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ABSTRACT

Examining Democratic Ideals: A Case Study of Dialogic Interactions of Fifth-Grade Citizens

by

Jeanne A. Klockow

Dr. Martha Young, Committee Chair
Associate Dean
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Four overarching questions guided the purpose of this study: (1) to examine the role of dialogic and social interactions in the classroom setting when constructing a democratic classroom, (2) to explore whether the dialogic co-construction of a democratic classroom community supported student learning and student ownership of learning in the classroom, (3) to investigate how the use of classroom dialogue facilitated meaning about classroom community membership and citizenship for students in a democratic classroom community, and (4) evaluate the effects and influences a democratic classroom community had on students.

The study was a qualitative case study utilizing a cultural model and listening guide as part of data analysis. The analysis demonstrated that students progressed as community members, democratic classroom citizens, and academic learners through the use of dialogic interactions between members of the democratic classroom environment. The first part of the paper
articulated a conceptual background framed within a sociocultural theoretical perspective with the concepts of Lev Vygotsky and the progressive educational ideals of John Dewey. Next, an overview of the study including a description of the setting and participants was presented. This information was followed by an in-depth, multi-faceted, multi-layered analysis of the data, specifically the classroom dialogue, dialogic terminology generated from the cultural model, and social and dialogic interactions exhibited by the teacher and students to examine consequential progressions of the students as members, citizens, and learners. The paper concluded with a discussion of the implications of this work, specifically for teacher pedagogy and the role of teacher as a guide, facilitator, and mentoring facilitator.
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CHAPTER 1

RATIONALE

My Experience Leading to Research

I never really thought about a democratic classroom community until experiencing the powerful impact a democratic classroom community could have upon its students. I was taking a research course, during my doctoral studies, when it was suggested to me to visit a classroom known as Freedom Falls. My visit to Freedom Falls changed my notion of a democratic classroom community forever. This classroom of learners provided me with a powerful community experience. I watched students who, as community members, took ownership and responsibility for not only their classroom, but also for their personal and academic conduct and growth within that classroom. As members of a democratic classroom community, students created norms, a preamble, and a classroom constitution. They held community positions through democratic elections and jobs as community members. As community members within a democratic classroom, student responsibility was internalized and self-regulated. I realized that this democratic classroom community had created a culture of learners. I noticed that both students and teacher used the power of dialogue to construct negotiated meanings about their democratic classroom community with each other. I had been in many classrooms where dialogue
was utilized but never as a community building practice. I left Freedom Falls wondering how that process occurred. What were the dynamics of a democratic community within a classroom setting that created a culture of learners, or members, who were eager and willing to not only participate but self-regulate their classroom community through the use of dialogue?

The impact from that experience started me on an educational journey. I believe that the purpose of educational research should be to add to the greater body of knowledge. If I could understand the dynamics that occurred within that classroom setting, I realized that students in other classrooms could also benefit from possibly experiencing a democratic classroom community such as the one I had witnessed.

Beginning the Research

As I began my research, I looked at the concepts of democracy, community, and dialogue. It became clear that educational research had focused on issues related to the development of democracy within the classroom setting (Dewey, 1916/1966; Wolk, 1998; Pradl, 1996), community of practice (Wenger, McDermott, & Snyder, 2002; Wenger, 1998), and dialogue as a “psychological tool” (Vygotsky, 1978; John-Steiner & Mahn, 1996; Wertsch, 1991; Cole, 1996).

I found research studies that addressed the effects of community building practices in the classroom (John-Steiner & Meehan, 2000). I discovered researchers had studied the dialogue as a tool that mediated meaning (Lee & Smagorinsky, 2000; John-Steiner & Meehan, 2000). Other researchers, I noted, (Jennings, O'Keefe, & Shamlin, 1999) linked democracy to the idea of classroom community.
Linking the idea of democracy to the classroom was important when considering the effects on students. The research demonstrated that a democratic classroom provided students with a shared ownership of knowledge through which students constructed their own meanings about their environment and their learning (Sorenson, 1996). Additionally, this sense of ownership, through participation and dialogic interactions in the classroom, facilitated critical thinking and reflection for students (Sorenson, 1996). Further, classroom democracy also supported active participation through lived experiences that facilitated classroom community (Dewey, 1916/1966; Wolk, 1998; Jennings, O'Keefe, & Shamlin, 1999) and student learning (Webb & Sherman, 1989; Putney & Floriani, 1999).

Though these authors had linked democracy to the classroom, classroom as a community, and dialogue as a tool to mediate meaning, they had not investigated the construction of a democratic classroom community through the use of dialogue as a community building practice, utilizing a cultural model. For the purpose of this research, I believe that a democratic classroom community may be studied and understood in relation to dialogue, linking dialogue as a community building practice and investigating the use of dialogue in a classroom community, based on a cultural model. With this perspective, the purpose of chapter one was to:

1. Develop a theoretical framework for the study.
2. Discuss the theoretical themes of the study.
3. Discuss intersubjectivity, intertextuality, intercontextuality, and consequential progressions as a means of understanding and interpreting the effects of dialogic co-construction in the classroom.

4. Define the constructs of democracy, community, and dialogue.

5. Develop a rationale for a research project focused on the study of a democratic classroom community that utilized dialogue as a community building practice within a cultural model framework.

6. Provide an overview of a project description, including a discussion of the purpose of the project, and research questions that guided the study.

Theoretical Framework for the Study

Sociocultural Theory

A sociocultural framework guided the theoretical perspective to evaluate participants' activities and interactions as they occurred within a cultural context (Vygotsky, 1978; Wertsch, 1991; John-Steiner & Mahn, 1996). Interactions and activities, mediated by language or other systems, facilitate meaning for participants about themselves and their environment. It was important to examine the dynamics of interdependence built within the democratic community, and the co-construction or mediated meaning defining community members, in order to understand why membership within a democratic community of practice occurred. Interdependence and co-construction may be created in a democratic classroom community through the empowerment of students (Sorenson, 1996). Further, “decision making, critical thinking,
reflection, and recognizing multiple viewpoints are all part of the process of empowerment” (p. 91). A democratic environment may enable students to act on the knowledge they acquire through classroom interactions and “action involves change” (p. 91). Students begin to understand that they can act on knowledge to produce changes in society (1996). Sociocultural theory addresses the dynamics of co-construction and interdependence through examining the individual within a certain social context as well as evaluating the effects of this social context upon the individual. Sociocultural theory also is based on the concept that “human activities take place in cultural contexts, are mediated by language and other symbol systems, and can be best understood when investigated in their historical development” (John-Steiner et al., 1996, p.191). Furthermore, based on the study of interaction mediated by language, sociocultural theory provided an accurate lens through which to view this research.

For the purpose of this research, dialogue was viewed as a “psychological tool” that mediated meaning for participants through the scaffolding of knowledge about a democratic classroom community (Vygotsky, 1978). Based on a sociocultural perspective, one way to define and identify the development of a democratic classroom community is to understand the co-construction of meaning about a democratic classroom community through student-teacher dialogue. Additionally, sociocultural theory examines the effects of this co-constructed meaning upon the individual student. “Knowledge is communication as well as understanding” (Dewey, 1927/1954, p. 176) and through the co-construction of dialogue students actively pursue knowledge that facilitates
meaning about a classroom (Dewey, 1927/1954; Sorenson, 1996; Jennings, O'Keefe, & Shamlin, 1999).

Co-construction, for the purpose of this research, was defined as “the joint creation of a form, interpretation, stance, action, activity, identity, institution, skill, ideology, emotion, or other culturally meaningful reality” (Jacoby & Ochs, 1995, p.171). Co-construction of meaning about a democratic classroom community may be facilitated through scaffolding dialogue between the teacher and students. Dialogue could then be viewed as a mediating action. The teacher and students engaged in active dialogue to construct or mediate meaning about a democratic community and about themselves within this democratic community. As stated by Wertsch (1991):

It is the sociocultural situatedness of mediated action that provides essential link between the cultural, historical, and institutional setting on the one hand, and the mental functioning of the individual on the other (p.48).

In other words, through this mediated action, the student begins to formulate meaning about a democratic classroom community and what it means to be an individual citizen within this community. Thus, the students' sense of community also relates to the students' sense of self that is internal and can be identified by the external behavior or actions the student exhibits within the classroom community.

This study was designed to examine social interaction, facilitated by dialogue, and how this interaction linked meaning about a democratic classroom community constructed by the individual student to the broader
meaning constructed by the collective group. Thus, sociocultural theory
provided the framework within which concepts about a democratic classroom
community and concepts about citizens within that classroom community were
developed. It is within a sociocultural framework that these constructs could be
studied (see Appendix A for overview).

_Understanding Democracy Through John Dewey_

Dewey's work (1916/1966; 1927/1954) underpins the study of democracy
and schooling and served as the framework for the progressive movement.
Progressive education was greatly influenced by the progressive movement.
Some of these influences remain continuous in education today. Concern for
children appeared in many of the progressivist writings as societal conditions
that largely influenced the educational reforms (Berube, 1994). Among other
social issues such as immigration and an imbalance of wealth “...the heart of
progressivism [was to make] efforts to expand democracy...” (p. 1).
Progressive education was known as one of the greatest reform movements in
the United States by centering democracy as the base of schooling.

The progressive education movement advocated that the aim of education
was: (1) student growth, and (2) the ability for the student to live successfully by
learning to conduct successful transactions with his or her environment
(Garrison, 1998). In addition, the democratic ideals behind the progressive
education movement related to this study included: (1) the child being given
freedom to develop, (2) the child's interest being based on motivation, and (3)
the teacher serving as a guide in the learning process (Webb, Metha, & Jordan,
1996). These ideals still are situated in contemporary educational ideas of
today. In an educational text edited by Gunter, Estes, and Schwab (1999) these ideals were linked to a chapter focused on instructional planning. Some of these goals supporting the ideals of the goals of progressive education were stated as follows: (1) learn to cherish the foundations of a free society, (2) develop ethical standards of behavior, and (3) develop skills necessary to obtain productive employment or to continue higher education (p. 9). The effects of the ideals based on the progressive education movement exist within educational literature today.

Democracy in the classroom supports the classroom as child-centered and precipitates the development of "reflective thinking" whereby students acquire the ability to problem solve through the following five step reflective process: (1) the feeling of a problem, (2) the definition of a problem, (3) the hypothesis or solution of a problem, (4) the logical reasoning about a problem, and (5) the testing of a solution through action. Reflective thinking for students, as a result of classroom democracy, has important implications when the result of reflective thinking is the students' transformation from "casual curiosity" to "thorough inquiry" (Doll, 1993).

Progressive educators such as John Dewey "championed for social reform" (Berube, 1994, p. 10). The tenets of this reform were to develop a school experience that would benefit the whole child through experiences that included intellectual, social, artistic, moral development, and critical thinking. Educational experiences would include creativity and self-expression (1994). Dewey, whose work was influenced by Rousseau's philosophy, had the notion of the "child in a state of grace who grows physically, intellectually, and morally" (p. 16). Thus, it
is the underpinnings of the progressivist movement, specifically the educational philosophy of John Dewey, which provides the framework for concepts about a democratic classroom community where citizenship within that community is developed. It is within the context of progressive educational reform, from the perspective of John Dewey, that these constructs were studied (see Appendix A for overview).

Dewey and Vygotsky-Similarities and Differences

According to Popkewitz (2001) Dewey and Vygotsky shared many of the same ideas, yet they differed in motivation and theory. Both emphasized the importance of community, yet, Dewey’s central focus was on community. Vygotsky’s emphasis was on language as the instrument that would transfer social experiences to the individual (2001). Pedagogically, both supported constructivist learning, however, for Dewey, learning was situated within the context of experiences based on the social interactions of the community and for Vygotsky, learning was situated within the interactions themselves. Glassman (2001) recognized the following three distinctions between Dewey and Vygotsky: (1) Dewey saw the role of society and its history as creating tools to utilize in current situations, and Vygotsky believed that tools developed historically over time, (2) experience was viewed by Dewey as a way to assist thinking while Vygotsky, within the cultural historical context of experience, considered culture as “the raw material of thinking” (p. 3), and (3) from Dewey’s perspective, the child was a free agent achieving goals through interests, while Vygotsky believed activity with others would lead the child to mastery (2001). Additionally, Glassman (2001) claimed that both viewed activity as vital yet the
way by which each examined the process of activity served as a fundamental
difference between the two. As noted by Glassman (2001):

I believe that the issues that separate these two theorists... could not be
more profound. It raises the question of whether teachers should
approach students as mentors who guide or direct activity, or facilitators
who are able to step back from children’s activity and let it run its own
course (p.3).

Similarities exist between Vygotsky and Dewey regarding their ideas
about the relationship between activity and learning/development, however,
within the educational context implementation of these ideas varies. Given
these considerations and conditions, dialogic interactions were viewed within a
social context, based upon these similar ideas between both Vygotsky and
Dewey.

Qualitative Methodology

Based on the sociocultural nature of this study, a qualitative methodology
was employed. Sociocultural theory studies the effects of interactions on the
individual, and qualitative methodology provided research methods to support
this study. These methods allowed the researcher to observe interactions
among participants and to examine the dynamics of these interactions among
participants in a natural setting. The methodology of this study was further
discussed in chapter three.
Theoretical Themes of the Study

Based upon the theoretical framework of this study, five theoretical themes were explored in relation to the constructs of the study. These five themes were as follows: (1) experience, (2) social interaction, (3) environment, (4) process, and (5) meaning (see Appendix B for overview). These themes, situated in theory, served as a way of viewing the constructs of community, dialogue, and democracy. These themes were found in the context of sociocultural theory as well as within the perspective of Dewey's work. They connected theory and the way of viewing the constructs of the study. The theoretical framework serves as a lens through which to view the theoretical themes and the effects of these themes on the specific constructs of the study (see Appendix B for a detailed description). For example, sociocultural theory served as a lens through which to view social interaction and the effects of social interaction specifically on community, dialogue, and democracy within the context of this study. Further, Dewey's perspective served as a lens through which to view experience and the effects of experience specifically on community, dialogue, and democracy within the context of this study.

Intersubjectivity, Intertextuality, Intercontextuality, and Consequential Progressions

Discussing intersubjectivity, intertextuality, intercontextuality, and consequential progressions provides an understanding and interpretation of the effects of dialogic co-construction in the classroom. Having varying definitions in
the literature, these conceptual ideas were defined and adapted for the purpose of this study. A glossary providing a definition of these and other conceptual terms used throughout the study has been included in the glossary (see Appendix C). Intersubjectivity occurs when "interlocutors share some aspect of their situation definitions [ways in which objects and events are represented and defined] (Wertsch, 1985, p. 159). This study regarded intertextuality as a means of examining "the interpretive system constructed by teachers and students to identify links between texts" (Putney & Floriani, 1999, p. 19). Additionally, this research recognized the criteria for intertextuality as proposed by Bloome and Egan-Robertson (1993) as being socially constructed and interactionally accomplished. The findings reflected intercontextuality as a means of examining "the interpretive system constructed by teachers and students to identify link between contexts" (p. 19). For the purpose of this study, both intertextuality and intercontextuality were: (a) constructed by members while interacting, (b) members having accountability to each other regarding tasks, and (c) creating practices that shape ways of being with texts (Putney & Floriani, 1999; Erickson & Shultz, 1981). In addition, consequential progressions were examined as a means of illustrating how conversation is built upon through past occurrences, and how these past occurrences shaped current conversational interactions (Putney, Green, Dixon, Durán, & Yeager, 2000; Wink & Putney, 2002).

Intersubjectivity, intertextuality, intercontextuality, and consequential progressions relate to sociocultural theory based upon the framework and focus of this study. They provide a clearer and more concise examination and
interpretation of the effects of dialogic co-construction in the classroom. These conceptual ideas served as a way of comprehending the effects that occurred as a result of the dialogic and social interactions of participants. These conceptual ideas proved vital in providing insight into interpreting the dynamics that occurred within this study and applications of these conceptual ideas were further addressed in chapter two.

Discussing the Constructs of Democracy, Community, and Dialogue

This study was designed to examine co-construction of a democratic classroom community through the use of dialogue. Dialogue was viewed through a cultural model framework that served as a data-collecting tool and was further described within the methods section of the study in chapter three. To provide a clearer understanding of the focus of this research, a definition of terms used throughout the study has been included in the glossary (see Appendix C). Varying definitions were found in the literature regarding the concepts of democracy, community, and dialogue. In order to provide clarity within the context of this study and a better understanding of the rationale behind this study, the concepts of democracy, community, and dialogue were defined, but first limitations will be addressed.

Limitations when Defining Democracy

Given the issues surrounding the idea of building a democratic classroom there were limits to constructing democracy. Spring (1994) asserts that the
influence of political power, special interests groups, and voters use schools to appease their own political agenda preventing individuals and schools from achieving a democratic state. Gee (1996) discussed democracy as an ideal founded in individual perspective by the individual who wields the most power. In his reference to Gutmann's perspective, Spring (1994) noted that Gutmann acknowledged democratic ideals as the protection of freedom of ideas and nondiscrimination. Additionally, Gutmann acknowledged the following four political models for education: (1) there is no objective definition of "the good" (p. 19), (2) the good should not be determined by the state or by families that have been limited in their choices and education, (3) education prepares children to choose the good for their life while remaining neutral, and (4) education is a means of preparing children to actively participate and share in the shaping of society. Spring (1994) surmised Gutmann's view that democratic ideals are important, however, it should never interfere with a student's ability to make their own considerations about the good. As noted by Macedo (1994):

The most educators can do is to create structures that would enable submerged voices to emerge. It is not a gift. Voice is a human right. It is a democratic right (p. 4).

My intent was not to address the ideal of democracy from the perspective of critical theory, but rather to examine how language served to foster democratic ideals. It is my belief, as an educational researcher, that my responsibility is situated in the betterment of the educational body of knowledge.
Defining Democracy

Democracy is a common term, but conceptually it is understood or lived by few. In his discussion of democracy, Dewey (1916/1966) cites Plato's analysis of the purpose of democracy:

No one could better express than did he [Plato] the fact that a society is stably organized when each individual is doing that for which he has aptitude by nature in such a way as to be useful to others. . .and that it is the business of education to discover these aptitudes and progressively to train them for social use (p. 88).

Dewey supported the purpose of democracy as a means of personal liberation, yet, disagreed with Plato's use of the classes. For Dewey the function of education, in the deepest sense, would be in "discovering and developing personal capacities, and training them [individuals] so that they [individuals] would connect with the activities of others" (p. 89). From this perspective, democracy serves as a catalyst within an educational system to provide opportunities to develop an individual's potential. Based on these opportunities, these individuals are able to connect based upon the development of these potentials, and are better capable to serve as productive members of society.

For Dewey (1916/1966), there were two kinds of democracy, governmental democracy and democracy as a way of life. Governmental democracy included the function and structure of our governmental systems. This type of democracy is found in our schools. Democracy as a way of life is what Dewey believed was vital to the goal of democracy. "A democracy is more than a form of government; it is primarily a mode of associated living, of conjoint
communicated experience” (1966, p. 87). Dewey believed it is the democracy in our daily lives that makes our governmental democracy valid.

Believing the social environment was an important concept Dewey (1922/1988) noted:

If an individual were alone in the world, he would form his habits...in a moral vacuum...but since habits involve the support of environmental conditions...then it sets up reactions in the surroundings (p. 16).

The importance of community and the relationship between the community and the individual was vital to Dewey. “...Dewey understood the relationship between the two as wholly reciprocal. The end of the community is the self-development of the individual” (Savage, 2002, p. 93). It is through Dewey’s concept of democracy and education, specifically in relation to the importance of community, that concepts within the context of this research were studied.

Defining Community

Wolk (1998) advocated for a different conception of community. “We must stop seeing community as merely a physical thing, as a place where people live, but rather as how people live...Rarely does school see community as people getting together as a regular part of their daily lives” (p. 10). Community viewed within this research encompassed a look at the day-to-day lives of community members and how the daily interactions among these members created meaning about a democratic community.

Wenger, McDermott, and Snyder’s (2002) perspective of community was also used within the context of this research. They referred to a community as a community of practice and defined a community of practice as:
A unique combination of three fundamental elements: A domain of knowledge... a community of people who care about this domain; and the shared practice that they are developing to be effective in their domain (p. 27).

Wenger, McDermott, and Snyder's (2002) view was important because it solidified the process of co-construction of a classroom community as examined by my study. From their perspective a domain is a body of knowledge about community constructed by members or students, who, as a community, care about this domain of knowledge due to their active participation in the construction of this knowledge. Further, a co-constructed classroom community is a continual practice of developing the ability to be effective members in the classroom community. These perspectives of community, specifically in relation to the development of a democratic classroom community, were applied within the context of this research study.

Defining Dialogue

Vygotsky (1978) believed that while "material tools are aimed at the control over processes in nature, psychological tools master natural forms of individual behavior and cognition" (p. xxv). Kozulin (1990) noted these tools are symbolic artifacts, such as signs, symbols, and languages. These tools have an internal orientation and transform inner psychological processes to higher mental functions. For the purpose of this research, dialogue was viewed as a tool used socially to mediate meaning about democratic classroom community membership.
Rationale for a Research Project Focused on the Study of a Democratic Classroom Community that Utilizes Dialogue as a Community Building Practice

Rationale for Studying Democracy

Dewey (1916/1966) stated that "society exists through a process of transmission quite as much as biological life" (p. 3). For Dewey, democracy created a transmission of society, or social order. Democracy, in its truest sense, should serve the individual first by developing that individual's highest potentials. It is through this development that the individual can then be of service to society, thus, improving the quality of society as a whole. The transformation of the individual serves as a transformation of the collective. In its finest form, democracy then serves as a means of preservation of the culture.

Dewey (1916/1966) believed that schools held the greatest influence where this transmission of culture was concerned. "The devotion of democracy to education is a familiar fact" (p. 87). For Dewey, democracy in education need not only be a transmission of ideals, but a way of life. Dewey believed in democracy as "a mode of associated living" (p. 87) that promoted interactions among individuals. These interactions allowed individuals to not only question the action of others, but also the action of self. Dewey also believed this interactive reflection was "equivalent to the breaking down of those barriers of class, race, and national territory which kept men from perceiving the full import..."
of their activity." It is through the process of the individual interacting with the greater community that society can be sustained.

Based on Dewey's notions of democracy and education, studying how classrooms are transformed into a democratic community proves vitally important. This importance is noted on several levels. In a classroom community where democracy is lived, students acquire a reflective process of not only the behavior of others, but their own behavior as well. This reflection serves as a means of creating students as citizens who take ownership of their classroom as a community and as learners by being citizens within this community. Democracy also supports the notion of "other" or living in community. Often schools study community as a singular unit as opposed to a way of living. As noted by Wolk (1998):

> Rarely does school see community as people getting together as a regular part of their daily lives to enjoy one another's company, grow from one another, share perspectives and experiences, care for one another, and engage in important conversation. These are the requirements for a deep and thoughtful democracy (p.10).

This study examined the construction of democracy in the classroom setting and Wolk's view solidified the concept of the elements of classroom democracy. Wolk's (1998) view provided criteria by which students as citizens, experienced a democratic classroom community as a way of life, and based on this experience, possibly evolved into adults who promoted democracy as citizens.
Rationale for Studying Classroom Community

Communities of practice are an integral part of our daily lives (Wenger, 1998). Additionally, what a community of practice means for individuals is that learning is an "issue of engaging in and contributing to the practices of their communities" (p. 7). Further, community of practice means that learning is an issue of refining practice for communities and ensuring new generations of members. Thus, the classroom serving as a community could: (1) promote students who actively engage in their classroom community as members and as learners, and (2) allow students as citizens to utilize their community skills in other realms.

For students in a classroom, the three elements of community of practice support these ideas: (1) a domain of knowledge, (2) community of care, and (3) a shared practice. The domain creates a sense of common ground and common identity (Wenger, McDermott, & Snyder, 2002). The domain also recognizes the value and purpose of the community of members. This value directs members to participate and contribute, as well as gives meaning to their actions and guides their learning (2002). In simple terms, a domain is a shared knowledge that promotes a sense of accountability to the group (2002). For students this accountability may support student responsibility and student ownership of the community and of their learning. Thus, students would not only be sharing a classroom they would be members constructing and participating in a democratic classroom community.

The second element as stated by Wenger, McDermott, and Snyder (2002) is the community of people who care about the domain. "The community creates
the social fabric of learning" (2002, p 28). This element of community facilitates intimacy and caring among members. Through this intimacy and caring relationships of respect and trust can occur as well as a sense of belonging among community members (2002). This type of community membership might enable students to trust that the democratic community is safe and fair for all members, since they are in fact the ones who have constructed it.

The third element concerning community of practice is the idea of practice. "The practice is a set of frameworks, ideas, tools, information, styles, language, stories, and documents that community members share" (Wenger, McDermott, & Snyder, 2002, p. 29). The distinction between domain and practice is that domain refers to the topic that the community focuses on, whereas the practice is specific knowledge the community develops and shares (2002). It might be through practice that a shared body of knowledge about the classroom community comes to fruition. By examining the formulation of meanings about the classroom community and community membership, self-regulation and ownership of the democratic classroom community might be understood more clearly. These elements of community provided a way of viewing how students constructed a classroom community effectively. Understanding this process could assist future educators in the creation of community within their own classrooms, resulting in students who are actively engaged and taking ownership and responsibility for community membership and learning.

Classroom community has also been viewed as a collaborative effort or a shared morality between the teacher and students (Wolk, 1998). According to Wolk in order to have an authentic classroom community traditional roles of the
teacher and student must be put aside. "Classrooms that are communities have teachers who are learners and students who are teachers" (p. 57). A shift in roles means greater responsibility for students as community members and as learners. Wolk also states that an authentic classroom community will offer "valuable, real-life learning opportunities" (p. 56). Relevance supports student enthusiasm and engaging learning opportunities. It is possible that students, as learners, will transfer relevant skills from the classroom community to their everyday lives.

Rationale for Studying Dialogue

For the purpose of this research, dialogue was viewed from a sociocultural perspective as a social tool to mediate meaning about classroom community membership. As noted by Gutiérrez and Stone (2000):

From this theoretical perspective, learning is not an individual process but rather a transactional process mediated by the use of cultural tools such as writing or spoken language as people participate in routine activities in communities of practice such as classrooms (p. 153).

Within sociocultural theory, dialogue can also be viewed as a "psychological tool" promoting meaning about classroom community through the active participation of community members within that dialogue (Vygotsky, 1978, pp. 52-55). Dialogue used in social interaction can create common meanings for members engaging in dialogue. The words a student hears become a way of reflecting a community of action that is common to all members of that classroom community (Putney, 1996). Dialogue, in this sense, serves as a means of promoting democracy and community to classroom members.
Within the context of a classroom community culture, Ochs (1990) introduced the idea of "language socialization" (p. 287). A basic tenet of language socialization was to not view language only as a symbolic system that encoded social and cultural structures, but also as a tool for establishing, maintaining, and creating social realities within that structure. Thus dialogue, as a tool, can create students within the classroom community who establish and appropriate the meaning of a democratic community through the connection of the external to the internal, and the social (community) to the individual (student).

An Overview of a Project Description,

Purpose of the Project, and

Research Questions

Guiding the Study

Project Description

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between three constructs: (1) democracy, (2) community of practice, and (3) dialogue. A cultural model framework served as the basis for analysis. These constructs were investigated from two points of view: (a) the collective, and (b) individual group members (Vygotsky, 1978). Unifying theoretical assumptions supported the research project.

The research project was a dual design. One part investigated the macro (collective), and one part investigated the micro (individual) interactional levels. Both parts were incorporated into a three-phase cultural model adapted from
the work of Kronenfeld (1985, 1992, 1996). Phase one investigated the use of classroom terminology on an individual level. Phase two involved student generation of a salient scale of classroom community terminology collectively. Phase three conducted a comparative analysis between the individual use of community terminology and the collective community terminology that was generated as a group. The incorporation of the cultural model was used as a way of identifying elements of a culture and was supported by the work of D'Andrade (1992), Strauss (1992), and Quinn and Holland (1987).

Purpose of the Research

The purpose of this research was to examine: (a) the way student dialogue influenced co-construction of meaning about a democratic classroom community of practice, (b) how students co-constructed meaning, through dialogue, about citizenship or membership in a democratic classroom community, and (c) the relationship between dialogue as a community building practice and a democratic classroom community that yielded students who were interdependent and self-regulated learners and citizens. Additionally, the examination of the effects of dialogic interactions in the construction of a democratic classroom community provided a foundation for educational implications for the pedagogy of the classroom teacher and university educators.

Overarching Questions

The overarching questions examined in this study were:

1. What was the role of dialogic and social interactions in the classroom setting when constructing a democratic classroom community?
2. By what means did the dialogic co-construction of a democratic classroom community support student learning and student ownership of learning in the classroom?

3. How did the use of classroom dialogue facilitate meaning about classroom community membership and citizenship for students in a democratic classroom community?

4. What developmental influences did a democratic classroom community have on students?

This chapter provided an overview of the importance of studying the co-construction of a democratic classroom community. Specifically, this chapter provided a rationale as to the development of a sociocultural theoretical framework for this study, as well as providing a rationale for the application of the ideas of John Dewey and the progressive educational movement. In addition, this chapter discussed and defined the constructs of community, dialogue, and democracy and introduced five theoretical themes that were applied as a way of viewing the study. This chapter also examined the conceptual utilization of intersubjectivity, intertextuality, intercontextuality, and consequential progressions as a way of interpreting the findings. The chapter concluded by providing a description of the study, the importance of the study, and the four overarching questions that guided the research.

Chapter two provides a discussion of the literature as it pertains to community, democracy, and dialogue within the framework of sociocultural theory and from the perspective of John Dewey. Additionally, chapter two provides a discussion of the literature as it pertains to the five themes and the
relation of these themes to the theoretical perspective and methodology of the study. Chapter two concludes by providing a review of the literature as it pertains to the teacher's role as guide and facilitator. Chapter three examines the use of qualitative methodology as a means of studying how students co-construct democratic classroom community through the use of dialogic interactions. Additionally, chapter three explores the use of a cultural mode, listening guide, and work ethic rubric as a means of analyzing the data. Chapter four discusses the findings and results from the analysis of the data collected through an in-depth analysis of the cultural model, a discussion of the qualitative findings, and the utilization of "A Telling Case" as a means of providing a microcosmic view into the group dynamics. Chapter five provides a discussion of the implications of the results of this study on teacher pedagogy and the field of education as a whole.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of my study was to examine the effects of dialogic interactions in the democratic classroom community. This literature review was designed to support answers to these following questions:

1. What was the role of dialogic and social interactions in the classroom setting when constructing a democratic classroom community?

2. By what means did the dialogic co-construction of a democratic classroom community support student learning and student ownership of learning in the classroom?

3. How did the use of classroom dialogue facilitate meaning about classroom community membership and citizenship for students in a democratic classroom community?

4. What developmental influences did a democratic classroom community have on students?

The concepts of community, democracy, and dialogue have been studied from several different fields and from varying perspectives. Through educational research, these concepts reinforce ideas linking them to the classroom. Investigations based on different theoretical perspectives in education relate ideas and meanings that lead to defining and redefining these concepts.
Within the field of education and based upon the assumption that social interactions within the classroom develop classroom community, it is important to study community within a sociocultural framework (John-Steiner & Meehan, 2000). It is pertinent also to study democracy from the underpinnings of a progressivist perspective that identifies democracy in the classroom setting as a lived experience (Dewey, 1916/1966). One of the primary purposes of a democratic classroom is to promote a community of responsible learners and citizens. Within the field of education, it is applicable to study dialogue within a sociocultural framework when dialogue is viewed as a psychological tool used socially to construct meaning (Vygotsky, 1978; Wertsch, 1991).

Within these theoretical frameworks and perspectives community, democracy, and dialogue were examined as the basis of this literature review. Literature reviewed explored the concepts of community, democracy, and dialogue, specifically related to the classroom setting. The purpose of the review was to provide a clear and concise definition of community, democracy, and dialogue and to identify specifically how they related to the classroom experience. The review explored the following:

1. Sociocultural theory and the perspective of John Dewey in relation to the context of this research;
2. Five theoretical themes of experience, social interaction, environment, process, and meaning, that served as a lens through which to view the constructs of community, democracy, and dialogue;
3. Community of practice to explain how community and community membership influenced classroom community for students;
4. Democracy within the classroom setting to explain how democracy and citizenship in the classroom influenced students and the classroom community;

5. The different ways these varying frameworks examined dialogue, as a community building practice, that negotiated meaning about community in the classroom;

6. Intersubjectivity, intertextuality, intercontextuality, and consequential progressions to examine and understand the effects of dialogic co-construction in the classroom;

7. The role of the teacher as a guide and a facilitator within a democratic classroom community.

Theoretical Framework

Sociocultural theory provided a framework for the following research. In a study of elementary education through San Francisco State University, Marshall (1996), studied the construction of knowledge, utilizing a sociocultural approach that focused on the interaction of cultural and linguistic factors among elementary students and found that interaction between students as individuals and with groups assisted or sustained their learning. Wertsch (1991) used a sociocultural approach when studying mediated action and the social processes underlying individual mental functioning. John-Steiner and Meehan (2000) applied a sociocultural approach when discussing the effects of peer collaboration and creativity. These studies viewed the effects of some phenomenon such as the construction of knowledge, mediated action and
mental functions, collaboration and creativity, upon the individual within a social and cultural setting. Sociocultural theory is expressed in terms of the interaction of elements as noted by Vygotsky (1986/2000) in his work. Two elements are studied in union, to understand the effects of that union upon the individual elements. In this research the elements studied in union are the democratic classroom community and ways students as members, or citizens, use social interaction through the use of dialogue to create and negotiate meaning. Based on the study of these elements, the current study was from a sociocultural perspective.

*Sociocultural Theory in Relation to Community*

The social collaboration or community of students has also been studied within a sociocultural framework. In their study of the importance of collaboration upon the co-construction of knowledge, John-Steiner and Mahn (1996) examined and analyzed two main collaborative groups consisting of adults and adolescents. These two groups participated in a program that focused on home, school, and community environments susceptible to drug and alcohol abuse. The results demonstrated that collaborative learning played a vital role in the adults and adolescents' ability to learn, foster a learning community, and encourage the construction of knowledge in individuals.

In a study of African American high school students and social discourse in the African American community, Lee (2000) studied the effects of utilizing dialogue as a mediational tool when applying literary strategies within a classroom community that honored prior knowledge brought by African American adolescents. The results demonstrated that high school students
were able to utilize language as a mediator for understanding through signifying. Based on this ability to mediate, students then were able to create shared understanding, particularly when reading literature that did not reflect common experiences or values that were part of their culture.

Wells (2000), supported by a grant from the Spencer Foundation in a study of elementary teachers and students, cited the effects of dialogic inquiry among students and their teachers, within a collaborative classroom community setting. The results demonstrated that students and teachers were able to construct cultural resources of knowledge and skills that they were able to utilize when problem solving. Through a sociocultural framework, these studies examined the effects of social interactions on students within the classroom in various contexts. This study examined the construction of community through interactions among students within the classroom setting and the effects of these interactions on the classroom as a community and on students as learners and members.

*Sociocultural Theory in Relation to Democracy*

In a study of Chicago elementary students, Wolk (1998) advocated for a democratic classroom that held "ideals such as equality, dignity, freedom, the common good, empathy, and caring" (p. 9). From Wolk's perspective, democracy was viewed as a way of life, as a lived experience. Dewey (1916/1966) recognized the importance of the social environment of student development and learning. Beane and Apple (1995) noted the importance of social affairs and participation in the construction of successful democracy in schools. Goodlad (1997) acknowledged the social interactive role in democracy.
when discussing the notion of “social democracy” (p. 24) as a way of individuals living together while attempting to follow democratic principles.

Democracy in the classroom can be viewed as the culmination of social interactions among students as citizens, and the effects of these interactions on the classroom and students as members and learners (Wolk, 1998; Beane & Apple, 1995). This study examined the construction of classroom democracy and the role of social interactions among students within a classroom setting and the effects of these interactions on the development of a democratic classroom and on students as citizens.

Sociocultural Theory in Relation to Dialogue

In his discussion regarding how Vygotsky viewed speaking, Bruner (1987) noted:

An action one takes to create a text (utterances and nonverbal actions) that another can read and interpret in order to construct a common context of situation (what people are doing together) at a particular point in time (p. 6).

Dialogue is also a tool used to interpret and construct negotiated meaning about community, and what membership within the community means (Wertsch, 1985; Moll, 1990). This negotiation or “semiotic mediation” is supported by the use of tools (Wertsch, 2000; John-Steiner & Mahn, 2000). Through a sociocultural framework, these studies examined the effects of dialogue in various contexts upon students within the classroom. This study examined dialogue and dialogic interactions among students within the classroom setting and the effects of these interactions on developing a...
democratic classroom community and on students as learners and citizens of the classroom community.

*John Dewey*

The progressive movement was considered one of the "great movements of social reform in American history" (Berube, 1994, p. 9). Literature and writings within this movement expressed concern for children. This concern eventually moved into the field of education. Hence, the progressive movement shifted into progressive education. "Progressive education was the first and perhaps greatest educational reform movement in the United States" (p. 14).

Progressive education supported the idea of making education as lifelike as possible with the educative process being wholehearted purposeful activity that would be consistent with the child's goals (Webb, Metha, & Jordan 1996). Progressive education sustained the purpose of education as being the means of preparing youth for responsibilities and success in life (Dewey, 1938/1997). John Dewey, whose ideas were founded in Rousseau, was considered to be a strong force within this movement (Berube, 1994). John Dewey believed the school experience should benefit the whole child artistically, intellectually, socially, and morally (1994). He also believed that learning took place best when doing and that experience was critical in making ideas clear (1994).

Dewey's work provided a framework for research in education and experience. Sorenson (1996) discussed the importance of the empowerment of students through shared participation and experience taking place. In their study of elementary students at the Center for Inquiry Public School System in South Carolina, Jennings, O'Keefe, and Shamlin (1999) examined inquiry-
based pedagogy and democratic practices in the classroom. The results demonstrated how students needed opportunities or experiences to learn to participate as active agents in the classroom. Wolk (1998) shared how experience in classrooms precipitated learning when it was meaningful to students. Situated from the perspective of Dewey, these studies examined the effects of experience on students within the classroom. This research examined the role of experience among students within classroom settings and the effects of these experiences on students as learners and students as members of the classroom community.

John Dewey and the Meaning of Community

Dewey (1927/1954) claimed the importance of community stating, “happiness which is full of content and peace is found only in enduring ties with others…” (p. 214). Campbell (1995) discussed Dewey’s two criteria regarding the notion of community:

The first criterion is internal. . . how numerous and varied are the interests which are consciously shared? . . . The second criterion is external. . . how full and free is the interplay with other forms of association? (p. 173).

Campbell (1995) also noted Dewey’s distinction between community and a group of people, acknowledging community being held together by bonds that lie deeper than just political bonds (1995). Community, for Dewey, cannot be a community without some degree of shared meanings and shared experiences. Chambliss (1971) formulated that community, or society, is held together by people because “they are working along common lines, in a common spirit, and with reference to common aims” (p. 185) supporting Dewey’s notion about
community and experience. This study examined the construction of community in the classroom setting and the effects of community on students as learners and as community members based on Dewey’s notion of community.

**John Dewey and the Meaning of Democracy**

Dewey (1916/1966) discussed the importance of democracy as a means of transmitting society. Dewey described democracy as being more than a structural form of government, but as a way of life. Dewey (1916/1966) summarized his notion of a democratic society:

> A society which makes provision for participation in its good of all its members on equal terms and which secures flexible readjustment of its institutions through interaction of the different forms of associated life is in so far democratic (p. 99).

Wolk (1998) reinforced Dewey’s concept of democracy in his emphasis on participation of students within the democratic classroom. Damico (1978) asserted, “...politics and community are inseparable. ...successful democracy depends on the existence of community, the people organized as a ‘public’”(p. 5) while acknowledging Dewey’s theory of democracy being a way of life. The current research examined democracy within the classroom setting and the effects of democracy on students as citizens and as democratic community members utilizing Dewey’s concept of democracy.

**John Dewey and the Meaning of Dialogue**

Dewey (1916/1966) acknowledged the importance of speech or communication in his work. “Men live in a community in virtue of the things which they have in common; and communication is the way in which they come...
to possess thing in common" (p. 4). Supporting this idea, Jennings, O'Keefe and Shamlin (1999) noted, "central to the notion of democratic practices, then, is that students actively engage in community life through communication and interaction" (p. 1).

Dewey (1916/1966) viewed communication as a means of creating a common understanding among individuals. "The communication which insures participation in a common understanding is one which secures similar emotional and intellectual dispositions..." (p. 4). Supporting this concept, Putney and Floriani (1999) recognized, "as teachers and students interact they construct a common set of expectations, responsibilities, practices, and language that define ways of learning, living, and being in the classroom" (p. 18). Dewey (1916/1966) also related communication to the ability to learn noting, "all communication is educative" (p. 5).

In their research of two fifth grade classes taught by the same teacher, Putney and Floriani (1999) examined the interactions among classroom members across time to discover ways in which transformation of knowledge about community practices and academic knowledge were constructed for each class. The results demonstrated how the formulation of language supports student opportunities for learning. This study examined dialogue of students within the classroom setting and the effects of dialogic interactions on students as learners and as community members, situated in Dewey's idea of communication.
Five Themes in which to View
Community, Democracy,
and Dialogue

Based on the review of the literature, five theoretical themes were explored in relation to the constructs of the study. From the review of Vygotsky and Dewey these themes emerged as pervasive ideas. These five themes were as follows: (1) experience, (2) social interaction, (3) environment, (4) process, and (5) meaning. Based upon the theoretical framework of this study these themes provided a way of viewing the constructs of community, dialogue, and democracy. Based on sociocultural theory as well as within the perspective of Dewey's work, these themes served as a connection between theory and the way of viewing the constructs of the study (see Appendix D for summary). The theoretical framework served as a lens in which to view the theoretical themes and the effects of these themes on the specific constructs of the study. These themes were further explored in the literature.

Experience

Dewey (1916/1966) described experience in education as being the continual renewal of social life. “Each individual, each unit who is the carrier of the life-experience of his group, in time passes away. Yet the life of the group goes on” (p. 2). The importance of experience in the classroom is noted in Jennings and Green (1999) who discussed how active student participation or experiences promote community members that contribute to their classroom community. Wolk (1998) determined that a requirement for a deep and thoughtful democratic classroom community is students having daily
experiences together. This study viewed student experiences within the classroom as a way of transmitting meaning about a democratic classroom community to students as members. The shared experiences by students over time may serve as a way of viewing how these experiences by members facilitated meaning about the students as citizens and the democratic classroom community.

Social Interaction

Vygotsky (1978) believed that humans are active participants in their own existence. The importance of social interaction in the classroom setting is supported by the literature. Claxton (2002) surmised the majority of learning is done with others in the context of “social partners” (p. 21). In a study through the Autonomous University of Mexico (UNAM), Mercer (2002) compared teachers in state schools whose pupils had developed well in reading comprehension and mathematical problem-solving with teachers in similar schools whose students had not made similar achievements. The results demonstrated how student involvement in joint activities could generate understanding. In an analysis of Vygotsky in relation to Marx, Lee (1985) accounted the relationship between an individual's interactions with the world and the construction of consciousness. Lave and Wenger (1991) discussed how knowledge of the social world is socially mediated, giving meaning to individuals through the course of this interaction. Cole (1985) recognized the important connection between “the social organization of behavior and the individual organization of thinking” (p. 148). This study viewed the social interactions of students within the classroom as a way of creating meaning
about a democratic classroom community for students as members. Social interactions, specifically through the use of dialogue, may provide one way of mediating meaning about students as citizens and the democratic classroom community.

Environment

Dewey (1916/1966) indicated the significance of environment, “we never educate directly, but indirectly by means of the environment” (p. 19). In his discussion about Vygotsky's concept of the Zone of Proximal Development, Bruner (1985) identified the importance of the arrangement of the child's environment to facilitate higher learning for the child. Rogoff (1990) regarded the value of viewing the child in relation to their environment. The importance of environment in the classroom setting is supported in the literature. This study viewed the classroom environment of students as a way of facilitating and creating meaning about a democratic classroom community for students as members. Dialogue may serve as a way of mediating meaning about a democratic classroom environment for students as citizens and as learners.

Process

Vygotsky (1978) validated the significance of understanding the process of social interactions and the effects of this process on higher psychological functions. Rogoff (1990) asserted that the “particulars of development are built into the process of development...” (p. 30). Rogoff further claimed that the understanding of process is essential when attempting to understand change or development. Lave and Wenger (1991) affirmed when attempting to understand a community of practice, the process of community must be deciphered. This
study viewed the interactive processes of students within the classroom and how this process of interaction facilitated a way of creating meaning, for students, about a democratic classroom community. Viewing the classroom processes, specifically interactions through the use of dialogue, may serve as a way of mediating meaning about the democratic classroom community and students as members of this community.

Meaning

Vygotsky (1978) stated that education must be relevant. Dewey (1938/1997) noted that when learning is meaningful it creates an important desire to continue learning. Rogoff (1990) supported the idea of meaning stating, “meaning and purpose are central to the definition of all aspects of event or activities and cannot be separated or derived from summing the features of the individual and features of the context” (p. 29). Wolk (1998) assessed that student learning is a product of their own personal perceptions and meaning about their learning is the result of this process. This study examined students’ negotiation of meaning, based upon interactions, about their democratic classroom community and about themselves as citizens and learners within this community. Examining the concept of meaning, specifically, how meaning is facilitated through dialogic interactions, may provide a way of understanding how students mediate meaning about the democratic classroom community and membership in this community.
The Construct of Community

Defining a Classroom Community as a Community of Practice

Practice has been defined as "any process of transforming raw material into a finished product" (Rosa & Montero, 1990). Various research has defined community within a social context. Rogoff, Goodman Turkanis, and Bartlett (2001) stated:

...community involves relationships among people based on common endeavors-trying to accomplish some thing together-with some stability of involvement and attention to the ways that members related to each other (p. 10).

Researchers have also acknowledged a community as a community of practice. Lave and Wenger (1991) termed community of practice as "a set of relations among persons, activity, and world, overtime... and in relation with other communities of practice" (p. 98). Within the context of social theory, Wenger (1998) defined community of practice as having the following integrated components: (a) meaning as a way of talking about ability, (b) practice as a way of talking about historical and social resources, (c) community as a way of talking about social enterprises defined as worth pursuing, and (d) identity as a way of how learning changes who we are. Within the context of managing knowledge, Wenger, McDermott, and Snyder (2002) explained community of practice as the combination of a domain of knowledge, a community of people and the shared practice that they are developing to be effective in their domain.

The study of community, defined within the framework of sociocultural theory, portrays community as one element and the individual member of that...
community as another element. Research has focused on the effects of the union of these two elements. Community, often defined as a community of practice, is supported through various research (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998; Wenger, McDermott, & Snyder, 2002). This study viewed community of practice within the context of: (a) social activity and interaction, (b) students within the setting of the classroom, and (c) exploring the effects of these classroom interactions upon students as members.

Influences of Community on Students

Influences of a community of practice on students are discussed in several studies. John-Steiner and Meehan (2000) addressed the importance of examining the dynamics of interdependence within the classroom community. Diaz, Neal, and Amaya-Williams (1990) expressed the importance of self-regulation among students as a result of a classroom community. These influences, interdependence and self-regulation, will be discussed in the following sections.

*Examining the dynamics of interdependence.* Moll and Greenberg (1990) defined interdependence as a child's learning with the socially provided resources to support that learning. The concept of interdependence can also be found within a sociocultural perspective (John-Steiner & Meehan, 2000). In support of this, Vygotsky (1978) stated:

> an operation that initially represents an external activity is reconstructed and begins to occur internally. . . .[T]he transformation of an interpersonal process into an intrapersonal one is the result of a long series of developmental events (pp. 56-57).
It is possible to build the process of interdependence within the community of practice through collaboration or joint construction. The idea of collaboration and the effects of collaboration on a classroom environment were discussed by several authors. Lee and Smagorinsky (2000) elaborated on the use of collaborative inquiry and the joint construction of knowledge to construct meaning about individual learning within a social context. John-Steiner and Mahn (1996) emphasized the role of interdependence of social and individual processes and the effects of social interaction on the construction of knowledge within the classroom setting. John-Steiner and Meehan (2000) viewed the theory of creativity in relation to the social construction of knowledge to examine the concept of interdependence.

Research has reflected the influence that interdependence has had upon students. Lee and Smagorinsky (2000) explained that knowledge is constructed through joint activities rather than transference between teacher and student. The joint construction of knowledge created an interdependence between the teacher and students. The student played an active role, as opposed to passive, in their learning based upon this participation. Interdependence can be created by the students' taking ownership of their learning. John-Steiner and Mahn (1996) emphasized the nature of the interdependence between individual and social processes in the construction of knowledge. Based upon this interdependence, higher mental functioning may occur for the learners. Participation in a variety of joint activities has possibly served as a synthesis of understanding. John-Steiner and Meehan (2000) examined the theory of creativity in relation to the social construction of
knowledge to examine the concept of interdependence. Interdependence can foster relationships between students, as active agents, who reconstruct and co-construct knowledge to the acquisition of this knowledge.

These studies support the idea that the development of community membership is socioculturally situated within this process of interdependence. This process is supported by the joint participation or co-construction of meaning. Noted by the research (Lee & Smagorinsky, 2000; John-Steiner & Mahn, 1996; John-Steiner & Meehan, 2000) this mediation or co-construction can influence students in several ways. This study considered how students within a democratic classroom community took ownership of their roles as citizens and as learners. This study further examined student participation in a variety of joint activities within the classroom that may have served as a synthesis of understanding. Students could become active agents within their classroom community in reconstructing and co-constructing knowledge about their classroom community. This process could lead to the acquisition of this knowledge.

*Exploring self-regulation.* Self-regulation, defined by Diaz, Neal, and Amaya-Williams (1990), is the child's capacity to plan, guide, and monitor his or her behavior from within and flexibly according to changing circumstances. The child’s behavior follows a goal or plan that is formulated by the child. As supported by Diaz, Neal, and Amaya-Williams (1990):

> Since the human infant is immersed from birth in a sociocultural environment, the child’s functioning and behavior are externally regulated by the adult caregiving interaction. We propose further that
self-regulatory capacities develop within the context of adult-child interactions, especially when the caregiver sensitively and gradually withdraws from joint activity, allowing, promoting, and rewarding the child’s take-over of the regulatory role (p. 129).

Research (Diaz, Neal, & Amaya-Williams, 1990; Vygotsky, 1978; Wertsch, 1991) has supported the influence of self-regulation upon students as a result of participation in joint activities. Studies have supported the idea that self-regulation, as a result of joint activity, may lead to higher mental functions (John-Steiner & Meehan, 2000). As a result, student knowledge could be transferred from the collective (classroom community) to the individual (community member). Self-regulation could create interdependence between the child and adult (Dial, Neal, & Amaya-Williams, 1990). Interactions “provide the source of development of a child’s voluntary behavior” (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 90). Self-regulation, in the classroom community, could therefore be viewed as students voluntarily taking over the teacher’s role in some type of capacity. This study viewed the effects of dialogic interactions among students within a democratic classroom community to examine how students may become self-regulated members, or citizens, in their classroom community.

Influences of Community Membership on Students

Several authors addressed the influences of classroom community membership on students. Jacoby and Ochs (1995) examined the importance of co-construction when defining community members. John-Steiner and Mahn (1996) revealed the significance of co-construction when defining community
membership. The influence of co-construction was further addressed by an in-depth view of the literature.

The importance of co-construction. In order to understand why membership within a community of practice influences students, it was important to examine the co-construction or mediated meaning defining community members. Jacoby and Ochs (1995) considered co-construction as a collaboration of several elements including interpretation, action, activity, and identity that create meaning. Several studies examined how the co-construction of meaning about community was facilitated through the scaffolding dialogue between the teacher and student. Wells (2000) described dialogue as a mediating action that created cultural meaning for students. Lee (2000) discussed how language served as a primary mediator of knowledge for students. Teacher and students engaged in active dialogue to construct, or mediate meaning about community and about themselves within this community. Putney (1996) viewed speaking as co-constructed by describing it as an action that creates a text that another can interpret and read in order to construct context.

This research examined student co-construction through the use of dialogue to create meaning about a democratic classroom community. It is possible, through co-constructed action that the student could begin to formulate meaning about what community is in addition to meaning regarding citizenship within this community. Thus, the student’s sense of community could also be related to the student’s sense of self. The student’s sense of self or his/her internal view of themselves could be identified by the type of behavior or actions the student exhibited, through the external, or how their behavior is expressed.
within the classroom community. The co-constructed community may provide
the framework within which concepts about community and concepts about self
are developed.

Research has acknowledged the effects from developing a community of
practice (Wenger, McDermott, & Snyder, 2002; Wenger, 1998; Lave & Wenger,
1991). Studies have noted the use of dialogue as a tool within a sociocultural
context (Vygotsky, 1978; Lee, 2000; John-Steiner & Mahn, 1996). Within these
dynamics, studies have explored the effects of classroom communities on
students who actively create and develop community within their classroom.
Research also reported the effects of democratic classroom communities upon
students who actively create and develop democracy within their classroom.

*The Effects of Classroom Community*

Rogoff, Goodman Turkanis, and Bartlett (2001) defined “community of
learners” (p. 7) as the collaboration between both, children and adults, situated
in learning activities. Effective learning activities only occurred when both
learner and instructor were willing participants, developing within the process of
collaboration. Lempert Shepel (sic) (1995) shared the importance of teacher
development within the concept of teacher as researcher. “For the teacher to be
able to change and develop curriculum it is necessary to have the cultural and
educational tools to change and develop as a professional” (p. 439). Several
classroom community cultures viewed from the perspective of teacher as
researcher, examined ways these teachers as researchers developed a culture
of community among their students within their classrooms.
Creating community through the co-construction of curriculum. Goodman Turkanis (2001) examined the effects of creating a classroom curriculum within the context of classroom community (2001):

When people work together as a community to develop curriculum, fascinating units of study emerge as individuals make suggestions for topics, objectives, sequence, learning activities, and culmination (p. 95).

Goodman Turkanis (2001) explained experiences with a fifth and sixth grade science class with specific reference to teachable moments that were termed as "emergent curriculum" (p. 92). "Emergent curriculum" (p. 92) allowed the direction of the classroom content to be based on an on-going dialogue from students, which promoted a flexible learning environment that created opportunities for learners. Upon reflection, Goodman Turkanis (2001) discovered classroom climate was key and that in order for a culture of community to be created, co-construction by members, including students, teacher, and parents, was imperative. This co-construction of community by members built a concept of safety where students were able to take risks without feeling threatened and allowed to freely participate in dialogue, which assisted in the construction of meaning (2001).

Randell (2001) supported the idea of the co-construction of curriculum as a way to also build student knowledge about themselves and others, and within the process of co-construction, teachers should serve more as a guide. It is also through co-construction that teachers could learn from students thinking,
and build upon that thinking as well as incorporating background knowledge that allowed students to feel a sense of belonging and importance.

These researchers described teacher practices supported by theory. Within these teacher practices dialogue could be viewed as a tool (Vygotsky, 1978) that contributed to a culture of community. Dialogue, as a tool, may be viewed as a means of enabling a community of students to co-construct meaning about their classroom curriculum. Collaboration as a community building practice (John-Steiner & Meehan, 2000) was seen by the effects of students working together to construct a culture of classroom community, and democracy could be developed by students through the active participation of the lived experiences of the classroom setting.

Creating community through shared responsibility. Polson (2001) extended creating a culture of community to members who make responsible choices. Polson (2001) reflected how her experience as a mother allowed her to change her concept of choices. Her experiences as a mother led Polson (2001) to the idea of "logical consequences":

...helping children to make responsible choices in school begins with making sure that choices are available, then allowing children to learn from the logical consequences of their choices, with support from adults in reflecting on the process and results (p. 123)

Polson (2001) realized that it is through logical consequences that students learned about responsibility and choices. Choice making also contributed to the students desire to be responsible for their own learning (2001). These choices were a vital part of membership within a classroom community. Considered by
Poison as important, choice making by students was actually a part of the student's assessment. Poison (2001) summarized:

As part of the evaluation of each student's learning progress, the children, parents, and teacher look at how well the children make responsible choices in using their time, organizing their work, participating in activities, and contributing to the community of learners (p. 127).

Seaman (2001) examined the process of decision making for students within the classroom community to promote student responsibility and reported the use of dialogue established the process to allow students the ability to co-construct the meaning about responsibility as a community member. Seaman (2001) reported:

I began opening up decisions to my students, such as the kind of behavior that is appropriate for learning in our classroom, how long to make an assignment, how big a reading goal they should have, where to put up a bulletin board display, how to schedule computer time...the kids always surprise me (p. 139).

Through the process of co-construction Seaman (2001) recognized the effects of ownership on students as classroom community members. Seaman recalled, "kids could handle a lot of this [management techniques] responsibility on their own...most of the children loved [the] challenges...peers came up with solutions..." (p. 139). These researchers exhibited teacher practices supported by theory. The concept of dialogue as a tool served as a community building practice (Wertsch, 1985). Dialogue allowed a community of students to
co-construct meaning about being responsible community members (Gutiérrez & Stone, 2000). The use of reflection upon choices and consequences utilized dialogue within a sociocultural framework (Wells, 2000). Students utilized reflection as an individual, as well as a community, to construct the meaning of being a responsible community member. Collaboration as a community building practice was observed by the facilitation of student’s discussions, and the way these discussions served as a means of constructing a culture of classroom community membership for students (John-Steiner & Meehan, 2000).

The Construct of Democracy

Defining Democracy

Democracy is a term that is essential in understanding the purpose of American education. Dewey (1916/1966) defined democracy as a lived experience. Beane and Apple (1995) described the following conditions in order for democracy to occur:

...open flow of ideas...faith in the individual and collective for resolving problems...critical reflection...concern for the welfare of others...

...concern for the dignity and rights of others...understanding democracy is not so much an 'ideal' to be pursued as an 'idealized' set of values that we must live...the organization of social institutions to promote and extend a democratic way of life (p. 7).

Wolk (1998) presented democracy as a daily experience lived and shared by individuals as members of a community. Goodlad (1997) acknowledged “social democracy” (p. 24) as people living together utilizing common principles
and "democracy of the spirit" (p. 24) that served as a hope that somehow binds all individuals together in a common goal. The study of democracy, defined within the framework of sociocultural theory, views democracy as one element of the classroom community and the individual member or citizen of that community as another element. Research has focused on the effects of the union of these two elements. Democracy as an ideal within the classroom setting is supported through various research (Dewey, 1916/1966; Jennings, O'Keefe, & Shamlin, 1999; Jennings & Green, 1999; Wolk, 1998; Sorenson, 1996).

The Influences of Democracy on Students

Studies have acknowledged the influences of a democratic classroom on students. Roche (1996) discussed five components essential to democracy in classrooms that influence students. The first component of democracy was personal meaning. Personal meaning was linked to an individual's purpose and motivation. Roche believed meaning was discovered through the process of success, failure, and "reflective evaluation" (p. 29). A democratic classroom enabled students to "reach goals, reprioritize, and learn" (p. 29) through the process of problem solving and being active participants in their classroom community. Democratic classrooms could create personal meaning for students through this process. Since the teacher served as a facilitator, students were encouraged to reflect and develop their own meanings about themselves as citizens and as learners.

Roche (1996) referred to ownership as the second component essential to democracy in the classroom. Roche extended ownership to include both daily
and monumental decisions that occurred within the classroom setting as well as
dialogic interactions regarding these classroom decisions. Shared responsibility
and decision-making in the classroom facilitated genuine participation of
students. Students had ample opportunities to become active participants
involved in the construction of their democratic classroom community. Through
this participation, students as members, acquired ownership of their classroom
community.

The third element was cooperation and community. Roche (1996)
acknowledged how democracy in the classroom allowed students the ability to
collaborate and work through difficulties as members of a group. Students
learned ways of working together through negotiation and conflict. Cooperation
contributed to the development of community as students viewed their
classroom as a place of shared power where respectful disagreements could
take place. Students acquired their own definitions of cooperation and
community based upon their interactions with each other while respecting the
viewpoints of others.

Moral and ethical dimensions were the fourth element noted by Roche
(1996). Morality referred to what is thought to be right and what is known to be
right, this served as a framework for students on which they formulated the
strength and courage to act. A democratic classroom allowed students to
reflect and question their beliefs by classroom groups working together to
formulate resolutions. Moral values were discussed, supported, and challenged
by the group during these group interactions that strengthened students' own
beliefs, while having encouraged students to be tolerant of the beliefs of others.
Critical awareness was the fifth element essential to classroom democracy. (Roche, 1996). Being critical enabled students to question and challenge "perceived authorities" (p. 33). Students asked critical questions to analyze and discern between falsehood and truths. A democratic classroom enabled students to share perspectives and become critically aware by allowing students to develop a greater sense of reflection of their own behavior and the behavior of others. Roche believed constantly sharing perspectives was essential to growth and facilitated the acceptance of criticism serving as a foundation in supporting classroom citizens who continuously developed democracy and citizenship in the classroom.

Wolk (1998) acknowledged that democracy in the classroom allowed students to learn how to live in community. Students were encouraged to work together to strive to learn how to become part of each other's daily lives. Sorenson (1996) concluded democracy empowered students. Students were encouraged to make decisions in a non-threatening environment. Students became active participants as citizens in their classroom and as learners. Cunat (1996) identified democracy in the classroom as a vital and dynamic process of community that allowed students to be recognized and validated as individuals and as responsible members of that community. Students could develop this sense of responsibility by engaging in a cooperative, reflective, and dynamic process for developing and reevaluating rules and procedures. This literature has acknowledged the effects of classroom democracy on students. This research examined the effects of a democratic classroom community on
students as learners and as community citizens. The research reviewed supports the idea of democracy serving as an influential force for students. 

*The Influences of a Democratic Classroom Citizenship on Students*

Research acknowledged the influences of citizenship on students. Goodlad (2001) noted that the development of self, including democratic relationships, depends upon one’s experiencing relationships of mutual generosity, trust, and respect. Csapó (2001) stated that students as citizens are required to think democratically. Democratic acting and decision-making required a broad knowledge base including critical thinking skills. Wolk (1998) concluded that students as members or citizens have a “shared morality” (p. 55). It is through this shared morality that students define a common set of values, goals, purpose, conduct and responsibilities. Sorenson (1996) discussed how students as citizens realize that they can act on knowledge to make changes in society. Brodhagen (1995) examined how students as citizens created a classroom community through the creation of a classroom constitution as well as planning a meaningful curriculum together. The literature acknowledged the effects of students as citizens within a democratic classroom community. This study utilized the idea of students, as citizens, within the classroom setting. This research examined the effects of citizenship on students as learners and as community members. The research reviewed supported the notion of citizenship as an influential force for students.
The Construct of Dialogue

Dialogue as a Community Building Practice

Wink and Putney (2002) defined dialogue as "any talk to which two or more people contribute to construct both internal and external meanings" (p. 149). Dialogue contributed to the co-construction of meaning. In order to define and identify how a positive community and community membership was developed, it was important to understand the mediation of meaning about community through dialogue, and to examine the effects of this mediated dialogue upon the individual student. Quinn and Holland (1987) noted, "...talk is one of the most important ways in which people negotiate understanding and accomplish social ends" (p. 9). Talk may be viewed as an action. Dialogue may be considered a powerful way for participants to have negotiated meaning about their classroom culture. Talk could influence interaction among people. Actions, according to Quinn and Holland (1987) may be based upon these interactions. Talk initiating action can be a powerful force experienced much of the time. As further asserted by Quinn and Holland (1987):

Talk influences social relations among people and the subsequent actions they take toward one another. ...talk is itself a kind of act, and speech acts can have powerful social consequences (p. 9).

Based on this idea of dialogue, this study viewed dialogue as a means of facilitating meaning for students about the classroom community within the context of social activity and interaction. In addition, this study examined the effects of these classroom interactions upon students as members.
The Influences of Dialogue on Students

Many authors acknowledge the concept of dialogue as a tool that constructed meaning about the social environment for students. Diaz, Neal, and Amaya-Williams (1990) assessed that dialogue, with socially constructed meaning, assisted children in attempts to master their environment. Lee and Smagorinsky (2000) referred to dialogue as the “tool of tools” (p. 2) and discussed how dialogue became the primary medium in a child’s construction of meaning, cultural understanding, learning, and transformation. Putney (1996) examined students’ hearing of words as becoming a way of reflecting a community of action that is common to all members of that classroom community. This study viewed how the dialogic interactions of students served as a way of reflecting a democratic classroom community that was common to all members as citizens of that community.

The Influences of Dialogue on a Classroom

Within the context of a classroom community culture, Ochs (1990) introduced the idea of “language socialization” (p. 287) noting that a basic tenet of language socialization was to not view language as only a symbolic system that encoded social and cultural structures, but also as a tool for establishing, maintaining, and creating social realities within that structure. Dialogue as a tool could assist students within the classroom community to establish and appropriate the meaning of positive community through the connection of the external to the internal, and the social (community) to the individual (student). The scaffolding of dialogue, as a tool, to negotiate meaning about classroom
community could appropriate meaning about community for members.

According to John-Steiner and Meehan (2000):

Knowledge, therefore, is both reconstructed and co-constructed in the course of dialogic interaction. It involves agentive individuals who do not simply internalize and appropriate the consequences of activities on the social plane. They actively restructure their knowledge both with each other and within themselves. Such reconstruction can occur as the outcome of positive shared dialogue and joint activities (p. 35).

This research examined dialogic interactions of students as a way of constructing meaning about community and membership for students.

**Intersubjectivity, Intertextuality, Intercontextuality, and Consequential Progressions**

The conceptual ideas of intersubjectivity, intertextuality, intercontextuality, and consequential progressions are grounded in sociocultural theory and founded upon the ideas of Vygotsky (1978). Based on the review of the literature these conceptual ideas were used as a means of interpreting and understanding the dynamics that occurred in this study. Further, since varying definitions were found in the literature regarding these ideas they were defined in order to provide clarity.

*Defining Intersubjectivity*

Vygotsky (1978; 1986/2000) believed the effects of social interaction were influential upon higher mental functioning. One may wonder how an adult and child interacting with varying vocabularies and definitions can communicate
effectively. Intersubjectivity is a means to explaining this phenomenon. Intersubjectivity exists when participants "share some aspect of their situation definitions" (Wertsch, 1985, p. 159). There are varying levels and degrees of intersubjectivity. During the early stages of development intersubjectivity operates on the basis of a minimal level of shared definitions (1985). Dialogue when negotiated among participants creates a state of intersubjectivity through the process of this negotiation. This study examined the varying levels and degrees of intersubjectivity a classroom teacher and students developed, over time, in constructing their democratic classroom community. Additionally, this study examined the use of dialogic interaction as a means of creating intersubjectivity about community membership and citizenship.

*Defining Intertextuality*

Kozulin (1990) defined intertextuality as "the transposition of one or several sign systems into another, and more specifically the presence of antecedent texts in consequent texts"(p. 144). Sign systems may include gestures, symbols, and language (Vygotsky, 1978). "The use of signs leads humans to a specific structure of behavior that breaks away from the biological development and creates new forms of a culturally-based psychological process" (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 40). Intertextuality is a process whereby prior understanding is brought into current understanding to create an in-depth comprehension (Putney & Floriani, 1999). This study utilized dialogue to examine student’s prior understanding about a democratic classroom community and how students viewed themselves as citizens and learners within this community. Further, this study explored how prior dialogic interactions were brought into consequential
dialogic interactions to formulate new meanings about a democratic classroom community, students as citizens, and students as learners.

**Defining Intercontextuality**

Research defined intercontextuality as the process of negotiating everyday life, thus creating a context of knowledge and experience (Floriani, 1993; Putney & Floriani, 1999; Wink & Putney, 2002). This knowledge and experience is then drawn upon and linked to a new context of knowledge and experience (2002). Intercontextuality is linking the context of one experience to the context of the current experience. This study examined how students linked their prior context of a classroom community and their view of themselves as citizens and learners, with their current experience and knowledge of their democratic classroom community and their view of themselves as citizens and learners. Additionally, this study explored developmentally, over time, how these links effected the context in which students viewed themselves as responsible learners and citizens.

**Defining Consequential Progressions**

In the literature, consequential progressions have been described as conversation that builds on what has happened in the past (Putney, Green, Dixon, Durán, & Yeager, 2000; Putney, 1997; Wink & Putney, 2002). The nature of this interaction “is a negotiated production with an implicated future and an intertextual past” (Wink, et al., 2002, p. 136). Intersubjectivity, intertextuality, and intercontextuality can be linked to consequential progressions (2002). Consequential progressions may be based on a shared or common understanding of negotiated dialogue. This shared dialogue is
composed of intertextual and intercontextual links. Intertextual links are formulated through the sharing of prior knowledge to create a deeper understanding of current knowledge. Intercontextual links are created by the negotiation of new contexts based upon prior contexts of past knowledge and experiences. Current dialogue is influenced and formulated based on these prior links. By participating in this current dialogue there is a consequence (2002). Each cycle of dialogic interaction progresses as a consequence of participating. The concept of consequential progressions was adapted for the purpose of this study to examine students who: (a) developed a democratic classroom community, (b) developed as responsible learners, and (c) developed as community members and citizens over time.

The Role of the Teacher

The Role of the Teacher as a Guide

Current literature examined the teacher’s role as a guide within the classroom. For the purpose of this research, guide was defined as an individual who could “point out the way; lead” (Webster 1996, p. 273). Wolk (1998) believed that teachers served as a guide by the example they set in their role as a teacher. Wolk (1998) acknowledged that the teacher’s role must be that of a learner if students were to develop into learners themselves. A teacher who is a guide may set limits and expectations that creates a safe environment for students to flourish in (Roche, 1996; Sorenson, 1996) A teacher as a guide does not need to renounce authority though it is important that, as a guide,
having this authority does not exclude teachers from being learners or "students from being genuine teachers" (Wolk 1998, p. 57).

The Role of the Teacher as a Facilitator

For the purpose of this research a teacher as a facilitator was someone who gave students the necessary skills to navigate their academic and social learning interdependently. Teachers as facilitators offered students choices and allowed students to make decisions, enhancing student ownership and accountability of their behavior and learning (Polson, 2001; Goodman Turkanis, Bartlett, & Rogoff, 2001; Sorenson, 1996). Teachers as facilitators promoted discussion as a way of increasing student's critical thinking and problem solving skills (Sorenson, 1996). Teachers as facilitators relinquished control, allowing students the freedom to develop as learners and as members of a classroom community (Wolk, 1998; Garlock, 1996).

Summary

The literature reviewed has explored concepts of community, democracy, and dialogue that are grounded in theory and exhibited in effective teacher practices, whether the teacher is serving as a guide or facilitator. The literature also reviewed five theoretical themes: (1) experience, (2) social interaction, (3) environment, (4) process, and (5) meaning. A democratic classroom community may be created through the experiences and social interactions of its members. It is through the process of creating a democratic classroom community environment that citizenship and community for its members can assume a specific meaning. If a democratic classroom community is how members define
themselves, student participation as learners and citizens is how student members come to create these definitions. Within a classroom setting, a community by which members define themselves may exist. A classroom community is reflective of the members it serves.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to examine (a) students' co-construction of meaning, through dialogue, regarding democratic classroom communities of practice, (b) students' co-construction of meaning, through dialogue, regarding citizenship or membership in a democratic classroom community, and (c) the relationship between dialogue as a community building practice and a democratic classroom community that yielded students who were interdependent and self-regulated learners and citizens. Specifically, the overarching questions examined in this study were:

1. What was the role of dialogic and social interactions in the classroom setting when constructing a democratic classroom community?

2. By what means did the dialogic co-construction of a democratic classroom community support student learning and student ownership of learning in the classroom?

3. How did the use of classroom dialogue facilitate meaning about classroom community membership and citizenship for students in a democratic classroom community?

4. What developmental influences did a democratic classroom community have on students?
The purpose of this chapter was to describe the methodology and methods that were used to understand how a democratic community developed within the classroom culture utilizing dialogue. According to Bogdan and Biklen (1998), methodology refers to “the general logic and theoretical perspective for a research project” (p. 31). Further, methods refer to “the specific techniques you use, such as surveys, interviews, observation—the more technical aspects of the research” (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998, p. 31). Based upon the nature of this study, this study was considered a qualitative case study. Specifically, in relation to methodology and methods, this chapter:

1. Defined the notion of a qualitative case study in relation to this research.
2. Examined the relationship between theory and methodology.
3. Summarized the influences of prior pilot studies upon current research methods utilized.
4. Discussed methods utilized within this study.

Defining a Qualitative Case Study

This study was defined as a qualitative case study. This section included: (a) exploring the notion of qualitative as it referred to this study, (b) defining case study as it applied to this research, and (c) discussing the relationship between theory to methodology.

Exploring Qualitative Methodology as it Relates to this Study

Denzin and Lincoln (1998) referred to qualitative practice as “a set of interpretive practices, [that] privileges no single methodology over any other”
Qualitative research is used in many disciplines, and does not have a distinct set of methods that it specifically uses (1998). Regardless of methods, qualitative research is “committed to the naturalistic perspective, and to the interpretive understanding of human experience” (p. 6). Using a qualitative approach allowed the researcher to gain an understanding of the participant experience in an in-depth manner by observing and interpreting the participant within their natural setting. The natural setting allowed participants to act and react in a manner that was most natural to them.

As a qualitative study, commitment of understanding human experience existed. For example, it was important to examine student’s interactions as members of a democratic classroom community through the co-construction of dialogue and the effects of this interaction on student’s as community members. If a democratic classroom created students as citizens who were responsible, reflective, and self-regulating, understanding the process by which students constructed a democratic classroom community could provide a foundation of knowledge from which classroom educators could utilize to construct democracy within their own classroom setting.

Characteristics of qualitative research, as outlined by Merriam (1998), support qualitative research as an effective methodology in gaining access and understanding to this process and were examined in detail. Merriam (1998) characterized qualitative research as consisting of description, interpretation, and an understanding that provides the “goal of investigation”. Given these characteristics it was an appropriate method for this study because in this study, I described the classroom environment and the dialogic interactions that
occurred between teacher and students. In so doing I provided interpretations of the classroom environment and dialogic interactions that occurred within the context of a democratic classroom community. Through the analysis I created an understanding about how dialogic interactions supported and facilitated a democratic community culture within the classroom. Further, Merriam (1998) explains that qualitative research “identifies recurrent patterns in the form of themes or categories” (p. 12) and “may delineate a process” (p. 12). For purposes of this study, I examined units of data or terminology to unfold the process of constructing a democratic classroom community through the use of dialogue. Additionally, qualitative research also seeks “to understand a phenomenon, a process, or the perspectives and worldviews of the people involved” (Merriam, 1998, p. 11). This study examined the process of students constructing a democratic classroom community based upon the perspectives and views of its students as citizens and learners. Qualitative is an appropriate methodology based on the characteristics of qualitative research and the nature of this study.

Defining Case Study as it relates to this Research

According to Denzin and Lincoln (1998), a case study is focused on a specific object such as a “child or a classroom” (p. xv). This study was a case study focused on specific processes that occurred within one specific setting. For example, this study examined dialogic interactions among classroom community members, which served as the object of this study. Merriam (1998) described a case study as an “intensive, holistic description and analysis of a single unit or bounded system” (p. 12). In this study, I examined a single unit or
a classroom to gain an in-depth understanding of how students created meaning about democracy and community within their classroom. This study combined the characteristics of qualitative research with a case study design including description, interpretation, and understanding of specific processes, such as the use of dialogue, and categories, like the construct of democracy and community, of a single or bound unit, like the classroom setting. In other words, studying democratic classroom construction facilitated an in-depth understanding of the dialogic process involved in community construction.

The Relationship Between Theory and Methodology

Defining Sociocultural Theory

This study was designed to explore a democratic classroom community and the ways in which meaning about this community were constructed by its members through the use of dialogic interactions. Specifically, this study focused on social interactions through dialogue to construct a democratic community in the classroom setting. The study of interactions situated this study within a sociocultural framework.

Sociocultural theory examines the individual within a certain social context and the effects of this social context upon the individual. It is based on the concept that "human activities take place in cultural contexts, are mediated by language and other symbol systems, and can be best understood when investigated in their historical development (John-Steiner & Mahn, 1996, p.191).
This study explored the way interaction, through classroom dialogue within the culture of a democratic classroom community, mediated meaning about learning and membership within the classroom community.

Defining the Constructs

In order to better understand how sociocultural theory related to the methodology of this study, the concepts of community, democracy, and dialogue within this study were briefly reviewed. For the purpose of this study, community was defined as a community of practice. Wenger, McDermott, and Snyder (2002) defined community of practice as having a domain of knowledge, people who care about this domain, and a shared practice to be effective within this domain. The purpose of this study was to examine a classroom community that had a domain defined as common knowledge about a community, individuals who cared about this domain, specifically the teacher and students, and practices to be effective within this domain, specifically the dialogic interactions among members that created meaning (see Appendix E).

According to Dewey (1916/1966), there are two types of democracy that can be examined. The first is governmental structure and the second is viewing democracy as a way of life. The second type of democracy should serve as the goal of schools. A democratic classroom should serve as a way of life where students get to know each other through thoughtful dialogue and action (Wolk, 1998). The purpose of this study was to examine how students as members of a classroom community construct democracy based upon their interactions as learners and as citizens.
Dialogue, or speech, within a sociocultural context, is defined as a psychological tool (Vygotsky, 1978). This study examined classroom dialogue as a way of negotiating meaning about democracy within a classroom community for its members through the connection of the external to the internal, and the social, defined as community, to the individual, defined as the student. The dialogue obtained within the classroom setting from: (a) student to student, (b) student to teacher, and (c) teacher to student served as a primary focus of this study.

The Relationship Between Theory and Methodology

The relationship of sociocultural theory to qualitative methodology was explored in the context of five themes: (1) experience, (2) social interaction, (3) environment, (4) process, and (5) meaning. These themes provided an underlying connection that supported theory to methodology (see Appendix F for overview).

Qualitative research values the study of human experience (Denzin & Lincoln, 1998). It is based upon the view that reality is constructed through interaction (Merriam, 1998). Qualitative research notes the importance of setting upon the participant, is concerned with the process not the product, and is interested in participant meaning (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998).

Sociocultural theory seeks to understand the nature of human experience and the effects of this experience on the individual (Kozlin, 1990). It emphasizes the importance of social interaction on the individuals and how these interactions must be explored and recognized (Wertsch, 1991). Sociocultural theory acknowledges the effects of interaction upon the child within their
environment. It also notes the importance of process by Vygotsky's (1978) discussion of higher psychological functions and the importance of studying the process, not objects. Further, sociocultural theory relates the importance of relevance within the educational setting. Based on these connections, the theoretical foundations of this study were supported within a qualitative methodological perspective.

The Influence of Prior Pilot Studies upon Current Methods

Previously two pilot studies were conducted and these influenced the methods selected in this study. The first pilot study was conducted during the Fall semester of 2001 and the second pilot study was conducted during the Spring semester of 2002. Based on the findings, these pilot studies shaped and altered several research method decisions of this study. The following section addressed these issues.

Choosing the Participants and Setting

During the first pilot study I conducted research in Ms. Janet Smythe fifth grade classroom in a Professional Development School. My first impressions of Ms. Smythe were based on the classroom setting and first meeting her. These impressions revealed that her teaching was based in student-centered practices. The setting was comfortable and conducive to learning. This was evident by the student projects and work displayed as well as having tables versus disks for the students to work at with each other. The room also had the class Constitution and Preamble posted, bearing students signatures in show of
support of these documents, signifying that students had input into their classroom environment. Upon meeting Ms. Smythe I realized she cared very much about her students well being in the way she spoke about them. I also noticed her ability to talk to the students, as an equal in the way she had them stand when speaking to her. Based on these first impressions, I knew I found an environment in which I wanted to conduct my research (see Appendix G for detailed description).

**Deriving the Focus of the Study**

*Conducting observations and interviews.* In both pilot studies I conducted participant observations and both formal and informal interviews. Through the pilot studies, I was able to narrow my focus from teacher beliefs to how community is built within a classroom discourse through the scaffolding of community dialogue. Further, from the pilot studies, I derived the following questions for the student questionnaire:

1. What is your classroom community like?
2. How do you feel about your classroom community?
3. What does classroom community mean to you?
4. Describe community activities (see Appendix H for detailed description).

Additionally, based on the pilot studies, I derived the following questions for the focus group interviews:

1. Tell me about a typical day in your community.
2. What do you like best about your classroom community?
3. How could your classroom community by recreated?
4. What needs to be done in order to be a part of your community?

5. In order to teach like Ms. Smythe, what would I need to do? (see Appendix I for detailed description).

**Democracy as an element of community.** The domains within my pilot study revealed several important elements of community. The domain I chose to focus on was democracy. During the Network for Learning Conference (NFLC), a three-day conference conducted by Ms. Smythe and her students, democracy of the classroom was referred to and discussed at great length. These discussions reflected democratic ideals through: (a) the way students became active participants in their classroom, (b) how students were able to discuss and describe the democratic ideals that occurred in their classroom setting, (c) the way students became self-regulated based on the implementation of these ideals, and (d) how self-regulation was transferred into other areas (see Appendix J for detailed description). Based on these ideals in the discussion I recorded during my classroom observations, the domain of democracy became the focus of this study.

**Methods of the Current Study**

**Setting**

The setting of the current study was Taylor College Preparatory Academy (see Appendix K for detailed description). The school was a charter school, situated within a mid to low-income setting with a high African American population. The setting for this study changed from the setting of the previous pilot studies due to Ms. Smythe changing school locations. Based on the focus
of my study and the results of the previous pilot studies, I had chosen to follow Ms. Smythe to the new school.

Participants

The population was 25 fifth-grade African American students, evenly distributed in terms of gender, and the demographics of the school were considered low-income and high-risk. Students were chosen to attend Taylor based upon a lottery system. Parents were highly supportive due to the fact that the selection for student population was limited. The students had no prior knowledge of Ms. Smythe or her classroom procedures because this was Ms. Smythe's first year at Taylor School. A member check was also conducted and there were no students entering Ms. Smythe's class from the Professional Development School.

Data Collection

Scheduling the data collection. Data collection occurred in Ms. Smythe's classroom using the three-phase cultural model, video/audio taping, observations, and the collection of fieldnotes. The setting of the implementation of the three-phase model provided students with a natural and comfortable environment. Remaining in a setting familiar to them allowed for the greatest amount of comfortability and the least amount of distractions. Phase one and phase two involved whole group participation.

The focus group interviews and audio taping of these interviews occurred directly outside of the classroom. This insured student privacy and confidentiality. The focus group consisted of six students randomly selected, based on a class list where gender and prior student background was unknown.
The same focus group was interviewed each time the three-phase model was implemented. This was done to note the progression among community members about the meaning of a democratic community from the individual (student) to the collective (group).

The schedule for data collection was consistent (see Appendix L for description). The three-phase model was conducted three times, at six to eight week intervals between implementation. When conducted, the model was administered in three consecutive days to promote consistency. Prior research had concluded that ways of constructing a democratic classroom community meant that the relationships should carry beyond the confines of social portion (Putney & Floriani, 1999; Putney, 1996). The norms constructed should be incorporated into the academic areas as well. Therefore, academic areas, such as math and literature, as well as the classroom norms, were observed and recorded as a follow-up to see if community transferred to academic areas as well to support validity. There was a total of fifteen classroom visits including nine visits utilizing the cultural model and six visits utilizing observations and fieldnotes. Data collection was completed by January 1, 2003.

**Using of audio and video recording.** Aside from the three-phase model and interviewing, video and audio recording were also incorporated as part of the observations. Bogdan and Biklen (1998) note “...cameras [video] have significant potential as a data collecting aid...” (p. 101). Utilization of recording equipment ensured clarity by being able to go back and review the videotape and record the events that occurred during the three-phase model implementation. Watching the videotape, after implementation of the three-
phase model, allowed evaluation of the actions, body language, tone of voice, and other aspects of the participants not focused on while implementing the phases. This type of review also provided the means to go back to interview records and transcribe student statements, verbatim. The methods of data collection provided information about the participants that the three-phase model, alone, would not have provided.

Utilizing a cultural model. The utilization of a three-phase cultural model was based upon the work of Kronenfeld (1985, 1992, 1996) and was used in the study. Since the cultural model originated from an anthropological perspective, it was used only as an instrument to collect data. The cultural model substantiated the focus of this study by specifically examining the use of terminology. Further, the cultural model supported the qualitative methodology of this study by examining terminology through the use of open-ended questions, focus group interviews, and researcher coding of terms to see if patterns emerge. During the first phase, known as free listing, students were individually given a Community Questionnaire and were asked to formulate a list of terms, sentences, phrases, or stories that were associated with their classroom community. The purpose of phase one was to generate common terms associated with classroom community for this particular student culture. Phase two of the three-phase cultural model consisted of transferring the terms generated in phase one onto index cards and having the students sort the cards according to importance. Students, working in groups, sorted the index cards and based on this sorting a salient scale of importance of community terms was generated. During phase two the students also rated themselves on their ability
to work together based on the classroom work ethic rubric. This work ethic assessment was conducted each time phase two was implemented. This assessment was designed to examine whether students become more reflective in their ability to effectively analyze the quality of their individual work within a group. Phase three consisted of a focus group interview containing hypothetical questions, and was conducted in a round-table format, and audio recorded to ensure transcribing accuracy. All three phases were administered within a week.

Data Analysis

Using audio and video recording. Data transcribed during audio and video recording was analyzed qualitatively by organizing the data by reoccurring categories that emerged within the data sets. From a methodological perspective of qualitative research, these categories within the data sets served as a way of understanding how the data addressed the four specific overarching questions that guided the study. Additionally, the concepts of intersubjectivity, intertextuality, intercontextuality, and consequential progressions served as a way of understanding the dynamics that occurred within the classroom through the support of the transcribed and analyzed data.

Using the cultural model. Data collected during phase one was coded by occurrence. If a word only appeared once it was not coded and listed within the salient scale of terms. Words were listed and distributed into the four groups that corresponded to the student community questionnaire. The terms with an occurrence greater than one were listed as part of the words that were used to generate a salient scale for phase two. In phase two, the words from the index
cards were separated into the same four areas as phase one and listed. A salient scale of coding was generated by each of the student group’s sorting of the words. These words were given a number of salience according to their positioning on the list. If the term was decided to be the most important to the group, it received the highest number possible out of the number of words. For example, if Table 6 thought Norms was most important under the category Community Like, and there were ten terms possible in that category, Norms would have received a salient score of ten. Percentages were calculated based upon the total of the numbers in the scale, and divided by the salient number of a specific term. In phase three, the group interview was recorded and fieldnotes were taken. The recording was transcribed and then coded according to terms. As in phase two, a salient scale was created for the terms generated. The terms were ordered according to frequency and if two terms had the same amount, they were given an equal number on the scale. Interviews were open-ended and categories were not used.

Using the cultural model and phase three focus groups to examine interactions. The focus groups implemented during phase three of the cultural model were also transcribed and analyzed to examine the level of the group’s social and dialogic interactions over time. The number of positive and negative interactive occurrences was calculated based upon transcripts and audio interview tapes during the three focus group interviews.

Using the work ethic rubric. The work ethic rubric was based on a classroom work ethic that was posted in the classroom setting. After working in groups during phase two, students were handed a card and wrote the level of
performance they believed they attained as an individual working in their group. 
These were collected and kept separated by groups. The ethic was composed 
of the following four levels including zero:

Level 4: Productive, respectful, collaborates with others, 
craftsmanship;
Level 3: Productive, respectful;
Level 2: Works when reminded;
Level 1: Not working;
Zero: Interfering with others work

Using the listening guide. Brown and Gilligan (1992) utilize a qualitative 
method of analysis referred to as the "listening guide" (p. 25). The listening 
guide method incorporated the use of four types of interview text reading. As 
discussed by Brown and Gilligan this four part reading process occurred as 
follows: (a) within the context of the first reading dominant themes within the 
interview text were traced and the researcher's response to the text was 
reflected upon and identified to guarantee that the researcher was able to 
separate their voice from the voice of the participants, (b) within the context of 
the second reading the focus was on how students describe themselves, their 
work, and their knowledge. Attention is paid to voice of the self, usually 
expressed in the "I" form, and (c) context within the third and fourth readings 
centered on student relationship with teachers and peers.

The listening guide utilized a voice-centered relational and qualitative 
method of inquire and analysis. The listening guide analyzed the use of 
pronouns to see if a relationship existed between the individual and the
collective. The current research used this guide based upon the assumption that dialogue between the teacher and student may have served as a way of interconnecting community to citizenship, and citizenship to self. The methods employed in this study served to answer the overarching questions that guided the study (see Appendix M).

Using "A Telling Case"

"A Telling Case" was adapted from the work of Mitchell (1984) and provided a way of examining the dynamics of the classroom on a microcosmic level. For the purpose of this study, two students were randomly selected from the phase three focus groups and their interview transcription analyzed to examine the development of the students as citizens within a democratic classroom community and the effects of this individual development overtime. Using "A Telling Case" to view the development of the individual overtime could provide insight into the development of the collective group over time.

Researcher Access

Approval for this study was granted by the appropriate university and school committees (see Appendix N). Parents and students were sent an Informed Consent Letter (see Appendix O) that had been successfully returned to Ms. Smythe. Two copies of the form were made so that parents and participants could keep one copy and return the signed copy to the school.

The Role of the Researcher

According to Spradley (1980) the participant observer comes to a social situation in order to engage in activates and "to observe the activities, people, and physical aspects of the situation" (p. 54). During the observation period in
this study, level of involvement was what Spradley (1980) termed as "passive participation" (p.59). This occurs when the ethnographer is present at the scene but does not participate or interact with other people to any great extent. Interaction occurred with the students only during the implementation of the cultural model. During the interview process and the focus groups the researcher role was what Merriam (1998) considered "observer as participant" (p. 101). During this role activities were known to the group, yet participation in the group was control over what information students had revealed. Both roles were qualitative in nature yet served specific purposes based on the goals of the researcher.

The Notion of Triangulation

Denzin (1989) notes triangulation as "the combination of methodologies in the study of the same phenomena" (p. 234). Within a qualitative context, triangulation is open-ended and usually indefinite because the research is based upon phenomenon that is socially constructed (1989). Based upon the nature of this study, data triangulation was based upon Denzin's (1989) ideas about triangulation within two contexts. The two that were utilized for the purpose of this research were: (1) interactive analysis, and (2) within-method triangulation.

Denzin (1989) defined "interactive analysis" (p. 238) as the unit of analysis being the interaction of the participants, not the participants themselves. The context of interactive analysis was a suitable choice of triangulation based on the focus of this study, which looked at the effects of interaction or co-
construction, through the use of dialogue as a tool, which mediated meaning about classroom community for the participants.

This study also incorporated what Denzin (1989) referred to as the “within-method triangulation” (p. 243). This method allowed the researcher to take one method and employ other strategies within that method to examine the data (1989). This was consistent with the implementation of the three-phase cultural model in this study. The three-phase model incorporated the use of a questionnaire and interviews that, along with providing participant information, were used to generate a salient scale of community terminology. “Observers triangulate not only be methodology; they may also triangulate by data sources” (Denzin, 1989, p. 237). For the purpose of this research, triangulation was employed by data sources, to support the validity of the research methods and findings and the integrity of the researcher.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

In this chapter I examined how the teacher and her students formulated and reformulated a democratic classroom community, specifically through the use of dialogue and dialogic interactions. I conducted a total of fifteen visits to the classroom. This chapter examined what I observed during those visits and how these observations addressed the four overarching questions that guided this study. Further, data analysis were organized to examine the following four overarching questions that guided this study:

1. What was the role of dialogic and social interactions in the classroom setting when constructing a democratic classroom community?

2. By what means did the dialogic co-construction of a democratic classroom community support student learning and student ownership of learning in the classroom?

3. How did the use of classroom dialogue facilitate meaning about classroom community membership and citizenship for students in a democratic classroom community?

4. What effects and influences did a democratic classroom community have on students?
Triangulation of data analysis explored these overarching questions by utilizing the following:

1. A cultural model, adapted from the work of Kronenfeld (1985, 1992, 1996), which reflected how the use of dialogue and terminology reflected meaning about a democratic classroom community from the individual students to the collective group.

2. A listening guide, adapted from the work of Brown and Gilligan (1992), which examined the use of pronouns to convey positions of power and ownership within the classroom setting.

3. A work ethic rubric whereby students conducted a self-assessment of their phase two group work based on the classroom community work ethic rubric.

4. Qualitative observations, fieldnotes, and videotaped transcription of the classroom during the implementation of the cultural model, group interviews, and the academic areas of literature, norms, and math.

5. "A Telling Case" of two students during the focus group interviews over time.

The numeric data from the cultural model made visible the degree of saliency and commonality of terms. The dialogic data from the transcription made visible how that saliency and commonality was talked into being. Additionally, the data was viewed from a developmental perspective utilizing intersubjectivity, intertextuality, and intercontextuality, which served as links created between teacher and students. Analysis of these links was viewed in
relation to consequential progressions to see if there was development from the individual to the collective over time.

The Cultural Model: The Role of Dialogic and Social Interactions when Constructing a Democratic Classroom Community

Using the Cultural Model to show Consequential Progressions

A cultural model was implemented during three separate intervals to examine how students took up meaning in their classroom about their democratic community and about themselves as citizens and learners within this community. The cultural model examined specific terminology used by the students as a group (phase 2) and individually (phase 3) over time to see if the terms became more salient from the individual to the group. In all three sets the terms were sorted among top four, mid four, and the remaining low percents. The following three tables reflecting the results of the cultural model were important because if the use of dialogue in a democratic classroom resulted in the construction of common knowledge, then overtime a common saliency of terms selected by the individual and the group would be observed. These three tables represented a time frame occurring over four months. Table 4.1 represented data collected in late August, Table 4.2 represented data collected in mid-October, and Table 4.3 represented data collected in early December.

Set one of the cultural model data showed salience between only two terms between the individual and the group falling within the range of the top and mid percents.
Table 4.1

Terms Generated by the Individual and the Group Using the Cultural Model

Set 1 Initiated 8-28-02

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase Two Sorting (Group)</th>
<th>Phase Three Focus Group (Individual)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work together</td>
<td>Norms/rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and teamwork</td>
<td>Jobs/Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion/talks</td>
<td>Student run</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>Student Responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norms/rules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good attitude</td>
<td>Talks/discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share ideas</td>
<td>High expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens as young adults</td>
<td>Citizens as young adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student run</td>
<td>adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meetings/voting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping others</td>
<td>Prepare for future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning together</td>
<td>Work hard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom Falls</td>
<td>Learning games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Help students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>understand</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The phase two sorting groups chose “norms/rules” in the top four with 9.6% while the individuals in the phase three focus group chose “norms/rules” in the top four with 19.6%. The difference in salience between the group and individual in the top percents was 10%. In the mid-percents the phase two
sorting group chose "citizens as young adults" with 6.7% while the individuals in
the phase three focus group chose "citizens as young adults" with 5.8%. The
difference in salience between the group and individual in the mid-percents was
.9%. There were no salient terms occurring in the lower percents. The average
salience between the matching terms for set one was 5.54. The salience was
averaged to see if there would be a progression between the three sets of
terms collected in the cultural models. There were only two common terms to
the group and individual. Further, there was a greater salience between the
individual and the group-generated terms. This was expected considering it was
the beginning of the school year and the classroom community was in the early
stages of formation.

The second implementation of the cultural model was conducted in mid-
October. During this implementation five terms had common saliency between
the terms that were generated by the individual and terms that were generated
by the group as shown in Table 4.2. By set two, salience between five terms
between the individual and the group falling within the range of the top, mid,
and low percents occurred. The phase two group chose "citizen/leaders" in the
top four with 18.7% while the individuals in phase three chose "citizen/leaders"
in the top four with 12.7%. The difference in salience between the group and
individual in the top percent was 6%. The phase two group chose "work hard"
with 15.7% while the individuals in phase three chose "work hard" in the top four
with 10.6%. The difference in salience between the group and individual in the
top percent was 5.1%. The phase two sorting groups chose "norms/constitution"
in the top four with 9.9% while the individuals in the phase three focus group
chose “norms/constitution” in the top four with 10.6%. The difference in salience between the group and individual in the top percent was .7%.

Table 4.2
Terms Generated by the Individual and the Group Using the Cultural Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Phase Two Sorting Percentages (Group)</th>
<th>Phase Three Focus Group Percentages (Individual)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citizens/leaders</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>Teacher who cares 14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work together</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>Citizens/leaders 12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work hard</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>Norms/Const. 10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norms/Const.</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>Work hard 10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss/talk</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>Discuss/talk 8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>Have sense 8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be kind</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>Good listener 8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try-never give up</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>Learn as a group 6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>Learning and 6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fun</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>understanding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the mid-percents the phase two sorting group chose “discuss/talk” with 9.3% while the individuals in the phase three focus group chose “discuss/talk” with 8.5%. The difference in salience between the group and individual in the mid-percents was .8%. In the low percents the phase two group chose jobs with
4.3% while the phase three individuals chose jobs with 6.3%. The difference in salience between the group and individual in the low percents was 2%. The average salience between the matching terms for set two was 2.92. There was an increase in terms that were common to the group and common to the individual in the classroom community setting. This increase in commonality among terminology was expected as community was beginning to be formulated among members. Further, the salience between set one and set two showed that the gap in salience between the individual and the group was beginning to narrow, meaning that terms generated between the individual and terms generated by the group were beginning to become closely aligned over time.

Set three showed six terms falling within the range of top and mid percents as shown in Table 4.3. By set three, salience among the six terms between the individual and the group falling within the range of the top and mid percents occurred. The phase two group chose “talk things out” in the top four with 14.5% while the individuals in phase three chose “talk things out” in the top four with 12.5%. The difference in salience between the group and individual in the top percent was 2%. The phase two group chose “work together” with 15.3% while the individuals in phase three chose “work together” in the top four with 12.5%. The difference in salience between the group and individual in the top percent was 2.8%. The phase two sorting groups chose “work hard” in the top four with 14.5% while the individuals in the phase three focus group chose “work hard” in the top four with 12.5%. The difference in salience between the group and individual in the top percent was 2%.
Table 4.3

Terms Generated by the Individual and the Group Using the Cultural Model

Set 3 Initiated 12-04-02

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Phase Two</th>
<th>Phase Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sorting (Group)</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work together</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>Norms/jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>Work hard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk things out</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>Talk things out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work hard</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>Work together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen on citizen teaching</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>Student operated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do your best</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>Citizen on citizen teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student operated</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Do your best</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help others</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>Prepare for future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fun</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the mid-percents the phase two sorting group chose “citizen on citizen teaching” with 11.4% while the individuals in the phase three focus group chose “citizen on citizen teaching” with 7.8%. The difference in salience between the group and individual in the mid-percents was 3.6%. In the mid-percents the phase two sorting group chose “do your best” with 7.4% while the individuals in the phase three focus group chose “do your best” with 6.2%. The difference in salience between the group and individual in the mid-percents was 1.2%. In the
mid-percents the phase two sorting group chose "student operated" with 5.2% while the individuals in the phase three focus group chose "student operated" with 8.5%. The difference in salience between the group and individual in the mid-percents was 3.3%. The average salience between the matching terms for set three was 2.48. The decrease in the salience between the individual and the group generated terms, showed that the terms between the group and individual were becoming more closely aligned. This was expected considering the classroom community, by December, had more time to form.

The increase in terms occurring within the top and mid ranges showed an increase in commonality of terms among students. The increase in the use of common terms regarding the meaning of what a democratic community was like and what it meant to be a member of this community between the individual and the group increased over time showing that intersubjectivity, or common meanings and common terms about the community and community members were becoming shared between the individual member and the group. This is important because this progression showed how students in this community were beginning to assume membership overtime.

Table summary. The average salience between the terms appearing in all three sets were calculated between the terms occurring and appeared to be evolving as more concise and succinct. The average salience evolved from 5.45 in set one to 2.92 in set two and 2.48 in set three. The salience between the terms used by the individual and the group narrowed overtime revealing that the shared definitions between the individual and the group were becoming more closely aligned implicating consequential progressions.
Additionally, the terms chosen by the students also showed intersubjectivity. Progressions from the individual to the collective were seen through the use of “democratic dialogue” that supported the meaning about a democratic classroom by using phrases and terms that had a common meaning to all members about their democratic classroom community such as “student operated”, “citizens on citizens teaching”, and “citizens as young adults.” These terms were common to the members of this classroom, creating a link among members. As the terms were continually applied within different contexts of the classroom, the terms continually evolved with new meaning about the democratic classroom community and community membership, supporting the consequential progressions of meaning and membership regarding the democratic classroom community.

*Examining the Interactions during the Focus Group Interviews to Show Consequential Progressions*

Phase three of the cultural model involved a focus group interview. The interview during the focus group was a round-table format that was given to the same six students. The focus group was given a total of three times at different intervals of time. The social and dialogic interactions between the focus group members were observed and recorded. This data was transcribed and analyzed to better understand the social and dialogic interactions that occurred between these students over time. Several findings emerged as a result of this analysis as shown in Table 4.4.
Table 4.4

Focus Group Social and Dialogic Interactions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Group</th>
<th>Interruptions</th>
<th>Signal &amp; Positive</th>
<th>Offers</th>
<th>Positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>reference to another</td>
<td>dialogic</td>
<td>dialogic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gesturing</td>
<td>student's comments</td>
<td>help to other student interaction between students</td>
<td>(+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-30-02</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-18-02</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-07-02</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The social interactions among participants during the interviews showed how students were evolving as effective communicators over time. The (-) symbol represented negative interactions among members and the (+) symbol represented positive interactions among members. Dialogue and dialogic interactions became more centered in the spirit of community and democracy.

In set one students had a high incidence of “interruptions” (5) and “negative gestures” (5) to other speakers. During set one, two students in particular seemed to monopolize and attempt to control the group’s responses to the individual interview questions through interruptions, gesturing, and signals. Examples of these signals and gestures included a student in the group giving another student in the group a “thumbs down” while he was giving his response to the interview question. Additionally, these signals and gestures included a student in the group kicking another student in the group under the table to...
responses he did not approve of. Signals also included the vehement silent mouthing of responses to students to try and get them to change their replies. At one point one student’s signaling was so strong the student I was interviewing stopped in mid-sentence and would not finish his thought.

During set two there were no incidence of “signals” or “gesturing” to try to control responses. The number of “interruptions” (3) among students decreased by almost 50% while students began to exhibit positive dialogic behaviors including helping other students with a word they couldn’t pronounce or referring positively to another student’s comment in the form of acknowledging that they agreed with the student’s response and then often times further elaborating the point.

Set three also had no incidence of “gesturing” or “signaling.” “Interruptions” increased by one only because the third interview offered much more dialogue between students. Reference to another student’s comments in a positive way doubled while assisting a student stayed constant at four incidences. Dialogic interactions occurred during the final set (17). These interactions involved students conducting dialogue with each other. Students would question each other or inquire for further clarification of some point or idea made by the speaker. Before initiating this dialogue students looked to me, the interviewer, for acknowledgment and approval that it was permissible to initiate this type of dialogue. The dialogue was inquiry based and probing in nature. For example, at one point in the interview a student used the word “concept” in regards to teaching. Another student, after asking me if he could ask this student a question, politely inquired stating, “Excuse me, but what actually is meant by a
'concept'? When that student could only provide a vague definition another student, inquiring with me first, asked if he could assist that student in defining that term.

Observations/ Fieldnotes: The Role of Dialogic and Social Interactions when Constructing a Democratic Classroom

The teacher used dialogue with her students as a way of establishing a democratic foundation for students to construct their own democratic classroom community. Observations and fieldnotes were recorded and analyzed from three sets of data, each set representing a separate visit to the classroom to show the student progressions in their meanings about constructing a democratic classroom community. Different categories emerged as a result of the qualitative analysis of the transcription in the three data sets. In the first set of transcriptions three categories of dialogue emerged as a way to view the data. These categories were: (a) establishing norms, (b) having a voice, and (c) expectations. In the second set of transcriptions the dialogue revealed the category of "reflection" as a way to view the data. The third set of data revealed the category of "accountability." Throughout the transcripts, dialogue between the teacher and her students centered on these categories.

Examining Consequential Progressions through the Categories in Data Set One

Establishing norms. During set one, through her dialogue, the teacher began by establishing a clearly defined meaning about the democratic process of
voting on the classroom norms that provided the students with a foundation from which they could build.

"(Ms. Smythe) Could we speak up...now it's time for us to consider them...is it something that you as a person could live with...is it fair or unfair...is it something that will help the community as a whole...let's look at if from that turn...right now it's your turn to listen...weigh the things you want to say" (Transcripts, August 28, 2002).

Her comments were reflective in nature, modeling for the students through her own dialogue the process of reflective evaluation. She didn't just ask if the student wanted the norm or not. She gave examples of reflective thoughts that the students should consider before choosing their norms, making reflection an active component in their own thinking and decision making. Students developed prior understanding about the classroom norms and through the reflective process of having voted on them began to take them up as their own (see Appendix P for description of norms).

"(Sam) Ok...so these are the norms that we came up with."

(Transcripts, August 30, 2002).

Creating a voice. Having a voice in the classroom was another theme that emerged from the transcripts of data set one. Having a voice also contributed to solidifying the democratic foundation that students could build upon. The teacher clearly stated that part of being a citizen was having a voice.

"(Ms. Smythe) Uh...I'm going to tell you citizens you're gonna have to...well we didn't take the 'no's' we should've taken the 'no's' on that first one...you don't sit here passively you either vote 'yes' or not...you
gotta make a decision. . .we’re waiting for your vote. . .You do have a voice. . .because I said in this community you have a voice to express your opinion” (Transcripts, August, 30, 2002).

It is clear that the expectation of active participation in the construction of the democracy in the classroom was required. The teacher required an active voice. The teacher also made clear that the expectation to follow the community norms was still required though students may have voted against them and she allowed dialogue to remain open for students who did vote no to voice any concerns.

“(Ms. Smythe) Now do you realize that these are what we’re going to be working by and living by and though some of you did not vote for them that does not mean that you do not obey them. . .now if you have some problems with it you need to state it now because these are the rules and regulations that we are going to use” (Transcripts, August 29, 2002).

The transcripts supported the idea that the teacher provided students with a sense that their voice did matter, even if their voice was not in agreement with the rest. Students eventually utilized this classroom experience as a means of gaining confidence to express their own voice within the classroom community.

“(Melinda) I think we should not keep it [the norm] because its like saying the same thing but in different words” (Transcripts, August 29, 2002).

Through dialogue the teacher continued to reinforce the democratic ideals of active voice and participation, providing intertextual links that students could draw upon to continually recreate and improve their classroom environment.
Setting expectations. The third theme that emerged from the data in set one was expectations. The teacher clearly outlined and defined classroom and citizen expectations. Further she provided the students with clear examples.

"(Ms. Smythe) I'm not going to be subjected to someone calling your class the worst class that does not know library etiquette...oh no...you're gonna take pride in yourself that you can obey rules and regulations wherever you are" (Transcripts, August 30, 2002).

The teacher made clear her expectation that the norms applied to outside life as well. She not only stated behavioral expectations, she provided the students with the expectation of exhibiting life skills.

"(Ms. Smythe) You will need to use your four life skills: Cooperate, caring, respect, and responsibility. In order for us to create a 'kid operated' classroom we must be responsible for ourselves" (Transcripts, August 28, 2002).

She never stated or demanded to the students that they must obey them, she phrased it as the students could obey them or would need to use them. She further asserted reasoning behind the expectation providing students with the opportunity to see the reasoning behind the idea. Her dialogue allowed her students a choice while revealing to her students that her expectation of them was that they would choose to obey them.

Examining Consequential Progressions through the Category of Reflection in Data Set Two

Discussing the use of reflection. In the second set of transcriptions the dialogue revealed the category of reflection as a way to view the data.
Throughout the transcripts, dialogue between the teacher and her students centered on this topic.

"(Students to Ms. Smythe) Okay today we’re going to count our norms.

(Ms. Smythe) Evaluate.. .we don’t count our norms you’re evaluating"

(Transcripts, October, 10, 2002).

During this same time Ms. Smythe clearly provided a rationale as to why reflective evaluation is an important part of the classroom community.

"(Ms. Smythe) Now how many weeks have we.. .let’s look at this to see if we’re showing any growth from the first week of evaluation for this community" (Transcripts, October, 10, 2002).

The teacher then positively affirmed evaluative reflection by her students and the importance of self-evaluation.

"(Ms. Smythe) That’s better. . .I’d just like to compliment . . .I think the majority of you are really thinking about the performance as a community and you’re just not trying to uh evaluate yourself high in order to have a high week and that is very good you’re looking at it honestly"

(Transcripts, October, 10, 2002).

Reflection and evaluation provided students with a model for critical thinking. The teacher reinforced the importance of critical thinking by reaffirming that a class score was not as important as the component of honest reflection.

Examining Consequential Progressions through the Category of Accountability in Data Set Three

*Discussing accountability*. The third set of data revealed a theme of accountability. The teacher continually reinforced, through her dialogue, the
idea that students were accountable. She framed the accountability to the students themselves not to her.

"(Ms. Smythe) Some of you are in very bad positions [regarding progress reports]. It is not that you don't have the ability...it is your lack of preparation" (Transcripts, December 7, 2002).

She also framed the accountability of her students to others, such as society.

"(Ms. Smythe) Nothing is free...someone is paying for you to be here and you're thanks to them is to make F's. Everything has a day of accountability...you're overall performance will say whether this school is succeeding or not succeeding...are you satisfied with that...with what you're doing? Too many people are working behind the scenes to see that you are successful and you're not even meeting them halfway...you are not doing the best you can" (Transcripts, December 7, 2002).

The teacher specifically described the sources of accountability for her students. She discussed how their performance was being regarded as an assessment of the success of the school.

These three sets of transcripts explored the categories Ms. Smythe incorporated into classroom dialogue as a means of assisting students in developing a democratic classroom community. Within these transcripts the teacher used dialogue with her students to establish the foundation for students to construct a democratic classroom community. Each set of data progressed from foundational (this is what we are/say/do) to reflective (this is why we are/say/do) to accountability (what I am/say/do has these effects).
Using the Cultural Model Focus Group to Examine the Progression of Students as Responsible Learners

The transcription during the focus group interviews was recorded and analyzed to better understand the way students viewed their responsibility as learners in a democratic classroom community. The focus group consisted of six students interviewed in a group setting on three separate occasions. Several findings emerged as result of this analysis.

Examining the first focus group interview. Initially during the first focus group interview students believed that the majority of the learning was the teacher’s responsibility. During the first focus group, the students only came up with two statements that described their responsibilities as learners yet they felt frustrated and angered by what they described as their teacher’s inability to allow them to learn by not just separating them as their last year teacher had done.

"[Last year she would find] out who’s bad and who’s not so bad and [she] just separate[d] us..." (Transcripts, August 30, 2002).

The daily dialogic interactions promoted by the teacher in the construction of classroom democracy, for students, also appeared as a waste of time.

"There’s nothing really going on in this classroom yet" (Transcripts, August 30, 2002).
Students appeared frustrated adjusting to a classroom where democratic ideals would create a more student-centered rather than teacher-directed environment. Students considered the meetings and dialogue to be a great source of frustration and preferred to be separated and told what it was they needed to do.

*Examining the second focus group interview.* The second focus group interview showed a substantial increase in student responsibility for learning. Under the realm of teacher responsibility students discussed it only once as "she teaches us stuff." The rest of the interview students outlined a minimum of at least eight responsibilities as learners. These responsibilities included: (a) students "helping their learning" by raising their hands and asking questions, (b) asking the teacher "do I hear you say" to get a better understanding of the material, (c) being attentive and a good listener in class, (d) talking to your classmates, (e) being honest and a person "of your word", (e) staying positive, and (f) never saying "never mind" because your ideas count. Learning began to be viewed as an individual responsibility within a group experience.

"Our class is learning as a group of studious learners" (Transcripts, October 18, 2002).

Students were also able to identify specific actions when taking responsibility for their learning.

"Students will say 'do I hear you say' and will try to understand more... you need to give 100%... make students take notes so they can study..." (Transcripts, October 18, 2002).
Students also identified that the responsibility of understanding the instruction relied in part on the learner.

"People are not doing...not helping their learning...some of the kids just don't understand and they just sit there and be a seat warmer...If you have a problem you need to ask...you don't keep it to yourself because that's making you not get the concept she's trying to teach you" (Transcripts, October, 18, 2002).

The second focus group clearly showed a shift in progression from teacher directed to student centered. Shared terms, such as "do I hear you say" created a shared meaning in defining what a learner in this particular classroom was like. Students began to connect prior dialogue to the current dialogue of the focus group. This shift from the dialogue in focus group one, showed a type of progression among students and their view as learners.

*Examining the third focus group interview.* The third focus group interview revealed only two teacher responsibility statements.

"She gives us time to study...she brings us up to a higher level"

(Transcripts, December 7, 2002).

These statements were more specific and reflective in nature. The student's were able to acknowledge a specific teacher behavior that produced specific results. In the two prior focus groups students were very vague about the teacher's behavior in regards to their learning.

"She teaches us stuff...you gotta help them understand it..."

(Transcripts, August 30, 2002).
Additionally, students referred to their responsibility as learners from a more social perspective.

“We had a meeting and there was disappointment in the class because of our averages. . .we have to discuss things in our group before we answer” (Transcripts, December 7, 2002).

Students were also able to outline very precise student behaviors in order to be learners.

“They [students] need to pay attention and study a lot. . .take notes. . .listen attentively. . .and work to the best of your ability. . .keep focused. . .get the greatest grades you can by giving 100%” (Transcripts, December 7, 2002).

Intersubjectivity was apparent by students’ reference to “citizen on citizen teaching,” explaining how this occurred when one citizen taught another citizen. Learning was becoming more social in nature for the students. The progression of responsibility for learning moved from teacher directed to student centered to student-to-student centered. This shift was based upon the intertextual links created through common terms and experiences as learners shared by the group as well as intercontextual links, referring to student meetings and applying the context of these meetings to their identity as learners. These links created a consequential progression as students evolved as learners within their classroom setting. In addition, this shift directly related to the shift in teacher and student roles. The teacher began as a guide, setting the foundation for students as community members by providing clearly defined limits and expectations. This role then shifted as the teacher became a facilitator,
relinquishing control of the classroom to the students. Students, confident in their foundation as members, began to take an active role in their classroom community.

**Using the Cultural Model Focus Group to Examine how Students Define Themselves as Learners and Learning in a Democratic Classroom**

The transcription during the focus group interviews was recorded and analyzed to better understand the way students defined learning. Additionally, the transcription was further analyzed to understand how students viewed themselves as learners in a democratic classroom community. Several findings emerged as result of this analysis.

**Examining the first focus group interview.** Initially during the first focus group interview student’s view of learning was vague.

"We get all the work and stuff...we do math stuff" (Transcripts, August 30, 2002).

During this focus group most of the student’s comments centered upon their frustration of not being separated.

"Like they [other students in the focus group] said this isn’t right...we got more work done [last year when separated] than the people who didn’t want to be here. If they tried to get their act together [students who were separated] they gave them the workbook...now in fifth grade it seems like we’re back in third grade because this in not what I call learning” (Transcripts, August 30, 2002).

The intercontextuality from the prior year created a dissonance within the students. They were referencing prior knowledge of what a classroom was
supposed to be like and attempted to apply it to their current classroom, experiencing great frustration in the process. Students anticipated that learning was defined as the teacher's responsibility. They believed that giving other students "workbooks" if they were separated and did not want to learn was also the teacher's responsibility.

*Examining the second focus group interview.* The second focus group was much more specific in nature. Students were able to define their learning in a more concise manner.

"Reading...we are reading for understanding...our learning fits all together...like a sequence...have a teacher teach you in a different way and you'll understand it" (Transcripts, October 18, 2002).

Students also were able to bring the social element of environment into their view of learning.

"A typical day in our classroom community is learning...we have a great learning environment" (Transcripts, October 18, 2002).

Students were even able to access their own knowledge about learning and apply it to what a teacher would need to do to assist students with their learning.

"Make learning fun...keep your teaching fun and they'll [students] be more involved...you should make learning interesting" (Transcripts, October 18, 2002).

A shift occurred in the way students viewed learning. Students were able to define specific ways of being a learner and also were able to begin to view learning within a social context. This shift was based upon prior classroom
experiences and dialogue. Students were able to provide a rationale for their learning. When they discussed reading they talked about how they read for understanding not because it was assigned. They were also able to transfer and apply their definition of learning to how a teacher should teach in order to facilitate learning.

*Examining the third focus group interview.* In the third focus group students were very clear about what they thought about learning. The definitions were very student orientated.

"Kids write goals for what they want to do in the year. . .you can’t take things out of the air and guess about this or that" (Transcripts, December 7, 2002).

Students also began to differentiate types of learning and learning materials.

"[Last year] our tests were ‘kindergarten wise’ . . .not up to our expectations. . .not the highest it should be. . .it [the tests last year] challenged the people who really didn’t get it that much" (Transcripts, December 7, 2002).

Students were also able to compare their learning from last year to this year in a way of explaining why this year was challenging.

"[Last year] we had to study our spelling words. . .but the terms. . .they didn’t teach us no terms. . .no math terms. . .or social studies terms. . .she didn’t. . .we didn’t even think about it. . ." (Transcripts, December 7, 2002).

Students were also able to reflectively define the types of learning they encountered in school.
“If we did learn something it would be out of a song or rote. . . [when defining rote for me] you know how in multiplication you learn how to write like the steps but you are not really understanding what those steps are meant for” (Transcripts, December 7, 2002).

Students were also able to identify the nature of their learning struggles.

“You really have to look at those books [referring to the texts they used last year]. Now we have ones as a class [student is able to even name the publisher]. The other ones didn’t have terms and we didn’t have to think about it” (Transcripts, December 7, 2002).

During the focus group students also began to compare Ms. Smythe to their favorite teacher and attributes that made these teachers like Ms. Smythe.

“Tests were hard. . . they taught us what the meaning was and we read [lists novels that were on a higher level]” (Transcripts, December 7, 2002).

When I asked the students if they liked being challenged they emphatically replied “yes.” Students were much more concise and reflective in nature.

Students were able to actually compare and contrast different learning texts and styles. Students were able to apply new skills and contexts about learning to use them to reflect upon past learning and actually evaluate what didn’t work for them while using this knowledge to figure out what works for them today as learners. This ongoing knowledge progressed through all three sets of data. Learners evolved from very teacher directed, as observed in the first focus group, to student centered, as observed in the second focus group, and
eventually student-to-student centered regarding their teaching and academic learning.

Observations/Fieldnotes: Dialogic Co-construction of a Democratic Classroom Supporting Student Learning and Ownership of Learning

Using Observations and Fieldnotes to Examine the Progression of Student Learning

Ownership of Learning

Throughout the three sets of data the teacher continued to set clearly defined expectations and goals. These expectations and goals centered on the classroom community, citizenship, and learning. These expectations and goals served as a guideline from which students could begin to reflect, develop, and evaluate themselves as learners.

Setting expectations. The teacher set defined expectations of several areas of the classroom community such as safety.

"I just want to remind you that in this community it is safe to give opinions and to take risks when it comes to solving problems" (Transcripts, August 29, 2002).

In addition, Ms. Smythe expressed individual expectations of citizens.

"I don’t want to hear 'oh forget it' when you’ve got something to say. . . in this room what you got to say is valued because your thoughts may help someone else " (Transcripts, August 29, 2002).

She also outlined the expectations as learners in a community.
"You have the right to learn but you do not have the right to keep others from learning... nor do you have the right to keep me from teaching" (Transcripts, August 29, 2002).

Expectations were even defined for group work.

"So we gonna have to go back and first learn how to work independently then I'm going to move you into more smaller groups cause learning must occur" (Transcripts, August 29, 2002).

These expectations provided students with clear guidelines about their role as learners and citizens within the community.

Setting goals. Ms. Smythe conducted dialogue concerning goals by having the students first define what they thought goals were. Through scaffolding the students reached the conclusion that goals were something you worked toward. Ms. Smythe proceeded to have students explain goals and then give examples of some of the goals they had set for themselves.

"(Student) [Goals] are something that you achieve in life... in math [one of my goals submitted] is to work on my number sense" (Transcripts, August 29, 2002).

Ms. Smythe continued by discussing how specific this student's goals were to make them more obtainable. She incorporated the use of scaffolding to enable students to take broad concepts, such as expectations and goals, and apply and individualize the concept to themselves.

Students developing as reflective and self-regulated learners. Students began to engage in reflective dialogic inquiry with each other. Dialogue was initiated between students without the probing of their teacher. This dialogue
encompassed not only dialogue regarding community behavior, but also
dialogue regarding expectations as learners. The progression of students
developing into self-regulated learners and acquiring ownership for their
learning was examined in Table 4.5.

Table 4.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development of Students as Self-regulated Learners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raymond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excuse me but I think this [norm] also goes for our packets. . . if you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>really think about it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That's why I raised my hand [another student who was missing packet]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree with Raymond. If you'd want others to be treated as you are to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be treated you would have turned in your report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like that comment. . . what do you have to say for yourself? [to other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student who scored low on his test]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had an attitude. I didn’t clarify what I was suppose to do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She told you. . . you should have been studying like the rest of us. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. . what do you have to say for yourself?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listen to Ms. Smythe. . . she didn’t have to give us another chance. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. . we all would have flunked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everybody besides Sam should have been studying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you have to say for yourself as a leader?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I should have clarified what I needed to study and studied it</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table reflected the dialogic interaction between the students concerning
their homework packets and test results as a class. The dialogue did not
include teacher input because Sam, the Mayor initiated the class discussion.
The Mayor continually asked for clarification and student ownership of
responsibility of failure to complete their student packets or study for their test by framing his questions as "What do you have to say for yourself?" This type of questioning placed the responsibility on the students, which they accepted as shown by their responses of "I had an attitude" or "I should have clarified." The dialogue in Table 4.5 and the transcripts showed a consequential progression in students as citizens and as learners taking up ownership of their learning. Self-regulation, described as guiding or monitoring your own behavior, could be observed with these students. Students conducted dialogic interactions with each other by: (a) incorporating an honest evaluation of one another, (b) incorporating community standards by connecting their own learning behavior to the classroom norms, (c) defining what the expectations were for classroom leaders and each other, and (d) coming up with their own solutions to their problems as learners. Students progressed as learners based on prior links set by teacher expectations and goals. Students had drawn from prior knowledge to continue to set the same level of expectations and goals of each other.

Emerging Categories Supporting Student Learning and Student Ownership of Their Learning

The academic areas of math and literature were observed and transcribed to determine if democracy and the effects of a democratic classroom on learners transferred. Four prevailing categories emerged from the data collected concerning the organization of teacher and student dialogue. These categories were as follows: (a) team/group, (b) accountability, (c) academics linked with democracy, and (d) expectations. Three sets of data were collected at different times for the academic areas of math/norms and literature. The
teacher used these categories in the dialogue as a way of providing and reinforcing democratic constructs even in the academic areas of the classroom.

*Examining the category of being a team/group in the first data set.* The first set of data collected of classroom math, norms, and literature focused on being a team. This reinforced the idea of being part of or an individual among a group.

"(Ms. Smythe) It is not your garden it is the team's garden . . . as a team you have to water it" (Transcripts, September 12, 2002).

Later this was reflected from students when reviewing their classroom norms.

"It's important to work together because if you don't work together you'll never be a team" (Transcripts, September 12, 2002).

Ms. Smythe also phrased learning in a “we” position supporting the idea that learning occurred as a group.

"What do we as good readers do? Let's all listen so we can get clarified. . . clarify why we turn chapters into questions. . . we really need to get that internalized. . . we really need to own that concept" (Transcripts, October 22, 2002).

Later during the lesson, a student framed a question in the “we” stance, supporting the prior modeling done by the teacher in her method of dialogue to the students. The teacher provided intertextual links for the students to access and create new meanings from. The information provided about being a team concerning the classroom gardens and the “we” position were both reflected later in a student's responses.
Examining the category of being a team/group in the second data set.

During set two of the data collection the context of team was incorporated into academics by the students. Ms. Smythe asked students if there were any other types of problems when discussing the classroom norms.

"(Student) Like if you're having a math problem which you can't figure out you can ask the person that's in your group instead of asking you because the other person most of the time they're listening. ...they were grasping it" (Transcripts, October 23, 2002).

Students drew from intercontextual links to apply the idea of the classroom norm about working together to overcome your problems to academic problems. The idea of working on their academics in community added meaning to the idea of working as a team or group.

Examining the category of being a team/group in the third data set. In the third set of data the class defined team as a group of learners related in community.

"(Mayor) I thought we had a pretty good week this week what do you think? Everybody passed our test. ...took good notes" (Transcripts, December 13, 2002).

Team and group took on an entirely different meaning for the students. When assisting a student who "was on a detour" or having problems, other students offered solutions during literature circle.

"He needs to go back and reread. ...I suggest that you need to go into your book and read for understanding. ...I think you should try to reread
your work when you write it down...you need to read all your notes”
(Transcripts, December 12, 2002).

In data set one, a team applied to students working together on classroom activities. In data set two, team was dialogically applied to the idea of working together to overcome academic problems. In data set three, team was illustrated by students sharing and reflecting on their academic success as a group regarding a social studies test they took as individuals as well as assisting a student who was “on a detour.” The progression of meaning about team was based on prior knowledge through lived experiences in the classroom, applied to current knowledge, which then created new meanings for students.

Examining the category of accountability in the first data set. The second category discussed within the data was accountability. The first set of data directly connected accountability to classroom academics. The dialogue provided a cause and effect for students.

“(Ms. Smythe talking to students) Yesterday as a result of your not listening attentively or making sure that you understood what was being taught many of you didn’t do well on that math exam...when you walk in that door you should come prepared...we all are going to be accountable” (Transcripts, September 12, 2002).

Accountability was first linked to academics, followed by solutions. The teacher did not state that the students didn’t do well on the test. This type of statement may have left students believing they were not smart enough to pass the test. The teacher never once eluded to the idea that the students couldn't pass the
test, instead she offered what she saw as solutions such as listening or making sure the content was understood.

*Examining the category of accountability in the second data set.* The second set of data the teacher provided accountability of expectations followed up with the modeling of reflection as a way of becoming aware and accountable of classroom academic practices.

"(Ms. Smythe talking to students) Cause we've got to understand what we're doing... I want you to get that clear... [calls on student about multiplication]. See you're very bright. Than why are you having problems? Evidently there is someway you are not studying them in a very organized manner... just to glaze over is not studying them... you should have a purpose for why and when you are studying... What is it I want to study today? What is it that I really want to make sure I know when I go in tomorrow?" (Transcripts, October 23, 2002).

Ms. Smythe called on a student first questioning as to why the student did not know the answer. She then proceeded to offer the student a solution by modeling her own reflective thinking as a way for students to grasp what it meant to study. She asked herself specific questions that might be asked while studying to provide students a baseline to work from as well as the modeling which provided an in-depth definition of what studying really required.

*Examining the category of accountability in the third data set.* The third data set involved accountability at the group level. Students initiated accountability with themselves and each other. While discussing the literature terms it became evident that many students did not complete their home assignment. Ms.
Smythe acknowledged and defined the meaning of a home assignment. She further probed and asked why students believed they did not get it done. Students began to volunteer responses.

"I apologize. I looked the first three up that you told us to but the last one skipped my mind...I'm very sorry" (Transcripts, December 12, 2002).

Additionally, this type of accountability could be viewed during the voting on the evaluation of the classroom norms as displayed by one student who believed the voting was not being conducted in a fair manner.

"(Raymond) Excuse me it seems like when one person votes they all vote...they should really vote what they think...if they know what's right" (Transcripts, December 13, 2002).

Students had accountability to themselves, each other, and to the group. The transcripts provided showed a progression from accountability through dialogue from the teacher to the group, the teacher to an individual student, and then from student to student. The teacher modeled reflective thinking for students as a way of enhancing the idea of accountability. Reflection provided a way for students to support their actions and ideas before implementing them. This was seen in the student-to-student dialogue where the student supported his position, even providing a solution of what students should do, as opposed to just making a statement.

Examining the category of academics linked to democracy in the first data set. The third category in the data was academics linked to democracy. The teacher clearly used academics as a way of reinforcing democratic ideals. In
data set one Ms. Smythe connected the idea of good discipline to the students' first writing assignment.

"You're gonna have to explain line by line the essence of good discipline. I don't see the level of your understanding. I hear you say it but you're going to have to live it. What DOES respect mean? What DOES good discipline based on respect mean? What does attitude mean? If it does begin at home how does it begin at home?" (Transcripts, September 12, 2002).

Ms. Smythe also had students compare and contrast themselves with the literary character in the novel they read.

"What are the commonalities. . .similarities. . .differences between me as a reader and my character have. . .what is that ongoing purpose that all of us have?" (Transcripts, September 13, 2002).

Relevance and connecting learning to the real world was a principle of creating democracy in the classroom. Ms. Smythe incorporated the student's world into the classroom by combining academics with reflective assignments that enabled students to inquire reflectively as learners not only about their academic work but themselves as well.

Examining the category of academics linked to democracy in the second data set. In data set two Ms. Smythe talked to the students about herself as an ongoing learner.

"I've got a job to do and I love doing it. What I do every moment counts. I'm also an observer. I'm also a participant. I get feedback-I use that feedback" (Transcripts, October 23, 2002).
By presenting herself as a learner, Ms. Smythe was by providing an academic environment that promoted learning. She used the example of how she herself was a learner to model characteristics of a learner to students by having stated that as a learner she observed, participated, communicated through feedback, and used that feedback for her own learning and growth. Ms. Smythe also used literature as a way helping students understand the importance of developing their own opinion through reflection and inquiry.

"What I'm trying to teach all of you...be very careful when you are giving a judgment and always be able to support it and right now he's supporting his thinking. ...I'm not out to change your thinking I'm out though for you to justify why you're thinking what you are thinking"

(Transcripts, October 22, 2002).

She provided students with a specific rationale as to what she was trying to teach yet let students know what her goal and purpose behind teaching was. Ms. Smythe further elaborated this point by expressing to students how they might stand-alone but if they could justify their thoughts they could feel good about themselves because they had accomplished something. She provided guidelines of what a learner was empowered to do within the classroom setting. She supported and justified those guidelines by providing students with a clear rationale while encouraging students to justify their own thoughts.

*Examining the category of academics linked to democracy in the third data set.* In data set three during the morning norms the class discussed a problem with a particular student. The class, while evaluating the norms for their week, considered this student to be pulling them down. They discussed the situation
as a classroom community and considered not including her in the averaging of the norms. Table 4.6 examined the idea of this reflective problem solving.

Table 4.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linking Democracy to Academics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sam I thought we had a good week [while considering the vote for a norm about attitude]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond We need to think about that Sam...Isabelle [not in class yet] hasn’t really been paying attention to Ms. Smythe and has had an attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students It is the majority of the class right...we can’t let Isabelle bring us down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Then what can you do to help Isabelle through?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smythe Talk to her...she doesn’t like listening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Excuse me but let’s not be so critical. If we are we need to be able to give some suggestions. Just being critical is very easy but to evaluate more objectively is a little bit more challenging...but it’s fair...so if you want to address her negativity than you need to make suggestions that’s workable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Ms. Smythe if she didn’t act up yesterday if she wasn’t in such a bad mood I think we would’ve got a four because everybody passed the social studies test...that showed that they were listening to you because mostly everybody mastered in at 80% and above...and I think everybody took pretty good notes this week too</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Ms. Yes I agree and I’m not negating that. What I’m saying is that when we do criticize we should be able to also suggest ways in which to improve...It helps us all grow. Anyone can be negative but not everyone can be objective...and have a caring attitude and that’s one or our life skills...she’s part of the community you know we gonna have to be more objective...I’m not saying accept that attitude of hers no...that we can’t do...that’s being untruthful to her but we should think about it...ok?
Ms. Smythe reinforced the idea that it was "ok" to evaluate a student but that the students needed to think about solutions in order for this student to be a successful member of the classroom community. Students wanted to separate the student they perceived as a problem, showing intercontextuality. Many students were using the context of last year's classroom experience whereby the teacher separated "problem" students and had categorized them. Students viewed this as a similar problem and offered a similar solution. Ms. Smythe connected the problem to a class life skill and finished the talk by acknowledging and affirming her agreement with the student's concerns but left it open-ended for students to individually reflect upon, transferring the responsibility of this challenge onto them. Unfortunately, the issue went unresolved that day since Isabelle was absent.

Ms. Smythe also incorporated life skills into her literature circles. She challenged her students to incorporate the life skill that their character was using in the novel they were reading.

"What life skills would you say these characters have and why or why not? (Student) I think these three characters have the life skill of being able to survive at a very young age without parents. (Ms. Smythe) I hear the life skill of survival which would be considered perseverance" (Transcripts, December 12, 2002).

Even when students did not directly incorporate the life skill into their dialogue Ms. Smythe used their dialogue to reaffirm their answer and then directly applied it to one of the class life skills. Students were able to use this as a model for future responses.
“(Ms. Smythe) What would you say about Dr. Carter? (Student) Caring and kind because if he wasn’t he would just let them stay on the street. I think he’s caring because he cared over all three of them” (Transcripts, December 12, 2002).

Based on prior dialogue students were able to identify and connect specific life skills to characters, as well as providing a rationale and justification for their thinking. Connecting the life skills to academics provided students with a deeper meaning of what these life skills meant. It encouraged students to critically think about these skills. Instead of just asking what perseverance means, students were challenged to create their own meaning of perseverance and then be able to apply it to the behavior of the character in their novels.

*Examining the category of expectations in the first data set.* The final category that was found in the data was the idea of expectations. In data set one several expectations were found directly in reference to ownership of learning.

“(Ms. Smythe) We really need to own that concept...we really need to get that internalized” (Transcripts, September 12, 2002).

The teacher set high expectations of student learning. She did not make reference to specific questions about their academic learning. Instead she approached their learning with critical learning concepts such as internalization to promote ownership of learning. She also used terms to reinforce the identification of students as learners.

“That’s what I should hear now because we are mathematicians...be thinkers now...” (Transcripts, September 12, 2002).
Ms. Smythe reinforced the use of terminology by students when providing answers in math. These expectations set forth by Ms. Smythe assisted students in owning their identity as learners.

*Examining the category of expectations in the second and third data set.*

During data sets two and three, Ms. Smythe used scaffolding to provide a clear rationale as to why students were expected to use academic terminology in their dialogue as shown in Table 4.7.

### Table 4.7

*Student Ownership of Learning Support by Scaffolding Dialogue*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ms. Smythe</th>
<th>Now in multiplication there are certain components that we use... for example...a carpenter knows his tools doesn't he?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Smythe</td>
<td>If he wants a hammer he calls it a what?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond</td>
<td>Hammer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Smythe</td>
<td>If he wants a chisel he calls it a what?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monica</td>
<td>Chisel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Smythe</td>
<td>Mathematicians do the same ok? So therefore when you're working you should know certain things about that mathematical equation like was is a factor?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ms. Smythe scaffolds the importance behind using the terms within the context of math. She compared math terminology to that of a carpenter. She
created an analogy of comparing the student use of math terminology to a carpenter having specific names for tools he uses to illustrate the idea that the students, as mathematicians, needed to use the terminology that a mathematician would use. Viewing students as mathematicians created a high standard as to how students regarded themselves as learners. Ms. Smythe had her students use the terminology during their dialogue as a way of reinforcing and eventually owning these high expectations of themselves as learners. Additionally, she encouraged learners to refer to themselves in way that further supported the idea of high standards as a means of developing the way students viewed themselves academically.

“You are the experts...you will be the experts” (Transcripts, December 12, 2002).

Students who viewed themselves as successful learners took-up ownership of their learning based on the meaning generated about themselves as learners. This meaning, in part was generated through the scaffolding of academic terminology and dialogue. The teacher set clear and high expectations of what it meant to be a learner in this classroom community supporting student identification and ownership of these expectations as learners through dialogue.

The Cultural Model: Classroom Dialogue
to Facilitate Meaning about Democratic Membership/Citizenship for Students

Using Cultural Model Terminology to Examine ways in which Students Create Meaning about Community Membership and Citizenship
The terms generated from the cultural model were examined from all three occasions of implementation and two specific categories emerged. These two categories, made visible from the data, were either terms referring to group responsibility (G) or terms that referred to the individual’s responsibility to the group (I). An example of a term that referred to group responsibility would be the term “working together” while an example of a term that referred to the responsibility of the individual towards the group would be the term “having a good attitude.” Table 4.8 represents the number of occurrences of the two categories of terms generated during the cultural model implementation.

Table 4.8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Sets</th>
<th>Phase Two Terms (G)</th>
<th>Three Terms (I)</th>
<th>% of Salience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occasion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>50% - G</td>
<td>33% - G</td>
<td>17 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50% - I</td>
<td>67% - I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>20% - G</td>
<td>33% - G</td>
<td>13 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80% - I</td>
<td>67% - I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>30% - G</td>
<td>27% - G</td>
<td>3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70% - I</td>
<td>73% - I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During occasion one, the terms collected from the phase three focus group exhibited a higher generation of individual responsibility terminology. This was attributed to the fact that in the focus group terms were generated through
individual dialogue, not dialogue as a group. It was apparent that in the focus group, the individual felt a greater responsibility to the group based on the occurrences of terms they generated. The difference between the group (phase two) and the individual (phase three) was 17%.

During occasion two, the terms collected from phase two shifted from 20% to group and 80% individual responsibility toward the group. There was a significant increase in the way students, as a group, viewed themselves responsible as an individual within the group. The difference between the group (phase two) and the individual (phase three) was 13%.

During occasion three, the terms collected from both phases two and three exhibited higher percents of the individual’s responsibility toward the group versus group responsibility. The difference between the individual terminology produced in phase three and the group terminology sorted in phase two was significant at 3%. Table 4.8 illustrated that the classroom or democratic dialogue progressed, becoming closely aligned between the group (phase two) and individual (phase three) responses. Additionally, table 4.8 revealed a progression from students thinking as a group, group mentality or peer pressure, to students thinking as an individual within the group or for the good of the group.

Using the Focus Group to Examine Ways in which Students Create Meaning about Community Membership and Citizenship

As a result of examining the data collected during three focus groups, five categories of organizing the data occurred. These five categories were: (a) prior notions and resistance, (b) student run/preparing for the future, (c) student
responsibility and accountability, (d) the role of dialogue, and (e) citizens as learners. The first focus group was conducted in August of 2002. The second focus group was conducted in October of 2002. The third focus group was conducted in December of 2002. The same five categories were used when organizing the data.

*Examining prior notions and resistance in focus group one.* The first category, prior notions and resistance, was created as a result of the underlying and obvious irritation and frustration with Ms. Smythe during the first focus group. The students were experiencing difficulty in negotiating their current classroom democracy and referred back to a prior year where they had been separated as a solution to this problem.

"(Sam) Yeah last year like in the first two days of school we got more work done than we did this whole week because Ms. Jones had already found out like the bickerers and the non-bickerers so she just separated us and then therefore the non-bickerers, the one's who wanted to be here and learn, we got more work done and then the people who didn't want to be here they tried to straighten their act out and they gave them the workbook" (Transcripts, August 30, 2002).

All students in the group, except one, agreed with this statement. The students believed separating was a solution, not realizing that these same students that were together "bickering" this year in the current classroom situation were some of the same students from last year. The students also associated "bickering" or conflict with not wanting to learn. Student dissonance was generated by
entering a democratic classroom where democracy was based upon daily-lived experiences with each other.

When asked if this solution solved the problem or if the "bickerers" always stayed in trouble the students agreed that they believed the problem was solved.

"If they got their act together they could move on the side of the non-bickerers and we got more work done in the first week of school than we did this week because people can't come to explain, argue, bicker, and now we have to preach to the same old same old" (Transcripts, August 30, 2002).

These students believed that the dialogue they were engaging in regarding their norms, work ethic rubric, constitution, responsibilities, and preamble among other things appeared to be a source of frustration and useless arguing, keeping them from their school work.

When asked if the students who were separated last year ever learned to work with other students they replied "yes" but added that it was at the end of the year. A student also added that students could be moved from one side to the other at anytime. This statement provided insight into the student's inability to think critically or reflectively about that classroom practice. They thought separating worked yet admitted that students could be and were moved back at any give point. The students were very teacher centered in the nature of their focus.

Examining prior notions and resistance in focus group two. The second focus group, conducted in October of 2002, used the same five categories
when organizing the data. The first category, prior notions and resistance, appeared much more student centered than in the first focus group. Students were more reflective of their own behaviors and the behavior of others. Students were also able to connect their role in these behaviors.

"People are not raising their hands that’s going against our norms and Constitution. . .First we start our day off nicely and then after that we just start going downhill its like a slope going up and down and there are some people they don't like to listen. I know I'm one of them though I try to do better” (Transcripts, October 18, 2002).

Students had become much more reflective about their behaviors and about their responsibility for their behaviors and the behavior of others. Student comments were much more student centered, focusing on what the problem was or what they needed to do to solve the problem. Students were able to even acknowledge the resistance of others and reflected on the behavior by connecting it back to the guidelines of their norms and Constitution.

**Examining prior notions and resistance in focus group three.** The third focus group, conducted in December of 2002, used the same five categories when organizing the data. The first category, prior notions and resistance, appeared to be more student centered than in the previous focus groups. Students were reflective and much of their reflection centered upon their academics.

“We just had a meeting and there was disappointment in the class because of the averages” (Transcripts, December 7, 2002).

Unlike the first and second focus groups students began to focus and reflect on their performance as learners. This progression was very reflective and very
student centered. Students also used their meeting as an intertextual link to create understanding about the role of the learner in their classroom community.

Examining the category of a student run classroom in focus group one. The second category in the data focused on how the class was student run and prepared students for the future. This category in data set one was limited. Students were very teacher centered in their focus and even when asked what they thought or they wanted they would refer back to the teacher.

"[Melinda] I think it's a shame for the students because Ms. Smythe only has trust in like a couple of people and I think she should have it in all of the class" (Transcripts, August 30, 2002).

The student believed trust was the teacher's responsibility, that the student had nothing to do with receiving it. Further, the students acknowledged the goals of Ms. Smythe wanting to make the class student operated yet fail to see their role in the achievement of this goal.

"She wants to treat us like young adults... if they want to give their teacher a break... they can um... let the kids run the class" (Fieldnotes, August 30, 2002).

The students associated allowing students to operate the class as giving the teacher a break, completely unaware of their role as active members in the classroom community. Additionally, students viewed student participation as teacher centered. Students did realize one of the goals of the construction of the democratic classroom community was to prepare them for their future.
“Ms. Smythe is treating us like this is gonna be our future and she’s getting us ready for like our life” (Transcripts, August 30, 2002).

Students were aware of some of the goals of their democratic classroom yet still failed to see their role in its construction.

Examining the category of a student run classroom in focus group two. The second category focused on the classroom being student run and preparing students for the future. This category also appeared to be much more student centered.

“She relates us to the real world. . . you have to be responsible. . . its not just like you can get the job to be Mayor you have to run for it”

(Transcripts, October 18, 2002).

During focus group one the issue of jobs was the teacher’s responsibility. They were something given away and taken away if students got caught in certain behaviors. The student defined having a job here as first having to be responsible and then running for the job. Intercontextual links about the classroom community structure were made based on the information in focus group one and facilitated the shift in focus group two. Students defined participating in jobs as a student choice and responsibility. Students also appeared to be clear on the types of behaviors a student needed to exhibit in order to run for a job.

Examining the category of a student run classroom in focus group three. The second category referred to the community being student run and Ms. Smythe preparing students for their future. The majority of statements by students supported the community as student run.
"We go over our norms... we have meetings... we add up our norms... all of the citizens... we work together... we have a mayor" (Transcripts, December 7, 2002).

Students clearly took up ownership as members of the community stating how they worked as a community in reviewing norms, having meetings, and working together. Students discussed how they ran their classroom as opposed to focus group two where students still referred to many parts of the classroom structure as teacher directed.

Examining student responsibility and accountability in focus group one. The third category in the focus group data was student responsibility and accountability. To these students, accountability for behavior rested mainly with the teacher.

"She goes hard on us... she never let's us get away with anything... she'll put you in the teaching" (Transcripts, August 30, 2002).

Even when discussing jobs one student referred to the class norm of "choosing what you do wisely" and further added that "if you got caught you would sacrifice your position." Students believed jobs were something given and taken away on the basis of getting or not getting caught on certain behaviors. Jobs were not yet viewed as something earned by being responsible and continued positive behavior. The students viewed the teacher as responsible for a student losing their job. Students believed they lost their jobs for getting caught in negative behavior, not reflectively and critically acknowledging the role of their own responsibility in obtaining and maintaining their jobs.
Examining student responsibility and accountability in focus group two. The third category of data analysis was student responsibility and accountability. Students appeared to take a more active role in their responsibility and accountability as members of the classroom community though still relinquished some of that role to the teacher.

“She has Mayors, City Council, Police, and its just like adults in the real world. They have to follow rules and regulations and if they don’t they have to suffer the consequences just like in Freedom Falls we have to follow the rules and regulations and if not..we have to suffer the consequences..so if we don’t follow the rules and regulations..the consequences are on us” (Transcripts, October 18, 2002).

Students still regarded the community as “her” community when they referred to jobs stating, “she has a Mayor” yet the students clearly identified themselves as responsible and accountable for their own behavior. This identification was linked back to the real world when the students provided the example of how adults also have consequences. This example served as an intertextual link. Students related their own responsibility as members in their classroom community to an adult’s responsibility as a member of society.

Examining student responsibility and accountability in focus group three. The third category of data analysis was student responsibility and accountability. Students took a greater role in their responsibility and accountability as members of the classroom community.
"The Mayor he helps run the class... he helps run the community actually for Ms. Smythe and the Lt. Mayor is like... they're kind of like substitute teachers" (Transcripts December 7, 2002).

Students diverted the responsibility of running the class from the teacher to now the students. In the previous focus groups the students viewed the community as “Ms. Smythe's” community. Students acknowledged the role of the student and the student's responsibility in the classroom as active members in the classroom governance structure.

*Examining dialogue in focus group one.* The fourth category in organizing the data was the role of dialogue. Dialogue was clearly defined by students. Students considered classroom dialogue to be “preaching” and made several references to the annoyances of this preaching throughout their school day. They insisted this “preaching” took away from their learning time. Students believed that the responsibility of dialogue was that of the teacher.

“She'll talk it out with you” (Transcripts, August 30, 2002).

When dialogue was teacher initiated it was considered “preaching.” When dialogue was initiated among students it was considered “bickering.”

*Examining dialogue in focus group two.* The role of dialogue, the fourth category of the data, had progressed from social interaction from student to teacher to also include student to student.

“When a [student] is not making a very intelligent decision then you um you should like... if you need somebody to talk to you should just go and get with somebody because some people in this classroom you can
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really talk to but some people you can't and you have to choose."

(Transcripts, October 18, 2002).

Dialogue was now being viewed as a way to assist a student whereas in focus group one dialogue was viewed as a means of hindering students. The student was able to distinguish between people you could have dialogue with and people you could not while not suggesting separation of those individuals from the rest of the group. Instead the student concluded that they themselves were the ones that had to choose.

Examining dialogue in focus group three. The role of dialogue served as the fourth category of the data. Dialogue progressed from teacher centered to student centered and reflective. Students originally viewed dialogue as a hindrance (focus group one) and then as a way to assist a student (focus group two). The students had begun using dialogue as a way to problem solve and negotiate problems with each other.

"If we have like a problem that happened during the week mostly we discuss the problem...if something bad happens in the week we talk about it" (Transcripts, December 7, 2002).

Students became active, not passive, participants in the dialogic interaction within their classroom community by utilizing dialogue as a means of problem solving.

Examining citizens as learners in focus group one. The final category within this data set was citizens as learners. The students viewed themselves as learners based on teacher behaviors.
“Students should work as hard as they can to please her to like never get in trouble” (Transcripts, August 30, 2002).

Students did not view themselves as learners. They believed their knowledge was based upon the teacher. Their motivation for learning was derived by the fear of getting in trouble.

Examing citizens as learners focus group two. In the final category of citizens as learners, students had begun to identify themselves as citizens that had an active choice in participating in their classroom community and in their learning.

“Well since I joined Freedom Falls Ms. Smythe has helped me on my math because I used to be bad in math and now she taught me a mental way to do math and now I’m better” (Transcripts, October 18, 2002).

Students were beginning to identify themselves as successful learners. This student also referred to “joining” Freedom Falls as opposed to being in a classroom. Joining denoted a choice on the student’s part, followed up by democratic community behaviors.

Examing citizens as learners in focus group three. Originally in focus group one the students believed that the teacher should trust them. During this focus group the students had begun to see themselves and their role as responsible citizens running their classroom, and that responsibility formulated trust by their teacher.

(Melinda) If you wanted a class like ours you need to have a class that your teacher can trust with running the classroom and you have to have
a mature class...you need to prove to your teacher that you can take her out in her learning time” (Transcripts, December 7, 2002).

During focus group one this same student had stated that the teacher should give the students trust. This student showed a progression of her conceptualization of citizenship as being student generated and how the actions of students as responsible citizens earned the trust of the teacher. This perspective, being student centered, made visible the shift in responsibility for earning trust from the teacher to the student.

**Summarizing the categories of data.** Consequential progressions were viewed through five categories that organized the data. These categories reappeared throughout the three focus group sessions. Progression of student reflection, responsibility, and self-regulation were viewed over the three sets of data. Students progressed from being very teacher centered to very student centered in how they participated and viewed themselves as citizens in their classroom.

The Listening Guide: Classroom Dialogue to Facilitate Meaning about Democratic Membership/Citizenship for Students

The listening guide looked at the use of pronouns and was used to examine ways in which students as members and citizens viewed themselves, either as individuals in a classroom or as members of a community. The pronouns analyzed were generated from the questions asked from phase one of the cultural model questionnaire that were distributed to all students and completed.
individually. The students responded to questions framed in a singular "I" stance. Table 4.9 illustrated the results.

Table 4.9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results from the Listening Guide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Set</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Occurrences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>I/Me/My</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>They/Them/Their</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Though the questions were formulated in a singular stance, progressions in responses occurred toward a group stance. In set one singular or the "I" position occurred the highest at 94 with a group stance occurring two below at 92. Set two and three showed an increase in the "We" response with 133 and ultimately 160, almost doubling from the "I" stance. The use of the pronouns shifted from a higher use of singular to a lower use of plural to a higher use of plural to a lower use of singular. Questions were formulated in a singular stance yet progression in responses occurred toward a group stance. This shift in pronoun usage indicated a shift in thinking on the student's part from the "I" to the "We." The students appeared to be taking a group stance in their thoughts.
about their community as opposed to an individual stance in their thoughts about their community. Through pronouns they positioned themselves as a group.

The Work Ethic Rubric: Developmental Influences Affecting Students in a Democratic Classroom

The work ethic rubric was a classroom community rubric, co-constructed by the teacher and students, designed to examine the work ethic of students. This rubric examined the data from phase two in the cultural model when students were working in groups sorting their terms. This work rubric was used to show how the students assessed themselves on their individual work within their group over time.

The ethic was composed of the following four levels including zero:

- **Level 4:** Productive, respectful, collaborates with others, craftsmanship;
- **Level 3:** Productive, respectful;
- **Level 2:** Works when reminded;
- **Level 1:** Not working;
- **Zero:** Interfering with others work

After the sorting was completed in phase two, students received a card and were instructed to evaluate their work as an individual within the group, not the group itself. Results can be examined in Table 4.10.
Table 4.10

*Phase Two Sorting-Work Ethic Rubric*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ave.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>Absent</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set 1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>Members</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2.5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set 2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Absent</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set 3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>3.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.5</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>Members</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.35</td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>14.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>11.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The groups were averaged to obtain an overall average score for the data set. Based on videotaped observations, group behavior during the first set had...
several incidences of negative behavior, as will be examined in the Methods of Sorting Analysis. The first group ranked themselves a 3.57%. During the second data set, all groups had improved with no negative incidences of behavior and groups even created systems of sorting methods. They ranked themselves a 3.71%. In the third data set, all groups were very focused and on-task. There were no negative incidences and systems of sorting increased among the groups. The overall group average was 3.35%, the lowest average out of the three sets. It appeared as the behavior improved the self-evaluation became more stringent. The findings in table 4.10 indicated the groups were becoming more reflective and had higher expectations about themselves and their work ethic ability. This was apparent by the increase in positive student behavior coupled with the decrease in a higher work ethic rubric score. Students appeared to be more critical of themselves when evaluating their own behavior.

Observations/Video Taping: Developmental Influences Affecting Students in a Democratic Classroom

Observations and videotaping were conducted during phase two to observe the methods students implemented to conduct their sorting as a group. Before phase two sorting was implemented, students were only given instructions as to the purpose of the sorting. Instructions were not given as to how to sort within groups. The findings that emerged as a result of these observations and videotaped data are examined in Table 4.11.
Table 4.11

**Methods of Student Sorting**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Set 1</th>
<th>Data Set 2</th>
<th>Data Set 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8-29-02</td>
<td>10-17-02</td>
<td>12-5-02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**(-)** Negative Interactions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discussing/Voting</th>
<th>Discussing/Voting</th>
<th>Discussing/Voting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Games</th>
<th><strong>(</strong>) Systematic Voting**</th>
<th><strong>(</strong>) Systematic Sorting**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raise Hands</th>
<th>Lays each card along the desk</th>
<th>Lays cards along the desk and discusses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(-) No discussion</th>
<th>One person holds up cards one at a time</th>
<th>Stacks cards and then sorts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(-) SHHHHH each other</th>
<th>Puts cards in certain order and reviews</th>
<th>One person holds card up each group member talks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(-) Pulling on cards that other students are holding</th>
<th>Cards are laid out in center of the group</th>
<th>Students defining the terms as they sort them</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(-) Group argues</th>
<th>Hands cards out to each group member</th>
<th>Students review answers and decide as a group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(-) Raise voices to each other</th>
<th>Lists cards numerically</th>
<th>Hands cards to each group member - they take turns discussing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(-) Group member forces hand of another group member up while voting</th>
<th>Group discusses quietly as terms introduced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(-) Group members kicking each other under the table</th>
<th>Cards laid out in center of the group and they take turns discussing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Group reviews and justifies their final choices.
The first set of students had exhibited limited positive methods of sorting their terms and several negative ways of sorting their terms with each other, such as pulling on the cards the other students were holding or forcing the hand of another group member up while attempting to vote on a term. The negative occurrences were not limited to one group and occurred periodically among groups and group members. The second set of data had no incidences of negative sorting behavior. Students were more focused and actually began implementing systematic ways of voting. For example, members of the group agreed to lay the cards in the center of the group and discuss them one term at a time. Another group had one group member hold the cards up like flash cards and the other members took turns discussing them. Students conducted systematic sorting and they often interchanged their method of sorting by a group vote. The third set of data had no negative incidences of sorting and had increased systematic sorting occur within the groups. The sorting also became increasingly complex, including the elements of review, reflection, and justification of answers. Examples of sorting included handing out the cards to each group member and then taking turns discussing them or laying the cards along the desk and discussing each one. Methods of systematic sorting progressively increased across the data sets. Set one contained no systematic sorting methods, set two contained five ways of systematically sorting, one included reviewing, and set three contained nine ways of systematically sorting and one group went back and reviewed by justifying their choices. The student's ability to systematically sort as a group not only increased, but the methods of sorting increased in complexity as well. A microcosmic view of
student development over time will be explored and examined next through "A Telling Case."

"A Telling Case": Developmental Influences Affecting Students in a Democratic Classroom Community

"A Telling Case" (Mitchell, 1984) provided a microcosmic view of the individual development of two students within this democratic classroom community over time. Two students were randomly chosen and their individual statements were analyzed from the three focus groups they participated in. The progression of these two students provided a small view of the dynamics that appeared to occur for the group as a whole. Data from the focus group was analyzed according to the questions given during the focus group interviews. The results provided a telling case (see Table 4.12).

During the first focus group the students were asked specific questions regarding their classroom community. Responses from both students were closely aligned. Both students appeared oppositional to the classroom community practices that were taking place. Raymond appeared to echo the responses of Sam. Some responses however did vary. When both students were asked what was liked best about the community, Sam’s perspective was that the teacher did the monitoring whereas Raymond’s perspective was that the teacher allowed for the students to monitor. When asked what advice to give to a friend Sam advised to have the friend’s teacher talk to his teacher to learn about how to run the classroom community, bypassing student
involvement whatsoever. Raymond advised to follow the rules or there would be consequences. He did not refer to them as classroom norms and still viewed them as rules to follow as opposed to norms to be lived by. Both students believed that the teacher needed to be hard on the students.

Table 4.12

"A Telling Case" Focus Group One

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question (Summarized)</th>
<th>Sam</th>
<th>Raymond</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explain a typical day in your community</td>
<td>We do our norms and then the day goes downhill from there. Ms. Smythe just preaches to us and I don't think she should preach to us every single day. Last year in the first few weeks of school we got more work done</td>
<td>When we go through the steps we get all the work and stuff...like they said we...this isn't right we shouldn't have to do this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain what you like best in your community</td>
<td>She treats us like young adults...she'll monitor us</td>
<td>She will let us monitor the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain to your best friend how to make a community like yours</td>
<td>Always be a teacher...and have your teacher come and she could have a conversation with my teacher</td>
<td>Give people a chance...you gotta have rules and consequences...you need a strong teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What advice would you give a new student</td>
<td>I would tell you to act like a young adult</td>
<td>Practice working as hard as you can to please her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain how I could teach like Ms. Smythe</td>
<td>I would tell you to be bold on the kids</td>
<td>You have to be tough</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In focus group two (see Table 4.13) both students seemed to progress in their comments from being focused on the behavioral aspects of their democratic classroom community to becoming focused on learning within their classroom community. When asked what they liked best about the community Raymond commented that it was the way he was getting to know everybody on a personal level. When asked about what you would tell your friend who wanted to construct a community like yours, Sam advised the student would need to ask the teacher what kind of jobs they would need and stated he would record for the student so the student could go home and study his notes about the community and then present it to his teacher to see if his teacher approved. During the first focus group Sam had stated that the teacher would need to talk to the teacher, leaving the student completely out of the interaction. This time Sam allowed the student to take the responsibility of finding out how to create a community and even offered to record and then allowed the student to take notes from the recording and study them and then present it to his teacher. Sam used specific classroom skills in order to provide ways of gaining access about information regarding his classroom community. He even offered to help in accessing this information. It is as though Sam believed if the student wanted to implement a community the student should gather the information and then check with his teacher. In the first focus group Sam suggested merely that the teacher speak to the other teacher. For the advice to a new student Sam provided detailed, specific suggestions of how to succeed in the community. He also encouraged the student by telling them that in the community they are one. His ideas focused more on attitude and interaction.
Table 4.13

"A Telling Case" Focus Group Two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Sam</th>
<th>Raymond</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Summarized)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain a typical day in your community</td>
<td>A typical day is just us learning</td>
<td>I would say a typical day in our classroom is like learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain what you like best in your community</td>
<td>She relates us to the real world...consequences fall on us</td>
<td>We're getting to know everybody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain to your best friend how to make a</td>
<td>First they would need to ask her what kind of jobs we have or I could just record...he could study the notes and see if his teacher approves</td>
<td>First I would tell my friend that you have to have a strong teacher...strong students and leaders and you need responsible students to decide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community like yours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What advice would you give a new student</td>
<td>I would tell you to stay positive...give all of your ideas...we are one in here</td>
<td>I would tell you to give 100%...she'll get on you for not trying and putting in all of your effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain how I could teach like Ms. Smythe</td>
<td>Never sit down...stay energetic...talk to us a lot students will just face you but they're daydreaming</td>
<td>Be a strong teacher...don't let the kids walk over you...be fun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Raymond, on the other hand, gave suggestions that focused more on academics. He, too, though gave very specific ideas on how to accomplish success. The last question addressed how to teach like Ms. Smythe. Sam assessed student behavior noting that teachers would need to watch for students pretending they’re learning when in fact they were daydreaming.

In the third focus group (see Table 4.14) Sam and Raymond provided very specific actions when asked about a typical day in the community. Raymond recalled having had meetings about bad weeks and how the class talked about what they could do differently. When asked about what they like best about the community, Sam stated he liked the way citizens were able to relate to each other. Raymond talked about how he liked giving and getting respect from Ms. Smythe, and how the classroom was student run. Both responses were relational in nature. They focused on the formation of relationships with each other and with their teacher. When asked about what advice to give a friend, Sam suggested asking the teacher first and then the student should come and observe the classroom community. His answer has progressed from a teacher contacting a teacher, as he stated in the first focus group, to a student helping a student, as he stated in the second focus group, to now a student learning by becoming a part of. Raymond also progressed in his response. In focus group one, he originally stated his class had rules. During the third focus group he now stated that his classroom community had rules that were called norms. He made a clear distinction by re-identifying the rules as norms. In his mind, as stated in the earlier focus group, if there were no differences between the two, he would have just stated them as rules.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Question</strong></th>
<th><strong>Sam</strong></th>
<th><strong>Raymond</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Summarized)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explain a typical day in your community</strong></td>
<td>We go over norms. We have meetings. I was very disappointed in our class... then we talk</td>
<td>We add up our norms and see what we get, if it was a bad week we get a low grade... we discuss what we could do differently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explain what you like best in your community</strong></td>
<td>That all of the citizens were able to relate to each other and can talk... also its related to the real world</td>
<td>Ms. Smythe is a strong teacher, she lets you run the classroom... she lets us make up our norms... she gives us respect and we give her respect and I like that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explain to your best friend how to make a community like yours</strong></td>
<td>Tell them to come in and observe... ask your teacher if you can watch our classroom</td>
<td>You need a strong teacher and kids who are willing to take charge and good rules that we call norms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What advice would you give a new student</strong></td>
<td>Act like you normally act like a young adult and try not to get into confrontations... take notes, listen, do your best, and participate</td>
<td>I would tell that person when you're right and someone else is wrong don't back down... tell what you're thinking... do you best... get great grades, give 100%, study hard and don't be a class clown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explain how I could teach like Ms. Smythe</strong></td>
<td>Don't be boring... and don't yell at students it will stop their thinking</td>
<td>Be a strong teacher, give the person a chance, be able to teach. You can't take things out of the air... at the Art Museum people couldn't answer...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When giving advice to a new student both boys were concise with specific actions and attitudes you needed to take in order to succeed in the classroom. They even offered advice on situational things like supporting your thinking and to not back down and also avoiding confrontations. When asked how to teach like Ms. Smythe, Raymond referred to a trip to the museum to explain the idea of not “taking things out of the air” and Sam advised not to yell at students or it would “stop their thinking.”

The two boys showed consequential progressions in their development about their ideas about what classroom community was like, how to construct classroom community, as well as being a successful member. The class shared a common dialogue. This intersubjectivity could be observed through terms like “stop their thinking”, “take things out of the air”, and “young adult.” These students used these terms and their references to these terms to construct current ideas. These terms and the experiences surrounding these terms provided intertextual links. The example of the museum, holding meetings, and conducting norms provided these students with these links. Raymond was able to talk about grasping knowledge based on his experience at the museum. Sam was able to talk about disappointment with his class based on classroom meetings. These links provided a way for these two students to continually evaluate and reevaluate their meanings about their community and their membership, as seen through the consequential progressions during the focus group. "A Telling Case" provided a means in which to view the specific processes occurring for the individual and the effects of these processes over time.
The cultural model, listening guide, observations, and "A Telling Case" provided evidence to understand the dynamics of the construction of a democratic classroom community. Through dialogue, the teacher and students co-construct the meaning about their democratic classroom community. Major ideas in this chapter related to the use of dialogue to co-construct meaning about a democratic classroom community and the teacher's role as guide and facilitator to enhance dialogic interactions in the classroom setting. Further, the teacher's role continually shifted from guide to facilitator throughout the transcripts. The teacher continually set the foundation for her students as members by providing clear guidelines and limits within the classroom community. Once the foundation for students was built, the teacher maintained the role of facilitator, enabling students to become active participating members in their community. Examining the data in chapter four showed: (a) the democratic development of a classroom community facilitated through dialogic and social interactions, (b) growth in students academically as learners and socially as community members, and (c) the classroom becoming more student-centered than teacher-centered over time. These ideas provided the foundation for the discussion in chapter five. Chapter five discussed the implications as a result of this in-depth analysis of the data.
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to explore dialogic interactions as a means to facilitate the co-construction of a democratic classroom community. This work further examined the idea that a co-constructed democratic classroom, through dialogic interactions, supported student learning, ownership, and membership within a classroom community while having developmental influences upon students. The phases of this study were multiple and consequentially progressive, illustrating cycles of development from the individual to the collective. Additionally, “A Telling Case”, an example of two specific students’ development as community citizens over time, provided a microcosmic view of the consequential progressions on an individual basis. The focus of this chapter was to: (a) provide an analysis of the results of the study, (b) discuss the limitations of the study, and (c) provide recommendations for further research.

*Framework and Methodology of the Study*

The development of learning is a socially constructed process. This study was in response to the need for a research perspective which was multi-layered and included: (a) a foundational theory of development and learning, (b) a cultural lens for viewing the dialogic and social interactions of members over time, and (c) an analytic methodology using within method triangulation to provide a means to construct representational data to inform others.
about ways of revisioning classroom pedagogy.

The research framework that I initiated was from a sociocultural perspective (Vygotsky, 1978; 1986/2000) conceptualizing the effects of socialization, specifically through dialogue as a tool, to examine the collective and personal development of students as citizens and learners within a co-constructed democratic classroom community. In addition, I utilized the ideas of Dewey (1916/1966; 1922/1988; 1927/1954; 1938/1997) grounded in the progressive movement, to explore the effects of a democratic classroom on students as community members, learners, and self-regulated citizens. Further, I examined the developmental influences a democratic classroom had on students by viewing progressions over time.

Qualitative methodology based in a cultural model and listening guide were applied in gathering and analyzing data. This approach combined a progressive perspective of classroom culture with sociocultural theory to examine the effects of dialogic interactions within a classroom to explore over time construction of democracy, and the influences of a democratic classroom community on the social and academic. Further, I utilized four overarching questions that guided the focus of this study. This chapter discussed the implications based upon the data collected and analyzed in chapter four within the context of the following four overarching questions:

1. What was the role of dialogic and social interactions in the classroom setting when constructing a democratic classroom community?
2. By what means did the dialogic co-construction of a democratic classroom community support student learning and student ownership of learning in the classroom?

3. How did the use of classroom dialogue facilitate meaning about classroom community membership and citizenship for students in a democratic classroom community?

4. What developmental influences did a democratic classroom community have on students?

The Role of Dialogic and Social Interactions in the Classroom Setting when Constructing a Democratic Classroom Community

Dialogic and Social Interactions Viewed as a means of promoting a Democratic Community to Classroom Members

Intersubjectivity and "democratic dialogue." Findings of the cultural model suggested that the use of certain dialogic terms and phrases facilitated intersubjectivity in Ms. Smythe's classroom, so that participant's created common meanings about the democratic classroom community and community citizenship over time. The theoretical theme of "experience" supported this idea. Daily experiences of "democratic dialogue" in Ms. Smythe's classroom facilitated common and shared meanings about the democratic classroom community and membership by the group. Teacher and students shared certain phrases such as "citizen on citizen teaching" or "young adults" that were mutually understood by this particular classroom community. Teacher and
students negotiated and renegotiated this dialogue on a daily basis, promoting
group and individual meaning about the democratic classroom community.

*Examining student dialogic and social interactions.* Focus groups conducted
in Ms. Smythe's classroom showed students evolving as successful
communicators based upon the intertextual links formulated through the
dialogic social interaction between teacher to students and students to
students. Consequential progressions of student's dialogic and social
interactions occurred based upon the continual renewal and reformulation of
this prior knowledge. Consequential progressions were observed between
student dialogic interactions during the three focus group interviews. Social
interaction among students evolved, progressing from the extinction of negative
group interactions, such as signaling to control other student responses, to the
increase of positive group interactions, such as assisting with the clarification of
dialogue among each other.

The theoretical theme of “social interaction” supported this idea. Knowledge
of the social world was socially mediated. Ms. Smythe's students were
encouraged to conduct dialogue as a means of learning about effective and
democratic ways of communicating, such as listening to the thoughts and ideas
of others as well as contributing their own thoughts and ideas. Through the
continued social interactions within Ms. Smythe's classroom, students learned
about effective and democratic communication by actively participating in
communication. These skills could not be transmitted from teacher to student by
lecturing and discussing with students as to how they should speak to one
another. In essence, Ms. Smythe enabled these skills to develop and evolve through social interaction within the classroom.

**Discussing Categories of Dialogue**

During classroom observations Ms. Smythe utilized dialogical techniques to assist students in creating a foundation for a democratic classroom. During qualitative data analysis, these techniques emerged into categories. These categories were viewed as a way of understanding how dialogue facilitated meaning for students. The categories found in the transcription of the data were: (a) establishing norms, (b) having a voice, (c) expectations, (d) reflection, and (e) accountability.

**Establishing norms.** When establishing norms, Ms. Smythe clearly defined elements within the democratic process such as voting. She utilized the modeling of her own reflective thinking to enable students to consider the reflective process prior to making decisions. The process of reflection as opposed to transmitting a "yes" or "no" answer encouraged students to clearly develop a sense of ownership of their norms. Reflective decisions enabled students to contribute to the group as an individual, reinforcing a democratic principle. Hence, this reflective practice served as an intertextual link for students in their decision-making ability. When discussing the norms, students linked back to the context of the reflective process they experienced when they were deciding upon them, reminding them that these were their norms. This reflective process became a way of being with text, or intercontextuality.

Students utilized the context of their experiences with their norms, or text, as a way of being a democratic member of their classroom community.
Having a voice. Ms. Smythe also encouraged students to utilize their "voice." Active participation and having dialogue to state any disagreements provided a democratic foundation for students. Student voice eventually became more pervasive indicating that the foundational dialogue the teacher had set served as another intertextual link that the students referred back to in understanding their own voice within the classroom environment. This was shown by the ability in which students began to feel comfortable in expressing their own opinion.

Setting expectations. Ms. Smyth used expectations as a resource for students to clearly define meaning about community and community membership. She continually provided a rationale for the expectations that were set. For example, she discussed the importance of using the life skills and informed the students that the life skills were needed in order for the students to operate the classroom. Setting clear expectations and then providing sound rationale for these expectations allowed students to make informed choices. Informed choice making supports democratic principles. This type of choice making allowed students to maintain the full responsibility for whatever decisions they made.

Utilizing reflection and accountability. The teacher used dialogue to provide students with a model of how to reflectively think about and evaluate concepts, such as their norms. Students actively reflecting and evaluating classroom community concepts supports student accountability. By initially providing a model of reflective thinking and then encouraging active participation, students were free to construct concepts that they were used in their everyday classroom life.
Conclusions. Ms. Smythe used "democratic dialogue" to facilitate dialogical experiences for students to enhance their understanding about the structure and meaning of their democratic classroom community. At the onset of this study, some students believed this dialogue to be an effortless waste of classroom learning time but discovered that through this dialogue, they began to feel a sense of belonging and ownership of their classroom community. Intersubjectivity occurred through the co-construction of commonly shared dialogue among the students, creating an intertextual link within the group. This link bonded students as members and citizens of their democratic classroom community, giving students a resource of knowledge about the group from which to continually draw upon. Additionally, students utilized prior classroom experience of positive versus negative interactions as a means of communicating with fellow students into their current ways of communicating with each other. Intertextuality regarding the ways in which students took up social dialogical interactions with one another provided a link in the consequential progression of students altering their way of communicating with each other over time.

The sets of observational transcripts provided a way of viewing how dialogue precipitated democracy by establishing what Dewey (1916/1966) referred to as common lines, common spirit, and common aims (Chambliss, 1971). The common lines provided a democratic foundation in the classroom through the establishment of norms, voice, and reflection. This provided students with an intercontextual link from which to make reference to when continuing to reestablish their democratic community and themselves as
citizens in this community. They had a solid context from which to draw upon. The common spirit was established through reflection. Students were creating and recreating their own spirit of community through the evolving reflection of themselves and others. The common aims occurred through accountability to self and others. The three developed meaning about democracy and developed over time as a result of further dialogic interactions.

The Dialogic Co-construction of a Democratic Classroom to Support Student Learning and Ownership of Learning

Student Learning supported by Dialogic Co-construction of a Democratic Classroom Community

Students identify their responsibility as learners. Findings of the focus group interviews and phase two terminology implicated that consequential progressions occurred through dialogic interactions in the way the students identified their responsibility as learners as opposed to the teacher's responsibility for their learning. Transcripts from the focus group interviews supported this idea. Transcripts from the first focus group examined student's perspective about and evaluation of classroom dialogue. Initially students regarded dialogic interactions as frustrating and would have preferred to be separated and told what to do. During the second focus group students began to define processes of social interaction and reflect on prior interactions, evaluating what was effective and useful for them as community members, as
well as defining what current challenges faced them based upon prior limitations. Students were capable of outlining specific academic and social behaviors to create student success. Intersubjectivity attributed to the shared and common knowledge about what it meant to be a learner in this classroom by the use of terms and phrases familiar to this particular group such as "do I hear you say" and "don't be a seat warmer." These students evolved as community members capable of successful interactions based upon the intertextual and intercontextual links formulated through the dialogic social interaction between teacher to students and students to students.

Transcripts from the third focus group supported the idea that students had become very clear about defining their learning. Students were capable of differentiating different types of learning, such as the defining of rote learning, in addition to explaining student expectations of learning, as noted by the way they referred to their learning the previous year as "kindergarten wise." Further, students were able to compare prior learning to identify difficulties they were encountering in their present learning.

The transcripts from the three focus groups supported the theoretical theme of "experience", highlighting the idea that active community participation and experiences promoted students to contribute as community members as well as developing reflective thinking. Interdependence occurred as a result of socially provided resources for the students to utilize when actively engaging in the classroom community environment. Ms. Smythe enabled her students to acquire the skills to navigate their academic and social learning independently. She provided lived experiences and social interactions, facilitated by dialogue,
to create links which promoted meaning about a democratic classroom community and citizenship to the individual student and the collective group.

*Student ownership of learning occurs.* The classroom observations implicated students evolving as learners and taking ownership of their learning over time. Dialogic interaction served as a powerful construct in setting the foundation for students to identify as learners. Ms. Smythe used goals and expectations to provide a guideline from which students could begin to develop as learners. Setting clear goals and expectations enabled students to become reflective and evaluative of themselves by providing clear examples of the community parameters. This is supported in transcripts. Students initiated dialogue concerning their class grades and completing class assignments. Students also began to challenge each other about their individual performance on class tests. Throughout the transcripts, Ms. Smythe served as a guide, setting limits and directing students. It is through setting this foundation for students that students began to identify themselves as learners and through identification created an interdependence regarding their individual role as a learner.

*Discussing Categories to Create Meaning and Ownership of Learning*

During the observations of classroom academics the instructor used categories to create meaning about learning for students. These categories were found throughout the transcription of observational data. These categories provided a way of scaffolding the meaning and ownership of learning for students and were as follows: (a) teamwork, (b) accountability, (c) academics linked with democracy, and (d) expectations.
**Teamwork.** Initially, students perceived the idea of a team from the perspective of an individual member of a group. This was reflected by a student's request to make a decision concerning their team's project, without the team being present. The idea of team then progressed from the individual as a team member, to incorporating teams into classroom academics. Students began to relate working as a team to assisting each other with their academics. This was reflected by student's offering suggestions to each other regarding the comprehension of math concepts that initially posed as confusing. Finally, students identified team as being a group of learners related within a classroom community. This was apparent by the class discussion and evaluation of their social studies exam. Students even provided a rationale as to why class members were successful on the exam.

**Accountability.** The concept of accountability of students also progressed. Initially, students connected accountability with academics. Ms. Smythe utilized cause and effect when referencing an exam that students failed. She outlined specific causes such as the inability to listen or not formulating good questions, giving students the opportunity to be accountable by choosing to act on these suggestions. Student accountability progressed through the use of modeling reflective practices. When referencing student's academic challenges, Ms. Smythe discussed the idea of studying by asking herself study questions out loud as a means of defining and modeling the concept of studying to her students. Finally, accountability progressed to the group level. Students began to question each other about their academic performance and abilities.
Linking academics to democracy. The linking of academics to democracy was used as a means of reinforcing democratic ideals, supporting student ownership of their learning. Ms. Smythe incorporated student assignments with democratic ideals, such as the writing of essays on respect or having students compare themselves to the literary character in the novel they were reading. The ideals progressed as Ms. Smythe began to refer to herself as a learner and provided examples of how she developed herself as a learner while encouraging her students to do the same. Eventually, students began to evaluate not only themselves but other community members as well. This evaluation moved from academics to community membership. When the class began to evaluate the negative behavior of a community member, Ms. Smythe provided students with a way of thinking more critically about it, not allowing separation, as suggested by students, based upon their experience a year prior. She encouraged students to go beyond and problem solve. Additionally, she used a life skill to justify her connection. Using the life skills as common terms created intersubjectivity for students to use as a resource. Students were shown a situation where they needed to have a caring attitude. This situation facilitated meaning about the life skills for students. This dialogue linked the idea of democratic belonging in the classroom. Ms. Smythe let students know that regardless of attitude, they each had a right to be there and if a citizen in the community was struggling, helping that citizen was their responsibility.

Expectations. The idea of expectations progressed throughout the transcripts. Initially, expectations were linked to learning. Students referred to themselves and each other as mathematicians, supporting this idea.
Expectations progressed through the use of scaffolding. When discussing the importance of math terminology, Ms. Smythe would scaffold the idea by posing questions to the students regarding the way a carpenter referred to tools by name. She drew the analogy of a carpenter to a mathematician concluding that the students, as mathematicians, needed to refer to the correct mathematical terminology. The interactive scaffolding of dialogue allowed students to draw conclusions about the importance of using terminology while creating high expectations for the students as learners.

Conclusions. Based on the observations, the classroom structure supported the idea of an emergent curriculum (Goodman Turkanis, 2001). Students had a safe environment to participate, build knowledge about themselves and others, and become academic thinkers that developed their thinking from casual curiosity to inquiry.

The theoretical theme of "social interaction" supports the idea that interactions provide a source of development of the child's voluntary behavior (Vygotsky, 1978) that denotes significance in understanding the process of social interactions. The traditional role of the teacher as only a guide was put aside. Teacher expectations and goals were set high, allowing learners to view themselves in the same manner. Ms. Smythe's expectations of herself and her students produced high student expectations for themselves. The theoretical theme of "social interaction" supported the idea that learning is done in the context of social partners. Students progressed in the development of taking up ownership in viewing themselves as learners. The theoretical theme of "meaning" further supports that learning needed to be relevant in order for
students to become motivated and interested in their learning. Students began to see themselves as successful learners, which supported student's actions as successful learners, such as exhibiting critical thinking and specific learning behaviors. The theme of "meaning" provided relevance during this process. Students became motivated to participate in activities that interested them as successful learners, acting on knowledge they acquired through social interactions. Students began to understand that they could act on knowledge to produce changes in their classroom.

The use of Classroom Dialogue to Facilitate
Meaning about Democratic Classroom Membership and Citizenship for Students

Examining the Shift from the Individual to the Group Perspective

Findings of the cultural model and listening guide suggested that the intertextual links created through dialogic interactions within the classroom promoted a shift from students thinking about group responsibility as opposed to their individual responsibility to the group. This was supported by the number of occurrences of group versus individual terms used by students during the implementation of the cultural model. Students began to use terminology that related to the individual's responsibility to the group. For example, students began to examine their own attitude when working in a group as opposed to examining the group's attitude. Further, students began to refer to the community in a "we" stance as exhibited by the results of listening guide.
Conclusions. This democratic classroom community created common meanings about a democratic classroom community membership and citizenship over time. These common meanings provided students with a resource with which to draw from in the identification of themselves as members in the classroom community. The theoretical theme of "process" supports this idea. Understanding process is essential when attempting to understand change or development. Ms. Smythe allowed the process of membership and citizenship to develop for students over time by allowing students to encounter daily experiences in the classroom. She encouraged students to work together to overcome their problems with each other as opposed to the solution of separating, which the students themselves viewed as a valid solution at the beginning of this study. This facilitated the progression of students from an individualized or "I" stance to a community-based or "we" stance.

Examining the Shift from Teacher-centered to Student-centered

Findings of the focus group interviews imply that the intercontextual links created through dialogic interactions within the classroom promoted a shift. This shift was centered on the students thinking about the classroom as being teacher-centered to the classroom being student-centered. The categories, from the qualitative analysis, to be discussed illustrating this progression included: (a) prior notions and resistance, (b) student operated / student responsibility, and (c) the role of dialogue.

Prior notions and resistance. Initially, students believed it was Ms. Smythe's responsibility to resolve class conflicts. They were frustrated with her when she
allowed the conflicts to ensue as opposed to separating the students who did
not get along. The students used intercontextual links from their prior school
year in dealing with their current classroom situation. Their idea of school
appeared traditional in the sense that they were accustomed to coming to the
classroom and giving the teacher what she wanted. As the students became
reflective their response to classroom conflicts became student-centered. This
progression occurred from intercontextual and intertextual links made by the
social interactions and experiences in the classroom. Students originally used
their intercontextuality from their previous school year, exhibiting much
frustration. Eventually, students were able to link prior knowledge, for example
the reference to their norms, in solving challenges about their current behavior
and the behavior of others.

Student responsibility. Initially when discussing their classroom, the students
frequently referred to what they believed the teacher wanted. They viewed jobs
as the teacher's responsibility. Initially they did not connect the choices about
their own behavior to holding classroom jobs. They believed that "getting
caught" was the primary motivation for positive behavior. They initially believed
that allowing students to run a classroom was an attempt at "giving the teacher
a break." Students were unaware of the active role they played in the
formulation of their classroom community.

The role of dialogue. Students viewed themselves in the passive role,
believing dialogue should only be teacher not student initiated. Students
considered dialogue as social interaction but limited to only between student to
teacher. Based on intertextual links, such as class meetings, academic
dialogue, and classroom norms, students began to see dialogue as a way to negotiate and create meaning. As students increased their participation in classroom dialogue, the decision and responsibility of dialogic interaction centered on the student.

Conclusions. The theoretical theme of "meaning" and "experience" supports these ideas. Ms. Smythe facilitated a student-centered environment, allowing students as members to engage in social and academic experiences that were meaningful. This created an important desire to further contribute to that learning. This applied not only to academics, but learning about themselves, others, and becoming citizens in their community. Experience is a requirement for a deep and thoughtful democratic classroom community whereby students are having daily, lived experiences together. Experiences as well as the learning must be meaningful in order for students to participate. Based on this premise, students were able to define participating in jobs as a student choice and responsibility, as supported by transcripts. Additionally, students developed clear definitions of behaviors and responsibilities needed to operate their classroom community. By creating a meaningful environment and providing students with relevant experiences, students were required to think critically, reflectively, and democratically about themselves.
Developmental Influences Affecting Students in a Democratic Classroom

Students Become Self-regulated as Learners

Examing work ethic. During the sorting phase of the cultural model, students were asked to assess their individual work within the group. The results of this assessment revealed how students were beginning to regulate their individual performance within the group. Progressions could be seen regarding the student's ability to assess and reflect on behavior. The analysis of the work ethic rubric indicated that the students scored themselves lower as their behavior improved, suggesting the students had higher expectations of themselves.

Examining methods of student sorting. During the cultural model phase two group work students were able to develop systematic ways of sorting and organizing their work with each other as a group. The sorting among the groups became more reflective in nature. Originally in set one, groups had a very difficult time negotiating with one another about the choices they wanted to make. Several groups exhibited negative behaviors as a result of their frustrations. The proceeding groups became very focused and were able to discuss and agree upon different methods of sorting that their groups wanted to use. The ability of students working together in groups and the methods and occurrences of systematic sorting progressed over time.

Conclusions. The theoretical theme of "experience" supports this idea. Experience refers to the continual renewal of social life. The way students experienced their ability to work in groups and evaluate that work was
continually re-evaluated because it was changing. If students did not actively reflect upon their own behavior the behavior would not change unless some outside source promoted change. During the sorting sessions I allowed students to work as a group with no distractions, suggestions, or interruptions. I instructed the students as to what they would be sorting but how they sorted was left up to them. It was apparent through the analysis of the work ethic rubric that student group behaviors had changed. They were not working in groups for their teacher, Ms. Smythe, they were working in groups for me. If the teacher were the only determent of the behavior than they would not have shown the marked improvement that they did during the sorting.

Self-regulation has been identified as the ability to monitor or guide your own behavior. The research results of this study supported the idea that the construction of a democratic classroom and the interdependence offered to students promoted the development of self-regulation. Students that are given free reign do not necessarily develop into self-regulated students. The teacher must be willing to function as a guide and facilitator and be willing to be flexible in these roles. Observational data reflected that Ms. Smythe, in her classroom practices, was willing to relinquish control and shift to her role as a facilitator, after providing her students with meaningful experiences and social interactions that would encourage them to become interdependent. The development of students was a pervasive theme throughout this research. Students were continuing to develop over time into learners and citizens. Self-regulation was not only limited to behavior, students also began to regulated their academics and their academic activities.
A microcosmic view of the development of self-regulation through "A Telling Case." "A Telling Case" provided a way to closely view the developmental process that two students experienced within their democratic classroom environment. The theoretical themes of "process" and "meaning" were significant to the findings. Both students initially experienced dissonance and frustration with the democratic process this teacher was initiating in the classroom. Both students had traditional ideas and traditional student roles and wanted to maintain these ideas and roles. Through the course of about four months, these two students evolved with their ideas and meanings about classroom community, citizenship, and learning. Concepts about self were developed and redeveloped. Ms. Smythe provided these students with clearly defined constructs to develop from. "A Telling Case" made clear just how vital the process and meaning really was for these students and illustrated how knowledge could be generated from two students that may have served as representative of the classroom. Though Ms. Smyth supported positive student development, progressions in the classroom could also occur negatively, as seen by the student's reference to the teacher who had separated students as a way of solving a classroom behavioral problem. The message that was sent to students was enormous. This could be seen by the way students still referred to that type of problem solving in their current situation. Throughout this study consequential progressions were evident, based on common classroom knowledge for classroom members and prior links to this knowledge from experiences and similar situations.
Implications of the Research

The focus of this study was to examine if the ideal of democracy could be successfully implemented in a classroom community setting through the use of dialogue. Roche (1996) defined five components to democracy that I believe are indeed five components found in the classroom of Ms. Smythe. These five components were: (1) personal meaning and reflective evaluation, (2) ownership, (3) cooperation and community, (4) moral and ethical dimensions, and (5) critical awareness. The data from chapter four supported these components and have described how one teacher, without any large expensive curricular programs, implemented an ideal into her classroom resulting in students who may possibly develop into strong citizens. Additionally, Dewey as discussed in previous chapters, discussed democracy as an ideal. Throughout the data the teacher continually implemented democratic ideals within her classroom setting yet did not label them as democratic. She encouraged students to live these ideals in their everyday classroom life. Democracy came to fruition for students through their ability to be heard as equal members within their classroom community. They believed their voice was valid and became confident and active participants within their community socially as well as academically. Additionally, prior studies have supported the importance of social interaction within the classroom as well as the effectiveness collaboration has upon students as social members of the classroom community in addition to the academic success of students as learners. Students were able to become active members of their classroom community through social and dialogical interaction.
Pedagogy plays a very powerful role in the development of classroom democracy, and pedagogical practices can be modeled for new teachers by allowing them to experience classrooms such as the one described in this study. Pedagogical practices are not limited to curriculum and may also include the redefining of the role of the teacher and clarifying when the teacher should be a facilitator or guide. Some classrooms never develop beyond the teacher as a guide. This study demonstrated that democratic ideals can be developed in a classroom where students are encouraged to participate and feel a sense of belonging. Though imperfect, democratic ideals lay a foundation for the possibility of one student’s voice to be heard. As expressed by Dewey (1916/1966), we educate indirectly by experience. We need to evaluate the experiences we are creating in the classroom. If the experiences serve as negative, then what kind of democracy is being modeled?

Limitations of the Study

This study is limited by the time frame in which it was conducted. The social and academic development of students was examined within a limited time frame of four months. To examine whether positive changes in the academic and social development of the students were lasting, research throughout the entire school year would need to occur to better substantiate this finding. Additionally, this study was limited to exploring behavior only within the classroom setting. To examine whether positive changes occurred within the development of students as citizens, research of student academic and social behavior in other areas such as specials or assemblies would need to occur to further support the results. This study was also limited to observing only
literature, norms, and math. Further research would need to be conducted in
order to conclude whether or not democratic principles were carried over into all
academic areas and curriculum. In replicating the study, the class size served
as another limitation. The class size in this study was limited to twenty-five
students. This study would need to be applied to a larger group to examine
whether all students would support the dynamics of the classroom community.
If applied to a larger group, different results might occur based on a greater
number of students producing a greater variation.

Concluding Thoughts

What began for me as one simple observation of a classroom community
led to a study that transformed my judgment about democracy in the classroom.
Specifically the teacher never stated democracy, yet democratic ideals were
upheld in the classroom. Thoughts about democracy, for me, conjure thoughts
of freedom. The ideal of freedom provides the foundation for student
transformation. The classroom becomes a student-centered environment,
whereby students are free to express their thoughts and opinions. I believe the
foundation for this transformation occurs mainly in the teacher’s ability to shift in
the role of guide to facilitator. Throughout the study, initially Ms. Smythe served
as a guide, providing students with specific expectations and goals through the
use of modeling and scaffolding of dialogue. Specifically, the use of “democratic
dialogue” provided students with an environment that facilitated classroom
community ownership. Eventually Ms. Smythe shifted her role to that of a
facilitator, allowing students to take-up responsibility and ownership of the
classroom. This shift encouraged students to become self-regulated as
members and as active leaders in their classroom community. This membership enhanced the students' ability to become reflective and critical thinkers about behavioral and academic issues within their classroom community. Observing this progression was an exciting and exhilarating process for me. I began to reflect and think critically about current teacher preparation programs and how important it is for teachers to be able to make that shift from guide to facilitator. Teacher education programs need to provide new teachers with the ability to clearly define these roles in the classroom setting. When conducting a follow-up member check with Ms. Smythe, she commented to me about how her pedagogy now made sense to her after reviewing this study and reading about theory applied to her practices. Her comment revealed that there still exists a gap between theory and pedagogy. Pre-service teacher programs need to provide new teachers with research supporting the roles of teacher as guide and facilitator, as well as modeling and practice of the implementation of these roles. This study made clear that the success of democratic ideals in the classroom is dependent on the teacher. If democratic ideals are to occur in the classroom, teachers need to be educated to support the successful implementation of these roles in their classrooms.

I additionally began to reflect on current practicing teachers who may never be able to make the shift from guide to facilitator, thus creating traditional and authoritarian classrooms that are teacher not student-centered. In order to encourage teachers to shift their roles, I believe the change must occur gradually. Too often teachers are encouraged to implement entire curriculum "packages" or behavior "modification" plans that are all encompassing. Certain
components need to be in place in order to encourage changes in teacher pedagogy. First, teacher training needs to be implemented for new and existing teachers explaining and modeling the teacher's role as guide and facilitator. Once these roles are clarified, teachers need to be provided with the opportunity to implement the shift in their role in a curricular area in which they feel most at ease. Too often teachers are expected to radically change practices they have been initiating for years, leading to a decline in teacher pedagogical change. Most teachers, like most students, want to feel successful. Promoting a collaborative partnership for change within the educational community needs to begin as a process. If this process facilitates students who, as in this study, become confident in their abilities to think and learn by participating in a democratic classroom, I believe the effort and time in this process is well worth the benefits to students.
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APPENDIX B

THE RELATION OF THEORY, CONSTRUCTS, AND THEMES TO THIS STUDY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEMES</th>
<th>DEWEY</th>
<th>VYGOTSKY</th>
<th>QUALITATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXPERIENCE</td>
<td>Everything depends on experience</td>
<td>Social nature of humans</td>
<td>Interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL INTERACTIONS</td>
<td>Chief principle for interpretation</td>
<td>Exploring group interactions</td>
<td>Constructed reality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENT</td>
<td>Interactive conditions</td>
<td>Learning interactive</td>
<td>Setting is vital influence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Examine how students created a democratic classroom through dialogic interactions.
**GLOSSARY OF TERMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terms</th>
<th>Defined for the Purpose of this Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intersubjectivity</td>
<td>Students mutually construct and take ownership of shared understandings and meanings in the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intertextuality</td>
<td>Students make connections between prior text, dialogue, or learning to current text, dialogue, or learning to create a new and deeper understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercontextuality</td>
<td>Students and teachers negotiate everyday life in classrooms and these cultural practices are linked relationally as ways of being or actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequential</td>
<td>Dialogic, behavioral, cultural, and academic practices that are initially enacted on, elaborated and expanded through this action, and then subsequently used as a cultural resource, become more complex.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# GLOSSARY OF TERMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Any group sharing interactions to create meaning about their surroundings, themselves, and others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy</td>
<td>A mode of living that encompasses such ideals as equality, dignity, freedom, the common good, empathy, and caring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Classroom</td>
<td>A way to collectively and individually validate participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>Interchanging of ideas, knowledge, thoughts, and beliefs by open discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>An individual who gives students the necessary skills to navigate their academic and social learning interdependently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guide</td>
<td>An individual who directs or leads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech/Speak</td>
<td>Communicating through words to make desires, wants, and requests known.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk</td>
<td>Express ideas or gossip/chatter into words.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

THE RELATIONSHIP OF THEORY TO
METHODOLOGY- EXPERIENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualitative Research</th>
<th>Dewey</th>
<th>Vygotsky</th>
<th>Relation to this study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;... the naturalistic perspective, and... the interpretive understanding of human experience&quot; (Denzin &amp; Lincoln, 1998, p. 6).</td>
<td>&quot;[Educators] arrange for the kind of experiences which are... more than immediately enjoyable since they promote having... future experiences&quot; (Dewey, 1938, p. 27).</td>
<td>&quot;The social character of human existence and... interpersonal communication allow an individual to rely on the almost infinite pool of experiences of others&quot; (Kozlin, 1990, p. 81).</td>
<td>This study utilizes qualitative research methods to describe, interpret, and understand the dialogical experiences of a classroom.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SOCIAL INTERACTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualitative Research</th>
<th>Dewey</th>
<th>Vygotsky</th>
<th>Relation to this study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“The key philosophical assumption, as I noted earlier, upon which all types of qualitative research are based is the view that reality is constructed by individuals interacting with their social world.” (Merriam, 1998, p. 6).</td>
<td>“[The word ‘interaction] . . . assigns equal rights to both factors in experience-objective and internal conditions. Any normal experience is an interplay of these two sets of conditions. Taken together, or in their interaction, they form what we call a situation” (Dewey, 1938, p. 43).</td>
<td>“In his analysis of Vygotsky’s approach Minick (1985) argues that ‘the links between dyadic or small group interactions and the broader socio-cultural system must be recognized and explored. . . [A]ctions are at one and the same time components of the life of the individual and the social system (Wertsch, 1991, p. 47).”</td>
<td>This study utilizes qualitative research methods to describe, interpret, and understand the way a single unit, or classroom community, is constructed through the use of social and dialogical interactions by classroom community members and how these dialogical and social interactions formulate meaning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ENVIRONMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualitative Research</th>
<th>Dewey</th>
<th>Vygotsky</th>
<th>Relation to this study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Qualitative researchers assume that human behavior is significantly influenced by the setting in which it occurs...” (Bogdan &amp; Biklen, 1998, p. 5).</td>
<td>“An experience is always what it is because of a transaction taking place between an individual and what, at the time, constitutes his environment... The environment, in other words, is whatever conditions interact with personal needs, desires, purposes, and capacities to create the experience which is had” (Dewey, 1938, pp. 43-44).</td>
<td>“... learning awakens a variety of internal developmental processes that are able to operate only when the child is interacting with people in his environment and in cooperation with his peers” (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 90).</td>
<td>This study utilizes qualitative research methods within the classroom community setting to describe, interpret, and understand the way a classroom community is constructed by classroom members through the use of teacher and student dialogue.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PROCESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualitative Research</th>
<th>Dewey</th>
<th>Vygotsky</th>
<th>Relation to this study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Qualitative researchers are concerned with process rather than simply with outcomes or products&quot; (Bogdan &amp; Biklen, 1998, p. 6).</td>
<td>&quot;It was assumed that a certain set of conditions was intrinsically desirable, apart from its ability to evoke a certain quality of response in individuals. This lack of mutual adaptation made the process of teaching and learning accidental. Those to whom the provided conditions were suitable managed to learn. Others got on as best they could. Responsibility for selecting objective conditions carries with it, then, the responsibility for understanding the needs and capacities of the individuals who are learning at a given time&quot; (Dewey, 1938, p.45-46).</td>
<td>&quot;Analyzing process, not objects. The first principle [out of three principles that form the basis of our (Vygotsky's) approach to the analysis of higher psychological functions] leads us to distinguish between the analysis of an object and of a process&quot; (Vygotsky, 1978, p.61).</td>
<td>This study utilizes qualitative research to describe, interpret, and understand the process by which members construct meaning about their classroom through the use of dialogue.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**MEANING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualitative Research</th>
<th>Dewey</th>
<th>Vygotsky</th>
<th>Relation to this study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Meaning is of essential concern to the qualitative approach.....this approach [is] interested in how different people make sense of their lives....[or what is called] participant perspectives&quot; (Bogdan &amp; Biklen, 1998, p. 7).</td>
<td>&quot;Collateral learning in the way of formation of enduring attitudes, of likes and dislikes, may be and often is much more important than the spelling lesson or lesson in geography or history that is learned. For these attitudes are fundamentally what count in the future&quot; (Dewey, 1938, p.48).</td>
<td>&quot;Therefore, the issue of teaching [writing] entails a second requirement... [it] must be 'relevant to life’&quot; (Vygotsky, 1978, p.118).</td>
<td>This study utilizes qualitative research methods to describe, interpret, and understand how meaning is constructed, about classroom community, through the use of dialogue by the classroom community members.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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INCORPORATION OF WENGER'S (ET AL.)
COMMUNITY OF PRACTICE TO A
DEMOCRATIC CLASSROOM
DOMAIN

Co-construction of knowledge

(Students construct a democratic Constitution, Preamble, and norms)

PRACTICE

Specific knowledge about community is shared and developed

(Students reinforce and renegotiate democratic Constitution, Preamble, and norms)

COMMUNITY

Relationship of trust and respect are built

(Students have a sense of belonging through democratic community membership)
APPENDIX F

EXAMINING THE RELATIONSHIP OF THEORY TO METHODOLOGY
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Social Interaction</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Interpretive</td>
<td>Constructed</td>
<td>Setting influential</td>
<td>Process over product</td>
<td>Participant perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dewey</td>
<td>Quality of</td>
<td>Situations</td>
<td>Interactive</td>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Collateral learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experience</td>
<td>experience</td>
<td></td>
<td>conditions</td>
<td>conditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vygotsky</td>
<td>Social nature of experience</td>
<td>Dyadic interactions</td>
<td>Awakens learning processes</td>
<td>Analyze process not objects</td>
<td>Relevant to life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This study</td>
<td>Examines</td>
<td>Views social</td>
<td>Classroom setting</td>
<td>Views the process by which</td>
<td>Examines how meaning is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>experiences</td>
<td>interactions of a</td>
<td>used to understand the way classroom</td>
<td>students construct</td>
<td>constructed about the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of classroom</td>
<td>classroom and</td>
<td>the way classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>members and</td>
<td>how these social</td>
<td>democracy is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>how</td>
<td>interactions</td>
<td>created by</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>experiences</td>
<td>create meaning</td>
<td>members through</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>create meaning</td>
<td></td>
<td>their classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>through dialogue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>by members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G

FIRST IMPRESSIONS BASED ON CLASSROOM SETTING AND MEETING OF MS. SMYTHE

"I made my way down the hall to a room located within a corridor of rooms. On the outside of the door I saw a class schedule and on it the name “Janet Smythe” room 42. I walked in. The radio was playing some “oldies”. I noticed two bright orange chairs with a small table in-between. When I looked at it, it looked like it should be in someone’s living room- it looked comfortable...While viewing the room I noticed the class Constitution and Preamble with the signatures of all the students at the bottom” (Fieldnotes, October 11, 2001).

"Ms. Smythe is a middle-aged, African American woman who speaks with a slight accent. Her dialect, to me, had hints of Jamaican in it. She was about five feet in height, broad shouldered, and had a powerful, commanding voice when she spoke. When I first met her, I found myself taken aback by the power in her voice, yet felt comforted when she greeted me with a warm smile as she gently touched my shoulder. It was as though I was a welcomed guest who came to visit. When she spoke, she spoke to you, not at you. She had direct eye contact and always stood face forward. Not once, while I was in her room observing, did she ever have her back to me or her students. When she spoke of her classroom or her students, a warm expression of fondness appeared to come over her face. Her eyes would brighten and her voice would soften.
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There was a genuine sense of care and concern for her students" (Fieldnotes, October 11, 2001).
COMMUNITY QUESTIONNAIRE

Please answer the following questions about your classroom community. There are no right or wrong answers. You may write as much as you want or as little as you want about each question. You will not be expected to share your answers with anyone, nor will you be asked to read your answers aloud. Your answers will be kept confidential, which means they will not be discussed with other students unless you choose to do so.

1. Describe for me what comes into your mind when you think of classroom community. You can include words, phrases, or stories about your classroom community. What is your classroom community like? If you were telling your best friend, who was not in your classroom what your classroom community was like, what would you tell them?

2. Your classroom community is a part of you. So are your feelings (such as happy, sad, excited...) Tell me how you feel about your classroom community, not what you do but how you feel.

3. Complete the following sentence for me: For students in my classroom, classroom community means that you

4. List all the activities that you believe are part of your classroom community. What are some of the things that you do as part of being in your classroom community?
APPENDIX I

FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEW

1. Tell me about a typical day in your classroom community.

______________________________________________________________________

2. Tell me what you like best about your classroom community.

______________________________________________________________________

3. If your best friend, who was not in your class, wanted to make their classroom community like yours, what would you tell them they would need to do? What would they need to do in order to create a classroom community like yours?

______________________________________________________________________

4. If I were a new student who just became a part of your classroom community, what good advice would you give to me in order to be a successful part of your classroom community?

______________________________________________________________________

5. If I were a student teacher learning to teach like Ms. Smythe, what good advice would you tell me in order to be a successful part of your classroom community?

______________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX J

FORMULATING THE DOMAIN
OF DEMOCRACY AS THE
FOCUS OF THE STUDY

"(Ms. Smythe) …welcome to Freedom Falls Network for Learning….they have learned how to live together- that's because of that preamble…..you won't see a class constitution- that’s not yours- you’re gonna have to develop it….you do have a voice in here because this year your focus is going to be on the court as well as the micro society" (Fieldnotes, July 30, 2001).

(Students are active participants in the construction of their classroom community, denoting democratic ideals by involving student input and active participation).

"Students were invited to develop and participate in a community that was based upon democracy. Based on this democracy, students developed their own classroom government structure. Through this structure, the students became self-regulated '(Ms. Smythe)... she is the CIA person, but there are times when she just raises her hand and when you see that hand raised and its'
not to answer a question what does that mean? Take the verbal or physical signal- stop talking..." (Fieldnotes, July 30, 2001).

(During and informal discussion students describe the components of their classroom as a democratic classroom community).

"Students became very comfortable within this role of self-regulation and took it very seriously. During my observations, I witnessed this self-regulation at the beginning of everyday. When students entered the classroom they were regulated by other students. '(Student) ...take out your stuff quickly and quietly...’" (Fieldnotes, October 11, 2001).

(Based on student involvement, students appear to become self-regulated of themselves and others based upon the democratic freedom in their classroom).

"During this time Ms. Smythe was not even present within the class. Students understood this and accepted it as part of their responsibility to their community '(Ms. Smythe)...this morning I was not even there when they (students) came into the classroom but I guarantee you that they (students) weren't running...’" (Fieldnotes, July 30, 2001).

(The transference of the effects of self-regulation through the process of a democratic classroom community)
APPENDIX K

A DESCRIPTION OF TAYLOR SCHOOL

“My first impressions of Taylor were very positive. Pulling up to the academy came me a sense of professionalism and respect. The grounds were neatly kept, a flag was proudly displayed, as was the Taylor mission statement upon reaching the front of the academy. When I first entered the building there was a large room full of computers. It was obviously the school lab. The colors were deep and rich. The workstations appeared new. The floors had beautiful swirls of deep and rich colors, including brown, burgundy, and burnt sierra imbedded in them. Large cloth banners hung within the computer center. They were brightly rainbow colored. Along the back wall of the center were large clean windows and glass doors. There was a round information counter situated at the front of the lab. Waist high bookshelves enclosed the lab area. The shelves were filled with books and games. I was immediately struck by the atmosphere. It gave me a sense of great expectations for anyone who had attended here. For me, the atmosphere communicated a strong sense of success, almost as if to say ‘you’re worth it’” (Fieldnotes, August 30, 2002).

“The main office was located to the right. I noticed the office was clean and well organized. The colors were very mild, done in shades of gray and blue. There were two cloth chairs with a table located in-between. I noticed
Newsweek and other professional magazines on the table. The magazines were significant to me. The school was situated in a high-risk, low-income area. To me, the magazines again reflected the level of expectations the school held not only about its' students, but about the community as well" (Fieldnotes, August 30, 2002).

“The office was staffed but also had several parent volunteers working. The staff was very friendly and eager to assist me when I inquired about locating Janet’s room. I briefly met the principal, Mr. Johnson, who I observed, was on his way out to greet students as they first walked in. I noticed the students had uniforms of blue pants, burgundy shirts, white or black shoes, and even blue back-packs to match” (Fieldnotes, August 30, 2002).

“At one point I observed the principal talking to a student who did not have on the required colored shoes. As he spoke his words remained kind, yet firm in a soft-spoken tone. He asked the student about their shoes. The student readily admitted they were of the wrong color. He had asked the student what they thought they needed to do to solve that problem. The student said that he could call home and get a change of shoes. The student proceeded to the phone located at the information desk and called to get the required shoes. Mr. Johnson congratulated him on making that choice. It was apparent to me that expectations and standards were the norm” (Fieldnotes, August 30, 2002).

“I proceeded to make my way down the colored halls to the classroom of Janet Smythe. As I entered the radio was on playing “oldies.” The wall to my right was a bright sunflower yellow and burgundy. The Taylor mission statement was posted. Large pieces of blue and burgundy paper were posted with the
following: student work ethics (a rubric listing four levels of student work ethics), respect, team responsibilities, Preamble, and a classroom Constitution. Located next to these were large copies of the U.S. Constitution and the Declaration of Independence. The U.S. flag also hung from this wall” (Fieldnotes, August 30, 2002).

“The wall parallel to the door had a large white board. On one side of the white board was a door leading to the outside. The door had ‘goal getters’ listed. These were small goals listed for students on circular pieces of paper. Some of these read ‘compute’ ‘study’ ‘compare.’ There was a regional map located next to the door. The white board had a detailed classroom schedule listed for the day. The other side of the white board contained a large world map and another poster about team work” (Fieldnotes, August 30, 2002).

“The wall parallel to the Preamble and Constitution was for storage. The wall was a creamy beige brick with forest green cabinets and book boxes for student storage. There was also a sink located at each end of the gray counters on each side of the book boxes” (Fieldnotes, August 30, 2002).

“The beige wall parallel to the white board had the class library containing bookshelves. There were also computers along this wall with a poster above them explaining ‘parts of the compute.’ There was a large bulletin board listing the ‘inquiry process.’ The poster next to the bulletin board discussed how to ‘study smarter’” (Fieldnotes, August 30, 2002).
APPENDIX L

TENTATIVE DATA COLLECTION SCHEDULE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Method of Collection</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 28, 2002</td>
<td>Wed.</td>
<td>7:45 a.m.</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>Phase 1- Free Listing</td>
<td>Whole Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 29, 2002</td>
<td>Thurs.</td>
<td>7:45 a.m.</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>Phase 2- Sorting</td>
<td>Group Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 30, 2002</td>
<td>Fri.</td>
<td>7:45 a.m.</td>
<td>Hall</td>
<td>Phase 3- Interview</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 12, 2002</td>
<td>Thurs.</td>
<td>7:45 a.m.</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>Obs./Fieldnotes (Norms/Math)</td>
<td>Whole Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 13, 2002</td>
<td>Fri.</td>
<td>8:45 a.m.</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>Obs./Fieldnotes (Literature)</td>
<td>Whole Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 16, 2002</td>
<td>Wed.</td>
<td>7:45 a.m.</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>Phase 1- Free Listing</td>
<td>Whole Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 17, 2002</td>
<td>Thurs.</td>
<td>7:45 a.m.</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>Phase 2- Sorting</td>
<td>Group Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 18, 2002</td>
<td>Fri.</td>
<td>7:45 a.m.</td>
<td>Hall</td>
<td>Phase 3- Interview</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 23, 2002</td>
<td>Wed.</td>
<td>7:45 a.m.</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>Obs./Fieldnotes (Norms/Math)</td>
<td>Whole Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 25, 2002</td>
<td>Fri.</td>
<td>8:45 a.m.</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>Obs./Fieldnotes (Literature)</td>
<td>Whole Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 4, 2002</td>
<td>Wed.</td>
<td>7:45 a.m.</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>Phase 1- Free Listing</td>
<td>Whole Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 5, 2002</td>
<td>Thurs.</td>
<td>7:45 a.m.</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>Phase 2- Sorting</td>
<td>Group Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 6, 2002</td>
<td>Fri.</td>
<td>7:45 a.m.</td>
<td>Hall</td>
<td>Phase 3- Interview</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 12, 2002</td>
<td>Thurs.</td>
<td>7:45 a.m.</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>Obs./Fieldnotes (Norms/Math)</td>
<td>Whole Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 13, 2002</td>
<td>Fri.</td>
<td>8:45 a.m.</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>Obs./Fieldnotes (Literature)</td>
<td>Whole Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Questions</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the role of dialogic and social interactions in the classroom setting when constructing a democratic classroom community?</td>
<td>Cultural Model (terminology)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus Group Interviews (phase three)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By what means does the dialogic co-construction of a democratic classroom community support student learning and student ownership of learning in the classroom?</td>
<td>Focus Group Interviews (phase three)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural Model (phase two-sorting)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work Ethic Rubric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observations/Fieldnotes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Videotaping (literature / math / norms)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How does the use of classroom dialogue facilitate meaning about classroom community membership and citizenship for students in a democratic classroom community?</td>
<td>Cultural Model (terminology)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listening Guide (pronoun usage)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus Group Interviews (phase three)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What developmental influences does a democratic classroom community have on students?</td>
<td>Cultural Model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work Ethic Rubric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observations/Fieldnotes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Videotaping (literature / math / norms)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus Group Interview (phase three)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;A Telling Case&quot; (focus group)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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    M/S 3001
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RE: Status of Human Subject Protocol Entitled: Elements of Community:
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This memorandum is official notification that the UNLV Social/Behavioral Sciences Institutional Review Board has approved the protocol for the project listed above and work on the project may proceed. This approval is effective from the date of this notification and will continue through July 26, 2003, a period of one year from the initial review.
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May 8, 2002

Jeanne Klockow
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Dear Ms. Klockow,

Members of the Center for Educational Research and Planning (CERP) have approved your research proposal entitled "Elements of Community." I will forward a paper copy of this letter to you and Dr. Young.

Sincerely,

Gregory Schraw, Ph.D.
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To: Jeanne Klockow  
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From: LeAnn G. Putney, Ph.D.  
Research Director and Liaison to Taylor College Preparatory Academy

Re: Research Study

Date: May 4, 2003

I am pleased to inform you that Taylor College Preparatory Academy Research Committee has approved your proposal to conduct a research study in Ms. Janet Smythe's fifth grade classroom. The study will be completed in January, 2003.

Please make sure that all appropriate forms from parents and students are completed before beginning your study.

If I can be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me at 895-4879.

Good luck with your research.
APPENDIX O

LETTERS OF CONSENT
LETTER OF CONSENT TO PARENTS

UNLV/ Taylor College Preparatory Academy

Dear Parent/Guardian:
I am Jeanne A. Klockow, a doctoral student at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. I would like to conduct a study with your child at the Taylor College Preparatory Academy. This study will involve students in Ms. Smythe’s classroom. The purpose of the study is to better understand how students and their teacher work together to construct the notion of a democratic community through dialogue.

We will guard your child’s privacy by changing his or her name in any paper or conference presentation that may come about as a result of this study. The students will be videotaped August 2002, and at other selected times throughout the year until January 2003. Any video taped images may be shown to other professional educators only for examining student and teacher interactions in the classroom. Students will also be given a questionnaire regarding their classroom community and some students will be selected to be interviewed involving questions about what classroom community means to them. The video data, questionnaire, and interviews will be viewed for analysis by the researcher to select key events for transcription. The videotapes will be contained in a locked facility at UNLV for a minimum of 3 years after completion of the study. After that time they will be destroyed. The transcription will be used in publications and presentations using researcher assigned names to assure anonymity. Each phase of data collection will be short (15-20 minute intervals) and will involve minimal disruption of normal classroom interactions.

Your child’s participation in this study is voluntary. Your child is free to quit participating in the study at any time, and you should discuss the study with your child before agreeing to let him or her participate. If your child does not wish to be video taped or to participate in the study she/he will be excluded from the program. They will be kept out of camera range, and the microphone will be set to pick up the talk on the opposite side of the room. Students who do not wish to participate and other students not selected for specific interviews will be continuing regular classroom activities with their teacher at this time.

Should you have any questions regarding any aspect of the data collection or its purposes, feel free to contact me, Jeanne A. Klockow, at 269-2430 or my UNLV research supervisor, LeAnn Putney at 895-4879. For questions regarding the right of research subjects, you may contact the UNLV Office for the Protection of Research Subjects at 702-895-2794.

I agree for my child to participate in this research project.

Signature of guardian  Date
LETTER OF CONSENT TO STUDENTS

UNLV/ Taylor College Preparatory Academy

Dear Student Participant:
I am Jeanne A. Klockow, a doctoral student at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. I would like to conduct a study with you at the Taylor College Preparatory Academy. This study will involve students in Ms. Smythe's classroom who decide to participate. The purpose of the study is to better understand how you and Ms. Smythe work together to construct democracy in your classroom community.

I will take video information, questionnaire information, and interviews with you and I will analyze them. The videotapes will be contained in a locked facility for at least 3 years after completion of the study. After that time they will be destroyed. Each phase of information collected will be very short (15-20 minute intervals) in length and will involve minimal disruption of normal classroom interactions.

We will guard your privacy by changing your name in any paper or conference presentation that may come about as a result of this study. Those students who want to participate and have parent permission will be videotaped August 2002, and at other selected times throughout the year until January 2003. Any videotaped images may be shown to other educators only for studying student and teacher interactions in the classroom. You will also be given a questionnaire regarding classroom community and some students will be selected to be interviewed involving questions about what classroom community means to them.

Your participation in this study is voluntary. You are free to quit participating in the study at any time, and you should discuss this study with your parent or guardian before agreeing to participate. If you do not wish to be video taped or participate in the study you will be kept out of the program. You will be kept out of camera range, and the microphone will be set to pick up the talk on the opposite side of the room. If you do not wish to participate or are not selected for specific interview you will be continuing regular classroom activities with your teacher.

Should you have any questions regarding any aspect of the information collection or its purposes, feel free to contact me, Jeanne A. Klockow, at 269-2430 or my UNLV pilot research supervisor, LeAnn G. Putney at 895-4879. For questions regarding the right of research subjects, you may contact the UNLV Office for the Protection of Research Subjects at 702-895-2794.

I agree to participate in this research project.

______________________________  __________________________
Signature of participant           Date
APPENDIX P

CLASSROOM NORMS

1. Treat others as you wish to be treated.
2. Pay attention to the teacher and others.
3. Always choose what you do wisely and intelligently.
4. Work together to overcome your problems.
5. Never tell a person no just say, "you're on a detour."
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Elements of Community: Building Discourse in a Fifth Grade Classroom. Invited presentation at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas Annual Doctoral Colloquium (Las Vegas, NV: November 16, 2001)

Practice and Implications of a Correlational Approach to Motivation, Efficacy, and Behavior Research in Teacher Education (with Dr. Tom Sharpe, Hosung So, and Matt Martin). Invited presentation at the Research Institute for Sport Science (Seoul, Korea: June 15, 2001)

Invited Presentations
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