he was “just not grasping it [his concept, his writing] yet” (line 20-16); however, he would use the break to think on his ideas because “I always do” (line 20-30). At this moment in Kane’s writing process (12/17/10), he was unsure and needed time to think. For Kane, working through his ideas and writing essays took time; fortunately for him, this time was validated in Ms. Cook’s classroom. Kane’s process is an example of how Ms. Cook (and her curricular structure) embraced repetition of concepts: Kane needed time and various attempts to work through his ideas for his claim and how to write about it in his argumentative essay. Because he was not expected to master the concept early or after one exposure, Kane was successful. Additionally, Kane maintained an alignment with Ms. Cook and was building a relationship with Dana and Chad.

The following three events all occurred during a thirty-five minute conversation between Kane, Chad, and Dana during session 15 (1/5/11). Together, these events
represent a kind of deep learning with regard to Kane’s content topics. As indicated in my field notes, the final essay was due in two days (1/7/11) and students were expected to have a full draft for peer reviews. During this class session (1/5/11), Kane was still writing his essay during peer review time.

I selected the following transcript (transcript 4.9) as a telling event because it offers a representation of how Kane worked through his ideas over time, building relationships with text and with his peers. Specifically, Kane worked to develop his claim statement: an aspect of his essay that was pivotal to his organization, his evidence, and Ms. Cook’s assessment of his final essay.

The key that precedes Transcript 4.9 provides meaning for the codes used in the analytic columns to the right of the message units. An explanation of why and how I analyzed in this manner are explained in the two paragraphs preceding the transcript.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Key to Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uptk</td>
<td>uptake to another person’s proposal or idea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q Clar</td>
<td>question of clarification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clar</td>
<td>clarification of own ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cont</td>
<td>continuous discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persp</td>
<td>continuing yet offer a new perspective to conversation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>evidence in the text (explicit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUT</td>
<td>lived experiences as evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rel: Text</td>
<td>interpretation of text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rel: Peer</td>
<td>attending to peer relationship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transcript Key
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line #</th>
<th>Spkr</th>
<th>Message Unit</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Uptk</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Clar</th>
<th>Cont</th>
<th>Persp</th>
<th>IN</th>
<th>OUT</th>
<th>Rel: Text</th>
<th>Rel: Peer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-1</td>
<td>Kane</td>
<td>what do you think we should use for like saying like positive stuff (.3) like</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X: we &amp; asking for help</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>for the transition words or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>Kane</td>
<td>like I’m just saying I think that he like agrees with like how the way things are but then</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>wait, are we all doing the same painting</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>Kane</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>okay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>Kane</td>
<td>but I don’t see like how either of the um passages that we have to read like really</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X X: we</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-8</td>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>do you mean like he agrees</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-9</td>
<td>Kane</td>
<td>help that</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>with the social class</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-11</td>
<td>Kane</td>
<td>yea basically</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-12</td>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>I don’t think he agrees</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-13</td>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>or like does he think that the workers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-14</td>
<td>Kane</td>
<td>well I’m just wondering if there’s any good examples for saying that</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-15</td>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>I don’t know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-16</td>
<td></td>
<td>I put the workers like accepted their roles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-17</td>
<td>Kane</td>
<td>yea well I’m like trying to find like</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued
Transcript 4.9 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line #</th>
<th>Spkr</th>
<th>Message Unit</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Uptk Q Clar</th>
<th>Clar</th>
<th>Cont</th>
<th>Persp</th>
<th>IN</th>
<th>OUT</th>
<th>Rel: Text</th>
<th>Rel: Peer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-18</td>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>well I’s just trying to say</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-19</td>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>well you’re trying to find like</td>
<td>X to line 17, not line 18</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X: offeri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-20</td>
<td>Kane</td>
<td>examples and stuff</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-21</td>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>well all the workers seem pretty happy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X: offeri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-22</td>
<td>Kane</td>
<td>yea</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X: offeri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-23</td>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>yea but</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X: offeri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-24</td>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>it looks like he’s singing</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X: offeri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-25</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.3) that guy’s pretty focused on his work so</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-26</td>
<td>Kane</td>
<td>yea I think that just through like everything it just kind of shows that they accept it really</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X: offeri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-27</td>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>they accept it but like if they wanted to they could break free because they’re all strong and working</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X: offeri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-28</td>
<td>Kane</td>
<td>well if they wanted to but the thing is they’re not showing any resistance</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X: offeri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-29</td>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>well but like the only place there’s like real tension is with the dogs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X: offeri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued
Transcript 4.9 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line #</th>
<th>Spkr</th>
<th>Message Unit</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Uptk</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Clar</th>
<th>Cont</th>
<th>Persp</th>
<th>IN</th>
<th>OUT</th>
<th>Rel: Text</th>
<th>Rel: Peer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-30</td>
<td>Kane</td>
<td>yea except it’s also like when dogs play they play like rough so you it’s like you can’t really tell if they’re just playing or if they’re really angry</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X: yea &amp; except</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-31</td>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>well he looks scared out of his mind, this one’s just like whatever, and this one’s sleeping</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X: well</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While analyzing Kane’s conversations with his peers during peer review sessions, I noticed that it was typical for them to grapple with text deeply, offering various perspectives and deepening their relationships with texts and with peers. What I mean by deepening is that Kane, Dana, and Chad’s conversations were continuous rather than full of restarts or questions that took the conversation in a new direction. Students did not need always agree with one another, but there was depth to the dialogue that I needed to attempt to capture in my analysis. I used the symbols as descriptors to help explicate how the language was deepening over time. In my analysis, I indicated how I understood the message units and how I analyzed the talk between Kane, Chad, and Sue. In the “Rel: Peer” column I wrote accompanying notes because I thought this column may be more
interpretation; my notes are my attempt to show my thinking. This next paragraph is an illustration of my analysis.

As made visible in line 1-1, Kane made a proposal in the form of a question. He also used the pronoun we indicating a connection to his peers. In Kane’s proposal he asked for help; this also suggests that he needs or is interested in his peers opinions. With both moves, Kane was attending to peer relationships. In line 1-2, there was uptake to this proposal because Chad took up Kane’s question and added to it. Chad asked a question of clarification; still, the conversation was moving forward on the same topic. In line 1-3, Kane clarified what he meant in his proposal, citing explicit evidence in the text and offering his interpretation of the text (what I am calling relationship to text). In these three lines, data indicate that Kane and Chad were building a relationship with text and with each other; as the duration of the transcript makes visible, these moves continued and deepened both relationships.

In lines 1-3, 1-7, and 1-9, Kane’s words indicate that he has a claim in mind. He believed that the artist, Ford Maddox Brown, “agrees with the way things [the social classes] are,” yet Kane was unsure of how to use either of the two print texts [Bartleby, the Scrivener or The Communist Manifesto] to help support his claim, as required in the assignment. Making intertextual links across print texts and the paintings was a sophisticated, complex requirement, one that Ms. Cook specified in the assignment directions. On a base level, this suggests that Ms. Cook found her students capable of such creation. The need for intertextual links also allows us to think about student creation rather than replication. As Kane was trying to create and write his claim statement, he needed help piecing text together, and for this he leaned on his peers.
There was not a single text or model essay on which Kane could rely to find the answer; rather, he needed to think deeply about the multiple texts and display his thinking and understanding with his writing.

This conversation in Transcript 4.9 also shows how Kane’s request for help with his intertextual links was taken up by his peers and was redirected as the three students talked through and deepened their understandings of their content topics.

As the transcript began, all three students were drafting final portions of their essays, getting them ready for a final peer review—the assigned task for the day (1/5/11). Kane’s first proposal was in the form of a question: “What do you think we should use for like saying like positive stuff” (line 1-1). This “positive stuff” represents Kane’s new direction with his ideas and shift in claim statement. Previously focused on the reliability of man, “whether they would keep such a beautiful place as peaceful as it appears to be, or if one or more people will ruin it” (Work Sample 4.3, 12/15/10 & 12/17/10), Kane was unsure about his direction. When Ms. Cook questioned his group, “do you guys like what you’re writing,” (session 12, 12/17/10), Kane responded with the following: “I just think I need some more time to let this like concept develop in my mind” (line 20-14) “cause like I’m just not grasping it yet” (line 20-16). His question for his group then, on January 5, 2011 (session 15): “What do you think we should use for like saying like positive stuff” (line 1-1) indicates that Kane is still working out his ideas. Looking across these data points, Kane’s struggle and writing process remain clear: Kane was not beginning his work late or choosing to wait until the last moment to write. Rather, on this day (1/5/11), Kane was still processing his ideas. He was still trying to express his ideas in writing while attending to both his interpretation and his assignment.
An examination of Kane’s pronoun choice within his question, “What do you think we should use for like saying like positive stuff,” (line 1-1) situates him with his peers. Though upcoming analysis will discuss the direction the transcribed conversation went, I find it significant that Kane asked his peers how to use shared texts for a shared assignment, and did so through a shared, plural pronoun. With the use of “you” to direct his question at both Chad and Dana, Kane switched to asking what “we” should use, not what “I” should use. This plural pronoun suggests that Kane may consider his struggle to be shared; it also indicates that he and his peers are working on a shared assignment, with shared tasks and are both willing and capable of helping one another. Kane’s question also reveals possible vulnerability: he is still piecing his essay together, two days before its due date. Kane’s considerations of his ideas over time suggest engaged thinking.

During this peer review session, Kane asked his peers for help. Chad entered the conversation after Kane’s three second pause, with uptake to Kane’s question in the form of his own question of clarification: “for the transition words or”. From the words Kane proposed, Chad drew on his assumption that Kane wanted help with the transition words, a topic and worksheet that Ms. Cook handed out earlier in the class period. As indicated in Kane’s response to Chad in line 1-3, a repair was needed; Kane had not shared enough information for Chad or Dana to fully grasp what he needed from them. Kane used his next turn at talk to clarify his question, making direct reference to his focal painting, a reference that resulted in Dana’s uptake and question of clarification: “Are we all doing the same painting”. In line 1-7, Kane continued his idea (his claim) from line 1-3 and Chad again spoke up with a question of clarification (line 1-8), using his uptake and interrupting the conversation flow. With no uptake in line 1-9 or
1-10, Chad and Kane are talking to one another but are not yet in sync. In line 1-11 Kane acknowledged agreement with Chad’s question, yet his own question remained unclear. In line 1-12 then, Dana made a proposal to join the conversation. Her idea, a contrary perspective to Kane’s was clearly and firmly stated, yet there was no uptake; rather, Chad continued to extend his question to Kane. It was not until line 1-14 that Kane finalized his request for help and Chad responded with “I don’t know.” Thus far in the conversation, the repairs and questions of clarification break the flow and moments of continuity are shallow (i.e., lines 1-5 and 1-6) or interrupted (i.e., Kane continuing his own thoughts in lines 1-7 and 1-9).

Chad, unsure of how to use the print text to support Kane’s claim, went on to offer how he supported his claim with evidence from the painting (line 1-16)—help Kane has not requested and does not need (as stated in line 1-26). Dana tried to insert herself into the conversation in lines 1-18 and 1-23, yet it was not until line 1-28 that there was uptake to her ideas. It is also at this point in the conversation (line 1-28) that Kane and Dana engage one another in dialogue surrounding their interpretations of the painting Work. Lines 1-27 through 1-31 offer a sample of a continuous conversation, marked with conversational hedges but, well, yea except. As Dana and Kane work to express their own ideas, each gives a nod to his/her peer’s idea. For example, Kane believes that the workers in the painting Work accept their roles and the class system but Dana disagreed, slightly. As stated in line 1-27, Dana agreed with Kane (“they accept it”) and then added a nuance, a conditional “but” to begin her idea that the workers, “if they wanted to” could “break free.” This use of but, well, yea except continued throughout the exchange of ideas; Kane and Dana disagreed, yet remained cordial and did not discount the other’s
ideas. After Dana’s comment in line 1-31, the conversation abruptly ended and the three students resumed their work.

This bit of continuous dialogue is different from the continuous markers noted in lines 1-15 through 1-26. In lines 1-15 through 1-26, all three students talked to one another without engaging deeply into the content topics; rather, they offered short responses that kept the conversation moving, as shown with the talk marked “uptake” and “continuity.” A moving conversation does not equate with a deep conversation, as these twelve lines indicate; however, they did get the students talking about and clarifying their own ideas, which led to deep conversation about the content topics in lines 1-27 through 1-31.

During this same peer review session (1/5/11), Ms. Cook walked around the classroom checking in with students and asking groups how they were feeling about their work. When Ms. Cook arrived to Kane’s group, the three students had their desks arranged in a circle. Dana and Chad were reviewing essays and writing on their peer review worksheets, while Kane simultaneously wrote his essay and reviewed Dana’s. The upcoming transcript represents a conversation between Ms. Cook and Kane’s group, during their thirty-five minutes of work time. The transcript indicates that within Ms. Cook’s response to Kane, she marked an alignment to his timing and his writing process. This represents a typical event.
Ms. Cook: so do you three feel confident about what you’ve accomplished so far

Dana: [ I don’t like it. ]

Kane: ] Um

Dana: [ I don’t like this type of writing

Kane: um my idea for what I’m going to be writing my essay about just hit me a few minutes ago so I’m going to be rewriting it a lot tonight

Ms. Cook: that that happens

it’s the process of writing

Kane: yea

Ms. Cook: you know and sometimes you’ll get through it and you’ll like wait I’ll be right over [aside to student across the room]

Kane: My paper started out so negative when I read it over I was like oh my gosh it’s so negative I don’t want it to be like this because that’s not really how I feel about it

Ms. Cook: right and that’s just how it happens and so you go back in and you refresh it and fix it and everything

Dana: that doesn’t happen until I turn it in [laughter]

Ms. Cook: Okay so Dana

you don’t like this kind of writing

Dana: No

Ms. Cook: but do you find that you like what the product is

Dana: Not really it’s just different

Kane: I like it I think it’s good

like I don’t know it’s just like the way you like describe it makes it seem like you really like get into it

like you try to like I don’t know how to say it but you try to like jump into it and understand how they’re all feeling and yea

it’s really good

Dana: thank you

Ms. Cook: do you think if you were to read it cold, like if it wasn’t you writing it do you think that you would think it was a good paper

Dana: probably

Ms. Cook: that’s good that’s all we can ask

as much as it pains me as an English teacher I understand not everybody is going to be like I LOVE ENGLISH

I think they all should be that way

but as long as you have the tools to be an effective good communicator that’s all I can ask so I understand.

What about you? [to Chad]

Chad: xxxxx [inaudible]

Ms. Cook: Do you feel in control

Chad: xxxxx [inaudible]

Ms. Cook: [to whole group] keep working I won’t bug you anymore
As shown in line 14-1, Ms. Cook specifically addressed the whole group: “So do you three….” Although Kane and Dana offered a simultaneous response, Chad was silent. Dana asserted her dislike of the essay (lines 14-2 & 14-4) and Kane asserted his interest in Dana’s essay (lines 14-18 & 14-20) in a “teacherly” way. During these conversations, Chad sat silent, head down, doing his work. In line 14-28 Ms. Cook directly asked Chad a question. When she made this explicit move, Kane and Dana returned to their conversation about their essays. Such conversational moves were typical for this triad. Dana and Kane dialogued with Ms. Cook and unless Chad had a specific question for Ms. Cook, he did not respond or when he did he gave short answers (audio analysis, 12/17/10). Noting this pattern is not to suggest that Chad was disinterested or unable to answer; rather, the contrasting responses among Chad, Dana, and Kane highlight how both Dana and Kane offer elaborate responses and work to align themselves with Ms. Cook and one another. Chad, on the other hand, seems to have a different stance toward participating in class.

As the transcript made visible, Ms. Cook labeled the timing of Kane’s rewrite as him embracing the writing process (lines 14-6-14-11), a process she understood and utilized as a writer herself. Because Ms. Cook aligned Kane’s process with a legitimate choice for writers, Kane was encouraged to rewrite. Ms. Cook’s pronoun use of “you” (line 14-9) also suggested that Kane was a member of a group; her continuation of what “you” do during the process of writing (line 14-9) was a further indication that Ms. C understood Kane’s process. Ms. C’s choice of words “refresh” and “fix” (line 14-11) is an additional indicator that Kane’s process was validated. Finally, Dana’s insertion of “That doesn’t happen until I turn it in” helped frame Kane’s process as helpful—one that
Dana wished she could accomplish. This wistful comment also situated this conversation as relaxed, particularly because Ms. Cook and Kane both responded in laughter. Kane’s recursive process of revising was categorized as something positive.

Throughout this unit (field notes 12/17/10 & 1/5/11) and with subsequent units (interviews, 1/3/11 & 5/20/11), Kane wrote and rewrote, often shifting perspectives across drafts; it mattered not that he typically wrote close to the deadlines (field note, 1/6/11). Examining Kane’s explanation in the transcribed conversation, his ideas on his writing process were made visible. He began by stating, “My paper started out so negative” (line 14-10), indicating that his paper had a beginning or a starting point which was different from his final point of view. This suggests that Kane’s writing was not merely a forward motion; rather, he wrote recursively. Kane also stated “when I read it over” (line 14-10), suggesting that he both writes and reads his drafts. This notion of rewriting may be fortified by an explanation Kane gave during our first interview (1/12/11):

like um when they like when my partner [Chad] gave me my synopsis of my paper I was thinking like oh okay, well they do kind of get my point like they thought that it was a valid point but they said okay well I could expand on it some more and like when I started expanding on it I realized that this wasn’t really my opinion like this isn’t how I feel. (interview 1/13/11).

Using Chad’s comments and focusing on the guiding questions on the peer review sheets, Kane was able to think more deeply about his topic and how he structured his ideas within his essay. As a result, Kane rewrote his essay. Returning to the analysis of the event during the peer review session (1/5/11), Ms. Cook’s responses to Kane indicate that
Kane was neither scolded for writing his essay two days prior to the deadline nor for writing his essay while also completing a peer review during class. This is significant because not all students were afforded this courtesy.

To offer a contrast, the group Ms. Cook spoke with prior to Kane’s was a dyad: two males who sat working side by side with minimal conversation and little to no eye contact. When she arrived at their desks, Ms. Cook questioned why both were writing their own essays instead of peer reviewing. Anis—who self-identified as Somalian American—responded first. He did not provide an excuse nor did he engage Ms. Cook in lengthy conversation. Most of Anis’s response was mumbled and inaudible; however, it was within Ms. Cook’s verbal response that I noted a misalignment. She started her response with the term “sweetheart,” [a term she used frequently with male and female students alike, across class sessions and school years] and then noted that Anis had a pattern of not completing his work, which was problematic (field notes, 1/5/11). This misalignment between the teacher’s expectations and the student’s performance was further marked when the student’s partner, David—who self identified as White—took the next speaking turn to clarify why he was off-task. David stated that writing his essay because he was just adding a new thought, which Ms. Cook praised (field notes, 1/5/11). This praise suggests an alignment with the teacher’s expectations and the student’s performance, but it also emphasized a contrast between the two male students and how they were being positioned in the class.

In a later, private conversation, Ms. Cook told me that Anis was troubled: both academically and socially, with a most recent school suspension. She admitted that she was frustrated with his pattern of incomplete work and was not certain how best to
support him. On his student survey, Anis marked that he found small-groups and homework “somewhat unhelpful” yet did not elaborate. In reviewing the written peer review documents Anis and David turned in with their final essays (1/7/11), David’s work was complete and Anis’s was not. David also turned in three peer worksheets from Anis although Anis only turned in one of David’s (1/7/11).

A more extensive illustration of a deep conversation about the content topics occurred later in the trio’s conversation, during the same peer review session on 1/5/11. This next transcript (transcript 4.11) is a typical event representing how these three students used their peer grouping and class time to have a deep conversation about content topics. As time for peers to converse was a typical instructional move, this transcript offers an illustration of how Ms. Cook positioned students as thinkers capable of engaging with argumentation and argumentative writing; she could have filled instructional time with lectures and guided conversations, yet as this transcript makes visible, students grappled with complex topics on their own. This conversation also marks relationships within this peer group. The transcript key for the codes used in the analysis precedes the transcript.
### Codes | Key to Meaning
---|---
P | proposal
Uptk | uptake to another person’s proposal or idea
Q Clar | question of clarification
Clar | clarification of own ideas
Cont | continuous discussion
Persp | continuing yet offer a new perspective to conversation
IN | evidence in the text (explicit)
OUT | lived experiences as evidence
Rel: Text | interpretation of text
Rel: Peer | attending to peer relationship

**Transcript Key**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line #</th>
<th>Spkr</th>
<th>Message Unit</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Uptk</th>
<th>Q Clar</th>
<th>Clar</th>
<th>Cont</th>
<th>Persp</th>
<th>IN</th>
<th>OUT</th>
<th>Rel: Text</th>
<th>Rel: Peer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-1</td>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>hey Kane do you have your fourth body paragraph</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X: uses his name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-2</td>
<td>Kane</td>
<td>ah no I don’t</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-3</td>
<td></td>
<td>it’s basically I: lost it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-4</td>
<td></td>
<td>[Kane laughs]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X: reveals vulnerability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-5</td>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>how do you lose it?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-6</td>
<td>Kane</td>
<td>I wrote it and I don’t know where I put it [laughs]</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X: reveals vulnerability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-7</td>
<td></td>
<td>I have no idea where it is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued

Transcript 4.11  1/5/11 minutes 20:25-22:11
Transcript 4.11 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line #</th>
<th>Spkr</th>
<th>Message Unit</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Uptk</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Clar</th>
<th>Cont</th>
<th>Persp</th>
<th>IN</th>
<th>OUT</th>
<th>Rel: Text</th>
<th>Rel: Peer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-8</td>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>(.2) basically it was about like the interaction between the classes and it was just like how the little girl grabbed the boy was grabbing the boy’s head and like the little boy was like working and like it was kind of saying like how the classes can interact in like a healthy manner</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-9</td>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>but they choose not to?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-10</td>
<td>Kane</td>
<td>I wouldn’t say they choose not to I say that they like really well like I don’t know it was just kind of like</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-11</td>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>(.4) I don’t know like I’m trying to remember what I put but it was like (.2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-12</td>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>well to me it seems like they don’t really interact</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-13</td>
<td>Kane</td>
<td>it’s just like</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-14</td>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>‘cause you don’t see the rich people touching the poor people</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transcript 4.11 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line #</th>
<th>Spkr</th>
<th>Message Unit</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Uptk</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Clar</th>
<th>Cont</th>
<th>Persp</th>
<th>IN</th>
<th>OUT</th>
<th>Rel: Text</th>
<th>Rel: Peer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-15</td>
<td>Kane</td>
<td>but see it’s not really that they have to touch it’s like the way they like that they I don’t know how the one woman who looks rich like over here like how she like steps over it instead of just being like get out of my way like how they all just kind of go around</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-16</td>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>ah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-17</td>
<td>Kane</td>
<td>it just kind of shows like they all agree with it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-18</td>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>well it seems like they are more avoiding it</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-19</td>
<td>Kane</td>
<td>well I don’t know like it seems like by the way she’s looking down she’s like more like trying not to interfere.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-20</td>
<td></td>
<td>and usually like the upper class would just be like okay move I’m coming through like how the guy ran over</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-21</td>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>ah</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued
Transcript 4.11 began with Chad directly addressing Kane with his name, “hey Kane” (line 20-1) that led into a six-line conversation revealing that Kane lost his fourth body paragraph. As Kane’s peer reviewer, Chad was responsible for reading and
commenting on Kane’s essay, yet could not finish his task during class because of the lost paragraph. A later conversation with Kane revealed that he gave Chad a final draft in between classes and Chad finished his review before the due date, allowing Chad to earn full points as a reviewer and for Kane to get feedback. This use of out of class time may be a simple reflection of Chad’s desire to earn the grade; however, I find it also indicative of their relationship and mutual respect. Kane knew where and when to get his finished draft to Chad and valued the peer feedback. Chad—instead of verbalizing frustration with Kane, tattling to Ms. Cook about Kane’s incomplete draft or jotting a note on the review sheet with this message—took the time out of class to read and finish his job as a peer reviewer.

In line 20-1, Chad held Kane responsible for his work. Kane took up Chad’s question first with a direct answer “ah no I don’t” (line 20-2) and then an admission: “ah I lost it” (line 20-3). Kane’s tone of voice changed slightly between the two responses and his admission was followed by a hesitant laugh. Though spoken within seconds of one another, Kane’s responses suggest that although he was embarrassed (indicated in his laughter in line 20-4), he was able to be honest with his peers. Though neither Chad nor Dana laughed with or at Kane, Dana pressed the issue in a slow, quiet voice (line 20-5). Dana’s uptake “ho:w do you lose it?” to Kane’s confession “ah I lost it,” may be teasing. It is also possible that Dana’s question indicates that this trio holds one another accountable—akin to Chad’s original question in line 20-1. Regardless of intent, Kane answered Dana’s question with repeated statements of confusion: “I don’t know” (line 20-5) and “I have no idea” (line 20-6). Using the first person I as his subject, Kane took responsibility for the lost paragraph and makes himself vulnerable to ridicule, which
neither Chad nor Dana take up, though there was a two-second pause (line 20-8) before Kane continued talking, explaining his recall of the missing paragraph. It is likely that Kane moved back into textual analysis (line 20-8) to repair his previous hesitant responses and reposition himself as prepared, as a thinker in the group, yet his voiced “I don’t know” in line 20-11 still indicates uncertainty. Again, neither Dana nor Chad exploited Kane’s weakness; rather, Dana asked a question of clarification (line 20-9) that led into an explication of her understanding (lines 20-12 & 20-14), a perspective that countered and challenged Kane’s.

Lines 20-8 through 20-31 also indicate that this trio had a respectful relationship that allowed them to listen to one another, push one another’s thoughts, and disagree. As indicated in the transcript table, there was continuity in this conversation: the students were able to move forward in their conversation. To use the analogy of an open circuit, the content topic conversation was continuous, with only a few breaks in the flow (i.e., a question of clarification in line 9 or a new/different perspective in line 12). Within this continual flow, the three students were able to deeply engage with their own opinions and grapple with one another’s perspectives and with their shared texts.

Both Kane and Dana worked to voice their claims and provide textual evidence to support them; in so doing, Kane made an intertextual link to help explain his idea. In line 20-22, after five attempts to explain what he wrote about in his missing paragraph, Kane referenced an event from A Tale of Two Cities, the novel previously studied in class. Dana’s response to Kane (line 20-21) midway through his intertextual link indicates understanding. She did not ask for clarification; rather, as Kane was midway through his thought, Dana followed his reference. Kane then finished his link, and Dana moved
directly into disagreement (line 20-23). This is significant because Kane leaned on previous understanding to help explain a current idea; this move suggests that Kane was making use of past learning to deepen his ideas about his topic of social classes.

Additionally, Kane’s and Dana’s language reveals relational dimensions that indicate respect for one another’s ideas. In lines 20-16 and 20-21 Dana vocalized that she was listening to and following Kane’s perspective with a simple “ah”; however, she made explicitly clear in line 20-23, “I don’t agree with you.” Notably, her statement of disagreement was followed with her reasoning and careful attention to textual evidence: “cause they have the fence around them…” (line 20-23), which also offered textual evidence to her earlier statement in line 20-17. Kane, having tried previously to counter her perspective, acquiesced and replied, “I respect your opinion” (line 20-24). This mention of respect ended their dialogue, yet Chad picked up the conversation thread and offered his own interpretation of the fence (line 20-26) to which Dana responded, “true but I think….” (lines 20-27). At this point, two days before their final essays were due, Dana seems solid in her understanding of her topic and her claim. Although she was more subdued in the first conversation sampling I offered from this same class session, in this conversation, eighteen minutes later, she was assertive.

More relational markers occur throughout this transcript as conversational hedges, often marked by repetition. I conceive of hedges as relational markers because they acknowledge another’s perspective without passing judgment. A conversational hedge, particularly when marked with repetition, indicates listening and may be layered with politeness (in the form of pronouns or soft verbs). I situate the function of conversational hedges as continuing a conversation rather than shutting it down.
In this conversation, the hedges often come in pairs. For example, as Dana began to assert her opinion on the issue of interaction, she stated, “well to me it seems…” (line 20-12). The conversational hedge, “well,” is followed by “to me,” an opinion that is followed by “it seems,” another indication of personal interpretation. Such moves indicate that Dana’s ideas, as well as Kane’s, are possible. Kane countered her opinion with, “but see….” Which I also mark a hedge. Kane could have explicitly said, “I disagree” but he softened his different perspective with the hedge, followed by his interpretation of the textual evidence.

As Kane later made a claim about his opinion (line 20-17), Dana offered a hedge: “well, it seems like…” She softened her disagreement to which Kane immediately mimicked, “well I don’t know.” The repetition of the hedge “well” allows both Kane and Dana to disagree with one another but still move the conversation forward, working to deepen their understanding of their own ideas, and possibly, each other’s ideas. It was not until Dana’s assertion “I don’t agree with you” (line 20-23) that this dialogue ended. Though not a conversational hedge, Kane’s response to this assertion also functioned as a pairing: “I respect your opinion” (line 20-24). Both students asserted their opinions, and the relationship was salvaged. However, the conversation needed to end or take a different direction; it was at this point that Chad reentered.

The following day in the library, Kane and Dana sat together working on their final essay drafts in deep conversation (field notes 1/6/11). Curious if this was a continuation of peer group conversations surrounding the painting Work, I asked Kane about it in his interview (1/12/11) because I did not have an audio recorder available for them during the library workday. Kane remarked that he and Dana trying to discuss
his/her views and what each really thought of the painting. Their conversation in the library focused on the dogs and how each interpreted/viewed the interactions among class systems. Though the conversation in the library was not required, Kane shared, “We actually got into the painting a lot more than usual that time. Dana and I our like minds are actually a lot different” (interview 1/13/11). Kane then explained to me what he and Dana wrote about in their essays.

Notably, Kane did not mark either of their interpretations as right or better; both his knowledge of her topic and his use of “different” indicate that he respected Dana. This was particularly interesting to me because while Kane was Dana’s peer reviewer, Chad was Kane’s. This means that Dana was not required to read Kane’s essay, though all three shared their ideas during peer review sessions in class. Kane’s acknowledgement of different perspectives also hints that in this classroom, students were allowed to take up ideas differently, yet still be successful. Additionally, as Kane shared in his interview (1/3/11), Dana read his full essay the night before it was due. Dana, like Chad, took time out of class to review Kane’s work. Such work indicates a commitment to one another’s ideas. Given the conversations within their trio (field notes, 1/5/11), Kane, Dana, and Chad exemplify how students who work together over time can support one another and push one another to think deeply. As Kane stated, “We both basically knew each other’s papers and we knew each other’s points and claims” (interview 1/13/11).

Employing the ABCD claim method, Kane’s final draft (1/7/11) of his claim statement read as follows:
Marx and many others believed that the working class just created new problems, while Brown believed that the new working class actually fixed them. Considering the problems evident in the past class systems, Ford Maddox Brown painted work [sic] to show that the classes can exist in peace through nature, interactions between classes, and the overall changed attitude of the upper class.

Work Sample 4.4  
Kane’s 1st Essay: Full claim statement

To review, the ABCD format Ms. Cook taught contained the following elements:

- **A** = author’s name and title of the work
- **B** = abstract concept you are examining
- **C** = your commentary on B
- **D** = the rhetorical/literacy device used to develop B

Kane’s final claim statement fits the ABCD template as follows:

- **A** = Ford Maddox Brown painted work
- **B** = to show that the classes can exist in peace
- **C** = Considering the problems evident in the past class systems
- **D** = through nature, interactions between classes, and the overall changed attitude of the upper class

Kane’s elements were present, yet were written in a CABD format. When Kane and I spoke about his claim statement, he provided more explanation than what he wrote in the final claim. He also continued to grapple with the notions of positivity.
And it’s just like like this probably the overall change of the upper class is kinda of what I just said like I notice that like they [sic] actually happier than what they used to be and like they just seem like I don’t know they just seem more peaceful than before. (interview, 1/13/11)

Kane’s use of “before” held layered meanings: first, he referenced previous conversations and ideas from the previous class novel, Dickens’ *A Tale of Two Cities*, and how class systems functioned in history during the French Revolution. Secondly, Kane referenced how he previously thought of the class systems and his ideas in his early drafts of his claim statement. His words offer an explanation:

and then um at first um, my paper it was kind of like negative, like I was looking for more at more the downside of it and then I thought like like as I took another look at it [the painting] I realized that the actual um p, like the actual painting is more like positive than negative, like it has like a bright sky. . . . (interview, 1/13/11)

Kane’s shift from negative to positive helps explain how the upper class “is more peaceful than before,” with before referring to his early interpretation of the upper class as negative. This shift also illustrates how his ideas where shaped over time, particularly after a peer review and peer dialogue helped Kane understand how his ideas were being read, ideas he did not agree with and changed for upcoming drafts. Throughout his final essay, Kane wove in textual evidence to support his claim from the painting *Work*, *The Communist Manifesto*, and *Bartleby, the Scrivener*. Though it took him the entire instructional unit, Kane succeeded in writing an essay per his assignment guidelines as well as one of which he and Ms. Cook were proud.
Looking across perspectives and hearing what his peers had to offer allowed Kane to access deep understanding of his content ideas. As deep understanding, I mean that Kane is thinking about his ideas over time, considering and reconsidering so he can unpack his ideas and elaborate his understanding for himself and his peers, whether in spoken or written form.

Table 4.4 offers a snapshot into Kane’s evolving claim statement for the painting Work. Though more contextualized versions have already been presented in narrative form, in this table I shaded elements that represent Kane’s shifting understanding of his topic; through this shifting, I argue that Kane’s understanding of his content deepened and the instructional moves Ms. Cook made aligned with his writing process. In Table 4.4, I also included Kane’s interview responses regarding his final claim statement and his overall responses to his first argumentative essay.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Session</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Kane’s Words on his essay <em>Work</em></th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Session 8 (12.13.10)</td>
<td>Spoken response to Ms. Cook arriving at his desk, asking for his thoughts on his claim statement</td>
<td>I want to say um considering the reliability of man and the ideology of like of the ideology of the ideology of a perfect society, um Ford Maddox Brown painted <em>Work</em> to show the um to question the reliability of man to and like to question the reli reliabil</td>
<td>Kane stated that he did not have a claim written down yet, but said he could verbalize his idea (shown in the quote).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 8 (12.13.10)</td>
<td>Spoken response to Ms. Cook’s question: “And what are your devices?”</td>
<td>I said like I did like how his face is engulfed in the shadows and also there’s a dirt road so there’s a really like long way to go and also like saying that like sometimes man can be kind of silly and be kind of dimwitted by um like by the dogs with the wearing the sweater because they don’t have a fur coat so</td>
<td>Ms. Cook evaluated him positively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 10 (12.15.10)</td>
<td>Written Handwritten draft of the claim within the introduction</td>
<td>Considering the natural beauty of the Earth and the tension in the class system, Ford Maddox Brown painted <em>Work</em> to question the reliability of man, whether they would keep such a beautiful place as peaceful as it appears to be, or if one or more people will ruin it, through his image choice, Brown shows how he wants things to be, but he always has a hint of doubt.</td>
<td>ABCD marked by peer (Chad) yet D is off: it marks part of the hook instead of the devices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 12 (12.17.10)</td>
<td>Written Handwritten draft</td>
<td>Considering the natural beauty of the Earth and the tension in the class system, Ford Maddox Brown painted <em>Work</em> to question the reliability of man, whether they would keep such a beautiful place as peaceful as it appears to be, or if one or more people will ruin it, through his image choice, Brown shows how he wants things to be, but he always has a hint of doubt.</td>
<td>No change from 12.15.10 but during peer work time he wrote the first body paragraph about Bartleby being unreliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 12 (12.17.10)</td>
<td>Spoken response to Ms. Cook’s question: “Do you guys like what you’re writing”</td>
<td>I just think I need some more time to let this like concept develop in my mind ‘cause like I’m just not grasping it yet</td>
<td>Kane is struggling with his ideas; at this point, he has an introduction and first body paragraph. He is not struggling with the structure of writing a claim, yet needs more time to think about his ideas for his claim.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4  *Kane’s Writing/Thinking Process. 1st Essay, Grade 9: Work*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Session</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Kane’s Words on his essay Work</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Session 15 (1.5.11)</td>
<td>Spoken response to Ms. Cook’s question: “Do you three feel confident about what you’ve accomplished so far?”</td>
<td>Um my idea for what I’m going to be writing my essay about just hit me a few minutes ago so I’m going to be rewriting it a lot tonight. My paper started out so negative when I read it over I was like oh my gosh it’s so negative I don’t want it to be like this because that’s not really how I feel about it.</td>
<td>Kane is supposed to have a complete draft of his essay for Chad to review; however, he only has a partial draft due to his rewrite and because he lost his fourth body paragraph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.7.11)</td>
<td>Written Final essay</td>
<td>Marx and many others believed that the working class just created new problems, while Brown believed that the new working class actually fixed them. Considering the problems evident in the past class systems, Ford Maddox Brown painted work [sic] to show that the classes can exist in peace through nature, interactions between classes, and the overall changed attitude of the upper class.</td>
<td>Kane refers to previous conversations and ideas from the previous novel: Dickens, <em>A Tale of Two Cities</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.13.11)</td>
<td>Spoken response to researcher’s interview question: “What did you end up with as your claim?”</td>
<td>As, as my claim I um I said that the classes can exist in peace through nature, interactions between classes, and the overall, the overall changed attitude of the upper class. And it’s just like like this probably the overall change of the upper class is kinda of what I just said like I notice that like they actually happier than what they used to be and like they just seem like I don’t know, they just seem more peaceful than before.</td>
<td>Again, a reference to “before”—referring to how class systems were represented in Dickens’ novel and during the French Revolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spoken response to researcher’s interview question: “How did you feel about this essay when it was done?”</td>
<td>When it was done I actually didn’t really have any big regrets about it like I felt like I really like got all my points in and I really like like I had enough like I had enough um filling just to like make my point</td>
<td>At this point, Kane believes that an argumentative essay needs to contain a claim and evidence: this fits his explanation of his success here</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As indicated in the shifts to his claim statement and through his remarks about how he understood the painting, I argue that Kane was deeply thinking, doing, and playing with text and with his understandings of argumentative writing.

As Kane reviewed his process during our first interview, his revealed an attitude of deep understanding:

at first I was like slowly like piecing things together like like like/I like/when I first looked at the painting I first just like like/ I looked at what I noticed first and like I tried to find out like does he [Ford Maddox Brown] agree with it does he accept it does he want things to be different and all of that and um/I just kind of like tried to analyze it for like what it really is/like what more like what his opinion was rather than just mine. (interview, 1/13/11)

Kane worked to accomplish the assignment, to create his notion of Ford Maddox Brown’s argument by trying to figure out “what his opinion was rather than just mine.” This move suggests both uptake to the assignment as well as deep understanding about his content and argumentation. By deep understanding I mean that Kane is considering someone else’s perspective in addition to his own, and this other perspective is helping to shaping his own. Through his work with Ms. Cook and with his peers, Kane continued to consider the perspectives of others. In a sense, Kane’s notion of relating his ideas to others suggests that argumentation, as taken up in this class, is social.

Final instructional unit. During his sophomore year, for the final capstone project, Kane worked with a female student with whom he had never collaborated. Both students were completing their second year of instruction with Ms. Cook. After initial plans to work alone because of scheduling constraints, the students realized that neither
of them had a partner and chose to work together. As mentioned at the beginning of Kane’s narrative, due to an IRB constraint, analysis will focus on the written text and Kane’s interview data.

As Kane and his partner worked together, their schedules were a hindrance because there were numerous days one of them was not in class. Regardless, when the three of us talked, both spoke positively about their collaboration and were proud of their essay and presentation. In my final interview with Kane, he summarized working with his partner as follows:

we: are a good pair and um we just kind of like we had to get a lot done and like we just kind of just sat down and did it I guess/I think what really got us going is like is that this cause is really important it’s a cause that’s happening right now it’s not something that happened like ten years like a bunch of years ago you know what I mean this is happening now and relates to us I guess. (interview 5/24/12)

As Kane indicated in this interview, he found this final essay and project significant because it’s topic was relatable.

This final assignment was a capstone assignment for all tenth graders in the school district. The topic was a solution for poverty and required two products: a written essay and a multi-modal presentation. Kane’s full essay is in Appendix L and their .ppt slides are in Appendix M.

During this final unit, Ms. Cook presented the Toulmin claim method (her name for it) as a scaffold, a structure for her students to practice with as they worked to write explicit warrants. She presented the structure as follows:
“Because/Although _____________, therefore ________________ since ________________.”

Ms. Cook instructed students (field notes, date) to fill in the open slots with the following: reasons, claim, warrant. A look at this together, with the information students are to insert is in bold:

“Because/Although reasons, therefore claim since warrant.”

Ms. Cook also embedded the following notes to students (field notes, date), indicated within parentheses on an instructional sheet:

Because/Although (remember, can be implied) _____________, therefore (can be unstated) ________________ since (you can leave “since” out as long as warrant is present) ________________.

Kane wrote his final essay and created a multi-modal presentation with his partner. Using the format of the Toulmin claim method, their claim statement read as follows:

Because of the growing percentage of families trapped within the poverty cycle, families should come together to eliminate poverty in their neighborhood, since the poverty cycle is hardly possible to escape alone and there is a power that grows with numbers.

Work Sample 4.5  **Kane’s + Partner’s final essay: Claim statement**
Their claim statement fits the Toulmin claim statement as follows:

**Because** of the growing percentage of families trapped within the poverty cycle, families should come together to eliminate poverty in their neighborhood, **since** the poverty cycle is hardly possible to escape alone and there is a power that grows with numbers.

Kane and his partner used the prompt word *because* to indicate their reasons (evidence) and *since* to mark their warrant. As shown, they chose to state their claim without the use of *therefore*, a prompt word Ms. Cook said could be unstated.

Considering the significance of claim statements in this classroom and for Kane as a writer, this next section analyzes his final claim statement alongside his claim statement in the first instructional unit. It is significant to note that both the first instructional unit and the final instructional unit, over the span of two academic years, focused on claim statements. Maintaining a focus on this concept of claim suggests that repeatedly foregrounding claim statements allowed Ms. Cook to complexify argumentative writing in a way she may not have accomplished if she taught argumentation in a single, isolated unit. As a reminder, the first claim statement was written with the ABCD claim as its guideline. The final claim statement used the Toulmin claim as its guideline.
The two claim statements follow in two work samples:

**Work Sample 4.6  Kane’s 1st essay: ABCD claim statement**

Considering the problems evident in the past class systems, Ford Maddox Brown painted work [sic] to show that the classes can exist in peace through nature, interactions between classes, and the overall changed attitude of the upper class.

**Work Sample 4.7  Kane and Partner’s final essay: Toulmin claim statement**

Because of the growing percentage of families trapped within the poverty cycle, families should come together to eliminate poverty in their neighborhood, since the poverty cycle is hardly possible to escape alone and there is a power that grows with numbers.

As indicated in the above work samples, Kane used Ms. Cook’s formats in his written work. Not surprisingly, given the different structures she offered, Kane’s claim statements have changed. With a quick glance, the statements have similarities: both begin with an introductory phrase, are similar in length, and have a clear statement of purpose. At a close read, a deepening exists, as Kane and his partner took up a more sophisticated writing move. By more sophisticated, I mean that the final claim statement moved outside of an organization plan and into a succinct statement that Kane and his partner unpacked and promoted throughout the essay. The main distinctions—outside of the content differences—further illustrate what I mean in saying Kane’s claim statements have become more sophisticated. In each essay, the final phrases are a part of the suggested claim statement, yet reveal what they offer the essays overall.
In the first claim (work samples 4.4 & 4.6), the final prepositional phrase (in peace through nature, interactions between classes, and the overall changed attitude of the upper class) told readers how Kane would organize his evidence to support his idea that the classes can exist in peace. His three body paragraphs followed this organizational plan: the first on nature, the second on interactions, and the third on the changed attitude.

In the final claim statement (work samples 4.5 & 4.7), Kane and his partner used the clause beginning with *since* to indicate their warrant. This final clause was not a signpost for the rest of the essay, as it was in Kane’s first. Rather, Kane and his partner presented a concise warrant statement undergirding the upcoming evidence and connections. The essay explored and unpacked the warrant implicitly and explicitly, made stronger with clear attention to a counter argument.

*Outside the classroom.* Although it was not part of the research plan to collect data on activities outside the classroom, one of Kane’s activities outside the classroom does reveal an important aspect about the use of what students were learning about argumentative writing. During his sophomore year of high school, Kane collaborated with his peers to begin a Gay Straight Alliance (GSA) at their school. When I asked Ms. Cook (field notes, 5/7/12) how Kane was progressing during his sophomore year, she spoke briefly about his work in class—which was positive—yet emphasized that he was taking his argumentative skills outside of the classroom. Throughout his sophomore year, Kane collaborated with his peers to begin a Gay Straight Alliance (GSA) at their school. As Ms. Cook reported this, she was proud that Kane was using a tool she was offering and making it work for him and his cause (field notes, 5/7/12). In effort to help create the GSA and make student voices heard, Kane helped draft letters, set up meetings
with the school principal, scheduled a presentation at a school board meeting, and worked closely with his peers across grade levels to make change (interview, 5/20/11).

When Kane and I talked about this work during our final interview, he shared that he was “very proud of it and would definitely/ if I needed to/ I would do it again” (interview 5/24/12). He also explained how he thought about argumentation and beginning a GSA at his school:

we had to know like we had to know what would work/just like just like in this class like we couldn’t come up with some crazy solution like all people should just jump over like just get out of poverty/we had to know that isn’t going to work/we had to be realistic and we had to know what would work to help us get this GSA. (Interview 5/24/12)

Kane’s attitude toward argumentation involved the notion “Everything’ an Argument” that Ms. Cook taught and he took it upon himself to take this up inside and outside of class. This attitude also suggests that argumentation is social and relational; it is a process that takes shape by those who engage with it.

**Conclusion.** Ms. Cook provided ways of thinking and ways of writing in her classroom over two years time. During the 9th grade year, she taught the ABCD claim structure; then, as she saw students struggling to write explicit warrants and using counter-arguments, she taught the Toulmin claim. Kane, following the steps Ms. Cook offered, learned claim structures and how to organize his overall essays by following this teaching progression. Over two years, Kane’s written argument became more complex as he made more argumentative elements visible in his written products, specifically warrants and counter-arguments. This shift was most noted in his claim statements, a
notion that was repeated and incrementally complicated over time. Throughout his productions of writing, Kane co-constructed peer relationships and built knowledge with his classmates, illustrating argumentation as a social and relational process.

**Case study narrative #2: Sue.** Ms. Cook described Sue as intelligent and a free spirit. Sue described herself as a writer:

> I consider myself a good writer in the sense that I have a lot of worldly experience with these things. I know it sounds a lot coming from a freshman saying that but I’ve been through a lot of experiences with people in general so when I write I like to play off with sarcasm and cynicism a lot. I just like to bring in a sense of reality to the writing. (interview, 1/12/11)

It was typical for Sue to express her opinions about writing with increased volume and emphatic words, as shown in the above quote. It was also typical for Sue to reference her out of school writing of poetry, lyrics, and short stories (interview, 1/12/11). She was also a musician, playing violin in her high school’s orchestra and a selective youth city orchestra (interview, 5/24/11).

To offer a more complete understanding of Sue, I return to Ms. Cook’s descriptions of her. When Ms. Cook described Sue, she took a pause and shook her head slightly, stating, “She’s beyond high school” (field notes, 12/6/10). Ms. Cook worried that Sue’s high school grades and daily “student” habits could hinder her from reaching her goals for college—a place Ms. Cook felt she was more suited than a high school classroom. My observations of Sue’s participation and conversations with Sue during her ninth and tenth grade years align with Ms. Cook’s descriptions and concerns. Sue consistently raised her hand to participate verbally in whole-class conversations (e.g.,
field notes, 12/10/10) offering in-depth responses with references to academic, social, and political knowledge. She engaged with her peers and talked almost non-stop to her partner(s) during peer work sessions (audio analysis, 12/15/10, 1/3/11, & 5/9/12). Although Sue’s ideas were most often made material in her verbal participation in full class conversations or small group peer sessions, the structure of high school was not a great fit for her. Across the two years, Sue took on writing tasks in school, yet she did not always do so in ways that matched Ms. Cooks’ requests. Although she typically completed summative assignments (such as written essays or projects), the smaller assignments leading up to them were inconsistent. It was also typical for Sue to borrow a writing utensil from a friend or write in highlighter because that is what she had in her bag. Sue commented that she often lost her work in the “black hole of my backpack” (audio recording, 12/17/10). She also scribbled on her papers and reused pages that had empty space; for example, the last page of her handwritten essay had both her essay conclusion and a list of verbs to practice for Spanish class.

Organization of the narrative. In this narrative, I present Sue’s participation across selected events during two instructional units. Tables 4-13 & 4-14 indicate the collected data that foreground Sue’s participation during both units. From that data, I selected typical and telling events to represent Sue’s participation. This narrative focuses on seven events from the first unit (12/15/10, 12/17/10, 1/3/11, 1/5/11, 1/7/11) and five events from the final unit (5/9/12, 5/15/12, 5/18/12, 5/24/12).

First, I offer analyses of events (12/15, 12/17, 1/3, 1/5, & 1/7) between Sue and her peer review partner, Keith, during the first observed unit during their ninth-grade year. Second, I offer analyses of events (5/9, 5/15, 5/18, & 5/24) between Sue and her
partners Neal and Regan during the final instructional unit during their tenth-grade year. The representation of the peer conversations were constructed by using the data from the video and audio analysis but they were also triangulated with detailed descriptions of full class instructional conversations, interviews, and Sue’s written artifacts across the two observed years (AY 2010-2011 & AY 2011-2012).

The first row on Table 4.5 and Table 4.6 indicates verbal data (moments when Sue spoke) and the second row on each table indicates written data (written by Sue or written comments about Sue’s written draft). In each column, markings indicate the specific data within the verbal and/or written column. The key for the data described in Table 4.5 and Table 4.6 is below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Key to Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WK</td>
<td>worksheet completed by focal student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>small peer group conversation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>whole class conversation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PrWk</td>
<td>worksheet completed by a peer on the focal student’s draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR</td>
<td>essay draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FE</td>
<td>final essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>counter argument practice writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VID</td>
<td>project video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT</td>
<td>interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 9</td>
<td>Unit 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>SG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue’s written texts</td>
<td>WK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data analysis across the two units indicate three key findings for Sue’s participation in the classroom:

- Sue’s writerly moves influence her take up and resistance to the learning opportunities offered
- Sue indicates deep understanding of content topics and argumentation through personal links outside the classroom’s physical boundaries, making herself vulnerable.
- Sue engages deeply with and across texts

**First instructional unit.** My analysis of Sue’s participation during the first instructional unit focuses on typical events between Sue and her partner, Keith.

Sue and Keith partnered for the six peer review sessions in preparation for their final essays on the painting *Detroit Industry: Man and Machine* (see Appendix N). Sue typically shared her ideas verbally during whole class conversations, yet Keith was more reserved. Keith had a slight stutter and was not a regular verbal participant for whole class conversations (field notes, 12/6/10). Both Sue and Keith talked to one another regularly during peer sessions (field notes, 12/15/10), yet Keith typically asked Sue...
questions regarding content (audio analysis, 12/17/10) and about how to put his essay together (audio analysis, 1/5/11). Sue, on the other hand, talked: she did not ask Keith many questions (field notes, 12/17/10).

A telling event during session fifteen (1/5/11) offers a further glimpse into Sue and Keith’s peer dynamic as well as Ms. Cook’s positioning of the duo. On this day, Ms. Cook stopped by Sue’s and Keith’s desks to check their progress. Keith had his draft out on his desk, yet Sue did not. When Ms. Cook questioned her, Sue spoke in a quiet yet assertive voice:

| 00-1  | Sue: and I leave it at HOME |
| 00-2  | Ms. Cook: [ Well I still want you to |
| 00-3  | Sue: [because my work will get LOST |
| 00-4  | Ms. Cook: [use your time to do this [peer review worksheet] with each other because I still need his to be evaluated okay so |
| 00-5  | Ms. Cook: do your best |
| 00-6  | Sue: yes |
| 00-7  | Keith: can you help me with the information |
| 00-8  | Sue: sure |
| 00-9  | Keith: I just can’t find anything |

Transcript 4.12 1/5/11 minute 0

Emphasizing words HOME and LOST, it appears that Sue is suggesting that it was not an accident she was without her draft. Sue did not apologize or offer an excuse; rather, she referred to her organization (or rather a lack of organization) and her tendency to write at home, on her own schedule. Sue’s explanation also suggested that she did not need to
bring her essay to class for Keith’s help, yet further conversation indicated that he needed hers (lines 00-7-00-9).

Ms. Cook’s response was atypical for two reasons. First, in this exchange with Sue and Keith, Ms. Cook foregrounded a more teacherly stance than she typically used in this classroom. Though Sue was not explicitly scolded, she was directed by Ms. Cook to assist Keith and evaluate his draft. Sue was also directed to do your best, perhaps suggesting that leaving her draft at home was not her best and she needed to improve. Secondly, Ms. Cook also used atypical linguistic patterns in this exchange. As her pronouns (I want you and I still need his) indicate, Ms. Cook asserted her authority rather than align with Sue through a plural, first person pronoun we. Ms. Cook also used verbs want and need as the action verbs for the first person pronouns I, indicating that Ms. Cook was central to this exchange; Ms. Cook was asserting her authority.

Analysis of this event indicates that Sue may not be motivated by nor was she taking up Ms. Cook’s writing schedule; however, she responded to Ms. Cook’s directive with the affirmative, yes. This suggests that Sue respected Ms. Cook while simultaneously feeling like she could reject specific deadlines, such as this rough draft deadline.

This next event (1/3/11) offers additional insight into how Sue positions herself in relation to her teachers. This is significant for this narrative because of the time Sue spends on portraying herself as a writer and talking about writing. This event also provides insight into the school histories for Sue and Keith and may help explain what motivates each in Ms. Cook’s classroom.
Class session 13 (1/3/11) was the first day back from an extended winter break.

Ms. Cook eased the ninth-graders back into school writing by having them read and critique a sample essay. As Keith reviewed the essay, he verbally referenced a previous, middle school teacher: “Ms. X would have a field day with this [essay]. She would just correct it.” Interested in his use of “just correct,” as opposed to evaluate the essay’s argument and overall structure (as Keith and Sue were assigned to do), this next transcript unpacks what may motivate Sue and Keith as school writers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line #</th>
<th>Spkr</th>
<th>Message Unit</th>
<th>Following (teacher)</th>
<th>Rejecting (teacher)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-1</td>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>I always got um got an A on it so I didn’t care what she wrote</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-2</td>
<td></td>
<td>it was an A paper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-3</td>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>yep yep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-4</td>
<td></td>
<td>I mean she obviously had a different writing style than I did so I just ignored the tips that she would put on the side</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-5</td>
<td></td>
<td>because yea</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-6</td>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>thus XXXX [reading aloud the sample essay]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-7</td>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>Because she would start all the tips “the way I would have done it was”</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-8</td>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>it’s like okay well it’s not the way I would have done it</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-9</td>
<td></td>
<td>that’s how you would have that’s how you do it not me</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-10</td>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>That’s how you do it this is how I do it</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transcript 4.13  1/3/11 minute 18

The practical bit that students write for teachers who evaluate them with letter grades is evident in Keith’s first comment (line 18-1). Although he does not indicate why a grade was more significant than the comments the teacher provided, it can be assumed that
Keith was taking up a narrative of schooling: students write to please their teachers. Keith also focused on the letter grade, the A, rather than the teacher’s comments on his writing. Because he earned an A, he didn’t care about the comments. Sue’s first turn at talk in this exchange (line 18-3) acknowledged Keith’s experiences, however it is unclear whether she was agreeing with receiving an A paper or not caring about the teacher’s comments. However, as the conversation continued, it becomes a plausible interpretation that Sue was adding on to Keith’s experiences by adding her own. Although Keith stated that he “didn’t care what she wrote” because he received an A on his paper, Sue explained that she “just ignored the tips” because the teacher had a different writing style. Though Keith and Sue seem to have different motivations for when to pay attention to a teacher’s comments, they constructed their retellings similarly: both began with a statement followed by a negative phrase that was connected with the conjunctive phrase “so I.” It is due to this conjunctive use that Keith and Sue make visible their rationale for their “not caring” or “ignoring.”

Sue referred to both herself and the teacher as writers (line 18-4), putting the two on a more even playing field than what may be suggested with a teacher/student dynamic: teacher as knower, student as learner. As Sue explained it, the teacher’s comments suggested an obviously different writing style (line 18-4); the comments did not suggest that Sue’s style was wrong. This is also supported by the fact that both Sue and Keith received A’s (lines 18-2 & 18-3). Sue and Keith were both successful writers in middle school, with Keith focused on the grade and Sue focused on her identity and positioning as a writer. This is salient for Sue’s narrative because she marked a difference in positioning when in Ms. Cook’s class. She noted, Ms. Cook and I “treat each other as
equal writers but don’t break student teacher boundaries” (interview, 1/12/11). Sue’s statement suggests an alliance with a fellow writer as well as an understanding that there were limitations and expectations for the student/teacher relationship. Naming herself and Ms. Cook “equal writers,” considered with the obviously different writing styles she and her previous English teacher had suggests a preference for her relationship with Ms. Cook. Sue appreciated how Ms. Cook positioned her. Sue’s use of equal writers also referenced the constraint and disrespect she felt in middle school, when she felt unequal and without the power to make her own writing decisions. It is interesting Sue clarified that being “equal writers” did not disrupt the boundaries of a student/teacher relationship, suggesting a nuanced understanding of the word equal. Although Sue and Ms. Cook could be equal writers, they need not be equal participants in the classroom; a dynamic Sue willingly accepted. Sue thrived in Ms. Cook’s classroom intellectually, yet her grades did not always match that; perhaps this indicates that for Sue, being positioned as a writer was more significant than the grade received.

Sue and Keith’s peer review session during class session nine (12/15/10) was a key event for understanding Sue’s participation and identity as both a student and as a writer. The peer review session occurred after a full class review of the ABCD claim format (field notes, 12/15/10) and represents a typical conversation between Sue and Keith. For the first seven minutes of the class period, Ms. Cook engaged students in full class conversations about how the elements were used in the sample essays (field notes, 12/15/10); select students labeled the ABCD elements on the Smart Board. Ms. Cook then directed students to move into peer review groups. Students were expected to
provide feedback (written and verbal) after reading one another’s claim statements and introductions. Students were also expected to make use of the ABCD claim.

Typical of many of the peer review sessions between Sue and Keith, the two worked on their assigned tasks with near constant conversation. During this thirty-two minute work session, Sue and Keith read and commented on one another’s drafts while simultaneously discussing a myriad of topics, as illustrated in Table 4.7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conversation topic</th>
<th>Duration of time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assigned task</td>
<td>5 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night terrors &amp; other hauntings + family</td>
<td>20 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The audio recorder</td>
<td>3 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art &amp; drawing</td>
<td>1 minute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay due date</td>
<td>.30 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upcoming holiday</td>
<td>2 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Names of ghosts who haunt Sue</td>
<td>.30 seconds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7  Sue & Keith’s Conversation Topics 12/15/10

Periodically during work time, Ms. Cook interrupted with a class announcement or a check-in to gauge students’ progress.

As indicated in Table 4.7, Sue went on extensively about night terrors. She revealed childhood monsters and how she felt when lying in bed in fear. She also described the condo she shares with her family [her mother, father, and brother], her mother’s trips to a laundromat, her father’s medical conditions [he has one leg], and the names of ghosts who haunt her. Keith joined the conversation about night terrors and shared his own family stories; he also shared how he once had to walk around a crime
scene in order to get home. Across all topics, Sue and Keith talked, listened, and wrote (audio analysis, 12/15/10). Each elaborated on the other’s topics and did not question validity of stories nor did they react with surprise at any topic. Both provided specific details and elaborate descriptions as they talked, possibly indicating that the two did not know one another’s families or neighborhoods intimately and full descriptions were necessary for understanding. Such elaborate descriptions also suggest that Sue and Keith seem to be school friends who do not spend time together outside of school hours. Throughout their talks, Sue and Keith inserted their opinions and life experiences into the conversation, creating personal links to their school assignments, connecting to one another, and at times, being vulnerable. Such dialogue and social interaction between these two suggests that the process of argumentation was social and relational. Within their conversations, the two did not mark “on task” from “off task” topics; instead, they used their developing relationship to help them move toward deeper understanding of content topics and argumentation.

The following transcript presents a twenty-four second conversation near the beginning of Sue and Keith’s work time. Looking across this transcript as a whole, Keith made himself vulnerable and marked his weakness while Sue attached negative emotions to a framework Ms. Cook offered; regardless, both students made positive claims about Ms. Cook as a teacher.
Both Sue and Keith reacted emotionally to the ABCD claim in this conversation. To begin, Keith’s word choice of “I suck” suggests how Keith positions himself as a writer within this format: he does not feel skilled. Keith’s words may also mark a stress in his ability to complete the assignment; because he stated, “I suck” aloud, it is possible that he voiced his lack of skill as a way to request Sue’s help on this task. Sue’s uptake to Keith’s statement was to the ABCD claim. Sue did not agree with Keith’s negative self-evaluation nor did she offer an evaluation of her own abilities with the format; instead, Sue shifted the topic from ability to feelings and offered her emotional response to the ABCD claim (line 4-2). Sue used the word “hate” (line 4-2) and repeated it in emphasis at the end of this conversation (line 4-13). She also qualified her use of “hate” with a raised inflection and volume as she voiced, “SO MUCH” (line 4-2). Sue continued her passionate reaction toward the ABCD claim by offering her preference,
what she wished Ms. Cook would do: “I mean if she just/gave us a prompt I would write” (lines 4-3 & 4-5). Focusing in on the adverb just (line 4), Sue indicated a desire to write, to just be given a prompt. This suggests that Sue was ready to write and did not need nor want a structure for how to do so. Ms. Cook offered the ABCD claim as a way to help students think about their arguments and to help them structure their essays; however, for Sue it was a source of frustration.

The next section of the transcript (lines 4-4 & 4-7-4-10) situated Ms. Cook as a “good teacher” and is critical in understanding Sue’s positioning of Ms. Cook. Keith and Sue and could simultaneously “suck at” and “hate” what Ms. Cook taught yet find her to be a “good” teacher. This also suggests that it was acceptable for both students to express their emotional responses to what they were learning: argumentation as process made space for and encouraged embodied participation. The timing of this dialogue is also significant. As Sue voiced her frustration, Keith offered qualifier: “but she is a good teacher though” (line 4-4). Their talk overlapped, yet immediately after Sue voiced her frustration about the ABCD claim, she responded to and agreed with Keith’s qualifier, “but she is a good teacher though” (line 4-6). Keith’s qualifier and Sue’s uptake suggest that both students care about Ms. Cook. It is also interesting to note that Sue agreed with Keith without requiring an explanation of how he conceived of a “good” teacher. This indicates that the previous and current experiences in school allowed both Keith and Sue to judge who and what is good. It also suggests that it is may be typical for students to emotionally respond to what they are taught and to evaluate their teachers; this certainly was typical for Sue.
As Sue continued talking, she offered a hint at what she perceived as “good” about Ms. Cook’s teaching: a good teacher offers useful ways (line 4-8) and different methods (line 4-9) to accomplish a task. As Sue has structured her explanation, we may infer that she understood and appreciated Ms. Cook’s knowledge and her teaching and realized that she need not take up every little bit of structure presented; however, on this particular day (12/15/10), working within the ABCD structure was a frustration and a scaffold that Sue did not need in order to write her essay. Sue presented herself as a writer with carefully thought out writerly moves, not as one who was learning how to produce written text within school structures and expectations.

I find this conversation significant because it reveals how Sue positioned the writing framework [ABCD claims] Ms. Cook provided the class. This positioning is important because Sue’s passionate rejection of Ms. Cook’s structures made space for Sue to recontextualize the writing tasks for herself.

Not only did Sue reject Ms. Cook’s ABCD claim format, Sue did not align with the structure for introductions, at least not in the way Keith was presenting it. The upcoming transcript indicates how Sue and Keith navigate a conversation around writing introductions during session twelve (12/17/10). During this conversation, Keith offered Sue advice on how to improve her essay, which Sue did not accept. The significance of this transcript is not the disagreement between the two students; rather, the ways in which each supports his/her idea is telling, as each student’s talk portrays how they are moving toward a deeper understanding of and ownership for their writing practices. This conversation also offers insight into how they are co-constructing their relationships with one another.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line #</th>
<th>Spkr</th>
<th>Message Unit</th>
<th>Extend or Repair</th>
<th>Essay Structure</th>
<th>Essay Content</th>
<th>Following (teacher)</th>
<th>Rejecting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35-1</td>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>you kind of just go straight to the point on yours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-2</td>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>a: and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-3</td>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>you need an intro</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-4</td>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>THAT’S [pointing to her draft] my intro</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-5</td>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>no like an intro to like your body like she said to</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-6</td>
<td></td>
<td>like an introductory like you know dah dah dah</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-7</td>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>well you don’t need an introductory for your body paragraph</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-8</td>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>yea you do it said so somewhere</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-9</td>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>shesh [shrugging shoulders]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-10</td>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>(.3) it says so right here</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-11</td>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>I don’t DO intros to body paragraphs</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-12</td>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>like like a hook</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-13</td>
<td></td>
<td>there is no hook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-14</td>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>[the hook’s in the intro]</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-15</td>
<td></td>
<td>there is eyes are Communist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-16</td>
<td></td>
<td>that’s fine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-17</td>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>well the hook doesn’t have to be the very first sentence it can be like the second sentence or something</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transcript 4.15 12/17/10 minute 35

Within this transcript, there is one explicit reference to content and thirteen references to essay structure (i.e., intro, body paragraphs, hook). As Keith offered Sue suggestions to improve her essay draft, her responses prompted him to extend or repair what he said. For example, the conversation began with Keith’s observation on Sue’s
draft: “you kind of just go straight to the point” (line 35-1). Sue’s elongated response prompted Keith to extend his meaning, which he did with a suggestion: “you need an intro” (line 35-3). Sue responded with a light tone, rising pitch, and increased volume, emphasizing “THAT’S” vocally. She labeled her introduction for Keith through the construction of a predicate nominative (subject = that, verb = is, pn = intro) and physically pointed to her introductory paragraph while speaking. At this point, Keith needed to repair his suggestion, working to make evident how he was defining “an intro.” He began by cancelling Sue’s evidence of an intro with “no”—he was not referring to her introductory paragraph. He then restated his idea with further explanation: “like an intro to like your body”—at this point it becomes clear that the body of the essay needed an introduction. Finally, to make his suggestion more credible he added “like she [Ms. Cook] said to.” Within this repair, Keith called for a stop to Sue’s interpretation, developed his explanation, and explicitly marked Ms. Cook’s previous teaching. He then extended his idea (line 35-6) through a simile: a comparison between what Sue needed and what was done in introductory paragraphs, what he voiced in a sing-song “dah dah dah” and later labeled “a hook” (35-12).

Though Keith worked at making himself clear and explicitly brought Ms. Cook’s teaching and structural worksheets into the conversation, Sue did not accept his suggestions, as depicted with Sue’s verb choices in line 35-7, “well you don’t need” and 35-17, “the hook doesn’t have to be.” Most indicative, however, is the talk exchanged in lines 35-8 through 35-11. Within this segment, both of Keith’s turns at talk point Sue directly to instructional materials on how to structure essays; although this may be legitimate evidence (and a clear reminder) for some students, Sue was not persuaded.
She first responded with a one syllable, non-word, while shrugging her shoulders (line 35-9). Then, in a staccato rate and raised pitch, she marked her own writing practices and style through this first person construction: “I don’t DO intros to body paragraphs” (line 35-11). This climax of the conversation emphasizes Sue’s identity as a writer who does need nor appreciate being told how to structure her ideas. It also makes visible Keith’s use of and possible reliance on teacher handouts to help him navigate argumentation in the classroom. Notably, Sue did not label Keith’s suggested structures as wrong, yet she considered them options that she did not choose to use.

Given Sue’s hatred for the ABCD claim statement and her irritation with structured introductions, it likely comes as no surprise that Sue’s final essay makes evident some dimensions of recontextualization (cf., Van Leeuwen, 2008). Sue substituted Ms. Cook’s ABCD claim for her own format (BAC). This substituted format was evident in Sue’s final essay (see Appendix O) and read differently than her classmates’. Instead of structure her claim with the explicit ABCD claim, Sue wrote with a less formulaic approach. As Sue recontextualized the notions of claim and introduction, she made them her own, as indicated in her final essay (1/7/11). Work sample 4.8 shows Sue’s full introduction.
Is it possible for man, the dominant species of the earth, that rules and ruins nations, it is possible for such a great race to become a slave to its own machine? Is the idea that we would work ourselves raw to these machines so unfathomable? It’s not if you take in the act that [sic] these times, “machines” meant “money”. This idea is clearly represented in the painting “Detroit Industry” by Diego Rivera. The artist himself has ulterior motives, but they were carefully blended into a picture made to look that Rivera had the opinion that man was loosing [sic] itself not only to the machine, but to a higher class, the same class that saw the words “machine” and “money” as synonyms in the Oxford English Dictionary.

Work Sample 4.8  Sue’s Introduction, Final Essay, 1/7/11

Sue began her introduction with two questions, hooking in readers to her essay. Sue’s first two questions also provide the antecedents for her pronoun “this” in the beginning to her claim statement (shaded in work sample 4.8). One needs to read the full paragraph to understand Sue’s claim. Sue maintained the “A” (author’s title and name of the work) but she placed the author and title of work but in the predicate of the sentence rather than as subject. Sue did not use the “D,” literary devices. Overall, Sue’s writing was more circular than the majority of her classmates who followed Ms. Cook’s format for the ABCD claim. In her interview (1/12/11), Sue spoke about the “C,” what she called “the concrete details or commentary.” As Sue explained her use, she talked about her essay in full. She did not locate the “C” as solely a part of the claim; rather, she took up “C” as the bulk of her essay and the ways she explained her ideas to her readers. This enactment and explanation is an alteration of Ms. Cook’s framework, yet it is one Sue was allowed to create in this classroom. It was typical for Sue to boldly reject some of Ms. Cook’s learning opportunities (audio analysis, 12/17/10) yet outright, verbalized rejections were not typical in this classroom.
Sue’s introduction also references an intertextual link: the notion that man may be a slave to a machine (a notion raised in class discussion), the painting, “Detroit Industry,” her understanding of Diego Rivera’s motives, and the *Oxford English Dictionary*. As Sue moved across texts, she touched on class discussion, an image, her knowledge, and printed text. In her final essay, these intertextual links are expanded as Sue uses various key points of texts (as she understands them) to support her claim and make her argument. Due to the specific links she chose, and the particular quotes she leaned on in the final essay, Sue’s argument was unlike any of her classmate’s. While the students and Ms. Cook co-constructed knowledge of these anchor texts, how each student made use of texts to build their arguments is unique.

*Building Knowledge Together: Deepening Understanding.* Session 12 (12/17/10) was full of rich points of conversation between Sue and her partner Keith. Ms. Cook gave students the tasks of tightening up their introductory paragraphs, writing their first body paragraphs, and evaluating one another’s drafts. As Sue and Keith began writing, Keith asked Sue where he could find examples to support his ideas; Sue directed him to the internet because of its quick links (video recording, 12/17/10). Ms. Cook briefly stopped by their desks to offer ideas for sources and how to organize their writing with transitions.

Ten minutes into their work time (12/17/10), Sue and Keith engaged in an extended dialogue, a two-minute conversation about their interpretations for Diego Rivera’s painting *Detroit Industry: Man and Machine*. The following transcript is one of four conversations during this class session, typical conversations that reveal a deepening of content knowledge and how Keith and Sue enact argumentation during small group
work. Two of these conversations are presented in this section and represent Sue and Keith as thinkers capable of engaging with argumentation and argumentative writing. During this first conversation, Sue and Keith were verbalizing a “close read” of Diego Rivera’s painting and then were theorizing what they saw.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line #</th>
<th>Spkr</th>
<th>Message Unit</th>
<th>Clar</th>
<th>Cont</th>
<th>Persp</th>
<th>IN</th>
<th>OUT</th>
<th>Rel: Text</th>
<th>Rel: Peer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10-1</td>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>Those hands don’t look like they’re trying to smash through like upper class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-2</td>
<td></td>
<td>they look like they’re po’ed that [laughing] they’re stuck there</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-3</td>
<td></td>
<td>I think I forgot my Biology book in XX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-4</td>
<td></td>
<td>oh nevermind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-5</td>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>sitting right there in front of ya [laughs]</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-6</td>
<td></td>
<td>if it had been a snake you’d a been dead</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-7</td>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>see look that looks like it’s in ag look they just look like they’re in pain like</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-8</td>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>writhing</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-9</td>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>(.2) this is fucking creepy by the way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-10</td>
<td></td>
<td>I don’t think as a Communist (.3) Diego Rivera he wouldn’t care about the class systems but because where he came from they didn’t ex like exist</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-11</td>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>yea I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>[ there were just XXX</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-13</td>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>ssa:ay the hands</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transcript 4.16  12/17/10 minutes 10:44-12:46
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line #</th>
<th>Spkr</th>
<th>Message Unit</th>
<th>Clar</th>
<th>Cont</th>
<th>Persp</th>
<th>IN</th>
<th>OUT</th>
<th>Rel: Text</th>
<th>Rel: Peer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td></td>
<td>the hand represents his Communist beliefs though it’s disguised in the painting as</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-15</td>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>[ the class system</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-16</td>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>[ as them being frustrated with the class system</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-17</td>
<td></td>
<td>[ because of that XXX wall right there</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-18</td>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>I would totally disagree with the um like the um like class discussion about this painting</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19</td>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>yea</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>it was (.2) stupid</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-21</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.3) like that meaning like a wall system of</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-22</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-23</td>
<td></td>
<td>I think that it means how it’s overtaking like our history and that equals a man who like mankind like equals the</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-24</td>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>machine-kind</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-25</td>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>yea</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-26</td>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>har har</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-27</td>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>like this is like human like</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-28</td>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>the human element is being lost</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-29</td>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>yea</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-30</td>
<td></td>
<td>and that’s just overtaking it (.2) not no that doesn’t mean the class system and that’s the oh no</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-31</td>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>who even brought up class system for this</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-32</td>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>I don’t know</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-33</td>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>I should punch them in the mouth</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-34</td>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>yea those people are (.2) lower like class but I don’t think they that that matters to (.1) like them</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-35</td>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>the class system is NOT the focus of this painting</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-36</td>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As indicated in the analytic codes used in Transcript 4.16, Sue and Keith were engaged in a continuous discussion, talking with one another to vocalize what they saw and how they interpreted it. Once they moved beyond Keith’s aside regarding his Biology book (lines 10-3-10-6), both worked to clarify what Rivera meant with the hands in the painting. Keith’s first two lines (lines 10-1 & 10-2) offered his first attempt, and then he tried again in line 10-7, to which Sue took up and revoiced: “writhing” (line 10-8). Beginning with line 10-9, Keith and Sue added in their out of text experiences to contextualize their interpretations, yet the most salient moment of this conversation started at line 10-18. At this point, Keith and Sue passionately disagreed with what their peers suggested in previous conversations (field notes, 12/9/10); Keith named the idea “stupid” (line 10-20) and Sue wondered who began the interpretation she and Keith disagreed with, stating that she should “punch them in the mouth” (lines 10-33).

Examined in isolation, these comments may appear startling; however, given Sue and Keith’s tendencies to connect with their texts and engage in their conversations vulnerably, these moments indicate how both are invested in their academic content. Moreover, this section of transcript (lines 10-18-10-30) made visible that Sue’s and Keith’s disagreement with a classmate’s interpretation made space for them to deepen their own; the conversation was more on content than it was about name-calling. This conversation also makes visible how Sue and Keith made use of classroom conversations as text; in so doing, lines 10-18-10-36 are another indication of intertextual links. In this case, Sue and Keith worked across classroom conversations and the painting, two modes of communication that were positioned as texts in this classroom.
Sue and Keith were passionate. They were involved in their conversation and do not seem concerned about “doing school” or using a school-approved vocabulary. Rivera’s painting could be studied through close reads alone, yet Sue and Keith began there and extended: they took their conversation and the painting into their lives. They built connections with it and engaged with one another throughout this conversation. As shown in the code marked Rel: Peer, Sue and Keith made deliberate moves to build and maintain their relationship as fellow students and partners. Their talk at times overlapped (i.e., lines 10-12 & 10-13) and moved quickly, but their use of “yea” (i.e., line 10-11, 10-19, 10-25, & 10-29) served as both acknowledgements of the other’s ideas as well as a way to build on one another’s ideas and deepen understanding.

As line 10-36 ended this specific dialogue, Sue and Keith continued to draft their own essays and remark on their interpretations of Diego Rivera’s painting. One minute later, Sue stated, “The focus of this painting is clearly on the revolution of man and the industrialization while Work on the other hand is more focused on the class system than anything.” With this turn, Sue spoke confidently and asserted her opinion, akin to what she was beginning to hint at in line 10-35. Keith, typically a bit more hesitant in vocal presentation, agreed with Sue and found details in the painting to support the notion of industrialization.

Ten minutes later, Keith and Sue talked with Ms. Cook about their interpretations of the painting. The upcoming transcript shows how the students were gaining a deeper understanding for their topic, building on one another’s ideas throughout this conversation as well as building on their initial ideas raised in the previous transcript.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line #</th>
<th>Spkr</th>
<th>Message Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22-1</td>
<td>Ms. Cook</td>
<td>did you find some good evidence?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-2</td>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-3</td>
<td>Ms. Cook</td>
<td>some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-4</td>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>[ like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-5</td>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>[ well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-6</td>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>[ in the picture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-7</td>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>[ I’ve got the theory going that the hands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-8</td>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>[ It’s cringing not fighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-9</td>
<td>Ms. Cook</td>
<td>mmmhh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-10</td>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>I’ve got the theory that the hands represent his Communist beliefs rather than</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-11</td>
<td>Ms. Cook</td>
<td>well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-12</td>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>[ what we discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-13</td>
<td>Ms. Cook</td>
<td>[ that this is the symbol of the Communist party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-14</td>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>so its disguised as frustration within the class systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-15</td>
<td>Ms. Cook</td>
<td>very good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-16</td>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>but where he came from there was no like class system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-17</td>
<td>Ms. Cook</td>
<td>okay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-18</td>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>so why would he</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-19</td>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>[ Well that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-20</td>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>[ think about it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-21</td>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>[comes that way to us it comes off a different way completely to his own country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-22</td>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>since he knew he was painting it in America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-23</td>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>it’s like you know coming coming from America going to France and saying something we would get and laugh at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-24</td>
<td>Ms. Cook</td>
<td>that they would be like what are you talking about</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-25</td>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>[ that they would be like what</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-26</td>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>[ like like um the like Aeropostale shirts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-27</td>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>it says like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-28</td>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>[ it’s like an inside joke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-29</td>
<td>Ms. Cook</td>
<td>airplane er or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-30</td>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>[ airplane mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-31</td>
<td>Ms. Cook</td>
<td>[ air mail (laughs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-32</td>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>people would be like what are you wearing?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-33</td>
<td>Ms. Cook</td>
<td>and it’s just that notion of we don’t think of ourselves as a class system or a class culture as strictly as say the British system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-34</td>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>but all you have to do is just take a step back and look and we definitely have classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-35</td>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>[ yea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-36</td>
<td>Ms. Cook</td>
<td>[ now ours are based on you can traverse them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-37</td>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>not easily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-38</td>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>I mean you can go down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-39</td>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>it takes forever to um like like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-40</td>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>it takes forever to go up our our system but it only takes a few minutes to fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-41</td>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>dude it takes seconds if you’re doing it by credit card</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-42</td>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>that makes you fall faster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-43</td>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>weeeeeeehhhhh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transcript 4.17  12/17/10 minute 22
In transcript 4.17 Sue and Keith summarized their ideas from their earlier conversations, beginning with Transcript 4.16. As indicated with their overlapping talk (lines 22-4-22-8) in Transcript 4.17, both students bid for the floor to answer Ms. Cook’s question: “did you find some good evidence?” (line 22-1). This indicates eagerness and interest. Sue then controlled the floor by dialoguing with Ms. Cook about her theories for the hands in the painting. Interestingly, Sue marked a separation between what was discussed in class and what she believed to be true (lines 22-10 & 22-12). Ms. Cook began to interrupt Sue’s explanation with “well” (line 22-11), and then continued this interruption with a reminder or clarification that the hands that Rivera painted resembled the hands that serve as “the symbol for the Communist party” (line 22-13). Not phased, Sue’s explanation took this into account, explaining that these hands held multiple meanings (lines 22-14), to which Ms. Cook evaluated positively (line 22-15).

Keith’s uptake to this dialogue between Sue and Ms. Cook indicates that he was listening and needed a clarification. Beginning his utterance with “but,” Keith brought in historical perspective with his knowledge of Diego Rivera, a Communist: “where he came from there was no like class system” (line 22-16). He continued by asking, “so why would he/think about it” (lines 22-18 & 22-20). Keith’s question made visible his struggle with understanding Sue’s interpretation. If Diego Rivera was a Communist and Communists did not have class systems, why would he think about class systems? This notion did not make sense to Keith and because of his relationships with Sue, Ms. Cook, and the text, he was able to voice his confusion or his wondering. The next twenty-two lines responded to Keith’s question, with Sue drawing an analogy to an American visiting France. Interestingly, Ms. Cook helped build the analogy with Sue, and then, in line 22-
26, Keith helped build it as well, with his offer of Aeropostale shirts [at the time of research, Aeropostale was a popular clothing brand for youth in the United States]. At this moment (line 22-26), Keith displayed an understanding that was achieved because Sue shared her idea, Keith listened, Keith questioned it, and Sue, Ms. Cook, and Keith all worked to explain Sue’s perspective through their experiences. It is within this conversation that we also see evidence of how Ms. Cook’s positioned her students as capable thinkers. Rather than offer an answer, Ms. Cook took part in building an analogy through personal connections and shared knowledge of popular culture. In this, there is evidence of argumentation as a social and relational process and evidence that Ms. Cook positioned her students as thinkers capable of engaging with argumentation and argumentative writing. Within this conversation, meaning was constructed and relationships were deepened across students and with Ms. Cook.

Looking across both Transcript 4.16 and Transcript 4.17 together also helps make visible how Keith and Sue were building knowledge together, trying on ideas. They used intertextual links to revisit ideas over time, deepening their own interpretations as they socially interacted.

**Final instructional unit.** Sue’s participation during the final instructional unit makes visible how she worked toward deep understanding of her content topic and a fuller understanding of argumentation. In this section I first introduce Sue’s partners and then introduce their assignment. The remainder of this section is a representation of Sue’s participation as she and her partners created a project together and Sue wrote their essay. Data indicated that in this final unit Sue and her partners deepended their ideas
about their topic and their knowledge of argumentation through a series of conversations and consecutive work sessions. As a result, I organized this narrative chronologically.

_Introductions._ During this final unit, Sue’s new partners were Neal and Regan, neither of whom enrolled in humanities as ninth-graders. All three students were friends outside of school, as made clear through numerous conversations about their own talents (field notes, 5/15/12 & 5/18/12), health (field notes, 5/18/12), and schedules (field notes, 5/22/12). As the three collaborated during this unit, Sue and Neal were the most vocal and on-task. It was typical for Sue and Neal to reference political and historical events as they discussed their solution to poverty and as they worked to create their project and write their essay. Regan was more reserved, typically listening (audio analysis, 5/9/12). When she engaged in dialogue it was typically on topics of her art contributions (audio analysis, 5/18/12) or off-task conversations (audio analysis, 5/18/12). Although Sue’s identity as a writer remained an influence, the ways she and Neal spoke about their ideas suggests that Sue was working with a more equal partner. She could passionately engage in conversation and have a dialogue with someone who understood her references and returned the passion.

The last observed unit during the 10th grade year occurred at the end of the school year (2011-2012), ending just in time for students to take part in the high school’s final exam schedule. The summative assignment offered during this unit was a 10th grade capstone, a district-level requirement for English and social studies teachers. The assignment required students to create a solution to poverty; specifically, students were to argue for a systemic change that they felt would work in the United States. Students had to write a short argumentative essay (2-3 pages) and present a multi-modal project to
their classmates and teachers. Students had the choice to work alone, though their
teachers encouraged them to work with peers.

Because Ms. Cook and Mr. D were both assessing the assignment, students were
given the full one hundred ten minutes of humanities time to work on their projects most
days. During the fifteen-day unit, students were given 12 days of class time (in various
time increments) to work on this project with presentations during the final 3 days. Ms.
Cook did some explicit teaching, specifically around argumentative elements: Toulmin
claim statements (field notes, 5/18/12), warrants (field notes, 5/9/12), reading and
interpreting texts (field notes 5/15/12), and counter arguments (field notes 5/18/12).

Figure 4.2 displays the final unit instructional chain.
Figure 4.2  Final Unit Instructional Chain, Grade 10: Solution to Poverty
I first observed Sue, Neal, and Regan on May 9, 2012. This was their second session dedicated to peer work and the third class session in the unit. To begin class on this day, Ms. Cook reviewed warrants and how students could make them explicit; she used repeated exposure to help students gain a deeper understanding of the concepts. The second half of class was devoted to student work time, a time dedicated to putting these ideas into practice with peers.

During this peer work session (5/9/12), Sue, Neal, and Regan sat at a computer googling possible sources. It was typical for Sue to manage the keyboard, with Neal sitting close, and Regan slightly off to the side (field notes 5/9/12 & field notes, 5/22/12). While they searched, Sue and Neal talked about ideas for their solution and how they were to conceive of the assignment with their specific topic. The following transcript is a representation of how Neal and Sue began to verbalize the guiding question for their topic.
Neal’s first statement (line 1-1) offered his explanation of the group’s guiding question. As he constructed with two questions, the wording within the second question “or is like what” suggests that his understanding is a bit muddled at this early point of view. Almost immediately, Sue revoiced his ideas (line 1-2), attributing the group’s focus to power issues. Sue’s reference to power and who has it within society set a tone for this group and can be traced throughout their process and into their final essay (Appendix P) and power point project (Appendix Q). In their final work, the group wrote: “We aim to build a community not a company,” marking a community as “open to all” (final essay, 5/23/12). In effort to achieve a systematic overhaul, they suggested and relied on “the largest community at play”—the internet. Through their proposed solution they spoke to power issues and suggested how people across social classes can access or gain information from their proposed website: TheFamousPoor.org.
Returning to the dialogue between Sue and Neal, there is a typical exchange occurring between the two students. First, the two agree with one another. Secondly, the two may have similar motivations. Given the content, it appears that both Sue and Neal are socially minded individuals who are comfortable challenging societal power dynamics. Twice Sue used the word “bad,” first to reference a belief that a challenge to the social monarch would be bad (line 1-6) and secondly to suggest that one who desires such change is bad (line 1-9).

During session 7 (5/15/12), Neal was absent due to a regular doctor’s appointment; as a result, the significant events from this class session were Sue reporting on the group’s progress. This is significant for two reasons. First, Sue’s participation was grounded in talk, talk with peers, talk with Ms. Cook, and talk about her process. Due to what Sue revealed about herself and her thinking while talking, I found it salient to include her report on how the group was progressing and how she was describing the workload across the three peers. Secondly, the absence of Neal made visible that the depth Sue was displaying in content knowledge and toward fuller understanding of argumentation likely resulted from interacting with Neal. When just Sue and Regan worked together, my field notes (5/15/12 & 5/18/12) indicate less on-task conversation.

During work time (5/15/12), Sue explained that the group’s claim had been shifting. She then offered her retelling of their thinking process thus far:
Sue’s explanations indicate that she and her peers position unemployment as a “basic problem” and “little thing,” quite different from “a huge political upheaval” and “human nature” as a whole. The data corpus of their conversations over time indicates that these students were not minimizing unemployment with such labels; rather, they carved unemployment out as a “measurable thing” to focus on and for which to offer solutions.

In her explanation, Sue connected unemployment (line .00-6) with prior knowledge: a community in her home state went bankrupt in the last few years. Using
this link as a reference point to deepen her understanding of unemployment is one indicator of how Sue made this project personal. Another indicator of connecting with this project is previous (audio analysis, 5/9/12) and future conversations (audio analysis, 5/22/12) referencing social revolutions, a topic Neal and Sue discussed at length.

This topic of social revolutions was also a focal point in their final project, as they used a reference to the failed KONY 2012 to counter their claim. Using what they perceived as failures within KONY 2012, this group centered their project helping one another using brief moments of time to draw people in to their ideas. A main goal was to minimize time and effort for people who visited their website; unlike the failed KONY 2012, Sue and Neal expressed interest that their website succeed (audio analysis, date). This notion was reflected in their written conclusion in the final essay (5/23/12):

The Famous Poor, is simple, and easy to follow. The amount it would take to participate would be no more than a few minutes. Is your life so busy that you can’t possibly spare two minute that could save someone’s life?

The last sentence of the essay, then, played on the notion of time yet added in an emotional appeal. Neal dubbed this appeal “the ethos shotgun” (audio analysis, 5/22/12) with the expressed purpose of pelting people “with so much guilt that they can’t not do it” (audio analysis, 5/22/12).

The students’ website idea was premised on the notion that people create videos to help others understand and prepare for employment, “sign a petition or do a poll” (final essay, 5/23/12); in essence, their idea was rooted in the notion that people work together to help one another. They also explicitly linked their idea to youth involvement. In their final essay, Sue added in a future goal that was not discussed by the students during
observed work sessions: “One future foal [sic] is to be recognized as a community service project, which allow students to become more involved and complete necessary volunteer hours to graduate” (final essay, 5/23/12). Within this goal, there are indications of Sue’s understanding of graduation requirements and her group’s desire to help others. Although this website idea was created because of a class assignment, Sue and her group made it personal. They connected their own knowledge and life experiences to the creation of this website: “The Famous Poor” (final essay & .ppt, 5/23/12). This trio positioned their project as a true possibility and not just as an assignment.

A few minutes later during the same session (5/15/12), Sue and Regan were googling information on Sue’s phone. When I asked how the group was tackling the project and divvying up their work, Sue and I engaged in the upcoming dialogue. Regan did not add to the conversation.
From Sue’s explanations it becomes evident that she and Neal have major roles in this project: Sue is the writer and Neal is the “brains.” Though not indicated in this transcript, previous (field notes, 5/15/12) and future (field notes, 5/18/12) conversations indicated that Regan’s primary role was as group artist, working to draw images for the final PowerPoint; however, as time moved on, this work did not occur. Although none of the students commented on equal work or a concern for Regan’s minimal input, Ms. Cook was concerned and evaluated Regan separately.

Returning to the analysis of the event from the transcript above, the way Sue framed the group’s project is significant. Sue is not just framing this project as an assignment. She and her group are situating their project within historical and social contexts: Occupy Wall Street and KONY 2012. In so doing, as they consider how to
create systemic change, Sue and her partners are deepening their knowledge of similar social movements to learn from the strategies. The group was also making intertextual links, leaning on their understanding of one cause to understand and create another. In line 3-10, Sue shared that their project idea was too similar to Occupy Wall Street and “people aren’t going to want to do it.” In addition to this message, her verb construction is telling. Using the present and future tenses, Sue seems to be working toward a solution to poverty, considering what people will actually do. This again supports the idea that Sue and her partners are doing more than school with this assignment; perhaps they are investing their time in one another to engage deeply with the content and build a strong argument that may influence others.

Three sessions later (session 10, 5/18/12), Sue spoke confidently about her group’s ideas and how they were pulling together knowledge of their topic—unemployment—with knowledge of resources—online videos, polls, mobile apps, viral marketing. In so doing, she shifted the way she spoke about her group’s purpose: “We went from an overhaul of the system . . . to revolution to like education to a sort of website that helps” (audio analysis, 5/18/12). With the focus on the website and how it could help the unemployed, Sue again made interesting shifts with her verb tense, as indicated in the following transcript excerpt.
Sue began with the past tense “put” and then noted “we’re we’re trying to format.” This verb use suggests what she and her group have done (past tense “put”) and what they are in the process of doing (present tense “we are”). Such a move suggests that Sue, Neal and Regan have videos and are looking into formatting them in a variety of social, online modes. In line .00-3, Sue used three present tense verb phrases in one message unit: “we’re trying,” “we have,” and “we’re looking.” Connecting the first two with coordinating conjunction “so,” Sue’s discourse indicates that the trio is trying “to format stuff” so they have various modes for their solution, they are in the process of both formatting and having a website. The use of “we’re looking,” connected with conjunctive adverb “then” indicates a unit of time, when something is going to happen. This suggests that the group’s research of viral marketing will happen after they work on the other two: formatting and creating the website. Finally, Sue links viral marketing with “so we would know” (line .00-5), expressing the possibility of sharing their solution with others online.

Analyzing this small bit of text suggests that Sue is invested in this project; she is moving toward deep understanding of her topic by building relationships across texts and
with her peers. As the three build knowledge together, they are creating a new solution in the process. Although Sue appears eager about their ideas, she shared that writing the essay would be difficult:

The hardest part is going to be writing about it you know . . . because we have to explain poverty you know and it’s like a mash of two essays about using a smash of two essays about poverty and why education will solve it. (audio analysis, 5/18/12)

This was the first time in all the observations that Sue marked an essay as a challenge.

Two sessions later (5/22/12), Sue’s concern for writing the essay was gone; in fact, she commented that the paper would be “easy” now. She did not unpack this shift in attitude, nor had she written the essay. Sue indicated that she did not complete the essay over the weekend because of an email problem; this did not concern her or her peers. During the day’s work time, Sue, Neal, and Regan examined and edited their PowerPoint Neal created over the weekend. The students and Ms. Cook were pleased with their project (field notes, 5/22/12).

The students also discussed their counter argument, a topic Ms. Cook reviewed at the beginning of class. As Sue, Neal, and Regan began working, Sue thought they needed to add a counter argument but Neal insisted that their reference and use of KONY 2012 was their counter argument. This disagreement was atypical. It was brief and marked the first and only time Sue and Neal verbalized polarizing opinions (field notes, 5/22/12). In the upcoming transcript, Sue explained how she understood counter-arguments in written essays, with Neal supporting her ideas:
As Sue began talking about how to manage their counter argument, she immediately talked about how to use it and how to “patch it up” in their work. Sue did not ask how to use a counter argument or what a counter argument was; rather, Sue’s analogy with booster shots was likely Sue taking up Ms. Cook’s discourse. Earlier that class period (field notes, 5/22/12), Ms. Cook reviewed counter arguments. In explaining how it was helpful to use counter arguments Ms. Cook stated, “They [those who hold other views] can’t argue their point because you’ve sort of inoculated yourself, given yourself like a polio shot, a vaccine, then they have nothing to say” (video analysis, 5/22/12). Returning to the analysis of the event from the transcript above, Sue used the analogy of “a booster shot” (line 3-10) to explain herself. It was at this point, with this wording, that Neal agreed with her (line 3-11).

This topic of counter arguments is interesting to consider within Sue’s participation because of the way Sue spoke about counter arguments in her original interview her ninth-grade year. When asked if she used a counter argument in that first
essay, she commented that she did not. She felt it was unnecessary for her argument (Interview, 1/1211). In that first interview she did not verbalize confusion nor indicate trouble understanding the concept of counter arguments; she simply did not find a counter argument necessary. For this final essay, the solution to poverty, the counter argument was a critical component for the argument. It was their counter argument that caught Ms. Cook’s attention and praise when she reviewed a draft of their PowerPoint: “you’ve kind of knocked down all the potential things that stand in your way” (audio analysis, 5/22/12). Though Sue and Neal did not agree with how they used their counter argument in their first conversation about it (field notes, 5/22/12), their final project and essay both foreground KONY 2012 and present their solution as an improvement upon it. In both modes, they also wrote about how those without technology can access their website and participate (final essay & .ppt, 5/23/12). This was done by focusing on the power of the internet: “the biggest community” (.ppt, slide 4, 5/23/12). As Sue presented her group’s project to the class, she also emphasized community with her voice inflection and with pausing (video analysis, 5/23/12). As Sue finished the presentation, the class burst into applause, followed by Ms. Cook’s praise. Turning to the class, Ms. Cook commented, “You know that is something that would definitely work. That is something you guys should think about” (video analysis, 5/23/12). By acknowledging what may disallow their solution from working, Sue, Neal, and Regan successfully presented a well-developed, civic-minded solution to poverty. In addition, Ms. Cook’s moments of praise for Sue, Neal, and Regan’s ideas indicate that she positioned them as thinkers capable of engaging with argumentation and argumentative writing. Taking on a topic as
significant and complex as poverty, Sue and her peers provided a solution Ms. Cook found valid and possible.

**Conclusion.** Sue’s identity as a writer permeated her participation in the ELA classroom. Aligning herself with Ms. Cook as a fellow writer, Sue boldly resisted some of the instructional opportunities and recontextualized her uptake to others. At times making herself vulnerable, Sue was a consistent verbal participant. Through a series of conversations, Sue engaged with her peers, often bringing in personal experiences to enhance her understanding of the academic content and explanations for her interpretations. Sue’s relationship with texts and with those around her indicated that for her, argumentation was social and relational.

**Case study narrative #3: Bob.** Ms. Cook described Bob as intelligent yet quiet (field notes, 12/6/10). Bob was a serious student who did not think he was “that good at English” (interview, 1/12/11) but described himself as “more of a math guy” (interview, 5/20/11). For him, college was a desired and expected step after high school: Bob’s mother was a first-grade teacher and his father was a doctor. He said he preferred doing homework at his family’s kitchen table, where it was quiet. He also mentioned that he regularly asked his older sister for help with writing assignments because she previously had Ms. Cook as her teacher and was good with essays. Specifically, Bob asked his sister to revise his draft for his first formal essay in 9th grade humanities (field notes, 1/6/11). Bob was also a musician, playing the piano, guitar and drums, and learning the flute. Bob was motivated to go to college.

During class, Bob’s typical verbal participation during full-class conversations centered on questions regarding deadlines (field note, 12/17/10) or how to make use of a
particular strategy. Bob did not typically volunteer comments during the sharing of ideas, yet when Ms. Cook called on him he attempted to answer (field notes, 12/7/10). In so doing, when he verbalized uncertainty, Bob used Ms. Cook’s typical suggestion and “phoned a friend.” This allowed him (and other students who used it) to shift attention away from himself and allow classmates to help him (field notes, 12/7/10).

**Organization of the narrative.** In this narrative, I represent Bob’s participation across events during two instructional units. Table 4-8 and Table 4-9 indicate the collected data that foreground Bob’s participation during both units. From that data, I selected typical and telling events to represent Bob’s participation. Due to the ways Bob participated in the classroom, I have less events foregrounding Bob’s participation than I have of Kane and Sue. This narrative focuses on three events from the first unit (12/7/10, 12/17/10, 1/3/11) and three events from the final unit (5/18/12, 5/22/12, 5/23/12).

I have organized the narrative of Bob’s participation by instructional unit. First, I offer analyses of one full classroom event (12/7/10) and two events (12/17/10, 1/3/11) between Bob and his peer review partner, Tom, during the first observed unit during their ninth-grade year. The representations of the conversations were constructed by using the data from the video and audio analyses but they were also triangulated with interviews and written products.

The second half of Bob’s narrative focuses on his participation in the final observed unit his tenth-grade year. The unit was a capstone project: a solution to poverty. Bob and his partner Hudson wrote an argumentative essay and created a video presentation. Due to the nature of Bob’s participation, I offer the analysis of the final instructional unit differently than the first instructional unit. Many of my observations
for Bob and Hudson’s peer work time were captured in field notes rather than audio recordings because of continued anxiety with the audio recorder; however, Bob allowed me to check in with him and Hudson and talk about their process during three peer work sessions (5/18/12, 5/22/12, & 5/23/12). For this second portion of my analysis on Bob’s participation, I rely on my field notes, video recordings, and final interview with Bob and Hudson.

The first row on each table indicates verbal data (moments when Bob spoke) and the second row on each table indicates written data (written by Bob or written comments about Bob’s written draft). In each column, markings indicate the specific data within the verbal and/or written column.

The key for the data described in Table 4.8 and Table 4.9 is below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Key to Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WK</td>
<td>worksheet completed by focal student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>small peer group conversation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>whole class conversation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PrWk</td>
<td>worksheet completed by a peer on the focal student’s draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR</td>
<td>essay draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FE</td>
<td>final essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>counter argument practice writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VID</td>
<td>project video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT</td>
<td>interview</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.8 *Bob’s Unit One: Work or Detroit Industry: Man and Machine.* 12/1/10-1/7/11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade 9</th>
<th>Unit 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob’s written work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data analysis across the two units indicate three key findings for Bob’s participation in the classroom:

- Bob aligned his participation with Ms. Cook’s instructional strategies and timing, using both as ways to be a successful student and writer
- Bob wrote in a linear fashion
- Bob positioned himself as an on-task student and took his role of peer reviewer seriously yet differently during the first and the final instructional units

**First instructional unit.** My analysis of Bob’s participation during the first instructional unit focuses on session five (12/7/10). I organized this section in two parts: first, Ms. Cook’s typical pedagogical moves, and secondly, how Bob’s early ideas moved forward in a linear fashion to his final written essay. I begin this section with an emphasis on Ms. Cook’s typical pedagogical moves as Bob’s participation aligned with Ms. Cook’s expectations and deadlines.
Figure 4-3 provides the agenda for session five (12/7/10) as enacted during the fifty-minute class period (field notes, 12/7/10):

- Teacher-led talk
  - Topic = Final essay deadlines
- Class conversations
  - Topic = Completed homework (“Reading Images” worksheet, Appendix __)
    - Specific talk = #5 from the worksheet (links between paintings *Work* and *Detroit Industry* and *The Communist Manifesto*)
    - Ms. Cook called on students to share ideas (Bob’s response is located here)
  - Topic = factory work in the local area; connections between class texts and local history
  - Topic = plans for college
  - Topic = completed homework (“Reading Images” worksheet)
    - Specific talk = #5 from the worksheet (links between paintings *Work* and *Detroit Industry* and *The Communist Manifesto*)
    - Ms. Cook called on students to share ideas
- Teacher-led talk
  - Topic = Final essay explanation (“The Argumentative Essay” worksheet, Appendix __)
- Class conversation
  - Topic = links between *Bartleby, the Scrivener* and the painting *Work*
  - Topic = links between *Bartleby, the Scrivener* and the painting *Detroit Industry*
- In-class task
  - Topic = write a messy claim (early ideas)
    - Teacher’s question to students: What is the author’s (Ford Maddox Brown or Diego Rivera) argument?
- Homework = review *Bartleby, the Scrivener* with “fresh eyes” and find examples to interpret as evidence

Figure 4.3 12/7/10 Enacted Agenda
As Ms. Cook began class, she directed students to take out their planners and record the due date for the final essay. Because Bob was attentive to deadlines, he followed Ms. Cook’s request (field notes, 12/7/10). As Ms. Cook gave the deadline, she offered an explanation for the essay and what students could expect over the next several weeks:

I literally (.3) take you through the entire paper in class. It’s not one of those papers where we’re trying to get informational stuff where you just sit down and write it. This is a very formally constructed paper and it’s going to be based on some things that we’ve we have already done, um a story that you that we haven’t even discussed yet, and part of *The Communist Manifesto* which, theoretically, some of you have already read. Okay so that’s why it’s kind of complex. I want to make sure you know exactly what you’re doing and how to do it. We will also have library time in which to make sure formatting is correct. (video analysis, 12/7/10)

In this preview of the assignment, Ms. Cook made her expectations clear. Her use of clauses and words “take you through,” “very formally constructed paper,” “complex,” and “library time” suggest that this paper would be challenging and that Ms. Cook expected students to need help—help she planned to provide during class. The use of intertextuality was verbally initiated, “based on some things that we’ve we have already done, um a story . . . and part of *The Communist Manifesto*” and written on their assignment sheet (Appendix I). Ms. Cook also provided a contrast to what students had previously done, “It’s not one of those papers . . . where you just sit down and write it,” deliberately marking this paper as new; she did not want students to do this paper on their own in a manner that they already understood. Though this preview of the assignment
did not provide discreet essay details, Ms. Cook let students know that she was attending to their needs on several levels: she would provide opportunities for students to know “what you’re doing and how to do it” (emphasis mine).

These notions of what and how fit Bob’s needs in the classroom. Bob paid attention to what Ms. Cook offered. He completed and turned in all the accompanying worksheets and drafts assigned throughout this first instructional unit. The worksheets were primarily peer review worksheets that students exchanged with one another during peer review sessions. A main focus to these worksheets was the writing trajectory. First, students reviewed and commented on claim statements, then introductions, then body paragraphs and so on. Throughout this progression, Bob stayed on-task. It was typical for Bob to attend to deadlines and Ms. Cook’s suggested structures. In so doing, his writing appears linear. By linear I mean that Bob structured his participation and writing process in accordance with Ms. Cook’s instruction. To illustrate, I offer Bob’s participation during session five of unit one (12/7/10). During the first class conversation, Ms. Cook called on students to share their ideas from a homework assignment. Specifically, she asked students to pay attention to question #5 of the “Reading Images” worksheet (Appendix R) and share how they were building textual connections between the paintings Work and Detroit Industry: Man and Machine and The Communist Manifesto. Though Bob was typically a nonverbal participant, he raised his hand. Ms. Cook called on Bob as the second student to share. Transcript 4.23 represents the verbal exchange between Bob and Ms. Cook, publicly, during class during session five (12/7/10).
There is a noticeable shift to Bob’s participation between his initial offering of ideas (lines 10-2 & 10-7) and his subsequent responses to Ms. Cook’s clarifying questions (lines 10-14 & 10-19).

As he offered his ideas (lines 10-2, 10-4, & 10-5), Bob gave specific textual evidence from *The Communist Manifesto* that he then linked to *Detroit Industry: Man and Machine* (lines 10-7 & 10-9): his ideas were clear, backed up with evidence, and fitting the requirements for intertextual links. Bob began (line 10-2) with a hesitant “um” followed by qualifier “I think someone already said this,” (line 10-3), Bob’s statement (line 10-4) was linked to a reference within *The Communist Manifesto*. He continued his response with connectors “and then.” Such a linguistic move suggests that Bob was
building his case and making his interpretation clear. As requested, Bob gave direct
evidence for how he understood the painting to be linked with evidence from another
text.

As indicated on Bob’s assignment worksheet (work sample 4.9), he had prepared
these three examples ahead of time.

 Written Work

5. Now, read the excerpt from the Communist Manifesto and highlight any textual
connections with the artwork that you see and list them below. You may copy individual
words, phrases, and/or clauses. The authors of The Communist Manifesto
say one “becomes an appendage of the machine” and
workers are “enslaved by the machine.” “Detroit Industry
shows the machines more abundant and powerful than
the humans.

Translation:
The authors of The Communist Manifesto say one “becomes an appendage of the
machine” workers are “enslaved by the machine.” “Detroit Industry shows the
machines more abundant and powerful than the humans.

[Bob’s response to #5 from the Reading Images Worksheet]

Work Sample 4.9 Bob’s assignment worksheet

Bob also mentioned the significance of his preparation with the “Reading Images”
worksheet (work sample 4.9) in his interview:

this [“Reading Images” worksheet] just helped to get everything basically just in
my brain already on what the painting is about because I think like we were in
groups when we did this and the teacher kind of went over it so that’s how I got
like a lot of the things. (Interview, 1/12/11)
Working with peers on a shared task helped Bob think more deeply about the two paintings being studied. He got ideas from his peer. Given that Ms. Cook’s instruction was based on the notion, “Everything’s an Argument,” Bob’s use of and seeming need for the social aspects suggests that argumentation was a social and relational process. In his quote, Bob also mentioned “the teacher kind of went over it,” indicating that conversations Ms. Cook led (field notes, 12/2/10 & 12/9/10) helped him gain a deeper understanding. As Bob worded it, “that’s how I got like a lot of the things.” Within this comment, Bob did not indicate specific helpful moments within peer groups or in Ms. Cook’s review, yet Bob completes his “Reading Images” worksheet (work sample 4.9) as a result. His participation with others helped him complete his work. In turn, the ideas on this worksheet helped him move forward on and complete his final essay. It is likely that Bob’s preparation on the worksheet gave him the courage to verbalize his detailed ideas. With the ideas “in my brain already,” Bob had an idea to voice when he originally volunteered to participate.

The shift in Bob’s participation became visible in Bob’s response to Ms. Cook’s clarifying questions in line 10-13. Bob responded with a noncommittal: “maybe both” (line 10-14). This response included the hedge “maybe,” marking Bob’s uncertainty yet willingness to answer. Bob’s response also lacked explicit evidence or explanation, a contrast to Bob’s previous responses. Ms. Cook continued the exchange, responding to Bob with a positive evaluation “good.” She then verbalized an immediate revoicing, “maybe both,” indicating that Bob needs to explain or “unpack” his idea, followed by a direct question in line 10-17. At this point, Bob’s shift in participation was made clear.
He lowered his volume, perhaps to remove himself from full class conversation and perhaps indicating that he was out of prepared ideas.

Ms. Cook paused for one second before offering Bob a way to remove himself from direct participation: “now do you want to phone a friend” (line 10-18). His inaudible response and his classmates’ immediate hand raising both indicate that Bob’s turn at talk was complete. It was both typical and acceptable for students to build on one another’s ideas. The classmates’ volunteering to answer questions Ms. Cook initially posed to Bob indicated that they had been listening to the exchange between Bob and Ms. Cook. Though Bob did not complete the question/response he and Ms. Cook began, his peers willingly finished it for him. Bob was free from responding. He was able to shift from speaker to listener and gain a sense of how other people where thinking about the ideas he raised. Given the common language of argumentation, as well as shared class time to study shared texts, such collaborative participation was typical in Ms. Cook’s classroom.

No longer verbalizing a prepared idea, it is possible Bob did not yet have an idea to share. Perhaps he needed more time to think about and create his answer. It is also possible Bob became nervous speaking in front of the whole class. Such behavior fits with his general anxiety to being recorded during peer review sessions. Regardless of the reason Bob stopped verbally participating, it is important to recognize that Bob made an attempt (line 10-14) to answer Ms. Cook’s question, just as he agreed to be a case study student. It is possible that Bob is compliant yet not thrilled to be carefully observed while working through his ideas.
This shift in Bob’s participation may reflect an attitude about his participation that he revealed in an interview. During his first interview (1/12/11), he mentioned several times that when Ms. Cook did not give explicit directions, he was not sure what to do. This is where his self-label of “I’m more of a math guy” (interview 1/12/11) is at play. Neither confident in ELA class nor confident in himself as a writer, Bob gained confidence when Ms. Cook provided baby steps. Bob was confident enough to raise his hand and verbally participate during session five and his responses were a direct voicing of completed work. This suggests that the homework assignments were not only “baby steps” to the completed essay, but building blocks for Bob’s confidence as a writer in this classroom. As Bob took up Ms. Cook’s learning opportunities, he was successful.

Final essay. Looking at Bob’s participation in the first unit, there is evidence that these “baby steps” impacted his final essay (Appendix S). Specifically, the baby steps resulted in Bob taking his ideas and producing textual connections between The Communist Manifesto and Detroit Industry: Man and Machine shared in class on December 7, 2010. Bob then took his ideas and wrote them into his final essay. The four ideas I am referencing are as follows:

1. he becomes an appendage to the machine (line 10-4)
2. he’s enslaved by the machine (line 10-5)
3. the machines are more abundant (line 10-9)
4. they’re like more powerful looking than the humans are (line 10-9)

Bob’s first two ideas stem from The Communist Manifesto and the remaining two from Detroit Industry: Man and Machine.
Bob made the above four ideas visible in two ways in his final written essay: (1) as exact replicas of the original ideas listed on the “Reading Images” worksheet (Appendix R) and verbalized in class on December 7 (Transcript 4.23), and (2) as a beginning idea that was unpacked and reworded over time.

During this section I will show how Bob’s four ideas were replicated and reworked across time and data points as he worked toward his final essay. This section serves as evidence for my claim that Bob was a linear writer who took up Ms. Cook’s learning opportunities. It also supports the notion that repetition, repeated exposure to concepts and content, helps students gain a deeper understanding.

Work sample 4.10 is an excerpt of paragraphs three and four from Bob’s final essay (5/23/12).
In these two body paragraphs, Bob used two direct quotes. Each quote replicates Bob’s first, two, original ideas (12/7/10): an “appendage to the machine” and “enslaved by the machine.” A replica of his original ideas, Bob’s use of these ideas can be traced across his writing process: in his final essay (work sample 4.10 & Appendix S), in his rough drafts, in his verbal responses during class session five (12/7/10), and on his “Reading Images” worksheet (work sample 4.9 & Appendix R). It is this continuation and building of ideas that suggest Bob wrote in a linear, progressive fashion. He did not begin with an
idea and change his mind about it or write a rough draft and scrap it before the final essay. Rather, Bob maintained his ideas over time, replicating and reshaping them to fit the written mode.

To begin, on his original “Reading Images” worksheet (work sample 4-9 & Appendix R), Bob jotted down his ideas. Then, during the verbal exchange on December 7, 2010 (transcript 4.23), Bob voiced these ideas, marking their spots in the text. As Ms. Cook questioned him and pressed him to explain, Bob did not unpack or make his thinking visible. However, he took time to do so in his final essay. As shown in Work Sample 4-10, Bob wrote both ideas as full quotes. He then provided commentary after each one. For example, after “an appendage of the machine,” Bob explained that, “The man in the factory setting is mere part of the machine.” Both Bob’s quote and commentary speak to Ms. Cook’s clarifying question asked during the class conversation on December 7 (line 10-13, transcript 4.23). Ms. Cook asked if Bob considered man as machine a metaphor or that man was turning into machines. Bob did not select between the two options in his original response, responding with “both.” In his final essay, he seemed to respond with the same notion. Though he did not explicitly write that he was considering both sides (metaphorical and literal interpretation), Bob’s written work suggests that he has maintained his choice of “both.” Now, however, the commentary within his essay marks an attempt to explain his reasoning: a distinction between his verbal and written responses.

Looking across the original event (12/7/10) and the final essay (work sample 4.10 & Appendix S), it seems that Bob stayed with his idea and deepened it. Originally, Bob was not prepared to respond fully to Ms. Cook’s question (line 10-11, transcript 4.23), yet
in his essay, he made a clear statement and provided commentary. Bob wrote, “The man in the factory is a mere part of the machine according to the authors” (final essay, 1/7/11). It is possible that Bob is suggesting man is turning into a machine, one of the options Ms. Cook asked. Then, Bob “unpacked” this notion, to use Ms. Cook’s words: “Not only does this show their distaste for the factory systems, but it also could easily provide an influence of Rivera’s motives for negative thoughts against factory systems of production” (final essay, 1/7/11). Though Bob did not explicitly use Ms. Cook’s wording of metaphor, his written construction of “not only does this show” suggests a metaphorical use.

Bob’s original notions of machines as “more abundant” (line 10-6) and “more powerful” (line 10-6) were not replicated; rather, they were unpacked and reworked throughout paragraphs three and four (work sample 4.10). Bob’s first sentence in paragraph three clearly restates his original ideas of machines as abundant and powerful in Diego Rivera’s *Detroit Industry*: “machines are more important than the human workers” (final essay, 1/7/11). Although being “more important” may not necessarily mean “more powerful,” Bob explicates this idea of power in paragraph four, writing about machines painted larger than humans, “unofficial power” attributed to such size discrepancy, “control” and “the large machine ‘watching’ the small humans work” (final essay, 1/7/11). Bob also explicitly stated, “With the power going towards the large machine, less is given to the workers” (final essay, 1/7/11). Throughout the two paragraphs, Bob described Rivera’s images, making it clear that the machine looms over the humans. Bob did not use his original word “abundant” to describe or comment on the machines, yet his continuous descriptions of machines rather than humans suggest this
notion. Bob’s writing and reworking of ideas also suggests that Bob writes in a linear fashion, using teacher-created scaffolds like the “Reading Images” worksheet (work sample 4.9 & Appendix R) and discussion as steps toward the final product.

What we are seeing across the event and within Bob’s written work was also mentioned in Bob’s interview: “this [“Reading Images” worksheet] is where I got like the details from the painting that went straight in there [final essay] cause like a lot of the things in the painting I wouldn’t have even seen if it weren’t for this paper” (interview, 1/12/11). Through Bob’s participation and through his reflections in his interview, we see an uptake for the step-by-step approaches Ms. Cook offered. Bob also expressed appreciation for Ms. Cook’s teaching with his words, “I wouldn’t have even seen if it weren’t for this paper.” According to Bob, he did the thinking but Ms. Cook’s scaffolds prompted it. Another one of Bob’s reflections also suggests his stance toward participating during this unit. When asked what made his final essay good, he shared: “I kind of stuck to the sheet with the ways to write it like most of my details were pretty concrete like different things from The Communist Manifesto and the painting” (interview, 1/12/11). Bob linked the notion of uptake with a good essay; this also indicates that he positions Ms. Cook as capable of teaching him and his peers how to write a good essay. Bob also expressed that as a writer, he “manages” and “listens to the teacher and write like that” (interview, 1/12/11). For Bob, when Ms. Cook taught him and he took up the learning opportunities, he was a successful writer.

This analysis is supported with a contrasting example from this first instructional unit. Ms. Cook did not teach students how to write a conclusion; rather, she told them to do their best (field notes, date) and she would teach them later—they simply ran out of
time before the essay was due. Both Bob (interview, 1/12/11) and Kane (interview, 1/13/11) expressed concern and were not confident with their conclusions. Bob specifically stated,

If we got a sheet on how to write it [conclusion] I lost it or something/ I don’t even think we got one so I really did not know how to do it I just tried to like end the paper as smoothly as I could I just didn’t really know how. (interview, 1/12/11)

Specific mention that there was no sheet on how to write it indicates that Bob paid attention to Ms. Cook’s assignments and was supported by Ms. Cook’s step-by-step worksheets. As illustrated with his “Reading Images” worksheet (work sample 4.9 & Appendix R), the event on December 7, 2010 (transcript 4.23), his final essay (1/7/11), and the surrounding data points, Bob fully participated in what Ms. Cook offered. In the absence of clear direction, Bob felt unsure and “just tried” (interview, 1/12/11).

Peer review sessions. Given Bob’s alignment with Ms. Cook’s teaching of argumentative writing, one may anticipate similar participation in peer review sessions. Bob completed assignments and offered feedback to his partners. Observations and analyses indicate that Bob’s performances during peer review sessions were on-task and productive.

During their ninth-grade year, Bob partnered with Tom for peer review sessions. Throughout observations and data review, Bob and Tom participated similarly during their first unit. Both students identified as White males (survey data). Both sat in the middle, back row of the classroom (field notes, 12/1/10). Both Bob and Tom completed his written work and turned it in on time. Bob and Tom also participated similarly in
full-class conversations. They typically were not verbal participants during full-class conversations, nor was it typical for Ms. Cook to call on either of them (field notes, date). In peer review sessions, Bob’s and Tom’s participation remained similar, at least as indicated from the gathered data. Notably, when Bob and Tom sat with an audio recording (requested by the researcher) to capture how they reviewed one another’s drafts and essays, they followed the same procedure: they turned the audio on to capture their conversation surrounding the teacher’s assignment and turned it off when that was complete. A typical review of the audio recordings from their peer review sessions sounds like a read-aloud of the written work they completed on peer review worksheets rather than a natural conversation with uptake and questions. Both Bob and Tom completed their review sheets and then verbalized their answers to one another, alternating speakers (audio analysis, 12/17/10 & 1/6/11). Their typical conversation was on-task and formal, with both Bob and Tom revoicing specific terms modeled by Ms. Cook and highlighted on the worksheet (audio analyses, 12/17/10 & 1/6/11).

The following transcript represents a typical verbal exchange between Bob and Tom during a peer review session. The talk in the transcript occurred during session 12 of the first unit (12/17/10). The transcript below begins forty-five seconds into the verbal exchange and the duration of the entire conversation was 8 minutes, 6 seconds. The fourth column on the table represents the portion of the peer review worksheet that Bob or Tom read or referred to during their talk.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line #</th>
<th>Spkr</th>
<th>Message Unit</th>
<th>Peer Review Worksheet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.00-1</td>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>and your claim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line #</td>
<td>Spkr</td>
<td>Message Unit</td>
<td>Peer Review Worksheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>II. Write down the <em>claim statement</em> in the space below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>The class system is unfair</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.00-2</td>
<td></td>
<td>yea the class system is unfair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.00-3</td>
<td></td>
<td>it was pretty basic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.00-4</td>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>your claim statement was like (.1) <em>boom</em> it was like right there</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.00-5</td>
<td></td>
<td>you like you have a lot of detail in that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.00-6</td>
<td></td>
<td>your um</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.00-7</td>
<td></td>
<td>I like the ah yea it was your claim statement was really effective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.00-8</td>
<td></td>
<td>it helped ah it fit in with ah your body paragraph</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.00-9</td>
<td></td>
<td>your body paragraph fit in with it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Transcript 4.24 continued
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line #</th>
<th>Spkr</th>
<th>Message Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.00-10</td>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>um evaluate the effectiveness of the claim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.00-11</td>
<td></td>
<td>It was like well rounded supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.00-12</td>
<td></td>
<td>like you said the people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.00-13</td>
<td></td>
<td>I put I put like the quotation marks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.00-14</td>
<td></td>
<td>like you said the people working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.00-15</td>
<td></td>
<td>and then the same sent I think the same sentence I think you said the wealthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>people are not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.00-16</td>
<td></td>
<td>and the painter thinks its like its not right for people like him since he has</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>like a connection with the man in the center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.00-17</td>
<td></td>
<td>it’s not like right for people like him to work hard while others don’t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.00-18</td>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>yea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.00-19</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.2) um yea</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transcript 4.24 continued
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line #</th>
<th>Spkr</th>
<th>Message Unit</th>
<th>Peer Review Worksheet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.00-20</td>
<td>I liked how your background</td>
<td>IV. Does the writer provide enough <strong>background</strong> to understand the context of the claim? Give examples (or suggest some if there are none).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.00-21</td>
<td>like you provided the details from the painting itself that the people were faceless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.00-21 Bob (.2) XXXX</td>
<td>Again the connection to the painter the dude in the center and the fence around the poor workers like there’s XXX around it and then (.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.00-22</td>
<td>transition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.00-24</td>
<td>like the last sentence of your introduction was about the guys and the first sentence was about the first sentence of the next paragraph was about them too so I GUESS that’s a good transition</td>
<td>V. Is there proper transition between paragraphs and ideas to lead the reader smoothly from one idea to the next? List the transitions used below.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.00-25</td>
<td>it’s about the same thing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As indicated in transcript 4.24, Bob read off of the worksheet during each turn at talk. Verbalizing prepared ideas was typical for him, both in peer review sessions (12/17/10 & 1/6/11) and full class conversations (12/7/10). An atypical move occurred as Bob closed his comments regarding Tom’s claim statement. Bob stated what he noticed and then offered an evaluation: “it was pretty basic” (line .00-3). This evaluation was the atypical part.

It is significant to note that in this classroom, Ms. Cook had been working to shift students out of writing a “basic claim” (field notes, date) and into writing an “ABCD claim” (field notes, 12/15/10); therefore, Bob’s label of “basic” was not a compliment. Rather, it was a clear indication that Tom needed to reshape his ideas into an ABCD claim. This comment also suggests that Bob was taking up Ms. Cook’s vocabulary and the different formats for claim statements. Such a notion is supported with Tom’s next turn at talk. As Tom described Bob’s claim he altered his voice and performed “boom” (line .00-4) as well as state, “you have a lot of detail.” Although it was typical for Tom to summarize what he noticed, rather than read off the worksheet like Bob did, it is what Tom did not say that is pertinent. Tom did not label Bob’s claim as an ABCD claim.

Thinking back to Tom’s claim that Bob evaluated as “pretty basic” (line .00-3), it is possible that Tom did not yet understand the ABCD claim, yet Bob did, as indicated in his language (line .00-3) and his own written claim (draft, 12/17/10).

Another interesting moment in this transcript occurred on the topic of transitions (lines .00-23-.00-25). It was typical for Bob to participate literally and do just as requested by Ms. Cook. In this next illustration, Bob participates differently on his peer review worksheet than he does when verbalizing his ideas and evaluations to his partner.
Tom. Bob’s adjustment to his participation indicates that he worked to position himself as capable on graded assignments. Ms. Cook’s prompt on the peer review worksheet (Appendix T) asked students, “Is there proper transition between paragraphs and ideas to lead the reader smoothly from one idea to the next?” (lines .00-23-.00-25 & Appendix T). After directly asking students to provide feedback on whether or not their partners had “proper” transitions, Ms. Cook asked students to “list the transitions used” (lines .00-23-.00-25 & Appendix T).

As indicated in work sample 4.11, on the written worksheet, Bob responded to the prompt, yet not directly.

![Peer Worksheet]

In his written work, Bob did not evaluate Tom directly, nor did he “list” a transition word(s); instead, he explained Tom’s transition: “last sentence of introduction about man in center, first sentence of body is about some guy” (12/17/10). In his verbal response (transcript 4.24), he attended to both parts of the prompt: feedback and a list of transitions. As line .00-24 indicates, he began by listing Tom’s transition. Then, Bob
added his evaluation: “I GUESS that’s a good transition.” Emphasizing the word “guess” with increased volume as well as a rising tone near the end of the word, Bob revealed uncertainty. This was compounded with his next utterance: “it’s about the same thing” (line .00-25). Bob’s explanation (line .00-25) of how he understood a good transition is a qualifier to his evaluation. If a good transition means that two bordering sentences are “about the same thing” topic wise, Tom was successful and Bob evaluated accurately. However, Bob’s uncertainty may be attributed to the fact that Tom did not use one of the transition words on the list Ms. Cook provided (Appendix U).

It is interesting that Bob did not write his uncertainty on the worksheet Ms. Cook would see; rather, he verbalized it to his peer. This move suggests that Bob did not want to position himself as confused or uncertain on a graded assignment. On the day prior to Bob and Tom’s conversation, Ms. Cook gave students a list of transitions (Appendix U) as she reviewed general writing moves. Her review included reminders for students to have the following: topic sentences for paragraphs, transition within and in between paragraphs, support for evidence, and integrated quotations (field notes, 12/16/10). The timing of Ms. Cook’s review suggests that students in general were struggling to understand and apply a good transition in their writing; however, Bob did not reveal his own uncertainty on the graded peer review worksheet. Instead, he left a spot blank.

Bob’s choice to merely voice uncertainty to Tom supports the possibility that Bob was aware of his audience (teacher or peer) and made deliberate choices. It was fine to let Tim know he was uncertain, yet Bob positioned himself differently toward Ms. Cook. This is supported by an idea Bob shared in his interview. When asked if he used the feedback given to him during peer review sessions, Bob shared that he used some of it.
When asked to share how he determined which to implement, he explained that he relied on “pretty much how it sounded and how I thought a teacher would read it” (interview, 1/12/11). Across data, we see that collaborative peer work was beneficial to Bob’s participation and written performances; yet Bob was consistently aware of the grading attached to this work. How a “teacher would read it” was a constant presence for Bob.

On the peer review worksheet, both Bob and Tom wrote using the third-person “he” yet both shifted to the second person “you” and “your” when talking to his partner. Even though the worksheet was intended to provide feedback for the student writers, such a move suggests that the worksheet was completed with Ms. Cook as the intended audience. Because Ms. Cook graded students on how they completed the worksheets, it is not surprising. Also, both Bob and Tom typically participated by completing their assignments, so again, distancing the author with the third person and writing to Ms. Cook makes sense. The shift each made to verbalize his ideas in the second person indicates that both Bob and Tom positioned one another as the audience in their verbal exchange. It is significant to note that Bob and Tom’s typical process of reading their written feedback aloud was not common for other student groups. I remain uncertain whether Bob and Tom chose to perform for the audio recorder or if the flow of their verbal exchanges were a manifestation of how they understood their tasks and roles as peer reviewers. Regardless, throughout their typical peer review sessions, they spoke to one another in statements. Each presented his idea to the other, with little uptake or verbal fillers from the listener. As a result, they did not engage in dialogue or grapple with ideas; rather, they presented what they noticed about one another’s work. Each understood the texts used by the other; thereby, they understood one another’s
interertextual links. The two were able to offer opinions from an intelligent reader. It is also possible that hearing their own ideas voiced aloud by another was a social act that helped the two improve as writers and thinkers.

On 1/3/11, Bob and Tom recorded their work time. Their task was to analyze a sample essay written about *The Lord of the Flies* and complete the accompanying worksheet. During the conversation Bob shared his knowledge of *The Lord of the Flies* and Bob and Tom disagreed over what was used as a concrete detail and what was used as commentary (audio analysis, 1/3/11). However, neither of these topics is salient or the reason for including this event in Bob’s narrative. The significance of this peer work session is its atypical nature.

For this verbal exchange, Bob and Tom recorded their full conversation: both on-task and off-task talk. As Bob and Tom worked on their individual worksheets (1/3/11), a myriad of topics were broached during the 26 minute, .26 second talk. During other peer review sessions (12/17/10 & 1/6/11), Bob and Tom focused on another’s essays; in this session (1/3/11) they analyzed a sample essay on *The Lord of the Flies*. Table 4.10 shows the breakdown of their conversation topics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conversation topic</th>
<th>Duration of time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main point of sample essay</td>
<td>4 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is possible that this difference in task may have attributed to Bob and Tom’s change in recording practices.

Bob responded to all topics, though he initiated conversations with Ms. Cook as she stopped at their desks. Tom initiated the other conversation topics. As indicated in the list of topics, Bob and Tom did not spend long amounts of time on any given idea. The two topics with the longest duration were not as salient as they may appear. Rather than continuous, four-minute conversations, the majority of time was Bo and Tom working silently on the listed topics.

As the two moved across on-task and off-task topics, Bob and Tom worked to complete their assignment. Near the end, Tom said to Bob, “You know, Bob, we’re not going to get this done” (audio analysis, 1/3/11). Less than a minute later, Bob asked Ms. Cook how he could shorten his written responses to save time. It is interesting that Bob did not suggest to Tom that he would turn in an incomplete assignment nor did he
complain to Ms. Cook. Instead, Bob continued working, asked Ms. Cook a question, and completed his work (audio analysis, 1/3/11): typical participation for Bob.

As this conversation came to an end, Bob spoke directly to the audio: “That’s all folks” (audio analysis, 1/3/11). It is possible that Bob was becoming more comfortable with observations and the audio recorder; however, given the timing of this recording and Bob’s anxiety about recording peer review sessions the next year (2011-2012), it is unlikely. Rather, this audio recording (1/3/11) is more suggestive that Bob found the conversations and the work during session thirteen (1/3/11) as less significant than those in other peer review sessions (12/17/10 & 1/6/11). It is likely that Bob did not find this particular activity as helpful as he found other steps in the writing process.

**Final instructional unit.** Looking across data from the first observed unit and this final unit, Bob’s participation had changed. This is likely due to the fact that during the first unit Bob was working on an individual essay and during the final unit, Bob worked with a partner. Even so, there were subtle shifts to Bob’s participation that are salient and worth considering.

During the first unit, Bob and his partner Tom made deliberate choices with their audio recorder, capturing on-task information in a script-like manner and then turning off the recorder. During the final unit, Bob and his partner Hudson spoke more naturally, sometimes deepening ideas for their project and sometimes talking candidly about current events or their lives. With this said, the two were not comfortable having these natural conversations recorded; as a result, I sat next to them and wrote field notes. I also have one audio recording from twenty minutes of their last peer review session (5/23/12). On this day, I stopped by their computer to ask how they were doing and they allowed me to
record our conversation; I did not, however, leave the audio recorder to capture their conversations when I was not there.

Hudson was a new student to humanities; he transferred to Center High School for the 2010-2011 school year because he had personal conflicts with the curriculum and a few of the teachers at his previous school. Hudson also explained that Center gave him the opportunity to be in sports—something his other school did not offer. Although Bob and Tom said they were friends, Bob and Hudson knew one another through church and community connections prior to being classmates. It is likely that their relationship outside of school time made space for more natural conversation. Additionally, Hudson was more vocal and outgoing than Bob or Tom. During observations of peer review sessions during the final instructional unit, Hudson was the dominant speaker (field notes, 5/18/12, 5/22/12, & 5/23/12) during peer review sessions with Bob.

Bob’s shift in participation may also be attributed to Bob’s changing positioning toward school. On May 18, 2012, Ms. Cook stopped by their computer station to check on their progress. Bob responded that they were doing well. He then explained that he and Hudson lived close to one another, so they could get together over the weekend to make more progress. Such an explanation suggests that neither he nor Hudson may be displaying participation or producing work that appeared on-track, but they knew how and when to complete what was expected. Ms. Cook did not press for more. Bob’s explanation sufficed. During our final interview Bob reiterated that what made this partnership work was their proximity in living near one another. He shared that “we worked together on small stuff and we’re both kind of like get ‘er done” (interview, 5/25/12).
During the next class session (5/22/12), Bob and Hudson reported to me that they were still doing well. They explained that they worked at home, each working on his own portion of the paper, and then they Skyped one another as they put the essay together (field notes, 5/22/12). This preference to work at home fits what Bob shared with me during his ninth-grade year (he preferred doing homework at his family’s kitchen table, where it was quiet), yet Hudson expressed irritation with homework during a conversation between Bob, Hudson, and I the following day:

*People tell me they have all this homework like all this crazy stuff. I’m just like okay like I can work with that but I like finish it at school because it’s like yea I have homework but if you actually do it at school then there’s no issue but like everyone’s staying up until 1, 1:30 at night and I’m like you’re ridiculous like I never do homework at home, like ever. (interview, 5/23/12)*

Given what Bob and Hudson reported on 5/22/12, Hudson’s proclamation of never doing homework at home does not mesh. Bob and Hudson were not observed to be writing their essay or creating their project during class time, yet they produced a rough draft, final essay (Appendix V), and video on their due dates (field notes, 5/24/12). Hudson’s proclamation was also contrasted with his and Bob’s final video project—a video that Hudson took the lead on and noted he spent “hours and hours” creating (field notes, 5/24/12). Analysis across observations, field notes, and interviews suggests that Hudson worked to describe an identity he did not enact. He labeled himself “very opinionated” (audio analysis, 5/23/12), and given the ways I observed Ms. Cook and Mr. D react to Hudson during the final unit, it is likely that it was typical for Hudson to make bold statements that were not always supported by his actions.
Regardless of Hudson’s motivations, Bob participated differently during peer sessions in this last instructional unit. Bob’s shift in participation may be attributed to a comment Bob made (5/23/12) the day before their project was due. After I asked Bob and Hudson how they were feeling about their project, they engaged in the following dialogue:

| 16-1 | Hudson: I’m not nervous about anything in school |
| 16-2 | Bob: yea I’m not either |
| 16-3 | Hudson: to be honest school is ridiculously easy for me |
| 16-4 | school is ridiculously easy |
| 16-5 | Bob: Well NOT for me |
| 16-6 | yesterday I realized there’s only like two days of school left |
| 16-7 | I don’t know why I’m worrying so much |

Transcript 4.25 5/23/12 minute .16

Focusing my analysis on Bob’s talk, I tracked his statements: he is not nervous about anything in school (line .16-2), he does not find school ridiculously easy (line .16-5), and he is unsure why he worries so much (line .16-7) given the remaining school days (line .16-6). Giving in less to concern for school work is a shift for Bob, one he marks with his present verb tense: “I don’t know why I’m worrying so much” (line .16-7). Bob claims that he is not nervous yet wonders why he worries so much. A contradiction lies in these statements. Perhaps Bob’s verbal constructions suggest that at the time of talk, Bob was not nervous or was trying not to be nervous. To carry this idea further, his use of the present tense “I’m worrying” (line .16-7) may suggest Bob was typically one to
worry about school-related tasks and he was now (line .16-6) wondering why. Given the data from Bob’s 9th grade year, it seems that Bob is beginning to wonder why he worries so much in general, about school, yet at the same time, claims not to be nervous. Typically, when one is nervous it is because one is worrying about something; however, in this verbal exchange, Bob claimed that he is not nervous and does not know why he “is worrying.” Given Bob’s previous typical participation in ELA, his seemingly contradictory statements may suggest a shift in participation in general or may suggest a shift in participating with a different partner.

The order of Bob’s talk is also interesting to consider. When Bob first responded to Hudson (line .16-2) he aligned with him, twice. First, he affirmed Hudson’s idea with “yea” and then stated, “I’m not either.” Hudson then responded with a double statement, repeating “school is ridiculously easy” (lines .16-3 & .16-4). In response, Bob set himself apart from Hudson (line .16-5). Bob used increased volume to indicate the contrasting “NOT” (line .16-5) so as to not align himself with the notion that “school is ridiculously easy.” What this suggests is that Bob had to work for his school success, an idea that fits previous understanding of Bob’s participation. Ms. Cook assigned work and Bob completed it, working to align himself with her processes and learn. Bob was a serious student. Bob’s response to Hudson also carved out his turn for more extended talk. Given Hudson’s proclivity to dominate conversation (field notes, 5/18/12, & interview, 5/25/12), it is possible that Bob used increased volume (line .16-5) to gain Hudson’s attention that Bob had something to share (lines .16-6 & .16-7).

The data I collected on Bob’s participation over two years parallels Bob’s participation during the first and last observed instructional units. During the 9th grade
year, I have data that represents how Bob moved through Ms. Cook’s instructional opportunities and learned how to write a formal essay. Using Ms. Cook’s “baby steps” and working with Tom, Bob wrote a successful essay and began to shift his identity as a writer. During the tenth grade year, I have data that shows how Bob talked about his process of writing an essay and producing a video presentation with his partner Hudson. Working with a friend and working at home, Bob and Hudson created products both were proud of and eagerly shared with their classmates and teachers (video analysis, 5/25/12). Across the two years of time and the two instructional units, Bob’s participation changed; however, a statement he made during our final interview resonates an underlying theme to Bob’s participation during both years. “As sad as it is in the end it’s all about the grade” (interview, 5/25/12). During both school years and focal units, Bob was aware that Ms. Cook was his audience (audio analysis, 5/23/12) and that he was working on skills he would continually use as a student. Although his participation shifted, his overall positioning as achieving student remained the same.

Asked why he chose to enroll in ninth-grade humanities, Bob explained that he was unsure, stating, “I just got a schedule, but I’m glad I got it” (interview, 5/20/11). Given that humanities was a self-enrolled course elective, it is likely that Bob’s parents made the decision for him, perhaps because of his older sister’s experience with Ms. Cook and/or because humanities was an advanced course, on the college track. Regardless, Bob took ownership for enrolling in tenth-grade humanities, explaining:

I really like the teachers and it’s just like the whole idea behind it. I like how it’s not, it seems like every other class is just like read a book, do a worksheet on it,
and then turn it in. But this is like more I don’t know, like trying to actually get you to understand it. (interview, 5/20/11)

This notion of understanding, rather than “just” reading and completing a worksheet is interesting to consider. As Bob’s participation indicated, he appreciated Ms. Cook’s frameworks and structures. He also stated that the worksheets Ms. Cook provided for peer review sessions helped him (interview, 5/20/11), explaining that the concrete ways to be successful in Ms. Cook’s class gave him direction and helped him feel successful as a writer.

That being said, Bob seemed to grapple with the notion of school, as his experiences in humanities did not necessarily fit. In two of his interviews, first at the end of his 9th grade year and then at the end of his 10th grade year, Bob talked aloud about school’s purpose. At the end of his 9th grade year, Bob explained that “this class [humanities] kind of like shows you how you actually have to learn stuff, which is cool” (interview, 5/20/11). Bob continued talking and expressed that “it was cool to learn stuff and not put it in your mind and just like spit it out on a test and forget about it” (interview, 5/10/11). He admitted that he did not recall all the specifics about what he did or was taught, yet marked “argumentation was the biggest help. I’m almost positive I’ll use it in the future” (interview, 5/20/11).

Finally, at the end of his 10th grade year, Bob was still grappling with school’s purpose and how his experiences fit. He shared,

School is meant to learn but a lot of times it’s about terms and tests. Teachers teach for students to take tests but there are not a lot of tests in humanities but I still learned the most, which is weird. (interview, 5/25/12)
Bob found that learning the most, yet not taking a lot of tests, was “weird.” The contradiction he sets forward, “school is meant to learn but” and “there are not a lot of tests in humanities but I still learned the most” indicates that Ms. Cook’s ELA class was different from other classes Bob had taken.

**Conclusion.** Across instructional units, Bob aligned his participation with Ms. Cook’s instructional strategies. Following Ms. Cook’s trajectory for writing, Bob wrote in a linear fashion. He began by writing a claim statement, moved into an introduction, added body paragraphs, and concluded. This description is not meant to suggest that Bob was not reflexive about his ideas or his writing; in fact, Bob’s appreciation for Ms. Cook’s “baby steps” (interview, 5/20/11) alleviated stress and allowed him to think about his ideas without worrying how or if he could write the essay. As Bob worked with Tom and with Hudson, he positioned himself as an on-task student, yet over time, he began to think differently about what it meant to be a good student. Socially participating in his own way, Bob gained confidence in himself as a writer and ELA student over time.
Chapter 5

Overview, Findings, and Discussion

In this chapter, I first present an overview of the dissertation study. Secondly, I share key themes that emerged from Chapter 4. Then, I review and discuss the findings from Chapter 4. Next, I respond briefly to each of the research questions. Finally, I synthesize the implications of these findings for theorizing the teaching and learning of argumentation and argumentative writing.

Overview of the Study

This dissertation describes a two-year study of argumentation and argumentative writing in a high school English language arts classroom. The theoretical foundations of the study are grounded in social and interactional constructs. The six specific constructs prominent in the conduct of the study follow:

1. knowledge is not given; it is socially constructed.
2. people’s identities are not given; rather they occur through social interactions.
3. people acquire habits of mind that are situated in particular kinds of events and social practices.
4. an individual’s cognitive processes are influenced from the outside, social environment.
(5) students’ activities must be regarded within their meaning system.

(6) students acquire knowledge by engaging in dialogue.

The research topic, broadly stated, is how we can understand the teaching and learning of argumentation as a socially constructed process. Four research questions guided the study:

(1) How do teachers and students interactionally construct a manifest pedagogy for the teaching and learning of argumentation and argumentative writing?

(2) How do teachers and students interactionally construct a deep understanding of academic content (in this case, a deeper understanding of humanities) through the teaching and learning of argumentation and argumentative writing?

(3) What social identities and social relationships are constructed, over time, during the teaching and learning of argumentation and argumentative writing?

(4) What are the habits of mind that students take up, acquire, and employ as they engage in the instructional activities and classroom interactions associated with the teaching and learning of argumentation and argumentative writing?

An ethnographically informed study, I analyzed data from two school years (AY 2010-2011 & AY 2011-2012) at various levels of scale. Although I provided information on all the observed instructional units as context, I focused my analysis on two
instructional units: the first observed unit during the ninth-grade year and the final instructional unit during the tenth-grade year. In the first instructional unit Ms. Cook required students to write their first formal argumentative essay. Students wrote on either the painting *Work* by Ford Maddox Brown or the painting *Detroit Industry: Man and Machine* by Diego Rivera. In the final instructional unit, Ms. Cook required students to write an argumentative essay and create a multi-modal presentation arguing a solution to poverty.

I began analysis with an overview of the curriculum and created instructional unit chains (cf., VanDerHeide & Newell, 2013). Next, I selected typical and telling events (cf., Mitchell, 1984) from both units. Focusing on three case study students, I offered three narratives that trace the students’ participation over time. Using a micro-ethnographic discourse analysis, I created transcripts to represent full instructional conversations and peer group conversations from typical and telling events.

**Key Themes**

There are five key themes that emerged from Chapter 4. They are as follows:

- The affordances of repetition
- Argumentation as a process (rather than a product)
- The provision of opportunities for constructing intertextuality
- Students’ take up, rejection, and recontextualization of learning opportunities
- Students positioned as thinkers capable of engaging with argumentation and argumentative writing
As indicated in Ms. Cook’s curricular arc (Table 4.1), Ms. Cook’s instruction over time encouraged repetition. As indicated in the column labeled “Argumentative Focus” (Table 4.1), Ms. Cook built in opportunities for students to learn, question, apply, and play with claim and evidence in all units for two school years. Allowing this time to think through and across ideas suggests that one does not gain deep understanding when something is taught and applied or when something is taught and replicated. Rather, Ms. Cook’s instructional arc suggests that to engage deeply, one needs opportunities to create and discuss arguments via various texts and assignment modes. As the three student narratives suggest, students will not take up these ideas in the same manner; rather, allowing for social interactions surrounding argumentation over time allows students multiple exposures and experiences with text and with various perspectives. Students need time and repetition to gain deep understanding.

Additionally, situating argumentation as a process allows teachers and students to engage and experience arguments rather than just learn elements of a product that needs to be replicated. While it is the case that many teachers make use of Toulmin’s elements of argumentation, situating argumentation as a process allows teachers to contextualize argumentation and work with it organically. When students need more time with a concept, they can have it. When teachers need to foreground a particular mode of argumentation, there is space to do that because argumentation as a social and relational process is not one, singular thing to be replicated across classrooms; rather, teaching with the mindset that argumentation is a social, relational process gives teachers agency to tailor instruction to their students.
Another theme was intertextuality. To begin, Ms. Cook offered assignments that asked students to work across texts rather than working within a monotext (See Appendix I); such a move made visible that students should consider ideas across texts and across perspectives. Ms. Cook also foregrounded dialogue about text, indicated with the numerous instructional conversations and moments to work in peer review groups. Such dialogue became text to consider and use when students developed arguments and produced their argumentative essays. As students moved across dialogue, written text, printed images (i.e., the paintings *Work* and *Detroit Industry: Man and Machine*), they created intertextual links and anchored understanding via shared texts. In addition, Ms. Cook’s validation of students’ personal connections modeled for students that linking their experiences to text and with one another was a significant aspect to their process of argumentation.

A fourth theme was to allow students to take up, reject, and recontextualize learning opportunities. As indicated in Kane’s, Sue’s, and Bob’s narratives, these three students participated differently, yet each was successful. As each experienced argumentation over the two years, Ms. Cook made space for them, and their classmates, to move through their process. Ms. Cook did not have a singular notion of success, even when students produced argument in the same or similar modes.

Finally, Ms. Cook positioned students as thinkers capable of engaging with argumentation and argumentative writing. During instructional conversations, her language made this visible. For example, she used whole class time to ask students how they were building textual connections between the paintings *Work* and *Detroit Industry: Man and Machine* and *The Communist Manifesto*. As indicated in her responses to Bob
(Transcript 4.23), Ms. Cook validated Bob’s ideas with “okay” (line 10-6) and “good” (line 10-15). She also asked Bob a complex question (line 10-13), putting forward her ideas in connection with his; this is significant because she asked his opinion rather than tell him what to think. Though the conversation ended with Ms. Cook’s suggestion that Bob “phone a friend” (line 10-18) to help him, Ms. Cook’s language indicates that her students are capable of engaging in argumentation. Throughout my observations, Ms. Cook offered complex tasks and texts as well as scaffolds (teacher modeling, peer review sessions, teacher coaching) that were visible to the students. Students, in turn, worked together to construct ideas and grapple with difficult text and claims.

Throughout observations in Ms. Cook’s ELA classroom, I observed students and Ms. Cook collaborating and working toward a deeper understanding of argumentation and argumentative writing. To review, the five key themes that emerged from my data analysis include the following:

- The affordances of repetition
- Argumentation as a process (rather than a product)
- The provision of opportunities for constructing intertextuality
- Students’ take up, rejection, and recontextualization of learning opportunities
- Students positioned as thinkers capable of engaging with argumentation and argumentative writing

Given what I have observed, it seems that when teachers make space to live an enacted pedagogy in the classroom, notions of school shift, as occurred with Ms. Cook and her students.
Review of Findings

The key findings reported in chapter 4 are organized below. I begin by explaining Ms. Cook’s typical pedagogical moves and then organize students’ participation via case study student: Kane, Sue, and Bob.

First, Ms. Cook offered learning opportunities over time. With two school years (AY 2010-2011 & AY 2011-2012) together, Ms. Cook foregrounded argumentative elements (i.e., claim, evidence, warrant) progressively, co-constructing knowledge of argumentation and argumentative writing with her students. Ms. Cook also built intertextual links through her curricular choices, assignments, conversations, and participant structures. Guided by a philosophy that “Everything’s an Argument,” Ms. Cook promoted the language of argumentation through a careful study of multiple texts, the production of argumentative essays, instructional conversations, and peer review work sessions. With an emphasis on social interactions, Ms. Cook encouraged students to think across perspectives, consider their audience, and be reasonable human beings. As she stated in class, she did not want her students to be vulnerable or taken advantage of; rather, she wanted them to consider reasoned choices and make their thinking visible to others (12/7/10). She encouraged them to depend on reasoning as a habit of mind. This desire was again made visible as Ms. Cook evaluated students’ work. In her verbal remarks about evaluating essays, she positioned students as thinkers, first, and then as writers (5/2/10). This was made manifest through her written comments because she remarked on how/if students made their thinking clear to readers as well as their use of argumentative elements (i.e., claim, evidence, warrant, counter-argument, rebuttal) rather than focus on sentence structures or overall essay structure.
Kane followed Ms. Cook’s teaching progression and developed a deep understanding of argumentation and how to organize his ideas into argumentative essays. Over two years, Kane’s written argument became more complex as he made more argumentative elements visible in his written products. This shift was most noted in his claim statements, yet his use of warrants and counter-arguments also deepened. Throughout his productions of writing, Kane co-constructed peer relationships and built knowledge with his classmates. As Kane identified and performed as a “good student,” he aligned with Ms. Cook and made time to write and rewrite in a recursive manner.

Sue’s identity as a writer permeated her participation in the ELA classroom. Aligning herself with Ms. Cook as a fellow writer, Sue boldly resisted some of the instructional opportunities and recontextualized her uptake to other instructional opportunities. Sue engaged with her peers, often bringing in personal experiences to enhance her understanding of the academic content and explanations for her interpretations. Sue’s relationship with texts and with those around her indicated that for her, argumentation was social; additionally, as she produced argumentative essays, her understanding of argumentation and what it entailed was nuanced and situated.

Bob aligned his participation with Ms. Cook’s instructional strategies. Following Ms. Cook’s trajectory for writing, Bob wrote in a linear fashion. He took up the learning opportunities offered and developed a deeper understanding of argumentation, argumentative writing, and his academic content. Though Bob originally characterized himself as a “math guy” (interview, 5/20/11), over time, Bob’s confidence in ELA heightened. As he considered his second year in humanities as well as his future work in college, Bob situated argumentation as both necessary and doable.
Discussion of the Findings

In Ms. Cook’s class, argumentation was a social and relational process: students built relationships with one another and with the teacher about, with, and through spoken and written texts. As Ms. Cook and her students enacted these processes, learning opportunities occurred across participant structures and were provided in ways that allowed students to take up argumentation in multiple ways. Students were able to align themselves with the teacher’s approach to writing argumentative essays but were also allowed to deviate from that approach. These deviations were oriented to different identities that the students took up in the classroom.

Driven by the philosophy “Everything’s an Argument,” Ms. Cook taught students the language of argumentation. This included learning technical terms for argumentation but also schemes (such as the ABCD claim scheme) for producing argumentative essay. Students took up and used this “language” over time and adapted their uses of such language as they engaged in a range of argumentative writing tasks.

One aspect of the language used in the classroom was the use of intertextuality. In all instructional units, students were expected to create an argument by thinking across multiple texts. Text was broadly defined and included traditional print text (e.g., *Bartleby, the Scrivener*), a painting (e.g. Ford Maddox Brown’s *Work*), a conversation, a PowerPoint slide, a teacher-created handout, a student essay, and a speech/presentation. Regardless of form or mode, according to Ms. Cook’s philosophies, all text makes an argument through a statement of a claim and supporting evidence.

Opportunities to learn argumentation and argumentative writing were produced at multiple levels including through the tasks the teacher provided, through the instructional
chains orchestrated by the teacher, by the face-to-face interactions the teacher had with the students, and by the instructional conversations the students had in peer groups.

In the sections that follow, I discuss each of these sets of findings: (1) argumentation as a set of social and relational processes, (2) the language of argumentation, (3) intertextuality, (4) providing opportunities to learn through multiple levels of classroom activity. I then respond briefly to each of the research questions. In a final section, I synthesize these findings and discussions to suggest one way to theorize the teaching and learning of argumentation and argumentative writing.

**Argumentation as a Set of Social and Relational Processes**

Argumentation was a way of being in Ms. Cook’s classroom. Students interacted with one another and with Ms. Cook as thinkers, as writers, and as members of the discourse of argumentation. They were expected to create and locate arguments across their instructional units and across texts. At no time during observations did Ms. Cook name argumentation as a genre or a singular product; rather, she explained that it was a way to think and work with others. One of Ms. Cook’s main goals was for her students to be considered “reasonable human beings” (interview, 2/15/11). As Ms. Cook enacted her pedagogy with this goal in mind, she foregrounded dialogue with and between students, reminding students that their reasoning needed to be visible in their written work and believable to their audience (whether information was shared verbally or in writing).

**The Language of Argumentation**

Ms. Cook foregrounded claim structures to model and structure students’ entry into an argumentative discourse. To begin, she offered the ABCD claim (field notes,
12/10/10), focusing students on the use of claim and evidence. By the final instructional unit, she used what she called the Toulmin claim (field notes, 5/8/12), adding in an explicit focus on warrants and counter-argument. Ms. Cook used these structures and explicit labeling of argumentative elements to build a shared vocabulary among the class. Additionally, Ms. Cook revoiced students’ ideas into more academic language, modeling for them how they could write in a more sophisticated manner than they may do on their own.

It is critical to note that although the language of argumentation was foregrounded across the two years, it was not a constraint or something students had to replicate just as presented. Rather, through an understanding of the language and an ability to talk with one another, students were encouraged to create and develop their own writing styles.

**Intertextuality**

Intertextuality was an anchor point in the observed classroom. As students and Ms. Cook studied and talked about text, it was typical for someone to make reference and utilize previously studied text to support a claim or explain one’s line of thinking (i.e., Kane’s use of previously studied *A Tale of Two Cities* to explain his interpretations of the painting *Work* in Transcript 4.11, line 20-22). Text, as studied and as created, anchored understanding; it served as a connecting point across students and Ms. Cook as well as a way for students to create meaning through use of multiple intertextual links.

I view intertextuality as both the comprehension of multiple texts (Goldman, 2004) and a social construction (Bloome & Egan-Robertson, 1993). The overall curriculum, a humanities course, included two disciplines of study: English language arts and social studies. In course design, humanities was intertextual, as teachers worked with
students across disciplines, merging histories, texts, and ideas. In the curriculum for English language arts, Ms. Cook created assignments that required students to move across texts (e.g. the essay assignment for the first instructional unit, see Appendix I). Both of these levels of curriculum indicate intertextuality as the comprehension of multiple texts. For this dissertation, I am interested in the enactment of overall course design and ELA curriculum and how Ms. Cook and her students (in grades 9 and 10) used multiple texts as a nexus to think across perspectives, think through notions, and explore relationships. One of the ways students and Ms. Cook engaged deeply with argumentation was through intertextuality; it is this intertextuality that helps them engage deeply with argumentation, argumentative writing, their content topics, and with one another.

According to a social constructionist’s view, intertextuality is a purposeful and public juxtaposition of texts “viewed as a socially constructed resource people use to construct culture and ideology” (Egan-Robertson, 1998, p. 462). As defined by Bloome and Egan-Robertson (1993), “a juxtaposition may be proposed, be interactionally recognized, be acknowledged, and have social significance” (p. 308). In Ms. Cook’s classroom, intertextuality was enacted as a purposeful and public juxtaposition of texts (i.e., Kane’s intertextual link in Transcript 4.11, line 20-22). Intertextuality was also socially constructed across participant structures (i.e., Keith’s use of a class discussion regarding the painting Detroit Industry: Man and Machine in his conversation with Sue in Transcript 4.16, line 10-18, and their subsequent conversation about it as partners, lines 10-1-10-36, and with Ms. Cook in Transcript 4.17, lines 22-12-22-43) and over time. Together, Ms. Cook and her students made space for students to create and play
with ideas, and for students to build relationships (with texts, with ideas, with one another) over time.

Ms. Cook did not structure her lessons or units as a study of a mono text that culminated in a written exam, nor did she make use of reading quizzes or accompanying worksheets to check in on students’ understanding. Rather, hers was a dialogic classroom that foregrounded the social processes of argumentation and the opportunities to create with intertextual links. It is the case that students and teachers in other classrooms could gain deep understanding of content knowledge through a study of a mono text; however, from my observations, the ways Ms. Cook and her students made use of intertextual links to develop their arguments was unique and is worth consideration during curricular planning.

**Providing Opportunities to Learn Through Multiple Levels of Classroom Activity**

Working across multiple levels of classroom activity was a way of life in Ms. Cook’s ELA class. As indicated in the instructional chains for both focal units (Figure 3.1 & Figure 4.2), students worked alone, in peer groups, and as a full class. The assignment for the final instructional unit required students to write an argumentative essay and give a multimodal presentation to the class; this is a prime indication of how students were expected to think about and do argument. As students grappled with their solutions to poverty, they researched, developed ideas in peer groups, and expressed their ideas in a variety of modes.
Research Question #1: How do teachers and students interactionally construct a manifest pedagogy for the teaching and learning of argumentation and argumentative writing?

The pedagogy that was interactionally constructed in Ms. Cook’s classroom began with Ms. Cook’s understanding of argumentation: “Everything’s an argument.” She noted that although not all is an argumentative essay, the language of argumentation was in everything (interviews 2/15/11, 5/24/11, & 6/23/12). Ms. Cook did not present her lessons and move forward with a set schedule; rather, she planned her curricular units around the English language arts and history goals undergirding the humanities course and prepped her materials. Then, as Ms. Cook began instructing her students, the pedagogy was enacted through co-constructions with the students. Enacting the pedagogy with her students is significant because a lived pedagogy is shaped by the classroom talk, the interactions, and the understandings and confusion of the students in real time. Such instructional moves allowed Ms. Cook to respond to her students and create meaningful learning opportunities for their particular needs, rather than stay stagnant with plans for intended instructional moves or delivery of a prescribed curriculum.

As indicated in a full class conversation (field notes, 12/15/10), Ms. Cook and her students talked with one another to build a working understanding of argumentation and how it was used in texts. Through verbal and nonverbal participation (e.g. “thumbs up if you understand, thumbs down if you are lost,” field notes, 12/16/10), students gave Ms. Cook feedback and offered their recontextualizations (i.e., Sue’s narrative; 1/7/11); in response, Ms. Cook adjusted her curricular plans and learning opportunities and
responded to various student needs. Students also moved across various participant structures: whole class to small peer group to individual work time with teacher conferencing back to small peer groups and whole class conversations. Students consistently interacted with one another and talked about their ideas and essays, as indicated in the Unit One Instructional Chain (Figure 3.1). Creativity was encouraged and students and teacher worked together to build knowledge and shape one another’s understanding of argumentation and their content topics.

**Research Question #2: How do teachers and students interactionally construct a deep understanding of academic content (in this case, a deeper understanding of humanities) through the teaching and learning of argumentation and argumentative writing?**

In order to answer this question, I must first explain how I operationalize deep understanding. By deep understanding I mean the following:

- thinking about ideas over time, considering and reconsidering so one can elaborate one’s understanding for oneself and peers, whether in spoken or written form.
- considering someone else’s perspective in addition to one’s own, and this other perspective helps to shape one’s own
- connecting through personal links, making oneself vulnerable and open to creating new ideas
- building relationships across texts

The ways in which Ms. Cook and her students achieved deep understanding was through their interactions, with a primary focus on talk and dialogue. Because Ms. Cook
structured this ELA class around the notion “everything’s an argument.” I am unable to separate their social interactions from the processes of argumentation; rather, in this particular classroom, social and relational processes were intertwined with how argumentation was enacted and how argumentative writing was produced.

Specifically, students worked within the same peer groups for the duration of a unit (i.e., Sue and Keith) or the duration of a school year (i.e., Kane, Dana, & Chad). This time together allowed students to build relationships with one another and share their developing ideas over time. For example, as shown in Transcript 4.9, Kane and his peers had a continuous dialogue regarding their interpretations about the painting *Work*. Given that these three students had four conversations and activities surrounding their ideas just in peer groups prior to this indicates that they were able to press one another’s ideas, unpack their own, and articulate their ideas deeply because they did not have to start over with each conversation. These students knew one another’s work and had been reviewing one another’s ideas; as a result, they could interact and build upon what was shared in previous conversations as well as engage in the moment. In addition, because the full class shared anchor texts (i.e., Ford Maddox Brown’s *Work* and Melville’s *Bartleby, the Scrivener*), students could also rely on full class instructional conversations to begin and build base understanding and add to or speak back to those in peer group sessions (e.g. transcript 4.16).

Students also grappled with the notion of counter argument. As their written essays indicated, counter arguments were not foregrounded in their first formal essay yet were a critical way to unpack their arguments and present their solutions to poverty in the last essay. Instructional conversations also explicitly and implicitly raised the notion of
perspectives. First, full class conversations typically consisted of students offering ideas and sharing their interpretations about shared texts. At times students continued a peer’s idea and other times they verbalized a different perspective; regardless, Ms. Cook promoted both as valid, requiring students to support their ideas with evidence (field notes, 12/7/10). Because these conversations were public, all were heard and multiple ideas were made available to students while considering ideas for their academic content. Challenging one another’s perspectives also occurred in peer review groups, as was indicated in Kane’s narrative. In transcript 4.11, Dana asserted not only that she had a different perspective than Kane, but, “I don’t agree with you” (line 20-23). As the conversation unfolded, each student explained his/her interpretation. This conversation is one illustration of how students in this classroom did not need to “win” or be “right”; rather, they interacted with one another and developed their interpretations through supporting evidence.

As indicated in Sue’s narrative, connecting through personal links was another way to engage deeply and move toward a deep understanding. In Transcript 4.14, Keith made himself vulnerable by admitting his weakness with the ABCD claim format. In so doing, Keith risked his status in his peer group, yet Sue responded with her passionate hatred for the format. As the two continued working together, they grappled with writing structures as they applied them to their own work and interpretations of text (i.e., Transcript 4.15). Sue, who identified as a writer, connected structure and format with ideas; working through and recontextualizing her structures allowed her to deepen her understanding of her content ideas.
Students and Ms. Cook built relationships with texts, and in turn, with one another. Texts, broadly conceived, were part of the dialogue between Ms. Cook and her students. During full class instructional conversations, it was typical for students to take up author’s ideas and dialogue directly with text. In fact, Ms. Cook’s essay assignment for the first unit required students to do just that (see Appendix I). Additionally, texts were not to be considered alone or as a single-read; rather, Ms. Cook and the students contextualized text through discussions of historical time periods, close readings of what was illustrated or printed in words, and conversations surrounding readers’ interpretations. As students gained understanding, they were encouraged to think across texts and create a more nuanced understanding. It was these nuanced understandings that showed up in students’ conversations with one another and in their final argumentative essays. To use Ms. Cook’s words, students were encouraged to think across texts and “unpack” their ideas as they developed arguments and wrote argumentative essays; in so doing, they gained deeper understanding because they were creating ideas rather than replicating expected responses.

**Research Question #3: What social identities and social relationships are constructed, over time, during the teaching and learning of argumentation and argumentative writing?**

To begin answering this question, I focus on the three student narratives in this dissertation and described in Chapter 4. Kane identified as a good student, Sue identified as a writer, and Bob identified as “math guy” who was learning to improve his writing and his ELA skills. The identities of “good student,” “writer,” and “math guy” represent some of the social identities performed in this classroom and were identities to which
other students ascribed; however, these identities are not meant to be exhaustive for all social identities present in the classroom. Additionally, though each of these identities was represented in Kane’s, Sue’s, and Bob’s participation in Ms. Cook’s class, they are just one identity for each student. For example, Kane also identified and was identified as a swimmer, Sue as a violinist, and Bob as a musician. These additional layers add to the social identities constructed in this classroom. What these layers also reveal is that I operationalize social identities as those that are constructed by and for individuals, made visible through talk and actions. Although other aspects of identity such as gender, race, and class exist for the students, they are not the focus of my analysis.

By social relationships I refer to the relationships between Ms. Cook and her students and between students and their peers. As Ms. Cook’s talk made evident, she positioned students as capable and smart. As a result, she approached her students as co-thinkers and co-writers, a positioning to which both Kane and Sue aligned. As students talked with Ms. Cook in full class instructional conversations, she helped them engage with their idea in the language of argumentation; as she voiced their thoughts, she modeled how to write these thoughts so as to be read as reasonable. Students also interacted with Ms. Cook at individual and small group levels, again dialoguing with one another and embracing displaying different stances as they worked with (i.e., Kane and Bob) and reshaped (i.e., Sue) Ms. Cook’s learning opportunities. As Bob’s participation indicated, performing and maintaining a serious relationship with Ms. Cook and with his partner Tom allowed him to learn the language of argumentation, work within a structure for argumentative writing, and thereby, gain a deeper understanding of his content topic. One who aligned himself with Ms. Cook’s strategies and habits of mind, Bob became
more confident and expressed his ideas more fully as he engaged with his partner throughout the unit. Within this particular peer group, Bob and Tom focused their conversations on the assigned tasks; Sue and Kane, on the other hand, engaged more freely in both on-task and off-task conversations. To illustrate, as indicated in Table 4.7, Sue and Keith’s conversation topics were typically more off-task than on-task, yet work was accomplished. In Kane’s group, his relationships with his peers impacted their assigned work times and beyond. As Kane and Dana chose to talk about their ideas and essays one final time the day essays were due (field notes, 1/7/11) and Chad and Kane arranged time outside of class to review one another’s work, peer relationships were shaped.

**Research Question #4: What are the habits of mind that students take up, acquire, and employ as they engage in the instructional activities and classroom interactions associated with the teaching and learning of argumentation and argumentative writing?**

I define the habits of mind in Ms. Cook’s classroom as intellectual strategies that were taught and acquired. This is not meant to suggest that all students took up these habits of mind in the same manner or at all, yet the habits of mind were expected and accepted ways of doing in this classroom. One habit of mind Ms. Cook presented was to support an idea with evidence. Another was to consider multiple perspectives. A third was to unpack ideas so others can find those ideas reasonable; others need not agree, yet they need to understand and see how an argument was developed. Each of these three are inter-related, and students’ uptake to them varied. Another habit of mind was to “turn away and turn back” (field notes, 5/22/12), aka. “consider’ the counter argument and
determine how/if it should be included in your argument.” Another habit of mind was to consider argument an intertextual process. Across these habits of mind, students were encouraged to think deeply.

**Final Comments**

Ms. Cook’s classroom was a space for youth and their teachers to come together, create new ideas, and play with text while working to be reasonable human beings. It was not typical *schooling*. In May 2012, Ms. Cook began class with announcements and then gave students time to work in their peer groups. As the majority of the students began working, one female student was off-task and noisily wandering around the classroom. Immediately calling out to this student, Ms. Cook asserted her teacherly stance (atypical for this class) and stated, “Melissa, if I have to school your behavior, neither one of us is going to be happy” (field notes, 5/15/12). I froze on the spot. In that moment, when Ms. Cook was reprimanding Melissa, I realized that the interactions and language in this classroom were not about authority, school rules, or constrained questions with select answers students needed to regurgitate. In fact, during my two years of observations, Ms. Cook and the students in this classroom were not doing typical school. Rather, Ms. Cook challenged the students’ academically, positioning them as learners and thinkers, capable of navigating across a myriad of texts and themes. Students, in turn, treated one another as intellectual peers with whom they enjoyed talking and laughing.

Students engaged one another in deep understanding of argumentation and argumentative writing, building relationships with one another, Ms. Cook, and their texts. Ms. Cook and the students referenced connections to life outside of the classroom to
anchor what they were studying/thinking about inside the classroom. Writing argumentative essays, then, was a way to structure one’s thoughts about text: traditional print text, art as text, class conversations as text.

In the current United States educational system, classroom teachers and students are held accountable to standardized assessments and the newly adopted Common Core State Standards (National Governors, 2010). The forty-five states and school districts adopting the Core operate under the assumption that argument is significant and important. Across grade levels K-12, the Common Core language positions argument as a set of tasks to learn and apply. High school students are to write argumentative essays not only in ELA but also across disciplines (National Governors, 2010). According to the Common Core State Standards, the tasks set out for students promote college and career readiness. Specifically, as students are asked to organize their writing, the Standards assert, “Writing is a key means of asserting and defending claims, showing what they [students] know about a subject, and conveying what they have experienced, imagined, thought, and felt” (National Governors, 2010, np). In analyzing this statement’s language, the juxtaposition of “asserting claims” with what students have “experienced, imagined, thought, and felt” raises questions. Do students have the freedom to draw on their life experiences? Does the language across the Common Core promote situated, embodied learning?

In an attempt to answer, the following table offers a glimpse into the task-specific language for students in grades 9-10 and 11-12 respectively. Both snapshots provide the purpose for the “anchor standards”—the overall writing task (identical across grades 9-12)—and then a sample “grade-specific standard” students are expected to master.
Although the Common Core State Standards identify curricular outcomes in both the anchor standards and grade-specific standards, there is no mention of the social complexities of classroom life; no call for teachers to require students to “experience, imagine, think, and feel.” The Common Core language is also without operationalized definitions. For example, the grade-specific standards for grades 9-10 require students to use “valid reasoning” and the grade-specific standards for grades 11-12 require students to “logically” sequence; however, how reasoning or logic are defined is absent.

**Implications**

As a social and relational process, the teaching and learning of argumentation and argumentative writing is complex. Providing students opportunities for taking up and
adapting argumentation in a range of ways that are sensitive to student identities and sensitive to an adaptation to a range of tasks opens up space for students and teachers to create. More so, when argumentation is presented as a way of thinking—a habit of mind—rather than a regime of textual discipline, it becomes another way to interact with others and gain deep understanding of academic content. As a process, argumentation is constructed through the uses of language in a variety of participant structures. It is through Ms. Cook’s classroom, then, that we are given a glimpse into how argumentation can be taken up in school without being prescriptive. The focus on talk and social interactions also reminds us that students and teachers create meaning through language.

When classroom teachers foreground the teaching and learning of argumentation and argumentative writing as only structures to replicate, students’ agency is diminished. Akin to the banking model of teaching, students are treated as things: vessels to be filled (Freire, 2008). A banking model, teaching to students, also eliminates an embodied exchange of ideas: “A person is merely in the world, not with the world or with others; the individual is spectator not re-creator” (Freire, 2008, p. 75). On the contrary, in classrooms foregrounding student thinking (Fecho, 2011; Kinloch, 2010), relationships (Gilligan, 1982; hooks, 1994, 2000; Noddings, 2005), and an ideological view of literacy (Street, 1995, 2003), students are challenged because they are loved and believed in (Freire, 2008; hooks, 1994, 2000; Noddings, 2005). It is such a classroom that Ms. Cook co-constructed with her students.

Using Ms. Cook’s classroom as a model, there are both curricular implications and social implications. To begin, teachers may consider offering time for students to practice and play with concepts and texts. As Ms. Cook and her students’ experiences
indicate, structuring argumentation as a process moves the work out of a contained unit and more into a habit of mind. Another curricular implication may be teachers creating instructional opportunities that foreground intertextuality and then modeling how to think across texts. Socially, yet connected to curricular implications, the ways in which Ms. Cook allows various types of students’ participation to be successful is a key reminder that students will take up, reject, and recontextualized learning opportunities. Positioning students as capable thinkers and allowing them time to create and engage in their own deep understanding is critical, at least it was for Kane, Sue, and Bob. Students in Ms. Cook’s classroom had time to dialogue; they did not need to experience argumentation exactly as it is described in the Common Core State Standards; instead, Kane, Sue, Bob, their peers, and Ms. Cook enacted a manifest pedagogy for the teaching and learning of argumentation and argumentative writing.

All teachers and classrooms are unique and argumentation need not be the same across sites. Ms. Cook’s classroom allows us to see how high school students may engage deeply with argumentation and argumentative writing when it is offered as a process.

Ms. Cook’s classroom was an organic site of learning and co-constructing. Both teachers and students embodied their work, engaged with academic content and with one another, and honored relationships as knowledge building. When the teaching and learning of argumentation and argumentative writing are social and relational, argumentation and passion are a powerful pair and notions of schooling argumentation and argumentative writing move away from a contained, deficit model, and become more nuanced and human.
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Appendix A
Prepared Teacher Interview Questions, January 2011
(IES Grant)
Interview Protocol for Teachers (30 minutes after instructional unit)

Interview after instructional unit on argumentative writing.
(Remind participant of his/her rights to end the interview at any time and that they do not have to answer any questions they would prefer not to answer. Note that you need to have the essays that the students wrote for the teacher.)

Say: “Today’s date is _______ and I am interviewing ______________________ who teaches ____ grade ___ track English language arts at ____________ High School.”

Questions about the target class, the curriculum for the class, and two sample essays

Now that you have taught the instructional unit, tell me about what you wanted your students to take with them from the unit and the extent to which you feel you were successful/less successful. How do you know?

Tell me about how argumentative writing fits into the course as a whole. How often have you taught it this school year and how often do you plan to return to it after today? How is argumentative writing related to the readings you assign or other parts of your curriculum?

When you begin the school year, what do you assume that your students know about argumentative writing? What would you like them to know as they begin the school year and what would like them to know by the end of the school year?

Please take one of the more successful papers and talk through what the student is doing with argument. What are the strengths of the paper? Its problems? What continuing growth would you like to see as this student continues to develop as a writer?

Please take one of the less successful papers and talk through what the student is doing with argument. What are the strengths of the paper? Its problems? What continuing growth would you like to see as this student continues to develop as a writer?

General Questions about teaching argumentative writing

Tell me about your feelings regarding the teaching of argumentative writing. Do you like teaching it? Why? Do you feel it is important? Why?

Do students seem to like learning to do argumentative writing? How do you know? What do they find engaging? What do they find challenging/easy about learning to do argumentative writing?

Tell me about your most successful experience teaching argumentative writing. Why was it successful?

Describe your own writing activities for school and outside of school and how the writing you do influences (or not) how you teach writing/argumentative writing.

Conceptual framework for teaching argumentative writing

How do you define argumentative writing? What are the key components of argumentative writing? How is it similar to and different from other types of writing?
How would you describe your approach to teaching argumentative writing? What instructional strategies do you view as critical to teaching argumentative writing?

When you respond to a student paper involving argumentative writing, what do you look for? What is your approach to responding to student papers? Why do you take this approach?

What are your general goals for teaching argumentative writing? (Prompt for teaching reasoning, considering other perspectives, learning from other people’s arguments, deep understanding of the topic, etc.)

General experiences in teaching argumentative writing
How long have you been teaching argumentative writing? How has your teaching evolved over time? Describe some of your more memorable events in teaching argumentative writing (times when it went exceptionally well and times when the instruction did not go well).

If you were to guide a new teacher in teaching argumentative writing, what advice would they give to that new teacher?

Do you consider your students to be good writers of arguments? Why?

Experiences with classroom discussion
When you are discussing ideas and literature with students, what do you try to keep in mind? Why?

What do you want your students to learn from discussion?

When discussing ideas and/or literature with your students, do students ever disagree with you or with one another?

How do you feel about disagreements during discussion? How do you typically respond? When there are disagreements, how do you handle them?

Describe how you understand the connections between discussion and learning to write argumentatively?

Is there anything else you would like to tell me about the teaching and learning of argumentative writing that we have not discussed.

Thank you!
Appendix B
Prepared Teacher Interview Questions, February 2011
(IES Grant)
Argumentative Writing Project
Teacher’s Report and Survey of Practices Since the Post-Test

To understand the long-term effects of your teaching, we would like to have an idea of your instructional goals and activities since the post-test that we conducted earlier in the school year. We are especially interested in your teaching of reading and writing as related to development students’ understandings of and practice with argumentation. Please base your answers on the class being observed for OSU Argumentative Writing Study.

Teacher’s name: ________________________

Today’s date: ___________________________

Instructional days since post test: Dates from _____ to _____

• Briefly describe the goals and some of the content of the lessons since the post-test. What are the possible connections to what you taught during the observational study and to future lessons?

• Did you teach argumentation since the post-test? Briefly describe goals and content.

• Writing and related activities: Since the post-test, to what extent did you use/assign the following activities for tests, classwork and homework in the target class? (Check one for each type of writing.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>activity</th>
<th>Not used in this class</th>
<th>Used occasionally</th>
<th>Used frequently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple choice or fill in the blank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note-taking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-answer responses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing at least paragraph</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting of events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summarizing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytical/Argumentative writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speculating about ideas or opinions (without evaluation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal uses of writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imaginative (Creative) writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Connections among Class Activities

How often do the following practices characterize your instruction since the post-test? (Circle a response or write in a response.)

1. About how often did students in your class write about (or in response to) things they have read?
   - Not at all day
   - One day
   - More than one day
   - Most days
   - Every day

2. About how often did you discuss writing topics with your students before asking them to write?
   - Not at all day
   - One day
   - More than one day
   - Most days
   - Every day

3. About how often did you and your class discuss the readings that you assign?
   - Not at all day
   - One day
   - More than one day
   - Most days
   - Every day

4. About how often did your class relate its discussion to previous discussions that you have had?
   - Not at all day
   - One day
   - More than one day
   - Most days
   - Every day

5. About how often did you and your class discuss things that students have written about?
   - Not at all day
   - One day
   - More than one day
   - Most days
   - Every day

6. About how often did you ask students to explain their answers, ideas, or comments?
   - Not at all day
   - One day
   - More than one day
   - Most days
   - Every day
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7. About how often did you ask your students to write about a controversial issue?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>One day</th>
<th>More than one day</th>
<th>Most days</th>
<th>Every day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8. About how often did you ask your students to discuss a controversial issue?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>One day</th>
<th>More than one day</th>
<th>Most days</th>
<th>Every day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9. About how often did you ask as your students to read and discuss argumentative essays?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>One day</th>
<th>More than one day</th>
<th>Most days</th>
<th>Every day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Appendix C
Prepared Teacher Interview Questions, May 2011

Interview Questions for the teacher (spring 2011)

· How did the students learn to write arguments this school year—what did they learn early/later in school year?

· What were the teacher’s goals and how well does she think they were reached?

· Does the teacher distinguish between simple versus complex argument and if so, how has her approach to argument included this distinction?

· How has the evaluation of AW changed across the school year?

· What are the teacher’s plans regarding teaching argument next year?
Appendix D
Prepared Teacher Interview Questions, June 2012
Interview Protocol for Teachers (30 minutes)

(Remind participant of his/her rights to end the interview at any time and that they do not have to answer any questions they would prefer not to answer. Note that you need to have the essays that the students wrote for the teacher.)

Say: “Today’s date is _______ and I am interviewing __________________ who teaches ___ grade ___track English language arts at ______________ High School.”

Pre-Observation Interview

Questions about the target class, the curriculum for the class, and two sample essays

Tell me about how argumentative writing fits into the course as a whole. How often have you taught it this school year and how often do you plan to return to it after today? How is argumentative writing related to the readings you assign or other parts of your curriculum?

When you begin the school year, what do you assume that your students know about argumentative writing? What would you like them to know as they begin the school year and what would like them to know by the end of the school year?

This is the second year you have been teaching the majority of these students. Has this impacted your approach to argumentative writing this year? Explain. Regarding argumentative writing, what approaches did you use with students who were new to your class this year?

What are some upcoming topics/units I may observe over the next three months?

General Questions about teaching argumentative writing

Tell me about your feelings regarding the teaching of argumentative writing. Do you like teaching it? Why? Do you feel it is important? Why?

Do students seem to like learning to do argumentative writing? How do you know? What do they find engaging? What do they find challenging/easy about learning to do argumentative writing?

Describe your own writing activities for school and outside of school and how the writing you do influences (or not) how you teach writing/argumentative writing.

Conceptual framework for teaching argumentative writing

How do you define argumentative writing? What are the key components of argumentative writing? How is it similar to and different from other types of writing?

How would you describe your approach to teaching argumentative writing? What instructional strategies do you view as critical to teaching argumentative writing?

When you respond to a student paper involving argumentative writing, what do you look for? What is your approach to responding to student papers? Why do you take this approach?
What are your general goals for teaching argumentative writing? (Prompt for teaching reasoning, considering other perspectives, learning from other people’s arguments, deep understanding of the topic, etc.)

General experiences in teaching argumentative writing

How long have you been teaching argumentative writing? How has your teaching evolved over time? Describe some of your more memorable events in teaching argumentative writing (times when it went exceptionally well and times when the instruction did not go well).

If you were to guide a new teacher in teaching argumentative writing, what advice would they give to that new teacher?

Do you consider your students to be good writers of arguments? Why?

Post-Observation Interview

Now that you have taught the instructional unit(s), tell me about what you wanted your students to take with them from the unit(s) and the extent to which you feel you were successful/less successful. How do you know?

Please take one of the more successful papers and talk through what the student is doing with argument. What are the strengths of the paper? Its problems? What continuing growth would you like to see as this student continues to develop as a writer?

Please take one of the less successful papers and talk through what the student is doing with argument. What are the strengths of the paper? Its problems? What continuing growth would you like to see as this student continues to develop as a writer?

This is the second year you have been teaching the majority of these students. As you consider their argumentative writing across two years, what are the group’s strengths? What continuing growth is needed? Do you feel these issues also apply to students who were new to you this year? Explain.

General Questions about teaching argumentative writing

Tell me about your most successful experience teaching argumentative writing. Why was it successful?

General experiences in teaching argumentative writing

How long have you been teaching argumentative writing? How has your teaching evolved over time? Describe some of your more memorable events in teaching argumentative writing (times when it went exceptionally well and times when the instruction did not go well).

Do you consider your students to be good writers of arguments? Why?
Experiences with classroom discussion

When you are discussing ideas and literature with students, what do you try to keep in mind? Why?

What do you want your students to learn from discussion?

When discussing ideas and/or literature with your students, do students ever disagree with you or with one another?

How do you feel about disagreements during discussion? How do you typically respond? When there are disagreements, how do they get handled?

Describe how you understand the connections between discussion and learning to write argumentatively?

Is there anything else you would like to tell me about the teaching and learning of argumentative writing that we have not discussed?

Thank you!
Appendix E
Prepared Student Interview Questions, January 2011
(IES Grant)

Interview Protocol for CASE STUDY Students (30 minutes after instructional unit)

To be conducted outside of instructional time for 30 minutes. Remind participant of their rights to end the interview at any time and that they do not have to answer any questions they would prefer not to answer. After the student gives an answer, you should consider following up on any item related to the teaching and learning of argumentative writing by asking, “Can you tell me more about ....?)

Before we talk about your writing experiences in English language arts (ELA), I have a few questions about you interests and background and about writing outside of school:

- What are the courses you are currently taking? Which is your favorite? Why?
- What kinds of interests do you have outside of school? (e.g., sports, video gaming, etc.)
- What are your plans for when you graduate from high school? Do you plan to go to college? What would you like to do when you finish school?
- What kinds of writing do you do outside of school?
- Where do you write when you are outside of school? Do you have access to a computer or do you do all of your writing on paper?
- Aside from your English teacher, who do you share your writing with? Why this person?

Okay, let’s talk about your school writing experiences.

- Do you consider yourself to be a good writer? Why? Do you like writing? Why?
- What kinds of writing do you do in school? (In social studies, science, math, etc.)
- Tell me about writing in ELA. What kind of writing do you do in ELA? Do you like writing in ELA?

Here are some questions about ELA in particular:

- When you are discussing ideas and/or literature in your English language arts classroom, what does the teacher seems to focus on? Please give me an example.
- When you or other students discuss ideas and/or literature with your teacher, do you ever disagree with one another? How do your teacher and the other students seem to feel about disagreements?
- When there are disagreements, how do they get handled? For example, does the teacher encourage the discussion?
- In your English class, (insert teacher’s name here) is teaching about how do argumentative writing: Writing which presents an idea or attempts to persuade someone. If you were to describe how the teacher is teaching you about argumentative writing and how you are learning to do argumentative writing to some one who never visited your classroom, what would you say?

Here’s one of the essays / texts you wrote for your English class.

- Tell us/me about how you wrote this – what were you thinking about? How did you go about writing it? Did you make an outline first or did you just begin writing?
- Let’s look at it very closely. What’s the first part that you actually wrote. Tell me about that part. (Work through the entire writing sample in a similar manner, asking the student to explain as much as possible the decisions they made as they wrote the paper. How would you evaluate this writing assignment?
- What makes it good? Not-so-good?
If you had to give advice to a new, incoming student at the beginning of the school year, about doing argumentative writing, what would you say? If you had to give them advice about doing well in (insert teacher’s name here)’s class, what would you say?

Recall that you wrote an essay before the argumentative writing unit started and one at the end of the unit.

- Do you recall what you wrote about? Do you recall why you selected that assignment?
- Did this kind of writing seem like the writing you usually do in ELA? Tell me about that.
- What do you find easy/difficult about this writing?
- How do you think you did on the writing test?

Is there anything else you want to tell me that I have overlooked?
Appendix F
Prepared Student Interview Questions, May 2011

Questions to help guide the "end-of-the-year questions"
For Students . . .

Peer review process
  o Had you participated in peer review groups prior to 9th grade humanities?
  o What is the purpose of peer review groups?

• Tell me about your peer review group this year
  o Same students?
  o Changes? Why?
• How was the experience as an editor/writer?
  o Were Miss Crombie's guided worksheets helpful/hindrance?
  o Varying deadlines: Did they work for you? Explain.
  o Amount of peer sessions: right amount, too many, too few

Argumentation
  o What is argumentative writing?
  o What is the purpose of argumentation?

Essays/Assignments
  o Major assignments this year:
    o Work or Detroit Industry/Man and Machine
    o The Turn of the Screw through a lens
    o The Merchant of Venice Socratic Seminar
    o Current multi-genre project
  o How did you take up argumentation in the varying essays/assignments?
  o Class discussion and essays: Is there a connection?

Overall writing
  o How do you feel about yourself as a writer?
    o Have you improved through the assignments?
      ▪ As you look through your essays, what do you notice?
    o Strengths
    o Areas of growth

Key learning from Ms. ____’s class this year =
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Appendix G
Prepared Student Interview Questions, May 2012

Interview Protocol for CASE STUDY Students (30 minutes)

To be conducted outside of instructional time for 30 minutes. Remind participant of their rights to end the interview at any time and that they do not have to answer any questions they would prefer not to answer. After the student gives an answer, you should consider following up on any item related to the teaching and learning of argumentative writing by asking, “Can you tell me more about ....?”

Before we talk about your writing experiences in English language arts (ELA), I have a few questions about you interests and background and about writing outside of school:

• What are the courses you are currently taking? Which is your favorite? Why?
• What kinds of interests do you have outside of school? (e.g., sports, video gaming, etc.)
• What are your plans for when you graduate from high school? Do you plan to go to college? What would you like to do when you finish school?
• What kinds of writing do you do outside of school?
• Where do you write when you are outside of school? Do you have access to a computer or do you do all of your writing on paper?
• Aside from your English teacher, who do you share your writing with? Why this person?

Okay, let’s talk about your school writing experiences.

• Do you consider yourself to be a good writer? Why? Do you like writing? Why?
• What kinds of writing do you do in school? (In social studies, science, math, etc.)
• Tell me about writing in ELA. What kind of writing do you do in ELA? Do you like writing in ELA?

Here are some questions about ELA in particular:

• When you are discussing ideas and/or literature in your English language arts classroom, what does the teacher seems to focus on? Please give me an example.
• When you or other students discuss ideas and/or literature with your teacher, do you ever disagree with one another? How do your teacher and the other students seem to feel about disagreements?
• When there are disagreements, how do they get handled? For example, does the teacher encourage the discussion?
• In your English class, (insert teacher’s name here) is teaching about how do argumentative writing: Writing which presents an idea or attempts to persuade someone. If you were to describe how the teacher is teaching you about argumentative writing and how you are learning to do argumentative writing to some one who never visited your classroom, what would you say?
• Tell me about your experiences with the peer review process (specifically in this classroom and over time, if applicable).
• Were you in this teacher’s class last year? If so, why did you choose to continue taking humanities? If not, why did you choose to take humanities this school year?
  o Tell me about your previous experience with argumentative writing (previous to this school year)?
  o If you were in humanities with this teacher last year, what do you find the same? What do you find different? Explain your experiences.
Here’s one of the essays / texts you wrote for your English class.

- Tell us/me about how you wrote this – what were you thinking about? How did you go about writing it? Did you make an outline first or did you just begin writing?
- Let’s look at it very closely. What’s the first part that you actually wrote. Tell me about that part. (Work through the entire writing sample in a similar manner, asking the student to explain as much as possible the decisions they made as they wrote the paper. How would you evaluate this writing assignment?
- What makes it good? Not-so-good?

If you had to give advice to a new, incoming student at the beginning of the school year, about doing argumentative writing, what would you say? If you had to give them advice about doing well in (insert teacher’s name here)’s class, what would you say?

Is there anything else you want to tell me that I have overlooked?
Appendix H

*Work* by Ford Maddox Brown
Appendix I
Essay assignment, Unit One

The Argumentative Essay for Humanities English 9

Your task in almost all academic papers (including this one) will be to create "an argument"—that is, to express a point of view on a subject and support it with evidence.

A claim is (usually) a specific, clear and direct sentence (or two) that announces the direction, mission, goal, or focus of your essay. It is a sentence that requires further clarification, explanation, and evidence. Your essay then works to support this claim numerous ways.

You begin to construct your argument from the first word of your opening paragraph, telling your readers the text(s) you will address in your paper (in this case, both paintings, The Communist Manifesto excerpt, and Bartleby the Scrivener), how you have begun to think about the text(s), and how your insights lend a key understanding to analysis or interpretation of the text.

Likewise, the conventions of academic essays call for you to make a clear and direct statement of purpose that announces in no uncertain terms what you will unpack, consider, demonstrate, define, suggest, reveal, critique, make a case for—or just plain argue—in your paper. You may have heard this type of sentence called a "thesis statement" in the past. For the rest of the year, you will hear this statement of purpose called a "claim."

In this essay you must construct an argument stating your interpretative claim regarding the overall argument made by either Ford Maddox Brown's Work or Diego Rivera's Detroit Industry or Man and Machine.
Appendix J
Kane’s Final Essay on *Work*

1/7/11

According to the Communist Manifesto, the working class “has but established new classes, new conditions of oppression, new forms of struggle in place of the old ones” (Marx 1). Marx and many others believed that the working class just created new problems, while Brown believed that the new working class actually fixed them. Considering the problems evident in the past class systems, Ford Maddox Brown painted work to show that the classes can exist in peace through nature, interactions between classes, and the overall changed attitude of the upper class.

Brown uses nature to show how he agrees with the way things are. Through the blue sky and green leaves, Brown is showing balance, order, and peace. Just like how “When Nippers’ was on, Turkey’s was off, and vice versa” (Melville 4). Although the Lawyer would prefer them both working, he accepts it and think that it is a "good natural arrangement" (Melville 4). Such is the case in this painting. Brown also shows that the classes have a long way to go, shown by the dirt road. The dirt shows being in a past time, because the roads are still dirt and not pavement. The path itself shows they still have a long way to go, but they are slowly starting to communicate between classes.

Brown also shows his agreement to the classes in his characters’ interaction, or their lack thereof. Like in Bartleby the Scrivener “‘Stationary you shall be then,’ I cried, now losing all patience, and for the first time in all my exasperating connection with him fairly flying into a passion” (Melville 18). At this point in the passage the Lawyer is tired of Bartleby’s constant presence in his office and after trying repeated times to help Bartleby, the Lawyer begins to give up on him. Correspondingly, the woman selling flowers is just trying to help herself live. She,
like the others in the ditch, are just looking for means of survival. The workers are also trying to survive, digging ditches to bring food home daily, instead of uprising and starting a strike. The upper class woman slowly makes her way around instead of causing the expected riot to make everyone move out of her way. The upper class can change, just like some members of the lower class did, to form the working class.

Many believed that the upper class was full of inconsiderate people who only thought of themselves, and thought that would never change. In the Communist Manifesto, it clearly states "Hitherto every form of society has been based, as we have already seen, on the antagonism of oppressing and oppressed class" (Marx 3). This is saying that the upper class was only made to show wealth and to oppress other classes, and that this could never change. Brown used the figures in his painting to disprove that. The upper class dog's eyes are connected with the lower class dog's, showing through animals that humans can get along, because animals are simply dehumanized humans. Therefore, is an animal is capable of being intelligent enough to make that connection, then humans are capable of it too. Likewise, the two men leaning on the pen, who appear to be the bosses of the workers, are laughing, smiling, and letting the workers take a break for a drink or sing as they work. Identically, the upper class man and woman riding horses are more consumed in their own affairs, instead of being rude and obnoxious to anyone of a lower class. The upper class truly can change, truly has changed, from the evil they once were.

Ford Maddox Brown truly agreed with the way things were portrayed in his painting. Brown knew that an emerging working class could not only aid the class system, it could save it, as explained in his painting. Through nature, interactions between classes, and the overall changed attitude of the upper class, Brown disproved the naysayers' point and fully explained his own, that the classes truly can get along, all in one painting. It is time to prove the naysayers wrong; it is time to recognize the good inside of man!
Appendix K

Review sheet by Chad on Kane’s written intro and thesis

Directions: Switch papers with one other person and carefully read the introduction...making sure that it makes sense. Then, follow the step by step instructions below. Readers...you are being graded on how well you evaluate what you have read and the advice that you offer.

1. After you have read the introduction for the first time, do you have a general understanding of the author’s main point? If so, please restate this in your own words below. If not, tell the author what you are struggling with in a sentence or two.

   Yes I have an understanding of Kevin's main point. I think that Kevin focused on how people tend to destroy the earth.

2. Now, rewrite their claim and carefully underline and initial its ABCD elements. If you find that some of the elements are either missing or unclear, write a brief statement below explaining what you think is missing and/or needs work in order to meet the requirements of the ABCD thesis.

3. Since the introduction serves as a sort of roadmap to where we are taking our arguments, your task is to scan the entire introductory paragraph for clues as to where the writer is planning on taking the reader. Does the intro provide any sort of map that lets us know what he/she is doing next? If so, please briefly paraphrase what you found. If not, offer constructive hints that you as a reader would like to see included.

   Yes he provides a sort of map, and I think he is going to talk about how the people were ruining the land in the painting/work.

4. Now, overall, has the author provided any sort of hook that brings the reader into the essay and keeps them reading? If so, restate below. If not, offer some suggestions that would make their essay more 'reader-friendly'. For example, would a quote from a learned scholar or famous person help? How about an anecdote that would grab our attention? Whatever you choose, make sure that you are offering specific advice.

   Yes he has, he uses an interesting story to grab attention.

5. Ok, finally you are to evaluate the entire introduction and thesis holistically and tell the author if you believe that his/hers works overall. Is it carefully crafted with no diction errors or grammatical mistakes? Could they clean up anything? This is where you are perfectly honest and share your advice...again, be specific.

   Yes it is carefully crafted, and I'm not sure if he accidentally changed the quote a little.
Appendix L
Kane and Partner’s Final Essay: A Solution to Poverty

May 22, 2012

The Solution to Poverty

“Poverty, it’s the lack of a sufficient amount of income to live in accordance to life’s plethora of necessities. Poverty, it causes suffering among millions of people. Poverty, it’s an awful trap that takes away food, shelter, clothing, happiness.”

Imagine a family working as a single unit; having little to no outside sources and for whatever reason this family falls below the threshold of poverty. They are now trapped in the labyrinth that is the poverty cycle, struggling to survive. Because of this, the number of adults in poverty continuously increases, as does the number of children who will become impoverished adults. In his essay Miles Corak states “...in the U.S. almost one-half of children born to low income parents become low income adults...”(Corak, 144). Therefore it must be true that as the rate of poverty increases and more families are roped into the poverty cycle, more children will become low income adults. Is it possible to break this cycle? There are many temporary fixes, but “roughly half of people who are in poverty return within five years”(Signe-Mary McKerman, Caroline Ratcliffe, & Stephanie R. Cellini). Until now, people have yet to create a permanent solution. Because of the growing percentage of families trapped within the poverty cycle, families should come together to eliminate poverty in their neighborhood, since the poverty cycle is hardly possible to escape alone and there is a power that grows with numbers.
Neighbors are not there to be ignored. They should become allies to face any problem that may arise, including poverty. Poverty exists in neighborhoods and it’s only natural that people want to get out, but the issue is that people only want to help themselves and their families. If individuals and families are going to escape the poverty cycle, they need to join their neighbors and help each other out of this, one unit at a time. A study in the U.S. Census shows that between 2009 and 2010, the percentage rate of families in poverty increased by nearly .70 percent while the percentage of people in “unrelated subfamilies” in poverty decreased by 5.5 percent. If everyone would become this unrelated subfamily, they would escape just as these people did. Although some people with the weight of poverty on them may be more trained than others, each and every person has some form of talent, most simply need to find their niche. Even those who have not received formal learning have still learned many skills, since “people are constantly learning everywhere at all times”\(^{(OECD)}\). When the skills these individuals are taught and gifted with are combined into one, the neighborhood in which this occurs becomes an unstoppable force, launching all of its members out of poverty. Achieving this strength as a community is a difficult thing to achieve, but poverty is much harder and has an end result that is nothing more than bleak when compared to the result of this unity.

While it is true that charity can solve some issues associated with poverty, when the faulty medicine of charity is depleted, the results are disastrous. All at once, money is thrown at people in poverty and they move high up in the ranks of taxes. The current IRS tax brackets show that as your income increases, you pay higher taxes. It also highlights that tax brackets change annually. Similarly, the census only occurs once every ten years. It may take years for a person to once again be defined as in poverty and they will have to pay higher taxes until they
are recognized as this. This is a form of the poverty trap, and this limits people in poverty’s accessibility to welfare and other benefits with come with the financial state of impoverished. Charity often is a support system that only responds to people’s needs, not their strengths. It seems as though people often see charity systems as a “springboard out of poverty” (Fil, 4). While in reality, it happens to only help families for the time being. Charity is built upon a system of dependency, meaning that it is designed as a support of the family, but it reduces the importance of peers and community. Although charity provides a temporary fix, the solution of coming together creates a sense of mutuality where the family is expected and encouraged to share resources and help others in the community even when some make the leap out of poverty.

The reality is that low-income communities are full of initiative, wisdom, creativity, and people willing to work together and move ahead. The only thing lacking is the access to resources that one can not get alone. Families need to be the leaders of their own change, and sometimes the best strategy of leading is to let someone else lead. As one neighborhood escapes poverty, it will cause a ripple effect until the whole city is less impoverished, then the whole state, region, and possibly country. If this system is employed in all countries, then the world can become a wealthier, safer place to live for all people!
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Appendix M
Kane & Partner’s Final .ppt slides
Love Thy Neighbor
Kane and Partner

Poverty in Neighborhoods
Location has an effect on poverty.
Many impoverished people tend to live near other people in poverty.
People can go forever without meeting their neighbors due to this.

What is the relation of people in poverty and their neighbors?
Between 2009 and 2010, the percentage rate of families in poverty increased by nearly 70% while the percentage of people in "unrelated subfamilies" in poverty decreased by 5.5%.

But why does this matter?
Because of the growing percentage of families trapped within the poverty cycle, families should come together to eliminate poverty in their neighborhood, since the poverty cycle is hardly possible to escape alone and there is a power that grows with numbers.

The Missing Piece
Because of the growing percentage of families trapped within the poverty cycle, families should come together to eliminate poverty in their neighborhood, since the poverty cycle is hardly possible to escape alone and there is a power that grows with numbers.

It’s That Simple! Right?
Wrong.
Learn what they could lose.
How can this work?

Nearly twenty-eight percent of people in poverty have at least a High School Diploma or GED.

Many people in poverty work full time.

The current IRS tax brackets show that as your income increases, you pay higher taxes.

Tips for Trusting Others

• Don’t rush into this.
• Get to know everyone.
• How badly do you want it?

• It takes time.
• Don’t trust strangers, trust friends.
• Is this worth it? The answer is yes.

What are you waiting for?

The time to act is NOW!
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Appendix N

*Detroit Industry: Man and Machine* by Diego Rivera
Appendix O
Sue’s Final Essay on Detroit Industry

January 7, 2011

Is it possible for man, the dominant species of the earth, that rules and ruins nations, is it possible for such a great race to become a slave to its own machine? Is the idea that we would work ourselves raw to these machines so unfathomable? It’s not if you take in the fact that these times, “machine” meant “money”. This idea is clearly represented in the painting “Detroit Industry” by Diego Rivera. The artist himself has ulterior motives, but they were carefully blended into a picture made to look that Rivera had the opinion that man was loosing itself not only to the machine, but to a higher class, the same class that saw the words “machine” and “money” as synonyms in the Oxford English Dictionary.

This higher class is represented in the painting as individuals sprinkled throughout the throngs of the workers, yet easily distinguished by their lavish dress. To the eye of the observer, they are investors, debating whether or not these machines and their human extensions were worth the money they would eventually part with. The people of this class were not only captured by the talents of Mr. Rivera, but by Marx and Engles as well during the writing of the “Communist Manifesto.” It is said in this document that “…oppressor and oppressed, stood in constant opposition to one another, carried on an uninterrupted…fight, that each time, ended either in a revolutionary reconstitution…., or in the complete ruin of the contending classes” (Max ETAL 1), meaning that the fight would not relent until there was either justice, or obliteration.
Diego Rivera was a genius. Why, you ask? Rivera was a communist and had been all his life, so how was he so aptly able to create a piece of work that practically screamed social injustice? It was a cover for the true message of communist support. The fists and hands that reach from the roof of the factory are not a visual summary, but rather a symbol of Rivera’s communist beliefs, disguised as the former. Not only does he recognize his own beliefs in his work, but to further spite Henry Ford, he depicts Ford’s factory as a living hell where the machines are the masters of human slaves, driving them harder still for the green bills.

In his painting, not only are the machines money to the high class, from the high class’s point of view, but from the lower classes’ point of view, the high class is the machine. They are what drives the “slaves” until their bones ache and fingers bleed. Just as in “Bartleby the Scrivener”. “My blind inveteracy returned. Was there any other thing in which I could prove myself to be ignominiously repulsed by this lean, penniless wight? - My hired clerk?” (Melville 8). This very passage is nothing but the anger that the machine, or manager in this case, could not get its human appendage to work properly.

To reiterate the point, to hopefully implant it into one’s mind where it will steadily grow until one finds themselves pondering even in the night before sleep, the higher class saw the machines as money, and the lower class as simply part of the machinery. The lower class saw the higher class as the machine and slave drivers. So while the lower class is becoming part of the machine and is loosing their humanity, humans are behind it in the end, just as we have been time and time again.
Appendix P
Sue, Neal, & Regan’s Final Essay: A Solution to Poverty

The Famous Poor

It is obvious that poverty is a major issue around the world. In the United States alone the census recorded over forty million people in poverty between the years of 2006 and 2010. The areas in which poverty manifests are Texas, New York, and California. Many of these people lack the materials to fulfill basic needs, such as sanitation, proper housing, and proper nutrition. While many of these people aren’t underweight, that doesn’t mean that they aren’t suffering from malnutrition. This is due largely in part to fast food, which contains filling food under a dollar, but does not have the necessary nutrients. Much like when people fill humming bird feeders with artificial sweeteners, thinking it would be better for the birds. Many people rely on social communities to support one another, but this is limited. So why not bring the largest community into play? Why not the internet?

In the past there have many an attempt at using the internet to help increase social awareness. There are many who use the internet as a tool to become social activists and to help others join a cause. The idea of this website is to use the internet in a similar fashion. However, there are certain ways to becoming a cause that people will join and fight for online, but not in person, which explains why the KONY 2012 “Cover the Night” project was a failure. Failure may be a harsh word, but it’s the best way to describe the way KONY 2012 ended. The project itself was based on rumors and a bit of elaborative fabrication rather than solid evidence, and the timing of the whole thing was off by miles. KONY 2012 spread like the bubonic plague, and hit its apex about a month after it was created. When the day finally hit, it was still about a month
before the "Cover the Night" date rolled around. By the time said day came about, no one remembered. Not only was the timing off, but facts were skewed and most of the filler was exactly that. Filler. When causes are fabricated, masses tend to reject the cause post haste and proceed debase it and turn it into a joke as a type of revenge. The people of the internet are not forgiving. This is a classic example of poor timing.

On the other hand, there's a website called Avaaz.org. Avaaz is a website meant to bring people from all over the world together on one website for a common purpose. It spreads over 6 continents, has multiple languages available, and has over ten million members. The main idea of this website is ease of access. It makes participating easy for the members. They're not required to sit on a street, or go on hunger strikes, or sacrifice anything. All that's needed is the ability to type. With Avaaz, members can sign online petitions, anonymously if they so wish, and participate in multiple causes in no more time than a few minutes. Avaaz has successfully stopped the infamous SOPA/PIPA acts that threatened to censor the internet, destroying the very idea of free speech. Avaaz has been a tremendous success with most causes, ranging from saving the rainforest, to saving the freedom of the internet and. The goal is to create a website similar in ease of access and in the success that Avaaz has garnered while solving the problem of poverty.

The idea for TheFamousPoor.org is to have a new topic each week, such as "what employers look for" and "how to compose a resume". We ask anyone able to submit a one or two minute video to discuss the topic of the week. With even 100 uploads, that's still 100 video tutorials on how to compose a resume. We do realize that not everyone has access to a computer, so as a solution, each week we'll take the highest rated video and ask the author to help in a workshop in an impoverished neighborhood where there's restricted or limited access to the internet. One future goal is to be recognized as a community service project, which allow
students to become more involved and complete necessary volunteer hours to graduate. Eventually “The Famous Poor” could tie into the handheld industry, and be accessible to Smartphones, Ipads, Ipods, etc., which would increase the range of our participants. This is not a site for any specific group, it being open to all. After all, this is a community, not a company.

Causes that require minimum effort, like Avaaz, have typically succeeded while projects requiring more dedication tend to fail. It is imperative that our cause is clear cut and simple, requiring very little effort on the part of the public. The idea of our website, The Famous Poor, is simple, and easy to follow. The amount it would take to participate would be no more than a few minutes. Is your life so busy that you can’t possibly spare two minutes that could save someone’s life?
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Appendix Q
Sue, Neal, & Regan’s Final .ppt slides

The Famous Poor
How the Internet can solve poverty
Neal
Regan
Sue

What is poverty?
Poverty is defined as having less money than is determined to be able to support a family based on a number of variables set fourth by the U.S. Census.

According to the 2010 U.S. Census, over 40,000,000 people in the U.S. are in poverty.

Many of these people lack access to healthcare, basic sanitation and food.

How can the Internet help?
Many people in poverty rely on communities of people, be it friends or family, to support each other. So why not bring the biggest community in the world together to help those in need?

Why not the internet?
What won’t work?
There have been many attempts to use the internet to help increase social awareness, and that is what we aim to do. However, it is imperative to understand what won’t work. An instance of failure is the KONY 2012 “Cover the Night” cause. The video was based on rumors and fabrications, rather than solid evidence, and the release was too far from the implementation. The video spread like the bubonic plague, and hit its apex a month after release – which was two months before the end date. By the time this day came around, the masses had lost interest. Since then, there have been various memes making a joke about the whole thing. We learn from this that timing is key.

What will work?
As much as KONY was a failure, Avaaz was a success. Avaaz is a website designed to bring people together for a common purpose. Spanning 6 continents, a myriad of languages and over 10,000,000 members, the website makes participation easy for the masses. Avaaz allows people to sign petitions digitally, without ever leaving home. This has been successful in multiple cases, most notably when it stopped the infamous SOPA/PIPA acts that threatened to censor the internet, and its effort, free speech. This shows with minimal effort, large goals can easily be accomplished.

What will we do?
The idea for our website, The Famous Poor, is to bring the participation of Avaaz to the masses. Each week will be a new topic, such as “How to make a resume” or “What employers look for”. The idea is to have anyone that can upload a 2-3 minute video about the topic of the week. Even with only 100 people a week, that’s still 100 tutorials that anyone can watch.

What if you don’t have access to the internet?
We realize that millions of people won’t be able to access our website, to combat this, we will have workshops in impoverished areas, and ask the top rated authors of the week if they could assist in a live tutorial. Even if we can only do one workshop a week at first, with some assistance from viral marketing, our website will start becoming well-known.
How do we get submissions?
To begin, our website will be heavily publicized early on, to increase interest on “opening day”. Once we have built a solid foundation, we could have our website recognized as a nonprofit, and could publicize that submissions count as volunteer hours for students. At some point we could ask students to offer longer videos that would be featured on the site, which would then make participation worthwhile to people like us. We could also tie the website in to mobile applications on smartphones, iPads etc., which would allow people to submit videos anywhere, or let people know who’s hiring.

We aim to build a community, not a company.

We have seen that minimal effort breeds massive results, as is the case of Avaaz. Inversely, asking for more dedication results in disinterest. Thus, if our cause is clear-cut and simple, requiring little effort from the public, it should be successful.

The amount of time it takes to participate is miniscule at best. This presentation lasted about 4 minutes. That’s twice as long as our request.

Is your life so busy that you can’t spare two minutes to save someone’s life?
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Appendix R
Reading Images Worksheet

Reading Images Name________________________
Work and the Still Image
December 1, 2010

Directions: Answer each of the following questions as you view Ford Maddox Brown’s Victorian allegory, Work (1852) and Diego Rivera’s modernist Detroit Industry or Man and Machine (1933). Remember, they not meant to be faithful representations of reality as they occurred but to symbolize the structure of Victorian life and the modern industrial revolution. We are looking at these works as representations of each artist’s perspective on a social issue, in other words...his argument.

1. What do you see in each of the following images...facial expressions, stance, body language, details, clothing, etc...I really want to see what you noticed...read these images.
   a. Work

   b. Detroit Industry

2. List the individual characters/images/details that suggest social stratification (upper, middle, lower classes).
   a. Work

   b. Detroit Industry
3. What tension or stress can you spot between the classes? Provide specific textual evidence
   a. Work

   b. Detroit Industry

4. What message or argument is each artist trying to portray in his work? How do you know
   Provide specific textual evidence
   a. Work

   b. Detroit Industry

5. Now, read the excerpt from the Communist Manifesto and highlight any textual connections with the artwork that you see and list them below. You may copy individual words, phrases, and/or clauses.
Appendix S
Bob’s Final Essay on Detroit Industry

January 7, 2011

Henry Ford, the man credited with the invention of assembly line production, once said, “As we advance in life, we learn the limits of our abilities”. Ford knew the abilities of humans and created a system of men and machines used for production, as shown in a mural on a wall of the Detroit Institute of Arts. Through his images of cars being produced but also through great detail of machines and plain, faceless workers, Diego Rivera’s “Detroit Industry or Man and Machine” shows the efficiency of assembly lines and factories but also how the individual worker is thought less of.

Diego Rivera was asked to paint a picture about Detroit’s history. Rivera accepted even though he was Communist. Throughout the painting, one is able to see sly hints of Rivera’s distaste of the American mass production process. Along the very bottom of the painting there seems to be a set of pictures describing the normal day of a factory worker. The very last picture of the set shows the people leaving, all but one with their heads down. Rivera possibly thought the everyday, same routine had very negative affects on the people working, and was probably right. Not only were the men affected. In the top left of the bottom section of the painting there is a character who seems to represent a child and in the top right are characters resembling a group of women working. Rivera’s great distaste for all having to put up with tiresome, robotic motion led him to paint in his views and opinions.

Diego Rivera’s painting seems to suggest that machines are more important than the human workers. He does this through images of the machines looking larger and more focused upon than any of the workers. Marx and Engels’s The Communist Manifesto states, “Owing to
the extensive use of machines and to division of labor, the work of proletarians has lost all
individual character, and, consequently, all charm for the workman. He, [in effect], becomes an
appendage of the machine...” (2). The man in the factory setting is a mere part of the machine
according to the authors. Not only does this show their distaste for the factory systems, but it
also could easily provide an influence of Rivera’s motives for negative thoughts against factory
systems of production.

Towards the bottom right of the painting, there is a large machine that seems to resemble
the shape of a human. As the largest figure in the painting, it is given a great deal of unofficial
power. With the power going towards the large machine, less is given to the workers. “[The
workers]”, states The Communist Manifesto, “are daily and hourly enslaved by the machine...”
(Marx 2). The machine very much seems in control of the humans, rather than vice versa.
Along with control, the large figure is high above all the workers, as if it is watching them work.
Dehumanization of factory workers, in essence, is reinforced through the image of the large
machine “watching” the small humans work.

Although the painting has many negative attributes, there are, undoubtedly, cars being
produced. Barely below the very center of the painting, the men are working on a car that is
almost completely finished. Below that are workers with almost completed base frames and
axels. These examples clearly show how the workers, although under all but favorable
circumstances, are working and getting things done. This shows how Rivera, even if he does not
endorse factory production, is not so narrowly minded as to see only one side of the argument.

When examined closely, Diego Rivera’s “Detroit Industry or Man and Machine” does not
look like a celebration of factory production systems, but a magnification of its flaws. One sees
great detail on the large, powerful machines, while the small, plain humans are simple, faceless
figures. It is also, however, undeniable that the workers are doing their jobs and cars are being manufactured. In conclusion, one must attempt to understand all that is to be understood and call to attention their own conclusion on human rights, workers' rights, and the processes by which humans will attain items necessary to continue daily life.
Appendix T
Peer Review Worksheet: Introduction and First Body Paragraph
Directions: Read through your partner’s essay two times. First, familiarize yourself with the subject of the essay and the author’s argument. Second, read for the elements we discussed in class: the hook, background information, topic sentences, etc. Mark the essay as you read and add questions or comments on this paper. Next, answer the following questions as completely as possible. Do not just give the paper and writer a thumbs up or thumbs down, you must provide specific advice regarding the information they have supplied in their paper. Remember, you (the reviewer) are being scored on the thoroughness of your responses. Finally, return the original to your partner so that he/she can use it for further revision.

I. Introduction/Hook: Is the introduction effective and interesting? Why or why not? Does the author use a catchy introduction such as an interesting anecdote or relevant statistics to catch the reader’s attention? Suggestions for improvement?

II. Write down the claim statement in the space below.

The class system is unfair

III. What does the author want to show/tell us? Evaluate the effectiveness of the claim statement, both in terms of its clarity and its actual intent (meaning is the argument clearly stated and is it a well-developed argument).

IV. Does the writer provide enough background to understand the context of the claim? Give examples (or suggest some if there are none).

V. Is there proper transition between paragraphs and ideas to lead the reader smoothly from one idea to the next? List the transitions used below.
VI. Are the claims adequately backed up with evidence? How so?
   * Say man is not being paid, are you positive?

VII. Regarding commentary...does the writer provide clear and compelling commentary on his/her evidence? Is there sufficient commentary to fully develop the argument? List the commentary below as a series of bullets. If there is none, provide an example or two.

   - Man works for no pay
   - Rich people get paid for no work

   Could use more commentary to sufficiently unpack examples
## Appendix U

### Transitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transition Words and Phrases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>In the first place</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not only ... but also</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>As a matter of fact</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In like manner</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In addition</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coupled with</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In the same fashion / way</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First, second, third</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In the light of</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not to mention</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To say nothing of</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equally important</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>By the same token</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Again</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moreover</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>As well as</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Together with</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Of course</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Likewise</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comparatively</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Correspondingly</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Similarly</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uniquely</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>As</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moreover</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additionally</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In other words</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To put it differently</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>For one thing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>As an illustration</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In this case</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>For this reason</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To put it another way</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>That is to say</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>With attention to</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>By all means</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Important to realize</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Another key point</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First thing to remember</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Most compelling evidence</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Must be remembered</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Point often overlooked</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Point out</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On the positive / negative side</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>With this in mind</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notably</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Including</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Like</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To be sure</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Namely</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chiefly</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Truly</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indeed</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Certainly</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surely</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Markedly</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Especially</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specifically</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expressively</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequently</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surprisingly</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Significantly</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In fact</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In general</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In particular</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In detail</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To demonstrate</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To emphasize</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To repeat</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To clarify</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To explain</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To enumerate</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Such as</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>For example</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>For instance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>For the event</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>That granted (that)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>As / so long as</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On (the) condition (that)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>For the purpose of</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>With this intention</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>With this in mind</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In the hope that</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To the end that</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>For fear that</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In order to</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seeing / being that</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In view of</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>If</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>... then</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unless</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In case</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provided that</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Given that</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Only / even if</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>When</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Whenver</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Since</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>While</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Because of</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>As</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Since</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>While</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Test</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inasmuch as</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space / Location / Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to the left/right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in front of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on this side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>here and there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the foreground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the center of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adjacent to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opposite to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>next</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>next</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>where</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>near</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>under</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at the present time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from time to time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sooner or later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at the same time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>up to the present time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to begin with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in due time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>until now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as soon as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the meantime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in a moment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>without delay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the first place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all of a sudden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at this instant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>immediately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quickly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>finally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formerly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suddenly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shortly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conjunctions**

- after
- although
- as
- as if
- as long as
- because
- before
- when
- once
- whenever
- eventually
- meanwhile
- further
- during
- first, second
- in time
- since
- prior to
- forthwith
- straightaway
- now
- henceforth
- whenever
- so that
- that
- how
- before
- until
- in case that
- in order that
- provided that
- as ... as
- just as ...
- both ... and
- ... or
- neither ... nor
- either ... or
- not ... but
- whether ... or
- not only ... but also

**FANBOYS**

For And Nor But Or Yet So
Appendix V
Bob & Hudson's Final Essay: A Solution to Poverty
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Throughout history, obesity has represented wealth and even fertility. Now however, poor health typically goes hand in hand with poverty. When a healthy diet comes with an extremely high cost, nutrition takes a back seat leaving the poverty stricken society malnourished and forced to lead unhealthy lifestyles, ultimately increasing health care costs and continuing the cycle of poverty. The cost of healthy food is continually rising, along with unhealthy food getting less and less expensive. Many people do not have health care of any kind, and those that do are suffering from rising costs. Overall, when the health crisis in America is resolved, the end of poverty will be near.

There is undoubtedly a direct correlation between obesity rates and poverty rates in certain areas of the country. The majority of states with an obesity rate greater than 24% have a poverty rate of 22.0-26.8%, and vice versa (Appendix A). This is a clear example of the cycle of poverty due to health related issues. Groups of people eat extremely unhealthy food, normally due to a low level of income. In an attempt to use as little money as possible, the people are actually costing themselves more in the long run due to health problems and complications. This harmful cycle also works the other way around. When a person or family has medicine and other medical entities to buy to treat preexisting illnesses and conditions, they typically do not have the money left over to purchase a variety of fresh fruits, vegetables, and cuts of meat. Upon spending money and time focusing on one specific ailment, they have less to use in protecting themselves from acquired epidemics such as type two diabetes and obesity, which typically go hand in hand. Thus, individuals are left to decide if they want to use all of their energy attempting to rid
themselves of conditions they have in the present time period, or if they want to work on preventing dangerous and potentially life threatening conditions later in life.

Food prices in America are constantly going up. Certain food prices, however, seem to always be lower than others. A pound of field grown tomatoes costs $2.27 on average and a pound of uncooked ground beef costs $3.47, compared to items such as double cheeseburgers and fries for 99 cents each (Average Retail Food and Energy Prices). This cost difference is a large reason that people tend to choose the unhealthy food which is the less expensive choice at the time. Prices are not the only reason people often choose unhealthy options. Time is also a large reason. People do not normally have time (or want to make time) to cook healthy, wholesome meals. With a drive thru, the time taken to get food is significantly reduced, but health and food quality are often sacrificed. In a society of instant gratification, people often overlook or simply do not worry what is fueling their bodily functions. Time and money are two things that Americans are not able to waste. The typical mindset is that unhealthy fast food options are the only way to maintain this approach. These choices in the long run, however, are damaging and dangerous to not only a person’s health and wellbeing, but also their bank account and wallet.

The Government plays a huge role in contributing to the unhealthy lifestyles discussed in the precious paragraph. The costly steps taken to provide health-care to said people are what assure the increasing fate of America. The Government sees growing obesity as a problem which is overly obvious. However, instead of finding a preventive solution and taking the necessary steps to prevent further generations from being susceptible to the same fate, they pour money into healthcare so that they might be able to treat the increasing population of our obese nation. In 1980 the United States Government paid roughly 250 billion dollars towards health-care
covering all areas of both treatment and research. In 2010, 2.6 trillion dollars were used for health-care, more than ten times of that spent not more than thirty years prior (National Health Care Expenditures Data). Thus proving the previous statement that when Government was faced with an epidemic of obesity, they focused on treating victims succumbed to the "virus" instead of providing society with an antidote of healthier lifestyles.

The health-care budget expands over one fifth of the total spending’s of the United States Government (Chantrell). Although health-care is not the main focus of Government spending, all people rely on some sort of health services. If 1% of said health-care budget was spent towards the prevention of unhealthy lifestyles, not only would we see a decrease in hospital visits but also a decrease in the need for such a huge dedication of funds towards health-care. Aside from the government action there are several areas on which rely on social dependence. We are obligated to allot time and money dedicated to living healthier regimes. We need to allow more funds for higher nutritional benefits and quality of food, as well as the time needed to prepare them properly. This will undoubtedly decrease the risk of health related problems, not only improving our standards of living but slowing and ultimately stopping the cycle of poverty.
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