CONNECTING "MAN IN THE MIRROR":

DEVELOPING A CLASSROOM DIALOGIC TEACHING AND LEARNING TRAJECTORY

MAUREEN P. BOYD*

** Graduate School of Education, University at Buffalo*

Abstract

In this paper I argue that dialogic teaching and learning is and involves a stance and comportment toward experience and information that is marked by joint purposes and intertextual ties that are manifest in classroom talk across time and across time scales. I assert that classroom talk practices must be examined in terms of patterned use and uptake; as part of a repertoire of past, present and anticipated discourse practices; and through ways they contribute to an overall classroom community teaching and learning trajectory. For this study I conducted a sociocultural discourse analysis on a daily five-minute activity Song of the Week in an urban second grade classroom community. I investigated ways this activity shed light on a classroom community dialogic trajectory of teaching and learning. I contextualized this activity in terms of selections of Songs of the Week across the year, and as a recurring activity of Morning Meeting. I purposefully selected and then examined the classroom talk around one song, "Man in the Mirror" by Michael Jackson, and explicated planned and in-the-moment intertextual ties that connected content and procedures across events and experiences, and across time. My findings showed how embedded connections within and across talk practices, and predictable but flexible procedures and routines, sustained shared dialogic purposes across interactions. This study is important because it showcases this classroom community's dialogic teaching and learning trajectory to situate and unfold an understanding of dialogic teaching and learning as a "big picture" and idiosyncratic process.

Keywords: classroom talk, dialogic teaching and learning, elementary

Boyd, M. P. (2016). Connecting "Man in the mirror": developing a classroom dialogic teaching and learning trajectory. Contribution to a special issue on International Perspectives on Dialogic Theory and Practice, edited by Sue Brindley, Mary Juzwik, and Alison Whitehurst. L1-Educational Studies in Language and Literature, 16, p. 1-26.

http://dx.doi.org/10.17239/L1ESLL-2016.16.02.03

Corresponding author: Maureen P. Boyd, Associate Professor, Graduate School of Education, University at Buffalo, 576 Baldy Hall, Buffalo, NY, 14260, email: mpboyd@buffalo.edu

"Education is the kindling of a flame, not the filling of a vessel"[1]

"I'm starting with the man in the mirror"[2]

Dialogic teaching and learning is and involves a stance toward experience and information (Haneda & Wells, 2010). This stance is manifest in the attitudinal comportment of the teacher and learner as they engage with each other and with learning (Boyd & Markarian, 2011, 2015). It is instantiated in classroom talk practices, understood across time, and characterized by dialogic purposes and relations. Dialogic teaching and learning is therefore not a linguistic formula; it is not a matter of a single talk move, strategy, approach or lesson, curriculum genre, literacy event, or instructional unit experience. The impact of a discourse format, instructional technique or classroom experience is connected to how it contributes to coherent knowledge building and purposeful understanding and use. Its impact must be understood as part of a whole learning experience. Dialogic teaching and learning is and involves a process of contextualizing and connecting learning moments to the content at hand.

Dialogic teaching and learning can and should employ a repertoire of instructional experiences and respectful talk practices that purposefully work together to engage multiple voices and perspectives, animate and explore student ideas and contributions, connect learning experiences, and advance individual and collective sense-making (Alexander, 2008; Aukerman, 2013; Bakhtin, 1981; Boyd, 2015; Boyd & Kneller, 2009; Burbules, 1993; Nystrand, Gamoran, Kachur, & Prendergast, 1997; Renshaw, 2004; Reznitskaya & Glina, 2013; Wegerif, 2013; Wells, 2001). Curricular content is taught and learned in ways that encourage students to ask questions and develop reasoning and problem-solving skills (Alexander, 2010; Boyd, 2016; Mercer, Wegerif & Dawes, 1999) and to *connect* what the student knows, understands and can do with the new knowledge he or she is encountering (Alexander, 2010). For teacher talk to provide "a cumulative, continuing contextual frame" (Mercer, 2008, p. 37) to support and further those connections, teacher talk must be responsive and purposeful—in the moment, across the school day, and across longer classroom learning timescales (Lemke, 2000).

In this paper I argue that an important aspect of dialogic teaching and learning is a "big picture" classroom dialogic trajectory. While acknowledging individual student learning trajectories (within and across settings), here I am focusing on the coherent and connected, planned and in-the-moment, decision-making of the teacher in a single classroom around the "chains or trajectories of events across which academic socialization occurs" (Wortham, 2005, p. 95). Across time and through ongoing focal and peripheral participation in classroom procedures and

[1] *A variation of this quote has been attributed to Socrates, Plutarch and Yeats. See http://quoteinvestigator.com/2013/03/28/mind-fire/*

[2] *Michael Jackson, 1988.*

classroom talk students are socialized into what counts as knowing, and expected participation and dispositions in a community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Mercer, 2008). In the elementary classroom one way children come to know and understand themselves as members of a learning community is through recurring participation in the varied everyday routines of literacy events (for example, morning message, calendar time, worksheet practice). Children learn what counts in their classroom community through *what* these literacy events *connect* to (including home and school values and resources, curricular content, other activities throughout the day and year); *how* students are expected to participate and the degree of joint purposes and inter-animation of ideas; and *the extent to which* structures and procedures are flexible or developing over time, and applicable and embedded across experiences. Across the sociohistoric patterns of interactions attending literacy events and routines (Boyd, 2012; Boyd & Markarian, 2011; Boyd & Rubin, 2006), students come to understand the degree to which teaching and learning in their classroom community is concerned with a dialogic *how*, a personally engaging *what*, and an inclusive *whose*.

Teachers adopting a dialogic stance wield their agency and response-ability (responsible planning and delivery of needed schooling content and teacher in-the moment and purposeful responsiveness to student ideas and contributions, Rubin, 1990) to design environments and experiences for students that draw students into reasoning and inquiry, and develop a meaning-making disposition. This involves envisioning a dialogic trajectory for teaching and learning in the classroom community—across activity, content and time; and harnessing a robust instructional repertoire to serve the dialogic purposes of this trajectory. Such teachers attend to (and strategically exploit) the dialogic potential of in-the-moment interactions but they also keep firmly in mind a "big picture" rhythm and vision of the classroom dialogic teaching and learning trajectory. In addition to exploratory talk and discussion opportunities, this includes explicitly teaching content, directing student reasoning, and upholding agreed upon structures and processes. These "monologic" moments of instruction, when contingent, responsive, and anticipatory to their learning context, can serve an overall dialogic educational approach (Alexander, 2008; Boyd, 2016; Boyd & Devennie, 2009; Boyd & Markarian, 2015; Boyd & Rubin, 2002, 2006; Lobato, Clarke, & Ellis, 2005; Wegerif, in Matusov & Wegerif, 2014; Scott, Mortimer, & Aguiar, 2006; Wells & Arauz, 2006). Understanding classroom talk through teacher planned and in-the-moment intertextual ties that connect content and procedures across events and across time can shed light on dialogic purposes and relations. Intertextual ties can provide markers of a classroom dialogic teaching and learning trajectory since "The meaning of an utterance or other language act derives from interplay with what went before and what will come later" (Bloome & Egan-Robertson, 1993, p. 309) and looking at how they are referenced and appropriated can point to the "role of longer time-scale constancies and how they constrain, afford and intrude into moment-by-moment activity" (Lemke, 2001, p. 19).

In this paper I tackle the theoretical and methodological challenges of unpacking dialogic teaching and learning as a "big picture" and idiosyncratic process. I conduct a sociocultural discourse analysis of a five-minute daily activity, the Song of the Week, part of the Morning Meeting literacy event in an urban second grade (six and seven year olds) classroom community. To understand how this activity contributes to teaching and learning I consider its patterned use in the context of this classroom community's daily literacy events. I then examine classroom talk across a purposefully selected Song of the Week, "Man in the Mirror" (Jackson, 1988), and take a close look at intertextual ties proposed and acknowledged in the first day's talk (six minutes). My research question asks: In what ways does the Song of the Week activity shed light on a classroom dialogic trajectory of teaching and learning in this second grade classroom community?

1. LITERATURE REVIEW

While research on dialogic teaching and learning recognizes the critical roles of classroom talk and interaction to enact the principles of respectful discourse, open exchange of ideas, engaging multiple perspectives and opinions, and joint critical inquiry, there are few studies that show what this looks like in practice and across timescales. The theoretical and methodological challenges of studying the classroom talk of teaching and learning over an extended period of time have been recognized and acknowledged (see for example Lemke, 2001; Mercer, 2008; Nystrand, Wu, Gamoran, Zeiser, & Long, 2003; Scott et al., 2006). Yet, classroom talk must be understood across time and in terms of repertoire to understand linkages across chains of interactions and events. Further, a particular discourse practice can neither be recommended nor condemned without seeing how it *functions* historically in the learning community in which it is embedded (Boyd & Markarian, 2011; Scott et al., 2006; Wells & Arauz, 2006). Function depends on the purpose of the activity and how it is intended to contribute to the unit as a whole (Wells & Arauz, 2006, p. 419). This is associated with stance toward learning and experience, and must be understood across time.

A dialogic stance is manifest in "how patterns of talk may open up discourse space for exploration and varied opinions, and how teacher and student decision-making about content is presented and discussed" (Boyd & Markarian, 2011, p. 515). For example, to understand stance as manifest through the ubiquitous teacher question, we must unpack whether the intention and function of the question is to refute or seek to understand and strengthen an idea in ways that "promote the capacity and disposition in students to become more effective questioners themselves" (Burbules, 1993, p. 100). To do this we must look beyond a single interaction—to sociohistoric patterns that influence how conversants hear and heed utterances (Boyd & Markarian, 2011, 2015) and to the (non)dialogic teaching and learning trajectory developing as these classroom patterns work together to shape

student dispositions to knowledge and knowing across time and experiences. Mercer's construct of the intramental development zone (IDZ: Mercer, 2008) and Bloome and Egan-Robertson's articulation of intertextual ties (Bloome & Egan-Robertson, 1993) provide a theoretical framework through which to explicate a classroom dialogic teaching and learning trajectory.

When teaching and learning share purposes and common knowledge, teacher and learner are attuned—they have a shared directed outlook—and opportunities for learning are optimized. The IDZ and the metaphor of a bubble represents ways the teacher and learner (or group of learners) "can stay attuned to one another's changing states of knowledge and understanding over the course of an educational activity" (Mercer, 2008, p. 38). As teacher and students move through time the IDZ represents the dynamic, reflexive, contextualizing work conversants must do to sustain shared purposes. The IDZ is constructed in talk through intertextual ties—explicit references to shared experience (current, remembered and anticipated), common tasks and goals, and common knowledge—as conversants share, clarify, connect, and generate meaning. Noting uptake on intertextual ties can shed light on mutual attunement and shared dialogic purposes. The degree to which a teacher's comportment is dialogic is reflected through both use of connecting language that acknowledges and makes significant student contributions and the degree to which the conversational floor is opened up for student contributions (Bloome & Egan-Robertson, 1993). As the teacher responds to, directs, supports, and advances student connections and elaborations, such teacher directive responsiveness (Shor & Freire, 1987) and response-ability (Boyd, 2016; Rubin, 1990) influence not only the scope of talk but the degree of coherence and dialogic relations within and across lessons. This is manifest in intertextual ties among exchanges, and through procedural or conceptual connections among old and new classroom tasks.

> Intertextuality can occur at many levels (eg, words, the organizational structure of texts, register level, genre types, content, and the situational contexts in which texts occur) and in many ways (eg, mixing registers, genres, contents, and social situations). (Bloome & Egan-Robertson, 1993, p. 306).

Lemke (2000, 2001) argues that to understand linkages among events we should look across timescales, and to unpack how patterns and processes function across separate timescales, we should *look one level up*. In other words, to understand interactions, we should look to their patterning within the same literacy event, and to understand the function of the literacy event we should look to the repertoire of classroom literacy events. Across time and dimensions we see the unfolding of "a meaning-making disposition, an attitudinal stance" (Lemke, 2001, p. 20). This disposition is connected to recurring activity, coherent community practices, a developing classroom teaching and learning trajectory. And so, in this study we examine classroom talk in terms of cognitive activity and relations among and across discursive patterns, procedures, and iterations of events across a unit, and across the year.

2. METHODS

The historic and dynamic aspects of sociocultural discourse analysis (Mercer, 2004), the iterative process of moving from macro to micro data framing, and backwards and forwards through time, help make sense of linkages within, among, and across interactions, events and timescales in this study.

2.1 Context and Data Collection

Student participants are second graders in a rust belt Northeastern US city where half of children live in poverty; because of this population, all students in this school district receive free and reduced lunch. In this school district, students speak over 40 languages and only about half of the student population graduate from high school. A sustained district-wide *strategy-in-search-of-success* has been to purchase and require use of publisher materials that heavily script teacher talk. This policy continues despite lack of evidence that supports its effectiveness (Dresser, 2012; Pullen, 2007).

The focal classroom was selected because I wanted to study the oracy practices of this particular teacher. She had been recommended to me, and my initial observations confirmed robust oracy practices in this classroom community. I learned that the focal classroom is located in a lottery charter school that has adopted the Responsive Classroom approach (www.responsiveclassroom.org). As an accredited charter school authorized by the state Board of Regents, it is autonomous from the local Board of Education and the attendant scripted educational approach. The Responsive Classroom approach advocates rich and responsive oracy practices to nurture students' social and emotional development as a pre-requisite for academic success. Social responsibility and connectedness to school and broader communities are explicitly valued and promoted. However, while my literature review of the Responsive Classroom yielded studies based on teacher-reported data such as questionnaires and mock-report cards (Rimm-Kaufman, Fan, Chiu, & You, 2007; Rimm-Kaufman et al., 2013), I could find no classroom-based studies and no examination of classroom talk in classrooms adopting the Responsive Classroom approach. This study thus adds to the Responsive Classroom body of research. My observations in this focal classroom confirmed some Responsive Classroom principles and practices in action. For example, I observed that during first six weeks of school the focus is on community building, and that throughout the year there is connected and on-going learning and practice of key social skills (CARES: Cooperation, Assertion, Responsibility, Empathy, Self-Control). In this school, every classroom community participated in the two literacy events that were a focus of this study: Morning Meeting (Kreite & Bechtel, 2002), and Writer's Workshop (Calkins, 2003; Calkins, Ehrenworth, & Lehman, 2012).

Rachele's Classroom Communities: Data Overview		
2012-2013 2nd Grade	Phase 1	Extended entrée 1st year – field notes and students getting used to video
	Phase 2	Full time data collection Apr-May: 2 months, paralleling 2 WW units
	Phase 3	Rest of academic year, Morning Meeting & Writer's Workshop, special events
2013-2014 2nd Grade	Phase 4	First six weeks of school 2nd year, (only audio) class agreement
	Phase 5	Rest of 2nd year, approximately once a week, Morning Meeting & Writer's Workshop

Two Year (2012-2014) 2nd Grade Data Collection Summary	
Types of data	**Scope**
Field notes written during observations	Over 100 visits
Weekly lesson plans collected	49
Weekly newsletters collected	30
Video & Audio recordings	About 139 hours (83 days)
Video & Audio recordings for Morning Meeting	About 20 hours (73 days)
Video & Audio recordings for Writer's Workshop	About 50 hours (82 days)
Video & Audio recordings of class agreement discussions	About 2 hours (8 days)
Video & Audio recordings of persuasive song writing unit	About 45 minutes (4 days)
Photos taken	More than 4500
Interviews with Rachele	29
Interviews with Students	More than 50
Students' works copied	More than 200 students works
Song of the Week student poll (top ten list generated)	

Figure 1. Data overview.

Data were collected across two school years (2012-2014) in two second-grade classroom communities taught by the same teacher. The teacher, Rachele, was Caucasian, held a master's degree in education, and had been teaching for more than 10 years. She had a child attending this school. Her second graders reflected the diversity of this school and school district in terms of a wide range of socio-

economic backgrounds, ethnicity (about half of the students were mixed race and or Caucasian, other students were African-American, Latino/a, Pakistani). Both years there were 25 students and 1 full-time teaching assistant, and about a quarter of the class received push-in and pull-out support services such as ELL, extra math and/or ELA support.

I recorded 139 hours of classroom interaction in Rachele's second grade classroom communities (see Figure 1). During the first school year my extended entrée included weekly visits, leading to classroom videotaping of Morning Meetings and two intact instructional units of Writer's Workshop. The second year, I observed and audiotaped the first six weeks of school (Rachele did not permit video at this critical time of the year) and then observed and videotaped regularly across the year. Across the two years, data included teacher lesson plans, student artifacts, photos of classroom large print charts and activities, and teacher and student interviews.

2.2 Selecting focal data and contextualizing data for close analysis

The Song of the Week five-minute activity was part of the daily Morning Meeting practice in this classroom. Analysis of the 39 Songs of the Week across the first year of data collection indicated some curricular and time of year connections for the teacher selection of these songs. "Man in the Mirror" by Michael Jackson (1988) was the number one student selection in the poll we conducted at the end of that first year. Fourteen of the 24 students named it as one of their top three (out of 39) songs (the second most popular song was named 8 times). "Man in the Mirror" was also selected as a Song of the Week in the second year. Its timing was explicitly connected to a new Writer's Workshop mini-unit on persuasive song writing. This knowledge informed my selection of the second year weekly classroom talk about "Man in the Mirror" for examination.

Two literacy events, Morning Meeting and Writer's Workshop, help contextualize understandings of ways the Song of the Week activity shed light on a coherent and purposeful classroom dialogic trajectory of teaching and learning. Observing a literacy event across time with the same participants provides a deep familiarity with discourse norms and expectations (signalling appropriate and expected degrees of explicitness, flexibility and comfort manifest in the talk) and the repertoire of talk functions.

3. ANALYSIS

To unpack the "big picture" trajectory of dialogic teaching and learning in this classroom community and to illuminate embedded connections and dialogic functions of talk, I analyze the dialogicality of the "Man in the Mirror" Song of the Week activity on three levels. First, I situate it as part of the Morning Meeting literacy event, and as explicitly connecting to the Writer's Workshop literacy event. For

contextualization, I report general pedagogical expectations associated with structures for these two events (as articulated by the researchers who designed them) and share some teacher interview comments about what they mean in this classroom community. I provide details about time spent observing each event. I limit my scope to specific details that inform a close look at intertextual ties in the focal classroom talk about "Man in the Mirror".

Next, I provide an overview of this classroom's week-long talk about "Man in the Mirror" and note ways the teacher explicitly aligned the talk with the persuasive song-writing mini-unit for Writer's Workshop.

Finally, I take a close look at the first day's talk about "Man in the Mirror" to unpack how this specific learning activity is part of a sequence and greater learning context of this particular classroom community. I impose *ipso facto* topical episodes on the transcribed data (intercoder reliability was over 92% across the author and two other coders for episode boundary coding on a random 20% sample of Writer's Workshop mini-lessons). I then present each transcript episode and identify and comment on intertextual ties. In the discussion section I step away from this listing out of practices to comment on what this portrait of dialogicality can offer teachers and researchers.

4. FINDINGS

4.1 Contextualizing Song of the Week as part of a teaching and learning repertoire

Rachele purposefully planned activities with time to listen and time to talk, time to be physically active and time to sit attentively. Across the day, if things took too long or she noticed she had lost students' attention, she changed her plans. She put it this way:

> As a teacher, I pay a lot of attention to the rhythm of the day. I know kids need time to move, time to talk and construct knowledge that way, time to listen, time to integrate and reflect, time to try things out, time to be silly... I try to plan my days with this rhythm in mind, but also stay tuned to it throughout the day and be ready to change how an activity is structured to meet the needs of the class at that moment.

This same attitude was reflected in long term and unit planning:

> Even with longer time frames, I keep the rhythm in mind. Every unit needs a mix of hands-on, games, physical incorporations of the material, time to talk and explore and mess around. To keep kids turned on, tuned in and engaged, and to continue "buy in," school has to be fun, has to speak to all of their various competencies, and in addition has to connect across the curriculum so that they can see/feel/talk about the significance of it all.

Writer's Workshop purposefully followed Morning Meeting in Rachele's classroom community (Rachele had formally requested a schedule change to administration for this to occur).

Morning Meeting. The routines and components of Morning Meeting are intended to build a community where both individual needs and collective obligations are recognized (Kreite & Bechtel, 2002; Rimm-Kaufman et al., 2007). Each child is welcomed into the space—and the collective gathers together for an affective check in, curricular preview, and connections with our worlds through practices that are fun, and ready students to learn. The power of Morning Meeting is not tied to extended time spent on each experience—most activities are brief. Rather, it is the coherence of the whole experience and the reoccurring, purposeful, relevant, varied, and accretive qualities that support student deeper involvement and learning. Community is created and sustained through clear, safe, and inclusive procedures and practices that encourage and support listening, sharing, conjecture, building, and questioning.

I observed 20 hours (73 days) of Morning Meetings over the course of two years in this second grade classroom community. I noted a broad repertoire of experiences with a wide range of expected student involvement. Procedures and practices were consistently clear across the four constituent components of Morning Meeting: greeting, sharing, schedule/announcements, activities (see figure 2, quotes from interviews with focal teacher Rachele are italicized).

1) Greeting: *"Through the greeting every student is welcomed by name, and seen, and smiled at."* I documented 9 different types of greeting games.
2) Sharing: *"Through sharing we learn to speak clearly and listen, to care for each other, to ask relevant questions, to let someone else 'take the stage'."* What was shared was required to be tied to the time of year or curricular focus. The sharer invited and fielded three questions and comments from listeners.
3) Schedule: *"Students should know what is planned, what's on the agenda, why this and not that. They are curious and the day goes more smoothly if they can track time passing and know what is coming next."* Students' questions were expected and consistently addressed.
4) Activities: In addition to the typical Calendar, Morning Message and thinking challenges, and singing to wish absent friends a good day, each day Rachele included two activities she valued: Yoga/brain gym and Song of the Week.

Figure 2. Morning Meeting Components

The purposes and functions of teacher talk shifted across time (for example, from direct and explicit instruction in greeting and yoga/brain gym activity routines, to more telegraphic instructional cues as students became more familiar and took on the role of leading activities) and across components (for example, the teacher mostly listened as students shared one "something" about their weekend during "what's the news" sharing and greeting but she did the elaborating when students

asked questions about the schedule). Throughout the school year, new variations on routines were introduced, learned, and switched again. Across all components, there were built-in accountabilities to and support for listening. As example, after "what's the news" Rachele would pull names (from set of craft sticks with student names) and invite volunteers to recall what that person shared. This paper focuses on a Rachele-designed daily addition to Morning Meeting activities: Song of the Week.

Song of the Week. I observed Rachele the first two years that she implemented the Song of the Week activity. Each week Rachele purposefully selected a commercially available pre-recorded music track to be a Song of the Week. This song was then shared in a particular way across the week—typically at the end of each Morning Meeting and averaging around five minutes of class time. The song was introduced and played on Mondays, then played on Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Thursdays—all the while as a listening activity. No lyrics were provided to accompany student listening until Fridays. Most of these second graders were not able to read the lyrics with fluency and Rachele shared in interviews that she wanted them to enjoy the experience of listening and to have a familiarity with the text before seeing it on Fridays. Second grader Imani put it this way when getting the lyrics to "Man in the Mirror":

> Like, now I can see, um, the words and hear them. Because I couldn't really hear them at first. But I did know the song because on the radio. It was better because I could hear it. (Interview with Imani, February 27, 2014).

Morning work on Fridays included pasting the lyrics into an exercise-songbook and illustrating the song in any way students pleased. Across the week, there were occasional brief discussions about the songs and at times these songs were referenced as resources in discussions outside of Morning Meeting time. Student body language indicated joy in listening to songs, there was wide-spread singing along, sometimes dancing as they sat on the floor, occasionally a full-out dance party. Each quarter's songs were burned on a CD and listening to the CD through headphones was a popular center choice (I witnessed several occasions of singing joy). This paper examines classroom talk about one song, Michael Jackson's "Man in the Mirror".

Writer's Workshop. The recommended overall structure for Writer's Workshop was followed quite closely in this classroom (Calkins, 2003; Calkins et al., 2012). A brief whole class mini-lesson (typically 6-11 minutes) preceded about 30 minutes of independent writing time while Rachele held individual conferences (across the week, Rachele held a writing conference with each student). Each Writer's Workshop unit lasted about a month, during which students built a writing portfolio. It ended with a publishing celebration of some sort (for example, after the fairytale unit dressing as a fairytale character and reading each other's and the other second grade class's retold and adapted fairytales).

Data collection focused on whole class Writer's Workshop mini-lessons. Across two years of data collection I gathered about 50 hours across 82 days.

Writer's Workshop Mini-lessons. Each mini-lesson included the connection, teaching, active engagement and link components advocated by Calkins and her colleagues (Calkins, 2003; Calkins et al., 2012, see figure 3, quotes from interviews with Rachele are italicized). During these mini-lessons, Rachele shared stories, wrote her own creative writing models, read books, and together with students created interactive charts. Each mini-lesson was designed as explicit whole-class instruction-telling but its purpose was dialogic. That is, the content was planned to model writing structures and strategies for students to immediately apply (for example, planning squares to chart the rise and fall of action) and was in response to what Rachele observed during individual conferences (for example, need to use varied speech words). As she presented each mini-lesson, Rachele referenced stories students were writing, and ideas and challenges they had discussed with Rachele during individual conferences; and Rachele's own experiences (such as biking to school).

1) Connection: teacher puts mini-lesson into the context of the class's ongoing work. "*It is supposed to be a connection to what we did before: something that happened a day before. And you tell them what they gonna learn today.*"
2) Teaching: teacher chooses from four main options: demonstrates; explains and shows an example; involves the class in shared inquiry; or takes students through a guided practice. *"There are…all different ways to teach whatever the concept is. But you have to choose your way, depending on what you're teaching.")*
3) Active Engagement: Teacher allows students opportunity to think, talk, or try what the teacher has taught and talk to a partner about it.
4) Link: Teacher restates the teaching point and gives directions about how students can incorporate the new strategy. *"So you tell them: Today and everyday you're writing, think about what you've just learned."*

Figure 3. Writer's Workshop components.

4.2 Explicitly connecting Song of the Week and Writer's Workshop

A Writer's Workshop unit that was repeated across the two years was on persuasive writing. Across the month, students wrote persuasive letters on a topic that was important to them (these were then mailed to the appropriate parties and responses were shared in class), and persuasive stories. The second data year Rachele included a persuasive song-writing mini-unit for the first time. An earlier unit had been on experiencing and writing types of poetry. For persuasive song-writing students were encouraged to write on a topic they cared about and to write

words to a familiar tune. Rachele suggested “This Land is Your Land” and “He’s Got the Whole World” but some students came up with another song as model or made up their own tune (see Figure 4 for examples).

Figure 4. Students with a voice: Titles of student-created persuasive songs.

In addition to delivering 45 minutes in mini-lessons for the persuasive song-writing week across the four-day week (Monday was a holiday), Rachele selected the Michael Jackson “Man in the Mirror” song as the Song of the Week and connected talk about it with the persuasive Writer’s Workshop unit. The recording of “Man in the Mirror” was a little longer than typical, lasting five minutes. Across the week a total of 32 minutes was spent listening to and talking about this song: 18 minutes of listening to the song and 14 minutes of whole-class talk about the song. There were two changes in Song of the Week procedures for “Man in the Mirror”: 1) This was the only song I observed when Rachele played only part of the song (Thursday, verse one only). 2) Rachele planned to give out the lyrics from the first day. However, there was a glitch in this plan as Rachele did not realize the second verse was not a repeat and so she had not copied the entire set of lyrics. Figure 5 provides a summary narrative of each topical episode and how time was spent each day.

Date	"Man in the Mirror" (MitM) Song of the Week		
	Total time	(Time for music) Time on talk (#TOT)	Summary by topical episode
2.24	School Holiday		
Tues 2.25	11m	(5m) 6m (41 TOT)	1) Teacher explanation of what will happen and logistics 2) Student question / student directed IRE 3) Student question and follow up question 4) Student sharing and teacher inclusive response 5) Why lyrics for "Man in the Mirror" today (first day) 6) LISTEN TO SONG (singing/dancing as sitting in circle) 7) Direction to think about this song as a persuasive song and turn and talk. 8) Teacher asking "what is the author's purpose?" and student noting she had no partner 9) Teacher repeating, "what is the purpose of the song?" and extended exchange with one student. 10) Referencing previous Song of the Week 11) Connect and transition to WW civil rights songs – context for listening *See next section for discourse analysis of this day.*
Wed 2.26	8m	(5m) 3 min (22 TOT)	1) Teacher explanation of what will happen and logistics 2) Drawing attention to length of song needing two columns of lyrics 3) LISTEN TO SONG w lyrics (not much singing/dancing) 4) Inviting students to comments on how it feels to have lyrics and directing a "turn and talk" about this 5) Transition to math
Thurs2.27	7m	(3m -verse 1) 4 min (19 TOT)	1) Teacher explanation of what will happen and logistics 2) LISTEN TO SONG with lyrics (some singing) 3) Read first verse out loud and answer "what's going on here?" 5 students participate 4) Transition to WW songs *See next section for transcript of episode 3.*
Fri 2.28	6m	(5m) 1 min (2 TOT)	1) LISTEN TO SONG (singing along) 2) Directing students to hand write in the title before pasting lyrics into song books 3) Transition to WW
Total	32m	(18m) 14 min (84 TOT)	

Figure 5. "Man in the Mirror" data overview.

In the following section I look closely at the first day of talk for "Man in the Mirror". I selected this day of the week because the many routines and procedures referenced (31% of the time was spent talking about *how* as opposed to *what*) situate this exchange as part of a chain and connected whole. A moment-to-moment look shows how talk practices associated with particular routines and discourse formats are taken up and appropriated for particular use. I end this section with an extended exchange from a day later in the week that focuses on content.

4.3 A close look at talk about "Man in the Mirror"

Following is a complete transcript for the six minutes of talk around "Man in the Mirror" by Michael Jackson as the first day Song of the Week activity for Morning Meeting on Tuesday, February 25, 2014. The talk is divided into 10 topical episodes. Researcher explanatory comments are in italics and bracketed thus < >. Classroom management asides are in square brackets [ ]. Words that are unclear are bracketed with ( ) and marked as inaudible or a best guess is provided. I offer commentary at the end of each episode and then a review of findings at the end of the lesson.

Episode 1

1. Rachele: Today for Writer's Workshop we are going to be talking about songs that are persuasive. We're going to be thinking about, learning about, singing, listening to persuasive songs, with the lyrics, in the hopes of all of *us,* eventually over the next few days, writing our own song, writing our own persuasive song and I'm going to teach you how to do that. So we will start with the "Man in the Mirror" <*Michael Jackson*> because that's the song, that's our Song of the Week and then I'll put in a different CD with some other persuasive songs that people have written, that songwriters have written that have helped changed people's minds about things, different issues that they have cared about. Looks like we have some questions. Isaiah?

Turn of talk (TOT) one is similar to an opening "connect" teacher turn in a Writer's Workshop mini-lesson. That is, the teacher articulates what the students will do now (and why) and explicitly connects that with what they will do "over the next few days." Here we see this activity explicitly situated in a purposeful and coherent teaching and learning chain. Rachele then recognizes time for student questions.

Episode 2

2. Isaiah: Are we going to start doing persuasive songs today?

3. Rachele: We are going to see if we have time to start writing our songs today. First, we're going to listen to some songs and see how far we can get with that. Okay?

4. Isaiah: Okay.

Here we have a student question, teacher response, and prompted student affirmation. In this episode and the next we see students asking unsolicited clarification questions. This is normal practice for *schedule time* during Morning Meeting and it

has developed in students an expectation and awareness of what they will do, why, and when. Students appear comfortable asking questions.

Episode 3

5. Rachele: Okay? Yes Annabella?

6. Annabella: But I thought we were doing stories?

7. Rachele: Well we were doing persuasive stories. First we did persuasive letters, right? We all wrote a letter and mailed it. Actually we haven't mailed them yet. We are going to mail them today. Then, a lot of us started a persuasive story, or two. Today, we are going to be persuasive with song writing. Now this doesn't mean Annabella that you can't keep writing your story. You can keep writing your story.

8. Annabella: So, we have a choice?

9. Rachele: No I mean in your spare time you can write your story and share it on Friday. Okay?

Annabella asks first one question and then a contingent follow-up question (a reversal of schooled-as-normal teacher-student roles yet this is effective student learning behavior). Teacher Rachele's response addresses her query and slides in even more detail about how this current Song of the Week activity ties with what they *had been* doing and *would be* doing in Writer's Workshop: "Today we are going to be persuasive with song writing". Rachele's response to Annabella's follow up question, "so we have a choice?" clarifies "spare time" boundaries for certain choices.

There is a very interesting consideration of time underpinning this exchange. Any teacher has only a certain, fixed amount of time in the classroom to influence student learning. Rachele is careful and explicit in articulating how what they are doing is connected and relevant, and that she needs their engagement in these teacher-directed moments. As reported earlier, Rachele is attentive to the rhythm and pacing of teacher-directed activities. Here we see referenced a time for choice. What Annabella does in her "spare time" at school is a matter of choice—and a reflection of trust.

Episode 4

9a. Rachele: Rex has a question.

10. Rex: I actually already know how to write songs and all the notes.

11. Rachele: Oh.

12. Rex: (*inaudible*).

13. Rachele: Because you what?

14. Rex: Because I've played piano for three years.

15. Rachele: Some of us have experience with music I know. Raise your hand if you have experience already with music, instruments. Now, it's okay if you don't. Anybody can write a song. Anybody. Whether you have experience or not.

Rex's sharing of his home-learned expertise is acknowledged, and other students with similar skills are invited to self-identify. But Rachele clearly states that this song-writing activity is one everyone is capable of: "Anybody can write a song. Anybody. Whether you have experience or not." This activity is inclusive.

Episode 5

15a. So, here are the lyrics of "Man in the Mirror". (*pause*) Wait, this in not, this is not correct. Let me see, I think I did something wrong. Yes I did. We are going to have to listen to it without the lyrics one more day. That's okay.

16. Brigida: Yeah, today's not Friday.

17. Rachele: I know. Who remembers why I said we should have the lyrics early this time? <*hands raised*> Moira, what did I say about it?

18. Moira: Because it will help you learn the music and sing along.

19. Rachele: It will. There's another reason too. [Rex and Brooke]. There's another reason too, this song is pretty complicated, it's hard to understand what he is saying. [Denzel I'm looking right at you. Denzel, can you please go sit right over there.] Mandy, thank you. [Mary, are you talking?] Oh, okay. This song in pretty complicated and it's hard to understand what he's saying. Sorry I made a mistake with the lyrics. Let's just really try to listen to what he's saying. I'll give them to you tomorrow.

In Episode 5 we see how Rachele has made a mistake with the printing of the lyrics for the song. She realized the mistake on-the-spot and admits it aloud as she realizes it. We can note two things about routines and community here. First, student Brigida assures teacher Rachele it is okay because "today's not Friday." Brigida is referencing the procedure of typically reading the lyrics on Fridays, not at the beginning of the week. Perhaps Brigida is remembering one of the previous songs of the week "I'm Not Perfect". Second, we see the teacher having to make disciplinary remarks to pull other students back into what Mercer (2008) calls the intramental development zone (IDZ) where teacher and learners are attuned to one another through their common knowledge and shared purposes. Brigida is still "with" Rachele—her explicit referencing of common knowledge (it's not Friday) marks this—but the others, perhaps responding to this change in routine, need reminding of community expectations for turn-taking and listening during teacher-centered time. We also witness accountability to these expectations—and a calling out of names. It is February and routines have been established. This is whole class time. In a matter of minutes, there will be time to talk.

We see again an environment where participants know what is going on as Rachele references her own earlier comments during schedule time in Morning Meeting when she asks, "Who remembers why I said we should have the lyrics early this time?" Moira's response is acknowledged but Rachele also restates her agenda-point about this being a "pretty complicated" song.

Episode 6

20. "Man in the Mirror" begins playing, <*8:37-8:42. Student listen, sing along, dance and chatter in the background*>.

Episode 7

21. Rachele: I want you to think about the song and what, this is a persuasive song. The author is trying to be persuasive. What do you think the author's purpose is in writing that song? [Juana and Mimi.] Michael Jackson had a reason to write that song. He is trying to be persuasive. What is he trying to persuade us to do? Turn and talk please.

22. <*Students talking to one another*, *8:43-8:44*>.

Here we see Rachele making explicit connections to the purpose for the Writer's Workshop persuasive writing mini-lesson, to the purposes of the song, and to the focus of the mini-lesson that will follow. We also see Rachele holding tight on whole class expectations—Juana and Mimi have to wait to talk until Rachele has articulated her prompt for partner "turn and talk": "Michael Jackson had a reason to write that song. He is trying to be persuasive. What is he trying to persuade us to do?"

Episode 8

23. Rachele: Alright, so what do you guys think? What is the author's purpose? What is the issue that he's trying to get us to change? [Mimi?].

24. Mimi: I didn't have anybody.

25. Rachele: [Oh you didn't? We'll have to make sure you have somebody.] What do you guys think? [I'm glad you pointed that out Mimi, we will have to fix that problem.]

Rachele's prompt to talk is interrupted by Mimi's problem—she did not have a partner. Her problem is acknowledged—"we" will have to fix that problem. The talk is then refocused on the song.

Episode 9

25a. Rachele (continuing): Brigida what is the purpose of the song?

26. Brigida: (*inaudible)*

27. Rachele: He's trying to do what? You're on the right track.

28. Brigida: Think of yourself.

29. Rachele: Think about yourself when you're doing what? Think about yourself to do what?

30. Brigida: Good stuff.

31. Rachele: Can you, can you say more about that? You're really doing some good thinking. Can you explain it? What does he think we should do to make the world better? [Shhh.]

32. Brigida: Help the world.

33. Rachele: How?

34. Brigida: Be a good person.

35. Rachele: How? Do what first? What do you change first before you change the world? What's the name of the song?

36. Brigida: "Man in the Mirror".

37. Rachele: So what do you have to change before you can make the world a better place?

38. Several students: Yourself.

39. Rachele: Yourself. So I think that's the author's purpose, make yourself a better person first.

In this episode we have an extended exchange between teacher Rachele and Brigida. Rachele opens with a repeat of her agenda-focus, "What is the purpose of the song?" and in this exchange she encourages, restates, and asks for more with repeated use of "How" as she presses Brigida to elaborate. Here we see what Lefstein (2010) calls a performance dyad—an extended teacher-student interaction that models for the listening class reasoning and elaborating practices in a whole class talk context. As long as the teacher is sensitive to varying who has this focus, Lefstein asserts that this interaction can serve a more dialogic purpose than choppy brief utterances involving more students. However, the potential for the performance dyad to model social and *dialogic* academic expectations (as opposed to serving as an extended exchange that excludes others from demonstrating knowledge or practicing interpretation) is dependent upon at least two factors. First, the performance dyad should not be so long as to lose the class IDZ should other students feel they are not included in the forming of knowledge. Second, students' experiences and predispositions (that have been developed through sociohistoric patterning during the event and across events and time) are such that they value respectful listening to student contributions. Students accept that by listening they are contributing to classroom norms that make it more comfortable for everyone to contribute.

Episode 10

39a. If you were here last week, raise your hand. Last week when we had two days of school. Our Song of the Week was *Hello In There* (John Prine). If you remember, give me a thumbs up. What was the author's purpose for that song? A song about older people. Antwan. [Denzel, Antwan is talking now.]

40. Antwan: When you seen an older person. Don't just walk away. Stay with them for a few seconds and talk to them.

41. Rachele: Talk to them and listen to them. That was the author's purpose of that song. Okay, we're going to listen to some more songs I'm going to give you a packet of lyrics. This song is called, *Ain't Gonna Let Nobody Turn Me Around.* This is a very famous Civil Rights song people used when they were marching for Civil Rights around the time of Martin Luther King. So it's a song people used when they were demonstrating, while they were marching or doing protests against unfair laws <Rachele readies students to listen to a recording of children singing this song>.

This final episode references and connects past and future teaching and learning practices. It harkens back to the previous Song of the Week and its purpose: "Talk to them and listen to them. That was the author's purpose of that song" and it transitions to the very activity that will open the Persuasive Song—Writer's Workshop literacy event. Here we see laid out how classroom moments are connected and meaningful. They also involve a range of talk functions. In these 6 minutes of classroom talk we have 7 students participating by clarifying, assuring, informing, reasoning, and reminding; and Rachele setting up clear expectations, listening, prompting, responding and weaving a host of purposeful, coherent connections. These are self-reflexive, self-referencing considerations of the moments that they have all already spent together, and preparation for the moments to come so that students may anticipate it, prepare for it, be invested in it simply through expectation. We witness intertextual ties—to the previous Song of the Week, the Writer's Workshop songs they will study that morning, and the persuasive writing stories and persuasive letters they have written. We see participants appropriating familiar discourse formats—Rachele's opening turn of talk mirrors the Writer's Workshop connect component, Isaiah and Annabella's questions replicate schedule time norms, and the performance dyad mimics close reading of literature texts. Laid out for us are connections across persuasive purposes—for Michael Jackson, this teacher, and these second grade authors. This is connected, purposeful, cumulative talk that illustrates the *dialogic how* and *inclusive who* of classroom talk in this community.

Talk about "Man in the Mirror" also offers a personally and morally engaging *what* to be discussed. Both through "turn and talk" opportunities each day, and through exchanges such as the following example—a close look at verse one prompted by Rachele's open question, "So, what's going on here?" Five students participate. Notice intertextual ties as teacher Rachele slides in the language of empathy (a school-wide CARES word) and inference (a reading strategy).

Thursday, February, 27, 2014, Episode 3

5. Rachele: So, what's going on here? What does this mean? Think about what the words of the whole song are. Brigida, what do you think about this?

6. Brigida: I think he's writing, singing about kids who don't have food or family or nothing like that.

7. Rachele: Who agrees with Brigida?

8. Brigida: Or homeless.

9. Rachele: You see these children on the street who don't have enough to eat. He's noticing them. He's having empathy for them. And while he's doing that, it says he's turning up the collar on his favorite winter coat. What does it mean that he has a favorite winter coat? A favorite winter coat. [*slight pause*] Let's make an inference about that. [*slight pause*] What does that tell us about the coats he has? [*slight pause*] What do you think? [*slight pause*] Denzel, what do you think? I heard you say it.

10. Denzel: He has more than one coat.

> 11. Rachele: He has more than one coat. He has a lot of coats, he's got a favorite coat, maybe a second favorite coat, maybe a third favorite coat. What about the kids that he is seeing on the street? Do they have a favorite winter coat?
>
> 12. Students: No.
>
> 13. Rachele: They probably have maybe one winter coat, if they are lucky, maybe not. Mary?
>
> 14. Mary: I think what this person cares about is, is about a person on the street and at the end it might tell how tell how he changed.
>
> 15. Rachele: Maybe a story about him changing his thinking about the world?
>
> 16. Mary: It says, "pretending not to see their needs" So he knows that they don't have enough to eat. But he, but he keeps walking past them and not seeing what they need.
>
> 17. Rachele: Wow, Mary, you are really thinking deeply about this song. Does anybody want to add to what Mary said or think or ask a question? Moira, what do you think?
>
> 18. Moira: Um, I think that was the man he used to be. Like just being selfish and not like, um, seeing kids and grown-ups needs and homeless peoples needs. And not having food and he's not doing anything about giving them like clothes, not giving them any money to buy stuff.
>
> 19. Rachele: So he doesn't have empathy before. But now he does. Interesting.

These six and seven year olds are engaged and empowered to "read the world" of the song by talking about the song. Through the song they are considering kids with coats and kids without coats, the idea of having and not having, and how they can think of themselves. Here we see opportunity for finding ways to allow content, in a moment, to connect and interconnect to other moments. It is about distilling and refining a larger meaning and understanding from any one "content-of-a-thing" such that these meanings and understandings can be applicable and influential in other moments, with regard to other "content-of-a-thing". Later that day (Feb 27, 2014) I interviewed Imani and she had this to say about "Man in the Mirror" and what she would do:

> Um, I think it's cool because it says, um, I'm, I, he sees kids and he's not seeing his needs, their needs. And he means like, you know what he means by, like, "I have, I have coats" and that means that he had more than coats so he was he was probably going to give it to um the kids… And every time I hear it [*she referenced earlier that she hears it often on the radio and sings along*] I'm thinking of kids. If I saw them I would say, "here's a coat, have it" and if I didn't have, if some clothes didn't fit me I'd just give them to the peoples.

5. DISCUSSION

The passage of time is embodied in classroom talk attitudes, dispositions and practices, and manifest in the intertextual ties marking shared purposes across participants and activities. Across time this classroom talk composes a trajectory. This is always already happening. When there are shared purposes and proposed and acknowledged connections across what is known and what is being explored and

what will come next, there is formed a classroom dialogic teaching and learning trajectory.

This paper addresses ways a five-minute *daily* activity—the Song of the Week—sheds light on a teacher-propelled dialogic trajectory of teaching and learning in a particular second grade classroom community. Recognizing that each exchange (or task, lesson, literacy event) serves more than an immediate purpose—that is, that there is a cumulative quality to learning and that across time and experiences students are socialized into ways of and values associated with learning (Barnes, 1992; Boyd & Markarian, 2011, 2015; Lemke, 2001; Mercer, 2008; Wells, 2006), I looked across timescales and unpacked the planned, accretive, nested, and unfolding dialogic opportunities of classroom talk surrounding the Song of the Week activity. First, I positioned "Man in the Mirror" as one of 39 Songs of the week intentionally selected by the teacher with varied curricular and social purposes in mind. These songs, like good literature, both encouraged development of a dialogical relational self and a singing "the world" and provided shared resources for intertextual connections to curricular foci. Then, to explicate how talk about Song of the Week exemplified the learning attitudes, dispositions and practices of this classroom community, I took Lemke's (2001) advice and "moved a level up" to the daily literacy event. I showed how the 14 minutes of talk across the week were part of an overall Morning Meeting recurring repertoire and how this particular Song of the Week explicitly and coherently connected with the Writer's Workshop focus. Finally, in a close examination of six minutes of talk, I investigated how proposed and acknowledged connections within and across present, future and past talk practices, and predictable but flexible procedures and routines helped sustain Mercer's (2008) bubble of shared dialogic purposes across interactions.

These data illuminate an inter-connected accretiveness to these moments-in-time building a classroom trajectory. Nested, dialogic talk opportunities are indeed (over)populated with other voices and intentions (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 294) yet as students heed what their sociohistoric and unfolding experiences cue as expected, valued and safe (Boyd & Markarian, 2011) they "take the word and make it their own" (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 294) to advance individual and collective sense-making. But making the word your own—like most learning—"does not happen suddenly" (Barnes, 1992, p. 123). In other words, classroom teaching and learning trajectory is not a matter of ONE thing, or instance—yet it has much to do with specific interactions and experiences. When we examine transcripts of classroom talk we can unpack *dialogic opportunities* that are attentively planned and the degree to which they are (or are not) responsively directed and harnessed to enact the principles of respectful discourse and open exchange of ideas. We can illuminate how across time and experiences a repertoire of classroom practices functions to engage multiple perspectives and opinions in joint critical inquiry. But there is no formula or script to be simply *applied*. "Each classroom must *find* its own way of working" (Wells, 2001, p. 174, italics added) as teachers actively wield their agentive flow—the freedom, space and time, and willingness to plan lessons and then to make

flexible in the moment decisions about pacing, materials, foci and process (Boyd & Galda, 2011, p. 2)—in service of a classroom dialogic trajectory that advances individual and collective understanding.

I showcase this classroom's dialogic teaching and learning trajectory to situate and unfold an understanding of dialogic teaching and learning as a "big picture" process that forms and functions dynamically across practices and time. My claim is not that the Song of the Week activity will *automatically* work in another context. A teacher must dynamically consider how to present it to each classroom community—selecting songs and making connections in ways that are responsive and response-able (Boyd, 2016), and developing and presenting dialogic opportunities for that particular classroom community. It is not a matter of simply replicating practices. Indeed, Rachele is currently teaching 5th grade. She has kept many of her same songs and replaced others. But she now utilizes You-tube and the classroom whiteboard because "student self-consciousness at the cusp of puberty is such that they can't sit and look at each other while they sing" (Rachele, email communication, February 21, 2015). Students watch the video (and scrolling lyrics) rather than sit in the circle to sing. (Re)Developing routines and roles is key to investment, engagement—and to developing a dialogic learnerhood that transcends and transfers across time scales and experiences.

6. CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

Dialogic teaching and learning is about encouraging and supporting perspective-taking, reasoning and exploratory talk through respectful discourse. It is about experiencing a dialogic *how*, a personally and morally engaging *what*, and an inclusive *whose*. But if such sought-after dialogic purposes and relations are not check-off-able and replicable; if they must be experienced *over time* and across a recurring, coherent repertoire of approaches, activities, tools and routines, not only mediated by, but also instantiated in, around, and through a dialogic stance and comportment to teaching and learning; what, then, can this portrait of the dialogic opportunities afforded by the Song of the Week activity to this second grade classroom community offer if it is not a listing out of recommended practices? I submit that this study provides contextual anchoring for a consideration of two connected "big ideas" about dialogism and about studying and enacting dialogism.

First, dialogic teaching and learning is a "big picture" process that must be understood across time and across time scales. Teachers who envision a classroom teaching and learning trajectory 1) plan and contingently enact a varied, recurring, robust, and coherent repertoire of dialogic teaching and learning opportunities and 2) balance the pressure of performing efficiently in the now with taking the time to make everything more connected. Sometimes this means directly teaching or reminding, other times sliding in particular language and references. Because they understand teaching and learning contextualized across time and across activity, these teachers and their students can embrace and play with productive ten-

sions—there are times for high and low inter-animation of student ideas, times for talking and listening, times for upholding of procedures and times for flexibility. Without the "big picture" context of classroom practices the *trajectory* of dialogic purposes and functions attending classroom practices may not be visible.

Second, we must consider the dialogical relational of the *what* and *how* we hold up as dialogic teaching and learning. While there are *likely* markers of dialogism—for example an open, divergent question that invites perspectives and intertextual ties—simply asking open questions does not make for dialogic teaching and learning (see Boyd, 2015, for fuller explications). We must consider how a structural marker *functions* (in the moment and historically) in a learning community to bring out the strengths in students' talk, and to engender coherence and forge connections.

I end with three questions. How can researchers keep the multiple timescales of teaching in view during analysis and reporting, and what might this look like across classrooms? To what extent are we open, able, and willing to do the messy and challenging work to see beyond surface features and single occurrences to unpack how interactions function to support cognitive activity and inquiry across classroom experiences? How can administrators support educators to be more intentional about purposeful shaping of classroom trajectories while keeping them dialogically open for student shaping?

7. AUTHOR NOTE

This research was supported by Spencer Foundation Grant # 201400015 and by a UB MEGAS grant 2014-15.

REFERENCES

Alexander, R. J. (2008). *Towards dialogic teaching: Rethinking classroom talk* (4th ed.). York, UK: Dialogos.

Alexander, R. J. (2010). Speaking but not listening? Accountable talk in an unaccountable context. *Literacy, 44*(3), 103-111. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-4369.2010.00562.x

Aukerman, M. (2013). Rereading comprehension pedagogies: Toward a dialogic teaching ethic that honors student sensemaking. *Dialogic Pedagogy: An International Online Journal, 1*. http://dx.doi.org/10.5195/dpj.2013.9

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

Bloome, D., & Egan-Robertson, A. (1993). The social construction of intertextuality in classroom reading and writing lessons. *Reading Research Quarterly, 28*(4), 304-333. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/747928

Boyd, M. P. (2012). Planning and realigning a lesson in response to student contributions: Intentions and decision making. *The Elementary School Journal, 113*(1), 25-51. http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/665817

Boyd, M. P. (2015). Relations between teacher contingent questioning and student exploratory talk in one elementary school ELL classroom. *Journal of Literacy Research, 47*(3), 370-404. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1086296X16632451

Boyd, M. P. (2016). Calling for response-ability in our classrooms. *Language Arts, 93*(3), 226-233.

Boyd, M. P., & Devennie, M. (2009). Student voices and teacher choices: Selecting read-alouds. *Childhood Education, 85*(3), 148-153. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00094056.2009.10521380

Boyd, M. P., & Galda, L. (2011). *Real Talk in Elementary Classrooms: Effective Oral Language Practice*. New York: Guilford.

Boyd, M. P., & Kneller, S. (2009). The 42nd Crochet: Getting students hooked into a literacy community. *Reading Teacher, 62*(5), 434-441. http://dx.doi.org/10.1598/rt.62.5.6

Boyd, M. P., & Markarian, W. C. (2011). Dialogic teaching: Talk in service of a dialogic stance. *Language and Education, 25*(6), 515-534. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2011.597861

Boyd, M. P., & Markarian, W. C. (2015). Dialogic teaching and dialogic stance: Moving beyond interactional form. *Research in the Teaching of English, 49*(3), 272-296.

Boyd, M. P., & Rubin, D. L. (2002). Elaborated student talk in an Elementary ESoL Classroom. *Research in the Teaching of English, 36*(4), 495-530.

Boyd, M. P., & Rubin, D. L. (2006). How contingent questioning promotes extended student talk: A function of display questions. *Journal of Literacy Research, 38*(2), 141-169. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15548430jlr3802_2

Burbules, N. C. (1993). *Dialogue in teaching: Theory and practice*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Calkins, L. (2003). *The nuts and bolts of teaching writing*. Portsmouth, NH: FirstHand.

Calkins, L., Ehrenworth, M., & Lehman, C. (2012). *Pathways to the Common Core*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Haneda, M., & Wells, G. (2010). Learning science through dialogic inquiry: Is it beneficial for English-as-additional-language students? *International Journal of Educational Research, 49*(1), 10-21. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2010.05.003

Kriete, R., & Bechtel, L. (2002). *The morning meeting book*. Greenfield, MA: Northeast Foundation for Children.

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

Lefstein, A. (2010). More helpful as problem than solution: Some implications of situated dialogue in classrooms. In K. Littleton & C. Howe (Eds.), *Educational dialogues: Understanding and promoting productive interaction* (pp. 170-191). London, UK: Routledge.

Lemke, J. (2000). Across the scales of time: Artifacts, activities, and meanings in ecosocial systems. *Mind, Culture, and Activity, 7*(4), 273-290. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327884mca0704_03

Lemke, J. (2001). The long and the short of it: Comments on multiple timescale studies of human activity. *The Journal of the Learning Sciences, 10*(1), 17-26. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/S15327809JLS10-1-2_3

Lobato, J., Clarke, D., & Ellis, A. B. (2005). Initiating and eliciting in teaching: A reformulation of telling. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education, 36*(2), 101-136.

Matusov, E., & Wegerif, R. (2014). Dialogue on 'Dialogic Education': Has Rupert gone over to 'the Dark Side'? *Dialogic Pedagogy: An International Online Journal, 2*. http://dx.doi.org/10.5195/dpj.2014.78

Mercer, N. (2004). Sociocultural discourse analysis: Analysing classroom talk as a social mode of thinking. *Journal of Applied Linguistics, 1*(2), 137-168. http://dx.doi.org/10.1558/jal.v1i2.137

Mercer, N. (2008). The seeds of time: Why classroom dialogue needs a temporal analysis. *Journal of the Learning Sciences, 17*(1), 33-59. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10508400701793182

Mercer, N., Wegerif, R., & Dawes, L. (1999). Children's Talk and the Development of Reasoning in the Classroom. *British Educational Research Journal, 25*(1), 95-111. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0141192990250107

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

Nystrand, M., Wu, L. L., Gamoran, A., Zeiser, S., & Long, D. A. (2003). Questions in time: Investigating the structure and dynamics of unfolding classroom discourse. *Discourse Processes, 35*(2), 135-198. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/S15326950DP3502_3

Pullen, M. (2007). Poor minority kids need scripted teaching; Everyone else deserves something better. *The Elementary Educator.* From http://mrpullen.wordpress.com/2007/06/03/poor-minority-kids-need-scripted.

Renshaw, P. (2004). Dialogic teaching, learning and instruction: Theoretical roots and analytical frameworks. In J. Van der Linden & P. Renshaw (Eds.), *Dialogic Learning: Shifting perspectives to learning, instruction, and teaching* (pp. 1-16). Dordrecht, NL: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Reznitskaya, A., & Glina, M. (2013). Comparing student experiences with story discussions in dialogic versus traditional settings. *Journal of Educational Research, 106*(1), 49-63. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00220671.2012.658458

Rimm-Kaufman, S. E., Fan, X., Chiu, Y. I., & You, W. (2007). The contribution of the Responsive Classroom Approach on children's academic achievement: Results from a three year longitudinal study. *Journal of School Psychology, 45*(4), 401-421. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2006.10.003

Rimm-Kaufman, S. E., Larsen, R. A. A., Baroody, A. E., Curby, T. W., Ko, M., Thomas, J. B., . . . DeCoster, J. (2013). Efficacy of the Responsive Classroom approach: Results from a 3-year, longitudinal randomized controlled trial. *American Educational Research Journal, 51*(3), 567-603. http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/0002831214523821

Rubin, D. L. (1990). Introduction: Ways of talking about talking and learning. In S. Hynds & D. Rubin (Eds.), *Perspectives on Talk & Learning* (pp. 1-20). Urbana, IL: NCTE.

Scott, P., Mortimer, E. F., & Aguiar, O. G. (2006). The tension between authoritative and dialogic discourse: A fundamental characteristic of meaning making interactions in high school science lessons. *Science Education, 90*(4), 605-631. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/sce.20131

Shor, I., & Freire, P. (1987). What is the "Dialogical Method" of teaching? *Journal of Education, 169*(3), 11-31.

Wegerif, R. (2013). *Dialogic: Education for the internet age*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Wells, G. (2001). *Action, talk and text: Learning and teaching through inquiry*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Wells, G., & Arauz, R. (2006). Dialogue in the classroom. *Journal of the Learning Sciences, 15*(3), 379-428. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327809jls1503_3

Wortham, S. (2005). Socialization beyond the speech event. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology, 15*(1), 95-112. http://dx.doi.org/10.1525/jlin.2005.15.1.95