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Abstract

The purpose of this qualitative ethnographic study was to explore inclusion along a continuum of educational placements by examining how classroom literacy teachers transform through the use of dramatic inquiry with students with special rights in inclusive settings. The main research question used for the research was: “How is the inclusion of students in collaborative activities affected by the classroom teacher’s changing practices in response to her awareness of how teacher and students are positioning one another?” Data were obtained from two different classrooms along a continuum of educational placements during teaching of units using dramatic inquiry. The settings included in the study were a high school classroom in a public residential school for the blind and a general education elementary classroom in a public elementary school, both in the Midwestern United States. The instructional strategies for literacy instruction in both classrooms were based on dramatic inquiry (Edmiston, 2014), which combines dramatic teaching for learning with inquiry-based instruction. Students, alongside their teacher collaborated to make meaning together as they stepped into real world and fictional spaces to explore different possibilities connected to a text.

This is the first time that collaborative inquiry has been done with classroom teachers with a sociocultural theoretical framework using dramatic inquiry to examine teachers changing pedagogy to support inclusion using my definition of inclusion in
settings along a continuum of educational placements. The collaborative inquiry research was conducted alongside the classroom teachers to include their voice alongside the researchers to inform and improve their own practice. The classroom teacher participants changing practice was identified using an adaptation of Emig’s (1983) inquiry paradigm to examine how each teacher’s theoretical framework, governing gaze, assumptions, and actions changed over time based on their past and present teaching with dramatic inquiry to include students with special rights. A sociocultural theoretical perspective, with a focus on identity, agency, and power, was used to explain why classroom literacy teachers who are committed to inclusion would want to use dramatic inquiry in their teaching. Positioning theory (Harre´ & Langenhove, 1999) was used to examine the inclusion of students with a dramatic inquiry pedagogy along a continuum of placements.

The dramatic inquiry methodology appeared to be a valuable methodology to include students with special rights in learning and support all students in having power in the classroom. Another finding was that the teachers use of mediating tools and signs, which included multiple modes, supported teaching and learning activities that did not privilege one mode of communication over another and supported the inclusion of all students in meaning making. The teacher participant’s awareness of how she positions her students, how students position themselves, and how students position each other was another factor affecting the inclusion of students with special rights. Lastly, collaborative inquiry was another contributing factor for the teachers in their awareness of their transformation over time using dramatic inquiry.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Historically, the segregation of students with special rights from their general education peers in educational settings was commonplace (Kliewer, 2008b; Osgood, 2005). During the 1940s and 1950s arguments began to be made against the segregation of students with special rights. This led to case law, such as *Brown v. Board of Education*, 347 U.S. 483 (1954) that impacted the inclusion of students with special rights in general education classrooms.

Congress was forced to act with legal mandated shifts to provide students with special rights access to a public school education. Congress responded to the large amount of students with special rights that were denied a public school education by passing the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, (EHA, Pub. L. 94-142), which was later renamed the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) in 1990. The number of students with disabilities aged 3-21 years served under the IDEA increased from 1990-91 through 2004-05 from 4.7 million or about 11 percent of public school enrollment to 6.7 million, or about 14 percent in 2004-05 (U.S. Department of Education, 2014). Legislation was important for students with special rights, because now students with special rights were required by law to receive a free and appropriate public education (FAPE) in their least restrictive environment (LRE).
However, in spite of these legal strides that required students with special rights have access to a FAPE in their LRE, inclusion was not mandated in the legislation (Harpell & Andrews, 2010). The IDEA did not include any specific language that mandated inclusion, nor defined the term. Numerous scholars have a multitude of definitions for inclusion in literature. The physical setting a child with special rights receives his or her education has been central to inclusion definitions, with the general education classroom setting the one that most identify for inclusion (Ryndack, Jackson, & Billingsley, 2000).

Even with all of the legislation and legal mandates that made strides to require students with special rights a FAPE, teachers were and remain the ones educating students with special rights and positioning them to be included or excluded. Literature has recorded that general education teachers have supported mainstreaming and inclusion, but that they have had concerns with procedural issues in the classroom (Scruggs, & Mastropieri, 1996). Teachers’ perceptions about their abilities and the tools for teaching and learning can affect their ability to educate and include all students. Thus, a student with special rights, and their general education peers, inclusion in the classroom can be impacted by the tools available to their teacher, as well as their teacher’s own beliefs about their ability as a teacher.

As I began this inquiry I observed characteristics of teaching and learning that supported the inclusion of all learners, whether they were in a general education setting or a setting that solely taught students with special rights. This led me to problematize the current definitions of inclusion in literature and to examine what is inclusion in
today’s education system. Identifying one clear definition of inclusion and inclusive practices from literature and research is a difficult task. There are a variety of definitions of inclusion that are prevalent throughout literature and research that mostly focus on the physical setting for where students with special rights are educated. With my definition of inclusion the focus was taken off of the physical setting and instead focused on the collaboration of students, with special rights and at times their general education peers, co-constructing meaning together along a continuum of educational settings with their teachers.

I used “person-first” language throughout this dissertation to ensure that the person or persons referenced in the inclusion topic are not defined by their disability or disabilities, but rather that disability is seen as only one characteristic that contributes to a person. For my definition of inclusion I chose to use person first language with the term students with special rights, as opposed to terms such as disabled students or students with disabilities. The change in terms and perceptions of people with disabilities in education and society has been and continues to be important for establishing the foundation for concerns about the placement of students with disabilities in education and defining inclusion. However, at times terminology is used in the literature review that represents vernacular of the time period in which the piece was written.

Theory of this Study

My definition of inclusion reflects a sociocultural theoretical perspective. It shifts the emphasis to the social practice of learning and the cultural context, instead of on an individual child’s placement or services, who are often separated from his or her cultural
knowledge. According to Wenger (1998), learning is a social process in which active participants shape who we are, what we do, and how we interpret the things that we do. Dramatic inquiry provides a method that teachers can use for collaborative learning amongst teachers and students on a joint task as they make meaning together. According to Edmiston (2014):

In dramatic dialogic inquiry, or dramatic inquiry, learners make meaning about real and imagined worlds. Over time, inquiry opens up meaning to new possibilities as inquirers learn from and with one another in ongoing authentic, substantive, polyphonic, dialogic conversations focused by implicit or explicit inquiry questions. (p. 40)

From a sociocultural theoretical framework, dramatic inquiry allows a teacher to support the mutual engagement of all learners as they collaborate on a shared inquiry to make meaning together about a topic. In addition, dramatic inquiry supports students and teachers collaborating with tools and symbols to mediate their understanding and extend their literacy practices.

Through discussions with the teacher participants, I explored the teacher’s changing awareness of her teaching pedagogy. I documented how their theoretical framework, assumptions, governing gaze, and actions changed as I analyzed the data with the teacher participants and documented their active participation. I used a sociocultural theoretical perspective, with a focus on identity, agency, and power, to explain why classroom literacy teachers who are committed to inclusion would want to use dramatic inquiry in their teaching. I also used an adaptation of Emig’s (1983) teacher inquiry paradigm to document teacher transformation to examine how each of the teachers
viewed their teaching pedagogy and methodology based on their past and present teaching experiences with dramatic inquiry over time in an inclusive setting.

While working with the two teacher participants I was interested in examining how the teacher participant’s awareness of her changing practices about teaching and learning through the use of positioning theory (Harre´ & Langenhove, 1999) changed or stayed the same. I was also interested in analyzing data with teachers. Analysis of the data through grounded theory (Charmaz, 2006) provided a framework for collaborative analysis of the data between the teachers and myself. This allowed me to explore emerging ideas while shaping data collection based on teacher transformation.

**Purpose of this Study**

The purpose of this research was to explore inclusion along a continuum of placements by examining how classroom literacy teachers transform through the use of dramatic inquiry with students with special rights in inclusive settings. This dissertation is based on a two part ethnographic study that began during the 2013-2014 school year and continued into the 2014-2015 school year. In addition, I wanted to understand and explore a new way of defining inclusion that focused on students co-constructing meaning within a dialogic community of people along a continuum of educational placements. Teacher transformation was also examined. In particular, the inquiry focused on the teacher’s awareness of her changing pedagogy over time through the collaborative inquiry and how this affected inclusion.

The main research question is:
How is the inclusion of students in collaborative activities affected by the classroom teacher’s changing practices in response to her awareness of how teacher and students are positioning one another?

From the main research question I pulled out key words or phrases to focus on as I observed in the classrooms and analyzed the data, such as: inclusion, collaborative activities, changing practices, teacher awareness, and positioning. I was interested in how the two teachers taught and the way that each teacher organized her classroom and activities, and how this impacted students with special rights being included in the classroom and the social and academic success of all students. Also, I wanted to identify how the use of dramatic inquiry for literacy teaching impacted the teacher’s own pedagogy over time.

The classrooms for the research sites for this study were chosen, because I wanted to have two inclusive settings that would fall along a continuum of educational placements. By analyzing the pedagogy and literacy events in the two classrooms, I examined differentiation methods used by the teacher participant and how these methods affected the inclusion of students, with a specific focus on issues of identity, agency, and power. Another reason the two classroom sites were chosen was because the two classroom teachers were familiar with using dramatic inquiry for literacy learning and supported inclusive practices. Both of the classroom teachers that participated in this research had taken two university courses on using dramatic inquiry and had experience using dramatic inquiry to teach literacy in their classrooms. Curriculum for the inclusive classrooms was designed to meet the needs and interests of students, while at the same
time incorporating the general education curriculum and Common Core State Standards. The goal of instruction during this study was classroom collaboration both socially and academically to solve problems and make meaning through shared experiences.

Methodology and reasoning will be discussed and explored through the collaborative inquiry and member checking between the researcher and the teacher participants throughout the inquiry process. Lastly, I used a qualitative ethnographic methodology for this research. This methodology is a way for researchers to observe and interview participants to analyze how people construct meaning with other people in their cultural group (Glesne, 2011). My data was primarily classroom observations, teacher interviews, and researcher fieldnotes during and after classroom observations.

**Rationale for the Study**

There is a dearth of literature that examines collaborative teacher inquiry between a classroom teacher participant and researcher analyzing data and recording teacher change over time with the intention of informing and improving the teacher’s practice. Also, the social and cultural understandings of students and the importance of communities of inquiry are often not used to inform teaching and learning. According to Enciso and Ryan (2011):

> Instead of understanding learning as socially mediated practice, schools are typically organized around the assumption that one monolithic, ‘standardized’ way of speaking, interacting, and building conceptual knowledge is natural and, therefore, meaningful and right for everyone. Thus, the forms of participation in learning that non-dominant children bring to school are viewed as suspect rather than as historically rich signs and practices for mediating new ideas (p. 133-134)
By looking at inclusion across a continuum of placements the cultural histories and forms of participation that students with special rights bring to school were examined to explore how students use their own historical knowledge to mediate new ideas in collaboration with others. This collaborative inquiry is vital in that it explored the different forms of participation that students with special rights bring with them and not privilege one dominant way of communicating and making meaning. This research is important because the teachers analyzed the data from the classroom alongside the researcher in order to support the inclusion of all students. The different histories that students with special rights and their general education peers bring with them to learning were examined over time as students collaborated together through dramatic inquiry.

Lewis, Enciso, and Moje (2007) argued that learning requires participation in something, and that this participation is complicated by the fact that participants bring their own histories to every new participation. Here the focus is on the social act of participation and the cultural knowledge that individuals bring with them to construct meaning. By participation I mean the social practice of collaborative learning amongst students and teachers and the cultural histories that inform their learning. Lave and Wenger (1991) emphasized, “the significance of shifting the focus from the individual learner to learning as participation in the social world, and from the concept of cognitive process to the more-encompassing view of social practice” (p. 43). They stressed that learning is a vital component of social practice, and there are multiple ways of being located in a community of practice. With my definition of inclusion, a larger emphasis is
placed on collaborative learning and the social participation of students and teachers in a community of inquiry.

According to Lewis, Enciso, and Moje (2007), issues of identity, agency, and power in knowledge production are lacking in theoretical frameworks that inform sociocultural research. “Making issues of identity, agency, and power visible is essential at this historical moment, a decade later, with political discourses about ‘scientific’ research having persuaded the public that literacy is a neutral skill and that ‘achievement gaps’ can be addressed without attention to the histories of power relations or group and individual struggles for identity” (Lewis, Enciso, and Moje, 2007, p. 3). By emphasizing identity, agency, and power I will address how individual students position themselves and how students position each other in a group to examine how students are included and excluded from learning. How literacy teachers transform over time impacts how students with special rights are included socially and academically in an educational setting on a continuum of educational placements. Teachers’ awareness of their changing pedagogy over time is vital in understanding students with special rights and their general education peers struggle for identity, agency, and power in today’s educational system.

How classroom teachers position students with special rights, and their general education peers, is a mediating tool that can make a difference in how students learn, as well as who is included and excluded from learning. I believe that research about how and why teachers change or stay the same in their positioning of themselves and their students in relation to academic and social goals is important in understanding how teachers can affect academic and social goals over time. Positioning theory (Harre´&
Langenhove, 1999) has been used to analyze classroom discourse, but it has not been used to examine the inclusion of students with a dramatic inquiry pedagogy along a continuum of placements.

The number of students aged 3-21 years old served under the IDEA each year since 2005-2006 was 6.4 million, about 13 percent of the total public school enrollment in 2011-2012 (U.S. Department of Education, 2014). Although the number of students served under the IDEA has declined, it is vital that the teaching and learning of students served under the IDEA be examined to identify teacher’s awareness of how students are being included or excluded from learning. This dissertation is critical at this time in education because it details the collaborative inquiry process between classroom teachers and a researcher to examine how a teacher’s pedagogy impacts the inclusion of students in different educational settings along a continuum of educational placements. This is unique in that teachers’ voices are included throughout the data analysis and thus positions the teachers with agency in that they have power to share their unique insight alongside the researcher to explore the possibilities of including students with special rights, and their general education peers, to support each student’s academic and social success.

**Researcher Role**

I established my role as a researcher with the two classroom teacher participants prior to beginning the semi-structured interviews during the pilot study. My role was to collect data from classroom observations through video data, audio data, photography, and fieldnotes. As a researcher I was cognizant of my role as an observer and attempted
not to overstep the relationship of trust created with each of the teacher participants and their students. I shared my background as an elementary inclusion classroom teacher openly with the teacher participants. I attended two of the same courses with the teacher participants that were focused on dramatic inquiry, so that I was exposed to the same content information, terminology, and experiences. For the research I wanted to use collaborative inquiry with the teachers, which allowed us, myself and the classroom teacher, to analyze data from the teacher’s classroom. I shared my inquiry interest with them, and both teachers designed with the researcher their own more specific inquiry for their classroom that was related to my inquiry.

In order to support the analysis of the data collected, data validity measures were incorporated. One of the key components of ethnography is analyzing participant observations and interviews to see how people co-construct meaning (Glesne, 2011). I shared my analysis of observations and interviews with the teacher participants to involve them in data analysis as well as to include their points of view in the analysis process. Semi-structured interviews with each of the teacher participants allowed me to expand upon member checking and collaborative analysis to a more critical ethnographic approach to data analysis.

**Teacher Inquiry Questions:**

Additional inquiry questions that were developed with the teacher participants in the study that were used with the teachers as data was analyzed were:
1. What can I do to make this group more of a dialogic classroom: a community of inquiry where everyone is included and their ideas make a difference to the meaning we make as we dialogue?

2. How do we as a community of people create a community where everyone is respected, equally valued, and has a voice so that everyone can succeed academically and socially?

**Significance of the Study**

Currently research on inclusion is only conducted and analyzed in terms of general education settings. This inquiry study examined inclusion in today’s educational system along a continuum of educational settings that extended outside of the general education setting. This study is the first inquiry conducted using my definition of inclusion that focuses on classroom teacher’s transformation over time and how the classroom teachers awareness of her transformation affected how students with special rights, and in one setting their general education peers, were positioned as included or excluded in dramatic inquiry activities to co-construct meaning alongside their classmates and teacher. The focus for inclusion in this study does not solely focus on inclusion in a general education classroom. This is significant in that the emphasis for inclusion is now on the teaching and learning activities that support the meaning making of students with special rights and their peers as they co-construct meaning together on a joint endeavor in multiple settings along a continuum of educational placements.
Definition of Terms

Collaborative Teacher Inquiry- inquiry conducted alongside those taking the action, teacher participant(s) being studied, to inform and improve their own practice. Data analysis is conducted with the teacher participant(s) and the researcher. Further data collection is decided in collaboration with the teacher participant/s and the researcher (Calhoun, 2002; Gordon, 2008; & Sagor, 2000)

Critical Ethnography- a way of conducting ethnographic research while suggesting possible changes to the participants of the research (Anderson, 1989)

Dramatic inquiry- “an approach to teaching and learning that combines dramatic teaching for learning, or dramatic pedagogy, with an inquiry-based pedagogy. Dramatic inquiry extends inquiry-based approaches into explorations in real-and-imagined worlds as if participants are people living in places only written about or alluded to in texts.” (Edmiston, 2013)

Ethnography- “a theory-building enterprise constructed through detailed systematic observing, recording, and analyzing of human behavior in specific spaces and interactions” (Heath & Street, 2008, p. 29).

Inclusion- students with special rights in an educational setting [Setting may have general education students, and special and/or general education teachers] found along a
continuum of educational placements, co-constructing meaning within a dialogic community of people, students and teachers.

**Low incidence disability**- a disability or impairment that affects a small portion of the population. Visual impairment is considered to be a low incidence disability (Wild, 2008)

**Students with special rights**- a term in special education that refers to a student with a disability. The use of special rights uses person first language to ensure that the student is seen as a capable individual and is not defined based on his or her disability (Thompson, 2006)

**Visual Impairment**- an impairment of the vision that causes a real or perceived disadvantage in performing specific tasks (Corn & Koenig, 2000)

**Organization of the Study**

This inquiry study is organized in five chapters:

Chapter 1 contains the introduction to the inquiry, the theory used, the purpose of the study, rationale of the study, inquiry question, significance of the study, researcher role, definition of terms, and the organization of the inquiry.

Chapter 2 contains a review of inclusion literature and research, theoretical frameworks, and dramatic inquiry in relation to the inquiry study.
Chapter 3 contains a description of the research methodology and data analysis used during the collaborative inquiry process with a high school English teacher at a public residential school for the blind. Findings will be presented.

Chapter 4 contains a description of the research methodology and data analysis used during the collaborative inquiry process with an elementary teacher at a public elementary school. Findings will be presented.

Chapter 5 contains a discussion of the findings from the collaborative inquiry, conclusions of the inquiry, limitations of the inquiry, and implications and suggestions for future research.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

Introduction

The purpose of this inquiry study was to understand and explore a new way of defining inclusion that focused on students co-constructing meaning within a dialogic community of people along a continuum of educational placements. Teacher transformation is also examined. In particular, the inquiry focused on the teacher’s awareness of her changing pedagogy over time through the use of dramatic inquiry and participation in collaborative inquiry and how this impacted inclusion. Chapter 2, a literature review of carefully chosen and pertinent research is divided into three main sections: inclusion, theoretical framework, and dramatic inquiry. The inclusion section is divided into eleven sections: inclusive educational research, historical case law impacting inclusion, legal mandated shifts in inclusive education, mainstreaming movement, inclusion movement, inclusion legislation, placement issue, teacher perceptions of mainstreaming and inclusion, inclusion definitions in literature, placement of students by law, and my inclusion definition. The theoretical framework section is divided into three sections: sociocultural theory, positioning theory, and grounded theory. The dramatic inquiry section is broken down into six sections: classroom teacher’s changing practice, mantle of the expert, identity, agency, power, positioning, and inclusion.
Inclusion

Inclusive Educational Research

One cannot define inclusion without first addressing the history of inclusion in education. Inclusion is a fairly new term that has not always been used to describe the education of students with special rights. Integration and segregation were terms used in research and professional discussions in the early 1900s though the 1960s to describe including or excluding children with disabilities (Osgood, 2005). Some of the terms that have been used to describe students with special rights in general education settings are mainstreaming, which was the term used in the 1960s through 1980s, integration and regular education initiative in the 1980s, and inclusion and full inclusion in the late 1980s to the present (McLeskey, 2007; Osgood, 2005). Terminology is important when addressing inclusion, because the way that terms related to special education have been defined has undergone many changes, as far back as the 1800s. The term mainstreaming was considered an honor for students with mild disabilities that did not require substantial modifications to the general education curriculum and teaching practices (McLeskey, 2007). Whereas inclusion has been considered a right for students with disabilities, and general education has been expected to change to accommodate the needs of the students (McLeskey, 2007).

The labels used to describe categories of disabilities have also changed over time. Osgood (2005) identified three changes related to category labels for disability. First, he explained that there were changes related to specific labels that continued to refer to similar disabling conditions. For example, he found that the term idiocy in the 1800s was
later changed to *feeblemindedness* by the late 1800s, but both terms referred to people who were deemed to have intellectual incapacities that would not allow them to function independently in a community. The second change he recognized was in labeling that reflected a shift in understandings toward a specific disabling condition or conditions, which aligned the new label with new understandings. The third change that Osgood identified in terms of labeling involved new labels that were based on the relationship of various disabilities, in addition to the development of medical, psychological, and social knowledge with social and cultural standards. For example, he reported that the terms for the category of behavioral disability have evolved from *moral insanity* and *moral imbecility* to *emotional disturbance* and *behavioral disorder*. Osgood identified that the altering of terminology to describe disability was a way to change perceptions from a negative deficit-driven view of a person to a way to show disability as a distinction and not a description of a person’s character. He found that the labeling of individuals with disabilities was a response by society to prejudice people that were seen as different. According to Osgood (2005):

   Related to this are recent efforts to avoid using the disability to define the person and instead to consider disability as but one feature of a person’s total being, and one that is not nearly as important as a person’s other qualities; such efforts are embodied in the movement defined as “person-first” language. (p. 8)

   The segregation of people identified with disabilities into private and public institutions for formal instruction and treatment was common during the late 1800s and into the 1930s (Osgood, 2005). Osgood identified that researchers and school professionals in the mid 1800s supported the segregation of children with disabilities.
The establishment of the initial self-contained class for retarded children was in 1896 (Hoffman, 1972; Polloway, 1984). The introduction of compulsory attendance laws in the 1900s resulted in the creation of self-contained *special schools and classes* for students with mild disabilities as a way to transfer students identified as problem children and students with disabilities from the general education classroom to special education (Dunn, 1968; Hollingsworth, 1923; McLeskey, 2007). There were a large amount of students with disabilities placed in self-contained classes and day classes in public schools, and yet there was still not enough special education being provided (McLeskey, 2007; Winzer, 1993). Some in special education supported the growth of self-contained classes for students with mild disabilities, while others found that the compulsory attendance laws just forced special education and general education to acknowledge the other to enforce the law (Dunn, 1968; MacMillan, 1982; McLeskey, 2007).

Negative views of disability gained fame and influence in the late 19th century with assertions that disability was dangerous and could lead to contamination of other people (Osgood, 2005). At this time segregation went mostly unchallenged and was believed by most to be in the best interest of social control, educational pedagogy, and management of schools (Osgood, 2005). Osgood recognized a discussion at the National Education Association (NEA) in 1908 that identified the importance of special education classes for students with disabilities. It was suggested that special education classes would benefit both students with disabilities and their general education peers, because the general education students would not interact with students with disabilities in the general education classroom. Johnson (1962) suggested that the goal of a *special class*
was to provide students with disabilities an environment with a social and emotional climate that would deter students from acquiring unsuitable attitudes and learning.

Special education began to be included in legislation and school policy during the 1930s and continues to today. Herbert Hoover convened the Committee on the Physically and Mentally Handicapped in the 1930s to present information on youth with disabilities that included recommendations, statistics, and descriptions (Osgood, 2005). Again in the 1930s and 1950s, enabling laws for students with disabilities were passed that authorized school districts to develop special education classes, required some special education programs be established, and provided some financial support (Osgood, 2005). In spite of this, students with disabilities that were perceived to negatively affect general education students were excluded from education settings. Exclusion of students with disabilities was permitted with approval from the state superintendent, state board of education, local school board, or a physician in numerous states (Osgood, 2005). An important question in the 1930s and early 1940s with regards to integration was, “Would handicapped students profit more from an opportunity to be schooled together with or apart from their nonhandicapped peers?” (Polloway, 1984, p.19). There were several research studies (Bennett, 1932; Pertsch, 1936; Shattuck, 1946) that investigated whether students with mild mental retardation had higher academic and social achievement in self-contained classes or in general education classrooms (Johnson, 1962; McLeskey, 2007). However, the studies had methodological problems and did not produce evidence to support the effectiveness of placements in self-contained classes.
Segregation of students with disabilities from general education continued during the 1940s and 1950s, but arguments began to be made against segregation. Some of the arguments that supported the segregation of students with disabilities identified that students would not truly be integrated into the instruction if they were placed in a general education classroom and that students with disabilities would be more likely to suffer isolation and rejection in the general education classroom (Orville & Kirk, 1950; Osgood, 2005). Another argument in favor of segregation was that segregation was believed to provide a place for students with disabilities to be accepted. In addition, some believed that students with disabilities could not keep up with the academic rigor of the general education classroom, which would lead to another form of labeling by failing the students academically (Osgood, 2005).

Parents and researchers began to question the efficacy of segregated settings on the academic and social development of children with disabilities as well as the larger impact on society (Osgood, 2005). Some of the arguments against segregation were that it was undemocratic, because it labeled some students and contributed to students not developing as a member of the community (Osgood, 2005). Segregation, like labeling and changes to terminology for special education, began to be identified as a form of stigmatization that disadvantaged students with disabilities from academic and life experiences, as well as opportunities to interact with their general education peers.

In the 1960s, policy and legislation for people with disabilities and special education began to be addressed by the federal government and researchers. Under President Eisenhower, Congress passed two laws in support of special education. The
first law provided loan services for films that were captioned for the deaf, and the second law provided federal support for training of teachers that taught students with mental retardation (Osgood, 2005). During President Kennedy’s term, funding was provided for more expansive and continued training for special education teachers, support for research and research facilities, and the Division of Handicapped Children and Youth was established within the United States Office of Education (Osgood, 2005). Under President Johnson, a permanent Committee on Mental Retardation was established, and support was given to The Elementary and Special Education Act (1965), which provided grants to states to support the education of students with disabilities and research in special education (Osgood, 2005).

Even with the support of the federal government, large amounts of students with disabilities continued to be segregated from general education and special education in institutions. From 1958 until 1966, the number of school-aged children that were institutionalized increased by over 40,000, with over 127,000 children enrolled (Osgood, 2005). The continued preference of physicians and other professionals for placement of children with disabilities in institutions was part of the reason for the large numbers. At the same time, Osgood found that by the late 1960s there was more support for educating children with disabilities in the community rather than in segregated institutions. The National Association for Retarded Children (NARC) worked to improve the status of those labeled with mental disabilities and to work with the government for more appropriate education for those with disabilities (Osgood, 2005).
Sparks and Blackman (1965) reviewed studies during the 1930s to the 1960s to compare the efficiency of educating students in general education classrooms, at the time labeled regular classes, as opposed to special education classrooms, that were then labeled special classes, for students that were identified as educable mentally retarded (EMR). Students that were labeled EMR made up the second largest group of students with disabilities being educated in public schools, with 99,000 enrolled in special day schools in 1940, which increased to 218,185 by 1985 (Dunn, 1962; Sparks & Blackman, 1965). Sparks and Blackman found that the evidence from the research for the placement of students that were labeled EMR favored the placement of students in regular classes for academic achievement, where as the placement in special classes was better for social and personal factors. The number of classes for students that were labeled EMR in special education began to grow. Forty-six states supported special education classes by 1957 (Mullen & Itkin, 1961; Polloway, 1984). The number of retarded students served in public schools between 1948 and 1966 increased by 400%, and by 1966 89.5% of all school districts provided education programs, with the majority being self-contained classes (Mackie, 1969; Polloway, 1984).

In 1968, Lloyd Dunn published an article that became a springboard for the mainstreaming movement, which was supported by his influential standing in the field of special education (McLeskey, 2007; McLeskey & Landers, 2006; Patton, Polloway, & Epstein, 1989). Dunn (1968) suggested that the large number of self contained special schools and classes raised civil rights and education issues. He suggested that about 60 to 80 percent of the students taught by teachers for the retarded were from non-middle
class environments and from low status backgrounds, such as racial minorities, non-
English speakers, and broken homes. He emphasized that society needed to stop labeling
these students as *mentally retarded* and stop segregating them into special programs.
Dunn was only advocating for students with minor disabilities and those students that
were identified as slow learning, not for students with severe and multiple disabilities.

Dunn’s (1968) rationale for the change from special segregated classes was due to
the previous practices and practices at the time of the article that removed students with
disabilities from general education teachers and students, without consideration of what
the slow learning student was being deprived of in a segregated setting. He identified
that regular education teachers and administrators thought it was beneficial for students
with mild disabilities to be removed from educational programs that were deemed
unsuitable and impractical. Special education teachers at the time also thought that
students with mild disabilities would make more growth in special classes and schools
than in general education classes. Dunn (1968) suggested that special education practices
could no longer be decided based upon “philosophy, tradition, and expediency,” but
rather the programs should be designed based on scientific evidence.

Dunn (1968) identified some areas of current practice and connected research to
support his rationale for change in special education, such as homogeneous grouping,
tracking students, and efficacy studies. He suggested that homogeneous grouping did not
support slow learners and those that came from underprivileged backgrounds, because it
was determined that students learned more from being in general education classrooms
with white middle class students. He also connected the grouping of students to tracking,
which was abolished by Judge J. Skelly Wright in the District of Columbia in *Hobson v. Hansen*, 269 F. Supp. 401 (1967). Judge Wright found that the tracks were in violation of the Fifth Amendment of the Constitution of the United States, because students were being discriminated against because of race and/or background (Dunn, 1968). Dunn explained that the tracking that Judge Wright abolished was directly connected to special schools and classes for students with disabilities, which was a form of tracking and homogenous grouping.

In addition, Dunn (1968) identified problems with the labeling process used at the time for students with disabilities, which focused more on finding what was wrong with a child in order to place him or her in special education. Dunn suggested that research demonstrated that the labeling of children as *handicapped* reduced a teachers expectancy for that child to prosper and that the segregation of children with disability labels added to the child’s feeling of subservience and problems forming relationships with peers. Dunn proposed the need for self-contained special classes instead of general education programs no longer held true as a preferred setting for students identified as mildly retarded. General education programs were now making improvements to better accommodate the needs of individual students, such as changes in the school organization, changes to the curriculum, changes in professional public school personnel, and changes in hardware (Dunn, 1968).

Dunn’s (1968) approach for education supported an extensive list of components, such as prescriptive teaching, itinerant and resource room teaching, teacher preparation, new curricular approaches, environmental modifications, motor development, sensory
and perceptual training, cognitive and language development including academic instruction, speech and communication training, personality development, social interaction training, and vocational training. The purpose of all of the educational components being that qualified teachers would modify lessons so that students could learn and make progress. Dunn’s goal for special education was to move from clinical intuition to clinical instruction and include students that had previously been stigmatized because of their disability label into general education. This article reignited the discussion over the placement of students with mild disabilities, led to discussions about the process for labeling students in education, and began the push for mainstreaming in education.

Deno (1970) built off of Dunn’s (1968) suggestions and outlined ways that special education and general education could work together with the support of a continuum of services for students with disabilities. Deno called for changing the focus from what is wrong with the child to a focus on what is wrong with what the child needs and the opportunities that are being made available to the child. This would move the focus to the individual child and the external variables, rather than the medical model criteria for assigning a categorical label to determine educational decisions. The American Psychological Association (1970) and the Joint Commission of the Mental Health of Children (1969) supported this change in classification, by suggesting that public resources needed to be provided based on a child’s functional level instead of a diagnostic label (Deno, 1970). Deno believed that in order for all children to receive an equal opportunity to education, change needed to begin with educational practice. Deno
proposed that educational change and development begin with special education by meeting the educational needs of students that were perceived as different instead of just being a curriculum and instructional resource for students that were labeled. For Deno, special education was in a position to develop an understanding about how all children learn, while also insuring learning occurs for children that required structured conditions and assessment.

Deno (1970) identified areas of special education that needed the data to support change, such as the medical model approach, having special education in the mainstream public education setting, and evaluation of the effectiveness of special education. Deno suggested that rather than special education working as a separate social institution it should work with general education by providing beneficial technology to support students with disabilities becoming part of the mainstream. Special education also needed to develop assessment instruments to evaluate the degree of success for learning conditions that were best for students.

The suggestions made by Dunn (1968) and Deno (1970) supported the placement of students with mild disabilities in general education classrooms. However, at the time their articles were published, the majority still believed that students with mild disabilities belonged in separate classes and settings (McLeskey, 2007). The reform efforts for the partnership between special education and general education that Dunn and Deno suggested were not acted upon immediately, but they did impact the mainstreaming movement during the 1980s and the association between special education and general education.
Historical Case Law Impacting Inclusion

The sole focus on students with mild disabilities in general education classrooms began to expand to include students with severe disabilities in the early 1970s. During the 1970s, the Brown v. Board of Education, 347 U.S. 483 (1954) case that legally declared that “separate but equal is not equal” became influential and served as a catalyst when addressing the efficacy of segregating students with disabilities in classrooms and settings outside of general education. There were at least forty-six cases between 1971-1975 in twenty-eight states that contributed to the right for students with disabilities to be placed in a public education program, such as Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, 334 F. Supp. 1257 (1971) and Mills v. Board of Education of the District of Columbia, 384 F. Supp. 866 (1972).

Legal Mandated Shifts in Inclusive Education.

In response to the amount of children with disabilities that were not allowed a public school education, Congress passed the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, (EHA, Pub. L. 94-142) (Daniel, 1997). The EHA was passed and signed into law by President Gerald Ford in 1975, which mandated that handicapped children aged 3-21 had the right to have their unique educational and related needs met in their LRE, that the rights of children with disabilities and their parents are protected, provided assistance to states and localities, and required assessment and assurances of the effectiveness of programs to educate students with disabilities (Conroy, Yell, Katsiyannis, & Collins, 2010; Mead & Paige, 2008; U.S. Department of Education, 2010, Wang, 1981).
By the 1980s special education was building support for including students with disabilities in general education. The U.S. Department of Education (1987) reported that approximately 68 percent of students with disabilities, by the 1984-1985 school year, received their education with students without disabilities for a minimum of 40 percent of the school day (McLeskey, 2007).

**Mainstreaming Movement**

The norm for the placement of students with mild disabilities in special education classrooms and general education classrooms for part of the day was known as mainstreaming (Hocutt, Martin, McKinney, 1991; McLeskey, 2007). Mainstreaming education programs were mostly designed without any involvement of general educators and were often perceived as a privilege for students with disabilities that were able to be placed in general education classrooms without the need of many educational accommodations or modifications (McLeskey, 2007). McLeskey reported that deals often needed to be made between special education and general education teachers in order for mainstreaming to be possible, and in cases where a deal could not be made students with disabilities stayed in special education placements. The accountability for achievement of students with disabilities lied solely with special education teachers and administrators and was incorporated into a student’s Individualized Education Program (IEP), because students with disabilities were not included in state, district, or school-based accountability measures (McLeskey, 2007).

Also during the 1980s, reform movements for general education and special education came to the forefront for the United States. "A Nation at Risk" (National
Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983) reported that student achievement in the U.S. was behind other countries and that schools needed to improve in order for the U.S. to remain competitive as a knowledge base and in the world market (Hocutt, Martin, & McKinney, 1991; McLeskey, 2007). Soon after the release of *A Nation at Risk* concerns began to rise about the inability of general educators and special educators to collaborate successfully to meet the needs of all students, which included those who were low achieving and not labeled as students with disabilities (McLeskey, 2007). Many recommendations for changes to the current education program for educating students with mild disabilities began to be made.

Margaret Wang was a leading scholar that was involved in the debate over mainstreaming and supported full inclusion of students with disabilities. Wang (1981) identified mainstreaming as the combining of students with disabilities and general education students into a common school environment with resources on a full-time basis, which would lead to the end of tracking and remedial programs. Wang emphasized eight essential characteristics for an effective mainstreaming program which were: 1) early identification of learning problems; 2) delabeling the exceptional child; 3) individualized instruction; 4) teaching self-management skills; 5) a comprehensive organizational resource support system; 6) multi-age grouping; 7) team teaching; and 8) family involvement. Like Dunn (1962) and Deno (1970), Wang also stressed the need to focus on the unique needs of the individual child instead of focusing on the diagnostic label assigned to a student.
Will (1986), an Assistant Secretary for the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services in the U.S. Department of Education, recommended that changes needed to be made for the future of all children with learning problems by developing a shared commitment between special education and general education. Will identified that there needed to be a strengthened relationship between special education and general education that allowed educators to collaborate to evaluate the educational needs of students with learning problems and create effective educational strategies to meet their needs.

Reynolds, Wang, and Walberg (1987) expanded upon Will’s (1986) proposed changes in special education and general education for students with mild disabilities. Like researchers before them, Reynolds and his colleagues identified a problem with the way students were categorized, which led to some students not being identified and not receiving special education services. Reynolds, Wang, and Walberg made several proposals that would require the cooperation of federal, state, and local levels based on their previous research reviews (Wang, Reynolds, & Walberg, 1986) which extended previous suggestions by Will (1986) and Deno (1970). The first part of their two-part initiative was to join practices that had been found to be effective from special, compensatory, and general education to create a more inclusive general education system that meets the needs of all students, especially those that needed greater educational support. The second part called for the federal government to collaborate with states and local school districts to support experimental educational trials of integrated forms of education for those students that were currently being segregated for services in special,
remedial, and compensatory education programs. The recommendations made by Reynolds and his colleagues led to the Regular Education Initiative (REI) (Teacher Education Division of CEC, 1987), which was the next stage in the mainstreaming movement (McLeskey, 2007). According to McLeskey, REI called for a large-scale reduction of the amount of pull-out or resource class programs for students with mild disabilities, in favor of programs in the general education classroom with the support of special and general education.

William and Susan Stainback were two other scholars that became influential in the integration of special education and regular education during the 1980s. Stainback and Stainback wanted to take the mainstreaming movement one step further by integrating students with severe disabilities into general education, which had previously been reserved for students with mild to moderate disabilities (McLeskey, 2007). Stainback and Stainback (1984) differed from previous researchers in very significant ways, because they called for the merger of special education and general education. Stainback and Stainback no longer thought it was beneficial for special education and general education to function as a dual system of education that existed alongside each other with separate students, teachers, staff, and funding.

**Inclusion Movement**

The suggestions made by Stainback and Stainback (1984) for the merger of special and general education laid the framework for inclusion in the late 1980s and into the 1990s (McLeskey, 2007). The previous articles addressed present information that demonstrates similarities and differences of leading scholars in the inclusion movement.
that contributed to and continue to be a factor in the difficulty in defining inclusive practices. Legislation also came to the forefront at this time to further the inclusion movement. The EHA (1975) was renamed the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA, 1990). Terminology also changed to person first language with the reauthorization of the Act with a shift from handicapped children to individuals with disabilities. The IDEA supports students with disabilities receiving a FAPE in their LRE, but it does not mandate inclusion (Harpell & Andrews, 2010). The lack of specific language mandating inclusion in the IDEA is another contributing factor to the challenge of defining inclusive practices.

Also at this time was an increase in the amount of students with special rights that were educated in the general education classroom for a considerable amount of the school day (McLeskey, 2007). Data from the U.S. Department of Education (1987) approximated that during the 1984-1985 school year, 27 percent of students with disabilities were educated in the general education classroom for 80 percent or more of the school day. These numbers increased by the 1994-1995 school year, to 45 percent, which was in part due to the practice of including students with mild disabilities, mostly learning disabilities, in the general education classroom (McLeskey, 2007; McLeskey & Pacchiano, 1994; U.S. Department of Education, 1997). However, students with severe disabilities were not being included in general education with the same amount of success. Thirty two percent of students with severe disabilities were in a segregated setting for the whole day during the 1984-1985, which declined to 28 percent during the 1994-1995 school year (McLeskey, 2007).
In contrast to the previous scholars that supported changes in special education, Fuchs and Fuchs took a more critical look at the inclusion movement. Fuchs and Fuchs (1994) began by identifying a disconnect between the advocates over the students that they were advocating for, with one group of the REI’s supporting students with mild to moderate disabilities and the other group advocating for students with severe intellectual disabilities. They identified this as a problem, because the two groups did not work together. They inferred that many that were advocating for students with severe disabilities were okay with letting REI advocates, like Reynolds, Wang, and others take the lead in getting students with mild to moderate disabilities into the mainstream, because they believed that this would lead to placements for students with severe disabilities in neighborhood schools. Fuchs and Fuchs critiqued the extreme position that was leading the full inclusion reform movement, while at the same time conflicting with important goals of reformists for students with mild disabilities.

Kauffman (1993) provided another critique of the radical reform of special education and the inclusion movement. Kauffman proposed that changes would be made to special education, and that those connected to education supported changes, such as collaboration amongst special and general education and a better education for students with disabilities in their LRE (McLeskey, 2007). He believed that the issue was with achieving reform for special education that would make a lasting impact on what special education does for students with disabilities, and not just a short term fix of change in structure. Kauffman identified what he believed were three important tasks that special
education must contend with in the current proposed reforms: keeping place in perspective, choosing idea over image, and avoiding fanaticism.

Kauffmann’s (1993) first task for special education was to keep place in perspective, which included location, perspective, status, and power. He identified that the physical place that students with disabilities are educated had been the central point of special education reform and had been exalted to the essential component in improving the outcomes for students with disabilities. However, he cautioned about focusing so much on the physical placement of students with disabilities, because he did not think there was enough information available to truly understand the relationship between placement and instruction in determining student outcomes. Kauffman included empirical evidence that did not signify the effective strategies for improving and maintaining academic outcomes for all students in general education, as well as studies that did not show that stigma and isolation that students with disabilities may feel as directly related to being educated outside of the general education classroom. His second task, choosing ideas over image, focused on advocates for special education spending more time addressing the complex ideas and self-examining their own suggestions, instead of over-simplifying ideas to present an image of inclusion that did not include all of the needs of students with disabilities.

Kauffman’s (1993) last task, avoiding fanaticism, focused on how special education reformists sole goal of placing students in general education settings led to fanaticism, because they did not consider what happens if the placement does not work for all students. Kauffman suggested that this view that all students belong in regular
education environments transformed a good idea for special education into a fanatical idea that no longer acknowledges differing views or ways that students individualized needs may not be met. Kauffman suggested three long-term strategies for achieving substantive reform, which were: disaggregating special education populations, repairing and elaborating special education’s conceptual foundations, and strengthening special education’s empirical base. According to Kauffman (1993), “Disaggregation of students is necessary to ensure the appropriateness of education for all” (p. 104).

Fuchs and Fuchs and Kauffman provided a critical voice in literature that had previously remained mostly silent in terms of the inclusion movement. For the most part advocates and critiques of the inclusion movement supported the belief that most students should receive their education in the general education classroom for longer amounts of the school day (McLeskey, 2007). Some of the key areas that continued to separate the field of reformers for the inclusion movement that were addressed in the Fuchs and Fuchs (1994) and Kauffman (1993) seminal articles were: the amount of time students should be included in general education classrooms, identifying which students should be included, the amount of change needed by special and general education to address school reform, and identifying if students with differing abilities and disabilities needed separate inclusion movements. The issues that divided the field of special education for the inclusion movement are another contributing factor to the difficulty in defining inclusive practices, especially since some advocates, like those for students with mild disabilities and those for students with severe disabilities, varied significantly on key issues and ideas for the inclusion movement. Key legislation authorized by the U.S.
federal government instigated much of the collaboration between special and general education that previously had been debated and at times resisted.

**Inclusion Legislation**

The IDEA was reauthorized in 1997 to ensure that students with disabilities had access to the general education curriculum, although accountability at the time remained on the shoulders of special educators (McLeskey, 2007; Wischnowski, Salmon, & Eaton, 2004). This was followed by the renaming of The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (1965) as the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB, 2001), which required that students with disabilities be taught by qualified teachers, have access to the general education curriculum, and be included on accountability measures for professional educators for student achievement outcomes (Friend, Cook, Hurley-Chamberlain, & Shamberger, 2010; Lashley, 2007; Thomas & Brady, 2005; Wakeman, Browder, Flowers, & Ahlgrim-Delzell, 2006). The IDEA was again reauthorized in 2004 as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 to provide a FAPE for students with disabilities, protect the rights of students with disabilities and their families, and assist Federal, State, and local education agencies with educating students with disabilities (Russo, Osborne, & Borreca, 2005). According to the U.S. Department of Education (2011), the number of students aged 6-21, identified as having a disability under the IDEA and educated in the regular education classroom for 80 percent or more of the day increased from 46.5 to 53.7 percent from 2000 to 2006. Federal legislation, such as NCLB and IDEA 2004, and previously mentioned academic articles have supported change to the relationship of special and general education, which now share
responsibility for addressing the needs of all students, including those with disabilities (McLeskey, 2007).

Legislation also provides mandates for curriculum design and instruction. NCLB (2001) mandates that students with disabilities be given access to the general education curriculum, better quality instruction, and a focus on research-based practices. (Thomas & Brady, 2005). NCLB requires that student achievement be measured by tests that are aligned with state academic standards (DiPaola, Tschannen-Moran, & Walther-Thomas, 2004). The scores from the tests need to be reported in terms of proficiency to allow for measurement against the comprehensive standards. Under NCLB, all students in public schools are expected to demonstrate “adequate yearly progress” (AYP) on state assessments by 2014, with 95 percent of all students required to participate in the state-level assessment (DiPaola et al., 2004). In addition, NCLB requires that schools demonstrate progress within student subgroups, including students with disabilities, with 95 percent of all students in each subgroup tested for the school to make AYP, which includes students that have only been enrolled for a year (Thomas & Brady, 2005). Also, NCLB encourages evidence-based practices based on proven measurements and methods to demonstrate high-quality education (Thomas & Brady, 2005). Curriculum design and instruction for inclusion will incorporate the above NCLB mandates with the students IEP goals for student achievement and ensure that students with special rights receive access to the general education curriculum and that their teachers use evidence based practices for curriculum design.
Placement Issue

With the increase in the number of students with special rights being educated in general education classrooms there became a greater need to address inclusion and program effectiveness. The issue over which placement, special education class or general education class, was most effective for students academically and socially has and continues to contribute to the difficulty in defining inclusive practices. The Carlberg and Kavale (1980) article examined the efficacy of placing students with disabilities in special and general education. Carlberg and Kavale focused on two paradigms, the comparison paradigm and the ethics paradigm, within the inclusion debate (Salend & Duhaney, 2007a). Carlberg and Kavale completed a meta-analysis of 50 primary research studies with the goal of adding to the inclusion debate about the shift from special classes to integrated classes. They identified that previous research had focused more on philosophical evidence rather than empirical evidence, which had led to a lack of evidence that supported or rejected the effectiveness of placing an exceptional child in a special or general education class. Also, Carlberg and Kavale reported that when they reviewed literature they determined that there was not consistent evidence to support placement in a general education class over a special education class or vice versa in regards to academic or social standards.

At the time that Carlberg and Kavale’s (1980) article was published, it served as a catalyst for future research that was done to study the effectiveness of the placement of students with disabilities in general and special education classrooms, while at the same time establishing a need for a research agenda that focused on which placement, special
or general education, would benefit students with disabilities the most (Salend & Duhaney, 2007b). Today researchers are expanding upon Carlberg and Kavale’s research by examining how educational, social, and behavioral performance of students with disabilities is impacted by inclusion, as well as the impact of inclusion on students without disabilities, educators, and family members (Salend & Duhaney, 2007b).

**Teacher Perceptions of Mainstreaming and Inclusion**

Teacher perceptions of mainstreaming and inclusion have been well documented during the evolution of special education. Dunn (1968) suggested a need to identify the attitudes of teachers in regards to the labeling of students and how this impacted their expectations and perceptions of students. Shotel, Iano, & McGettigan’s (1972) “Teachers Attitudes Associated with the Integration of Handicapped Children,” used a pre and post test to compare the attitudes of a control group of teachers who were not engaged in a mainstreaming program with an experimental group of teachers that were implementing a mainstreaming program. Their results signified that while the experimental group was more positive about mainstreaming before the start of the program, the post-test results demonstrated a decline in support of mainstreaming programs by both groups. This led to concern about placing students with mild mental retardation into general education settings (Waldron, 2007a).

Scruggs and Mastropieri (1996) synthesized research between 1958-1995 from twenty-eight investigations that surveyed 10,560 teachers about their perceptions of including students with disabilities in their classrooms. Their synthesis clarified misconceptions about teacher perceptions and provided tremendous information about
teachers from a wide range of U.S. geographic locations and experiences on the issues they faced with the implementation of inclusive programs in their schools (Waldron, 2007b). Scruggs and Mastropieri reported that approximately two thirds of the general education teachers surveyed supported mainstreaming/inclusion, while a smaller majority would be willing to include students with disabilities in their own classrooms. These findings contradicted perceptions at the time that suggested that teachers had negative perceptions about mainstreaming/inclusion (Waldron, 2007b). The response teachers gave for including students with disabilities in their own classroom varied based on the disability categorization of students and the amount of teacher responsibility that was required. They also found that about half of the general education teachers and about two thirds of special education teachers believed that mainstreaming/inclusion could provide some benefits. Only about one third or less of the teachers felt that they had enough time, skills, resources, or training needed for mainstreaming/inclusion. Scruggs and Mastropieri’s findings suggested that general education teachers concerns with mainstreaming/inclusion were connected with procedural issues in the classroom, rather than with social prejudice or negative attitudes towards mainstreaming/inclusion of students with disabilities.

**Inclusion Definitions in Literature**

In accordance with the legal mandates of the IDEA (2004), inclusion is the placement of students with special rights in his or her LRE, an educational setting. Using the legal precedent outlined in the IDEA students with special rights are provided with support aids and services to meet the child’s individualized needs for appropriate
academic and social outcomes, which are delivered by collaborative educational teams so that the child has equal membership in his or her classroom community and receives a FAPE. In addition, instruction for inclusion is differentiated to meet the needs of students, while also accommodating and modifying materials and assessments to meet the unique needs of students so that they have access to the general education curriculum. IEP goals and support aids and services are included into instruction and curriculum design. Special educators and general educators collaborate to design instruction to meet the needs of all students using research-based practices. Inclusion instruction may include students with special rights as well as general education students. General education teachers, special education teachers, and other education professionals collaborate to meet the individualized needs of students, as well as monitor and evaluate student progress to inform the planning of future lessons and instruction.

Multiple scholars have multiple definitions of inclusion. Ryndak, Jackson, and Billingsley (2000) conducted a study to examine how experts in the field of inclusion defined inclusion. For the study surveys were sent to people identified in the field as experts, which were people that authored relevant articles or were authors or editors of professional books that were related to inclusive education services. The experts were sent an 11-page questionnaire on inclusion. The survey response was 37 percent. The definitions that they received from the survey were analyzed using a content analysis process and each definition was read independently by two of the co-authors. Five themes and components were identified:
(a) Placement in natural typical settings; (b) all students together for instruction and learning; (c) supports and modifications within general education to meet appropriate learner outcomes; (d) belongingness, equal membership, acceptance, and being values; (e) collaborative integrated services by education teams. (Ryndak, Jackson, & Billingsley, 2000, p. 101)

The first three components identified by Ryndak, Jackson, and Billingsley (2000) all shared a common theme of the setting a child with special rights is placed in for inclusion. The first component indicated that students with special rights should be placed in a typical setting, and the second component suggested that all students are together in the same setting for instruction and learning. The third component built off of the first two in that students should receive their supports and modifications within general education to meet the individual students appropriate outcomes. All three components suggested that the setting a child with special rights receives his or her education is important and focused heavily on the general education classroom as the setting that most identify for inclusion.

Kirk, Gallagher, Anastasiow, & Coleman (2006) define inclusion as, “The process of bringing all, or nearly all, exceptional children into the general classroom for their education with special educational support” (p. 36). Daniel (1997) defines inclusion from one of his books with his colleagues as, “placement of students with disabilities into regular classrooms; [f]ull inclusion assumes that virtually all services are delivered in regular classrooms in the school the [disabled] child would attend if not disabled” (p. 440; Sperry, Daniel, Huefner, & Gee, 1997). Others such as Harpell and Andrews (2010) have referred to inclusion as a reform that is focused on addressing the needs of
exceptional students in a general education classroom setting. Epanchin and Friend (2007) identified a discourse between the focus on where students with special rights are educated as opposed to the quality of the education that is provided in those locations. Kauffman (1993) also identified an overemphasis on physical space and the need to keep place in perspective as one of the key tasks for responding to special education reform in the 1990s. According to Kauffman (1993):

The issue of where students should be taught demands no less attention to individual lives. Student-by-student decisions regarding placement require attention to subtleties, ambiguities, realities, and interconnections among ideas: and these requirements are not prominent features of today’s education reform movement. Making individual decisions necessitates weighing options and understandings that a given environment may have advantages and disadvantages for teaching specific skills. Case-by-case placement decisions are consistent with a fundamental idea underlying special education-rejection of overgeneralizations that allow the tacit exclusion of students from appropriate education for the sake of keeping all students in regular classrooms. (p. 101)

When reading the previous definitions of inclusion I am struck by the focus on the physical location of inclusion, for services and special educational support. The emphasis on the physical location for inclusion can in part be connected to the history of special education that segregated students with special rights in special classrooms and settings, even after LRE was mandated into federal law.

**Placement of Students by Law**

The physical placement of students with special rights in special education or general education classes has been a controversial issue throughout the history of special education and inclusion and continues to today. The physical placement of students became a central issue with the passage of the EHA in 1975, later amended and renamed
the IDEA (1990, 1992, 1997, 2004), because the act mandated that students with disabilities need to be provided a FAPE that is designed to meet the unique needs of the child in his or her LRE (Heller, Holtzman, & Messick, 1982; Kavale & Forness, 2000; Weintraub, Abeson, Ballard, & LaVor, 1976). The IDEA also requires that students with disabilities be educated with their peers without disabilities to the maximum extent appropriate, which many interpreted to mean mainstreaming (Daniel, 1997; Kavale & Forness, 2000). School districts and states need to have a continuum of alternative placement options available for the student in order to be compliant with the Act (Daniel, 1997; Kavale & Forness, 2000). According to Kavale and Forness, the continuum is not a particular setting, even though the LRE for some students may be the general education classroom.

Confusion over determining a student with special rights placement in his or her LRE is another contributing factor that makes defining inclusion difficult. The important part of LRE that needs to be emphasized is the appropriate educational setting is closest to the regular classroom, so that a child with special rights may receive a FAPE. The educational setting does need to be a setting that is closest to the regular classroom, which is often the general education classroom, but for some students it is a more restrictive setting so that the individual needs of the students can be met with aids and services to provide a FAPE. The location of schools within different federal circuit court jurisdictions often determines where a school begins when considering the placement of a child with special rights to determine his or her LRE. Schools in the 3rd, 5th, or 11th federal circuit courts jurisdiction use the Daniel R.R., 874 F.2d 1036 (1989) test. The
Daniel R.R. test begins with the student in the general education classroom with aids and services and then determines if the child’s placement needs to be moved if the general education classroom is not appropriate. Daniel R.R. was placed in a general education classroom with aids and services, and the court determined that the general education classroom was not his LRE. The court decided that Daniel R.R.’s appropriate placement was in a more restrictive environment, because in the general education environment he received little educational benefit, was disrupting the class, and needed constant attention from the instructor.

Schools that are located in the 4th, 6th, or 8th federal circuit court jurisdiction must use the Roncker, 700 F.2d 1058 (1982, 1983) portability test. Schools that use the Roncker test can determine where the student is put as long as aids and services are brought to the student to make the student’s education appropriate. Schools need to make sure that they are looking at each student holistically when determining the student’s appropriate placement under the IDEA. In the Sacramento City Unified Schools v. Rachel H., 14 F.3d 1398 (1993, 1994), Rachel H. was placed in the general education classroom and it was determined that the general education classroom was the appropriate setting for her with aids and services, because her non-academic/social benefits contributed to her academic benefits. These legal cases provide examples of ways that federal courts have shaped the determination of a student with special rights placement in his or her LRE, which at times was a general education classroom like in the Rachel H. case. In other instances, the child needed to be placed in a more restrictive
setting in order to receive a FAPE, as in the *Daniel R. R. v. State Board of Education*, 874 F.2d 1036 (1989) case.

Inclusive settings differ for a child with special rights based on his or her LRE on the continuum of alternative educational placements for the child. The continuum of alternative placements was described by Reynolds (1962) and later illustrated by Deno’s (1970) cascade model (Kavale & Forness, 2000). Reynolds explained a continuum of special education services, from the general education classroom to the most restrictive settings such as a hospital or treatment center, to describe services that a child with special rights, referred to then as handicapped or exceptional children.

While not all of the continuum of educational placements described by Reynolds (1962) hold true in today’s current educational system, many of the organizational features are relevant, such as a range of placements will often begin in a setting most like the general education classroom and extend to more restrictive placements based on the individual needs of the student. Also, with the more restrictive settings, students are separated more from the general education school setting and require more specialized personnel.

It appears that the over emphasis on the physical space for inclusion mentioned by Kauffman (1993) continues to be at the forefront of inclusion efforts and a contributing factor to the challenge of defining inclusion. For my definition of inclusion I focused on the placement of a student with special rights in his or her LRE on a continuum of educational placements, which in some cases may be considered the most restrictive environment, as opposed to solely focusing on placements in the general education
classroom. The shift in focus for my definition of inclusion puts more emphasis on a child with special rights being included in an educational setting that is most appropriate for his or her needs, while also providing the child access to the general education curriculum alongside his or her peers, whether they be other students with special rights or their general education students.

Summary

Historical, “classical”, research, case law, and legislation contribute to the challenge of defining inclusion and the placement of students with special rights. Inclusion educational research has detailed the segregation and labeling of students with special rights. Historical case law has had an impact on the inclusion of students with special rights in public education programs. Legal mandated shifts, as well as scholars during the mainstreaming movement and inclusion movement have also contributed to changes in the educational divide between special education and general education that have supported the inclusion of students with special rights. Inclusion legislation provides mandates for curriculum design and instruction. Placement issues and teachers’ perceptions of mainstreaming and inclusion became valued in terms of the efficacy of where students with special rights were educated. There continues to be a multitude of definitions of inclusion from numerous scholars in literature that emphasize the physical location that a student with special rights receives his or her education.

My Inclusion Definition

I define inclusion as students with special rights in an educational setting [Setting may have general education students, and special and/or general education teachers]
found along a continuum of educational placements, co-constructing meaning within a dialogic community of people, students and teachers. Some key inclusion characteristics are students collaborating and participating, working on social and academic goals, solving problems through inquiry, and making meaning by having shared experiences and opportunities to reflect.

Inclusive practices differ on a continuum of educational placements of students with special rights based on his or her LRE. Deno (1970) described a continuum of educational placements for students, which she referred to as the cascade system. According to Deno (1970):

The cascade system is designed to make available whatever different-from-the-mainstream kind of setting is required to control the learning variables deemed critical for the individual case. It is a system which facilitates tailoring of treatments to individual needs rather than a system of sorting out children so they will fit conditions designed according to group standards not necessarily suitable for the particular case. (p. 235)

Like, Reynolds’s (1962) continuum system, Deno (1970) used a tapered design to demonstrate the change in the amount of students enrolled in different programs along the continuum of educational placements. Deno separated her continuum into two separate programs, “out-patient” programs and “in-patient” programs. The “out-patient” programs began with the largest amount of students in the regular education classroom and then narrowed down to more restrictive placements, such as the regular class with aids and services, part-time special class, full-time special class, special stations, and homebound. The “in-patient” programs consisted of levels that were governed by health
or welfare agencies, such as instruction in a hospital or home setting or “nongradual” services in a medical or welfare care facility.

Many of the descriptions by Reynolds (1962) and Deno (1970) that describe the continuum of educational placements can be used to describe how inclusive practices differ. My continuum of educational placements is based on Reynolds’s continuum system and Deno’s cascade system that are described above. My continuum of educational placements for students with special rights is described in further detail in the following paragraphs. See Figure 1. Note how the design of the continuum begins large and then tapers down, this design was based off of Reynolds and Deno’s models which used a similar design to demonstrate the decrease in the amount of students that are placed at each level along the continuum. With the largest number of students with special rights being placed in the general education classroom and as the placements become more specialized the number of students that are placed in those settings for their LRE decreases. Students may move in and out of settings as their IEP is evaluated. The arrows along the side of the continuum demonstrate the movement that is provided for students with special rights based on their individual needs.
Level 1: Students in the general education classroom, including those with special rights and their general education peers. The general education teacher provides accommodations in the general education classroom.

Level 2: Students with special rights are educated in the general education classroom alongside their general education peers. Includes push in services, such as occupational therapy, and co-teaching by special education teachers and the general education teacher.

Level 3: Students with special rights are educated part-time in the general education classroom and part-time in the special education classroom.

Level 4: Students with special rights are educated full-time in a special education classroom, with support aids and services.

Level 5: Students with special rights are educated in a special education day school. Students receive more specialized support and services from specialized teachers.

Level 6: Homebound Setting

Level 7: Hospital Setting.

Level 8: Non-Educational Setting

Figure 1: Continuum of educational placements for students with special rights. Based on Reynolds's (1962) continuum system and Deno's (1970) cascade system.
I will begin with the general education classroom and gradually move down the continuum of placements to more restrictive settings to describe how inclusive practices would look across a continuum of educational placements for students with special rights. The first level along the continuum (Level 1) is the general education classroom, which would consist of accommodations, such as differentiated instruction, so that a child with special rights is educated beside their general education peers by the regular education teacher. This aligns with Reynolds (1962) and Deno’s (1970) first level with students with disabilities in the general education classroom with the most “problems” or “classroom accommodations” provided by the general education teacher. I would like to include Deno’s additional support to the Level 1 stage, which can consist of support for medical or counseling services. For example a student with a catheter may need medical support provided by a school nurse.

Level 2 has a student with special rights educated in the general education classroom with supplementary aids and services, as well as push in or pull-out support from a special education teacher or another member of the educational support team. For example, at Level 2 a special education teacher would push in to the general education class and co-teach with the general education teacher. An occupational therapist may provide therapy during class and or pull a student out for additional services. Level 2 combines the next two levels from Reynolds (1962) continuum by providing students with special rights consultation and supplementary teaching or treatment in the general education class. Level 2 also extends Deno’s (1970) second level to include co-teaching and support from other educational staff.
Level 3 along the continuum of educational placements of students with special rights is the student with special rights is placed part-time in the general education classroom with part-time pull-out programs to a special education classroom for over half of the educational day. Level 3 combines the next two steps by Reynolds (1962) with a student with special rights receiving services in the general education classroom and resource room, plus part-time special education services and corresponds with the next step by Deno (1970). For example, in this setting a student with multiple disabilities may receive part-time instruction in the general education classroom, and be pulled out for speech/language instruction by a speech therapist and reading instruction from a special education teacher for a specific learning disability. Level 4 would be full-time placement of a child with special rights in a special education classroom, with aids and services provided by special education teachers and paraprofessionals. For example students labeled as having an emotional disturbance may receive their education in a self-contained special education classroom in a general education setting.

Level 5 combines the next two stages along Reynolds’s (1962) continuum, which are special day school and residential school and corresponds with the next stage along Deno’s (1970) continuum as special stations. Level 5 is the placement of a student with special rights in a special day school or a residential school, with the school providing more specialized support and services by specialized teachers to meet the specific needs of the students, as well as providing access to the general education curriculum. For example, a state residential school for the blind provides instruction for students with visual impairments in Braille and orientation and mobility, as well as academic content.
area instruction, such as reading, writing, math, etc. In addition, residential schools and special day schools provide additional services for students with multiple disabilities. Also, because the amount of specialized residential schools within a state are limited, these schools provide overnight accommodations, so that students with special rights may live on the school grounds as they attend their educational courses and receive support aids and services.

The last three steps along the continuum of educational placement for students with special rights and services refer to non-educational settings. The last three steps along the continuum do not support my definition of inclusion, because they are not in an educational setting and they are not based on the collaboration of students with special rights and their peers to co-construct meaning alongside their teachers. In each placement educational services are provided, but vary based on the needs of the individual student. Support aids and services are designed to support the student with special rights with receiving a FAPE, so that he or she receives some educational benefit. Level 6 is homebound, with educational services as well as support aids and services provided to a child with special rights in his or her home. This level is identified as the next step along Deno’s (1970) continuum, but does not appear on Reynolds’s (1962) continuum. Level 7 is instruction provided in a hospital setting, which corresponds with the next levels on both Reynolds and Deno’s continuums. Level 8 is a non-educational setting such as a hospital, treatment center, or welfare care and supervision center. Level 8 combines the last two stages of Reynolds and Deno’s continuums. In level 8 a student with special rights in a hospital setting may have more severe medical issues that inhibit
the amount of educational support that can be provided. The IEP team would determine the appropriate goals for the individual student and the support aids and services that would be provided.

By only identifying inclusion as an education for a student with special rights in the general education classroom, the lessons learned from the past in education are not included. Labels such as general education and special education should not be used to stigmatize and categorize the inclusion of a child with special rights. Students with special rights may be segregated from settings that are most appropriate for their individualized needs if inclusion is only provided in a general education classroom, and thus may exclude students by the categorization of their placement. The focus must shift to the unique needs of the child so that the child’s needs are at the forefront of placement decisions. Inclusion must also ensure that students with special rights are included in instruction with his or her peers to co-construct meaning in his or her LRE on the continuum of educational placements, with support aids and services. Students with special rights should no longer be labeled based on their school setting, but rather by all of the qualities that contribute to the whole child. Using this definition of inclusion returns the focus to the student with special rights and positions the child as capable. Students with special rights are positioned as collaborating members of a classroom community. Also, inclusion now emphasizes that a student with special rights is included with his or her peers in an educational setting that is most appropriate for his or her needs and that provides access to the general education curriculum to support positive outcomes for the unique child. The focus on inclusion as students with special rights collaborating
with others to make meaning will be explored more using a sociocultural theoretical framework.

This inclusion definition includes a sociocultural perspective of learning that incorporates information on the social and cultural aspect of learning through the co-construction of meaning making when inclusion is viewed as a community of practice. “Communities of practice can be thought of as shared histories of learning” (Wenger, 1998, p. 86). Wenger emphasized the mutual engagement of individuals in a community of practice working together on a joint endeavor to contribute to some important learning. My definition of inclusion is based off of Wenger’s community of practice, because there is a strong emphasis on students mutually engaged with other learners in a community of practice, an educational setting along the continuum of educational placements, working together on joint tasks to co-construct meaning.

My definition includes the importance of having students with special rights included in learning activities in inclusive classrooms, because students with special rights and their general education peers need to be in educational settings that provide opportunities for students to share their cultural knowledge by participating in learning together. Social participation emphasizes that in communities of practice participants are recognized as competent and their undertakings are worth pursing (Wenger, 1998). Students with special rights need to be included in inclusive educational communities of practice. In this way all students are acknowledged as competent within learning communities and a larger range of social and cultural perspectives and histories are included in the process of learning and knowing.
Inclusion of students with special rights along the continuum of educational placements is evident when students are collaborating with other students, students with special rights and/or general education students, as well as teachers to co-construct meaning. The LRE for a student with special rights ensures that a student is provided a FAPE in the setting that is most appropriate for him or her (IDEA, 2004). The goal is that to the maximum extent appropriate students with special rights will be educated with their nondisabled peers, but at the same time the placement of a child with special rights in a general education classroom is not always the LRE for that individual child. The setting that a student with special rights receives his or her education no longer needs to be viewed as a stigma, but rather as the educational setting that is his or her LRE, so that a student with special rights is positioned to co-construct meaning with others in a dialogic community of people. The student with special rights LRE should emphasize the co-construction of knowledge happening amongst a dialogic community of people in the educational setting that supports meaning making of all students, no matter where the setting falls along the continuum of placements. The sites in this study are examples of educational settings along the continuum of placements.

**Theoretical Framework**

Much of the information included in the above examples of inclusion integrated legal aspects of the IDEA (2004), elements of research on defining inclusion (Ryndak, Jackson, & Billingsley, 2000), as well as the emphasis on the physical space for inclusion (Kauffman, 1993). Here my definition of inclusion is further expanded to focus on learning as social participation (Wenger, 1998) through collaborative activities as
students make meaning together reflecting a sociocultural theoretical framework supported by the work of Kliewer (2008a, & 2008b) and Edmiston (2007, 2014).

**Sociocultural Theory**

A sociocultural theoretical framework was used to explore how people, students and teachers, make sense of their interactions and their continued learning connected to a text. Lev Vygotsky (1972, 1978) is credited with developing a sociocultural theory to explain the connections amongst learning, society, and language. Vygotsky and his colleagues work differed from the psychologists of his time who were predominantly behavioral theorists who believed that human cognition could be supported with stimuli-response research (Enciso & Ryan, 2011). Vygotsky’s (1978) dialectical approach focused on the connections between on the one hand individual development and on the other hand social practices and cultural-historical knowledge and development (Enciso & Ryan, 2011, Rogoff, 2003). “According to Vygotsky’s theory, the efforts of individuals are not separate from the kinds of activities in which they engage and the kinds of institutions of which they are apart” (Rogoff, 2003, p. 50).

Vygotsky (1978) developed a theory that the cultural development of a child happens twice: first, it appears socially among people (interpsychological), and second, inside the child (intrapsychological) (Enciso & Ryan, 2011; Holland, Lachicotte, Skinner, & Cain, 1998). Vygotsky (1978) also stressed the importance of language development, because it provides participants with ways to develop understandings about problems that arise in different situations (Enciso & Ryan, 2011). Language is the tool of tools, and thus is integral to meaning making. Using Vygotsky’s (1978) theory of development,
language is viewed twofold: first, as a sign that can build understanding and memory, and second, as way to shape identity, agency, and power (Enciso & Ryan, 2011; Lewis, Enciso, & Moje, 2007). For Vygotsky, (Enciso & Ryan, 2011):

Spoken and written language, especially in the context of play, creates a zone of proximal development in which it is possible to rehearse ideas, formulate plans, imagine ourselves and others as a head taller, and reflect on actions and insights. (p. 136)

Wenger (1998) emphasized the mutual engagement of individuals in a community of practice working together on a joint endeavor to contribute to some important learning. Wenger identified three dimensions of a community of practice: mutual engagement, a joint enterprise, and a shared repertoire. These three elements are important elements of inclusion, because each element contributes to the shared history of learning that is created amongst students in the educational settings. With mutual engagement individuals become “insiders” by being included in what matters and connecting with the knowledge of others. Mutual engagement is an important element of inclusion, because the diversity of the members of a community of practice contributes to an individual’s ability to connect with participants with varying cultures and histories to engage in knowledge construction. A joint enterprise refers to participants negotiating responses to their learning with others. Inclusion allows students with special rights to negotiate with their peers in inclusion classrooms in pursuit of knowledge while holding each other mutually accountable.

Individuals become “insiders” in the community by participating in the social practices. “The repertoire of a community of practice includes routines, words, tools,
ways of doing things, stories, gestures, symbols, genres, actions, or concepts that the community has produced or adopted in the course of existence, and which have become part of its practice” (Wenger, 1998, p. 83). The repertoire for a community of practice in an inclusion classroom is important, because it represents the different ways that students within a community of practice express and develop their identities as members of the classroom community as well as the means for how students create meaning together. The repertoire of a community of practice can also be understood from the viewpoint of classroom literacies. This repertoire for a community of practice is important for students in inclusive classrooms, because the students have access to and develop a variety of tools as means for learning with their peers. Within communities of practice students’ social experiences and cultural histories are supported as contributing factors to the repertoire of the community. Shared experiences and opportunities to make meaning through mutual engagement, a joint enterprise, and a shared repertoire, will be examined more in depth in the upcoming sections through a sociocultural theoretical framework.

**Positioning Theory**

Positioning theory is way to examine how teachers and students position themselves and others over time in both fictional spaces and real world spaces. In this study I have analyzed for how positioning affected inclusion. In different social and cultural situations people participate in different discursive practices by taking up different reciprocal social positions as they communicate and make meaning in interactions with others. Positioning theory (Harre’ & Langenhove, 1999) is a sociocultural and socio-constructivist way of theorizing how people position themselves
and others in social interactions. Different events and activities change how people position others and how people position themself. As students and teachers create a classroom context, and as they position each other in activities.

Harre´ and Langenhove (1999) notes that when positioning occurs there are often multiple forms of positioning happening at the same time. Within positioning theory there are three orders of positioning: first order, second order, and third order positioning. “First order positioning refers to the way persons locate themselves and others within an essentially moral space by using several categories and storylines” (Harre´ & Langenhove, 1999, p. 20). First order positioning is when a person accepts how others are positioning them. Second order positioning is when a person rejects and/or challenges how others position them. Third order positioning, is positioning outside of the initial situation. This can be when people discuss a previous event or it can be about an event that did not actually happen to the people, including a fictional event. Tacit positioning is when people are not aware of how they position others. Intentional positioning is when a person intends to position themselves or others in a particular way.

Harre´ and Langenhove (1999) identified four forms of intentional positioning: 1) situations of deliberate self-positioning; 2) situations of forced self-positioning; 3) situations of deliberate positioning of others; and 4) situations of forced positioning of others.

Deliberate self-positioning occurs in every conversation where one wants to express his/her personal identity. This can be done in at least three different ways: by stressing one’s agency (that is, presenting one’s course of action as one from among various possibilities), by referring to one’s unique point of view, or by referring to events in one’s biography. (Harre´ & Langenhove, 1999, p. 25)
Forced self-positioning differs from deliberate self-positioning in that the initiative does not begin with the person involved, but rather with somebody else (Harre´ & Langenhove, 1999). Forced self-positioning or positioning others often takes the form of a demand and can also be given by a person who is an agent of an institution, such as teacher representing the larger institution of a school and education system. The positioning of others can disempower those being positioned by constraining the person’s agency. On the other hand, positioning of others can also empower people and position them with equal or greater power, which in turn supports a person’s agency. The deliberate positioning of others can be done with the person being positioned present or not present, such as with gossiping. Positioning theory provides a framework to analyze how teachers as well as students position themselves and others over time and in different spaces, the real world classroom space and the fictional spaces created through dramatic inquiry and how this supports and or hinders inclusion. Positioning within dramatic inquiry will be explored further in the dramatic inquiry section of this chapter.

**Grounded Theory**

Grounded theory is a way to build categories while still conducting qualitative research through data analysis, which informs further data that is collected. In this study I used grounded theory to build categories during data analysis with the teacher participants to inform further data collection, while still collected data. According to Charmaz (2006) grounded theory is:

A method of conducting qualitative research that focuses on creating conceptual frameworks or theories through building inductive analysis from data. Hence the, the analytic categories are directly ‘grounded’ in the data…This method is
distinguished from others since it involves the researcher in data analysis while collecting data—we use this data analysis to inform and shape further data collection. (p. 187-188)

Grounded theory can provide a framework for data analysis. Grounded theory also provides a framework that allows the collaborative inquirers to analyze data as the researcher continues to collect data (Charmaz, 2006). The data analysis is used to directly inform further data collection for the inquiry study. Grounded theory is incorporated by coding what is happening in the events to further define emerging ideas and fill in areas that need more clarification (Charmaz, 2006). Grounded theory provides a theoretical framework for collecting and analyzing data from the beginning of data collection in order to manage the data collection and explore ideas through collaborative analysis, while also shaping future data collection based on the teachers transformation over time.

**Dramatic Inquiry**

From a sociocultural theoretical framework, students and teachers using dramatic inquiry work together using tools and symbols to mediate their developing understanding of the world as they participate in literacy practices they develop their literacies. Teachers who use dramatic inquiry can create meaning with their students by interpreting, dialogizing, and dramatizing texts instead of solely putting the control of learning with the teacher and the text (Wolf, Edmiston, & Enciso, 1997).

An inclusion classroom is a community of inquiry that has students and teachers working together to create meaning. Dramatic inquiry can make classrooms more inclusive. “Drama can productively disrupt the sense of classroom normality to create
spaces where children can be viewed primarily as people using their strengths in learning literacy practices, rather than as children with or without disabilities” (Edmiston, 2007, p. 338). Using dramatic inquiry, students with special rights as well as their general education peers may be treated as competent and many begin to see themselves in the same way, thus contributing to the construction of their own identities.

Active and dramatic approaches can support a community of learners who are actively engaged in the curriculum to support academic and social goals, and thus make classrooms more inclusive. As Edmiston (2007) explains, “Drama makes classrooms more inclusive when teachers draw on the linguistic, technical, social, and cultural strengths and resources of all children” (p. 338). Classroom teachers who are committed to inclusion can use dramatic inquiry in their teaching to promote the various strengths of students and support the participation of all students as capable meaning makers.

Ensemble tasks are one example of active and dramatic approaches that become a part of instruction to support students choosing to actively engage with their peers at the same time in a collaborative and meaningful way on a shared goal that the students are invested in for learning (Edmiston, 2014). In ensemble tasks, leadership is distributed amongst teachers and at times students when they use collaborative tools, such as listening, moving, writing, singing, drawing, and using objects (Edmiston, 2014). Edmiston included dialogue in collaborative words and deeds as another core dimension for ensemble tasks, which can become a part of instruction and support student engagement by having students sing together or pretend together. Active and dramatic approaches to learning, such as ensemble tasks, support inclusion because they provide a
format that teachers can use to incorporate content across the curriculum with a shared
goal to instruct students while also supporting student collaboration and engagement.

Classroom literacy teachers who are committed to inclusion and who use dramatic
inquiry, can provide students with a joint enterprise to explore a complex social question
related to a text. “Using Goffman’s (1974) sociological theory of frame analysis,
Heathcote (1984) proposed that every dramatic social role also provides potential
“framings” of events” (Edmiston, 2011, p. 227). Inquiry questions can be used to frame
events using dramatic inquiry for student learning by teachers negotiating topics with
students for the fictional world. This allows for more analytical thinking as students and
teachers are mutually engaged in a joint enterprise (Edmiston, 2011).

Classroom literacy teachers who are committed to inclusion can use Enciso and
Ryan’s (2011) explanation of social mediation of learning when planning activities with
dramatic inquiry. Dramatic inquiry provides a way to capitalize on the varying forms of
participation of all students in the classroom, such as students with special rights (non-
dominant children). Classroom literacy teachers can design teaching and learning
activities for dramatic inquiry that support meaning making that is not monolithic and
does not conform to the belief that all students learn the same. The use of dramatic
inquiry in the classrooms can create a space for students to collaborate in a community of
inquiry where all students are positioned as knowledgeable and competent.

For Vygotsky (1978), children in their interactions with more skilled individuals
in the zone of proximal development (ZPD) develop understanding; use cultural symbolic
and material tools (Enciso & Ryan, 2011; Rogoff, 2003). Edmiston (2014) compared
problem solving in the ZPD with inquiry. Applying Vygotsky’s ZPD to drama, dramatic
inquiry provides opportunities for students and teachers to step into a fictional world with
the tools of movements, objects, languages, etc. to make meaning beyond what they
could do individually (Edmiston, 2007).

Edmiston (In press) analyzed an example of a classroom teacher using dramatic
inquiry to support playful and collaborative activities. The students and the teacher in the
classroom created a storm from *The Tempest*, which led to shared dialogue about the
tempest, stories about the power of the storm, and comparisons to other types of storms,
as well as connections from their in-role experiences as members on a ship that came in
contact with a tempest. Edmiston’s examples of dramatic inquiry in a literacy classroom
environment provided opportunities for the students to extend their meaning making
through collaborative social interactions with their peers and adults.

**Classroom Teacher’s Changing Practice**

Classroom teacher’s changing practice, also referred to in this study as teacher
change over time, is developed using the characteristics of the teacher participant’s
inquiry paradigm and view of teaching and learning. Using Janet Emig’s (1983) inquiry
paradigm, Goswami, Lewis, Rutherford, and Waff (2009) identified six characteristics to
qualify as inquiry paradigm, which are:

- A *governing gaze*-how and why do we see and perceive what we see?
- An acknowledged, or at least conscious, set of *assumptions*-the things we
  believe to be true.
- A *coherent theory* or theories-in other words, the strong reasons,
  hopefully based on good research, that inform our practice.
• An allegiance to an explicit or at least a tacit *intellectual tradition* that asks us to consider, to borrow from Jackie Royster (2000), “Whose company are we keeping?”

• An adequate *methodology*—how you actually conduct your research in your class. (p. 6)

• An *indigenous logic* consonant with all of the above.

An emphasis will be placed on the teachers governing gaze, assumptions, and coherent theory or theoretical framework, because these were the characteristics that emerged repeatedly over time during data analysis. This is a new way to examine teacher change over time. More specifically the teacher’s governing gaze and assumptions about teaching and learning will be identified through teacher semi-structured interviews, data analysis, and classroom observations of teaching and learning activities. Emig (1983) describes one’s “governing gaze” as:

> We see what we elect to see. We have, as the metaphor puts it, a gaze that is governed by our expectations, which in turn are governed by our experiences and what we have decided cognitively to make of them: by, that is, our hypotheses…, schemes…, and constructs…(p. 160, as cited in Goswami et al., 2009)

Dramatic inquiry provides a classroom format for collaborative inquiry to examine teacher participants’ transformation using an adaptation of Emig’s (1983) inquiry paradigm. Dramatic inquiry is always collaborative learning, with students and teachers together creating a fictional, dramatic imagined world. The different mediating tools that teachers and students use in dramatic inquiry, such as language, objects, and symbols, contribute to the shared repertoire that participants use for mutual engagement as they collaborate on a joint enterprise. The shared imagined world of dramatization and
play is created based on the interests and knowledge of students, alongside the everyday classroom world, by students and their teachers (Edmiston, 2003).

**Mantle of the Expert**

Heathcote’s (Heathcote & Bolton, 1995) “mantle of the expert” is an approach to dramatic inquiry when students take on the “mantle” or role of an expert, as they collaborate on a joint enterprise to solve a problem for a fictional client.

In the Mantle of the Expert, there is always an “enterprise” to be run. And always a client who needs help with a job needing to be done. The emphasis in on the tasks the children need to do, to make the “enterprise” a success and to serve the needs of the clients. (Mantleoftheexpert.com, 2013).

Using Heathcote’s (Heathcote & Bolton, 1995) “mantle of the expert” approach students are positioned to collaboratively participate on a joint endeavor/enterprise by exploring different perspectives and situations as they work together to meet the requirements for the job of the fictional client. The teacher can incorporate different areas of the curriculum into the enterprise and create learning opportunities as participants move between the real world and imagined worlds.

For example, Heathcote and Bolton (1995) describe how in 1976 at the head of the Watergate scandal, social interactions within their classroom community of practice were utilized to design a dramatic inquiry unit using the “mantle of the expert” approach. The social interactions in the classroom led to negotiations about the three inquiry questions for the students. A student conversation condemning President Nixon led to Heathcote negotiating a frame for the students, commissioned by the museum, as museum curators with the task of collaborating to make wax-models to teach the public
about what went on during Watergate. The implied inquiry being, “how do you share different perspectives of those involved with the Watergate scandal?”.

The students as experts designed wax museum models to represent different people involved in Watergate with lines of dialogue pinned to the models describing what the actual person might have said as well as how they may have thought. For the models, students designed people as a tableaux to illustrate the person they were depicting for the public. The students framed as museum curators had materials as part of their repertoire of a community of practice that consisted of words (facts and feelings of people involved in Watergate), texts (transcripts from the court proceedings that led to President Nixon’s removal from office), symbols (a globe), and stories (contradicting stories of two involved members designing their defense from jail). The students were in the role of museum curators who together negotiated the roles of the models as they decided how they would frame events of Watergate to share with the public. The students-as-museum curators decision to include facts and feelings allowed them to explore differing viewpoints and perspectives that people involved with the Watergate scandal may have contended with at the time. This example displays how a classroom literacy teacher can use students’ interests in a topic to negotiate an inquiry question to frame student’s analysis of a topic involving material artifacts, mediating cultural tools, words, and other signs as they collaborate on a joint endeavor to engage all students in learning.

Identity

Identity is “a role or position that one assumes or is assigned within a social group or network” (Bloome, Carter, Madrid, Otto, Shuart-Faris, & Smith, 2008, p. 50).
According to Wenger (1998), “Issues of education should be addressed first and foremost in terms of identities and modes of belonging, and only secondarily in terms of skills and information” (p. 263). Identities are both culturally and socially constructed through one’s activities and social practices with others (Holland et al., 1998). For Wenger, learning changes one’s identity and how individuals create their own histories in relation to the larger community, as well as how an individual identifies with a community. Identities can change over time with the use of dramatic inquiry.

According to Vygotsky (1978), play creates a ZPD for children with developmental tendencies that provide activities that occur for the child just as they would in the real world that provide a great source of the child’s development. Play is a component of dramatic inquiry that classroom literacy teachers can use in their teaching to support identity formation. Holland and colleagues (1998), using Vygotsky’s theories, identified that individuals inhabiting a cultural world through play are more aware of their agency in their identity formation. Enciso and Ryan (2011) identify that, “A play-like approach creates a socially vibrant space for inventing and examining the meanings of words and worlds” (p. 135). Children can participate in and develop their own identity through participation and interactions within the shared practices of a group people with which they belong (Dyson & Genishi, 2005). Edmiston (2007) observed students participating in playful in-role experiences as astronauts who contributed to the student’s sense of her own identity formation as an astronaut in the fictional world and her identity as a student that is blind. Adults can also extend students’ imagining potentials through
play by introducing fictional events and tools that children would not do on their own (Edmiston, 2014).

Kliwer (2008a) illustrated how classroom teachers who believed in inclusion considered dramatic play to be a key component in the learning of all children in their classroom, which led them to support students who otherwise may have been excluded in participating in the social activities. He described one scenario of a narrative (rocket ship headed to the moon) created by students in the classroom that was enacted through dramatic play, as students created three-dimensional tactile and visual symbols (a spaceship), pictures (American flag), and textual (captain sign) and oral language (students spoken words) symbols. A student with special rights who previously had avoided interaction with her peers was involved in a dramatic narrative with her peers on a trip to the moon. Although the student was nonverbal, her teachers positioned her as a literate citizen, and thus her fellow classmates positioned her as literate and actively engaged her as they constructed a shared narrative. Kliwer (2008a) identifies other research demonstrating that

providing young children with thoughtful interactive opportunities to participate in the stories of others has extremely positive implications for young children’s oral language development; written language development; effective AAC use; predicting, labeling, and sequencing skills; alphabet recognition skills; social skills; and general curricular and developmental levels (p. 113).

In the classroom described by Kliwer (2008a), the identities and sense of belonging for all students was prioritized, so that the literate potential of all students was included and valued as students socially participated in meaning making together through
dramatic play. Classroom literacy teachers that are committed to creating an inclusive classroom can use drama to promote identity formation and the literate potential of all students. This is so, even at an early age, via creating collaborative narratives with adults using material artifacts and mediating cultural tools to extend students development beyond what they could do on their own.

Vygotsky’s developmental theory, also focused on the use of tools and signs as mediating factors that alter a person’s social environment and the identity of those who are using the signs and tools (Holland, et al., 1998). Holland and her colleagues identified that the mediating tools that individuals construct and reconstruct are products of social history based on one’s social interactions with others and the ways that those participants constructed them previously with other participants. Kliewer (2008a) described how teachers supported students in the use of visual-tactile, pictorial, and text-based narratives of other students to make meaning in the preschool literacy classroom. Kliewer shared a story of a student in the classroom who brought in pictures of her family and her dog to share with her classmates about her dog’s upcoming birthday before she brought in her actual dog to meet her classmates. The students participated in dialogic classroom interactive events using visual and dialogic descriptions of their friend’s dog’s birthday, which was then retold by students while sequencing of pictures of the event. The use of the tactile objects and oral language were important signs that included all students, those with special rights working alongside their general education peers, as all participated in a literacy event in which they deepened their understanding.

According to Kliewer (2008a):
Young children with significant developmental disabilities must be exposed to, and actively connect with, others’ meaning making through narrative and symbol construction. This requires that children be in environments swirling with stories expressed by peers, heard on tape and CD, run on the computer, read, collaboratively created, played and acted, told by teachers, danced, drawn, retold, remembered by visiting grandparents, etc. (p. 112)

Kliewer (2008a) gave a clear example of the need for classroom literacy teachers to provide opportunities to involve all students in narrative and symbol construction which supported the development of the literate potential of all students, those with special rights and their general education peers. Classroom literacy teachers who are devoted to inclusion and believe in the literate potential of all students can incorporate the use of material artifacts and mediating cultural tools as mediating devices in their classroom. This in turn supports the development of a community of practice that supports all students making meaning together through their narrative and symbol construction.

Bakhtin (1981) theorized people create meaning dialogically as they experience dialogue among perspectives or viewpoints that they may experience externally with other people or internally as an intermingling of voices interpreting the event (Edmiston, 2014; Holland et al., 1998). Vygotsky focused on one person’s developed understanding guiding another person to extend meaning making beyond what the other already understood. In contrast, Bakhtin did not place importance on one person’s knowledge over another based on age or previous experience, instead he stressed that all people may create understanding in dialogue (Edmiston, 2014). Using Bakhtin’s theories of language and social practice, Enciso and Ryan (2011) identified how “dialogism” in social
interactions, such as teaching and learning, provide opportunities for people to experience numerous voices with cultural histories as they develop new understandings. For Enciso and Ryan, classroom teachers need to create dialogic learning zones that focus on a student’s cultural language and knowledge as much as they focus on the educational goals and concepts.

For Bakhtin (1981), individuals form new understandings in response to dialogue with others. Classroom literacy teachers can use dramatic inquiry to provide students with opportunities to dialogue with their fellow students and teachers in the dramatic, imagined world based on a text to create new understandings. Edmiston (2014) observed children using their bodies and sounds to create a storm in an imagined world. The teacher engaged them dialogically by addressing the students and having them respond by moving and speaking their thoughts about their experience in the storm, which led to meaning making from the dialogic interactions. Through dramatic inquiry experiences, like the ones described by Edmiston, teachers can engage students in dialogic experiences that provide students with opportunities to move, talk, and act with others and thus construct understanding of events as they collaborate with others using dialogue.

“In drama situations, children begin to form identities as competent language users when they are consistently positioned as capable participants in shared literacy practices” (Edmiston, 2007, p. 338). The inclusive literacy classroom is one of many communities that students belong to that may contribute to the formation of their identities. When teachers participate alongside their students in literacy events and practices that allow their students to be capable, they are able to promote student’s
language and literacy learning (Edmiston, & Enciso, 2002). Classroom literacy teachers can participate alongside their students in exploring conflicting perspectives to introduce and explore silenced voices to develop new understandings.

Edmiston (2011) explains:

That creating an understanding always involves a “dialogic” intermingling of competing interpretations of the same event; people must be able to hold, and experience at the same time, the conflict between more than one perspective; new understanding requires that old views are “refracted” by new views. (p. 229)

The classroom literacy teacher can support students in exploring conflicting viewpoints through both imagined and real spaces in dramatic inquiry by creating new understandings with students. This also provides students with opportunities to socially construct their own identities within the larger classroom community of practice. Students who may usually be silenced in the class may be given the opportunity to take on a dominant role or conflicting viewpoint. Working alongside one’s student’s, teachers can mediate students developing understandings with dialogically sequenced events (Edmiston, 2008, 2011; Edmiston & Enciso, 2002).

Edmiston (2011) shared an example of a fifth grade classroom teacher who presented an inquiry question about Thanksgiving: “From whose perspective should the story be told?” (p. 229). Using the mantle of the expert approach to dramatic inquiry the teacher had negotiated a task with the students, framed as sculptors commissioned by a museum, to create a sculpture to memorialize Thanksgiving. The classroom teacher and other adults created, designed, and then they presented a dramatic performance that contradicted the student’s designs and the narratives about Thanksgiving that appeared in
the students’ textbooks. The inquiry question was revised to “Should we continue to celebrate Thanksgiving as we have always done, or like, many contemporary indigenous and non-indigenous people, should we participate in the National Day of Mourning?” The intention was to explore dramatically and dialogically the voices of those silenced by the dominant texts available and the students past knowledge. The teachers’ mediating support of the students allowed for a critical conversation in which students took up differing viewpoints; some realized that they had the power to interpret Thanksgiving differently.

Enciso and Edmiston (1997) described their involvement in an elementary classroom as they engaged in drama alongside students responding to *The True Story of the Three Little Pigs* (Scieszka & Smith, 1989). Through the use of drama the students and teachers developed complex understandings of the world of the story as they read the text, stepped into the imagined world as if they were characters and created their own additional stories. The students’ power shifted as they were positioned with more authority than in everyday life, with the expert frame of defense attorneys who needed to create a defense for A. Wolf, who was accused of murdering the pigs in the story. The classroom inquiry described by Enciso and Edmiston is a strong argument supporting the power of dramatic inquiry for classroom literacy teachers committed to inclusion. In activities, such as interviews with characters in the story and the trial of the wolf, students were able to demonstrate and reflect upon competing interpretations of the text as they participated in social interactions with others, in critical analysis with the teacher. Using Bakhtin’s (1986) theories, Enciso and Edmiston identified that there is not one way to
interpret a text and that the dramatic inquiry supported this with a multitude of interpretations of the same text.

This dramatic experience was also important for students with special rights in this inclusive literacy classroom. All of the students in the classroom were positioned with authority in fictional roles that allowed them to participate in the imagined world of the text with power to act beyond those they would have in the classroom, such as a lawyer, judge, or police officer. Because of the way the students were positioned with authority as literate citizens in the classroom, Enciso and Edmiston (1997) were able to recognize the strengths of all students. Significantly, two of the students in the class who were identified as having learning disabilities and who attended classes for students needing additional reading support were identified by the researchers as two of the more “involved and insightful readers” (p. 77). Students were able to participate in constructing their own identities as they were positioned as capable literacy learners when using dramatic inquiry. For Enciso and Edmiston (1997), “Reading and interpretations had a purpose and relationship with the characters that gave them the [shared] authority to work as very astute readers, who could imagine and critique multiple, intersecting stories and points of view” (p. 77).

These two illustrations of drama in the literacy classroom support an argument about the potential of using drama in teaching to social and literacy inclusive practices and the literate potential of all learners. The first example described how the teacher used dramatic inquiry to dramatically and dialogically critique oppressive narratives. Dramatic inquiry can be transformative in any classroom, but in one with a commitment to
inclusion, it can open up spaces for the voices of all students to participate in a community of inquiry. The second example showed how dramatic inquiry provided opportunities for all students to enter the imagined world with an expert framing as they were positioned with authority that required understanding different viewpoints and thereby developing a more complex understanding of the text. In both examples, the adults participated in learning alongside the students in the real and imagined spaces in the literacy classroom to assist in students’ mediating their understanding. A community of inquiry that values all learners’ social and cultural resources as they explore critical issues for learning with dramatic dialogic inquiry has the potential to affect participants’ identity formation.

Agency

Moje and Lewis (2007) define agency as “the strategic making and remaking of selves, identities, activities, relationships, cultural tools and resources, and histories, as embedded within relations of power” (p.18). For Moje and Lewis agency plays a role in one’s opportunities to learn, because agency can be promoted or constrained by one’s inclusion or exclusion to discourses. They cited Lave (1996) and Gee (2000) for their arguments about people taking on “new identities along with new forms of knowledge and participation” (Moje & Lewis, 2007, p. 19). They went on to identify how learning involves one’s identification with different communities and the identities that one enacts based on the interactions, spaces, and relationships within the community. Agency is distributed amongst individuals within their worlds as social participants negotiate the construction of agency and interpret meaning (Jones & Norris, 2005). Agency is when
students know what they can do and dramatic inquiry will be shown to support students in identifying the potential of oneself and others as the students make and remake their identities.

Goffman (1959) called the way a person presents themselves in situations with others as a “performance.” Within a person/s “performance” there will be different settings, or environments, within which the individual or “actor” will adjust their identity based on the people in a given setting. The individual will also adjust their appearance and manner too based on the impression they want the audience to have of him or her. Goffman compared a person’s social interactions to theater to stress the importance of human and social interactions. The theoretical comparisons that Goffman made can be used to describe the different identities a person makes and remakes based on the social communities they are a part of and the opportunities one is given to participate in different communities of discourse.

The “front of the stage” that Goffman (1959) referred to can be used to represent a students identity in the classroom based on the expectations within the classroom setting as well as those of the other students and teachers within the community. Based on the power dynamics within the classroom a student may enact an identity with little agency due to the constraints provided for the student to interact with the tools as well as to participate in a manner outside of the role he or she is positioned in by others. A classroom teacher in a literacy classroom can promote agency for students by providing them with access to material artifacts, mediating cultural tools, dialogic experiences, and more empowered roles within the classroom. A student’s access to or lack of access to
different discourses within the classroom can impact how one makes or remakes one’s identity in the front, back, or off stage, to use Goffman’s terms, or in different social communities. This is significant, because classroom teachers’ awareness of the different settings in the classroom and how students are positioned within these settings may directly impact students’ identities and thus their agency in the classroom.

Holland and her colleagues (1998) identified a connection between semiotic mediation and agency. They described agency as a tool one used to gain control of one’s own behavior. “These tools of agency are highly social in several senses: the symbols of mediation are collectively produced, learned in practice, and remain distributed over others for a long period of time” (Holland et al., 1998, p. 38). This means that how an individual used a tool was based on their collaboration with others, which impacted how the individual took control of their own behavior. Holland and her colleagues used Vygotsky’s process of semiotic mediation, to identify that how others assign meaning to a particular object or behavior and place the object in an environment may socially and culturally affect a person (cf. Wertsch, 1991). People do construct and reconstruct the meaning of mediating devices, but the meanings are usually derived from one’s past social interactions with others. Classroom teachers need to be aware of the mediating devices that are available in the their classroom and create dialogic spaces for students to discuss and explore their social and cultural knowledge as they make meaning.

Classroom literacy teachers who are committed to inclusion would want to consider using dramatic inquiry because it provides opportunities for teachers and students to collaborate to construct meaning that may support a students’ development of
agency. With dramatic inquiry, the classroom teacher can create a doubled world, the everyday classroom world and the imagined world for students to collaborate with others and engage in meaning making using mediated tools, such as language, objects, and concepts. According to Edmiston (2003), “One reason why doubled reality of drama is so significant is that the social and cultural meanings that we make in one space-time affect the meanings in the other” (p. 223). Edmiston terms the everyday classroom world as the IS and the imagined world as the IF. An example he provided was of two students imagining that they were working together in the IF world, while they were collaborating together in the IS world. I am going to extend the significance of experiences in the IF world with mediating devices to construct new understandings while in dialogue with other students and teachers as having the possibility to also impact a students agency in the IS world. Students may begin to look at themselves and others differently based on their experiences in the IF world that can be used to remake and make oneself based on this new understanding to provide a student with agency in the classroom community or IS.

Edmiston (2008, 2011) illustrated how adults, such as classroom literacy teachers, can support changes in a student’s identity, by using dramatic inquiry over an extended period of time. Edmiston described how a student’s agency could be impacted by how one is framed and positioned by others within dramatic events. Over time, students can be positioned with more authority in the fictionalized world as they share responsibilities in collaborative tasks that allow them draw on their social and cultural knowledge. He found that the shifts in positions for students in dramatic events, relationships with other
participants, and differing and similar perspectives, and endless possibilities could provide opportunities for students to begin to look at themselves and their fellow participants in a new way. I argue that as students use dramatic inquiry over time, they may begin to make and remake their identities as they are positioned with more power and with increased agency through social experiences with others.

**Power**

Power will be referred to in this paper as, “a field of relations that circulate in social networks rather than originating from some point of domination” (Lewis, Enciso, & Moje, 2007, p. 4). This version of power comes from the work of Lewis and her colleagues, based on Foucault, which had individuals constructing power based on their participation in their larger social systems, which led to the reproduction of this power. “Power is always a matter of both being positioned by proximal and distal social forces and responding to being positioned in unique and agentic ways” (Kamberelis & Dimitriadis, 2005, p. 47). Jones and Norris (2005) identify power as those that control the positioning, rather than those who are identified as having agency. Power can be seen in the context of this paper in a variety of ways, such as but not limited to the educational institutions, the classroom literacy teachers, the environments, and students with special rights and their general education peers, as they interact with each other within their social networks and reproduce their power systems within other communities. Power in literacy classrooms usually flows mostly to the teacher, while the students are positioned with little power. In dramatic inquiry classroom literacy teachers may negotiate the distribution or sharing of power amongst all participants in the community of inquiry.
The access of students with special rights to a community of learning (included in an inclusive classroom) as well as the methods and opportunities for participation facilitated by teachers are all issues of power. Lewis and Moje (2007) illustrate:

That critical sociocultural perspectives may be the only available tools for demonstrating how children’s opportunities to learn are both supported and constrained by the role of power in everyday interactions of students and teachers and by the systems and structures that shape the institution of schooling. (p. 16)

Lave and Wenger (1991) emphasized that access to the social practices in a community are central to learning. Lave and Wenger (1991) referred to one’s participation, or ability to be located socially in the world, as “peripheral participation”. They theorized that one’s peripheral participation also comes with larger power issues. As a person’s participation increases in a community they are given access to a position of greater power. On the other hand when one is not given larger opportunities to participate in a community their position of power decreases. These positions of empowerment and disempowerment can happen in multiple ways for students with special rights, and their general education peers, in education.

For example, a student with special rights can be disempowered by being denied access to learning in an inclusive classroom and opportunities to participate in learning communities with his or her peers based on qualities of difference, such as a disability label. Kliewer and Landis (1999) conducted an extensive participant observation and interviews with preschool and elementary school teachers, colleagues and students. Kliewer and Landis discovered that, “Individualization appeared to be driven by an institutional understanding of the reduced possibilities, or complete lack thereof, for the
children’s engagement with the printed word” (1999, p. 90). Within the classroom they observed that students with an IEP, each of whom is labeled with moderate to severe intellectual disabilities, was given access to the practice of an inclusive literacy preschool classroom but was either denied access to participate in literacy activities or “alienated” from the classroom literacy communities. In this literacy environment the classroom literacy teacher and other adults separated students based on a disability label and provided them with rudimentary literacy experiences, such as matching colors and shapes and coloring worksheets, that lacked spoken language, print language, and collaborative involvement with peers. Students without disabilities in the classroom were exposed to stories, books, language activities, and language groups to explore literacy. Classroom literacy teachers who are not committed to inclusion have the power to exclude students with disabilities from communities of practice with their peers that can shape one’s identity formation by providing them with experiences that position them as incompetent. The exclusion of students with disabilities from their nondisabled peers in the classroom can also inform their nondisabled peers in their identity formations about themselves and how they view their peers with disabilities. Classroom literacy teachers who are dedicated to inclusion have the power to create an environment that can empower all students in their identity formation. This is what Kliewer (2008a, 2008b) calls local understanding.

A student with special rights can also be empowered by gaining access to an inclusive classroom that provides the student with equal opportunities to participate in learning communities with his or her peers. Access to or control over identities, tools,
and resources in communities may be easier to come by for some participants in communities, which can support a participant’s ability to attain full participation and control of resources in a community (Lewis & Moje, 2007). Drama can be one way that classroom literacy teachers who believe in inclusion can support literacy learning and the education of students, by providing collaborative experiences for teachers and students to work together to make meaning (Edmiston, 2007). Students with special rights need to be given access to inclusive settings that provide opportunities for student participation with their peers, with and without disabilities, in a community of learning. When students with special rights are not only given access to inclusive classroom settings, but are also given access to shared meaning making opportunities and communities of inquiry with their peers this can lead to empowerment for the student and other members of the community.

Even though students, both students with special rights and general education students, are given access to inclusive classroom communities issues of power still persist. According to Lewis and Moje (2007):

If one accepts that learning is always situated within discourse communities or is about gaining access to communities, as well as that discourse communities struggle over access to resources and that people within discourse communities are not always viewed or treated equally, one must then acknowledge that learning is shaped by and mired in power relations. In addition, in a globalized, increasingly diverse world, people move across discourse communities, seeking to gain entrance, while existing members may be seeking to retain control over the community or to retain the community’s power and access to resources, vis-à-vis other competing communities. Thus, gaining access to a community’s discourses - learning across discourse communities - is also a power-imbued process. (p. 17)
The power relations that Lewis and Moje (2007) described for learning stretch beyond just access and communities of learning. Students with special rights may face issues of access to a particular school environment, general education classroom or self-contained classroom, as well as issues of access to the curriculum, tools, learning communities, and opportunities for learning within the classroom. The classroom literacy teacher plays a key role in creating learning experiences for a child with special rights, as well as their general education peers, in creating access to classroom learning experiences and a community that empowers all students. Edmiston (2014) identified that classroom teachers must be willing to modify tasks in the classroom in order to include all students where they are to enhance the learning experiences and communication of all participants. Some examples from Edmiston’s teaching that he used to include all students are having adults kneel in order to be at the height of the students, providing more movement opportunities for a student with ADHD, and providing an opportunity for a usually silent child to share his idea with the entire class.

A teacher can use informal assessments as inclusive tools during learning tasks to ensure that students are not excluding themselves based on the task (Edmiston, 2014). Edmiston also stressed the importance of inviting students to engage in ensemble activities and creating spaces that allow students to include each other. Edmiston (2011) shared an example from his observations in a high school classroom and discussions with the classroom literacy teacher. The teacher and Edmiston had observed a student, the only white student in the classroom, excluding himself from learning activities. The students and the teacher were discussing issues of racism from a text they were reading.
The teacher students dramatized the events that they had been shown in video. Two students stood up and took the roles of the cops and invited the student, who usually did not participate, to take the role of the person being beaten because he was the only white person. The student immediately joined the dramatic event and stated that he trusted the others students would not hurt him because they were acting. The teacher recognized that within this moment the student was included in this literacy event with his fellow classmates and his difference within the class was recognized by others. This is an example of how a classroom literacy teacher supported students in grappling with oppressive issues, like racism, by using dramatic inquiry to create collaborative events in which all students could participate thus supporting their inclusion.

Literacy teachers’ can use drama to share power and authority with students in the inclusive classroom. The classroom is a community of practice in which students may share their identities and their social and cultural pasts in social activities as they create discourse in which the students frame events (Edmiston, 2003; Wenger, 1998). Frames are developed in imagined activities in the imagined, fictional world of drama, alongside the activities of the real world in the classroom, that students can use to develop their own understandings about events in their lives within school and outside of school (Edmiston, 2003). Edmiston identified how students can be framed with power in an imagined world. For example, students-in-role as astronauts, developed agency when the students were positioned as competent team-players. He also identified that teachers can use drama to support a classroom community in which young people may appreciate each other’s authority. The way a classroom teacher positions students as well as how
students position each other affects how power can be used. A teacher may provide students with more access to the tools of learning or may exclude students from these learning tools.

**Positioning.**

Once students with special rights are given access to inclusive classroom communities, power is still evident in how teachers design learning opportunities. Issues of power are evident when considering the evidence of a student’s access to resources within the classroom as well as their opportunities to participate with others. Holland and her colleagues (1998) discuss issues of power and privilege in cultural worlds in terms of positional identities. They define positional identities as, “a person’s apprehension of her social position in a lived world: that is, depending on others present, of her greater or lesser access to spaces, activities, genres, and, through those genres, authoritative voices, or any voice at all” (Holland et al., 1998, p. 127-128). Edmiston (2014) used a Bakhtinian approach to positioning theory, by identifying the ways that teachers or students provide others with access to dialogue within the classroom. Participants can accept how they are positioned in dialogic interactions to make meaning, or their meaning making can be diminished through monologic positioning, for example when a person contests how they have been positioned or is unable to negotiate a new position (Edmiston, 2014). “Positioning determines whose power and whose authority dominates, is silenced, or gets shared in a group” (Edmiston, 2003, p. 226). When classroom literacy teachers can position students dialogically they address and answer students in the inclusive classroom to support meaning making and empower all students.
Classroom literacy teachers who are committed to inclusion would want to continue using dramatic inquiry, because it provides a framework where all students can be positioned as meaning makers, thus supporting empowering experiences for all students. Gearing and colleague’s (1979) work emphasized that even when people are given access to the same learning community, learning can be unevenly distributed amongst participants. Students with special rights and their general education peers need to be given more than access to collaborative learning communities, but they also need to be positioned as capable in order to support their knowledge construction. Students can position themselves with more power and authority in the imagined, fictional spaces than in the real world (Edmiston, 2003, 2007). Teachers can provide opportunities to position students as more competent, by playing alongside them and fostering the creation of a community where students are able to share ideas and are seen as knowledgeable participants (Edmiston, 2007).

Classroom literacy teachers who are committed to inclusion can use the fictional world in dramatic inquiry to inquire into issues of power. Edmiston (2014) stressed that teachers can mediate dialogic positioning of students in their everyday world with opportunities to discuss and interpret monologic positioning, in the fictional world. According to Edmiston (In press):

In the dramatic inquiry focused on *The Tempest*, in addition to consistently acting from subject positions as dialogic inquirers, the young people could choose to take up multiple fictional subject positions ranging from dialogic sailors to monologic monarchs. Each fictional positioning opened up alternative ways to take action in relation to others, and thus additional dimensions to creating understanding both about events in the lives of fictional characters and how that understanding might relate to their own everyday lives. (p. 13)
Classroom literacy teachers can use inquiry that involves students collaborating in the fictional world of text to discuss difficult topics. Within the fictional world when students imagine they are acting as characters in a story they can take up different positions. Within the fictional world students may begin to grapple with positions that are different from positions in their everyday lives. As they grapple with these differing viewpoints they may socially construct new understanding. Edmiston (2003) wrote, “We can begin to use drama when we start to create, experience, and interpret an imaginary world in addition to the everyday world of the classroom” (p. 222). For Edmiston, drama provides the opportunity for students and teachers to create an imagined world with their social and cultural imaginations alongside their everyday world. This meaning making in the imagined world can also extend to conversations, with other participants or internally, about how the positioning of others through dialogue impacts power dynamics within the classroom and students changing identities. This may also impact how students position themselves and others in the future based on their social and cultural experiences in the imagined world and in their everyday lives.

Literacy teachers using dramatic inquiry may include or exclude students within dramatic experiences in terms of their access to mediating tools that support collaborative learning. Drama can be used to disempower students when teachers choose to control the actions of students and use tools and signs as ways to reinforce negative labels and position students as incapable participants (Edmiston, 2007). On the other hand, dramatic inquiry can also open up new possibilities for meaning making when students are positioned with opportunities to collaborate with their peers and adults through
dialogue with access to tools not available usually in everyday life. Teachers can socially position students as included in the learning community, and thus students may have access to positions of power; teachers may disempower others who have a lack of access to tools to construct new knowledge.

Edmiston’s (2007) examples of students with visual impairments in a self-contained second-grade classroom that used drama to engage in literacy learning are worth analyzing. The classroom teacher used drama as a way to make his classroom more inclusive for literacy learning. Edmiston observed the students in-role as astronauts and as Martians in the fictional, dramatic world of Mars looking for spiders and exploring the terrain. Students had access to various mediating tools, such as a surface view of the planet and three-dimensional map of Mars that the students created. The fictional world of Mars and the playful dramatic situations that the students participated in with their teacher and other adults provided opportunities for collaboration and literacy learning. Edmiston theorized that the students’ interactions with each other when using tools such as clay maps (objects), Braille, English, sounds in the classroom (languages), and gestures (movements) all provided opportunities for the students to extend their meaning making. He connected this to Vygotsky’s ZPD and the students’ ability to act beyond their actual level of development in a potential level of development as they cooperated with more capable peers and the adults in the classroom. The students concluded collaborative writing, in English and Braille over a 3 day period, with a 20-page paper documenting their mission to Mars as astronauts.
The classroom teacher in Edmiston’s (2007) example positioned students as capable learners; students and the other adults positioned them as capable as well, and the students were able to negotiate positions of power as astronauts for example giving a speech to the president. In this example, the classroom literacy teacher believed in inclusion in his classroom and he used drama in his teaching to support collaborative meaning-making with students and adults to extend the students understanding beyond what they could have done as individual learners. The teacher was shaping the students system of power within the cultural context of the classroom, so that the students’ were framed as capable literacy learners.

**Inclusion**

When students with special rights are included in an educational setting along a continuum of educational placements, co-constructing meaning dialogically in a community becomes possible for all students. Dramatic inquiry can provide collaborative learning experiences in the real and imagined world, that provide students with opportunities to step into positions of authority and thus begin to identify what they as individuals might do to construct knowledge in ways they are unable to in everyday life. Students and teachers can learn to negotiate power together, so that power no longer remains solely or primarily with the teacher. Dramatic inquiry provides teachers and students with a chance to share in knowledge construction and to support the positioning of every participant as capable and empowered members of the classroom community. As educators, we have an obligation to provide opportunities to engage all students in learning that provide access to inclusive communities of practice and tools and signs to
mediate learning. The identities that students create for themselves through social and cultural practices as capable and knowledgeable can extend into their everyday lives as they build a community of inquiry in the classroom. One challenge as researchers is how we might explore how that dramatic inquiry can be used by literacy teachers and students to support the inclusion of all learners.

**Summary of Chapter**

The challenges to defining inclusive practices have been documented extensively throughout historical, “classical”, research and continue today. Inclusion educational research detailed the segregation and labeling of students with special rights during the 1800s and into the 1930s (Osgood, 2005). Deno (1970) and Dunn (1968) made influential arguments for moving students with special rights into general education classrooms. Historical case law became influential in impacting the inclusion of students with special rights in public education programs. Legal mandated shifts in inclusive education mandated that handicapped children, 3-21 years old, had the right to have their unique needs met in their LRE, that the rights of children with disabilities and their parents are protected, provided assistance to states and localities, and required assessment and assurances of the effectiveness of programs to educate students with disabilities (Conroy, Yell, Katsiyannis, & Collins, 2010; Mead & Paige, 2008; U.S. Department of Education, 2010, Wang, 1981). During the mainstreaming movement and the inclusion movement scholars called for changes to practices of the time in order to better meet the needs of students with special rights (Fuchs & Fuchs, 1994; Kauffman, 1993; Reynolds, Wang, and Walberg, 1987; Stainback & Stainback, 1984; Wang, 1981; Will, 1986).
Legislation, such as NCLB (2001) and IDEA (2004), support change to the relationship of special education and general education, which now share responsibility for addressing the needs of all students, including those with special rights (McLeskey, 2007). There became a placement issue over whether a special education or general education classroom was most effective for students with special rights academically and socially (Carlberg & Kavale, 1980). Teacher’s perceptions of mainstreaming and inclusion were documented to identify their perceptions for including students with special rights in their classrooms (Scruggs & Mastropieri, 1996; Shotel, Iano, & McGettigan’s, 1972). Law determines the placement of students with special rights in special education or general education classes.

For my definition of inclusion I focused on the placement of a student with special rights in his or her LRE on a continuum of educational placements, which in some cases may be considered the most restrictive environment, as opposed to solely focusing on placements in the general education classroom, which is common throughout literature. The shift in focus for my definition of inclusion puts more emphasis on a child with special rights co-constructing meaning within a dialogic community of people. My definition was based on a sociocultural theoretical perspective that emphasized individuals in a community of practice working together in joint endeavors to make meaning (Wenger, 1998).

Theoretical frameworks such as, sociocultural theory, positioning theory, and grounded theory were explained. A sociocultural theoretical framework was used to explain the connections amongst learning, society, and language (Vygotsky, 1972, 1978).
Positioning theory (Harre´ & Langenhove, 1999) provided a framework to examine how teachers and students position themselves and others over time and how this impacts inclusion. Grounded theory was described as a way that collaborative inquirers could analyze data as the researcher continues to collect data by coding what is happening in the events recorded to further define emerging ideas and fill in areas that need more clarification (Charmaz, 2006).

From a sociocultural theoretical framework, in dramatic inquiry activities students and teachers work collaboratively using tools and symbols that mediate their developing understanding of the world; as they participate with others they develop their literacy practices. Heathcote’s (Heathcote & Bolton, 2005) “mantle of the expert” approach is a way that classroom teachers can use dramatic inquiry with students taking on the roles of experts as they collaborate in a joint enterprise to solve a problem for a fictional client. In dramatic inquiry issues of identity, agency, and power in knowledge production may be more visible and thus teachers may better understand the social and cultural practices in inclusive settings. Positioning by the teacher and students through dramatic inquiry can be used to include or exclude students, including those with special rights. Inclusion is possible when students with special rights are included in an educational setting along a continuum of educational placements and are positioned as capable members who are provided opportunities to co-construct meaning with a dialogic community of people.
Chapter 3: Cary Saxton

“It’s not about progress over time. It’s about moments that work.”

Cary Saxton

**Introduction**

I met Cary Saxton during a graduate course on Drama and Literacy taught by Brian Edmiston. Cary was an English teacher who taught middle school and high school students at a Midwestern School for the Blind. She shared about how she had students at various levels academically and socially and she was struggling with engaging them with the content as well as with each other in the classroom. When we first met, her teaching was more individualized instruction that focused on students’ individual needs and did not focus much on collaborative work. She began to identify that she would like to use dramatic inquiry as a way to teach her students English as opposed to what she had done in the past: reading an entire book or story and then answering questions about the text.

This study took place the following school year, while Cary was taking her second class on dramatic inquiry that incorporated using dramatic approaches across the curriculum. I was also a member of this class, so that I could participate in classroom discussions with both her and with the other teacher participant, Stephanie Barrows. Her
teaching will be analyzed in chapter four. The university classroom setting provided a space where the teacher participants could share their experiences with other graduate students, some of whom were also classroom teachers. In addition, the teacher participants made weekly posts to an online blog where during the week they could further discuss success stories, challenges, and areas of interest with their graduate school classmates.

Ethnography provided a methodology to observe and collect data on teacher and students identity making over time through the use of dramatic inquiry in an inclusive classroom. I used critical ethnography to gather and then present my observations and other classroom data collected with the intention to dialogue about possible changes in teaching. This allowed me as a researcher to address issues of power within my relationships with the teacher participants. Also, these discussions provided opportunities for the teacher participants to share their own analysis of their teaching to document their change over time. According to Carspecken and Walford (2001), “Qualitative research must make every effort to invite the people studied into conversations about the descriptions and analyzes to be produced” (p. 9). This research was truly collaborative inquiry with myself as the researcher working alongside Cary and Stephanie each step of the way. By involving the teacher participants in conversations about data analysis I intended to equalize the power relationships between the teacher participants and myself, while also using the teachers knowledge to mediate my own experiences and knowledge about their situations.

According to Heath and Street (2008):
An additional use that often draws ethnographers’ attention is the matter of how groups change over time without recognizing that they do so…the dynamism of cultural lives comes, more often than not, primarily through nearly imperceptible shifts in actions, collective memories and signs and systems of symbols. (p. 15)

Through the use of dramatic inquiry over time Cary began to shift in her perceptions of herself as a teacher and the types of methodologies and activities that she used to support literacy learning and inclusive practices. The students also began to construct new identities for themselves and through the use of dramatic inquiry in the fictional spaces and the real world spaces of the classroom, which also informed the teacher’s change over time.

**Purpose**

The purpose of this collaborative inquiry was to examine Cary’s awareness of her changing pedagogy and how her positioning of students over time with dramatic inquiry affected the inclusion of her students. Cary and I both had inquiry questions that guided the data collection and analysis. My inquiry question was: “How is the inclusion of students in collaborative activities affected by the classroom teacher’s changing practices in response to her awareness of how teacher and students are positioning one another?” Cary’s initial inquiry question was this: “How do I make my classroom more dialogic?” Cary’s final inquiry question, which was outlined after the end of the school year during the data analysis process was: “What can I do to make this group more of a dialogic classroom: a community of inquiry where everyone is included and their ideas can make a difference to the meaning we make as we dialogue?” Within her inquiry question I identified some key words and phrases that would help me when identifying key
moments from classroom observations and interviews to share with Cary for data analysis and as the case developed. The key words or phrases that guided me were: dialogic classroom, community of inquiry, everyone is included, and dialogue.

I used these key words and phrases to identify moments in the classroom observation video data when all students were being included, as well as when a student or students were being excluded. I also was looking for students in dialogue with each other as well as with the teacher. With regards to a community of inquiry I was looking for students collaborating on a joint endeavor to solve a problem. Cary’s interest in dialogue informed Cary’s teaching and how she set up tasks in her classroom. The theory and inquiry were interconnected and provided Cary and me with a way to dialogue about what we saw and did not see with the intent of Cary developing her pedagogy.

**Methodology**

**Setting**

**School Setting.**

The setting for data collection and dramatic inquiry instruction described in chapter three was a public residential state school for the blind in the Midwestern United States. Students at this school can receive their entire education, Kindergarten through 12th grade at this school. This school setting is an example of level 5 along the continuum of educational placements, mentioned in chapter 1. Students receive more specialized support from teachers and support staff to meet the individualized needs of each student. Students are pulled from classes to receive their support aids and services, such as orientation and mobility and speech. Students are enrolled in academic content
courses that incorporate the general education curriculum and Common Core State Standards. The main building on campus includes classrooms, a gymnasium, cafeteria, auditorium, and library. There is also a separate building that contains an indoor swimming pool.

The number of students enrolled during the 2011-2012 academic school year was 126 students (School for the Blind, 2012). Of those 126 students 56% were male and 44% were female (School for the Blind, 2012). Class sizes tended to be less than ten students due to the enrollment of students at that grade level with visual impairments. Students represented urban, suburban, and rural backgrounds. The demographics for students by race in 2011-2012 was 72 percent White, 20 percent Black, 5 percent Asian, 2 percent Hispanic, and 1 percent Multi-Racial. Visual impairments is identified as a low incidence disability. Students with low incidence disabilities make up less than 1% of the U.S. school population (Ludlow, Conner, & Schechter, 2005; U.S. Department of Education, 2002). The primary disabilities of students enrolled in 2011-2012 was 67 percent visual impairment, 28 percent multi handicapped, 2 percent traumatic brain injury, 2 percent Deaf-blind, and 1 percent hearing impaired (School for the Blind, 2012).

Some of the students lived on campus during the week and would go home on the weekends. Thirty three percent of the students that attended the school during the 2011-2012 school year were identified as residential students that lived on campus (School for the Blind, 2012). A bus would come and take the students to school on Monday and return them to their homes on Friday. This at times impacted the class size, because if a student had a doctor’s appointment or there was inclement weather on a Monday the
student would often miss an entire week of school. Other students commuted from home to school daily.

**Classroom Setting.**

The English classroom was located on the second floor of the school. Upon entering the classroom some students stopped and placed their canes into a round receptacle located to the left of the door. Some students had collapsible canes that they kept underneath their chair. On the left hand side of the classroom were cabinets. The back wall had a row of bookshelves that shelved books and other tactile objects, such as blankets, hair, etc., that the teacher stored for lessons. To the right of the bookshelves was a wall of windows. In front of the windows was a row of student computers. On the right hand wall, when entering the classroom was a chalkboard. The teacher’s desk was located next to the chalkboard in the corner by the windows. In the center of the classroom were chairs that were placed in a circle. Desks were arranged in two rows on the outside of the circle in front of the wall with the computers and in front of the wall with the cabinets.

**Participants**

**Students.**

I began working with Cary in her 12th grade English class during the 2013-2014 academic year. Her 12th grade class consisted of six students, all of them white. Five of the students were seniors and one of the students was in 11th grade. Like her other classes, there was a mixture of Braille readers and writers and print readers and writers. All students had a visual impairment that ranged from low vision to total blindness, and
some students had multiple disabilities. Also, since the class was a high school class many of these students had been together in classes for over ten years while attending the same school.

Some of her students were pulled out of class for other services as identified on his or her IEP, which would often take them away from learning in their English classroom and class size could be reduced to less than six students. This is something to note, because it became challenging at times to continue on with a unit of study, due to three or more students missing multiple days of class and time would then be spent catching them up on what had been done previously. At times positive momentum in the classroom in terms of an area of study or student collaboration would be halted in order to explain what had happened to those that were absent.

**Rachel.**

Rachel was a female student who positioned herself as soft spoken in the classroom at the start of the year. Cary’s governing gaze at the start of the school year when focused on Rachel (whom she had taught the previous year) was seeking ways to give her more authority in the classroom by getting her to participate more. Cary’s initial assumption was that Rachel was not capable of completing tasks independently, because she would repeatedly ask Cary for assistance. My role as collaborative inquirer became to focus on Rachel during classroom interactions. As I viewed data, my governing gaze became focused on Rachel’s interactions with others in the classroom and how she participated or did not participate. Cary’s assumptions were that Rachel was shy, quiet, and someone who preferred to work alone. Also, Cary identified that Rachel was very
literal and tended to go by what was written in a text. Cary began to notice that Rachel’s fellow classmates had begun to view her and treat her differently. According to Cary (2014):

Her classmates were initially just as frustrated as I, pushing back against her steady stream of lies, trying to reason with her. But at some point, these attempts were proven fruitless, and there was a drastic shift in the way they perceived Rachel. Instead of arguing with her about her capabilities, exasperatedly citing instances when Rachel did research online, or could handwrite, they soon began to buy into her helplessness. Frankly, they were tired of fighting. They were done trying to boost an ego that clearly could not be boosted. (Saxton, p. 4)

Cary assumed that Rachel’s fellow classmates were getting fed up trying to get Rachel to work with them, because she always claimed she could not do the task. Cary also found herself at a crossroads where she did not know what to do to include Rachel more and provide her with more agency in the classroom. Cary’s gaze was governed by how she saw Rachel at the start of the school year.

I would spend all class period teaching her to do something she already knew how to do. She was adamant, tearful, and obstinate in defense of her ineptitude. Then she would linger after class, slink over to my desk and confess her sins with a smile. I felt incompetent where Rachel was concerned. Nothing I’d tried had succeeded. Whereas before I had been an energetic, passionate advocate for Rachel’s potential, I felt myself letting those aspirations slip away. (Saxton, 2014, p. 4)

Cary was referring to an instance in class where Rachel had asked her to help her find the meaning of a word. Cary asked her to use her Braille notetaker, which Rachel responded she did not know how to use. Then, Cary suggested she ask a fellow classmate, Yared, to help her look on the computer. Rachel responded that Yared would not help her and that she did not know how to use the software on the computer. Cary
then took Rachel down to the library after class and used additional resources, such as a Braille encyclopedia, to find the meaning of words to help her with her assignment. Later, Rachel told Cary that she actually did know how to use the thesaurus on her Braille notetaker, the computer, and the resources and in the library. This was just one of many similar examples of times where Rachel pretended not to know how to do something, and Cary would respond by spending additional one-on-one time with Rachel to help her solve her problem. Cary was starting to wonder (that I coded as an emerging assumption) if the other students in the class were also becoming frustrated with Rachel and not wanting to work with her or acknowledge what she was saying, because they knew she was competent and could actually do much more than she claimed.

**Teacher Profile: Cary Saxton.**

At the start of this collaborative inquiry, Cary was beginning her sixth year of teaching and her second year of teaching English in grades 7-12 at a Midwestern residential School for the Blind. Cary’s English teaching methodology had previously consisted of teaching and reading an entire text that was then followed by a group discussion, students answering her questions about the text, and often an essay. “What I was calling dialogue was more like the forced answering of questions aloud” (Saxton, 2014, p. 7). Cary was using monologic positioning of her students to answer questions. Cary felt pressure to assign a conventional research paper like other teachers in her school. Her students completed many of these activities individually with little student choice included in the teaching and learning activities. Cary did not focus on community building, because her assumption was that they already knew each other since they had
been together for most of their education experience. Cary also identified that she herself liked competition, so she would make up activities that put the students in teams and had them compete against each other. The culture in her school was not one of sharing best practices amongst teachers, but rather most teachers kept to themselves with their classrooms becoming somewhat of an island that was separate from the rest of the school.

*Cary’s initial inquiry paradigm prior to teaching with dramatic inquiry.*

Cary’s transformation using dramatic inquiry during her participation in the collaborative inquiry will be examined using an adaptation of Emig’s (1983) inquiry paradigm. The following four characteristics will be used throughout this chapter: governing gaze, theoretical framework, assumptions, and actions, to detail Cary’s changing understanding of her own teaching pedagogy. It is important to note that this is a new way to examine teacher change over time and it is the first time that it has been done so with teacher participants during collaborative inquiry.

Cary had previously taught some lessons using dramatic inquiry prior to beginning the collaborative inquiry with me. She began implementing more dramatic inquiry activities at the start of the school year, which was still somewhat of a new experience for her students. As previously mentioned, Cary’s assumption was that most of her students did not experience teaching and learning activities where they were out of their seats, stepping into dramatic worlds, and collaborating together on a shared problem. According to Cary:

They’re [the students] not ever given opportunities to work together. It’s a very individualized school. And so, this might be their first taste of what we might even call inclusion…It’s [inclusion] like a foreign concept to them…they’re a
group of kids in the 12th grade that have been together for like ten years in the same class everyday. (C. Saxton, personal communication, August, 22, 2014)

Cary’s initial inquiry paradigm with her first attempt with dramatic inquiry was based off her initial governing gaze, which was focused on how she could be a more strategic and tactical teacher of these young people. Cary was taking her second dramatic inquiry course at the university and she was in dialogue with her instructor and fellow inquirer, Brian Edmiston, and myself as she was implementing dramatic inquiry in her classroom. Her assumption was that if she was “more flexible, spontaneous and purposeful as a facilitator” of her students learning with dramatic inquiry in the classroom she would be able to follow “wherever our (my students’ and my) dialogic trajectory might lead us” (Saxton, 2013, p. 1). After this initial attempt with dramatic inquiry Cary was aware that she needed to make a change. Cary wrote, “My issue in setting goals for both myself and my students is that I don’t yet have a clear grasp on the big picture” (Saxton, 2013, p. 1).

Cary’s governing gaze was focused on being more strategic and tactical, so that she could follow her student’s interests and conversations in the moment, but she was losing sight of the larger inquiry. Her assumption was that if she was strategic and tactical with dramatic inquiry she and her students would be successful. However, she had forgotten to create an inquiry that her students cared about and that could sustain her and her students over time. At this point in the year, September of 2013, Cary was also still having her students read entire texts. In an early hotseat activity with dramatic inquiry, Cary-in-role-as-John-Kerry told her students what actually happened in the real
world in regards to their inquiry question. Cary’s assumption was that because her students were interested in the inquiry they would want to know what actually happened. However she realized that was not the case. “By telling them what actually happened, I had basically shut down their need to work together to solve the problem” (Saxton, 2013, p. 7).

Cary was aware that she needed to focus on the big picture when designing an inquiry unit that could sustain her students over time and some of the steps in between before she could be, and understand how to be, more strategic and tactical. Cary writes (2013):

I know the two (tactical and strategic) are supposed to coexist in the teacher’s brain (one foot in the muck, one foot in the air), but I think for me they are still at odds. When I teach tactically, I tend to forget the big picture. (Saxton, p. 7)

Cary was making a shift in her governing gaze to focus on the big picture in terms of her actions as a teacher when she designed a collaborative dramatic inquiry unit that included the academic and social needs of her students. Cary’s theoretical framework was now beginning to change to include her student’s interests to guide inquiry. Her assumption being that by designing instruction with dramatic inquiry based on her students’ interests she would position them to be more dialogic and support collaborative meaning making. Cary (2013) states:

As I continue on in my efforts with dramatic inquiry, I will work toward marrying tactical and strategic teaching. I will work on creating a given curriculum that best suits my students’ social and academic needs (and does not kill me in the process). Lastly, I will continue to pay attention to the emergent
curriculum as it materializes from the dialogue we create collaboratively, and try to follow it as strategically as possible. (Saxton, p. 8)

*Cary’s initial inquiry paradigm about dialogue and community.*

According to Cary (2014):

Earlier in my teaching career...I used to think that an effective way to engage students in dialogue was to ask a question, and pause and wait for them to begin discussion. I also thought that the one-or-two-sided discussions that would emerge from situations like that were perfectly fine. Students like Rachel who didn't talk weren't talking because they either didn't want to, or they had nothing to say. I know now that it is not that simple. Similarly, my idea of building a classroom community involved icebreakers and introductory writing assignments for a few weeks, and then frankly, nothing. If a particular group of students didn't gel, I just chalked it up to irreconcilable differences. (Saxton, p. 6)

Cary’s theoretical framework prior to using dramatic inquiry did not entail dialogically positioning students to participate in polyphonic conversations. Her assumption was that students spoke when they wanted to or had something to say. In addition, her theoretical framework was not based on creating a community of practice where students learned through collaborating together on a joint endeavor to support the inclusion of all students.

**Data Collection**

The primary sources of data collection for this study of dramatic inquiry in inclusive education settings were classroom observations, interviews, and archival data. “Most scholars agree that qualitative research involves three basic kinds of data: observational data, interview data, and archival data” (Kamberelis & Dimitriadis, 2005). For the documentation of the classroom observations and semi-structured interviews I used fieldnotes, video data, audio data, photographs and screen shots, and teacher
selected classroom work. Archival data consisted of information provided by the teacher of her previous experiences teaching with the same group of students and information about the school setting and community that the classroom was located.

**Observation**

I was interested in teacher transformation through the use of dramatic inquiry with students with special rights in general education and self-contained classrooms. Stake (1995) identified that researchers need to make observations in locations that are relevant to their issues. Observations in this inclusive classroom provided me as a researcher with greater understanding of Cary’s use of dramatic inquiry with students with special rights. Also, her classroom allowed me to include research that involved an example of an educational setting along a continuum of educational placements so that I could analyze how she used dramatic inquiry to support the inclusion of all students. The observations were used to analyze the teachers’ transformation over time through the use of dramatic inquiry.

I began observing about once a week and then increased to daily observations during Cary’s dramatic inquiry unit on Edgar Allan Poe’s *The Murders in the Rue Morgue*. After *The Murders in the Rue Morgue* dramatic inquiry unit, Cary began recording some of her own teaching and conversations with her students, so that she could continue to reflect on the teaching and learning in her classroom. Cary went on maternity leave about two months after completion of *The Murders in the Rue Morgue* unit, so there were a few months at the end of the school year that the students were not engaged in teaching and learning activities using dramatic inquiry. No classroom
observations were made during this time. However, I did interviews with Cary after her maternity leave and she interviewed her students one more time before the end of the school year.

I kept a record of events in the classroom that detailed the interactions that I observed, such as the situation, problem, story, etc. and used this information later during the analysis stage (Stake, 1995). Jones and Somekh (2005) wrote, “Observation is one of the most important methods of data collection. It entails being present in a situation and making a record of one’s impressions of what takes place” (p. 138). While video recording classroom instruction, I also observed and took fieldnotes of Cary and the student interactions in the classroom. Social events of people acting and reacting to each other provide meaning and significance about what they are doing and how they are doing it together (Bloome et al., 2008). Dramatic inquiry is based on co-constructing meaning with other people, so I observed how the teacher and students co-constructed meaning together in fictional spaces and in real world spaces in the classroom through dramatic inquiry. I observed the social events in the classroom for meaning, action, and significance through the actions and dialogue of the teacher and students. I paid close attention to how the teacher and students interacted with one another and how they negotiated power within the classroom. Also, I paid attention to how the teacher and students positioned themselves and one another within the classroom through dramatic inquiry in fictional spaces and in real world spaces within the classroom. Cary moved the following school year, so there was no longer an opportunity to continue the collaborative inquiry with her in the classroom.
**Fieldnotes**

I took fieldnotes during observations in Cary’s class throughout the school year, as well as during the semi-structured interviews. Dyson and Genishi (2005) write the following about fieldnotes, “Ultimately they help to give an audience of readers a mostly verbal depiction of the site-an ethnographic sense of being in the world we call our case” (p. 63). They recommended that fieldnotes be descriptive and capture essential elements of the case study, such as time, space, participants, and the activity. Heath and Street (2008) proposed that fieldnotes contain a summary of events that happen, changes in classroom actions or in language and modes, as well as short phrases by participants that can be used to coordinate fieldnotes with video and audio recordings of events. My fieldnotes were used to record my observations in Cary’s classroom and semi-structured interviews, with an emphasis on recording notes that described the time, spaces, participants, and the activity. Also, I included short phrases with a summary of interactions to align my notes with transcriptions from video and audio recordings. In addition, I made notations of specific events in the classroom that allowed me to address any noticeable patterns or theories about events on a specific day or time period (Heath & Street, 2008).

Dyson and Genishi (2005) suggested that researchers use Bogdan and Biklen’s (2003) two categories (when organizing fieldnotes), descriptive, which have a great amount of detail of the cases, and reflective, which contain observer comments. I wrote notes in a two-columned chart on my computer. Heath and Street (2008) suggested that ethnographic researchers record fieldnotes in columns, one for straight data and the other
for researcher reflections, which are downloaded after each field visit. On the left hand side column of my fieldnotes were descriptive notes about what I observed that contained my accounts of what was going on in the case for that given day and time. On the right hand side column were my reflective notes with observer comments. As I began transcribing observations I began adding my descriptive and observational notes to the left hand side of the transcripts. At times I wrote my fieldnotes in a notebook that I later transferred into electronic form. All fieldnotes were labeled by teacher and date and saved electronically on an external hard drive in the corresponding file folder on the same day, following each field visit.

**Semi-Structured Interviews**

I recorded semi-structured interviews with video recording and/or audio recording. Interviews provide information about how others perceive and interpret observations and provide the researcher with a way to collect data on multiple views of the case (Stake, 1995). I video recorded or audio record these semi-structured interviews when reviewing data, so that I had data to support Cary’s view points and perspectives during the data analysis process. In addition, Cary conducted and recorded student interviews at the end of *The Murders in the Rue Morgue* unit to record the student’s opinions about using dramatic inquiry. Cary also returned to her classroom and conducted exit interviews with her students that examined the students change over time in relation to the use of dramatic inquiry for literacy learning and their own identity, agency, and power within the classroom.
I conducted semi-structured interviews prior to observations to support Cary in planning for future dramatic inquiry lessons. Post semi-structured interviews followed classroom observations with the teacher to analyze teaching and learning in the classroom. I conducted additional semi-structured interviews with Cary over the summer following the 2013-2014 academic year to continue to analyze data and answer further questions as cases began to emerge during the analysis stage.

Archival Data

Cary used archival data during semi-structured interviews and data analysis. Archival data consisted of the school’s demographics, Cary’s written work, and Cary’s prior knowledge about the school, her students, and her own teaching. I used archival data about the school’s demographics to describe the school setting. Cary also shared her written work for her class at the university on drama and literacy, which became useful during the data analysis stage as a point of reference as the case developed. Cary had taught the same group of students the previous academic year, so she had already formed relationships with these students. Cary used her previous experiences as a point of reference to examine student change over time as well as her own teaching practices and pedagogy. The information was helpful when looking at Cary’s theoretical framework, governing gaze, assumptions, theoretical framework, and actions prior to teaching with dramatic inquiry.

Video Data

I used video data to collect data from observations and semi-structured interviews with Cary. I used video recording as my main tool for data collection because it provided
a visual image to accompany the spoken language that was recorded in observations and
semi-structured interviews. Video data extended the focus beyond just spoken language
to include other communicative modes and provide context for interactions (Norris,
2004). Video recording was a useful data collection tool to analyze the different
communicative modes teachers and students embodied through dramatic inquiry in
fictional and real world spaces in the classroom. Stake (1995) suggested using segments
of video recordings to supplement instruction and oral presentations for qualitative
research. I was interested in looking at the different communicative modes that Cary and
her students enacted over time to identify shifts in modes that signaled a shift in a teacher
or student’s identity, agency, and/or power which was best captured through real time
video recordings of interactions.

For the organization of video recordings I transferred video data each day from
the camera to the external hard drive on my computer. I ensured that the external hard
drive was password protected to ensure that the data is secure. According to Norris
(2004) video data needs to be organized on a computer to accommodate qualitative
analysis that is necessary for multimodal interactional analysis. I catalogued the videos
in files on the external hard drive. The initial folder was labeled with the classroom
teacher’s name. The folders within the classroom teachers name were labeled by month
and within each folder was another folder with the day of the recording. Within each file
labeled for the day of a recording, I stored the video recording of the observation and
interviews, photographs, fieldnotes, and data log. Each of the items listed previously
contained the date and the heading indicating the information contained within the file.
This was done daily in order to stay on top of the data that I was recording from the field site.

**Audio Data**

Audio data was another tool that I used to record interviews and classroom observations. Equipment consisted of a hand held audio recorder, with built-in microphone. Audio recording is another way that researchers can record the exact words used by participants (Stake, 1995). Dyson and Genishi (2005) note that audio recordings provide the researcher with recorded information from the case site that they can go back to after the observation. I used audio recording mostly during semi-structured interviews when the need for visual recordings of the participants was not necessary for data analysis. In instances when audio recordings were used, I made sure to take detailed fieldnotes to describe any visual images that may have been pertinent to the semi-structured interview. I made sure to include member checks with Cary about the information recorded and my short hand notes of interactions (Stake, 1995). Audio recordings were uploaded daily upon use in the field onto my external hard drive and stored according to field site and date of recording.

**Photographs and Screen Shots**

Photographs were used to document still images of observations in the classroom. Detailed fieldnotes and/or classroom transcripts were typed to accompany the description of the image. Photographs were uploaded daily and stored within a file on an external hard drive based on the site and date the photographs were taken. A separate folder was kept in the daily files for still image photographs. Screen shots, still image photographs
Data Validity

I utilized member checking throughout the inquiry with both teacher participants. Member checking is a method in which the researcher shares transcripts from interviews and observations, thoughts, and drafts of writing from the research to check with participants to see if their ideas are represented according to their own perceptions (Stake, 1995). This is done to support trustworthiness or validity of the research measures used (Creswell, 1998; Glesne, 2011). Member checking was expanded during this study, because it was designed to be collaborative inquiry. Collaborative inquiry was used during the analysis of data through semi-structured interviews with the teacher participants to create a more collaborative approach with the teacher participants and the researcher.

This collaborative inquiry process positioned the teacher participants with an equal voice alongside the researcher. Gordon (2008) argued that collaborative action research can take place at any level amongst those involved in education. Gordon’s view of collaborative action research was influenced by how Sagor and Calhoun define action research. Sagor (2000) defines action research as “a disciplined process of inquiry conducted by and for those taking the action” (p. 4). Calhoun (2002) defines action research as “continued disciplined inquiry conducted to inform and improve our practice as educators” (p. 18). The collaborative inquiry, what Sagor, and Calhoun describe as action research, described in this chapter and in chapter four combined elements of both
definitions. The collaborative inquiry was conducted alongside those taking the action, the teachers, to inform and improve not only their practice, but also the practice of other educators.

During semi-structured interviews I at times suggested possible changes in the classroom, such as teaching ideas, and gained insight into Cary’s perceptions of meaning from the data. This sharing of ideas was established in the beginning stages of the research process. Planning of future lesson plans based on discussions of previous lessons became a common practice. I also utilized member checking during the writing stage of the dissertation. I shared chapters with Cary and she would provide feedback to ensure that her voice was represented appropriately and accurately.

I instituted validity measures with both teacher participants to support our collaborative inquiry. Using Reason and Rowan (1981) and Guba and Lincoln’s (1981) techniques, Lather (1986) suggested the following validity approaches for a more collaborative approach to critical inquiry: triangulation, construct validity/reflexivity, face validity, and catalytic validity. Triangulation was used to support data trustworthiness by incorporating multiple data sources, such as video and audio recordings of observations and interviews, fieldnotes, transcriptions, and photographs. The multiple data sources were triangulated with multiple methods, such as case study analysis and multimodal interaction analysis; and theoretical schemes, such as a sociocultural theory, grounded theory and positioning theory. During the collaborative inquiry I instituted participation through dialogic interactions with the teacher
participants for the reflexivity that I needed for collaborative theorizing about concepts that I identified from the data.

There was face validity because I used video and audio recordings of semi-structured interviews with the teacher participants to analyze data and theories from classroom observations and interviews. Lastly, there was catalytic validity because I brought the teacher participants into conversations about classroom observations and data analysis with me to create dialogue about their own understanding of their transformation through dramatic inquiry.

Data Analysis

Transcription

Transcription is the first step in data analysis (Heath & Street, 2008). I began transcribing everything, from classroom observations to semi-structured interviews at the beginning of the inquiry process with Cary. Student pseudonyms were used during the transcription process to ensure that student names were not associated with the data. I used Bogdan and Biklen’s (2003) descriptive and reflective categories to organize the transcription notes. I typed up the transcripts from video and audio recordings in a two-column format. On the left hand side were the descriptive transcription notes that recorded spoken language and some visual and auditory notes. On the right hand side was my reflective notes column, which I used to analyze the transcriptions. I also added in notes from my fieldnotes taken during observations and semi-structured interviews on the right hand side for further description. See Figure 4 on page 138 for example.
Then, as I developed cases I transcribed more selectively, instead of entire lessons, based on segments that seemed more closely related to Cary’s governing gaze, focus students, and key words and phrases from the inquiry questions. Dyson and Genishi (2005) note that researchers may choose to transcribe selected segments of interviews and observations that appear most relevant to one’s case, though researchers need to be aware that they may overlook some data in order to save time.

I noticed that something was missing as Cary and I analyzed the data. We were having discussions about what had happened in a lesson directly after a lesson was taught and it was fresh in our minds, but we were not watching any video clips of the teaching during the data collection process. We were noticing challenging moments and positive moments in the classroom and certain modes and activities that the students enjoyed, but we had yet to make any real headway in terms of finding specifics about Cary’s own teaching practices and her change over time based on what was happening in the classroom to answer the inquiry questions that we both had posed.

I decided to begin a second round of transcribing, after the data collection process. I began watching video clips from her classroom from the end of the school year and worked my way forward. What I started to notice were visual cues that the students would make that also began to tell a story alongside the transcripts of what the students and Cary were saying as well as what was happening in the lesson. I decided that now I needed to combine both a direct translation of spoken language with additional text to represent visual representations of other modes that were present besides just spoken language.
Norris (2004) noted that in some settings the images may play as much of a role as the way the participants use spoken language and nonverbal behaviors in their interactions. He suggested that researchers use multimodal transcripts that present not only the spoken word interactions through text, but also the visual interpretations of the participants. I needed to ensure that during transcription I was typing a literal translation of what I heard in spoken language and sounds as well as visual aspects that I observed during the transcription process. I made sure to record whether the interaction was happening in a fictional space or in the real world space in the classroom.

I once again found myself becoming overwhelmed with the amount of video and data that had been collected. I needed a way to organize the information, so I went back and completed data logs of the classroom observations and semi-structured interviews as recorded from fieldnotes, video data, audio data, and photographs and screen shots. My data log was based on Norris’s (2004) example of a data log that contains the date, fieldnotes, basic description, number of participants, the time of day, time on the video recording, and length of the interaction observed. Instead of recording all participants present during classroom observations, I recorded students that were not present as well as the names of participant’s involved in interactions that seemed pertinent at the time of the observation. I recorded all members present for interviews. The data logs were not only useful in helping me organize the events from the classroom observation videos and semi-structured interviews, but they also provided me with a space to begin to record events that extended my gaze beyond the one that I had while conducting the collaborative inquiry with Cary. The data logs became a way for me to go back and look
at cases that had previously been identified as well to detect other elements of the case and trends in the data that may have been overlooked upon initial data analysis.

As I began to analyze the transcription data, I identified interactions that appeared relevant to the inquiry questions and Cary’s governing gaze, such as any commonalities or changes. Based on the relevant segments of data I identified from my initial transcripts, I began to record these in the data logs with specific dates, times, and summaries of the event. Next, I made multimodal transcripts. This is when I began to take screen shots of images and watch video recordings in real time to record information about the different communicative modes from selected portions of transcripts. These additional transcripts were of selected portions of video recordings from a prevalent event that I then recorded in literal text to identify observations of a particular communicative mode, such as proxemics, posture, gesture, gaze, music, print, and layout. These transcripts were more descriptive than my initial transcripts of spoken language, because they were constructed through a multimodal lens. These multimodal transcripts focused solely on one of the communicative modes and recorded participants use of the mode, when the mode was used, and other participant’s response to the mode. I would then go back and watch the segments again to add in descriptions of other modes that were noticeable in the event. I made additional screen shots of the video recordings, as needed, to provide a visual image to correspond with the multimodal transcript. The multimodal transcripts were useful when analyzing the relationship amongst the communicative modes, as well as the location of the activity in the dramatic world or the real world, in specific interactions that involve teachers and students.
Mixed Methods

I used a mixed methods approach to data analysis that incorporated multimodal interaction analysis, case study analysis, and grounded theory. When I refer to mixed methods in this inquiry study I am referring to the use of multiple methods (multimodal interaction analysis, case study analysis, and grounded theory) for data analysis. I used multimodal interaction analysis to identify the relationships between the different modes participants used during their interactions through dramatic inquiry in fictional spaces and in real world spaces. Multimodal interaction analysis is “a holistic analysis of the multiple real-time sequential and simultaneous communicative processes that participants engage in” (Norris, 2004, p. 112). Multimodal interaction analysis allowed me to extend my analysis beyond just spoken language to include other forms of communication that participants used during interactions. By using multimodal interaction analysis I was able to identify the ways that participants mediated interactions in their communications with others through dramatic inquiry in real and imagined spaces with language and other communicative modes. Norris identified that multimodal interactional analysts must become good at distinguishing between different communicative modes, such as spoken language, proxemics, posture, gesture, gaze, music, print, and layout to investigate how the different modes participate together in interaction.

For Norris (2004), “all interactions are multimodal” (p. 1). Communicative modes are a system of representation that Norris used to define different rules and regularities in different actions. I was interested in how the interaction of the different modes over time in fictional spaces and the real world spaces in the classroom setting
contributed to the transformation of the teacher participants through the use of dramatic inquiry with students with special rights in general education and self-contained classrooms. I used recordings from my ethnographic observation by observing video recordings of the teacher and the student participants over time interacting in fictional spaces and in the real world space of the classroom to understand the individuals’ use of communicative modes. Norris (2004) identified that many of the communicative modes are culturally situated and differ depending on the culture/subcultures and the individual. He suggested that one use ethnographic research methods to gain a better view of how the different communicative modes in interactions are culturally habituated within given cultures. I analyzed the different communicative modes over time to identify how different modes were enacted by individuals in the different spaces, fictional and real world, and inferred how these modes were representative of the individual and the culture of the classroom or fictional space.

I was interested in how the teacher and students use of communicative modes over time through dramatic inquiry in fictional spaces and real world spaces in the classroom may change or stay the same for some individuals. I was also interested in how the teacher using dramatic inquiry with students co-constructs meaning in the fictional spaces and real world spaces in the classroom and how this could be developed through communicative modes, such as spoken language and head movements. In addition, I was interested in positioning and how different communicative modes were used. For example, how does the teacher position students, how do students position each other, and how do students position the teacher and how is this demonstrated with
different communicative modes. I wondered if different communicative modes were positioned as more important than others in during particular classroom activities and how this impacted the students and learning.

I made sure to focus on multiple communicative modes during the analysis stage. I needed to note in my analysis that students with special rights may use some communicative modes over others based on their abilities and preferred learning styles. By analyzing multiple communicative modes I was able to identify how different modes interacted with each other. I needed to be cognizant of my roles as a researcher so that I was not using the modes that the students did not appear to use as disabling features in my analysis. I needed to focus on person first research that focused on the abilities of the students and the modes that the students used as I analyzed multimodal interactions, noting that individuals interact differently.

Next, I analyzed for the interconnection of the modes. As noted before it is important that I as a researcher not privilege any communicative mode over another, but instead analyze the data to identify the modes present and how the participants employed different modes in their interactions and how the modes appeared to be interconnected. “The actual hierarchical structure that modes assume to one another may be different in any given interaction, and has to be determined through analysis” (Norris, 2004, p. 51). During analysis, I identified how the teacher and or student(s) prioritized the use of one or more communicative modes in their interactions with other participants in the fictional spaces or in the real world classroom spaces. I was interested in how the teacher may
prioritize the use of one or more modes through dramatic inquiry in fictional spaces and or real world spaces in the classroom to include or exclude students from the activities.

Norris (2004) recommended that researchers analyze what they see in the video recordings and not develop a hierarchical structure for how they interpret the different modes. I viewed selected portions of video recordings multiple times, with a focus on different communicative modes by the participants in the interaction and then analyze how the different modes are connected. For example, I would watch the interaction in a segment of a video recording with and without sound multiple times to analyze the gestures, head movements, layout, and gaze of participants while referencing the multimodal transcripts. I analyzed all of my observations about the different participants and identified how different modes appeared to be connected.

I began by reading through my data, the multimodal transcripts, using analytic coding of the key terms and phrases from the teacher and researcher’s inquiry questions, which allowed me as a researcher to figure out the conceptual importance of the classroom interactions through dramatic inquiry in the fictional spaces and real world spaces in the classroom. Analytic coding provides researchers with data about individual’s actions and reactions to others that will develop the narrative for what is happening in the case (Dyson & Genishi, 2005). During the coding stage, I read through the data and recorded information that seemed pertinent to the case by writing words and phrases in the reflection column to describe my analysis of the case. According to Dyson and Genishi (2005) researchers, “Read through data line by line, noting any words, phrases, patterns of behavior that seems relevant. The goal here is to begin to probe
beyond the behavioral descriptions, considering the social meaning or importance of what’s happening” (p. 84). As I analyzed the data I referenced the inquiry questions to help me look for relevant phrases or patterns.

During the coding stage I also began to construct headings based on common themes and ideas to support pre-writing of events and activities to construct a case study as I analyzed the research, such as dialogic classroom. I incorporated grounded theory methodology by refining analytic categories that I identified during coding and gathering additional data (Charmaz, 2006). As I began to analyze data, I started by looking for moments of when the focal student, Rachel whom Cary had selected, was being included and or excluded in the classroom. I then looked for examples of individual and group language development and changes in structures and the use of modes. In terms of language development, I was looking for examples in the transcripts and or fieldnotes of when a focal student changed the way that they talked during an interaction, such as through the use of different modes, the amount of time one spoke, and the way the student used language (Heath & Street, 2008). As I looked for changes in modes in relevant interactions from video recordings and through information discussed during interviews, this helped provide me with a focus for multimodal interaction analysis and to begin making connections with key words and phrases from the inquiry questions.

I interpreted the data by relating variations in student participation in fictional spaces and real world spaces with related information from Cary’s perspective, based on her responses in semi-structured interviews and her written work. I aimed to be reflexive as I interrelated data, mediated by sociocultural theoretical inclinations I brought from
my work and my personal experiences as a classroom teacher. One thing that I noticed while creating the multimodal transcripts and as I began to create the case studies was that our governing gaze was heavily focused on Rachel and the formation of the classroom community that we overlooked another student’s, Yared’s, pivotal role in this process. I extended my gaze and focus from one focal student, Rachel, identified by Cary, and the classroom community, and I began to focus on Yared as another focal student. I revisited notes that I made during the transcription process, in my fieldnotes, and data logs to identify sets of data as they related to the key words and phrases from Cary’s inquiry question to structure the data analysis process and the development of different narratives. As I began this stage of data analysis I began to create case studies to describe the different elements that contributed to Cary’s change over time.

In order to confirm my assumptions, and stay true to the collaborative inquiry, I needed to get Cary’s opinion. The next step was sharing the clips of data and the multimodal transcripts from over the year in Cary’s classroom with Cary. This happened over the summer after the end of the academic school year when data was collected from her classroom. One of the key components of ethnography is analyzing participant observations and interviews to see how people co-construct meaning (Glesne, 2011). I shared my analysis of observations and interviews with Cary to support the collaborative inquiry, to involve her in the analysis process, and to dialogue with her points of view.

**Dramatic Inquiry Unit**

Cary’s dramatic inquiry unit on Edgar Allan Poe’s *The Murders in the Rue Morgue* was her first large scale unit using dramatic inquiry. Prior to this she had never
taught a sequential dramatic inquiry unit over several weeks, which in this case turned into a month and a half. Here Cary reflects on her planning of the first day. According to Cary (2014):

The unit began on October 22nd, and as I approached the planning of this day, I knew it would be essential to get it right. Dramatic inquiry is engaging and fun for many students in many situations, but if there is no buy-in or a lot of resistance to the task at hand, it can be over before it even begins. (p. 20)

With *The Murders in the Rue Morgue* dramatic inquiry unit Cary created an event with the haunted house design task. Students were commissioned to solve the problem of creating a way for people to experience the haunted house. See Appendix B for commission letter. She first wanted to hook the students with Poe himself, which was someone that she thought her students would like. She began with an active collaborative game, social atom. With the social atom activity Cary would ask her students questions about Poe, scary stories, and other things related to the inquiry. If the student agreed with what she had asked they would move closer to the center of the circle. Cary placed a large plastic box in the center for students to touch to know they were in the center. Students stood around the large plastic box, the atom, and would move closer to it the more they agreed with the statement that Cary read aloud. See Figure 2. Notice that all students, including Rachel, who is seen with a smile on her face, participated in this game, by moving their body closer to the center or further away from the center.
The social atom game allowed Cary to evaluate her students’ interest in the topic. Cary viewed her students’ participation as a positive sign that they were interested in Poe and horror stories. Cary’s first goal was to build enough initial interest in the story that her students would want to read the short story. At this time, Cary was beginning to introduce mediating tools to support meaning making and access their background knowledge. Cary passed a Styrofoam head and a strand of hair around the circle. See Figure 3.
By introducing mediating tools Cary was incorporating Vygotsky’s (1978) theoretical frame, which focuses on tools and signs as mediating factors that alter a person’s social environment and the identity of those that are involved in using the tools and signs (Holland, et al., 1998). Cary’s students used mediating tools, such as strand of hair and a Styrofoam head, which positioned her students to construct and reconstruct meaning based on their social interactions with others and with previously socially constructed meanings (Holland, et al., 1998).

The following is an excerpt from the conversation on October 22, 2013, that Cary began as she started introducing objects to be passed around the group.

Cary: In this story in particular two women have been killed...These women weren’t left in very discrete places. The women weren’t killed in
the prettiest ways. Debbie, if I hand this to you it is a clue [hands Debbie a Styrofoam head].

Debbie: It’s a head and it’s not connected to a body.

Cary: What do you think happened to this woman?

Debbie: You don’t know if it is a guy or a girl.

Cary: It just so happens that there is a newspaper article about the story. The title of the article is 'Extraordinary Murders'. Would you like me to read it?

Cary had piqued her students’ interests. She introduced a bit of text and continued to pass students objects that represented something in the story around the group. Students were encouraged to stop and ask questions as they read aloud.

Here is an excerpt from October 22, 2013 as students became more engaged in the discussion as they explored different possibilities with tactile objects.

Yared: That’s disgusting!

Cary: What’s disgusting?

Yared: They pulled out their hair!

Cary: So if this [hands long strands of fake hair extensions to Tom] is the chunk of bloody hair, can you imagine someone pulling that much hair out of someone’s head? [Tom tries to attach hair to the Styrofoam head he is holding] Tom is trying to put the hair on the head. Do you think the hair came from that head?

Reflecting on this introduction Cary knew that continuing with the Poe unit would be something that her students were interested in, but equal participation was still something that was not happening at this time. Cary writes, “The entire group was not
engaged equally. Rachel's voice was vastly underrepresented in the conversation, although she did contribute four utterances to the group discussion” (Saxton, 2014, p. 33).

After the initial introduction to the topic Cary introduced the students to the inquiry that would guide their learning, and Cary’s transformation, for the rest of the unit. Cary had made a shift in her thinking and design of this unit prior to the clips that we analyzed. Cary had originally wanted to have the students be detectives rather than haunted house designers. Her university instructor and fellow collaborative inquirer, Brian Edmiston, mentioned that the detective role might lead the students to fixed conclusions. They came up with haunted house designers, which Cary realized, would take away from the competitive nature of students-in-role-as-detectives and lend itself more to collaboration. This change in who the students would be in role as in the fictional frame was important to note, because it marked a shift for Cary in terms of how she intended to position the students. She had made a shift to position her students to collaborate on a joint endeavor as opposed to competing with one, which she had done in the past. According to Cary (2014):

The conversation would no longer be about "what happened when" (although they would still need to have an understanding of this) but would revolve around the more nuanced ideas of tone, mood, theme, and characterization thus achieving the deeper level of discourse I had always wanted. This was not simply an exercise in reading comprehension and whodunit inferencing; students were empowered to infuse a house with a new narrative that paid homage to Poe but was distinctly their own. (Saxton, p. 18)
Looking back on this shift, Cary identified that Rachel needed to participate in the collaborative dimension of dramatic inquiry. “She [Rachel] needed to work together with her peers and design something that would make her feel proud and capable” (Saxton, 2014, p. 16). At the time of the unit this was not apparent to Cary, but it would emerge during the collaborative inquiry and her own self-reflection on her teaching. The self-reflection that the collaborative inquiry process required Cary to do as she examined her own teaching, was not always an easy process. However, Cary was committed to supporting her students and improving her teaching practices.

She began by using Edmiston’s (2014) ABCD events model. Edmiston described ABCD events as events that will probably “hook” students. “All need to experience a need to Act when they encounter a Big problem in an event they Care about and can experience from Diverse perspectives and Dialogue about” (Edmiston, 2014, p. 142). Cary positioned the students using Heathcote’s (Heathcote & Bolton, 1995) “mantle of the expert” approach, with the students positioned as experts, award-winning haunted house designers, commissioned by a fictional company, The Edgar Allan Poe Estate trustees, to design and create a haunted house that paid homage to Edgar Allan Poe, his work, and in particular his short story, *The Murders in the Rue Morgue*. Cary’s students were excited to Act as if they were haunted house designers. The Big problem was that they needed to design a haunted house and they Cared about this topic. The students were positioned as collaborative haunted house designers so that they could contribute diverse perspectives through dialogue. The Diverse perspectives and Dialogue that happened during this unit was something that emerged and changed over time. This
change over time will be explored using Harre’ and Langenhove’s (1999) positioning theory to examine how Cary positioned herself and her students, as well as how students positioned themselves and others during the unit of inquiry.

Cary and I met on August 22, 2014 to review a large amount of video data of classroom observations, teacher semi-structured interviews, and student semi-structured interviews using the multimodal transcripts and data logs I had created as a guide. I began by playing her a sequence of clips from her class during the unit the students were completing on Edgar Allan Poe. The following are photos and transcripts that describe our meeting on August 22, 2104 and additional data that describes Cary’s change over time through the use of dramatic inquiry and participation in collaborative inquiry during this unit.

The Power of Dialogue: Creating a Dialogic Classroom

Cary’s theoretical framework for understanding “dialogue” prior to this collaborative inquiry was more of a Behaviorist frame based off her assumption that students should be rewarded for talking and making their voice heard. Her governing gaze at the time was governed by her belief that one or two-sided discussions and questions with predetermined answers promoted dialogue. According to Cary (2013):

Reinforcing individualism, I would praise those students who made an exemplary comment for their ability to stand out from the crowd. I might highlight student responses that were in opposition to each other, simply to see if students could prove their contentions with evidence from the text. As soon as that narrow goal was accomplished, I moved on. I would let outspoken kids like Yared and Tom proudly and definitively state their opinions while Rachel sat silently in passive acceptance. (Saxton, pg. 10)
Her theoretical framework about dialogue was monologic, using Bakhtin’s (1984) idea of the monologic. In this framework, a person, usually the teacher, leads students towards predetermined and fixed answers to questions. Cary’s assumptions about teaching had focused on verbal discussions in terms of monologue, with those students that shared more rewarded over those that did not share. Language was a tool that each student was positioned to use not as a mediating collaborative tool, but rather as a tool to position themselves with more power than their fellow classmates; this positioning was rewarded by Cary’s responses. It was an acceptable practice for students, such as Yared and Tom, to deliberately self-position (Harre´& Langenhove, 1999) themselves with more power than their fellow classmates. Cary’s (2013) assumption was:

For those who didn't have the ability to chime in (because they weren't adept at navigating conversations or had trouble coming up with content to share) I thought that simply sitting in a room, listening to their more able peers would be a great exercise in modeling. By listening to the discussion, they were still "soaking up" content and the nuances of that genre of talk. As far as the students who wouldn't talk were concerned, I would go as far as prompt them to join, but if they were still unresponsive I did little to investigate why. (Saxton, p. 7)

Cary was unconcerned at the time with how her actions positioned her students and how they were affecting dialogue and whether or not students were being included in activities. The way Cary and her students used dialogue to position each other and how they reacted to that positioning affected collaboration, inquiry, student’s identities, agency, and power, and the creation of a dialogic community where all voices were included. It had become commonplace for Cary and her students to use forced-
positioning of others (Harre’ & Langenhove, 1999), specifically Rachel, as a passive bystander whose identity was tied to her lack of shared talk during class.

**Positioning Others with More or Less Power.**

The use of dialogue and how dialogue interacted with other modes in the classroom became apparent on November 6, 2013 when Cary was having a discussion. Her students were sharing information that they had talked about the previous school day about how the students were going to combine each other’s ideas to create a single model haunted house that represented elements of Poe’s *The Murders in the Rue Morgue*. I began by showing Cary a clip from early on in the lesson where she was asking if any of the students wanted to write down their discussions, so they had a record of what they were sharing and deciding on as a group. Students were in the real world of the classroom sharing their ideas for the haunted house design. The transcripts that will be referenced throughout are multimodal, with the visual and spoken language descriptions referenced on the right hand side and the literal spoken language text and changes in tone recorded on the left hand side.

Norris (2004) cautioned that one needs to view gesture and language together, because it is often hard to interpret the type of gesture or make a conclusion about an interaction without both the gesture and the language. When analyzing communicative modes in the data I paid attention to the interaction of the language spoken during interactions represented in the images as well as the gestures of the participants. In order to provide the reader with a semblance of the multimodal interaction analysis process with language and gestures, I have included the transcripts and photographs of the screen
shots of the clips to explain the analysis. This process contributed to my ability to identify key components of the modes separately and then identify how the different modes came together to make meaning for the participants in the interaction.

Cary and I began by watching the entire clip through and then we described what we saw as we stopped and looked at still images (screen shots) of portions of the clips with parts of the transcripts. I am going to share our analysis of the data in a similar format to how she and I reviewed it on August 22, 2014. First, I will share the entire excerpt of the data. See Figure 4.

The paragraphs that follow Figure 4 are a breakdown of select portions of the transcript into smaller pieces using photographs of screen shots of sequential images from the video clip as well as portions of excerpts of consecutive transcripts that align with the images to analyze the interaction of modes. Quotes will also be included from conversations with Cary over time about her changing governing gaze.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spoken Language Transcript</th>
<th>Multimodal Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cary: So, I feel like unless we get this all in writing we’ll keep coming back to the same question ‘What do we mean? What do we mean?’ Does anybody feel like writing?</td>
<td>Rachel is sitting with her hands in her lap. Her head and gaze are downwards towards the floor in front of her. Billy is leaning forward with his head in his hand, arms rested on each other on his lap.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom: I DID IT ONCE (loudly)</td>
<td>He points his left arm high into the air.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark: You did it bad.</td>
<td>Rachel turns her head and gaze towards Cary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cary: Woh, woh. He did it.</td>
<td>Yared laughs and sits up a bit. Yared laughs. Tom is smiling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yared: Woh</td>
<td>Rachel raises her hand in the air and keeps her head and gaze on Cary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark: And by bad I mean good.</td>
<td>Rachel smiles and puts her hand down. Rachel begins to get her Braille notetaker out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cary: We should be thankful that Tom did do it that one time. Does anybody feel like writing as we? So if we try it. Rachel you will.</td>
<td>Rachel says to Cary with her eyes and gaze towards her. She laughs quietly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel: Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoken Language Transcript</td>
<td>Multimodal Transcript</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cary: Tom, have you ever noticed on those fancy little machines right there you can put a USB drive in right?</td>
<td>Yared laughs and smiles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel: I know right. It’s like I can’t do that.</td>
<td>Rachel smiles and moves the paper in her lap. Her head and gaze turn upwards in front of her.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cary: Where could that possibly go?</td>
<td>All boys are smiling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel: On the computer.</td>
<td>Rachel puts her rough draft on the floor. Tom is smiling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cary: On a computer...[continues to explain how Braille can be turned into print]</td>
<td>Rachel has her Braille notetaker out on her lap. Her head and gaze are in front of her.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yared: Miss Saxton though</td>
<td>Rachel shifts her head and gaze towards Cary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cary: Yea</td>
<td>Rachel closes her Braille notetaker. She shifts her head and gaze towards Mark. Her facial expression appears dejected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yared: I personally vote myself to write it real quick, because I already have like the mental layout and I would have to re-explain everything.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom: (Laughs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cary: Let’s just</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel: (Says something unintelligible and really quiet)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yared: Well I can do that, but I’d really rather</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cary: The danger of that is it becomes Yared’s Haunted House.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spoken Language Transcript</th>
<th>Multimodal Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Figure 4 continued</strong></td>
<td><strong>Figure 4 continued</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spoken Language Transcript</th>
<th>Multimodal Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yared: No, I’m just going to write it out for all of us. I mean she can write it out, I don’t care, I was just saying I’d have to re-explain everything.</td>
<td>Rachel turns her head and gaze towards Yared at the mention of she. Then, she crosses her arms across her waist and rests them on top of her Braille notetaker. She moves her head and gaze downwards towards the floor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel: You can do it (quietly)</td>
<td>She turns her head and gaze towards Yared as she talks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yared: I mean I have no problem re-explaining everything.</td>
<td>Rachel shifts her head and gaze towards Tom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark: Explain it.</td>
<td>Rachel turns her head and gaze back towards Yared.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yared: I was just saying, that, that’s what was going to happen.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Students were sitting in chairs in a circle prior to the start of the first video clip from November 6, 2013. See Figure 5. In my proxemics analysis I identified how Cary and her students arranged themselves and others, as well as how they used their space in the real world space in the classroom. For Norris (2004), “Proxemics is the study of ways in which individuals arrange and utilize their space. We are concerned with the distance that an individual takes up in relation to others as well as to relevant objects” (p. 19). The students and adults, teacher and co-inquirer, were seated in chairs that were arranged in a circle. I noticed the distance between the boys and Rachel. I drew a white line down the middle to represent the clear divide in the physical space between the boys and Rachel. On this day all four boys were present and only one of the girls, Rachel was present. The four boys were sitting closely together on one side of the circle; Rachel was seated by herself on one side of the circle away from the boys as well as the adults. Norris emphasized that one needs to look at more than one interaction when interpreting the meaning of a person’s proxemic behavior.
Cary and I began by looking at the image to identify the proxemics of how the student’s bodies were positioned prior to the start of the discussion. According to Norris (2004), the study of proxemics through ethnographic observations and video clips can give the researcher insight into individuals’ interactions and proxemic behavior. In this lesson, the students, more specifically Rachel, appeared to be constrained by the layout, which thus impacted her interactions in this real world space in the classroom. Cary’s analysis of Figure 5 was, “She [Rachel] is like defensive…And she just knows this isn’t about me [Rachel] anymore. You know it’s about them [the boys in the class]” (C. Saxton, personal communication, August 22, 2014).
Posture is another communicative mode that I identified as I looked at the images from the video clip. “Posture is the study of ways in which individuals position their bodies. There are two important aspects of posture: first, the form of the body position, and, second, the postural direction that an individual takes up towards others” (Norris, 2004, p. 24). I analyzed the mode of posture of the students in the images to look at how one’s positioning of their physical body and the response by other participants during this specific interaction may represent one’s position during a specific literacy event. In Figure 5 I noticed that Tom is laid back in his chair, while Rachel and Yared are both slouched forward in their chairs. The difference being that Tom is positioning himself away from Rachel.

When Cary looked at the image, she also noticed that not only was Rachel slouched forward, but she was also had a “deadpanned” expression on her face. Yared and Rachel both had their heads down and their gaze was towards the floor. Head movement, such as conventional and novel, is another communicative mode that Norris (2004) identified. Multimodal interactional analysts can use qualitative measurements to identify head movements in everyday interactions and how this mode represents interactional meaning making. According to Norris (2004):

It is important to keep in mind that the same head movement may have a different meaning in different interactions, as interactional meaning is always dependent upon the individuals performing the movement and the individuals interpreting it. Meaning is always co-constructed, and unintentional actions may be just as communicative as intentional ones. (p. 33)
The arrows represent the gazes of Yared and Rachel. Once again, Yared’s gaze, like his body, was positioned away from Rachel. Rachel’s gaze was down towards the floor. When looking at the interaction of the different modes, proxemics, posture, head movement, and gaze, I began to interpret how the students were positioning themselves and each other prior to the introduction of any dialogue. The students were using first order positioning (Harre’ & Langenhove, 1999) to locate themselves and others in the real world classroom space. Yared and Tom were positioning themselves away from Rachel. Tom appeared relaxed by his posture in his chair. Yared seemed disinterested, due to his bent over posture, hand over his mouth, and gaze directed at the floor. Rachel appeared defeated before the lesson began by staring blankly at her feet, her crossed arms over her body, and her bent over posture. Rachel also did not look like a member of the group due to the proxemics that positioned her physically away from the rest of the group members. Neither Rachel, nor Cary resisted this positioning of the boys together on one side of the circle and Rachel apart from the class on the other side.

My analysis of the interaction of the multimodal cues provided insight into how the students positioning of their bodies within the space influenced who was a part of the group before the discussion even began. Rachel was not positioned as an equal member of this community. The addition of the multimodal analysis provided further details that supported Cary’s initial observation after the lesson on November 6th. Cary said, “There were four guys on one side and she was physically positioned over here. So she probably felt outnumbered and that the focus was all on her” (C. Saxton, personal communication,
November 6, 2013). After the lesson Cary identified how Rachel’s physical proxemics positioned herself as an outsider in the group.

Next, Cary and I viewed part of the clip again and then went back to look at screen shots of images from the clip alongside multimodal transcripts to further explore the interaction of the different modes, now including spoken language. Spoken language is the first mode of communication that Norris (2004) noted that people draw upon in their interactions. The dialogue initially following the image in Figure 5 was:

Cary: So, I feel like unless we get this all in writing we’ll keep coming back to the same question ‘What do we mean? What do we mean?’ Does anybody feel like writing?

Tom: I did it once! (loudly)

Mark: You did it bad.

Cary: Woh, woh. He did it.

Yared: Woh

Mark: And by bad I mean good.

Cary: We should be thankful that Tom did do it that one time. Does anybody feel like writing as we? So if we try it. Rachel you will.

Rachel: Yes

Cary: We have to solidify these things.

Rachel’s facial expression changed from “deadpanned” to a huge smile, when Cary identified her as the note taker. See Figure 6. Her smile combined with her posture change as she sits up tall in her chair, which represented a noticeable shift of Rachel attempting to position herself as a part of the group. Next, Rachel’s iconic gesture of
raising her hand signaled that she wanted to write, before she confirmed this verbally by saying yes. Norris (2004) identified four different types of gestures: iconic gestures, metaphoric gestures, deictic gestures, and beat gestures. “Iconic gestures depict pictorial content and generally mimic what the individual communicates verbally” (Norris, 2004, p. 29). When analyzing the interaction of the modes, Rachel was using the different modes to deliberately self-position herself with an agentic role within in the group. Rachel is attempting to show some agency in this moment and insert herself as the note taker for the group. But this is not acknowledged or accepted by other students. Her gaze and head were directed at Cary, as a way of looking for her to validate her and confirm that she could be the writer and have a role in the group. Rachel is attempting to empower herself by positioning herself as the note taker, while at the same time looking to Cary to validate this role. Yared still had not changed his physical position in anyway, which was an indication to me that he had yet to find a reason to join the dialogue at this point in time or to acknowledge Rachel positioning herself in the group.
Cary and I then started the clip again and heard the following dialogue as we looked for other noticeable modes present at the time.

Tom: You gotta do it in print

Rachel: (softly) I can’t do it in print.

Cary: What are you talking about?

Mark: (Says something quietly and unintelligible)

Tom: Well I have to be able to read it.

Cary and I stopped the video clip and looked at the visual modes present directly after Tom made the above comment. See Figure 7.
First we noticed that Rachel’s posture is now slouched down, her arms are crossed in front of her, and her face looks confused. Her head and gaze are still looking at Cary, and she is once again looking for Cary to accept and validate her positioning with an agentic role in the group. Rachel’s head turn towards Cary is an attempt at forced positioning to position Cary as the one who can support her in this moment. Yared remains slouched over in his chair with his hand rested on his chin, which represented his continued lack of interest in what was being discussed. Tom is still leaned back in his chair, but he is now pointing towards Rachel with his arm and his head and gaze are
towards her as he says that he needs the notes written in print. There is a struggle for who gets to position Rachel—Tom, Rachel, or Cary.

Cary identified this moment as pivotal to how she viewed dialogue as well as how she set up lessons. Cary had intended to include the role of note taker to position Rachel with a role that she was comfortable with for this activity. However, when she was planning the lesson she did not see how she positioned Rachel with less authority in this role than the other members and thus affirm her usual disempowered state. This positioning of Rachel as note taker opened up the discussion in unexpected ways when Tom used his spoken words and posture to attempt to forcibly position Rachel with less power, while using deliberate self-positioning to empower himself at the same time.

Following this lesson Cary noticed that Tom had used spoken language to position Rachel as inferior. According to Cary:

So he [Tom] said, when I asked her [Rachel] like that’s the other move I tried to make her write so she could have some part in it and she just kind of turned into the secretary, which backfired...Like the fact that when it’s just talking you know she clams up, because she, that’s not her strength... And I didn’t help that by saying, that’s why I sort of hesitate to say “What do you think Rachel?” That puts a spotlight on her. So I just need to set up the class in a way that doesn’t get us into situations like that, anyway. Tom was like Rachel you need to write in print, which I said was asinine to say and I really kind of got on him about that, because he was blatantly pointing out that no she can’t write in print and everybody who’s here know that if a kid does write in Braille it’s very to transfer that into print, so it wasn’t a problem anyway. We can put it on a usb drive, put it in a computer, Microsoft Word, print it out. Like, that’s never a problem, but yet he had to make that statement anyway just to put her down. So there was no point. He wasn’t trying to be helpful. It was just mean. (C. Saxton, personal communication, November 6, 2013)
In this instance, Cary’s assumptions about Tom’s use of dialogue were based on her background knowledge of the supplementary aides and resources available in the school. Cary’s assumptions were also based on her knowledge of her student’s familiarity with the available technology. Cary identified that Tom deliberately positioned Rachel using language to put her down for no reason, since he and the rest of the students were aware of many different ways that they could share information in print and Braille.

Looking back on the dialogue from the excerpt on November 6, 2013, Cary re-examined Tom’s talk in the classroom in August of 2014.

I understand that to some, Tom's comment might not seem like an insult. After all, Tom is a print writer/reader and Rachel is a Braille writer/reader so isn't that a valid issue? The answer is most definitely not. Because of the myriad of assistive technology available to the staff and students at SSB, there are many ways to translate print to Braille and vice versa (the USB method I mentioned is just one of those). Tom attended SSB for almost fifteen years. He was immersed in this kind of technology, and has probably witnessed this exact process thousands of times. The point is, there was no reason for Tom to tell Rachel, "You gotta do it in print," except to demoralize her. (Saxton, 2014, p. 28)

At this time, Cary and I reflected on how important the role language played in how students positioned themselves and others, as well as how students responded and accepted this positioning. In this example, Tom still positioned himself as more powerful than Rachel because he was a print reader and writer and Rachel was a Braille reader and writer. Print is another communicative mode that is understood as written text, including a wide variety of forms such as content, medium, language, pictures, etc., and how print is used by participants in interactions (Norris, 2004). At first, my governing gaze as a
collaborative inquirer was focused on how Cary used print in dramatic inquiry in the different spaces in the classroom. After viewing this moment again, I began to explore how print played an important role in terms of how students positioned themselves and others as members of the community. Even though half of the class were print readers and writers and the other half Braille readers and writers, how student’s accessed print was still used by Tom as a way to deliberately position Rachel as an outsider to the group. I found this to be interesting, because Tom did not bring up the same argument again in the next section of the dialogue when Yared volunteers to be the writer, even though he is also a Braille reader and writer. It seemed that at this time Tom was just interested in positioning Rachel outside of the community.

Cary was not aware of how by positioning Rachel as the secretary she was excluding her from her dialogically interacting with her peers and reinforcing the lowered positioning of Rachel in the class. It was not until it was brought to her attention through our collaborative inquiry process that she realized that the structure of her class was subversively supporting the lowered positioning of Rachel. Cary’s governing gaze had not allowed her to see that it had become a common practice for students to use language to negatively position students and exclude them from being a equal member of the classroom. Later on as our collaborative inquiry continued Cary identified that the only way to offset the use of spoken language that deliberately position Rachel as lesser was by Cary setting up activities in which Rachel was positioned, and could position herself, as equal and capable relative to the others in the group. Cary (2014) writes:
Clearly, if this was how she was feeling, it was very unlikely that she would wake up one day with a new confidence and passionately assert her ideas into the group discourse. This just goes to show that even despite my renewed advocacy, Rachel still felt hostility from the boys. This hostility was not going to be miraculously cured without a major change in the way they perceived Rachel. Gradually, their perception of her did change, but it did so sporadically-moments built upon each other like brickwork. (Saxton, p. 71)

Cary and I then began watching the next section of the clip when Yared volunteers to be the writer. Yared positions himself to take over the role Cary had given to Rachel. In doing so he also excluded Rachel.

Yared: I personally vote myself to write it real quick, because I already have like the mental layout and I would have to re-explain everything.

Tom: (laughs)

I immediately stopped the video after the interaction above. Rachel had just opened up her Braille notetaker to begin taking notes, and Yared volunteering to be the note taker immediately followed this. See Figure 8. Cary and I viewed the images repeatedly to look at the other modes present in each of the consecutive images. See Figures 8 and 9.
Rachel’s expression changes to one of shock as she looks out in front of her towards the floor. Her hands freeze on her Braille notetaker. Yared is now sitting up in his chair, which coincided with him joining the dialogue through spoken language. Tom is still relaxed in his chair with a smile lingering on his face, which could be because he feels that Yared is aligning with him. The arrows that are drawn on Figure 8 provide a visual divide of the gazes of the two boys in the image, Tom and Yared, in opposition to Rachel’s gaze. Even though Tom is not talking at this time he is still engaged, and interested, which was represented when he laughed and remained smiling as Yared inserted himself into the conversation.
Rachel’s response changes after Yared finishes volunteering to be the note taker. See Figure 9. For one of the first times, Rachel turns her head and gaze towards Yared and Tom. This is in contrast to the previous occurrence when she moved her head and gaze towards Cary, looking to her to decide how she would be positioned. For the second time, a male student has used deliberate self-positioning to stress his own agency with more power than others in the classroom. Yared is using deliberate positioning of himself and others, Rachel, to try and have her replaced as the note taker for the community, and thus exclude her from the group.

Figure 9: Photograph of Rachel closing her Braille notetaker on November 6, 2013.
Not only does Rachel turn her head and gaze towards Tom and Yared, but she changes her face to one of disgust. Of course, the boys could not see this reaction. And Rachel says nothing to their excluding positioning of her. It appears from her facial expression that she is upset that Yared is now trying to be the note taker after she had begun this job for the group. Rachel’s Braille notetaker becomes a visible tool that also represents Rachel’s response to this positioning. Although Rachel’s facial expression shows that she is upset, the closing of her Braille notetaker represents that she has actually accepted how Yared is positioning her. More specifically, Rachel closing her Braille notetaker is a sign that she has accepted that she will not be the note taker. When Cary examined this clip on August 22, 2014 she noticed things that she had not identified at the time, perhaps because this was a common and accepted occurrence in her classroom. Cary’s changed governing gaze was now allowing her to see things she had not seen the first time, by extending her gaze to include visual modes that Rachel and her classmates were using to communicate. Cary said:

Oh, my gosh! Rachel was immediately like, just the look on her face. Like when people, you know when people on TV do a double take. She had her Braille note, she had it open. She was like (Cary makes typing noises on the table) starting typing; probably putting the names on the top and then it was like, like the wind was knocked out of her. She shut the Braille note. Oh my gosh! And that, it’s crazy, because not just Yared, but Tom were both objecting to her writing. When Tom didn’t even want to write in the first place. (C. Saxton, personal communication, August 22, 2014)

Rachel’s spoken language in the following excerpt is another example of Rachel accepting Yared’s deliberate excluding positioning of her as incapable of contributing to the group and him deliberately positioning himself with more power than her.
Cary: Let’s just

Rachel: (says something too quiet to hear)

Yared: Well I can do that, but I’d really rather

Cary: The danger of that is it becomes Yared’s Haunted House.

Yared: No, I’m just going to write it out for all of us. I mean she can write it out, I don’t care, I was just saying I’d have to re-explain everything.

Rachel: (quietly) You can do it

Yared: I mean I have no problem re-explaining everything.

Mark: Explain it.

Yared: I was just saying, that, that’s what was going to happen.

Cary: Right and the beauty of you re-explaining it is if anybody wants to jump in and say ‘Hey, what about this?’ Then, they can.

Yared: That’s perfectly fine.

Cary: Then you sitting there writing it, it’s like Yared’s world.

Rachel: You can do it, Yared (very quietly)

Yared: No, you can go ahead and write, Rachel, I was just…

Twice during the above conversation Rachel quietly tells Yared that he can be the note taker. Her tone of voice even seems to be a further sign that she has accepted her identity in the classroom as someone with no agency and less power than her fellow classmates. This combination of communicative modes was an example of means. Norris (2004) suggested that when analyzing the real-time examples of multimodal interactions one needs to look for the meaning of the means (emphasis in text). “Means
structure meaning beyond words and sentences and also beyond the mode of language through multiple communicative modes in systematic ways. Here we speak of communicative semantics” (Norris, 2004, p. 115-116). Means are used by the participants in real-time ongoing interactions with other participants through communicative modes. When I analyzed the video recording I paid close attention to how other participants responded to the means based on other participants reactions as well as to the end of one action and the beginning of another action. Cary attempts to shift the focus from Yared being the note taker by explaining that if he is the writer that the haunted house will not be a truly collaborative endeavor that incorporates everyone’s voice. While Cary’s assumption was that if she positioned Rachel with a role that she was comfortable with in the group she would participate. However, Cary’s gaze could not be governed by what she was not seeing in the classroom. Cary ended up positioning Rachel with less power than the boys in the classroom.

At this time Rachel’s sense of identity seemed to be of a student who was only able to complete menial tasks as a member of the classroom community. She demonstrated little agency to stand up for herself and voice her opinion in terms of her desire to be the note taker and in classroom discussions. Rachel accepted how she was positioned by her teacher and her fellow classmates and thus positioned herself with little agency or power in the classroom. Rachel accepted that for the second time two of her fellow classmates had positioned her to not be the note taker, and she used multiple modes to represent that she would not contest this: closed her Braille notetaker and sheepishly told Yared that he could be the note taker.
Cary then assigned Rachel the role of note taker for the haunted house discussions. Once Rachel was assigned the role of note taker, her facial expression changed to a large smile on her face, after Cary decides that Rachel will be the note taker. See Figure 10. Rachel is smiling and gazing outwards in front of her. Our assumption was that Rachel was happy at this moment because she is smiling and looking out towards her peers.

![Figure 10: Photograph of Rachel when she is chosen to be the note taker on November 6, 2013.](image)

Rachel also has opened up her Braille notetaker to begin taking notes. Yared remains sitting up with a smile on his face. At this time in the school year Yared used
spoken language to deliberately self-position his ideas as more important than his fellow classmates. The norm of a classroom community with equal members and voices was not something that was evident in the social practices of the classroom at this time. Yared used the language of “I” and “me” more than “we” and “ours” to position his knowledge construction as an individual task and not a collaborative endeavor. Yared was deliberately positioning himself as “I for me” (Edmiston, 2014). His actions represented his identity as more powerful than Rachel in the classroom. Tom continues to sit laid back in his chair, but the smile is gone from his face. Upon further reflection of this moment Cary’s assumption was that:

Yared's dialogue in this section continues to reflect whose ideas are valued in the group at this moment in time. It is clear that Rachel cannot even be trusted when relegated to the role of secretary. Again I tried to defend Rachel, but I couldn't salvage the situation. Yared and the others weren't going to be convinced of her worth simply because I was forcing them to be, and Rachel had received the message very loudly and very clearly from her fellow haunted house designers. (Saxton, 2014, p. 29)

This lesson from Cary’s Poe unit was an eye-opening lesson for Cary in that she began to see things that she originally had not seen because of her previous governing gaze. To start, Cary identified the physical space and the privileging of spoken language as the only form of communication. Further, her actions did not position Rachel to be successful. According to Cary:

Like the fact that when it’s just talking, you know, she [Rachel] clams up, because she, that’s not her strength. And there were four guys and she was physically positioned over here and she probably felt out numbered and felt the focus was all on her. (C. Saxton, personal communication, November 6, 2013)
The privileging of spoken language during this lesson may have been in part due to Cary’s initial governing gaze in terms of dialogue.

I saw dialogue as a means of assessing student content knowledge and a skill in and of itself. Engaging in discussion was like writing an essay; it was another mode of communication in which I was trying to elicit student growth. (Saxton, 2013, p. 7)

Cary was aware at the time that other mediating tools, such as objects, pictures, and sound effects, provided her students with another means to communicate and make meaning together. But her assumptions about the importance of the different modes for communicating were not a part of her theoretical framework at the time. Cary was still relying on her positioning of Rachel with an individual role as a way to support her inclusion. Even though Rachel was smiling and engaged as the note taker during the lesson, Rachel was not positioned as an equal valued member of the classroom community. Cary attempted to get Rachel to share her ideas throughout the discussion by asking her questions, but Rachel refused to share. Cary’s assumption after the fact were that this was in large part due to the combination of the multimodal observations made above, as well as the privileging of spoken language over other modes. Spoken language was the only way that students were sharing their ideas for the haunted house, and Cary recognized after the lesson that this was Rachel’s least dominate mode of communication. Thinking back to other lessons Cary began to see things that she had not seen before; her theoretical framework was shifting. Cary identified other modes that Rachel was more comfortable using that supported deliberate positioning of others,
Rachel, Cary, and her classmates, with more power, and as capable members of the classroom community.

Cary attempted to talk with Rachel after class on November 6, 2013 by asking her to explain how she was feeling during the lesson.

Cary: So Rachel what was the difference today? Because, like I’ve just noticed in the past few weeks working on this Haunted House thing, you know some days you’re really outgoing. Some days you’re really into sharing and you want to share. And you know, you’ll stand up and talk and give your ideas. Can you help me out? What’s different today? What happened today that um worked against that [sharing ideas] because you were very very quiet today. Which, I’m sure you’ve got lots of good ideas. So

Rachel: I was scared to say anything. (quietly)

Cary: But what, yes? But what about today was different than other days when you are not scared to say something?...

Rachel: I don’t know exactly (she laughs).

Cary: Because it would really help me out you know?

Rachel: Yea (says quietly and then smiles)

Cary: Like if I know that then I can design the way we do class in ways that you can actually you know share your ideas. But to me it’s a mystery. Kind of. But like at what point today did you (snaps fingers) sort of stop or (snaps fingers) or decide I’m going to be quiet? Was there something said? I’m sorry I’m going to let you talk.

Rachel: Um, I don’t know exactly why. It’s just I was scared to say anything (Her voice gets quiet). (Laughs)

Cary: I mean does it have to do with other students? Does it have to do with the work we were doing? (3s)

Rachel: I’m sorry I really don’t know how to explain (laughs).

Cary: Like in your other classes are you more like you were today or are you more like outgoing and explanatory? I don’t know if that’s a word. Explanative?
Rachel: I don’t know, but I like it. Um, I’m more out going (she says the second sentence much quieter than the first).

At the time of the lesson, Cary’s assumption was that if she talked one-on-one with Rachel and identified what she needed Cary could then support her in the classroom. Cary’s gaze was on individual relationships between her and her students. She had yet to extend her gaze to see that positioning is social and that people react and position themselves in relation to others. Cary assumed that positioning was important in relation to her students and her, but she literally did not see positioning in relation to others and how that applied to her class.

Later on through our collaborative inquiry, Cary’s gaze began to change in terms of how she viewed Rachel and her assumptions about why Rachel positioned herself and how others positioned her in the classroom. Cary began to identify how she as a teacher needed to position Rachel to be a successful contributing member of the community. According to Cary, “At this point in her school career she had been positioned and had positioned herself as “less” than everyone else around her for years. She needed a teacher who authored moments in which she was positioned as an equal, contributing, valued member of the classroom community” (Saxton, 2014, p. 8). This was a shift for Cary, whose previous assumption had been that she needed to focus on the one-on-one relationship she had with Rachel. Instead, she now recognized that she needed to focus on the classroom as a community and how the members of the community positioned each other. By using dramatic inquiry, Cary was more able to deliberately position her
students as equal capable members and haunted house designers who needed to collaborate in order to make meaning in a shared task.

For Cary, it was not just using dramatic inquiry that was going to position Rachel as a valued member of the classroom community. Cary also had to reexamine what dialogue was in her classroom to support spoken language as a tool that could be used to make meaning amongst all students. Cary was reconsidering her governing gaze and assumptions about dialogue. Cary’s theoretical framework was changing as she took up a sociocultural view of teaching and learning as a social practice heavily influenced by the theories of Bakhtin (1981) and Vygotsky (1978). In her coursework at the university she had learned how, by stepping into-role as if she was someone in a fictional space, she could dialogue with students and make meaning about texts. Cary’s original governing gaze and assumptions about dialogue were changing based on her experiences as a student at the university, her theoretical readings, and her participation in collaborative inquiry.

In the semi-structured interview following this lesson, Cary was aware of how the boys in her class were using spoken language to position Rachel with less power. However, it was not until Cary watched the clip again in August 2014 that she realized how much that she and her students had changed over the course of the school year. It had become commonplace for students to use spoken language to position each other negatively. Cary’s transformation for how she dialogically positioned her class began when she was able to see beyond her initial governing gaze and see how language was used as a mode to exclude and include students. Cary’s changing theoretical framework
was now based in her belief that students needed to be dialogically positioned to use language to include each others’ voices in dialogue. Cary explained her theoretical framework by her actions in positioning students within the classroom to disrupt the existing social structure. “I had helped our group engineer a new social structure in which Yared couldn’t talk to Rachel like that anymore” (Personal communication, February 18, 2015). Cary began to deliberately position her students, so that they no longer used spoken language to negatively position each other. Cary was now aware of how moments over time supported the use of spoken language as a positive tool for collaborative meaning making.

Through Cary’s commitment to collaborative inquiry she was also beginning to question her assumptions about why Rachel did not talk during a lesson and re-examined what it meant to “dialogue” in her classroom. Through her readings Cary began to believe that dialogue was at the heart of teaching and learning. According to Edmiston (2014):

Dialogue is not an option if we want people to understand and thus learn. Unless young people, and adults, genuinely listen and respond to what others have said and done and seek to understand one another's views then there is little substantive learning going on in classrooms. Teaching is primarily about engaging in and facilitating productive dialogue with and among students to mediate their authoring of meaning about texts and their understanding over time about life and their selves. (p. 8)

Cary was no longer content to sit by and let dialogue be used as a tool to exclude others; this meant she had to address how her own teaching affected how students were positioning one another. Cary’s awareness of dialogic positioning was now starting to be
made clear to her through the discussions about what was happening in her classroom.

Cary (2013) believed that:

If the lessons I implemented and the general structure in my classroom allowed for a student to be excluded in such a drastic way, something needed to change. I also had to do some serious soul-searching about myself as a teacher. Was I content to let the Rachel’s of the world suffer in silence? The answer was a resounding “no.” I had always thought of myself as a caring, egalitarian teacher, and I wanted to reconcile that image with the reality I had just uncovered. (Saxton, p. 6)

**Collaborative Activities with Mediating Tools.**

During my semi-structured interview with Cary in August I also played clips from her teaching that highlighted moments that worked. There were moments that demonstrated Cary’s shifting governing gaze and assumptions about teaching and learning, even if she was not aware of them at the time. One of the lessons that Cary had done previously provided students with multiple mediating tools as they collaborated on designing elements and scenes for the haunted house. By looking at multiple interactions I was able to identify how participants positioned their bodies and used different modes to better inform my analysis.

On October 25, 2013, students were separated into small groups as if they were haunted house designers creating a script and/or a design for how people would experience the haunted house. Cary moved between each group providing support as needed. At this time Cary was providing additional mediating tools (Vygotsky, 1978) beyond just the text in print and Braille to her students. Students now had tactile objects: blankets and mannequin heads, materials to draw and build with, as well as sound effects
that could be played on a computer or handheld device. Cary was dialogically positioning her students in activities that allowed them to communicate by collaborating and making meaning using different tools, beyond just language. Cary’s students were being provided with opportunities to work together in a community of practice (Wenger, 1998) on a joint endeavor, as if they were haunted house designers. All could contribute to a shared inquiry. The following transcript is from a discussion that occurred between Yared, Rachel, and Debbie as they discussed how people should be introduced to a dead body when they enter the haunted house. See Figure 11. Their discussion was prompted by Rachel and Debbie who were wondering how someone with a visual impairment might experience the haunted house.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spoken Language Transcript</th>
<th>Multimodal Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yared: Right, right in the doorway so. Right when everyone walks in they sort of either bump into it or see it right away</td>
<td>Yared takes a step forward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel: Yea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yared: and be ahh (makes a noise of disgust).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel: And you are like showing the light.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie: But I would</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel: Like run in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie: But I would trip the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yared: On and offs don’t care about blind people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel: You would trip the and then like reach down and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie: Yea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yared: What is this oh my god. (Screechy voice)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel: And you would be like, ‘What is this?’ And reach down</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie: Yea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel: And feel what it is.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yared: And be like what is this? That would be the dead body of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 11: Transcript from October 25, 2013.
Figure 11 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spoken Language Transcript</th>
<th>Multimodal Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Debbie: But you can’t say it, because I would</td>
<td>Debbie turns towards Yared as she talks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel: You have to wait for her and then you can say, ‘‘That is the</td>
<td>Rachel and Debbie are looking up at Yared.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie: The body of</td>
<td>Yared’s voice has changed as if to signal that he is in-role-as-Edgar Allan Poe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yared: That would be the corpse of Madam La Sponia</td>
<td>Rachel is looking at Debbie as she talks and then she smiles as she gasps, jumps a bit, puts up her left arm and turns to look at Yared.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel: And then you could be like, “Uhh” (shocked sound)</td>
<td>Rachel and Debbie are both smiling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yared: Oh my god (in a high pitched voice as he smiles)</td>
<td>Rachel and Debbie are both smiling and laughing as they look at Yared.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel: We’ll take (starts laughing)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yared: (Inaudible talking in a high-pitched voice as he smiles)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie: I don’t sound like that though…</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yared, Rachel, and Debbie had been sitting at a table discussing elements of the Poe text that they would want included in their text. Tactile objects were available on the desks that the students could use as they dialogued. The mediating tools provided the students with opportunities to push themselves beyond the literal meaning of the Poe text and to extend their language as they dialogued. The students used the mediating tools to alter the space of the real world classroom to enter the fictional space of the haunted...
house as if they were haunted house designers, while at the same time incorporating their social and cultural knowledge about being a teenager with visual impairments. Yared, Rachel, and Debbie were using third order positioning (Harre´ & Langenhove, 1999) to discuss how visitors would be positioned in relationship to the elements of the text that they were attempting to include in their haunted house design. Yared, Rachel, and Debbie were on their feet touching actual objects as they dialogued, because they wanted the haunted house to be accessible for visitors with visual impairments. They were including their own cultural knowledge by sharing their personal experiences and opinions from times when they had gone to a museum. Through their discussion they recognized that they would need to incorporate more than just the narrator describing the haunted house.

During the dramatic inquiry project the students were dialogically positioned to share differing opinions and explore different outcomes. At first Yared was not convinced, but as Rachel and Debbie described their idea for having a dead body, using spoken language and tactile objects, they were able to express and clarify their opinion. Within the third order positioning, created by the dramatic framing of the students as if they were haunted house designers, Rachel and Debbie were asserting themselves with more agency outside of their usual roles in the classroom. The fictional framing was providing Debbie and Rachel with more authority as they deliberately positioned themselves and their group as knowledgeable. Neither Rachel nor Debbie cowered down and gave up their initial idea when Yared first signaled that he was not interested. Yared accepted how Rachel and Debbie positioned themselves as knowledgeable and began
collaborating with them. Yared-as-Edgar Allan Poe spoke as if in the haunted house and explored this idea with Rachel and Debbie. In this example, each of the students deliberately positioned themselves as knowledgeable and each accepted how the others positioned themselves; each took on an identity of a capable member of the classroom community.

The three students arranged the tactile objects and set up the dead body to describe possible scenarios that could be enacted in the haunted house. See Figure 12. The image shows the students as haunted house designers on their feet collaborating on a shared endeavor of designing a haunted house. In imagination, the students stepped back and forth between the real world of the classroom and the fictional space of the haunted house. The student’s head and gaze are all directed towards the objects that they were using as they described the dead body and how visitors might find out about the dead body. Their bodies are relaxed and their posture is bent down towards the objects. The multimodal interaction suggests that the students are sharing power as they collaboratively engaged in dialogue. No one in the group is positioning themselves away from the other members; no one is excluding anyone else.
Debbie, Rachel, and Yared entered the haunted house and described how someone would come in contact with the dead body. See Figure 13. Using multimodal interaction analysis (Norris, 2004), I identified that all three students were standing in a circle with their bodies directed towards each other. Their gazes were looking at their fellow collaborators, acting as if they were haunted house designers, and all had smiles on their faces. The students appeared to enjoy working together on the haunted house design. Rachel and Debbie were able to share their ideas with Yared, and Yared accepted their suggestions. The tools and fictional space had provided Rachel and Debbie with more authority than they had previously as “students” in the classroom. Rachel and
Debbie had positioned themselves, based on the actions that Cary made to set up the activity, as having knowledge that was valuable to the purpose of designing a haunted house. Rachel and Debbie asserted more agency over their participation and actively collaborated as haunted house designers.

Figure 13: Photograph of Debbie, Rachel, and Yared smiling on October 25, 2013.

Within the dramatic framing students utilized third order positioning to position themselves and their classmates with more authority as they talked about the text. Students accepted this positioning in a way that had previously not happened in the real world space in the classroom. Looking back and reflecting on these moments that
worked, Cary began to identify the types of actions she made during the dramatic inquiry that supported the needs of her students through dialogic positioning. Cary wrote:

As expert haunted house designers, they owned their reading of the story. They thoughtfully considered what they would and wouldn't need to know to accomplish the task at hand. Students then highlighted or copied parts of the text that triggered an idea, and then worked together to brainstorm ways in which they could bring those elements of the story to life. They had a myriad of tools available to them during this time. Some of the students sketched their ideas on whiteboards (if they had the usable vision to do so), and some borrowed an object from the prop table to help illustrate their plans. These were some of the best days of the unit, in terms of working toward achieving a dialogic community. Rachel was indeed inspired by the objects and the autonomy and agency she enjoyed as an expert haunted house designer. (Saxton, 2014, p. 18)

Cary’s view of dialogue was beginning to shift. Cary, inspired by her continued reading of Edmiston and Bakhtin, teaching with dramatic inquiry, and the continued collaborative inquiry process began to strive towards having a dialogic classroom that supported students in having polyphonic conversations. According to Edmiston (2014):

Extending dialogue from two people making meaning together to include the voices of more people makes a conversation polyphonic. Engaging as many people as possible in authoring understandings about a topic or text extends the meaning-making potential of each participant who answers utterances from more than one person. (p. 33)

Cary’s theoretical framework was now governed by her view of herself as teacher who made every effort to initiate teaching and learning activities that were “polyphonic” by positioning every student with agency to author understandings together as equals through dialogue. In the example above, Cary was able to support her students by dialogically positioning them to make meaning together on a joint endeavor. The students were engaged in small group discussions about a text, Poe’s *The Murders in the*
*Rue Morgue*, and they were extending meaning making through the use of tactile objects and the stepping into the fictional world. Students were given the power to author understandings together in an activity with a shared purpose: designing a haunted house.

**Community of Inquiry: Where Everyone is Included**

Cary’s awareness of her changing theoretical framework allowed her to see things she had not seen originally because of her governing gaze. Cary began to reconsider her assumptions about how she viewed the students in her classroom and how students were included. Cary was reexamining her previous assumptions about individualized instruction and lack of emphasis on the classroom as a community. Cary’s assumptions about community before using dramatic inquiry and participating in collaborative inquiry were that community was “a group of people who know each other well” (Saxton, 2014, p. 10). Cary’s assumptions about community did not take into account the social interaction of her students. Cary recognized that:

I had a serious misunderstanding about what a classroom community is, and should be. When I was a student (and I probably still behave this was as a student in college), I loved school. I loved talking and answering questions and participating and all that. It is a natural built in part of my personality. So for a very very long time I sort of projected this onto my students. I really praised those who were like me (Yared, John and Tom at times, etc.) and I pushed those who weren't like me to be more like me. But my pushing was actually doing the opposite of what I intended. By sitting everyone in a circle and talking at Rachel, pushing her to say something (anything!), I was doing a lot of damage. I thought that my talking, and the other students' talking would just make her magically start to participate in the dialogue. Talking + talking = talking, right?! I just thought if someone wasn't talking, they weren't interested in being a part of the community. (C. Saxton, personal communication, February 22, 2015)
Cary’s theoretical framework was based off her own experiences and her gaze was governed by her expectation about what a community should be. Cary did not realize that Rachel was not thriving in her classroom because of the health of her community until she sat down to examine how connected each of her students were. Fellow inquirer, Brian Edmiston, suggested that Cary make a sociogram (Edmiston, 2014), to assess student engagement. Cary took a picture of each of her students and moved them around to assess individual and group engagement in her class. Cary described her realization about the health of her classroom after making the sociogram:

I realized that not only was Rachel nowhere near the center in terms of power or popularity or anything, but she really didn't have anyone else in the class she related to besides Debbie. So then I realized that it really wasn't about me boosting her self-esteem everyday, it was about her being able to derive self-esteem organically from what was happening in class. This could only come from a healthy collaborative EQUAL (emphasis added by Cary) relationship with her peers. And of course I didn't really know what to do about it, or how to change my behavior yet to help Rachel, because just like she was in a rut for all that time, so was I. And it really didn't dawn on me just how much the dialogue in the class was overtly negative to her. (C. Saxton, personal communication, February 22, 2015)

Cary was now becoming aware of how she positioned her students and the ways that her students positioned themselves and each other was vital to the academic and social success of her students, as well as the health of their classroom community. Cary was aware that she needed to make a change but her gaze was still governed by whatever she was able to see. As the previous two examples from November 6, 2013 and October 25, 2013 illustrate, the norms in Cary’s classroom community affected how students were being positioned and thus how students were included or excluded in the classroom.
Cary’s changing theoretical framework about community led her to begin to change her assumptions about how to build community and her governing gaze about what to look for in her classroom. Cary’s previous emphasis on the individual meant she avoided dissonance amongst her students. Cary’s readings of Edmiston’s (2014) view of community, based on French philosopher Jacques Ranciere, were influential in her accepting that a community at times had tensions that emerged between individuals and the group. Cary’s theoretical framework was changing based on her awareness of the importance of her classroom community. Cary’s assumption was that:

My focus on individualism was undermining any sort of equality I was trying to establish between members of the community. It was in this way that I had helped to reinforce the hierarchy long established between this 12th grade cohort. (Saxton, 2013, p. 10)

A particular quote that rang true for Cary that initiated the change was, “instead of seeking a consensus that ignores or minimizes disagreement, a dissensual community embraces the potential and power of difference and dissonance in both the possible meanings of a topic explored and in the process of engaging in tasks” (Edmiston, 2014, p. 95). This led to Cary extending her governing gaze in terms of Rachel and her social positioning in relation to her fellow classmates. For Cary the change happened:

When I realized the problem was less about her and more about me, her situation became slightly improved. But when I realized that Rachel wasn’t thriving because of the health of the classroom community, the changes I implemented as polyphonic author/teacher began to bring her back to life. (Saxton, 2013, p. 10-11)
Cary and I watched a clip from October 24, 2014, to identify what she did as a teacher to position her students to be more collaborative and how her students began to see each other as capable and valued members of the classroom community. See Figure 14.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spoken Language Transcript</th>
<th>Multimodal Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yared: Good evening everyone. My name is Edgar Allan Poe. (John walks from right side, off camera, to the right side, on camera, and then stands near Tom. Tom moves closer to John.). And if you are not familiar with me, you are about to be. We are about to relive a story that happened a long, long time ago (his voice gets quieter). And uh, I’ll let you figure it out.</td>
<td>Yared has stepped back in-role. His voice is changed to lower and slower like before. Cary, Debbie, Rachel, and Tom have their bodies, head, and gaze towards Yared.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John: (Makes a loud, high pitched, shriek sound). Shriek</td>
<td>Yared steps out of character and says that in his normal voice to John and smiles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yared: That was actually right on cue.</td>
<td>She says with her head and her gaze on John.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cary: Okay, let’s all do it. (She smiles)</td>
<td>Cary turns her head and gaze towards Debbie &amp; Rachel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cary, Debbie, &amp; Rachel: Shriek (together they make a loud, high pitched shriek noise).</td>
<td>Yared is now in-role. He has changed his voice to signal the change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yared (in-role): Let’s go find out. What was that? Get the gates.</td>
<td>Rachel is smiling as she, Debbie, and Cary move towards the gates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cary: Inaudible sound</td>
<td>Yared, Mark, John, and Tom move towards the house in the fictional world. Rachel stops, turns her head and gaze towards Cary when she starts talking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel: What happened?</td>
<td>Continued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Tom moves to open the gates and makes a sound]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yared: Move to the house</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cary: Wait, hold on...[students talk about the sound of the gate]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 14: Transcript from October 24, 2013.
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Figure 14 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spoken Language Transcript</th>
<th>Multimodal Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cary: Do we imagine that it’s kind of a squeaky gate noise?</td>
<td>Cary is standing with her hand under her chin as if thinking. Rachel has her body and gaze turned towards Cary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel: Yea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Students start making noise]</td>
<td>Rachel bends and smiles and laughs. Then, she turns her gaze and body towards Tom, Mark, and Yared.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cary: Wait, wait. Mark. No, no, listen to Mark. Mark do it again…</td>
<td>Rachel is facing Cary as she talks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cary: So what did you say Rachel?</td>
<td>Cary turns her head and body towards Rachel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel: It would sound more scary if it was</td>
<td>Rachel turns her head and gaze towards the boys as she talks. Her left arm is across her body, while her right arm hangs down in front of her.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cary: Oh, did you guys hear this? Listen to what Rachel said. Say it again.</td>
<td>Cary moves her arm as if opening a gate quickly. Rachel has turned her gaze towards Cary. Cary smiles, laughs and then looks at Rachel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel: (Louder) It would make it sound more scary and creepy if it was fast.</td>
<td>Rachel laughs and then turns her gaze from Cary to Yared.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom: Yea, but</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cary: Well maybe it’s uh, maybe if we made a compromise. Maybe it’s a fast squeak. Rarr (She makes a squeak sound as she moves her arm again and then laughs).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel: Well yea, it could be that.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cary identified this clip from October 24, 2013 as important in her changing awareness of how she positioned students in specific actions she made to support them.
during learning activities. Cary’s response and awareness of the positioning in her classroom was very telling after viewing this clip in August. Cary’s governing gaze was no longer hindering her from seeing what was happening over time.

And that’s what I have to remember is it’s not…the terrible one [clip from November 6, 2013] we saw was in mid-November…And this was in October…I have to stop thinking linearly. It’s not about progress over time. It’s about moments that work. You know? It’s about how you set up the class, so even today if I had those 6 kids in here again. And what is it a year later? If I put them in a circle and just did the talking it would still go badly. You know? So, it’s not like a cure like they were bad and now they’re good. It’s about the fact that throughout the year I gave them more moments like this…where they were up and moving. They were collaborating. They were compromising. (C. Saxton, personal communication, August 22, 2014).

When Cary began analyzing this clip from October, she compared it to the clip from November 6, 2013. One of the first things she identified was that using dramatic inquiry was not a magic cure that would immediately change her teaching and lead her students on an upward trajectory. She recognized that there were still going to be moments that did not work and moments that did work. What she emphasized was that now she was aware that she needed to examine the moments that worked and identify the things that she did and the things that her students did that made those moments work. Through collaborative inquiry, Cary had begun and was now committed to examining her own teaching more closely so that she really reflected on each lesson.

Cary identified that how she set up a lesson and how she positioned students affected to what extent the lesson went well or did not go well for her students. She now saw that having a lesson that focused solely on discussion, as in the clip from November 6, 2013, would not be supporting the needs of all of her students. Her students needed to
be dialogically positioned to use a variety of modes and mediating tools as they collaborated to make meaning together. Just because Cary positioned her students a certain way was not the only factor. Cary saw that how her students viewed themselves and each other also affected their identity, agency, and power in the classroom. Her assumption now was that her students needed to trust each other as they collaborated in the fictional and real world spaces they created through dramatic inquiry in order to collaborate together as in a community of practice.

Going back to the transcript in Figure 14, dialogue was an important factor in how students interacted with each other. Cary used dialogue as a mediating tool, in order to support students in hearing each other. Cary recognized the importance of her action of using language at the time to mediate the situation. Cary said, “I think that would have fallen apart if I hadn’t been the one to make the compromise” (C. Saxton, personal interaction, August 22, 2014). Cary deliberately said statements and asked questions to draw attention to what each student said and she deliberately positioned the words or sounds that each student was sharing as valuable. Cary said, “Listen to Mark…What did you say Rachel?...Oh, did you guys hear this?...Say it again.” Cary also said, “Maybe if we made a compromise.” Cary used dialogue to demonstrate that there was not one right answer and to encourage some of the dissonance she had previously avoided. When her students worked together to make meaning, the possibilities were endless. Everyone’s ideas could be included and had meaning in supporting their shared purpose for designing a haunted house.
Cary identified how her changing awareness of the health of her classroom community supported the deliberate positioning of Rachel in activities to communicate in more ways besides just talking in order for Rachel to be included by her fellow classmates. Cary’s theoretical framework was connected to her awareness of the health of her classroom. According to Cary:

I realized that dialogue should be so much more than talking…I thought there was one right way to demonstrate your knowledge (talking, and writing to a lesser extent). But when I started giving her [Rachel] chances to show her ideas, I realized that she actually could be a capable, contributing member of the community. And that’s what community building really is, to me now-not icebreakers or get-to-know-you activities. As a teacher I can help build a community by structuring activities, instruction, interactions, etc. that facilitate the equality and freedom of expression of all those involved. (C. Saxton, personal interaction, February 22, 2015)

Students were in-role-as-haunted-house-designers in the fictional space of the haunted house on October 24, 2013. See Figure 15. All of the students were present and they were in role as if they were haunted house designers. Cary stood in the middle of the students. She kept her body positioned towards her students and would turn her head and gaze towards students as they talked and shared ideas. The image shows some of the students, the rest are out of camera view, standing in a circle. At this time all of the students stopped what they were doing and turned their bodies and gaze towards the group. The students’ bodies were turned inward towards the group, signaling for the first time in this lesson that they were ready to collaborate. Student’s heads and gazes would move towards students as they shared ideas. The students-in-role-as-haunted-house
designers moved their arms as if it was a gate, made noises as if they were running, or a loud squeal as if they were a squeaking gate.

Figure 15: Photograph of Cary and her students on October 24, 2013.

The students did not use language to exclude each other and ideas that were shared. The third order positioning that Cary and her students were utilizing allowed the students to include each other not only in discussion but in meaning making to support an inclusive classroom community where everyone was positioned with the power to act. Cary brought attention to everyone’s ideas and the students accepted each other’s ideas so that everyone’s ideas became part of the haunted house design. The students-as-
haunted-house-designers would step into the fictional haunted house space and enact the experience of someone entering the haunted house led by Yared-as-Edgar Allan Poe. The students laughed and smiled as they enacted the same moment several times adding in each others’ ideas to support their shared inquiry. Cary (2014) writes:

Moments like these were certainly not routine. But each fleeting time the equation was balanced and each person had a hand in creating our shared narrative, we chipped away at the old paradigm. We were building a community, not just an imaginary haunted house. And although students weren’t interacting harmoniously like this every minute of every class period, enough of these moments occurred that real change was in effect. (C. Saxton, p. 33)

The old paradigm of allowing language to be used as a tool positioning one student with more authority than another was no longer an accepted practice. Cary’s original apprehension about using dramatic inquiry with her students was gone. Cary was now dedicated to creating an inclusive community which demonstrated that she believed in the literate potential of all students, Kliwer’s (2008a, 2008b) local understanding, by positioning her students with agency and to respect the ideas of their peers. Her assumptions about dialogue no longer supported or accepted monologic conversations, but rather encouraged the polyphonic voices of all students grappling with the diverse perspectives and dialogue that she now believed was essential. Cary was aware that she needed to position her students dialogically in relation to the whole group. Community was no longer something that Cary assumed had already been established; instead it was something that she and her students strived to support and develop through the inclusion of all students as equal and valued members.
Reflection

Final Projects.

In order to examine Cary’s transformation or change over time, I looked back not at the improvement from lesson to lesson, but rather at the moments that “worked” and those that did not during The Murders in the Rue Morgue dramatic inquiry unit. Cary and I defined moments that “worked” in her classroom as moments when students were all actively participating and collaborating in meaning making. One thing that Cary was conflicted with was the final projects that she decided on for the unit. Her focus was on collaborative inquiry where students worked together to make meaning as they completed the commission for the dramatic inquiry unit. However, due to student absences and a wavering interest in creating the actual haunted house, Cary decided to let the students choose an individual project, a tourist brochure or an audio recording. Cary was afraid that the collaborative efforts that the students-as-haunted-house-designers had been using would end up with individualized projects even though her intention was to re-inspire the students with the unit and allow them to have some power in how their ideas were shared. I argue that Cary’s positioning of her students as capable and valuable members of the community truly became a part of the student’s identities. Cary’s students positioned themselves as capable and relied on their classmates and their strengths, in order to collaborate and make sure that each of them succeeded in the inquiry project. Even though the students were making an individual project, they were helping their fellow classmates by supporting their shared inquiry about the haunted house. Tom helped Rachel when she needed assistance in order to add sound effects to her audio recording.
Students would ask their classmates to remind them of things they had agreed upon as a group in order to make sure that their project stayed true to the group’s vision. Cary (2014) writes:

Despite the fact that I gave them an individualized assignment, they did not mentally retreat to an individualized state. The haunted house that lived in the group's consciousness was very much still alive and well. It should be noted that I didn't require that students abide by the group's version - they did so naturally, as if there were no other possibilities besides the ones they created together. (p. 34)

Cary’s assumption was that her students-as-haunted-house-designers were now viewing each other as capable and contributing members in their meaning making. The previous paradigm of not valuing everyone’s ideas was being replaced. Cary identified this as significant because her students took it upon themselves to include each others’ ideas. Cary had not required her students to include the ideas of their peers, and for her it was noteworthy that her students now positioned the ideas that they created collaboratively as important.

Upon completion of the projects, the students shared each of their projects with the entire class. Half of the class had made brochures, which were passed around for students to observe and touch while the creators explained them. Tom and Yared shared their audio recordings, which were received with laughter and smiles from their fellow haunted house designers. When it came time for Rachel to share, Cary noticed that Rachel resorted back to her identity as a meek and shy student who did not want to share in front of the whole group. Cary struggled with whether she should require Rachel to share, worried about how her fellow classmates would position her in response to either
option. However, significantly it was Rachel’s fellow haunted house designers who deliberately positioned Rachel as a valued member of the community by praising her and telling her that they knew her audio recording would be good and that she should share it with them. Cary identified that it was in fact Tom, who had previously positioned Rachel as less than him on several occasions that made the difference. Tom told his fellow haunted house designers that he had heard her audio recording when he was helping her with the sound effects, and that it was good. Tom was deliberately positioning Rachel as capable and as someone who did good work in front of the whole group through spoken language. Cary (2014) writes:

I want to highlight this occurrence as the first time I realized, in the moment, that a true transformation had occurred. This was indeed unprecedented. It seemed as if Rachel had finally emerged as someone whose ideas mattered to the rest of the group. They were clamoring for something she had created, something they had built with her. (C. Saxton, p. 34)

Rachel accepted how her classmates positioned her, and she agreed to have her audio recording played for the community. Rachel’s classmates were now deliberately positioning Rachel as someone who mattered and had a personal identity that was valued in their community. Cary described this moment in her classroom with such passion and joy not only in what her students had accomplished academically, but also socially as a community of inquirers.

It was great. It was really good. It was like the best work she had ever done, hands down. It was funny. Like I never knew this girl had a sense of humor. It was hilarious. Like the [Cary starts laughing] first thing she [Rachel] said was, ‘Your tour guide um looks like Edgar Allan Poe.’ She said, ‘Supposedly Edgar Allan Poe was very attractive, so if this guy isn’t attractive. I’m sorry. He’s the only guy we could find.’ [Cary speaks as though she is Rachel’s audio recording.}
Cary begins laughing when she is finished] I know. And we all laughed. And the boys loved it. They were hooting. They were hollering. So they got done, they gave her a standing ovation. ‘See Rachel you can do it.’ (C. Saxton, personal communication, December 5, 2013)

Using Vygotsky’s (1978) theory of language development, her students were able to build understanding through language and shape identity, agency, and power (Enciso, & Ryan, 2001; Lewis, Enciso, & Moje, 2007). Throughout the dramatic inquiry unit students had opportunities to collaborate and making meaning together using a variety of modes to share ideas for the haunted house, come up with plans for the house, as well as their individual projects, and push each other to be a “head taller” as they collaborated (Vygotsky, 1978). Together, the students were able to push each other through their interactions with a more skilled other, Cary, and make meaning beyond what they would have accomplished individually (Edmiston, 2007; Vygotsky, 1978). Rachel’s agency was no longer constrained, but rather she was positioned with more power and thus began to enact an identity of a capable member of the community of practice. Tom began to use words to empower Rachel instead of exclude her from the community.

Cary’s students previously had used deliberate positioning of Rachel as someone who was incapable and who did not have anything to offer the group. Now the students deliberately positioned Rachel as capable. Rachel’s fellow classmates were able to experience Rachel’s audio recording and Cary’s assumption was that they began to see her as capable of completing quality work. Rachel appeared to accept this positioning: she was smiling from ear to ear as her audio recording was played. Rachel’s identity as an outsider who did not have anything to offer was changing in terms of the students
wanting her to belong and also in terms of how they viewed her ability. Power was beginning to shift from only a few students to something that was shared amongst all members of the class from teacher to student. Rachel was now being positioned with more agency in the classroom, as her fellow classmates and her teacher’s view of her new identity shifted.

**Positioning of individual students in relation to the whole group.**

This transformation did not happen overnight, but rather through moments that worked. Cary reflected on the changes that she implemented to position Rachel differently in the classroom that she believed affected how Rachel positioned herself, as well as how her classmates began positioning her as a valued member of the community. According to Cary:

Essentially, those situations would be those in which she [Rachel] was free to show, not tell, her ideas. In instances where she could stand versus sit, or use objects, or move, or gesture, she was more likely to participate…So the opportunity to be multimodal in her expression helped greatly. The other shift I think that really contributed to her transition was when I started paying more attention to roles. I'd ask myself, is she acting as an equal museum curator, or whatever we were doing? Or is she a secretary? Or is she nothing at all because she's not participating? So I always had to pay close attention to both the modes and roles available for her to use/fill. (C. Saxton, personal communication, February 22, 2015)

Cary was aware that she had to pay attention to how she positioned Rachel in relation to the entire group. Her awareness of how people were positioned in the real space and in the fictional space created in the classroom affected her awareness of Rachel’s inclusion or exclusion. Moments where students used third order positioning to position each other in the fictional space as haunted house designers, where each person
had the authority to share differing ideas about their collaborative inquiry supported the inclusion of all students. Students, like Rachel, were positioned with the authority of haunted house designers. This authority provided over time through experiences in the dramatic world with third order positioning extended into the real world space in the classroom by students positively positioning each other as included. Cary’s use of dramatic inquiry over time supported changes in her student’s identity (cf. Edmiston, 2008, 2011). Rachel’s agency began to be promoted more during the dramatic inquiry unit, which aligned with the inclusion of student’s ideas to support the collaborative meaning making within the classroom community.

Cary also provided her students with the opportunity to reflect on their collaborative meaning making during the dramatic inquiry unit. Cary decided to interview each of her students one-on-one about their experience of the process of using dramatic inquiry in their literacy learning. By providing her students with an opportunity to reflect on what they liked about their experience using dramatic inquiry, Cary was positioning her students with a voice and power in relation to their own learning. Students were also able to verbalize their own change over time through the use of dramatic inquiry in terms of identity, agency, and power. The following are reflections by Rachel and Yared as they looked back at the use of dramatic inquiry during The Murders in the Rue Morgue unit and at the end of the school year.
Rachel.

Rachel identified how she was more interested in what they were learning about because they were coming up with their own questions and they were able to act it out, instead of just reading an entire text. According to Rachel:

And I think that doing this project it has helped me become more confident also, because I was more comfortable like saying what I thought about a certain part of a story. And also going along with the questions, I felt comfortable asking the questions; because I knew it was something I actually wanted to know. I also think it helped me become more confident that way by doing this project. (Rachel, personal communication, December 20, 2013)

Rachel verbalized how her identity changed during this unit in terms of how she felt more comfortable and confident. She also was more invested and interested in the content, which allowed her to speak up more and ask questions. However, even though she had identified some positive change in her identity in the classroom, she still identified that in a group dynamic she did not have a lot of agency. The following is an excerpt from the interview between Cary and Rachel on December 20, 2013.

Cary: So how does that group dynamic affect you, you think?

Rachel: Um, I think it makes me like, in a little way scared to say my opinion on things, because I kind of have a feeling like they really won’t want to listen to what I have to say or accept what I have to say. So I seem to be always quiet, because I’m just

Cary: Now is it just them or does that go with any group of people?

Rachel: Um

Cary: Or is it this particular group of people?

Rachel: That would be, I think it would pretty much be any person that’s like you were saying not aggressive, but wanting to say their opinion or whatever. So I
think I probably got a little scared to say what I had to say and also not really confident with what I had to say.

Even though Rachel still identified that she did not feel confident sharing with a large group, she was able to explain moments in the class that she felt confident. For example, Rachel explained a time when she had the opportunity to show others what she believed a character felt in the text. Cary pushed Rachel a bit in her questioning in how dramatic inquiry may help students that tend to be quieter, like her. Rachel stated:

Yes, I do think this would help because I know like for me at least, um, it helped because obviously if you are just sitting around in the classroom and the teacher tells you to like explain like say what you were thinking it might be a little bit more difficult for someone who is quiet. But maybe acting it out is like a different way of communicating with other people so I think it would be a lot easier. I actually really like that way of teaching. I think it really works a lot better for me at least. (Rachel, personal communication, December 20, 2013)

Rachel’s comment about how dramatic inquiry allowed her to communicate in a different way, beyond just sitting and talking demonstrated how Rachel was comfortable enough to share with Cary why she did not talk even when a lesson was all about talking. Looking back at the lesson on November 6th, 2013, Rachel was not able to verbalize why she did not talk during the lesson. But here, almost a month later, Rachel described how she learns best and situations when she feels more comfortable in the classroom. Rachel had successful moments, like the ones shared from October where she was positioned differently and she began to see herself as a member of the community. Cary deliberately positioned her students with more moments where they were given opportunities to communicate in different ways during the dramatic inquiry unit. By
deliberately positioning her students she empowered them to construct new identities as they stepped in between fictional and real world spaces created through dramatic inquiry as a collaborative community of practice.

**Yared.**

Cary’s interview with Yared provided some enlightening moments for Cary in terms of the educational content that her students got out of the dramatic inquiry unit and how they viewed their classroom community. Yared’s interview represented a noticeable shift in Yared’s identity and how he viewed himself and others. Where previously he used phrases such as “I,” “me,” or “mine,” he was now saying “we,” “our,” and “compromise.” Yared’s positioning over time of himself as a member of the community had shifted his view of himself in relation to his peers from “I for me” to “I for us” (Edmiston, 2014) that supported the inclusion of everyone’s voice and ideas. Edmiston (2014) wrote, “In all community activities ‘we’ experience together, and can reflect to make meaning ‘for us’. At the same time, each person is an individual ‘I’ who make meaning ‘for me’ about shared experiences” (p. 71). Through Cary’s changed theoretical framework she now dialogically positioned her students to value community and to listen to each other’s voices. Students, like Yared, now valued collaborative experiences and realized that he benefited from working with others and that collaborative meaning making supported the individual and group.

Once again, the dissonance of individual ideas was now accepted, and students, like Yared, used the individuality and cultural backgrounds of others as well as their strengths to support the shared inquiry and meaning making. Previously, Yared had
positioned himself as more knowledgeable then his peers and at times had told them to “shut up” or tried to take over a conversation. Now he was talking about how he and his classmates were compromising and including each other’s ideas. According to Yared:

There wasn’t, I don’t think there was too much like growing necessarily, but it forced us to kind of all to build with each other. Kind of like take all of our mashed up ideas and create them into one, you know, because everyone had different ideas. (Cary makes agreeing sound). We’d come to one part and there’d be like five different opinions on what we should do. Then we would all kind of blend them in together and say okay what about this. Or how about we do it like this and take everyone’s ideas and kind of make a compromise of you know what it should be. Because we didn’t agree unanimously. (Yared, personal communication, December 20, 2013)

Cary also asked Yared to think about the perspective of his fellow classmates and how dramatic inquiry may have helped students who were more shy. He identified that he thought dramatic inquiry brought people out of their shell a little bit through discussions. In terms of content he said that he liked that there was no one way to answer something. Students were able to be creative and explore different possibilities as they collaborated to make meaning together. He also said because he enjoyed the projects and the dramatic inquiry unit he believed that he was more likely to retain information because he enjoyed it. In the past he said he had read a whole text and written an essay, but he would forget it because he did not enjoy it.

The biggest shift in Yared’s identity came in terms of his view of working individually and with a group. Looking back on the data from November 24, 2014, Yared had positioned himself as the only one with ideas. Almost a month later Yared had said the following about working with a group:

194
Well working with people in a group can always be more productive than when you are by yourself… I’m just saying without the GROUP [emphasis added by Yared], without the, without the, the assistance from the GROUP. Even though I did my entire audio tour by myself and it was all me. The IDEAS, ALL of the ideas in that audio podcast were conjured up by our group. Three bells? (Cary makes agreeing sound) That was our group idea (Cary makes an agreeing sound). Screaming, that we should have screaming from the ta, from the house (Cary makes agreeing sound) that was a group idea. The creaky floor boards. That was a group idea… Everyone brings different strengths to the table and we all build off of it. (Yared, personal communication, December 20, 2013)

Cary’s fears about having the students complete individual final projects and how this would detract from the collaborative community were proven unwarranted. Yared shared actual examples of specific things that he included in his final project that were from the group that informed his final product. Yared’s identity had changed in terms of how he viewed and positioned his fellow classmates. He now positioned his peers as knowledgeable and capable, and consequently used their ideas and was open to compromise to make meaning with them and support an inclusive classroom.

**Conclusion**

One of Cary’s changing practices is using dramatic inquiry to make meaning through collaborative activities. Through the collaborative activities Cary identified the importance of the classroom community and the inclusion of all students in shared tasks to make meaning together. As her students came to identify themselves as valued members of the community they shared more about themselves with their teacher and their peers. Cary identified that at the end of the school year she had designed a second inquiry unit that truly focused on the students working together and collaborating as a team. The students took ownership of the final museum project that they did as a
collaborative team, making sure that their ideas went together like puzzle pieces. Students asked each other for help and assisted each other with writing. For example, Tom wrote rules for a sign in his section, and Debbie brailed them for him. This is in sharp contrast to November when Tom had positioned Braille as inferior to print, and now, several months later, Tom was asking a classmate to Braille a sign so that it was accessible for all visitors.

An additional changing practice for Cary is the use of dialogue in the classroom to create a dialogic classroom through polyphonic voices in dialogue together to make meaning. Due to Cary’s new theoretical framework, she no longer viewed dialogue as a way to assess student knowledge and answer questions with predetermined outcomes. Cary was now aware of the power of dialogue in meaning making and that she needed to dialogically position her students to make meaning with others. She is aware that dramatic inquiry provides authority for her students when they step into a fictional space, like with *The Murders in the Rue Morgue* unit, as if they are someone else and allows them to utilize third order positioning to position themselves and others as knowledgeable.

Another changing practice is using multiple modes for meaning making. The different modes allowed students to be positioned by others and to position themselves with power leading to increased collaboration amongst students using tools that they were most comfortable with. The multitude of modes students used to communicate as well as the collaborative meaning making empowered her students and provided them with more agency in the classroom. The examples from October represented moments that worked
when students were communicating beyond what they did when they just relied on spoken language, like in the clip from November 6, 2013. The clips from October represented moments when students used different mediating tools, like a blanket to make a dead body or sound effects to make a squeaking gate, as they dialogued and made meaning together for their joint endeavor.

Cary became more aware of how students use oral language to position each other with more or less power. She saw how dialogue was a mode that could be used to include students in learning, whereas the absence of dialogue excluded them. Cary is more aware of how she sets up activities for students to have more or less power. She identified that she needs to be aware of how she positions students in relation to the whole group, as well as how she positions certain students in relation to the group. By thinking about the different modes that students can use to communicate beforehand, Cary identified that she can mediate situations and support the students to be more successful. Cary now is aware that by privileging one communicative mode, like dialogue, over another she is positioning some of her students with more power than other students in the class. Cary is committed to sharing power with her students in the class and providing them with agency in terms of how they position themselves.

As Cary looked ahead to teaching again next school year she recognized that her theoretical framework is based on commitment to using dramatic inquiry to dialogically position her students so that everyone is included. According to Cary:

I don’t think I’ll ever go back to the way I did things…I think that this particular way of teaching helps bring those kids out of the background that would normally be in the background. And in a public school where there’s 30 kids in a class,
you’re going to have 5-10 kids that are always in the background. And so, that’s a good percentage of the population that in a general ed English classroom have little to no attention paid to them, so I feel like this way of teaching is the only way that I can really think of to sort of bring them into the forefront. (C. Saxton, personal communication, August 22, 2014)

Cary’s assumptions about teaching now are governed by her sociocultural theoretical framework and her commitment to creating a community of practice where all students are included. Her assumptions for teaching and learning are now focused on teaching with dramatic inquiry and dialogically positioning her students to support students in creating a community of practice where all students are included as they collaborate to make meaning together on a shared endeavor. Cary’s gaze is now governed by her realization that she needs to position her students to create a community where everyone is valued and recognized in order to support the inclusion of all students.
Chapter 4: Stephanie Barrows

“I hope to position my students so that everyone is valued and heard.”

(Barrows, 2013, p. 1)

Introduction

I met Stephanie Barrows in 2010 during my first year, at The Ohio State University while I was enrolled in a children’s literature class. She and I would go on to take about five more classes together while at the university. During this time we shared a very open dialogue about her teaching and learning experiences at her school. We were talking during a course on Drama and Literacy taught by Brian Edmiston when I brought up how I was curious about how the use of dramatic inquiry in the classroom might affect the inclusion of students with special rights in the general education classroom. At the time, Stephanie was a fourth grade teacher who was going to be looping with the same group of students the following year into fifth grade. She had one particular student with special rights who was having some challenges including himself academically and socially, as well as being included by others in the classroom community.

Stephanie was and continues to be committed to the inclusion of all students as well as to incorporating dramatic inquiry into her teaching. I began the inquiry process
with Stephanie during a pilot study during the 2013-2014 school year, while she was teaching fifth grade. Due to Stephanie’s strong commitment to inclusion and using dramatic inquiry, I continued to observe in her classroom the following school year, 2014-2015. Our collaborative inquiry during the 2014-2015 school year is described in detail in this chapter.

**Purpose**

Like Cary, the purpose of the collaborative inquiry was to examine Stephanie’s awareness of her changing pedagogy and how her positioning of students over time with dramatic inquiry affected the inclusion or exclusion of her students. During the summer in between the pilot study and the collaborative inquiry the following academic year I met with Stephanie to begin to develop an inquiry question for her classroom. I found that Cary and I were able to use the inquiry questions that she and I had designed for the collaborative inquiry to guide the data analysis process and I wanted to replicate this with Stephanie. I began by reviewing my inquiry question with Stephanie and we discussed specific elements that she was interested in exploring who connected with my inquiry question.

I looked back at the data from conversations about Stephanie’s written work during the pilot study as I began to draft an inquiry question for Stephanie based on her inquiry paradigm. I wanted to make sure that this collaborative inquiry was something that would support Stephanie in her teaching and her changing pedagogy, as opposed to me as a researcher coming in and telling her what we would focus on for the inquiry. We came up with the following inquiry question for Stephanie’s classroom: “How do we as a
community of people create a community where everyone is respected, equally valued, and has a voice so that everyone can succeed academically and socially?” Her inquiry question, along with my inquiry question, would guide the data collection and analysis for the collaborative inquiry.

**Methodology**

**Setting**

**School Setting.**

The data collection and the dramatic inquiry based instruction described throughout chapter four was conducted at a large public elementary school in the Midwestern United States. Grades Kindergarten through fifth grade are taught at the school. Classrooms for grades Kindergarten through third grade, the main office, media center, cafeteria/gym are located in the main school building. Classrooms for students identified as students with special rights and English Language Learners (ELL) that receive pull-out services are in the main building. Classrooms for grades four and five, the computer lab, music room, and one self-contained classroom are in the modular unit off the main school building. Students at the school are representative of over 29 countries from around the world. The school curriculum is aligned with the Common Core State Standards.

This school setting is representative of levels 2 and 4 along the continuum of educational placements described in chapter 2. Students with special rights in the school do not receive push-in services by special education teachers or members of an educational support staff. School support staff pull-out students with special rights for
services based on the individual student’s IEP for less than half of the school day, which is an example of level 2 on the continuum of placements. There is also a self-contained classroom for students with special rights who are identified as having an emotional behavior disorder in the modular. This classroom is representative of level 4 along the continuum of educational placements with full-time placement of a child with special rights in a special education classroom, with aids and services provided by special education teachers.

Based on the school’s report card for the 2013-2014 school year, the school has a performance index grade of a C, which measures the tests results of every student (Ohio Department of Education [ODE], 2015). The school received an F for indicators met for the 2013-2-14 school year, which measures the percent of students who have passed state tests (ODE, 2015). The school’s progress overall, for gifted students, students in the lowest 20 percent in achievement, and students with disabilities for the 2013-2014 school year was a C (ODE, 2015). Of the students enrolled at the school during the 2013-2014 school year, 6.0 percent were identified as students with disabilities, 41.6 percent were identified as economically disadvantaged, and 41.8 percent were identified limited English proficiency (ODE, 2015). The state recorded student demographics for the school during the 2013-2014 as 41.0 percent White, non-Hispanic, 20.9 percent Hispanic, 19.5 percent Asian or Pacific Islander, 11.8 percent Black, non-Hispanic, and 6.9 percent multi-racial.
Classroom Setting.

Stephanie’s classroom was located in the modular unit off the main school building. The classroom was a fifth grade general education classroom that contained general education students, students with special rights, and students identified as ELL. The fifth grade classroom is an example of level 2 along the continuum of educational placements, mentioned in chapter two. Students with special rights in her classroom are educated in the general education classroom with supplementary aids and services. Students with special rights in her class were pulled-out by support staff for individualized instruction for 60 minutes each day, as outlined in the individual student’s IEP.

Students placed their backpacks and coats in a cubby directly outside of the classroom before entering the room to start the school day. Students had mailboxes where papers were placed to take home of previous assignments as well as announcements from the school. The arrangement of student desks changed every two weeks. Each student was assigned a desk that had a nametag on the top of the desk. Students kept their supplies inside their desk. The classroom teachers desk was against the wall in front of the dry erase board on the left hand side of the classroom. The two student classroom computers were located on the right hand wall upon entering the classroom. A SmartBoard was located on the left hand wall when entering the classroom. There were two large white boards located on the left and right hand sides of the classroom. A classroom library with bookshelves and a carpet area was located in the left
hand corner of the classroom on the far wall. There was one window that was on the far wall opposite the door.

**Participants**

**Students.**

Stephanie’s class consisted of fifth grade general education students and students with special rights. There were a large number of female students in her class. As of January there were 15 girls and 4 boys in her class. The total number of students in January was 19 students. There was also a high matriculation in the classroom. Six students had moved by December and three new students entered the class between December and January. The students were very diverse in terms of nationality and race. Her students came from over six different countries with five different languages (English, Spanish, Chinese, Japanese, and Arabic) spoken in the classroom.

During the 2014-2015 school year Stephanie had three students enrolled in her class that were identified as students with special rights. I chose not to identify the students identified as students with special rights by name in this chapter, because I did not want to label them and define them based on a disability. Rather I chose to focus on five students and their peers during activities in the classroom and thus stay true to my definition of inclusion and keep the focus on the community of practice and collaborative meaning making.

The following sections contain five student profiles on students whom Stephanie chose to focus on during this collaborative inquiry. Stephanie’s awareness of her positioning of these students as well as the students’ positioning of themselves and others
will be documented over time in the case study that Stephanie and I developed as we analyzed the data. I must mention that it was difficult to narrow down the focus to only five students. Stephanie’s theoretical framework that focused on the inclusion of all students through a classroom community was evident in our weekly discussions. Stephanie did focus on the students whom I highlighted in this chapter, but she also focused on every single student in her classroom. Her belief that all students should be equally valued carried over into everything that she did, including her analysis of lessons and planning for future lessons. What follows are the student profiles of five students from Stephanie’s class.

Alex.

Alex was an outspoken and bright male student. He had some challenges in his home life that he often shared in the classroom either through stories during a classroom meeting or through changes in his attitude in the classroom. His social interactions with his fellow classmates in the classroom and outside of the classroom had on occasion been negative.

According to Stephanie:

He [Alex] says he likes to work by himself and that’s what he’s told everybody time and time again. ‘I’d rather work by myself.’ But then I see him sometimes like, it’s almost like he’s afraid, the reason he says he doesn’t want to be a part of the group is because he’s afraid he’s going to be rejected as a part of a group…When he works with a group he also doesn’t always want to hear their ideas. He wants his ideas to be heard and he sort of expects them to go along with them and says well I don’t agree with that. (S. Barrows, personal communication, October 2, 2014)
Stephanie’s assumption at the beginning of the year was that Alex was someone who was resisting how Stephanie and his classmates positioned him as part of the classroom community (whom Harre’ and Langenhove (1999) describe as second order positioning). She had identified moments where he used his voice to disempower others by excluding their ideas and not treating everyone as respected and equally valued. Her assumption was that his positioning of himself and others might be due to some insecurities he had about being rejected by members of the community.

AJ.

AJ appeared to be a happy male student who got along with his fellow classmates. I had observed him working well with his fellow classmates and he easily started conversations with anyone he sat near. AJ was unorganized and he often had a desk full of papers and spent a great deal of time looking through his desk to find materials. During the first dramatic inquiry unit on Greek mythology I observed him start multiple products for his group and not complete most of them. This was often attributed to his lack of organization because he was unable to find the product he had been working on the previous day. I had also observed him on multiple occasions playing with an object, drawing, talking, or walking around the room. At times he is still was able to stay connected to the conversation and or task at hand while playing with an object, drawing, talking, or walking around the room. On the other hand, there were also times when he was not able to stay connected to the task at hand and focuses on something unrelated to the task. For example, I had witnessed him drawing on multiple occasions while not focusing on the directions being given and not being prepared for an activity.
Socially, AJ was able to get along well with his peers and contribute to supporting the community of practice. Stephanie said, “AJ’s always willing to jump in and ask tougher questions. You know he’s really insightful about those kind of things” (S. Barrows, personal communication, October 2, 2014). Stephanie was referring to how AJ had asked Shayla how she wanted the class to make her feel like she was a part of the classroom community. AJ had said that Shayla often would get upset and he wanted to know if they should ask her how she is doing or let her calm down.

Nick.

Nick was a very social male student who shared multiple times during class discussions and was quick to share his opinion or thoughts with the entire class or those around him. This could be both a blessing and a curse. At times his verbal feedback was relevant and could be incorporated into discussions, but on the other hand it was often disruptive and could cause others to get off topic. Stephanie usually stopped at least once a day at the beginning of the school year to ask Nick to stop side conversations and pay attention to the task at hand. His outgoing nature at the beginning of the school year was perceived as a great asset and a hindrance to his collaborative group work. On the plus side, he was able to complete a project and share ideas throughout with others. On the other hand, he at times overpowered his fellow teammates and their ideas were not heard. Stephanie has had to step in on multiple occasions to talk with Nick and his fellow teammates to make sure that everyone’s ideas are heard. Like AJ, Nick was unorganized and would often spend time looking through his desk for an assignment.

According to Stephanie:
He [Nick] has so many awesome ideas and he is such a creative kid. I just need him to remember that other people have ideas too. Just once in a while...Because he wants his ideas out there and sometimes he is so concerned about that. (S. Barrows, personal communication, October 2, 2014)

Stephanie was also aware that she wanted students who were more outspoken to be a part of the classroom community and have a voice. At the same time she wanted students like Nick to equally value and respect their classmates and position them with agency so that they could have a voice too.

**Kelly.**

Kelly was an outgoing female student who always could be seen with a smile on her face. She got along well with others, but tended to work only with a select group of students in the classroom. I had witnessed her on multiple occasions hugging others, and starting conversations with those around her. I also observed Kelly taking the lead in being honest about classroom concerns. She had on multiple occasions written a concern about students in the class not getting along or being rude to others outside of their classroom for classroom meetings. Kelly had even identified that students in their class, including her, had been guilty of misbehavior when others have not. Kelly has had some social difficulties with one of her fellow classmates. Stephanie and I had wondered if this was in part due to Kelly’s increased academic success in the classroom. Kelly has had some personal issues outside of the classroom that she has shared with her fellow classmates, which at times have distracted her during class.

According to Stephanie:
She’s like my second little teacher. I’m trying to get her out of the habit of her telling me when everybody is doing something wrong. Um, because that’s one of her things…So she does that a lot but she’s getting better. She’ll just remind people. And she does it in a very nice way. She’s never mean about it, but Shayla can be really mean to her (S. Barrows, personal communication, October 2, 2014)

At the beginning of the year Stephanie’s assumption was that Kelly needed some support in how she positioned herself in relation to her fellow classmates. Stephanie wanted to position Kelly so that she would talk with her classmates and treat them with respect in terms of being able to change behavior that she viewed as “wrong” instead of always going to the teacher. Stephanie had observed other students, like Shayla, reacting negatively to Kelly when she would automatically go to the teacher with every concern. 

**Shayla.**

Shayla was a female student who can be very outgoing, but at times she chose to be guarded and separate herself from others. At the beginning of the school year Shayla would cry and/or make a visible scene in the classroom if she was late for school, which happened often, or had done something that was perceived as not on task or disruptive. Shayla appeared to have some challenges at home that she shared in the class and could influence her attitude while at school. She also appeared to have some trouble making friends. Shayla would choose to only work with one of her fellow classmates, Kendra, that she identified as her best friend. Shayla appeared to be a student that wanted to be wanted by her fellow classmates. She often shared information during a class meeting or discussion, which was not accurate about herself, which may have been a way for her to be included in the discussion at the time.
According to Stephanie:

Shayla is one of my students I really want to focus positively on, because she’s had a real negative experience. Like yesterday she told me, ‘Everybody hates me’. So we stopped yesterday and we had a class meeting…and we talked and I said I understand that people may not always get along with you, but people don’t hate you…AJ looked at her and said, ‘Why do you do that? Why do you put your head down? You either put your head down and start crying or you make a big scene. Do you want us to ask you what’s wrong? Do you want us to give you more bucket fillers?’ And this was him asking. ‘Do you need more bucket fillers? We can fill your bucket.’ And she finally sat up and started to realize okay this might be valuable. (S. Barrows, personal communication, September 18, 2014)

The quote from Stephanie indicates her multiple aspects of her inquiry paradigm at the beginning of the year in multiple ways. Stephanie’s sound practice, as referenced in the quote above, will be explained in more detail. As in chapter 3, Stephanie’s change over time will be analyzed using an adaptation of Emig’s (1983) inquiry paradigm by applying the following four characteristics throughout this chapter: theoretical framework, assumptions, governing gaze, and actions, to detail Stephanie’s changing understanding of her own teaching pedagogy. Stephanie wants to make sure that each student feels equally valued, respected, and that they have a voice. So when Shayla told her that everybody hates her, Stephanie immediately stopped instruction and had a class meeting so that Shayla could be positioned to have a voice and so that she could share her feelings with her classmates. Stephanie’s assumption of this situation was the Shayla was beginning to hear some of her fellow classmates voice, such as AJ, who was asking her what he and the rest of their classmates could do to make her feel a part of the community. Stephanie’s gaze at the time was focused on creating a community of
practice where all students were included, more specifically she was focused on ways that she could positively position Shayla. Stephanie’s theoretical framework was on the value of her classroom community and the social interaction of her students and herself. See below for her theory of community.

**Teacher Profile: Stephanie Barrows.**

Stephanie was beginning her 20th year as a classroom elementary teacher. Stephanie has a master’s degree in education awarded in 2000. She is currently working on her second M.A. in literacy. The 2014-2015 academic school year was her fifth year teaching fifth grade. Stephanie had taught multiple units using dramatic inquiry the previous school year. This year she was committed to teaching with dramatic inquiry to support literacy learning and the inclusion of all people in the classroom community.

**Stephanie’s inquiry paradigm prior to the 2014-2015 school year.**

As with Cary Saxton, I will analyze Stephanie’s transformation using dramatic inquiry during her participation in our collaborative inquiry using an adaptation of Emig’s (1983) inquiry paradigm. Prior to the pilot study, Stephanie’s initial theoretical framework was based off of her assumption that her main focus needed to be how she would justify using dramatic inquiry to her administrator and how she would assess student work. Stephanie’s pedagogy was largely driven by the curriculum required by her district and the pressures she felt surrounding the new Common Core State Standards and the increasing use of standardized tests. These pressures stemmed from her district and the emphasis that was placed on student and teacher “success” as measured by standardized test scores. Inquiry was not at the forefront of her instruction prior to
teaching with dramatic inquiry. According to Stephanie, “When I first started teaching fourth and fifth grade especially, I would look at the standards and say okay we have to focus on main idea and details, so we only focused on main idea and details” (S. Barrows, personal communication, January 28, 2015). Her assumptions were that if she followed the standards provided and designed her instruction accordingly, then her students would be successful. Her focus on standards-based instruction dominated her governing gaze: she consequently did not position students to work together, follow student’s interests or give students much of a voice in the classroom.

At the time, Stephanie’s understanding of “community” was located in a Behaviorist theoretical approach; this approach supported her assumptions that she should use direct punishment and removal punishment to reinforce how students should behave as students in the classroom community. Stephanie described her assumptions about community prior to the collaborative inquiry as:

Based on management practices that I did, that I learned in undergrad. So like, um, cards that you flip or pull a stick, or you know owe recess minutes when there was a problem. Um, like just for example, the conversation we had today I probably would have said, ‘Well sorry, no more phones.’ And that would have been the end of it. Instead of having a conversation. And you know, getting an idea from a student. (S. Barrows, personal conversation, February 13, 2015)

While teaching with dramatic inquiry and participating in the collaborative inquiry process, Stephanie’s theoretical perspective changed from a Behaviorist perspective to a more sociocultural perspective as she began to understand community as made by people in social interactions with others. As with Cary, her understanding of readings of Vygotsky and Edmiston, in particular, guided her shift in terms of her
assumptions about community. Her governing gaze shifted as she looked for social interactions more than individual behaviors. Unlike Cary, Stephanie’s awareness of needed change in her classroom community happened early on during the pilot study. Stephanie became aware that how the students were interacting was not allowing all of them to be successful. Stephanie identified two students, Roslyn and Bill, who were consistently positioning themselves outside of the group, sometimes in response to forced positioning by their fellow classmates. Roslyn would exclude herself from learning with others at times by arguing with her classmates, which often supported her peers in not wanting to work with her in the classroom. Bill often would need support interacting with his classmates, which would then lead to them excluding him from learning activities and thus would further support Bill’s off task behavior. Stephanie’s awareness of her need for a pedagogical shift in how she viewed and created community was in response to her awareness of the exclusion of students like them.

Once Stephanie changed her assumptions about her understanding of a community she wanted to create she began incorporating new social practices as part of changes to her teaching. One goal was to be more tactical in her teaching. Stephanie’s theoretical framework was influenced by her readings of Edmiston (2014). By being more tactical in her teaching Stephanie’s goal was to “make certain that every one of them [her students] has authority and is recognized as a valuable member of our community” (2013, p. 1). Stephanie (2013) writes:

I am working hard to be certain that I treat all my students with respect and expect them to treat each other respectfully as well. One way that I have tried to socially
position my students so that they all have a voice is by instituting class meetings that occur every Monday morning and whenever else the need arises. (p. 1)

One new social practice was that students could post concerns on a post-it note that they could place on a poster in the room. These concerns were discussed during Monday’s class meeting or as needed during the week. This was Stephanie’ first step in terms of actions that she implemented in which she deliberately positioned her students to have a voice in beginning to build their classroom community. Stephanie continued with a social practice of weekly classroom meetings the following school year. She also instituted other actions, such as a talking stick and “bucket fillers”.

As Stephanie continued to look for ways to support building the classroom community and to support students in positioning each other in positive ways in the classroom, she read the book How Full is Your Bucket? For Kids (2009) by Tom Rath and Mary Reckmeyer with the class. This led to a discussion about “bucket filling” in her class. During class discussions led by Stephanie, her students would share how they all at times had felt that their bucket was empty. Stephanie told her students she wanted them to focus on being “bucket fillers” by writing notes that they appreciated about their classmates and then placing the notes in their classmates’ “buckets”. “Buckets” were displayed on a pocket chart on the wall with each students name on a piece of paper with a picture of a bucket. Behind each student’s “bucket” was space for notes to be collected. This was something that Stephanie found deliberately had students positioning each other as valued members of the classroom community. Bucket filling became a social practice.
that Stephanie and her students used to support the inclusion of all students in classroom community building.

What Stephanie had not expected was that the bucket filling idea would also lead to her students positioning her as a valued member of the classroom community. Stephanie (2013) writes:

One of my students stopped me as I was wrapping up and said, “But Mrs. Barrows, you don’t have a bucket.” Other students then chimed in, “Yeah, you should have one too!” So I wrote my name on a bucket and put it at the end of the last row, leaving a few spaces between my name and the last student (thinking perhaps if we got new students they could go in those spaces). One of my students said, “But wait, that makes it look as though you aren’t with us, like you’re not in the class! You should move yours so it’s with ours.” I said “So you think I should put mine over farther so it’s next to all of yours?” They all cheered and said “Yea, do that!” That spoke volumes to me about how my students view me and how we share power in our classroom. (p. 2)

This bucket filling strategy that Stephanie introduced to her classroom allowed Stephanie to deliberately position her students as supportive of each other in the community. Unexpectedly, her students forcibly positioned her as included in the community. While this was one strategy that supported the inclusion of all students it did not work independently of more standard teaching and learning activities, and it was not enough to ensure that all students were included. Stephanie continued on with this strategy the following 2014-2015 school year as a key social practice that deliberately positioned students to position each other as valued.

Another teaching strategy that Stephanie used during the pilot study was facilitating small groups in reading to position all students as valued and heard. Her goal
focused on a new way of teaching that emphasized dialogue in her classroom and was another theoretical shift for Stephanie. Stephanie (2013) writes:

> I often find myself instructing the whole group and not being so much a facilitator as a lecturer. I find it difficult to teach the entire required curriculum without having to spend time in direct instruction first, often for large chunks of time. (p. 2)

Like Cary, Stephanie was also becoming aware of a desire to move away from monologic discussions. Stephanie became more focused on dialogically positioning her students to actively participate in discussions in her classroom. Stephanie’s theoretical framework was influenced by Bakhtin’s (1981) idea of dialogue not having a predetermined outcome. Stephanie was aware that she was teaching by direct instruction and often asking questions with a predetermined answer, which was stifling her ability to position students dialogically. She began implementing some strategies such as partner share, small group work to answer and solve problems, as well as dramatic strategies, but she was having difficulty spending time with each small group to mediate the process. While Stephanie was becoming aware of more dialogic strategies, her assumptions about the importance of a community that included all of her students was at the forefront of her governing gaze, which left dialogic positioning for teaching and learning more in the background. The question of how to mediate students’ learning by supporting them to position each other with authority over their own learning, is a question that she carried over into our collaborative inquiry the following school year.

Stephanie’s awareness of the importance of positioning, dialogue, and creating a classroom community during the pilot study led to some initial shifts in Stephanie’s
inquiry paradigm. Stephanie recognized that she was deliberately positioning her students to have a voice. According to Stephanie (2013):

One way that I have tried to position my students so that all of them have a voice is by using one of my student’s suggestions that we use a stuffed owl to pass around when we talk. The owl has been successful in helping everyone be heard because my students have begun to hold it up and wait until everyone else stops before they continue. (p. 1)

The actions Stephanie implemented in the classroom led her to begin to change her teaching assumptions about focus and about her inquiry. Stephanie (2013) writes:

Although my original goals this semester focused on justifying my dramatic inquiry teaching methods to my administrator and assessing the use of those methods in today’s test obsessed culture, our recent discussions in class and the work we have been doing in my classroom have led me to feel that I needed to set a new goal for myself…I am free to focus more on how my students are positioned in our class and how I can make certain that every one of them has authority and is recognized as a valuable member of our community. (p. 1)

Stephanie’s theoretical framework was shifting away from a more Behaviorist framework towards a more socio constructionist framework. Previously, students only spoke when they raised their hands and Stephanie assumed their learning was equated with all students passing standardized tests. Now she assumed she should create a classroom community in which students were positioned with a voice and were equally valued and further, that all of her students should position each other with mutual respect.

She began to question how she was dialogically positioning her students.

Well when we were talking about dialogic and you know positioning and those kinds of things. It got me thinking you know, is my class more monologic. Am I doing enough dialogic kinds of things? Without just talking about it. Because then you were talking about those modes and it got me thinking: am I creating
enough dialogic opportunities outside of let’s just talk about it? (S. Barrows, personal communication, November 7, 2013)

After the pilot study, Stephanie was still aware that creating a classroom community where everyone is respected, equally valued, and has a voice was essential for including all students in a classroom community of practice so that students with special rights and their general education peers succeed academically and socially. Her focus on how to create a classroom community that included all people became central to the collaborative inquiry with Stephanie that is analyzed throughout the rest of this chapter.

**Data Collection**

I used the same primary sources of data collection with Stephanie that I had used with Cary: classroom observations, semi-structured interviews, and archival data. I began collecting data for the collaborative inquiry described in this chapter in September of 2014. I used the same methods as described in Cary’s chapter 3 for video recording, audio recording and photographs and screen shots. However, based on my experiences with Cary I was more systematic with the data collection process with Stephanie. For example, I used a data log to record moments beginning the very first day of data collection to catalogue data collected each day, which then informed my semi-structured interviews and transcription process. This data collection process will be explored more in the following sections.
**Observation**

During the pilot study, classroom observations were made about once or twice a month during Stephanie’s literacy instruction with dramatic inquiry. A planning time was arranged prior to her instruction to go over Stephanie’s goals and to design activities that incorporated Common Core State Standards.

For the collaborative inquiry the following year I wanted to spend more time observing. I used the specific inquiry questions she and I had created to guide the data collection. I spent more time in her class observing: about four days a week for 3 hours a day during the classroom literacy block. I spent about 3 hours a day in Stephanie’s classroom for about 3-4 months during her classroom literacy block. The time spent each week varied depending on school testing, holidays, and snow days.

The focus of my gaze for observations was similar to that in Cary’s classroom. I recorded moments that included a focal student as well as any moments that seemed to relate to words or phrases in Stephanie’s inquiry question. As the study continued I would alter my gaze to include moments that I felt were related to emerging trends.

**Semi-Structured Interviews**

I completed semi-structured interviews during the pilot study with Stephanie, prior to a classroom observation for planning purposes, and as soon as possible after the implementation of a lesson, usually during her lunch or planning time. During the pilot study, no clips of classroom observations were used to guide the conversation or for discussion. We used our memories of a lesson that had just been taught and my field notes to guide the semi-structured interview. Additionally, as with Cary, semi-structured
interviews and group discussions took place during a dramatic inquiry pedagogy course that Stephanie was enrolled in and that I also attended.

Prior to continuing the collaborative inquiry during the 2014-2015 school year, Stephanie and I established a weekly time for semi-structured interviews during her planning time. During this time we would review our inquiry questions, review classroom observations, plan for future lessons, and analyze data. Semi-structured interviews began with Stephanie describing what she had been observing in her classroom and then with me responding. “As supplementary data, they [interviews] deepen an understanding of what we observe in the classroom and sometimes help to interpret observed activities from participants’ perspectives” (Dyson & Genishi, 2005, p. 76). Additional questions during the interview were more informal and took shape during the conversation with the classroom teacher. Informal interviews provided me with information about what was happening in Stephanie’s classroom in her own words and filled in gaps in the data (Dyson & Genishi, 2005). In addition, Stephanie often described other examples of her teaching that became a source of supplementary data.

My shift in methodology for semi-structured interviews with Stephanie was intentional based on my experience working with Cary. I really wanted to show clips based on my perceived assumptions about an activity and the developing case, and let the clips begin the conversation. Rather than me telling Stephanie what I assumed was happening or my interpretation, I wanted her to begin the dialogue based on what she saw and then I would share my interpretation. This was intentional, because I did not want her interpretation of events to be influenced by what I saw at the time.
I sometimes recorded interviews with students informally during classroom observations. According to Dyson and Genishi (2005), “Quick, informal conversations right after a child finishes an activity or in an interactional lull, can be effective because researcher and child share a common reference point” (p. 77). Interviews with students were more like informal conversations that I initiated after a specific activity or during breaks in instruction, so as not to interfere with instruction and to ensure that the reference point for the conversation was fresh in the student’s mind.

After four months (September, October, November, and December), I only observed about once a week during the literacy block. During this time Stephanie and I spent time meeting to review video data, analyze data, and plan future lessons based on the data analysis. This process is described further in the data analysis section.

**Archival Data**

I used archival data from previous interviews and classroom observations with Stephanie from the pilot study. This data was beneficial for using with Stephanie during semi-structured interviews, because she would at times reference a previous teaching situation when describing new strategies to try in her classroom. During the data analysis stage, she also referenced previous examples of teaching, student learning, dramatic inquiry lessons, etc. as she grappled to understand with new data from the current school year with me. This information helped illuminate new patterns in the data and contributed to the teacher’s awareness of her changing teaching practices and how she was positioning herself and the students. Archival data from previous observations and
semi-structured interviews was also beneficial for examining Stephanie’s change over time in relation to her governing gaze and assumptions about teaching and learning.

Archival data about the school community and the school demographics was available as another reference point. Researchers can use Web searches to find useful information about organizations for archival data during the research study (Glesne, 2011). I looked for information about the school’s academic performance and school demographics. This information was valuable as Stephanie and I began to focus on identity, agency, and power and how these issues could be understood as extending outside of the classroom and into the school and surrounding community.

Data Log

I used a data log during the 2014-2015 school year to organize data from each day’s video recordings and/or audio recordings, including classroom observations, such as teaching and learning activities, and interviews with participants. See Appendix A for the data log format that I used. I went back to the pilot study and completed data logs after the fact for observations and interviews. For each visit during the 2014-2015 school year I completed the data log on the same day following the field site visit. Typing up information about relevant events was helpful as I began to analyze data and look for emerging trends in relation to key words and phrases in the research questions. The data log provided me with a format to outline areas to focus on in my analysis as well as topics, focal students, and information to share with Stephanie during semi-structured interviews. I highlighted focal students’ pseudonyms in different colors to quickly
reference their participation in different events. I also would bold key words that described trends in the data related to the inquiry questions.

The process of completing a data log the same day as I collected data was different from what I had done with Cary. By completing the data log as I was collecting data I was able to be more systematic and better organized. In addition, I was able to select video clips from classroom observations to share with Stephanie during our weekly semi-structured interviews based on the emerging questions and trends.

**Data Analysis**

**Transcription**

The data analysis process with Stephanie was ongoing and it became more systematic overtime (Glesne, 2011). I was able to learn and grow from my experiences collaborating with Cary to become more systematic with Stephanie. In contrast to the transcription process that I used with Cary, when working with Stephanie during the 2014-2015 school year, I solely transcribed from classroom observations based on emerging trends and focal students identified in the daily data logs. I also began the transcription process by making multimodal transcripts, as described in chapter 3. The multimodal transcripts allowed me to share a written description of the modes that I recorded in select clips that I shared with Stephanie during semi-structured interviews and during the data analysis process. The multimodal transcripts were helpful when sharing information with Stephanie because they detailed the different modes that were present in specific clips of video data that we could then use when we analyzed the interaction of the different modes by specific students during different activities.
Mixed Methods

Based on my experiences analyzing data with Cary, I wanted to begin the data analysis process with Stephanie by showing her video clips each week. The previous year I noticed that the conversations about what had happened in the classroom during the school year stemmed solely from what the teacher or I remembered about a lesson. The discussions became deeper with Cary when I began showing her video clips of her teaching as well as how her students positioned themselves and others in the classroom during lessons. I felt it was important for me to change my methodology a bit when working with Stephanie, so that the data analysis process happened while we were watching video clips of moments in her classroom instead of just relying on our memories of activities. I felt that by watching video clips for the data analysis process from the beginning we would be able to identify specific examples of moments that Stephanie identified as important in her changing inquiry paradigm, as well as how she and her students were positioning themselves and each other and how students were being included.

After two weeks of me observing in Stephanie’s classroom and discussing her students and our goals for the collaborative inquiry we had a meeting to discuss data analysis and how we would like to organize the semi-structured interviews each week. I shared with her how I had showed Cary video clips of her teaching and how we had used those to analyze her data in relation to our inquiry questions and focal students. I asked Stephanie how she would like me to share data with her each week. Stephanie said that she wanted to see what her students were doing, even when her students did not seem to
be on task. More specifically, Stephanie said she wanted to see clips, “Especially if you notice a teamwork trend or issue, so I can look at that and be more aware” (S. Barrows, personal communication, October 2, 2014). Stephanie and I agreed that I would select video clips to show her each week during our weekly meetings for us to analyze.

I used multimodal interaction analysis (Norris, 2004) to identify the modes that participants used in real world spaces and fictional spaces created in the classroom. New ideas and areas of focus arose during our weekly meetings that shaped future data collection. Using grounded theory (Charmaz, 2006) I was able to analyze data with Stephanie, while still collecting data in her classroom. As Stephanie and I identified what we saw happening in the video clips from her classroom we began to define emerging categories related to the inquiry question and her inquiry paradigm. I used these categories, such as student choice, movement, positioning of individual students, positioning of the group, and reviewing of norms, to collect additional data and to identify areas that needed further discussion. Then, I would go back and watch video clips of classroom observations, based on Stephanie’s changing gaze. I would transcribe these moments using the multimodal transcription process to then share with Stephanie during the following semi-structured interview.

As a researcher I was using collaborative inquiry to present information about observations and data with the intention to change or propose change with her teaching in the classroom. This allowed me as a researcher to address issues of power within my relationship with Stephanie. We were in constant dialogue about my role in the classroom as an observer to record what I was seeing, as well as how best to share
information with her. She and I decided that my showing video clips of moments, whether they were positive examples of learning or examples of challenges, was the best way for me to share information with her. As we viewed video clips we always had her inquiry question out on the table on a piece of paper to refer back to as we analyzed what we were seeing in the clips. The important thing that we emphasized was this was not a space of judgment; as in the classroom community she created with her students, she and I created a safe space for our ongoing inquiry.

These weekly discussions provided opportunities for Stephanie to share her own analysis of her teaching and student learning, which allowed me to document her changing awareness over time. According to Carspecken and Walford (2001), “Qualitative research must make every effort to invite the people studied into conversations about the descriptions and analyzes to be produced” (p. 9). By involving both of the teacher participants in conversations about data analysis I intended to equalize the power relationships with the teacher participants and myself, while also mediating my own experiences and knowledge about the situation with the teachers knowledge. I video recorded and/or audio recorded these semi-structured interviews when reviewing data, so that I had data to support the teachers’ viewpoints and perspectives during the data analysis process.

**Data Validity**

Member checking, triangulation, construct validity/reflexivity, face validity, and catalytic validity indicated data trustworthiness (Guba & Lincoln, 1981; Lather, 1986; Reason & Rowan, 1981; Stake, 1995). I expanded upon member checking to include a
critical ethnographic approach during the analysis of data through weekly semi-structured interviews with Stephanie, as I had done with Cary. During these semi-structured interviews I suggested possible changes to classroom activities. Over time I gained insight into Stephanie’s perceptions as well as her assumptions, governing gaze, actions, and theoretical frameworks. I was cognizant of my role as a researcher, as I had with Cary, and made every attempt not to overstep the relationship of trust created with Stephanie. Also, as with Cary, I shared with her data I had collected as well as my written interpretation of her changes over time. Stephanie then provided me with feedback that I used to edit my written analysis and ensure that our collaborative analysis and theorizing was accurately documented.

The Case

My goal as a researcher was to understand Stephanie’s teaching as a case study from Stephanie’s perspective by engaging in collaborative inquiry with her. In dialogue with me we analyzed collected artifacts, such as classroom observations and interviews, video recordings, audio recordings, photographs, fieldnotes, and multimodal transcripts. In order for me to understand the case from Stephanie’s perspective, I began coding data the first week of classroom observations. I first began coding by focal students that Stephanie identified through our semi-structured interviews using key words and phrases from Stephanie’s inquiry question. I identified clips and quotes that seemed to illustrate contextualized examples of these key words and phrases:

- Community
- Everyone is respected
• Equally valued
• Voice
• Succeed academically and socially

Again, an example I would illustrate is an example of when Stephanie had Shayla explain her thoughts during a classroom meeting about how her “bucket” was not full. Stephanie specifically called on Shayla to share so that she was positioned with a voice in front of her peers and demonstrated that Shayla’s voice was equally valued in their classroom community. See pages 250 and 251 for a more detailed analysis of this moment.

I then went back over the data collected and began to analyze Stephanie’s comments in conjunction with the video data as I continued to document Stephanie’s changing inquiry paradigm over time. I coded data using an adaptation of Emig’s (1983) inquiry paradigm, as I had done with Cary as noted in chapter three: theoretical framework, assumptions, governing gaze, and actions. Stephanie and I began to organize and compare data across time by identifying new areas of the case that needed to be further examined, which we would then use for further data collection and future analysis. As we continued the case, I shared data with Stephanie during our weekly semi-structured interviews. See page 281 for an example of how I shared video data of a lesson that I had identified as in conflict with Stephanie’s goals for student learning and the inclusion of all voices. The analysis that follows describes how I had selected specific clips to share with Stephanie to guide our semi-structured interview and thus led to us designing a follow up lesson for her based on our analysis.
When I began to write up the data analysis for this dissertation I was struck by the multitude of ways that I could organize the case. I had originally intended to write solely in terms of the focal students that Stephanie had originally identified, but then I realized this was too limiting. Documenting Stephanie’s transformation was central to the case: her changing interactions with her students and their interactions with each other would show her transformation over time. This case study, as described in the remaining sections of this chapter, begins with Stephanie’s goals for herself and her classroom for the school year. Three sections documenting the dramatic inquiry units that she taught follow in which I focus on the focal students during particular dramatic inquiry units to illustrate her transformation. Stephanie’s transformation over time in terms of her changing inquiry paradigm: theoretical framework, assumptions, governing gaze, and actions. I include transcripts and photographs of selected lessons as well as information connected to Stephanie’s focal students, Stephanie’s inquiry paradigm, and connections to her inquiry question to record her changing inquiry paradigm.

**Stephanie’s Goals**

In 2013, Stephanie had begun the year with two goals: 1) justifying to her administrator that what she was doing with dramatic inquiry was meaningful and 2) that she was able to assess student learning to support the focus on standardized tests. At the beginning of the 2014-2015 school year Stephanie and I sat down to clarify the specific goals she had set for herself and her class, these indicated a changing governing gaze.

By 2014 Stephanie’s goals had shifted from the pilot study to focus on what *should* be happening in her classroom and what was important for the inclusion of all of
her students so that everyone succeeded academically and socially. Her first goal was as follows:

My biggest goal coming into this year was to actually, I kind of had two. One of them was to do what I know is good practice no matter what other people think of my practice. I’m really having an issue with that. I have an issue when I think people don’t think I’m doing a good job, because I want to change what I’m doing and it’s different than what they are doing. (S. Barrows, personal communication, September 18, 2014)

Stephanie was still aware of the pressures she felt during the pilot study to conform to what others were doing in her school, because no one else was using a dramatic inquiry based approach for teaching and learning. Stephanie was aware that the other teachers in her building were teaching in ways similar to how she had previously taught focused on meeting standards with a largely monologic positioning of students. Stephanie’s theoretical framework had shifted to a more sociocultural perspective. Stephanie now believed that her students learned best from being dialogically positioned to make meaning together through collaborative tasks, including using dramatic inquiry. At the same time, Stephanie was aware that she might face some “bumps in the road” during the school year, because she assumed that her teaching methods would not be supported by her colleagues.

Her second goal was related to another theoretical shift that happened during the pilot study apparent in her belief in creating a classroom community where everyone should be included. With Stephanie’s shift from a Behaviorist approach to a sociocultural approach she positioned students more often to have a voice and to share power to create a respectful community. Stephanie clarified:
The way I do my management with the community thing, philosophy. Like we didn’t come up with rules. We came up with what we want to be. And that’s what we always refer to…When I redirect them I’m always like ‘Is that being a part of our respectful community? Are you contributing to our community?’ But a lot of the teachers feel that I’m too relaxed, because I don’t yell at my kids anymore. I mean I have talked over them a few times, but I don’t yell, because I don’t feel like that contributes to us working together. And they get yelled at a lot in other places. And I’ve had some people make comments where they don’t feel like my kids are respectful, which really bothers me because I feel like my kids are really respectful with each other. And they can be honest with me. And that’s what I want. (S. Barrows, personal communication, September 18, 2014)

Stephanie’s commitment to a sociocultural theoretical framework meant she now conceptualized her classroom as a community of practice where students collaborated together on joint endeavors to make meaning; that informed everything she did in her classroom. How Stephanie began the school year was different from what she had done in her previous years of teaching. Her actions were now based off of her assumptions about the importance of creating an inclusive community.

Oh, well because this is a brand new group. It was really nice, because I started doing that community building work. Um, you know like the first thing I did with them on the first day of school. I put down ‘We want to be a community where.’ And I gave them each a sheet of paper to write about what they wanted to be so we could put it on there together. And they came up with respectful...Respectful, um where we share, where we are kind, um where we are responsible, and where we have fun. Um and then what was the other one that I thought was so good? Where we are a team. And so that’s hanging up on the wall. Instead of doing class rules, I did that. And so I always say to them, ‘Is that being part of a respectful community?’ (S. Barrows, personal communication, September 4, 2014)

Stephanie’s assumptions about building a community for teaching and learning, as well as her teaching actions were directly linked with her theoretical framework that students should be dialogically positioned to make meaning together. With her focus on
creating dialogic spaces in the real world and fictional spaces created in her classroom she was also including student’s cultural knowledge, voices, and histories as well as their educational goals. Stephanie’s governing gaze that she used to plan evaluate what happened in the classroom was governed by her belief that a community of people is one where everyone is respected, equally valued, and has a voice so that everyone is included and is successful academically and socially.

Greek Mythology Dramatic Inquiry Unit

Stephanie began the Greek mythology dramatic inquiry unit in September of 2014. A fictional client, the Apollo Research and Development Company commissioned her students as an expert team, a creative art department, in a company that the students later named C5. Her students-in-role-as-creative-arts-department were commissioned to make innovative products for kids related to Greek mythology. Stephanie had her students come up with themes they would be interested in for the inquiry, such as heroes and monsters, the underworld, gods and goddesses, journeys and quests, and Mount Olympus. Stephanie then invited students to choose the group they wanted to be in, based on the topic that interested them the most. Groups were no smaller than three students and one group had as many as 6 students. About a month in, as students were finishing their projects, Stephanie added an additional commission: they were commissioned by a newspaper company that wanted investigative reporters to research the Trojan horse and write up a newspaper article about the information they uncovered.
Positioning of Students in Relation to a Whole Group

As Stephanie’s students were beginning their dramatic inquiry unit as members of the C5 creative art department, Stephanie also planned lessons related to the Greek mythology inquiry unit. Her intention was to dialogically position her students in meaning making as a collaborative community of practice.

She began by reviewing the class norms that the students had created. Then she laid pictures from a text on the floor. She invited students to stand near a picture that they had made a connection with or had a question about. Then Stephanie positioned all of her students to share. She built off of students’ interest in this Greek myth they had explored by inviting her students to choose which character they would like to interview. Her students chose to interview Stephanie-in-role-as-Echo in a hotseat activity.

Stephanie-in-role-as-Echo sat down to be interviewed or “hot-seated”, by her students. Her students already had questions and things they wondered about from the previous activity, so they had been prepared to interview Echo. Stephanie and her students stepped into the dramatic world to ask Stephanie-as-Echo questions. See Figure 16.

I used a proxemics analysis of this hotseat activity. Students are seated at their desks with Stephanie sitting in a chair at the front of the room. Students have their heads and gazes turned towards Stephanie-as-Echo. Also, multiple students have their hands in the air, which suggests that they have a question. Stephanie was whispering as she talked to represent an aspect of the character. Students are not talking over each other, but they eagerly wait their turn to ask a question and learn more about Echo. Stephanie-as-Echo
would point to a student to indicate it was their turn to ask a question. I inferred that the
students were all interested and engaged in the activity.

Stephanie had deliberately reviewed the norms before the lesson with the
assumption that this would position students to treat each other with respect. Stephanie
said, “I felt that everyone felt respected and valued. Partly because I took the time to
review our norms first, our rules.” (S. Barrows, personal communication, January 28,
2015). She then began to look at actions that may have contributed to students’
engagement in terms of how dialogically she had positioned them.

Figure 16: Photograph of hotseat activity of Stephanie-in-role-as-Echo on September 18,
2014.
Stephanie’s gaze was on the arrangement of desks and students paying attention to her. She stated, “I think with the hotseat the desks are definitely working. Because even some of my students who don’t normally like ask questions or give me their undivided attention, like Shayla, are really focused” (S. Barrows, personal communication, January 28, 2015). Stephanie’s assumption was that student’s interest in the topic and the hotseat activity contributed to their dialogic positioning and was more important than the proxemics in this activity. Typically students were not as engaged in the topic or in class discussion when the activity physically positioned them at their seats. While lessons like this one supported Stephanie’s assumptions about what was happening in her classroom to support dialogic meaning making with her sociocultural theoretical framework, lessons like this were not consistent during this unit of dramatic inquiry. Most lessons during this unit of dramatic inquiry positioned students to work in small groups and not as a whole group community of inquiry.

**Positioning of Students in Relation to a Small Group**

Stephanie’s governing gaze at the time only allowed her to see small group instruction as a way to support her students in having a voice and having choice in their inquiry learning as if they were people in a dramatic world. What her governing gaze was not allowing her to see was that small group activities could have been set up to connect back to a larger inquiry purpose for the whole group. She viewed the small group work as a collection of individualized projects related to Greek mythology, but she was not positioning the whole group to collaboratively make meaning.
As a collaborative inquirer Stephanie had asked me to show her what she was not seeing in the classroom. I selected some video clips to show her what I assumed her gaze at the time was not allowing her to see or that she was not electing to see. Instead of telling her my assumptions about what was happening in the classroom, I would show her specific video clips to see if her interpretations were aligned with mine and to begin a discussion from there.

We began by watching a video from October 2, 2014. See Figure 17.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spoken Language Transcript</th>
<th>Multimodal Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie: Pause those of you that are still reading. I have a couple of you who are</td>
<td>Nick is walking in front of the projector in between the projector and the white board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>finished with your reading. You have gotten your notes. Remember your RAFT is your role.</td>
<td>Alex turns his head up towards SB and then towards Nick. Alex and Gabriel are writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are a reporter. You are writing a newspaper article for your readers. Right?</td>
<td>Nick is placing a piece of paper in front of projector to block it from shining on the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick: Can I write a newspaper article like that?</td>
<td>white board as SB talks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie: Your topic is the purpose of the mysterious chest. You are going to back your</td>
<td>Nick walks towards SB as he talks showing her a paper in his hand. Then, he walks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>facts up, or your information up with facts from where? Where are you going to get your</td>
<td>back towards the white board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>facts from?</td>
<td>Alex holds his paper in the air for all to see with a smile on his face.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex: Your story.</td>
<td>Nick is placing a piece of paper in between the projector and the white board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie: From the story I gave you, so think about how you are going to write a</td>
<td>Alex looks at Stephanie when he answers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>newspaper article. Think about this newspaper article. Right? It doesn’t have to be</td>
<td>Stephanie shakes her head yes and points at Alex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>super long. But it needs to give us important information about why this chest is there.</td>
<td>Stephanie walks to the white board and points to the article displayed on the white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All right. This (points to the article on the white board) is going to be our follow up</td>
<td>board. Stephanie moves her hands to show length in the air. Stephanie moves Nick’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>article to this. Why is that chest there? What is it doing? Okay, so what I want you to</td>
<td>paper down from the board. Nick walks back, with a smile on his face, away from the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do, now that you have your information. Put it together in a few paragraphs. However</td>
<td>board. Stephanie hits her hands together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>many you need with good 5th grade sentences. And explain to us why you think this</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mysterious chest is in the harbor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 17: Transcript of introduction to RAFT writing activity on October 2, 2014.
I wanted to show her clips from two days on the same task from two consecutive weeks. Students had now completed their C5 projects and were working as if they were a reporter writing for a newspaper article on the Trojan horse. After watching the clip from October 2, 2014 we watched an excerpt of video data from October 6, 2014 of students working on the same writing task. See Figure 18.

I had chosen these excerpts of video data deliberately to dialogically position Stephanie to talk about things that she saw that were different or the same in relation to her assumptions about the lessons. First, Stephanie noticed that Nick was having trouble keeping track of his work, and he had misplaced his rough draft of his article, so he was going to have to write it again. Stephanie identified that she was going to need to design some specific strategies to support him and other students, like AJ, in being more organized. Further, as she compared the second clip from October 6, 2014 with the one from October 2, 2014, Stephanie also identified that she had not positioned her students to be engaged by the way she introduced the lesson:

They weren’t as engaged in, I didn’t engage them in you are newspaper reporters and investigating the case of the mysterious chest. So I feel like I should have focused more on that, getting them back into the role a little more…it didn’t go really well on Monday. (S. Barrows, personal communication, October 9, 2014)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spoken Language Transcript</th>
<th>Multimodal Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie: For the next 20 minutes I would like for you to work on your article. About the case of the mysterious chest.</td>
<td>Stephanie turns on overhead projector. Then Stephanie walks around her table to her laptop computer and pushes keys on the keyboard. Students are moving around at their desks. Do not see student’s eyes on Stephanie.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shayla: Man. I have to pull that out. (Says under her breath.)</td>
<td>See students taking out folders and papers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex: (Unable to make out talk).</td>
<td>Stephanie may be responding to Alex’s question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie: If you are done and you have had a writing conference with me.</td>
<td>She holds her bucket fillers envelope above her head and waves it around.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston: (Unable to make out talk).</td>
<td>In response to Shayla’s comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shayla: My partner’s not here Mrs. Barrows.</td>
<td>Still in response to Shayla’s comment. Stephanie is moving around to the board and her projector while she talks to display the article on the board. Students begin to get up and move around (Alex, Kelly).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick: I must schedule one.</td>
<td>Nick is taking out papers from a folder and then he gazes at Gabriel. When Gabriel looks back at him, Nick shakes his head. Nick is looking at the papers on his desk as he talks. Stephanie turns her head down towards the ground when Nick tells her he can’t find his paper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie: You don’t need a partner.</td>
<td>Nick: Gabriel, where is it? (He is now looking at his desk looking through papers)...What are you seriously telling me, I have to do my rough draft over again?...Mrs. Barrows, I can’t find my rough draft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick: I want to schedule one Mrs. Barrows.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie: This is an independent article. You can work on it by yourself. If you are ready for a writing conference, so am I. If you are. If you’ve already had a writing conference you can start publishing. And if you’re not ready and you need to keep writing, obviously do that…</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick is taking out papers from a folder and then he gazes at Gabriel. When Gabriel looks back at him, Nick shakes his head. Nick is looking at the papers on his desk as he talks. Stephanie turns her head down towards the ground when Nick tells her he can’t find his paper.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 18: Transcript from October 6, 2014.

Continued
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Spoken Language Transcript</strong></th>
<th><strong>Multimodal Transcript</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie: Binder. Look in your binder. See if it is in your binder.</td>
<td>Stephanie walks way from Nick as she talks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick: I put it in, like I had</td>
<td>AJ and Lisa are gazing at Boston who is standing on Alondra’s crutches. AJ stands up and walks towards Boston after his second question. No one responds to him. Boston continues to walk around on the crutches. Lisa has her papers out in front of her on the desk and a pencil in her hand. Alondra is gazing towards Boston. Gabriel is gazing at AJ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie: Double check to see if it’s in your binder. Double check. If it’s not I will come and help you look. It’s here somewhere.</td>
<td>Boston, gazing towards Alondra, walks towards Alondra on her crutches as she talks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston: (Unable to make out talk)</td>
<td>Gabriel gazes towards AJ as he talks. Lisa is gazing towards Gabriel. AJ is now gazing and has turned his body towards Nick who is standing on his left.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJ: You’ve tried it before.</td>
<td>Boston begins dancing around in a circle on Alondra’s crutches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriel: I’ve never tried it.</td>
<td>Lisa, Alondra, Gabriel, and AJ’s gaze is on Boston. Lisa and AJ are smiling. Lisa is gazing down on the floor next to AJ and then her attention shifts to the papers in front of her. AJ sits down at his desk. Gabriel’s gaze is down towards his papers. Her gaze is towards Boston. Lisa picks up the papers in her hands and appears to be reading them. AJ is writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa: Um, Okay</td>
<td>Continued</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 18 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spoken Language Transcript</th>
<th>Multimodal Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alondra: What did you do yesterday?</td>
<td>Alondra and Gabriel’s gaze is towards Boston. Lisa stands up and turns her body and gaze towards Boston.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston: I was watching softball yesterday.</td>
<td>Boston’s gaze is towards Alondra and Gabriel. Boston does not turn and acknowledge Lisa. Lisa and Boston had worked together on the newspaper writing previously.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriel: Wait, you were watching basketball?</td>
<td>Lisa walks away and appears to go ask Keisha if she can work with her. I observe Keisha and Lisa collaborating on the newspaper writing later on in the video.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston: I was watching softball.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriel: I was watching soccer and (unsure of last word).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alondra: I was watching volleyball and basketball.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriel: I was watching basketball.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston: I was watching football and Once Upon a Time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alondra: Once Upon a Time? (She begins to laugh) What the crap?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa taps Boston on the shoulder with her pencil and points to her paper on the desk in front of both girls.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston: It was on Saturday after that, but then I had basketball the next day.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stephanie’s assumption had been that she needed to deliberately position her students in the dramatic world in order to position them to make meaning together and to reinforce their purpose. Also, she was noticing that her assumption about arranging the
students’ seats was not supporting the student’s academic needs. According to Stephanie:

I put this side of the room [side that was off task] together thinking that Alondra would balance Gabriel and help him be more focused and like Nick and AJ usually team well together because they have the same kind of ideas. Whereas when AJ sat with Alex there was a lot of tension. And I put Brie over there, because she’s so calm and helps people focus. (S. Barrows, personal communication, October 9, 2014)

Stephanie’s intentions in arranging student’s seats together had been strategic, but her assumptions about how students would interact with each other had not played out the way she had envisioned. Stephanie’s governing gaze was expanding to see what she had not seen prior to watching the video clips. She was becoming aware that while students were positioned dialogically, their social voice was being positioned as more important than their academic voice. She identified that in the clip above she had assumed that students were on task, because they were talking in small groups. However, once she watched the video clips she identified that at the time some students were engaged in discussions about their personal lives that were not related to the academic task. This led to Stephanie deciding that she needed to be more strategic in how she positioned students to start an activity by deliberately positioning students dialogically in conversation with others on content for shared meaning making that was directly tied to the inquiry.

**Positioning others with more or less power.**

Some students were having trouble positioning their classmates with respect, so that each person was positioned as having a voice that was equally valued as they worked to complete products for their C5 small group. Some students positioned themselves with
more power than their peers. One problem was that students were still working individually on products connected to a similar theme as opposed to working collaboratively on a joint endeavor with their small group members to create something that they could share with the entire group. For example, Nick and Brie were working together in a small group when their fellow teammate moved. The two of them were deciding how to complete the product she had been working on individually, because they did not have and did not know the content that she was working on for a board game about Greek mythology facts. One source of contention was that Nick, the team leader, positioned himself with more power than his teammates. As the team leader, Nick assumed that he could tell Brie what to do by positioned her with less power and exclude her voice in the process.

Stephanie stepped in and had a discussion with Nick and Brie to mediate the situation and position them to both listen to each other’s opinions about what was happening. See Figure 19. I inferred that Stephanie was attempting to mediate the situation and this disrupt Nick’s positioning of himself with more power than Brie because she was not the team leader.
Notice the physical proxemics of Stephanie, Nick, and Brie sitting closely on the floor in a circular shape. Nick’s head and gaze are turned towards Brie as she speaks to him. He is not talking, but rather showing her that he hears her talking by turning his head and gaze towards her as she speaks. Part of Stephanie’s theoretical framework was that every student should be treated with respect, so that they are equally valued and have a voice. She noticed that Brie’s voice was being excluded and she needed to step in and forcibly position Nick to listen to Brie and how she was feeling, and thus disrupt the uneven distribution of power in this small group.

Stephanie recollection of the moment was:
So when I sat down with them [Nick and Brie] today it was because they were kind of having a disagreement about who should be the team leader. And Nick, he wants the team leader position, but then he wanders so then his team never knows where he is...And then Nick would come and say Brie you do this...Brie just wanted to feel like she had a voice. I hope it was helpful to her to say I hear what you are saying and Nick do you hear what she is saying. Sometimes he doesn’t hear and he only hears what he wants to hear. (S. Barrows, personal communication, October 2, 2014)

Stephanie’s assumption was that if she used dialogue to mediate the situation so they heard each other’s voice it would support them in collaborating and including each other’s voice as they completed the products for their group. Stephanie left the two of them to collaborate on their joint endeavor. I stayed and recorded Nick and Brie’s conversation after Stephanie left. See Figure 20. I inferred that Stephanie had allowed them to decide who was team leader in order for them to share power and not have the power lie solely lie with her because she was the teacher.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spoken Language Transcript</th>
<th>Multimodal Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nick: Am I still team leader?</td>
<td>Brie and Nick are sitting next to each other on the floor. Each has a bag of clay in their hands. Nick turns his head and gaze towards Brie as he asks the question. Brie turns her head and gaze towards Nick as he talks. Nick then looks at the clay in front of him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brie: Yea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick: Sorry</td>
<td>Nick looks at Brie and then back down at the clay and grabs a piece from inside the bag. Brie looks at Nick and then grabs another bag of clay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brie: It’s okay…What color should we use to make</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick: It doesn’t matter.</td>
<td>Nick and Brie grab clay and begin building.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 20: Transcript of Nick and Brie talking on October 2, 2014.

After Stephanie spoke with Brie and Nick, they grabbed some clay bags to make figures for a game board. See Figure 21. Nick turns his head and gaze towards Brie and asks her if he is still the team leader, because Stephanie had not chosen who was the team leader. Nick turns his head and gaze towards Brie, a visible sign of respect. She responds by turning her head and gaze towards Nick. Brie tells Nick, “Yea” you are still the team leader. Nick then apologizes to Brie. Based on their prior conversation with Stephanie, my assumption was that Nick was apologizing for not listening to her and valuing her. Brie responds by saying, “It’s okay” and then the two begin making figures for the board game together as they dialogue. My interpretation of this moment was that
Nick was now positioning Brie with more power than he had previously when he asked her who was team leader and then apologized for not listening to her before.

Figure 21: Photograph of Nick and Brie talking on October 2, 2014.

Stephanie’s assumption that she needed to step in to mediate the situation by positioning them to hear each other’s voices led to their dialogic positioning of each other to solve a problem on their own that they were having. Stephanie positioned her students with the power to decide who was the team leader. By forcibly positioning Nick to listen to Brie, Stephanie was also strategically stepping in to support him in not talking over others and listening to other’s opinions than his own, which was something that
Stephanie had identified that he needed support doing. This intervention was an example of how Stephanie was changing her practice by making strategic moves to mediate small group concerns intending to dialogically position them to make meaning together.

**Classroom Community**

Students were losing interest in the C5 Greek mythology inquiry unit, which had not been structured as a shared inquiry for the whole class. The students waning interest in the Greek mythology unit was impacting how students were being included in the classroom community. Stephanie’s governing gaze was focused on her classroom community. Though she was aware that the Greek mythology unit was not sustaining her students’ interests. At the time she did not see that students’ tasks were more individualized and she was not dialogically positioning her students to collaborate together in an activity with a shared purpose:

I feel like this week we are kind of losing momentum with this [C5 Greek mythology unit], which is why I kind of encouraged them to get finished so we can move on to the next thing and get some momentum back. We’ve had some issues that have kind of fractured our groups. We had an issue with Alex where he offended some of the girls with the things that he said, which were truly offensive. So then their group had to split, because one of the girls in the group said my mom really doesn’t want me to work with him anymore. (S. Barrows, personal communication, October 9, 2014)

My analysis of this was that she did not realize that the issues that had arisen in her classroom were in direct conflict with her theoretical framework of having students work together in a community of practice where everyone is included. For example, Alex had used inappropriate spoken language with two of his group members who then positioned him outside of the group. Stephanie’s assumption was that he was resisting
the collaborative work by saying inappropriate things, because he wanted to work alone. She assumed that Alex had used second order positioning to resist being positioned as a part of the C5 group. Stephanie then responded by making Alex complete the rest of his project, a Greek mythology game and power point, individually. While Alex’s project turned out well his actions had excluded him from the classroom community. Stephanie said, “I feel like we need to refocus on our community” (S. Barrows, personal communication, October 9, 2014). Stephanie’s assumption was that she needed to focus on what should be happening with the classroom community in order for her students to succeed academically and socially. She felt that the classroom community was not supporting the inclusion of all students. Stephanie’s governing gaze in relation to Alex was focused on the classroom community and how she could position Alex to work with others and feel that he had a voice in the community that was equally valued while at the same time positioning his peers with the same respect.

Stephanie had made a specific action, adding additional classroom meetings, in her classroom based on her assumption that she needed to refocus on her students as a community of people where everyone is included socially and academically. During the pilot study she had begun social practices, such as bucket fillers and weekly classroom meetings. She continued these social practices during the 2014-2015 school year, and expanded upon these practices by adding additional classroom meetings as needed based on moments that she identified when all students were not being included. Their social practices were a way for her to consistently dialogically position the students as a whole group to be more inclusive. Edmiston (2014) wrote, “Another way to think of inclusion
is as dialogue in order to adapt tasks or environments to create spaces where people are less likely to feel excluded” (p. 119). Stephanie was deliberately positioning students to use dialogue during classroom meetings and with bucket fillers to create a space within the real world space in the classroom where her students would feel included.

Stephanie made a change from the pilot study, by having additional classroom meetings outside of the scheduled ones on Monday to address concerns and issues that were impacting everyone’s ability to work together and be included in collaborative meaning making. Stephanie’s assumption was that her students needed to be positioned to have a voice that was respected and equally valued by deliberately positioning them to discuss their problems during additional classroom meetings. This connected to one of her original goals of wanting her students to have power in the classroom that extended to each student having a voice in discussing problems openly together, as opposed to Stephanie forcibly positioning them to act a certain way.

During a classroom meeting some students mentioned a concern about not receiving bucket fillers or encouragement from people in their classroom. See Figure 22. Students had mentioned that the same few people appeared to be getting all of the bucket fillers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spoken Language Transcript</th>
<th>Multimodal Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lisa: When our bucket is full we like work better. We’re like happy and um</td>
<td>Lisa is sitting at her desk and holding the toy microphone as she talks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shayla: And we are like a little silly, we’re a little silly, but we’re working.</td>
<td>Lisa turns her head and gaze towards Shayla as she talks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa: Yea</td>
<td>Lisa turns her head and gaze towards Stephanie.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie: Because if you don’t get attention positively in your bucket, how do you look for attention then?</td>
<td>Students begin to turn their head and gaze towards Shayla as she talks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston: By doing stuff</td>
<td>Stephanie is standing and looking out at her students. Shayla has her hand raised in the air, with her head and gaze towards Stephanie.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shayla: That’s bad (says loudly)! Because if my buckets empty I try to make people laugh (laughs). Silly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie: Right. And that’s not what we want. We want to be a community where we support each other. Is that supporting each other?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick: No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie: Right. So Lisa, do you have any suggestions for us? What can we do?</td>
<td>Lisa is looking at Stephanie as she talks, still holding the microphone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa: I think we can write one bucket filler for everyone we haven’t wrote to.</td>
<td>Keisha raises her hand in the air.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shayla: Everyday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa: That we haven’t talked to a lot.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie: Okay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa: And not our friends.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 22: Transcript from class meeting on October 6, 2014.
Figure 22 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spoken Language Transcript</th>
<th>Multimodal Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stephanie:</strong> Can you pass it [microphone] to Shayla because she actually added something to yours that I want her to say so everyone can hear it? And some of you are doing a good job of writing to everyone. It’s just we need to encourage that from everybody.</td>
<td>Lisa stands up and walks over the microphone to Shayla. Shayla’s hand is in the air and she turns her head and gaze towards Lisa as she walks towards her.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shayla: Because, people are not giving me any bucket fillers. Because I have some about the last time we had a community meeting about me, but I’m not trying to brag or anything. I’m just saying. And that’s why I think people aren’t giving me any, because they think I have enough to fill my bucket with like my old ones. Old bucket fillers don’t really fill your bucket.</td>
<td>Stephanie turns her head and gaze towards Shayla. Boston turns her head and gaze towards Shayla. Shayla smiles and points at herself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston: They can if</td>
<td>Stephanie walks over and hands Shayla an envelope. Shayla turns her head and gaze towards her classmates as she talks. Her left hand moves back and forth in the air, while she holds the microphone near her mouth with her right hand. Boston looks at Shayla as she talks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shayla:</strong> Yea but if it’s just the same thing</td>
<td>Shayla looks at Boston as she replies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stephanie:</strong> It’s good to get new encouragement right?</td>
<td>Stephanie looks at Shayla as she talks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shayla: Yea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stephanie:</strong> I do keep my bucket fillers from you guys, but it is nice to get new encouragement. It’s always nice to get new encouragement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shayla: And people weren’t giving me any, because they think I have enough already in my bucket filler, but those are my old ones from last time…So everyday in the morning we could at least write two or three to someone we don’t know or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stephanie:</strong> And Lisa and Shayla have both suggested this.</td>
<td>Stephanie writes this suggestion on the board.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stephanie deliberately positioned Shayla to share during the classroom meetings. See Figure 23. Stephanie’s head and gaze are turned towards Shayla as she talks, which demonstrates that Stephanie is respecting her voice as the speaker during the classroom meeting. Shayla’s head and gaze are turned outwards towards her peers as she talks. Shayla is holding the microphone used during classroom meetings to signify whose turn it is to talk. This moment was important for Stephanie because she positioned Shayla to have a voice and she as a teacher positioned the students with the power to make suggestions for solving the problem. Stephanie said she had deliberately brought Shayla into the class conversation about bucket fillers so that she would be heard by her peers.

Figure 23: Photograph of Stephanie and Shayla during class meeting on October 6, 2014.
Stephanie said:

I was really proud of her [Shayla] for that moment. When she does things like that, I’m so excited for her, because this is and the class has tried to share with her that they love it when she’s involved like that. Not when she’s creating drama. (S. Barrows, personal communication, October 9, 2014)

This example shows how Stephanie was more aware of how to include more students in the classroom community. Stephanie had empowered Shayla by deliberately positioning her with respect and as having a voice that was equally valued in the classroom. Her assumption being that by deliberately positioning Shayla with a voice, that Shayla would respond by positioning herself with some agency as a part of the community as opposed to excluding herself as she had done in the past. Stephanie’s assumption was that she needed to find more opportunities to position Shayla with respect as a valued member of the community of practice so that her peers would also begin to position her that way.

**Native American Dramatic Inquiry Unit**

For the next, dramatic inquiry unit, which began on November 16, 2014, students were positioned with expertise in investigating and writing. This expertise was based off the students’ written articles that they produced during the Greek mythology unit. A fictional client, the Pre-Columbian Cultural Society, commissioned the students as an expert team of time-traveling investigative reporters to investigate parts of the Aztec, Mayan, and Incan cultures from the Mesoamerican time period. See Appendix C for commission letter. Students-as-time-traveling-investigative-reporters were asked to
present their initial findings to the company and then decide on a way to share their final findings with the public.

**Positioning of Students for Dialogic Meaning Making**

Stephanie’s students had accepted the commission by the client to investigate the Aztec, Mayan, and Incan people. Stephanie and I had met prior to the students accepting the commission to create small groups that the students would work with during this dramatic inquiry unit. During the time that Stephanie and I grouped the students, Stephanie went through each student individually discussing her assumptions about each student’s individual academic and social needs as well as each student’s relationships with other students. Stephanie’s theoretical framework was that students needed to be positioned in a way that everyone succeeded academically and socially. I had written each student’s name on a card and Stephanie moved the cards around as she talked about each individual student. She would place students in groups and rearrange groups throughout the discussion. By taking into account her students’ academic and social needs and abilities she assumed that this would support a classroom community where everyone was respected, equally valued, and had a voice.

*Alex.*

Stephanie’s governing gaze when she looked at Alex was focused on someone who had success academically with literacy, but she was noticing that he needed support collaborating with others and interacting with his fellow classmates in a positive manner. Her governing gaze and actions in the classroom were based off of her awareness of
Alex’s previous resistance to working with others and his preference for working individually. According to Stephanie:

I want him [Alex] to be outside his comfort zone…He always sticks to exactly what he knows…Part of me wants to put her [Susan] with him [Alex]. Because A she is going to stand up for herself if he’s not doing what he needs to be doing. …She won’t let him get away with anything either. She’s really independent that way. She’s a good candidate to be with him, because he needs someone that, because he’ll say I want to do it my way and walk away from the group and do it his way. And she’ll be okay if he does that, but she’ll also let me know that that’s happening. (S. Barrows, personal communication, October 16, 2014)

Stephanie’s assumption with selecting a group for Alex was that he needed to work with someone else who had a strong confident voice and who would not accept Alex’s positioning of her or her fellow group members as not having a equally valued voice. Stephanie’s assumption was that this would support Alex in positioning others with respect and an equal and valued voice and that he would collaborate to make meaning.

**AJ.**

Stephanie’s governing gaze for AJ was that he still would wander away during collaborative group work and that he needed support staying on task. Stephanie said:

I’m a little curious to see how he [AJ] would do, because he tends to sort of wander as well [Stephanie places AJ’s card with Ashley, Laura, & Kendra]…because they are my real quiet girls, but he’s also really respectful. He’s always really respectful and so but I’m wondering if I put him with that group is he going to wander off by himself. (S. Barrows, personal communication, October 16, 2014)

Stephanie’s assumption was that if she positioned him to work in a small group with students who positioned themselves on task the majority of the time that this would
carry over into AJ positioning himself on task. She was conflicted about whether his positioning in relation to the other students in the small group would support or hinder his ability to stay on task.

**Nick.**

Stephanie’s governing gaze for how she saw Nick was that he really needed to be interested in the content to stay on task and that he needed to work with another student who would not let him talk all over other people’s voices. Stephanie said:

I know that he [Nick] will be really into weapons so I was thinking about assigning him that group…The reason I want him to be inside his comfort zone though is because I know he will dedicate a lot of his time and energy to doing it well…See she [Alondra] is wiling to work with anyone, but she also has a real independent voice. So I feel like the two of them would be a good [group]. (S. Barrows, personal communication, October 16, 2014)

Stephanie’s assumption with Nick was that he would be more engaged and more inclined to position himself on task academically if he had a vested interest in the topic. Also, as with Alex and Shayla, she wanted to deliberately position Nick in a group with a student who had an “independent” voice who would position the group to respect and hear everyone’s voice and opinion.

**Kelly.**

With Kelly, Stephanie’s governing gaze at the time was focused on positioning Kelly with students that would position her with respect and a voice. Kelly had been having some difficult times with being bullied by some of her classmates. Stephanie said, “These two [Kelly & Grace] have really started to form a friendship. Because of the recent bullying issues I feel like that would be a good group [Kelly, Amber, Gabriel, &
Stephanie’s assumption was that if she deliberately positioned students with Kelly who respected the classroom community norms, Kelly would feel safe to collaborate and share her voice and ideas.

Shayla.

Stephanie was starting to see Shayla as successful academically and socially in the classroom. Stephanie was aware that who Shayla worked with often impacted how Shayla positioned herself and others to have a voice and be equally valued. According to Stephanie:

One thing I want to do with her [Shayla]...I want to separate Shayla from Kendra and Grace. So I want them in separate groups. Because I think she needs a friend, but at the same time I want to see how each of them react with someone who doesn’t overpower their ideas...[SB places Boston’s card with Shayla’s] I think that those two can work together because they both have really strong voices and she will not let Shayla tell her that her idea isn’t any good, but it’s good for Shayla to have someone that will stand up to her. But it’s also good for them to have two really strong girl voices in a group. They need to know that it’s okay. It’s okay to have different voices. What I’m hoping will happen, is that if I put these two together they can take it [the subject] in a different direction...and make the project even wider academically then it would have been. (S. Barrows, personal interaction, October 16, 2014)

Stephanie took into account Shayla’s social positioning in that she needed to be deliberately positioned with someone who had a strong voice and who would position himself or herself as having a voice that should be equally valued. Stephanie decided that Boston would be someone that would position herself with a voice, while at the same time positioning her fellow group members, in particular Shayla, as having a respected and valued voice. Stephanie’s assumptions was influenced by her theoretical framework:
Vygotsky’s (1978) theory of the ZPD, she hoped that through collaboration and their sharing of different perspectives each would push the other beyond what they could do individually.

**Small Group and Whole Group Positioning.**

Students began the dramatic inquiry unit by working in small groups to investigate a specific area of the Mayan, Incan, and Aztec cultures, such as education, agriculture and hunting, weapons, architecture, and ceremonies. Students began investigating by reading through a variety of non-fiction texts, researching online, and watching videos about the Mayan, Aztec, and Incan cultures. Students then separated into their expert groups to decide on a moment they wanted to see when they traveled back in time. Students were able to consult texts and take notes, but they needed to agree on the moment as a group.

*AJ.*

Going back to Stephanie’s assumptions above, she believed that by putting AJ with students who positioned themselves on task AJ would respond by positioning himself on task.

Students were working in small groups. See Figure 24. AJ is not participating during the small group investigative research activity. See Figure 25. AJ leans down to talk to Nick who is actively reading to his small group members as they collaborate to identify information about weapons in the text. In the photo we observed AJ’s body leaning away from his desk and group members. His head and gaze are on Nick, his friend. In contrast, Nick’s gaze is on the book he is reading aloud to his group members.
Alondra is gazing at Nick as he reads. Alondra has her notebook and pencil on her lap prepared to take notes of any relevant information. Michele’s body is positioned towards her fellow group members and she appears to be taking notes in her journal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spoken Language Transcript</th>
<th>Multimodal Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AJ: Nick</td>
<td>AJ leans down and looks at Nick.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick: Mrs. Barrows?</td>
<td>Nick turns his head and gaze towards Stephanie.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJ: What do you think is going on in here?</td>
<td>Nick turns around and looks up at AJ. AJ smiles and looks at Nick, while holding a book on his lap. Nick shrugs his shoulders. AJ gazes at Michele who is now turned and is gazing back at AJ. Stephanie walks over.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie: Your groups over here….</td>
<td>Stephanie taps AJ on the shoulder and points at his group. Stephanie bends down next to Nick as he asks her a question. AJ plays with a book on his desk behind the group as Stephanie talks with Nick and his group about the content they are reading in a book.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie: How are you contributing to your group? I see them writing, but I do not see you writing.</td>
<td>Stephanie gets up and points at AJ’s group members. AJ is looking at the book in his hands. Stephanie bends down next to AJ who is sitting at the desks with his group.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 24: Transcript of AJ during small group work on November 20, 2014.
Then, Stephanie bends down over AJ at his desk and asks him what he is doing to contribute to his group. See Figure 26. In this photo AJ has his head turned downwards toward his book as Stephanie talks with him. After her brief conversation with AJ, Stephanie moves down to the floor to talk with Nick and his group members. See Figure 27. Stephanie is now at the same level as Alondra, Nick, and Michele as she talks with them. AJ is still sitting at his desk and his head and gaze were looking off into the distance. AJ does not position himself to collaborate with his team members or to work individually on investigating for information even after talking with Stephanie.
These examples are a small glimpse of AJ and Nick’s positioning of themselves in relation to the rest of their small group. The majority of the time during small group activities in the Native American dramatic inquiry Stephanie needed to provide some one-on-one forced positioning of AJ to get him to position himself to collaborate with his teammates. Her original assumption about placing him with these three girls to support his success academically had not happened. Once Stephanie was aware of this she implemented additional actions for AJ to support his academic success, such as checking in on him regularly by sitting with him and his group or tapping him on the shoulder and asking him a question to redirect his attention. Stephanie’s assumption about placing
Nick with Alondra and Michele had been successful in terms of dialogic positioning for academic and social success. The three students were often viewed having very engaged discussions where they would include everyone’s voices and ideas.

Figure 27: Photograph of Stephanie talking to Nick's group on November 20, 2014.

The following day, November 21, 2014, Stephanie implemented a lesson that had whole group and small group components. Her students had told her they were interested in traveling back in time. Stephanie suggested that they travel back in time to observe one of the cultures and look for moments related to the area their small group/expert team
was investigating. Stephanie positioned her students with power by allowing them to decide which culture to observe, and they decided on the Mayan culture.

Stephanie also positioned AJ differently in relation to the rest of the group in this lesson. Stephanie had previously asked AJ to design the ship that they as investigators would travel on to go back in time in for their exploration. Next, Stephanie positioned AJ as the pilot. See Figure 28.

Stephanie and I analyzed the whole group time travel and a clear trend emerged in the data in terms of how Stephanie positioned students dialogically within the whole class and how she positioned certain students in relation to the whole class, as well as the modes that supported the students in being successful. According to Stephanie:

By stepping in and being a part of the dramatic world, everybody’s engaged. Everybody’s involved. You know even if they aren’t exactly 100% on task, 100% of the time they’re involved. AJ was involved to the point of where he was continuing to be in the dramatic world of the pilot and you know, not being involved in the other stuff. (S. Barrows, personal communication, January 28, 2015)

Stephanie’s assumption was that the dramatic frame supported the deliberate positioning of students because she had wanted them to step into the dramatic world as if they were investigators of the Mayan culture. She believed that her students were engaged and accepted their positioning. She even had identified that AJ had been so engaged that he stayed in-role as the pilot and on task for this lesson. Later, Stephanie compared AJ’s engagement with the whole group portion of the lesson with previous small group lessons connected to the same larger inquiry.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spoken Language Transcript</th>
<th>Multimodal Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie: Be sure you are with your group, because you need to be able to talk to them about what you are seeing. Now, when you see something important to your group, I want you to quietly discuss with your group what you see. Okay….Sit right there. Now remember it’s your job to look for the things that your supposed to be seeing right?</td>
<td>Students are sitting on the floor. Students-in-role-as-time-travelers are getting ready to travel back in time to observe the Mayan tribe culture. AJ and Susan are the pilots at the computer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan: We haven’t taken off yet. So.</td>
<td>Shayla moves to sit by her group. Alex is standing by the computers. Stephanie is standing in back of the students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie: Okay, so I’m going to be expecting you to look out the windows and observe. Right? All right. Will you make our sound effects?</td>
<td>Stephanie tells Alex to sit and points to a spot on the floor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick: Yes</td>
<td>Stephanie uses her hand and places it above her eyes, like she is looking out the window. Stephanie looks and points at Nick who is sitting beside the computers. Nick smiles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie: Nick’s going to be our sound effect person.</td>
<td>Nick smiles as he says yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female student: Ahhh (disappointed)</td>
<td>AJ turns to Stephanie as he talks with headphones on his head. Susan smiles and puts her headphones on and turns towards the computer. Students are smiling and looking up at AJ and Susan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJ: Can I be like the, “We have, we are now taking in route to F5 and the Mayan tribe in Mesoamerica.”</td>
<td>Shayla smiles as she talks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shayla: They are going to get us killed.</td>
<td>Continued</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 28: Transcript of time travel mission on November 21, 2104.
Figure 28 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spoken Language Transcript</th>
<th>Multimodal Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie: They aren’t going to get us killed. They’ve been training.</td>
<td>Susan laughs, smiles, takes her headphones off, and looks at AJ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan: 1-2-I don’t know what to do.</td>
<td>Shayla smiles and looks up at Stephanie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shayla: Are you sure Mrs. Barrows?</td>
<td>Amber points at Nick. AJ and Susan look at Nick.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Student: Keep on the headphones.</td>
<td>Susan is smiling as she talks. Alex and Nick are gazing and smiling towards AJ and Susan. Students are in the background gazing up at AJ &amp; Susan. Susan puts her headphones back on. Students are smiling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber: Do your sound affects.</td>
<td>Hear Nick making sound effects in the background.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie: Let him [Nick] know when we take off, so he can.</td>
<td>AJ turns around and looks at Stephanie and the students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan: 1-2-ready</td>
<td>Continued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJ: We are now driving through. In 3-2-1 (loud for numbers). (AJ makes a sound). (Susan and AJ begin pounding there hands on the table in front of them.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stephanie was deliberately positioning AJ with more authority in the dramatic world based on her assumptions that he would position himself with a voice in relation to the rest of the class. AJ dialogically collaborated with his co-pilot Susan as they piloted the time travel to observe the Mayan people. See Figure 29.

AJ’s positioning of himself as on task and as a collaborative member of the community in the fictional space created in the classroom is evident in the interaction of the modes that he uses. In the photograph AJ is seen with his head and gaze towards his fellow pilot, Susan, showing her a visual sign of respect when she talks. Susan is also smiling at her classmates. Alex and Nick both have their heads and gaze towards AJ and Susan and appear to have a smile on their face. The students are accepting AJ’s positioning as the pilot of the ship and look to him for direction as they begin the journey.
back in time. The rest of the students-in-role-as-time-travelers are seated on the floor as if they are in the ship gazing upwards towards the pilots of the ship.

Figure 29: Photograph of students traveling back in time on November 21, 2014.

According to Stephanie:

Thinking about AJ, now I’m thinking about how he wasn’t really engaged with the activity when it was in the small group with his group. But he was very engaged when he was talking about going back in time when he had a position of more authority there because he was the pilot and he drew the ship….Sort of looking to position my kids who aren’t successful in some ways in a better way in a different scenario. (S. Barrows, personal communication, February 27, 2015)
When Stephanie viewed this clip again her governing gaze was now focused on how she positioned individual students in relation to the group and within specific types of activities. Her assumption now was that by shifting the authority of individual students, like AJ, her students responded by demonstrating agency by positioning themselves with a voice that allowed them to be more successful academically and socially in relation to their peers.

Stephanie and I then watched the clips of the student’s group tableaux and Stephanie identified some actions that were beginning to be trends in whether her students successfully positioned themselves in relation to the whole group. Stephanie said:

So a couple of the things that I noticed that are common, when I let them move and have a choice in where they sit seems to be a big key in everybody being engaged. And then choice within the activity, even if it’s just a little bit of choice. Seems to make the activity more successful then when I don’t give them any choice, when it has to be a right or a wrong or if there is only one way to go about it. So those two things need to be a thing that I focus on. Allowing them choice to move around the room and allowing them choice within the activity with some say over what they do. (S. Barrows, personal communication, January 28, 2015)

The trends that Stephanie identified supported the inclusion of her students in the classroom community were: choice and movement. When Stephanie positioned her students with some power over their learning through choice in the activity, such as the proxemics for the lesson or in what they researched the students were more on task and were more inclined to position each other with respect and a voice. Also, Stephanie’s continuing assumption was that by incorporating movement in each lesson her students were more engaged in meaning making as a community of practice.
Alex’s education expert team showed an image of a student poisoning his fellow classmates at school. See Figure 30.

![Image of a student poisoning his fellow classmates at school.](image)

Figure 30: Photograph of education tableaux on November 21, 2014.

This image stuck out to Stephanie, because of some conflict she had been having with Alex in how he was positioned in the class. Alex had recently told Stephanie that he did not trust her as a teacher and that he did not believe what she was telling them about classroom community and having a voice. Stephanie said:

> The only one that I was bothered by was the one…Where they showed the poisoning happening at school, because it was something that did not go along with what they were doing. And, it’s also just a little bit disturbing to me that that’s what they chose. And I (Stephanie sighs), kind of wondering where did that come from and why in light of some of the things that have happened since. Why that group? (S. Barrows, personal communication, January 28, 2015)
The tableaux for Alex’s group was something that continued to be on Stephanie’s mind even in January, two months after the lesson. Stephanie was still wondering if that tableaux topic was a way for Alex to resist how Stephanie was positioning him within the dramatic inquiry. My assumption was that Alex’s tableaux allowed her to see that she needed to focus more on deliberately positioning Alex to be included.

AJ’s agriculture and hunting expert team showed an image of a bunny being hunted. See Figure 31.

Figure 31: Photograph of agriculture and hunting tableaux on November 21, 2014.

AJ had continued to participate during the dramatic inquiry activity with his small group expert team in the fictional space created in the classroom after the whole group
activity. AJ and his small group members dialogically engaged in conversations as they decided on the image they saw of the Mayan people hunting and discussed how they wanted to share this moment with others. The students collaborated and made paper images to attach to Kendra-in-role-as-bunny to provide a visual image to support her fictional positioning. They also used tools, such as pencils, to represent a weapon they would use to hunt the bunny. AJ demonstrated more agency in this small group interaction. AJ stepped in-role-as-a-hunter alongside his small group members that are also in-role to show the moment they witnessed during their time travel mission.

Nick’s weapon expert team showed a person being sacrificed with different weapons. See Figure 32. As Stephanie reflected on this group’s collaboration she included her observation of them as they were positioning each other dialogically to set up the tableaux. Stephanie said:

They’re having a really good time, but they are on task. They are talking about it. ‘Should I be chained to the wall?’ They are really having a good discussion there, so I mean even though there is a lot of conversation. It’s all focused on the task. It’s all focused on what they are supposed to be doing. And that group [Nick’s] is really working well together, even though Michele came in late and they had to explain to her what was going on. She just jumped right in. (S. Barrows, personal communication, January 28, 2015)

Stephanie’s assumption that Nick, Alondra, and Michele would collaborate well together was confirmed again for Stephanie by how she observed them including each other, respecting each others ideas, and making sure that everyone had a voice. Stephanie was impressed that even though Michele had not been on the fictional journey back in time, Alondra and Nick positioned her as if she was. They included her ideas
about what they saw as they designed their tableaux image and she felt comfortable joining the activity.

Figure 32: Photograph of weapons tableaux on November 21, 2014.

Kelly’s social life expert team showed an image of a victory ceremony after the Mayans had beaten the Incans in a battle. See Figure 33. Once again, all members were collaborating to decide on the image they saw and how they would share it with others. Kelly-in-role-as-a-Mayan person can be seen holding up the legs of an Incan person as a part of their victory ceremony.

Shayla’s architecture expert team showed an image of a building being built. See Figure 34. Stephanie said:
I can’t remember how it came about that he [Howie] was the one in charge. And, Shayla and Boston were the ones building. So I thought that was interesting that they put him in the position that he gets to be the one telling them what to do. (S. Barrows, personal communication, January 28, 2015)

Figure 33: Photograph of ceremony tableaux on November 21, 2014.
Shayla and Boston’s positioning of Howie with authority, as the king, in the fictional world was significant to her because Howie was a new student in their class. Stephanie’s assumption was that by positioning him with authority in the fictional frame they were empowering him by showing him that he had a voice that they valued.

I also prompted Stephanie to examine her purpose for this lesson. I asked her to describe why she had chose to have her students return from their mission observing the Mayan people, and then work with their small groups to create a picture, tableaux, of what they saw to share with the rest of the class. According to Stephanie:

I was just looking for a different way to assess. As opposed to writing. Because first of all they aren’t always all good at writing. Second of all, I need to deal with different learning modes. I need to have different ways for them to express themselves, because they aren’t all good at being able to write everything out.
Especially some of my students where English is a second language or some of my students that struggle with writing. (S. Barrows, personal communication, February 27, 2015)

By incorporating an active and dramatic strategy, tableaux, Stephanie was positioning her students to collaborate within their small groups to show her and each other that they were smart using different learning modes, such as gestures, facial expressions, and dialogue. All of her students were included and positioned themselves as a part of an expert team to create an image of a moment they saw to share with their classmates. Stephanie said, “All groups did a good job…they got to choose, which I think had a big impact on what they showed” (S. Barrows, personal communication, January 28, 2015).

**Stephanie’s Goals**

Stephanie was also being faced with some push back from another teacher in her school during the Native American dramatic inquiry unit. Stephanie’s goal at the beginning of the school year was to stay true to her beliefs about what is best for her students. According to Stephanie:

She’s [another teacher] even said to me that when you talk to them you give them too much power. I want them to feel that they can talk. They need to hear and they also need to hear from me why their way isn’t always the best way. (S. Barrows, personal communication, November 20, 2014)

Another teacher was questioning Stephanie’s theoretical framework, but Stephanie remained unwavering in her beliefs that students should be positioned with respect, equally valued, and with a voice. Stephanie’s assumptions about classroom
community and sharing power with her students was a part of Stephanie’s pedagogy that she was not willing to change, even if it caused some conflict with other teachers.

**Fairytale Dramatic Inquiry Unit**

For the fairytale dramatic inquiry unit, which started in January of 2015, Stephanie was beginning to introduce students to fairytales. Due to testing and snow days, Stephanie had not introduced the commission to the students using Heathcote’s (Heathcote & Bolton, 1995) “mantle of the expert” approach. The portion of the fairytale unit that is described in this section is based on the lessons that Stephanie had implemented prior to the end of data collection. According to Stephanie:

> The purpose of the activity is to create a story map. Um, to not only bring in setting, but the idea of home-away-home…Component of fairytales. And how that [home-way-home] is a main component. (S. Barrows, personal communication, January 28, 2015)

**Positioning**

**Individual Positioning of Students in Relation to the Whole Group.**

For the lesson on creating a story map for the home-away component of the fairytale unit Stephanie had students break into small groups of no more than 3 students based on students they were sitting near at their desk. AJ and Howie were positioned to work together, because they were sitting next to each other. See Figure. 35. At this time Stephanie’s governing gaze was not focused on how she dialogically positioned individual students in relation to the group.

I included a photo to accompany the transcript because it displays some of the visible modes that represent AJ and Howie’s dialogic positioning of themselves and each
other during this task. See Figure 36. AJ is a student Stephanie had previously identified as having difficulty staying on task when working at his desk, because he was more of a kinesthetic learner and he preferred to move around while learning. In the photograph AJ is seen collaborating with Howie by placing the paper in between the two of them, his head and gaze are aimed at the paper, and he is using spoken language to talk with Howie to support the two of them in meaning making. AJ was engaged even though the activity was taking place at their desks. When comparing AJ’s participation during this small group activity with his participation during the small group activity on November 20, 2014, there are noticeable differences. On November 20, 2014, AJ had not moved his gaze or head towards his small group members or engaged in the activity. On January 27, 2015, not only was he engaged in the activity but also he took the initiative to engage his fellow teammate, Howie.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spoken Language Transcript</th>
<th>Multimodal Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AJ: Do you want to draw a train Howie?</td>
<td>AJ is looking down at the paper and then he turns his head towards Howie and back down at the paper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie: Once you have drawn your train away, flip through</td>
<td>She is speaking to the entire class and not to any group in particular.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJ: Draw a train around it, around the word.</td>
<td>AJ points his finger at the word away and circles the word. AJ turns his head and gaze towards Howie.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howie: Around. What kind of train?</td>
<td>Howie and AJ move the paper closer to Howie. Howie begins to draw the train. AJ and Howie gaze towards the paper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJ: Any train</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie: And find the part where they get to their grandmother’s house.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJ: You draw a train around it.</td>
<td>AJ points to the word Away in the left hand corner of the paper. Howie draws the train underneath the word.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 35: Transcript from activity on January 27, 2015.

Stephanie was now beginning to make comparisons across lessons she had taught this year, which represented her extending governing gaze. Stephanie was now seeing things differently in terms of teaching and learning that she had not seen the first time. In part due to her assumptions and expectations for teaching and learning. Stephanie was comparing how she positioned AJ in the above lesson with Howie on January 27, 2015 with how she positioned him in relation to the whole group on November 21, 2014.
Stephanie said:

I think because I gave him [AJ] a real specific role and a role where he was in front of people and they were relying on him, so you know positioning him. You know what? When Howie was relying on him [AJ] for help, he did better than when he was relying on the girls. The girls were more self-reliant. So I wonder if having him in a position where he has to be relied on would make him more engaged, more focused. Cause that’s twice now that we’ve seen that. (S. Barrows, personal communication, January 28, 2014)

Stephanie was reaffirming her assumption that positioning specific students, like AJ, with more authority in relation to the rest of the class positioned students with a voice and led to students positioning themselves with more agency as active participants for collaborative dialogic meaning making with their peers. Stephanie’s assumption for
positioning individual students was now becoming a belief and something that she saw as a part of her governing gaze when she planned and observed her lessons.

**Tacit Positioning of Students.**

One thing that rang true to me during my time observing in Stephanie’s class was the power that the classroom teacher has in terms of forced-positioning of herself and of her students, because of the authority of her role as a teacher in the larger institution of the school. Most of Stephanie’s students would accept how Stephanie positioned them because of her role as teacher for enforcing discipline concerns and for on task and off task behavior. On one occasion I observed a student, Nick, accept his positioning by Stephanie as off task, which thus led to him no longer participating in his group. My assumption was that this was an example of tacit positioning (Harre’ & Langenhove, 1999), because Stephanie was positioning Nick as off task, but she was not aware of how she was positioning him. I began by playing another clip from January 27, 2015. See Figure 37. I had observed Nick on task for most if not the entire lesson and I wanted to share this moment with Stephanie during our collaborative analysis. This was common when sharing data with Stephanie, I would show a video clip and then stop and ask her for her analysis before sharing mine with her in order to not influence her reflection.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spoken Language Transcript</th>
<th>Multimodal Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Susan: Yea, but one thinks it’s home and the other one doesn’t.</td>
<td>Susan and Nick are standing on each side of Amber who is seated in a chair at her desk. Nick is looking at Susan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick: Yea, so we can just write one down here.</td>
<td>Nick turns his gaze and points down at the paper in front of Amber on her desk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan: That would make it sloppy. (laughs) Really sloppy</td>
<td>Amber and Nick look at Susan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber: You’re following the same path, but this is two different girls right next to each other.</td>
<td>Amber looks and points at the story map paper. Nick sits down in his seat and looks at the paper. Susan gazes at the paper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick: All right (his tone of voice sounds like he is giving up)</td>
<td>Nick puts his hand up in the air as if to symbolize that the girls win. Amber begins drawing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan: Does that make sense Nick?</td>
<td>Susan looks at Nick:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick: No</td>
<td>Nick shakes his head no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan: Okay, so basically Daphne thinks it’s home, but</td>
<td>Amber turns her head and gaze towards Stephanie. Nick and Susan turn their head and gaze towards Stephanie.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber: So, Mrs. Barrows are they still at home? Home, like you would draw another house.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie: But, it would be a house. Maybe for one you would have in green and for the other you would have them in red.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston: Yea, but Daphne’s home</td>
<td>Susan and Amber’s head and gaze is towards Boston (who is in the group in front of theirs.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 37: Transcript from small group discussion on January 27, 2015.
Susan: Yea, so we would write Daphne as a different house.

Nick: This is why it’s really confusing for me. I don’t get it.

Stephanie: You know what Nick. To be real honest with you. It’d be less confusing if you focused on what your group is doing. And talked with them about what’s happening. I heard you guys arguing about it, but what I’m not hearing is a lot of conversation about what’s going on.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spoken Language Transcript</th>
<th>Multimodal Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Susan: Yea, so we would write Daphne as a different house.</td>
<td>Nick is looking at SB. Susan and Amber are gazing down towards story map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick: This is why it’s really confusing for me. I don’t get it.</td>
<td>Nick is looking up at SB as she talks. Susan and Amber continue to look down at story map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie: You know what Nick. To be real honest with you. It’d be less confusing if you focused on what your group is doing. And talked with them about what’s happening. I heard you guys arguing about it, but what I’m not hearing is a lot of conversation about what’s going on.</td>
<td>Nick turns his head and gaze towards the story map on Amber’s desk. Nick has his arms crossed on his desk and a blank expression on his face as he looks at the story map. Nick places his head down on his arms and does not say another word for the rest of the small group time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stephanie had Nick, Amber, and Susan work together because they were seated next to each other. See Figure 38. During the lesson students were seated at their desk with one tablet to share amongst each small group so that students could use it as a reference. Throughout the lesson Nick, as well as Susan, could be seen looking off in the distance, playing with an item at their desk, or standing next to their desk. However, they were also observed looking at each other as they talked. See Figures 38 and 39.
Figure 38: Photograph of Susan, Amber, and Nick talking on January 27, 2015.

Figure 39: Photograph of Susan, Amber, and Nick's discussion on January 27, 2015.
Stephanie had heard raised voices and assumed that Nick was off task. However, upon further analysis of the interaction of modes, Nick’s spoken language was on task and connected to the story map activity. Even though at times the students’ tones of voices during their small group discussion may have sounded as if they were arguing, but after listening to what they were saying the students were sharing contradictory viewpoints, and at times Nick appeared confused.

Nick accepts the positioning by Stephanie as off task. Nick does not reject how he is positioned (second order positioning, Harre’ & Langenhove, 1999), and he does not tell her that he was confused about what they were doing, which was related to the activity. For one of the first times all year, Nick no longer contributes to his group through spoken language, his preferred mode of communicating, and excludes himself. Nick visibly excludes himself from the activity by putting his head down on his arms on his desk. See Figure 40. His facial expression looks disengaged and he does not talk again with his fellow classmates during small group work.
After watching the video clip, the day after the event occurred, Stephanie responded by saying:

Nick, Susan, and Amber kind of surprised me. The conversation that they were having. About the point of view and the difference, because sometimes when I looked at them yesterday I assumed that they were off task. They were actually on task there and having a really good discussion...I feel like I didn’t position him [Nick] very well there. Because I thought when he was arguing that meant he was just not agreeing with the way that they were doing, but he was not understanding. And watching his face and watching him look around at other people he was not understanding that. So looking at that now it would have been better to have had him explain what he thought he was supposed to be doing. And why it was so confusing to him. And then he would have been positioned to have more success, because I really confused him there (her voice gets quieter at the end of the sentence). (S. Barrows, personal communication, January 28, 2015)
Stephanie was surprised at the on task conversation they were having because she had relied on other multimodal signs that she had observed Nick and his small group members displaying, such as moving around in their seat, argumentative tone, and looking around the room, as well as past experiences with Nick being off task in class. Stephanie identified that her assumptions about what was happening affected how she positioned Nick and impacted how Nick positioned himself. Thus leading to Nick’s self exclusion from the activity. Stephanie began to question her governing gaze in terms of her beliefs about what was “on task” and what was “off task” behavior. Stephanie wondered about other moments in her class where she may have assumed a student was off task when they were in fact on task.

Stephanie had also spoken with Shayla on January 27, 2015 during small group time as small groups were drawing the story map. See Figure 41. Stephanie came over to Shayla and Kendra at a time when students were supposed to be drawing their home-away-home map. See Figure. 42. Shayla had previously physically positioned herself with her body away from her desk. As Stephanie spoke, Shayla’s head and gaze were downturned toward her desk and at times upwards towards Stephanie as she talked. Shayla and Kendra had not completed any part of the story map at this point. Shayla’s facial expression was dejected and she did not talk, but rather shrugged; she positioned herself without a voice. One possible reason for Shayla not talking could have been the physical positioning of Stephanie over the two girls, which may have unintentionally forcibly positioned the students not to talk.
Spoken Language Transcript

Stephanie: Where’s your story map that you started?

Shayla: (Shrugs her shoulders)

Stephanie: You are only sitting next to each other because I need your undivided attention. So here at the top (Stephanie picks up the white paper and puts it in front of Shayla).

Stephanie: You are going to start with away. Okay? This is the train. You can draw a train around it. (SB leaves the paper and pencil on the desk.)

Stephanie: All right

Shayla gives Kendra the pencil and paper to begin drawing.

Multimodal Transcript

Kendra is sitting next to Shayla at their desks. The tablet is on Kendra’s desk aimed towards Shayla. Stephanie is standing in front of their desks looking down towards Shayla. Shayla is looking up at Shayla with her head rested on her hand.

Kendra looks from the tablet to Shayla and back at the tablet. Shayla moves the paper closer to her.

Stephanie points her finger at Shayla and leans in closer with her head and her body towards Shayla as she talks. Shayla moves her arms and gestures as if to talk, but does not talk. Shayla rests her hand back on her hand and looks down at the tablet. Stephanie places the white paper on the desk in front of Shayla and writes away as she talks. Shayla and Kendra gaze at the paper.

Shayla turns her body away from Stephanie and Kendra and walks away as she talks.

Figure 41: Transcript from discussion with Stephanie, Shayla, and Kendra on January 27, 2015.

When the conversation ended Shayla gave Kendra the pencil and paper and forcibly positioned her to complete the task, which is something she had done earlier in the year but not recently. Shayla had recently positioned herself as capable and had
accepted the same positioning by Stephanie and her fellow classmates. However, she had
chosen to resort back to positioning others to do the work for her in this instance.

Figure 42: Photograph of Kendra, Shayla, and Stephanie on January 27, 2015.

Stephanie reflected on this moment with Shayla and said:

And with Shayla, with me having to go over there yesterday it just. I feel like her
being at her desk was not a good place for her. Um, but at the same time I also
feel like yesterday morning she may not have been content no matter where I put
her. Because she admitted to me that she did not have a good morning yesterday.
So, and that frustrates me. And then the more I ask her to do something then a lot
of times the more resistance I get because she is already in a bad mood…It’s just
her [Shayla] and Kendra together, I’m just. I need to figure out a way to make
sure they feel like they are included and know what’s going on. (S. Barrows,
personal communication, January 28, 2015)
Stephanie’s governing gaze was still focused on positioning all of her students to be included in the classroom community. She was also aware of how individual students, like Shayla were being excluded from learning. Stephanie’s assumption was that by having the lesson solely at the student’s desks, Shayla was physically positioned not to be on task because people and items around her at the desk area often distracted her. Stephanie also was aware of Shayla’s individual needs and that her mood often impacted how she positioned herself in the classroom. The difference being that now Shayla and Stephanie had developed a relationship of respect where Shayla felt comfortable sharing how she felt with Stephanie as opposed to causing a disruption in the classroom like she had done at the beginning of the school year. Stephanie’s theoretical framework still centered on making sure that each student not only was included in the classroom community but also felt like they were included.

Stephanie questioned some of her actions with her students based on her assumptions of what should be happening in her classroom and what she did or did not do to support them in being successful. Stephanie said:

One of the things that bothers me the most when I watch it is. I feel like I positioned them [students] to not be on task because I was not on task myself. My focus was split, because I was trying to figure out how to get all six of the tablets to work, so I was messing with that one tablet. And, I feel like that positions them to think that well if she’s not paying 100% of her attention then I don’t really have to either. That’s frustrating for me. I should have. Like going back to how successful that first one [video from September 18, 2014] was going over those norms, going over what we expect from everyone, and we wasted less time because we got right into it then. (S. Barrows, personal interaction, January 28, 2015)
Stephanie thought back to earlier lessons that we had analyzed as she made assumptions about the actions she had previously taken. She took the blame for her students not being successful, because she now saw that her students were more successful academically when she reviewed the classroom norms with them to start a lesson. This action of reviewing the norms and expectations forcibly positioned students to review the expectations and thus be more on task in how they positioned themselves and others during lessons. This led Stephanie to examine how she dialogically positioned students in relation to the whole group.

**Dialogic Positioning of Students in Relation to the Whole Group.**

As Stephanie and I watched the clips from her lesson on January 27, 2015 she immediately began to identify changes she would make. Changes that Stephanie identified that she would and did make to her lesson were based on our collaborative data analysis. According to Stephanie:

All right, so just from looking at this [video clips] I feel like I definitely should have gone over the norms to start with. I need to make sure I am doing that with this group every single time that we get ready to do something. Another thing I was just thinking, judging by the way that they reacted to the moving to the actual physical. So my idea would be not exactly being in the dramatic world of like client world, but maybe stepping into the story. If I were to have those locations, like on large sheets of paper, a house, a train. And have them kind of move through the story. Like actually move through it. And then they could put down on paper what we physically did together. So like we could have a house...I wonder if that would be a more successful way into it then the way I went about it the first time. Because that would give them that movement, and that actual being a part of the story. (S. Barrows, personal communication, January 28, 2015)

Stephanie began to identify changes in actions she wanted to make for the follow-up lesson to the one we had observed based on how she had positioned her students and
how they had responded to the positioning. This was in part due to actions she had observed over time that she assumed supported her students in positioning themselves and their classmates to be more dialogic as they made meaning together. She had identified that her governing gaze in this lesson had been focused on students making meaning about the home-away-home topic by making a story map, which she expected students to enjoy because they would able to draw and talk as they completed the activity. However, her governing gaze did not allow her to see that she was not including actions that would position all of her students to be successful dialogically as they made meaning together.

Stephanie was still unsure if proxemics mattered, in terms of where and how she physically positioned her students for an activity. Stephanie said, “Is it what I’m doing when they are at their seats that is causing disengagement? Or is it the actual having to sit at their seats for a long period of time or any period?” (S. Barrows, personal communication, January 28, 2015). Stephanie was questioning her assumptions about proxemics and she wanted to look more closely at proxemics in relation to other modes during the follow-up lesson. After viewing the video data, Stephanie identified specific actions, such as reviewing norms, movement, and stepping into the story, that she planned to implement in the follow up lesson.

**January 30, 2015 Lesson**

Stephanie’s lesson on January 30, 2015 was designed and implemented based on her observations of the related lesson on January 27, 2015, as well as other lessons she
had observed from video data from the entire school year. The following is a description of the lesson as well as Stephanie’s awareness of community and her inquiry paradigm.

Looking back at Stephanie’s inquiry question, she wanted to make sure that she was positioning her students as a community of people where everyone was respected, equally valued, and has a voice. Stephanie had identified from previous lessons, such as the Greek mythology lesson from September 18, 2014, that when she reviewed the norms and expectations before starting an activity she was deliberately positioning them to be respectful. Stephanie began by having her students review the norms for their classroom that the students created together earlier in the school year at the beginning of a lesson on January 30, 2015. See Figure 43. According to Stephanie:

I set it up as, I reminded them about our norms for respect and for having a safe space to share. And then assumed if I did that they would be more receptive to listening to each other and talking to each other and then so they were. (S. Barrows, personal communication, February 27, 2015)

Stephanie’s assumption was that by deliberately positioning the whole group with opportunities to tell her and each other about the classroom norms for respect and a safe space in the classroom that all students would then in subsequent tasks position each other respectfully. In addition, Stephanie used this time to reinforce a tactical teaching action that clearly was informed by her theoretical framework. Edmiston (2014) writes, “Planning to ‘Say Yes, and…’ as much as possible to students’ ideas is an essential tactical teaching stance anyone can adopt that significantly promotes dialogue” (p. 230). Stephanie modeled the ‘Say Yes, and…’ tactical teaching approach throughout the year, emphasized this approach, and reminded her students as needed of this approach as 293
evident in the excerpt from January 30, 2015. The ‘Say Yes, and…’ approach eventually became a class norm that students would reference before starting a lesson or remind their peers of during classroom meetings.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spoken Language Transcript</th>
<th>Multimodal Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie: Keep in mind, when we talk in this room these are all of the things that we agreed on. All right? Remember when our umbrella is up it is a safe space. What does this mean for us?...</td>
<td>Stephanie has her back to the class as she writes on the dry erase board. Students are seated at their desks. Most students have their head and gaze towards Stephanie as she talks. Stephanie walks back to her seat on the side of the room, sits down, and looks towards her class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley: Do you want me to read them?</td>
<td>Ashley points to the Umbrella drawing on the white board behind her.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie: Yes</td>
<td>Ashley gets up from her seat and stands next to the white board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley: Um, it says, team, respect others ideas, treat others how you want to be treated, respect others, have fun but respect others. Uh, I can’t really read what it says, but don’t talk over other people. I can’t read one.</td>
<td>Susan, Nick, and Boston have their heads and gaze turned towards Ashley. Ashley has her back to the class as she reads aloud. Ashley turns around and looks at Stephanie. Ashley walks back to her seat and sits down.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie: Okay</td>
<td>Stephanie turns her head and gaze towards her student and makes eye contact with her students as she talks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick: Don’t</td>
<td>See students nod their heads yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie: Did we all agree that those were the things we were going to do when we shared in class?</td>
<td>Shayla raises her hand. Stephanie points at Shayla. Lisa raises her hand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students: yes</td>
<td>Smiles and shakes her head yes. Shayla puts her hand up and then down when Stephanie points at Lisa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie: Okay, now remember your safe space also means that what? Uh, Shayla, thank you for raising your hand.</td>
<td>Continued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shayla: Don’t judge people</td>
<td>Figure 43: Transcript of students reviewing norms on January 30, 2015.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie: (Makes agreeing sound) Okay, we don’t judge what they say. It’s their opinion. What do we do instead of judging and saying no?</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 43 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spoken Language Transcript</th>
<th>Multimodal Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lisa: Yes and</td>
<td>Stephanie points to the papers they have on the white board under colored magnets that the students created.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie: We say yes and. That is right there up at the top. It is right under where that little blue magnet guy is. Yes AND, I also think this. Yes AND, this could work too. Right? All right. Let’s get back into making sure that we remember those things when we start to talk.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another assumption that Stephanie had about what should be happening in her classroom was that she wanted her students to position each other and themselves with more respect, equally valued, and with a voice. She assumed that when her students were given a choice in what they did in the classroom they were more likely to position each other positively as a community of practice. This supported Stephanie’s theoretical framework that her students should have some power in the classroom about their learning, and that through this power her students would be positioned with more agency. Shayla made a noticeable shift in that she was actively contributing to classroom conversations and asserting more agency by contributing her voice to community norms for the entire community of practice. Stephanie’s governing gaze was now focused on how she dialogically positioned her students within the group. Stephanie positioned her students with choice by being flexible and changing the lesson based on her students’ interests. Some of her students had mentioned that they had some questions for one of the characters in the text. Stephanie responded to this by deliberately telling her students...
she was going to begin with an activity using the hotseating dramatic strategy, per their suggestion. See Figure 44.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spoken Language Transcript</th>
<th>Multimodal Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie: What I would like to do since you guys asked is [hotseat], that is how we’ll start this lesson. That’s how we’ll get into our lesson</td>
<td>Stephanie is sitting in her chair on the side of the room looking out at her students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students: Yes!</td>
<td>Many students say this excitedly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie: And then we’re going to, instead of just drawing the world of the story. We’re going to actually physically move around inside the world of the story [Hear students gasp with excitement]. You guys are going to help me do</td>
<td>Stephanie places her hand down on a story map in front of her and turns her head towards the right side of the room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick: Just like with the Incans and Mayans?</td>
<td>Stephanie puts her hand out in front of her toward her students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stephanie smiles and nods her head yes. Ashley has a huge smile on her face. Susan, Ashley, Nick, Boston, and Alondra have their body, head, &amp; gaze towards SB as she talks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 44: Transcript of Stephanie positioning her students with choice on January 30, 2015.

During the hotseating students were engaged in a dialogic discussion about information about the text. Students demonstrated interest and engagement was gauged by looking at the various modes that students used such as turning their head and gaze towards the person speaking, smiling, raising their hands, and writing down questions.
and comments in their journals. Noticeable changes were observed with how Shayla and Nick positioned themselves during this lesson in comparison to January 27, 2015.

Stephanie’s theoretical framework was supported by her assumptions about including her students’ interests and dialogically positioning her students with respect and with voices that were equally valued. Her actions in being flexible, and following her students’ interests and including all students in dialogue meant she was dialogically positioning her students for polyphonic conversations. And students seemed to accept this positioning and all stepped into the dramatic frame to ask Stephanie-as-Sabrina questions they had about the text. None of her students appeared disengaged. See Figure 45. Stephanie’s assumption was that when her students were more interested in a topic or activity they would be more inclined to share and thus include more student voices to make the conversation more polyphonic.

On January 27, 2015, Shayla had been laying her head down on her desk, positioning her body away from her desk, and she was not actively participating in the activity. See pages 288 and 289. Stephanie acted to forcibly position Shayla to get her on task. In contrast, on January 30, 2015, Shayla positioned herself on task and was actively engaged in each activity. On January 30, 2015, Shayla was smiling with her head and gaze turned toward Stephanie after she asked Stephanie-as-Sabrina a question during the hotseat activity. See Figure 46. Nick was able to take his confusion over the home-away-home activity from January 27, 2015 and ask questions during the hotseat activity. He also took turns asking questions and he did not talk over other students.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spoken Language Transcript</th>
<th>Multimodal Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie: All right, I'm back in the world. So, I got a phone call and someone said that you had questions for me. (Hear students giggling)</td>
<td>Stephanie-in-role-as-Sabrina is sitting down in a seat looking out towards the students for hotseat interview. Stephanie and students smile. Shayla raises her hand. Stephanie points at Shayla.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick: I wonder who?</td>
<td>Shayla smiles and gazes towards Stephanie.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shayla: Were you scared when you saw the Pixies?</td>
<td>Stephanie uses her hands to symbolize little lights. Stephanie makes a disgusted face. Stephanie points at Lisa. Susan’s hand is raised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie: Well at first I thought they were really pretty. Just like little lights, little fireflies, but then they bit me. (Students laugh)</td>
<td>Lisa looks down at her notebook where she had questions written down for interview. Lisa is looking at Stephanie smiling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa: What did you think when you saw the mirror?</td>
<td>Shayla smiles and laughs. Other students, like Kelly, raise their hand in the air.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie: Well I wasn’t sure what to think at first, because remember it sort of yelled at me. And let’s face it, my grandmother’s house is super crazy. I mean green spaghetti and orange sauce. Eww!</td>
<td>Shayla is still sitting up, smiling and looking at Stephanie.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shayla: That sounds good!</td>
<td>Susan moves to a seat right in front of Stephanie. Stephanie turns her head towards Nick. Nick smiles and gazes towards Stephanie as he talks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie: People yelling at me from inside mirrors.</td>
<td>Students have their bodies and gazes towards Stephanie as she talks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick: What do you think about your Grandma after you found out she was your grandmother?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie: I’ll be honest, at first I didn’t believe that she was my grandmother, because my dad told me that my grandmother was dead. And I believed my dad.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 45: Transcript from hotseat activity on January 30, 2015.
Stephanie was now focused on dialogically positioning her students in small group and whole group situations to meet the academic and social needs of her students. Reflecting back on the lesson Stephanie said:

I felt like we got more quality. I feel like a lot of times I’m starting to shift from doing everything in smaller groups to a combination of the whole group to the small group and back to the whole group again. Where the smaller group contributes back to the whole group. Because when I just focus on small collaborative groups the discussion isn’t as rich. Whereas when I focus on the small group bringing it back to the whole group like they did when they drew the settings, but then we moved through them together and they explained them it was for the whole group. So it had more meaning. So I’m moving away from a focus on small group type projects to small group that leads out to something bigger. (S. Barrows, personal communication, February 27, 2015)
With Stephanie’s shift from small group to whole group she was positioning her students to be more dialogic and supporting her students in having a voice and listening to their peers’ voices. Stephanie’s assumption being that by having both small group and whole group activities she was taking into account her students comfort levels for talking and how they positioned themselves and others with an equal voice. Stephanie said, “Especially if they are more willing to talk in their small group. Their voice still gets heard even if they don’t share it out. The people they were talking to can share it out” (S. Barrows, personal communication, February 27, 2015).

Stephanie’s governing gaze was also focused on her hypotheses based on her observations of previous lessons, that her students would position themselves to succeed academically and socially during lessons where she incorporated movement and multiple learning modes. Her previous lesson just had students sitting at their desks and it only positioned students to communicate through drawing and discussion. Stephanie was now focused on incorporating a multitude of modes for students to communicate with during the lesson, so that no one mode was privileged over another. According to Stephanie:

I had them draw it on a larger scale and then we actually physically moved through the space, which was good for some of those kids because it gave them a chance to move through the physical world of the story. But also show what the characters were thinking and feeling as they moved through the story, which was really the point of the lesson but I wasn’t getting it with just the drawing part. (S. Barrows, personal communication, February 27, 2015)

Stephanie’s assumption was that by incorporating multiple modes for communication all of her students would be positioned equally with a voice and could communicate using the mode that they were most comfortable using. See Figure 47.
Figure 47: Photograph of students showing a character’s point of view on January 30, 2015.

By having students communicate with facial expressions students were positioned to dialogically communicate with Stephanie and their classmates how they believed a particular character felt at a particular moment in the text through a mode other than spoken language. All of her students accepted this third order positioning as they showed and then later discussed their interpretations of a particular character’s point of view. Her design of this activity was based off of her theoretical framework, influenced by the work of Bakhtin (1986) that there is no one way to interpret a text. The students could show individual interpretations of a character’s point of view in a text. Stephanie was also aware that some of her students, like Kelly, needed more support to share through spoken language. See Figure 48. Stephanie’s governing gaze was now focused on positioning
certain students differently in relation to the whole group to support dialogic meaning making.

Stephanie reflected on this moment of her teaching by stating:

Kelly sometimes has trouble articulating what she wants to say, but she was able to show it. And I even had her show it again, what she was doing there. It was hard to see, but on her face she felt like Sabrina was slipping away from her. And it was a really good moment to see that she understood that. I knew that she understood that even if she couldn’t necessarily put it into words, which is a struggle for her because Spanish is her first language. (S. Barrows, personal communication, February 27, 2015)

Stephanie had deliberately positioned Kelly in relation to the rest of the class to talk based on the visible expression she had represented on her face. Stephanie positioned Kelly with having a voice that was equally valued and respected. Kelly accepted this positioning and shared briefly with her fellow classmates. This led to some of her classmates beginning a dialogic discussion about their interpretations of how the character of Sabrina felt. Stephanie reminded Nick to let Kelly talk and hear her voice, and Nick accepted this positioning and remained engaged.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spoken Language Transcript</th>
<th>Multimodal Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston: She has a fear of losing her sister.</td>
<td>Students start crossing their arms and making a stern face.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie: So show me what she’s thinking? She’s watching Daphne and Daphne’s happy, so she’s not just mad. What else might she not be showing us? Show me what she might feel like on the inside.</td>
<td>See a student reach out their arm. Stephanie is speaking to Nick who spoke instead of Kelly. Stephanie points her finger at Kelly. Students turn their head and gaze towards Kelly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick: Happy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie: Oh, Kelly I like that. What are you doing?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly: Um</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick: Giving me a handshake.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly: (laughs)</td>
<td>Hear laughter from students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie: Let Kelly answer, because that was a good emotion she was showing. What was that?</td>
<td>Stephanie points at Kelly. Students begin to gaze at Kelly as she holds her arm out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly: I wanted to like be with her.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie: Yea, could you see? Can you do that again?</td>
<td>Students turn their gaze towards Susan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan: I feel like</td>
<td>Nick smiles and points at Susan with a sock in his hand. Stephanie holds up her hand as if to signal to Nick it is not his time to talk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie: I feel like you’re kind of on the inside.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan: I feel like what Sabrina did is that she shut down.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick: Yea, she was lying low (excitedly)</td>
<td>Boston waves her hand in the air.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 48: Transcript from whole group activity on January 30, 2015.
Susan: She didn’t want to open up to her because she was being stubborn.

Boston: gasps

Susan: Because I do that sometimes. Like, you like shut the people out and then you don’t listen to anything you are saying because they’re trying to get you to change what you said, but she like turned stubborn and she doesn’t want to do anything.

Stephanie: Even though she might, Daphne is starting to give it a chance. Is stubborn a good character trait for Sabrina at this point?

Students: Yea

Boston: She’s scared to accept change, because she’s so busy looking for people she can’t like see or accept something else.

Susan looks up at Stephanie. Nick begins to smile and sway back and forth. Susan begins to look at her classmates as she talks. Stephanie points towards Susan.

Stephanie points at Boston whose hand was raised in the air.

Stephanie and her students continued to discuss their interpretation of the character’s point of view. See Figure 49. Students are on their feet and in the corner of the room, because that part of the room had been designated as a particular location in the story. As the students stood in a circle they included Stephanie. Student’s bodies are faced inward towards the center of the circle and students turn their heads and gazes towards the speaker. The interconnection of modes led Stephanie and me to interpret this as students actively engaged and collaborating as a community of practice.
Figure 49: Photograph of students talking on January 30, 2015.

**Focal Students**

**Alex.**

Alex, had been telling Stephanie during the Native American dramatic inquiry unit that he did not believe that she cared about him and his positioning of himself as an outsider had carried over into the fairytale unit. Foundational in her theoretical framework was that all students should be included. Alex’s second order positioning was felt by Stephanie as in direct opposition to her understanding of what a classroom community should be. Stephanie had said that it was tough and it hurt her feelings at times, but she still believed that he should be included in the community. Stephanie
would even make a point to remind him that she cared about him. Stephanie recalled one situation where she told him:

> I said you know what, what you [Alex] said really bothered me, but all it did was make me even more determined to show you that I actually do care about you. So you’re out of luck, I’m not giving up on you. (S. Barrows, personal communication, December 4, 2014)

Alex continued to use second order positioning by rejecting his positioning as a collaborative member of the classroom community. He was not an active participant during the above lessons for the fairytale unit. Alex had rejected Stephanie’s positioning of him as a valued member of the classroom community. Alex refused to participate and said that he wanted somebody to give him a piece of paper to learn so he didn’t have to do anything but take a test on it. Stephanie’s theoretical framework was in direct opposition with what Alex said he wanted. Stephanie, while hurt by Alex’s choice to exclude himself from the community, was committed to her belief that all students, even students who excluded themselves, should be respected and included in the classroom community.

Stephanie decided that she did not want to forcibly position him to participate in the dramatic world of the fairytale unit. Instead, she pulled out separate work that he could do individually at his desk in the classroom. As Stephanie continued to use the dramatic inquiry pedagogy she always invited him to join them. His fellow classmates also took the initiative to invite him to participate as well. For two weeks Alex sat his desk and rejected their offers to collaborate. However, his reactions to them in the dramatic world told a different story. I observed Alex watching his classmates, with his
head and gaze turned towards them, and smiling as they talked. It appeared that although he was not interacting with them he was still interested in what they were doing. See Figure 50.

Figure 50: Alex watching his peers during a classroom activity on January 30, 2015.

After about two weeks, Alex decided to join Stephanie and his fellow classmates. Alex’s decision to include himself in the classroom was a great moment for Stephanie. She had recognized his power to decide and she had positioned him with agency. She did not use forced positioning to demand that he participate, rather she respected his voice and she waited until he chose to participate as a member of their community. Stephanie was still aware that she needed to be deliberate in how she positions him in relation to
herself and the group. Her belief in all students being included is something that she keeps at the forefront of her mind for everything she does to support a community in her classroom. Stephanie continued to think about the academic and social needs of each student when grouping her students for small group work as well as their needs as whole group when planning lessons for the entire class.

**AJ.**

AJ had begun to assert himself more with a voice in academic discussions. This was in part due to Stephanie’s assumption that he needed to be positioned with authority in relation to the entire group.

In situations where he [AJ] is positioned or has positioned himself with authority, he is better able to step into a leadership role as opposed to being a follower. It has also helped him be more aware of when he is off task when he is not in a position of authority. He is more willing to work with students that aren’t his best friends because he knows he does better quality work and he is more focused on the task at hand. (S. Barrows, personal communication March 7, 2015)

Stephanie had also implemented strategies, such as keeping papers in a binder to position him to take more ownership of his work and support him in being more organized in the classroom. However, she was still working with him on strategies to support him with organization. Lastly, Stephanie had also included more movement into activities, so that he was not constrained by the physical proxemics of an activity such as sitting at his desk.

**Nick.**

Nick was still outgoing and outspoken at times in the classroom. However, he now demonstrated more respect for his peers by listening to their voices during
discussions and not talking over them. In small groups, such as during the Native American unit, I observed him compromising to include others ideas to support the collaborative meaning making on joint endeavors. At times he still needed Stephanie to support him by deliberately positioning him to listen to others voices.

He actually is more embracing of the ‘Yes, and’ philosophy. Instead of saying ‘I don’t like that idea’ he will say ‘Yes, and I like this idea’. He is more open to the idea that other people have something to say that he might need to listen to…Whereas at the beginning of the year he would say no that’s wrong. Now he will say ‘I understand what he’s saying’…That is a big step for him. (S. Barrows, March 7, 2015)

Stephanie was also aware of how she positioned him as off task based on previous experiences with him off task in the classroom. Stephanie changed her actions: she listened more in conversations and asked more questions to position students as respected, equally valued, and with a voice. Lastly, Stephanie was aware that she needed to provide Nick, like AJ, with opportunities to move and not be constrained by the proxemics of his desk to position him to succeed academically and socially.

**Kelly.**

Kelly no longer ran to Stephanie every time she observed something that she perceived as a problem. Kelly deliberately positioned herself dialogically to talk with her peers in the classroom one-on-one and during whole group discussions. Kelly continued to bring up specific concerns during class meetings to the entire group to discuss as opposed to just talking to Stephanie about her concern. She had also dialogically positioned herself in the fictional spaces and real world spaces to talk about academic content. Kelly’s peers had accepted her positioning and respond by positioning her as
capable. Also, Stephanie had included more modes for meaning making into lessons, such as showing how a character felt during the fairytale unit. This was intentional, so that Kelly and others were able to communicate using multiple modes in addition to spoken language. Stephanie found that:

People take her more seriously…and she [Kelly] branches out more and will go and work with other people. Instead of always relying on them, because she’s got more confidence. (S. Barrows, personal communication, February 27, 2015)

Shayla.

Shayla now positioned herself as a capable member of the classroom community. She participated in activities in the fictional spaces, such as asking questions during the hotseat activity during the fairytale unit and the real world spaces, such as talking during class meetings, in the classroom. Stephanie was also cognizant of how she positioned Shayla in relation to the rest of the group in order to support her belief in herself. Stephanie said, “One thing I try to do with her is position her as capable even when we are not in the dramatic world, because she doesn’t think that she is” (S. Barrows, personal communication, February 27, 2015). By positioning Shayla as capable, Stephanie’s assumption was that she was positioning her with more agency. As with Nick and AJ, Stephanie was also more aware of actions she needed to do to position Shayla to be more successful, such as giving her choice in choosing where she works, such as on the floor for small group work, and incorporating movement instead of just sitting at her desk. Also, her classmates were now positioning Shayla as capable, which demonstrated their respect for her. According to Stephanie:
Shayla, I couldn’t put her with any group at the beginning of the year. I could not put her anywhere at the beginning of the year, because every time I put her in a group she would get upset. She would refuse to work. She would let everybody do the work for her. Or she would refuse to participate. And everybody else didn’t want her in the group. But now it doesn’t seem to matter where I put her. I mean even she and Susan have conversations and they were…not a group that would get along. (S. Barrows, personal communication, February 27, 2015)

Shayla’s changing identity to be a capable student, was now apparent in her collaborative work with many of her peers, and not just one friend, and in her ability to dialogue with her peers and her teacher.

**Conclusion**

Creating a community of practice where everyone is respected, equally valued, and has a voice so that everyone can succeed academically and socially is not an easy task. Here I summarize key findings from this study about how Stephanie created a community of practice that included students with special rights and their general education peers. I identified six key changes in her social practices that were apparent in her actions as a teacher.

Like Cary, one of her changing social practices was using dramatic inquiry to make meaning through collaborative activities. Prior to teaching with dramatic inquiry, Stephanie had designed instruction based on standards and had positioned her students to participate in monologic discussions with predetermined answers. By the end of this study she was using dramatic inquiry to support the inclusion of all students as well as herself as a team in a community of practice. She dialogically positioned students to collaborate and make meaning together through dramatic inquiry; she wanted her
students to use their power to position one another as equal participants. As reported by Stephanie:

I feel like it [dramatic inquiry] positions us as if we are a team that is working together. Including me in that team. Because I listen to their ideas instead of just saying okay, my way or the highway. Um, and also it positions them, I feel like it positions them [her students] to feel like they have power. Because one of the things that they brought up when we were doing the home-away-home thing was that sometimes school feels like home, because they have power. (S. Barrows, personal communication, February 13, 2015)

Her assumption was that dramatic inquiry can support the inclusion of all students. According to Stephanie:

I feel like the best way that it [dramatic inquiry] supported it [inclusion] is that they all feel like they matter in my room. Even if they can’t do every little thing that we are doing together. They can do something and they can try to do something. And they can be a part of it. (S. Barrows, personal communication, February 13, 2015)

A second changing practice was that she deliberately implemented social practices (alongside the use of dramatic inquiry), intending to create a classroom community that was supported by the inclusion of all students. Before teaching with dramatic inquiry she had not had classroom meetings or put much emphasis on community outside of behavior management. Now she consistently implemented social practices, such as weekly classroom meetings and bucket fillers, alongside the use of dramatic inquiry to position her students with a voice. Her actions were deliberate in that she wanted to position her students with shared power to create spaces for dialogue in both real world and fictional spaces in the classroom. She wanted to empower her students so that each member felt that they had a respected and equally valued voice.
Stephanie found that the community building in the real world space supported the dialogic and collaborative meaning making in the real and fictional spaces created through dramatic inquiry because of students’ increased power and interest in their learning. Stephanie concluded:

I think it goes back to the whole seeing how building community connects to being more dialogic in my academic work. I’m seeing that there’s benefits to the more power they feel like they have in our community, the more power it is that they feel they have in what we do. And the more willing I am to listen to them, because I know that they are doing it not just because they enjoy that power but because it makes them feel like they are involved in what they are doing. I don’t feel like I have a power struggle with my kids. I feel like we are doing it together. I don’t feel like they are doing it to get away with something. They are doing it because they really want to be involved. (S. Barrows, personal communication, February 27, 2015)

A third changing practice was relative to her awareness of the need for whole group meaning making. When Stephanie began with the Greek mythology unit she was not aware that she needed to deliberately position students to make meaning together in relation to the entire groups meaning making. Students were being positioned to make meaning individually on tasks related to a similar topic, but there was no collaborative meaning making. This was in stark contrast to the Native American Unit where Stephanie positioned students to make meaning in small groups to be shared with the whole group. Students were engaged in collaborative and dialogic meaning making as they traveled back in time to observe different cultures and when they created tableaux’s with their peers. This led to students positioning new students as well as students they had not worked with prior as capable and valued members of their expert team.
A fourth changing social practice was that how she positioned individual students in relation to the entire group so that everyone could succeed academically and socially. For example, Stephanie recognized that she needed to position AJ with some authority and/or as having some additional expertise in relation to the rest of the group. AJ accepted this positioning and became in Vygotsky’s (1978) words “a head taller” in relation to the entire group when he had more authority and perceived expertise in an activity, such as a pilot who designed a ship to travel back in time. AJ’s meaning making was now being extended beyond what he had previously done individually.

A fifth changing social practice was how she shifted to assumed that students were on task more than off task. For example, she is more aware that when she begins a lesson by reviewing the norms and expectations for an activity she is positioning her students to succeed academically and socially in completing a task. In contrast, when she did not review norms and expectations, did not have technology ready, or assumed a student was off task she positioned her students not to succeed academically and socially. The off task positioning had been unintentional, but now that she is aware of this positioning, she has implemented actions to support on task positioning of all students. This demonstrates that Stephanie does not want to constrain her students’ agency by how she sets up an activity or positions her students. Some of the actions are reviewing norms and expectations before each lesson, having materials prepared ahead of time, listening to student conversations, and asking students questions all of which position them as on task.
Lastly, the sixth changing social practice is that the teacher is more aware of how positioning her students with choice and movement supports students in collaborative meaning making where everyone can succeed academically and socially. Prior to teaching with dramatic inquiry, Stephanie had not taken into account her students’ voices in changing a lesson or looked much at the proxemics of an activity. During the fairytale unit, as well as during the previous dramatic inquiry units, Stephanie began giving her students some choice, such as hotseating a character when they had questions or sitting on the floor as they worked in a small group. Students were observed to be more on task and engaged in collaborative meaning making. Also, movement, such as between activities, within an activity as if they are physically moving within a story, or movement within their real world space so they could lay on the floor, contributed to students being more engaged in collaborative meaning making.
Chapter 5: Conclusions

Introduction

The purpose of this qualitative ethnographic study was to explore inclusion along a continuum of educational placements by examining how classroom literacy teachers transform through the use of dramatic inquiry with students with special rights in inclusive settings. More specifically, how teacher transformation might impact the inclusion of students with special rights. The main research question used for the research was: “How is the inclusion of students in collaborative activities affected by the classroom teacher’s changing practices in response to her awareness of how teacher and students are positioning one another?” Data were obtained from two different classrooms along a continuum of educational placements during teaching of units using dramatic inquiry. The settings included in the study were a high school classroom in a public residential school for the blind and a general education elementary classroom in a public elementary school, both in the Midwestern United States. The instructional strategies for literacy instruction in both classrooms were based on dramatic inquiry (Edmiston, 2014), which combines dramatic teaching for learning with inquiry-based instruction. Students, alongside their teacher collaborated to make meaning together as they stepped into real
world and fictional spaces to explore different possibilities connected to a text. The instructional strategies are described in more detail in chapters three and four.

This is the first time that collaborative inquiry has been done with classroom teachers with a sociocultural theoretical framework using dramatic inquiry to examine teachers changing pedagogy to support inclusion using my definition of inclusion in settings along a continuum of educational placements. There are 7 sections of discussion in this chapter: inclusion, classroom teacher’s changing practice, positioning theory, dramatic inquiry, inclusion along a continuum of educational placements, limitations of the study, and implications and recommendations for future research. Within the dramatic inquiry section there are three subsections: identity, agency, and power.

**Inclusion**

The IDEA (2004) mandates that students with disabilities have access to the general education curriculum, receive a FAPE in the students LRE, but it does not mandate inclusion (Harpell & Andrews, 2010). Multiple scholars have multiple definitions of inclusion that are prevalent in literature, with many placing an emphasis on the general education classroom being the physical location that determines inclusion. I defined inclusion as students with special rights in an educational setting [Setting may have general education students, and special and/or general education teachers] found along a continuum of educational placements, co-constructing meaning within a dialogic community of people, students and teachers. The shift in focus for my definition of inclusion puts more emphasis on a child with special rights co-constructing meaning within a dialogic community of people.
The emphasis in my definition of inclusion is on the social practices of learning and the cultural context, rather than an individual child with special right’s placement or services, which are often separated from his or her cultural knowledge. My definition was based located in a sociocultural theoretical perspective that emphasized individuals in a community of practice working together on a joint endeavor to make meaning (Wenger, 1998). Students with special rights need to be included in inclusive educational communities of practice. In this way all students are acknowledged as competent within learning communities and a larger range of social and cultural perspectives and histories are included in the process of learning and knowing.

Some key inclusion characteristics I identified are students collaborating and participating, working on social and academic goals, solving problems through inquiry, and making meaning by having shared experiences and opportunities to reflect. Researchers have previously not explored pedagogy using my definition of inclusion along a continuum of placements. By focusing on classrooms from two different settings along a continuum of educational placements using my definition of inclusion, the present study makes an important contribution to the field of education. A focus on students with special rights co-constructing meaning within a dialogic community of people on a joint endeavor will contribute to the discussion about how students with special rights are included. Also it will further the discussion about what is inclusion in today’s education system, while sparking further debate about whether the physical location that learning takes place should determine inclusion.
Students with special rights, and in one setting their general education peers, were positioned to collaborate and participate on activities using dramatic inquiry to support social and academic goals. Students with special rights solved problems through a dramatic inquiry framework by co-constructing meaning on a joint endeavor. Both of the classroom teachers demonstrated an inclusive frame for learning that represented my definition for inclusion. Students with special rights were positioned to co-construct meaning with their peers alongside their teacher within a dialogic community of people.

In Cary’s class from chapter 3, students were positioned as an expert team of haunted house designers. They collaborated by stepping into the fictional spaces of a haunted house and the real world space of the classroom to solve their commission for a fictional client. Students supported their academic goals of understanding a text, while working on social goals to position themselves and their peers as capable and respected. Students read Poe’s *The Murders in the Rue Morgue* and stepped in and out of the real world space and the fictional space in the classroom to discuss the meaning of the text and how they could apply their understandings of the text within their haunted house design to explore different possibilities. Over time Tom went from excluding Rachel from activities by positioning her with less power to encouraging her to share through dialogue in front of the whole group. Student’s co-constructed meaning by incorporating their peers ideas as well as their own as they made their final projects. Yared reflected in a post interview after the unit was finished and identified that although the final project was individually made it was still a group project and that he incorporated ideas from the group.
In Stephanie’s class she positioned her students to collaborate and participate on multiple units of study using dramatic inquiry. For example, students with special rights were positioned alongside their general education peers as an expert team of time traveling investigators as they collaborated to identify information about different cultures. Within their expert team they solved problems and shared information through various formats, such as written language, drawings, and tableaux images. Students were also positioned to support their academic goals of treating everyone with respect, as equally valued and with a voice. Power was shared with students so that they could suggest changes and voice concerns. Students co-constructed meaning in small groups and then shared and collaborated within the whole class to make meaning on their joint endeavor as time traveling investigators.

**Classroom Teacher’s Changing Practice**

The classroom teacher participants changing practice was identified using an adaptation of Emig’s (1983) inquiry paradigm to examine how each teacher’s theoretical framework, governing gaze, assumptions, and actions changed over time based on their past and present teaching with dramatic inquiry to include students with special rights. This is a new way to examine a classroom teacher’s changing practice over time. A sociocultural theoretical perspective, with a focus on identity, agency, and power, was used to explain why classroom literacy teachers who are committed to inclusion would want to use dramatic inquiry in their teaching. Issues of identity, agency, and power in knowledge production are lacking in theoretical frameworks that inform sociocultural research (Lewis, Enciso, & Moje, 2007). How each of the teacher participants changed
over time impacted their own teaching pedagogy as well as how they positioned their students with special rights, and in one setting their general education peers, to express their own identity, agency, and power.

**Positioning Theory**

Positioning theory (Harre´ & Langenhove, 1999) provided a framework to examine how teachers and students positioned themselves and others over time and how this impacted inclusion. Prior to this study, positioning theory had not been used to examine the inclusion of students with special rights with dramatic inquiry pedagogy along a continuum of educational placements. How the classroom teachers positioned students with special rights, and there general education peers, was a mediating tool that made a difference in how students were included or excluded from learning in the classroom along a continuum of educational placements.

How students are positioned and construct their own positional identities can also be an issue of power and privilege (Holland et al., 1998). Edmiston (2014) used a Bakhtinian approach to positioning theory, to explain that participants can accept how they are positioned in dialogic interactions to make meaning, or their meaning making can be stopped through monologic positioning, when a person contests how they have been positioned or is unable to negotiate a new position. Both Cary and Stephanie identified that prior to using dramatic inquiry they had positioned their students more monologically by constraining their meaning making to predetermined outcomes that did not empower the individual voices within the community of practice. Over time by using dramatic inquiry, Cary and Stephanie began to position their students with special rights,
and in one setting their general education peers, dialogically with more opportunities to construct dialogue with others and share their own cultural identities.

For example, Cary dialogically positioned her students during a small group activity using different modes to discuss multiple possibilities when designing a haunted house. The students accepted how they were positioned and responded by listening to the ideas of their peers as they discussed possible scenarios for designing the haunted house. This was in contrast to the lesson where Cary had positioned Rachel as the note taker and her peers had positioned her as not capable of contributing. At the time Cary was not aware that she needed to position Rachel differently since Rachel’s agency was constrained so that she was unable to negotiate a new position. Over time, Cary’s theoretical framework changed and she began to position Rachel with more opportunities to develop and show her understanding by incorporating different modes and tools in fictional spaces so that Rachel was positioned with more authority and her peers were able to see her as capable.

In Stephanie’s class she had begun the year monologically positioning her students to work in small groups on individual activities. After she identified that she needed to dialogically position her students she designed dramatic inquiry units, such as with the Native American unit, as a joint endeavor for the whole class. The joint endeavor dialogically positioned her students by incorporating their interests as well as activities that were designed for students to co-construct meaning in small groups and as an entire community of practice. Students now relied on each other within their small
expert groups as well as the whole group to collaborate and share information and thus extend their meaning making beyond what they could do individually.

**Dramatic Inquiry**

From a sociocultural theoretical framework, dramatic inquiry provided a format for students and teachers to work together with tools and symbols to mediate their understanding of the world and participate with others to expand their literacy practices. Dramatic inquiry also supported making issues of identity, agency, and power in knowledge production visible to better understand the social and cultural practices that students and teachers represent in inclusive settings. Positioning by the teacher and students through dramatic inquiry also served as a source of power and privilege for students with special rights and over time was used to include all students. Inclusion is possible when students with special rights are included in an educational setting along a continuum of educational placements and are positioned as capable members and are provided opportunities to co-construct meaning with a dialogic community of people.

Through dramatic inquiry Cary and Stephanie created a community of practice where students with special rights, and in one setting their general education peers, were included and positioned to succeed academically and socially. Using Wenger’s (1998) terms of community of practice to understand how students were participating, students in their classes were mutually engaged, which included students with special rights, and in one setting their general education peers. Students with special rights were positioned with opportunities to collaborate with the diverse members of their classroom and the cultural knowledge that each member brought with them as they engaged in knowledge
construction on a joint enterprise through dramatic inquiry. Dramatic inquiry supported the community of practice and the inclusion of all students through a shared repertoire of tools available to communicate and make meaning together. Dramatic inquiry became a key component to learning for students with special rights in Cary and Stephanie’s classrooms, which allowed them as teachers to position students who otherwise may have been excluded in participating as equally valued members of the community (cf. Kliewer, 2008a).

**Identity**

Bloome and his colleagues (2008) define identity as “a role or position that one assumes or is assigned within a social group or network” (p. 50). The classroom teachers in this study used dramatic inquiry to support the inclusion of students with special rights, and in one setting their general education peers, and to promote the identity formation and literate potential of all students. Over time the teachers’ positioned students and students positioned themselves and others as competent and they began to see each other in a new way, which contributed to the construction of their identity. Some students began to construct new identities through their activities and social practices with others (Holland et al., 1998). The collaborative learning through dramatic inquiry was contributing to students’ identities formation and how individuals created their own histories in relation to the group (Wenger, 1998). Using Vygotsky, to describe individuals, such as students with special rights and their general education peers inhabited the cultural world through dramatic play, which provided students with a sense of agency in their identity formation (Holland et al., 1998). The classroom teachers
positioned students with special rights as capable participants as they co-constructed meaning together on a joint endeavor through dramatic inquiry.

In Cary’s class she used dramatic inquiry to position Rachel with opportunities to socially construct her own identity within a larger community of practice as she collaborated on shared tasks, such as designing a haunted house. Her voice that had previously been silenced was now included in the fictional spaces that were created through dramatic inquiry and she began to construct an identity as someone that was capable and her peers began to position her as capable too. Rachel’s changing identity was noticeable in terms of the different communicative modes that she began to utilize. For example, Rachel was observed standing tall as she showed her fellow haunted house designers how she and Debbie were envisioning the haunted house. Rachel’s tone of voice represented one of authority as she positioned her fellow haunted house designers and shared her ideas alongside Debbie. Rachel even explained during an interview that she felt more confident in the classroom since they had started using dramatic inquiry. Rachel’s identity as a capable participant in the larger community of practice that was constructed in the fictional spaces through dramatic inquiry began to extend into the real world spaces in the classroom over time. For example, Rachel was observed using spoken language to position John as capable as she encouraged him to read a poem aloud and then praised him for how he read the poem with emotion.

An example from Stephanie’s class is how Stephanie deliberately positioned Shayla in fictional spaces created through dramatic inquiry as well as real world spaces in the classroom to support her in constructing her own identity through participation in
activities and social practices with her peers. Shayla went from someone who did not want to work with others besides her best friend and others not wanting to work with her to someone that others wanted to work with and that she wanted to work with as well. Shayla began constructing her new identity as a respected member of the classroom who actively took initiative to contribute.

**Agency**

Agency is defined as “the strategic making and remaking of selves, identities, activities, relationships, cultural tools and resources, and histories, as embedded within relations of power” (Moje & Lewis, 2007, p.18). According to Moje and Lewis (2007) agency plays a role in one’s opportunities to learn, because agency can be promoted or constrained by how a person is included or excluded from discourse. Agency can also be a tool that one uses to gain control of one’s own behavior (Holland et al., 1998). Over time the classroom teachers identified how the agency of some students was constrained by what was happening in the classroom.

For example, Cary identified that the health of her classroom had created a community of practice where it was commonplace to exclude others, more specifically Rachel. Using Goffman’s (1959) terminology, Rachel’s “performance” was directly connected to how she was positioned by others in the classroom community. Her identity was based on her exclusion and thus contributed to the impressions her peers, audience; saw of her as a timid student who did not have anything worthwhile to add. When Cary became aware of this she began to take steps in her actions that informed her theoretical framework of positioning Rachel as an equal and capable member of the community of
practice. Over time she created more moments where she positioned Rachel to be included and for Rachel to include herself, which promoted Rachel’s agency in the classroom. Rachel now demonstrated her agency through her new confidence in knowing what she could do as an individual learner and as a collaborative member of a community of practice to support her peers in co-constructing knowledge. Cary also began to promote agency by providing her students with access to tools and dialogic experiences.

Stephanie’s assumption, which was based on her theoretical framework, that the social interactions of her students can impact their identity formation and agency was evident based on her expectations for the classroom community. Stephanie positioned her students to co-construct their expectations for a classroom community of practice, and over time she reinforced these expectations before starting each lesson that she taught with dramatic inquiry. Students would apply their expectations for a classroom community during classroom activities, for example by looking at a person when they talked and not speaking over them. Stephanie also promoted agency within her classroom by providing her students with dialogic experiences and positioning them with power to share their feelings and opinions during class meetings and to suggest activities and ideas connected to their collaborative meaning making through dramatic inquiry.

For Stephanie, she identified that within her classroom community some students were excluding others and constraining their agency, while some students excluded themselves from the community of practice. For example, Nick’s outgoing identity was silencing others, such as Brie, and constraining her ability to demonstrate agency. When
Stephanie noticed this she mediated the situation by sitting with Nick and Brie and making them listen to each other’s voice to describe how they felt. Stephanie recognized the importance of social interactions and how these interactions impacted her student’s identity formation, meaning making, and sense of agency in the community of practice. Nick began to listen to Brie and began to control his own behavior and not talk over her as much. Brie responded by positioning herself with more agency and sharing her ideas with Nick.

Shayla, in Stephanie’s class, was also positioned with more agency over time. Agency began to be a tool for Shayla to gain control of her behavior in the community of practice. At the beginning of the school year she needed support to control her behavior and she would act out through spoken language and excluding herself from learning. Stephanie and her students began to position Shayla with an equally valued voice and position her to share her ideas during classroom meetings. Shayla began to include herself in collaborative meaning making during activities and would tell others when she was having a bad day to take control of her own behavior instead of acting out.

**Power**

Based on the work of Foucault, Lewis, Enciso, and Moje (2008) describe power as constructed based on the participation of individuals in their larger social systems, which leads to the reproduction of this power. Power was constructed in the classrooms described in this dissertation based on the participation of the students and the teacher in the respective classrooms. Issues of power were present in multiple ways during this study, such as through access to a community of learning, methods, and opportunities for
participation. Over time Cary and Stephanie became aware of their positioning of students and how this impacted how students were provided access to a community of learning. Cary and Stephanie’s use of dramatic inquiry provided them with a methodology to position their students with greater power as capable expert teams working together to co-construct meaning on a joint endeavor. In both settings, students with special rights were positioned as equal and capable members of the community and were positioned to participate in literacy activities in the real world and fictional spaces created through dramatic inquiry. The students with special rights, and in Stephanie’s class their general education peers, were empowered by having access to an inclusive community of practice that provided all students with equal opportunities to participate and learn with his or her peers.

Within Cary’s classroom students also learned to share power with their peers and not reproduce the power differential that had been so prominent at the start of the school year. At the beginning of the year, Yared and Tom used spoken language to position themselves with more power than Rachel. Through Cary’s positioning of her students as equal members and providing them all with authority through dramatic inquiry, as well as by mediating situations, she began to chip away at the uneven power distribution in her class. Over time, power began to be shared more evenly amongst her students. Yared identified that now he and his peers learned to compromise and listen to each others ideas to co-construct meaning for themselves as individuals as well as for the class as a community of practice.
Stephanie took this one step further, by implementing social practices, such as community meetings, for students to voice their opinion and or concerns about things happening in the classroom or in their personal lives with the community. Students were given this opportunity so they could be positioned with more opportunities to share about their cultural backgrounds and knowledge with their peers. The community meetings also allowed Stephanie to position her students with power to suggest possible solutions to concerns students had about things happening within their community. For example, a student had been using her cell phone during the school day and this was against the rules for the school and for the classroom. A student suggested that they keep their phones in a basket in the class and that they only get them from the basket during times when they are reading a book they have saved or for other educational purposes. The students discussed this with Stephanie and each other, and the student’s suggestion became a solution. Stephanie positioned her students with power to suggest changes within the classroom community of practice.

Lewis and Moje (2007) cautioned that even when people are given access to community’s issues of power can still persist. People need to be given more than just access to power; people need to be positioned as capable and with opportunities to participate with power in relation to the others in their community. Over time, Cary and Stephanie identified how their positioning of students for activities, methods they used for teaching, and the materials they provided all impacted issues of power within their classrooms. For Edmiston (2014) classroom teachers must be willing to modify tasks in the classroom in order to include all students at where they are to enhance the learning
experiences and communication of all participants. Both Cary and Stephanie began to design lessons that incorporated multiple modes for communicating and meaning making, so that one mode was not privileged over another in the classroom and thus empowering some students and disempowering others. Cary incorporated multiple tools for students to use, such as tactile objects, sound effects, drawing materials, etc., so that students could communicate their ideas with the mediating tools to support the empowerment of all students as they collaborated to make meaning together in the real world and fictional spaces created in the classroom. Stephanie incorporated a combination of small group and whole group activities that incorporated movement, drawing, and discussion to empower her students and include them at where they were to enhance learning experiences for the entire community of practice.

Inclusion along a Continuum of Educational Placements

The purpose of this study was to explore inclusion along a continuum of educational placements by examining how classroom literacy teachers transform through the use of dramatic inquiry with students with special rights in inclusive settings. For this study, two classroom teachers and their classroom settings found along the continuum of educational placements, a residential school for the blind and a public elementary school, were examined. The classroom teacher’s awareness of her transformation impacted how students with special rights, and in one setting their general education peers, were positioned as included or excluded from learning activities.

The dramatic inquiry methodology appeared to be a valuable methodology to include students with special rights, and in one setting their general education peers, in
learning and support all students in having power in the classroom. Dramatic inquiry provided the classroom teachers with a new way to design teaching and learning activities to support meaning making that was not monolithic and did not conform to the belief that all students learn the same. Prior to teaching with dramatic inquiry, Cary (chapter three) did not position her students to participate in collaborative tasks to make meaning together. She identified that her previous focus on individualism had contributed to the development of a hierarchy within her classroom that unintentionally had supported the exclusion of some students. She identified that by using dramatic inquiry her students were positioned to respect each others voice and ideas as they worked together on a joint endeavor.

Stephanie (chapter four) found that dramatic inquiry supported the inclusion of all students, because they were positioned to communicate in different ways in the real world and fictional spaces created in the classroom to collaborate on meaning making with their peers as the explored different possibilities on a joint endeavor. Stephanie also identified that when she used dramatic inquiry for teaching and learning everyone, including her, could be positioned as a part of a collaborative team. Prior to using dramatic inquiry she did not share power with her students or take into account her students ideas. Now she positions her students with a valued voice and creates a space where they can share their ideas and interests about inquiry and she acknowledges their contributions and makes changes to instruction to incorporate their ideas.

This study also found that dialogic positioning of students supported polyphonic voices in dialogue collaborating together to make meaning. Prior to teaching with
dramatic inquiry, both teachers identified that they used monologic positioning of their students in dialogue with predetermined outcome. Influenced by the work of Bakhtin (1981) and Vygotsky (1978), teaching with dramatic inquiry, and participation in collaborative inquiry, the teachers became more aware of how dramatic inquiry allows teachers to position students with more authority as they step in between the real world and fictional spaces created in the classroom to co-construct meaning on a joint endeavor. Also, the dialogic positioning supported the teachers and students in positioning each other as capable and knowledgeable as they explored different possibilities together to make meaning. For example, Cary had positioned her students to listen to each other’s ideas when they were in the fictional world created through dramatic inquiry as they talked, moved, and made noises to design a visitors experience in the haunted house they were designing together. An example from Stephanie’s class is when she dialogically positioned students to show each other how they interpreted a character’s point of view in a text, which led to a dialogic discussion amongst the students.

Another finding was that the teachers use of multiple modes that included mediating tools and signs supported teaching and learning activities that did not privilege one mode of communication over another and supported the inclusion of all students in meaning making. The use of multiple modes empowered students to communicate as they collaborated with others with a new sense of agency, because all modes were equally valued as ways of communicating ideas to support meaning making and to share one’s own cultural knowledge. Using Vygotsky’s (1978) ZPD students through their interactions with a more skilled other became “a head taller” as they collaborated
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together and pushed themselves beyond what they could do alone. In Cary’s class she positioned her students with mediating tools, such as a blanket and mannequin head that supported her students in discussing different possibilities for setting up the haunted house as if they were haunted house designers, while at the same time incorporating their social and cultural knowledge about being a teenager with a visual impairment. An example from Stephanie’s class was when she positioned students to create moments that they had observed on their time travel journey to share with their fellow classmates as if they were time traveling research experts. Students were able to combine spoken language, movement, facial expressions and body gestures to communicate with the entire group.

The teacher participant’s awareness of how she positions her students, how students position themselves, and how students position each other was another factor that impacted the inclusion of students with special rights. Prior to using dramatic inquiry and participating in collaborative inquiry the teachers had not identified how positioning impacted how students were included or excluded from the classroom community, as well as teaching and learning. Both teachers identified that they needed to deliberately position students in relation to the whole group, and that in some instances individual students needed to be positioned differently in relation to the whole group.

For Cary, she identified how oral language was used to position students with more or less power in the whole group, which was directly connected to students being included or excluded from the community of practice. This tied into how Cary positioned her students to dialogically make meaning together, as well as the
incorporation of other modes for communication so that oral language was not positioned as a mode for exclusion. Cary needed to mediate her students’ ideas in the dramatic world to model and support her students in using spoken language to include all students. She also identified that she needed to position Rachel differently in relation to the whole group, such as by providing her with tools or having her step into fictional spaces so that she positioned herself with more authority and that her peers accepted her positioning. Her awareness of the importance of positioning her students supported her students in including each other not only in collaborative meaning making but also as a capable member of a community of practice. Cary identified that when she positioned all of her students as capable during the Edgar Allan Poe unit, over time her students began to include each other in meaning making and as capable members of the community. This became evident to her when Tom positioned Rachel as a capable member of the community when he encouraged Rachel to share her final project and shared with his peers that she had done a good job.

For Stephanie, she identified that she needed to position students in relation to the whole group to make meaning together in small groups as well as large groups during dramatic inquiry activities. Previously she had been positioning students to make meaning individually on a similar topic, but there was no shared positioning for collaborative meaning making in relation to the whole group. When Stephanie began deliberately positioning students in relation to the whole group students became engaged in collaborative and dialogic meaning making with their peers and positioned new students as well as students they had not worked with previously as capable and valued
members of their expert team. In addition, she recognized that she needed to position individual students, such as AJ, differently in relation to the whole group. When she positioned AJ with more authority in relation to the entire group he became as Vygotsky would say, a “head taller” and included himself and was included by others to make meaning beyond what he could do alone.

Lastly, collaborative inquiry was a central contributing fact for the teachers in their awareness of their transformation over time using dramatic inquiry. For Cary, the collaborative inquiry allowed her to step back and reflect on what was happening in her classroom. According to Cary:

I never took the time to step back and look specifically at the dialogue that was going on in class, or the specific instructional choices I was making that probably contributed to these students' marginalization. Like, I never would have been able to come up with the conclusions I made for my M.A. portfolio if I hadn't sat down with you, and discussed and watched video of all this. (C. Saxton, personal communication, February 22, 2015)

For Stephanie, the collaborative inquiry was beneficial because she was able to sit down and watch video data of moments in her classroom that she was aware of and also ones that she was not aware of. For example, she saw moments of students talking about topics unrelated to the assigned task, when she had assumed that everyone was on task and understood the activity. By watching the video data she began to see things differently in the classroom, which contributed to her change over time, such as how she had positioned students as off task or how reviewing the norms and expectations before a lesson positioned her students to be engaged and include each other in learning activities.

In addition, she liked being able to talk through her emerging assumptions and ideas for
teaching and learning with the researcher and she felt this was supporting her in becoming more strategic and tactical in her teaching to support the inclusion of all of her students.

The teacher participants in this study believed and still believe that all students can learn. Student engagement was supported through the classroom community and instructional models such as active and dramatic approaches to learning. Over time the teacher participants’ awareness shifted in some areas with regards to how students were positioned with authority in the fictional spaces and real world spaces created in the classroom with dramatic inquiry. The teachers became committed to challenging their students through engaging and meaningful activities that positioned students with an increased sense of agency, so that each student was positioned as capable. This was in sharp contrast to the teacher’s previous positioning of students during the pilot study for monologic meaning making on tasks that often had a predetermined outcome.

The teacher participants were also committed to creating a classroom community where all students were included and viewed themselves and their classmates with respect and a valued voice. This was not something that happened overnight, but the teachers became dedicated to creating a classroom community that included all students, students with special rights and in one setting their general education peers, so that each member succeeded academically and socially in a community of practice. Through the use of dramatic inquiry and their participation in collaborative inquiry the teachers began to identify activities and modes that supported the inclusion of all students and also promoted the academic and social success of all students.
Limitations of the Study

One limitation of this collaborative inquiry study is that the data can not be generalized. This collaborative inquiry project is limited by the sample of students who were involved in the study. In addition, the format of the semi-structured interviews, dramatic inquiry curriculums, and the researcher could all diminish the interpretations of the results of this collaborative inquiry study.

The participants in this study were from two very different settings, a public residential school for the blind and a public elementary school. The participants in this study also represented two different age levels of students, high school and elementary school. However, the classrooms from the two settings both educated students with special rights and are a representation of different educational settings along a continuum of placements.

Another limitation is that the teacher participants did not teach the same dramatic inquiry curriculum. Both teachers implemented dramatic inquiry lessons using Heathcote’s (Heathcote & Bolton, 2005) “mantle of the expert” approach and they each designed the activities and inquiry to meet the needs and interests of their students while including academic goals connected to the Common Core State Standards for their grade level and content area. Also both teachers were experienced state licensed educators for their particular area of teaching. Both teachers were also pursuing a master’s degree at the time of the data collection and had taken two classes on teaching with dramatic inquiry.
An additional limitation is that the questions asked during semi-structured interviews were not the same. The semi-structured interview questions were based on the video data and the developing trends that emerged during data analysis. Therefore, there were no set questions that were utilized during the semi-structured interviews with each teacher. The same elements were used to identify both teachers’ changing practice in terms of her theoretical framework, governing gaze, assumptions, and actions over time. The video data clips were also preselected by the researcher to share with the teacher participants during semi-structured interviews, but the teacher participants were encouraged to identify additional moments they wanted to see from video data for the researcher to share during semi-structured interviews.

Also, the same method for sharing data with the teacher participants was not used with both participants. The video data was shared with the teacher participant in chapter three upon completion of the academic school year that data was collected. The teacher from chapter three did implement strategies and transform her teaching pedagogy based on discussions during semi-structured interviews during data collection. The researcher became more systematic based on her experiences collaborating with the teacher from chapter three which informed the analysis process for collaborating with the teacher in chapter four. Video data were shared with the teacher participant in chapter four throughout the academic school year, and she was able to design and implement lessons based on the data analysis process. The data suggests that once teachers began to dialogically collaborate with the researcher they began to see the benefits of utilizing dramatic inquiry as a teaching method for their students. In addition, the teacher
participants awareness of their changing pedagogy over time allowed them to become more tactical and strategic in their teaching with dramatic inquiry.

The initial coding of the data and the initial results were limited to the interpretations of the researcher. However, the coding and data were shared with each teacher participant during data analysis and during the write up process of the analysis to ensure the data was coded properly and the findings accurately recorded their interpretation of the data and their transformation over time. Validity measures (Lather, 1986), such as triangulation, construct validity/reflexivity, face validity, and catalytic validity, were instituted with both teachers to support the collaborative inquiry and the equal voice of the teacher participants and the researcher during data analysis and the final write up stage of the study.

The results of this study are limited to the interpretations of the researcher and the teacher participants. The reader must decide the relevance of this collaborative inquiry study with similar situations and students.

**Implications and Recommendations for Future Research**

This study illustrates a new way of conceptualizing inclusion. This is the first time that my definition of inclusion has been used to examine how students with special rights are included using a sociocultural theoretical perspective with dramatic inquiry teaching from two different educational settings on a continuum of educational placements. What are the implications of doing this type of research with my definition of inclusion in other educational settings on my continuum of educational placements? Special education teachers, general education teachers, researchers, and preservice
teachers need to know how a new way of conceptualizing inclusion can impact their teaching and the inclusion of students with special rights and general education students for collaborative meaning making along a continuum of educational placements. Since inclusion is usually only thought of as taking place in a general education setting, it is vital that more research be done in other settings along the continuum of educational settings outlined in this study.

Inclusion is much more than including students with special rights in a general education setting. Inclusion research needs to examine what is happening in educational settings with students with special rights to examine how students are being included. This research examined what classroom teachers are doing in two different educational settings along a continuum of educational placements to include students with special rights in learning activities with their peers. By examining inclusion from a sociocultural perspective using my definition of inclusion additional educational settings beyond the general education classroom are now identified as inclusive when students with special rights are included to co-construct meaning with their peers in a community of practice.

This study also illustrates how a teacher’s changing practice can make a difference in how students are included. The teacher’s awareness of her changing practice using an adaptation of Emig’s (1983) inquiry paradigm over time allowed the researcher to collaborate to identify her theoretical framework, governing gaze, assumptions, and actions. The teachers awareness of her changing practices over time allowed her to identify trends, such as the use of multiple modes, movement, and choice, that made a difference in how students were included in teaching and learning activities.
The teachers explored different forms of participation by students with special rights, and in one setting their general education peers, to incorporate their students cultural background and experiences and not privilege one dominant way of communication. Also the teachers were able to examine how their positioning of students within the classroom community as well as the role of dialogue in the classroom impacts whether students with special rights are included in a community of practice.

Another implication is that activities make a difference in how teachers and students position one another to be more or less inclusive. The teachers use of dramatic inquiry to create real world and fictional spaces in the classroom to support collaborative inquiry provided the teacher with a framework to dialogically position her students to include all students as they collaborated together on a joint endeavor to make meaning as a community of practice. The teachers became aware of how positioning by teachers, students, and one’s self in different settings and during different activities impacts whether one rejects or accepts how they are positioned by others. The teacher’s awareness of positioning theory (Harre’ & Langenhove, 1999) allowed them to deliberately position their students for dialogic participation on collaborative activities in relation to the whole group. The teachers also became aware of how individual students may need to be positioned differently in relation to the whole group in order to support that student in participating and feeling a sense of agency and power. The teacher’s awareness of the impact of how students were positioned in the real world and fictional spaces during dramatic inquiry instruction influenced how students positioned each other to support the inclusion of all voices.
Students with special rights were included in instruction in both settings of this study. More research needs to be done with students with special rights using positioning theory (Harre’ & Langenhove, 1999) and dramatic inquiry (Edmiston, 2014). This research is needed to explore how different teachers and students, both students with special rights and their general education peers, position one another and accept or reject this positioning and how this in turn impacts the inclusion of all learners. More research needs to be done in classrooms along a continuum of educational placements to explore the possibilities of including students with special rights in co-constructing knowledge with their peers on joint endeavors in a community of practice. This research should also be done with preservice teachers and their mentor teachers to begin discussions of how positioning students in different spaces created in the classroom through dramatic inquiry impacts the inclusion of students with special rights. By doing further research with preservice teachers and mentor teachers a dialogue begins about factors that impact the inclusion of students with special rights in learning activities with a new generation of teacher candidates, experienced mentor teachers, and researchers that are committed to education.

The field of education has many definitions in literature that define inclusion, but it does not have any that address how students are positioned in different settings along a continuum of educational placements to co-construct meaning within a dialogic community of people. More research needs to be done that examines how students with special rights are positioned to co-construct meaning using collaborative inquiry. The field of education needs more studies that are collaborative between the researcher and
the teacher. Thus, incorporating the teacher’s voice in describing his or her own awareness of how his or her teaching pedagogy over time impacts how students are included and how this in turn impacts teaching and learning. Collaborative inquiry research that is conducted alongside those taking the action, the classroom teachers, is vital because the classroom teachers are positioned with an equal voice to inform and improve their own practice as well as the field of education.

These are just some of the research possibilities that stem from this collaborative inquiry study that the field of education, and more specifically the field of inclusive education and special education need to address to explore the possibilities when inclusion is examined in terms of what is happening in educational settings along a continuum of educational placements and not solely by the general education setting. The possibilities of including students with special rights in collaborative learning with their peers through dramatic inquiry for the academic and social success of all learners in a community of practice must continue to be addressed as we continue to explore student academic and social achievement in today’s education system.
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Appendix A: Data Log

Data Log Completed:

Observation or Interview (list participants present for interview):

Date of Interview/observation:

Time of Interview/observation:

Time on Recording/recordings:
  • Video 1
  • Video 2

Length of interaction:

Number of Participants Present:

Participants Absent:

Participants Present in Prevalent Events:

Description of Interaction:

Description of Prevalent Events:
  1.

Time on Recording of Prevalent Event:
  1.
EDGAR ALLAN POE ESTATE

October 15, 2013

Dear Haunted House planners,

As the trustees responsible for promoting the work of Edgar Allan Poe, we are interested in engaging you, as award-winning Haunted House designers, for a project to promote Poe’s work and in particular his short story, *The Murders in the Rue Morgue*.

We have secured a Victorian property in Boston near the site of Poe’s birthplace (Alas now demolished). It is strikingly similar to the Parisian property featured in his short story. Though it has been uninhibited for several years the property is structurally sound and has only been minimally ‘modernized’.

We attached a copy of the Poe short story and would like to receive your proposal for creating a sort of “living short story” that visitors to Boston would find engaging and that would introduce them to this story as an example of the work of one of our greatest American short story writers.

We look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Peter Poe
On behalf of The Edgar Allan Poe Estate trustees
Appendix C: Native American Investigative Team Commission Letter

November 16, 2014

To the Investigative Team,

We here at the Eyewitness Books division are currently developing a new “Time Travelers Series” of non-fiction books on ancient civilizations. As you may know from having read our books, we have been very successful at informing our readers by sharing knowledge that has been gained through artifacts and other archeological discoveries, but we have found that many readers are interested in experiencing what life was like for the people who lived during these times. Our readers want to be able to find out what it was like for citizens of these ancient cultures and how their experiences are similar and different to today.

Only a few teams of investigators are capable of the research we require for such an undertaking. We received a strong recommendation of your company based on the work you did on the Trojan Horse. We know that you have been to Ancient Greece and that your investigation was top notch. While we are aware that this type of investigation can be dangerous, we believe that your team is the best equipped for this endeavor. We know that you will be able to investigate effectively without affecting the civilizations or even history itself.

Please keep in mind that the focus of your investigation should be on what life in the Inca, Aztec, and Maya civilizations. Our readers are also interested in comparisons between life then and today. As this is a new and updated series, we will be including not only photographs, but also embedding video and audio clips. We would like to keep the format of non-fiction texts, including all the features of such texts.

We would also like to be kept up-to-date on all facets of your investigation. Because of the dangerous nature of time travel and the risks involved with interactions between these civilizations and your team, we would appreciate weekly e-mails informing us of your progress. Our tentative due date for the prototype pages would be December 12, 2014.

We wish you luck in your investigation and look forward to hearing from you each week about your progress.

Sincerely,

Mark R. Wright
Department Chief, Eyewitness Books Division