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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

(Association of Teacher Educators, 1986; Holmes, 1986; National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education, 1985). This study described one way universities and schools might collaboratively address reform.

This case study examined the influence of collaboratively teaching a social studies methods course on the co-teaching participants. The participants included a university professor, a graduate student, and two elementary classroom teachers. The research analyzed the interactions among the participants. It described the importance of shared meaning making as related to the participants' relationships and their understandings of self and other participants.

This study was based on an interpretive approach to human science research (Gadamer, 1976a, 1976b, 1987; Linge, 1976; Rabinow & Sullivan, 1987). The concern of interpretive research is one of meaning making as it is embedded in particular lived experiences (Geertz, 1973; Van Manen, 1990). The study was methodologically based on the naturalistic paradigm which stresses understanding the meanings people give to the experiences that make up their world (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982; Lincoln & Guba, 1985).
Background of the Study

Many reform documents called for efforts to improve education that were similar to recommendations made in the past. "Why do the reform proposals and recommendations keep getting repeated? Why aren't there results? Who is listening and who is acting?" (Gratch, 1992, p. 48) Many people raised these questions. Gratch (1992), using the works of Clifford and Guthrie (1988), Herbst (1989), and Goodlad (1990), extracted the following historical reasons for the lack of action in teacher education programs:

The low to modest status of schools/colleges of education, resulting in a feeling of collective low self-esteem on the part of the teacher education faculty; the lack of articulation and cooperation between the arts and sciences curriculum and that of teacher education; the low priority accorded to teaching in the university; the paucity of top administrative leadership in support of excellence in teacher education; and an unsupportive fiscal structure in most institutions. (Gratch, 1992, p. 48)

A longitudinal study sponsored by the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education found formidable deterrents to change within teacher education programs. The faculty was portrayed as white, middle-age males; many who were tenured at institutions where they had been for a long period of time (Durcharme & Kluender, 1990). Students drawn to teacher education were chiefly white, female, conservative, and culturally homogeneous (Zimpher, 1989). Programs of teacher education had taken on a more
conservative tone, recreating the norms and passing on traditions rather than challenging these areas (Galluzzo & Arends, 1989). As described in Chapter Two, repetitive cycles of reform continued when these endemic conditions were not confronted.

Likewise, school systems did not initiate educational reforms that resulted in persisting improvement, rather schools were characterized as resisting change. Sarason (1971, 1982) described a school situation which typified schools' reputation when addressing change:

One of the most frequent reactions the outsider comes away with is that the school is a "closed" place that views with marked suspicion any outsider who "wants in" in some way. ... The adjectives that the puzzled outsider applies most frequently to school personnel are insecure, uncooperative, paranoid, and rigid. The adjectives vary, depending on how far beyond the principal's or superintendents's office the outsider gets. (p. 10, emphasis in original)

School change was difficult to initiate much less maintain in an atmosphere that was permeated with negative feelings.

Recent reports and research projects have described isolating settings at universities and school (Carnegie Forum, 1986; Goodlad, 1990; Gratch, 1992; National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education, 1985; Sarason, 1982; 1990). This study was concerned with the interaction between persons in school and university
cultures when working together. This working together was not easily accomplished. School-based and university-based persons inhabit different worlds and tend not to appreciate or understand each other's cultures. As Ruben Carriedo, assistant superintendent of the San Diego City Schools, expressed:

> We can't expect that university researchers and school practitioners will automatically work well together right away. Traditionally, they have not worked well together. (Watkins, 1990, A20)

The difficulty of university and school educators interacting also was heard in the words of a principal in a local school, when she said, "What do university professors do all day if they only have to teach two classes a week? They can give an evening a quarter and come and talk to these overworked [elementary] teachers" (PDS meeting, 11/21/91). Traditionally, school-based and university-based people did not work well together.

Reform proposals advocate a dialogue between the university-based and school-based people in order to encourage a shared understanding of their two cultures.

School reformers have advocated many changes in roles and in the relationships between them that would blur the boundaries between teaching, teacher education, and research. I believe that schools can foster a more productive relationship among these three activities and that this new relationship can enhance the quality of schooling. But I suspect that it will be difficult to find people who can work
productively in the boundary-blurring roles that institutional restructuring creates. (Lampert, 1991, p. 672)

Lampert argued that "boundary blurring" of roles enhanced teacher preparation, grounded research on teaching and learning, and enriched teaching, both at the school and university levels. In her study, interaction between the cultural worlds of school and university, usually took place when a university-based person worked in a school setting either as researcher or in the dual role of researcher and participant (see Lampert, 1991). More often than not, when a research project took place, whether at the school or university setting, the emphasis was to observe the problems and/or change in the school-based person, not the university-based person (Oja & Smulyan, 1989; Short, 1992). This study investigated a "boundary blurring" (Lampert, 1991, p. 672) experience where school-based people joined university-based personnel at a university setting, to co-teach a social studies methods course. The changes and influences on both the university-based people and school-based people were examined.

Rationale for the Inquiry

"Why do the reform proposals and recommendations keep getting repeated? Why aren't there results? Who is
listening and who is acting?" (Gratch, 1992, p. 48) These questions undergirded this study. A recent reform movement, the Holmes group (1986, 1990), stated that over one hundred major research institutions were listening and acting in the area of reforms in education. One of their primary goals was reform through schools and universities working together. The number of research institutions and the common purpose of the Holmes group were significant advancements in the area of reforms. The Holmes Group documents elicited both positive and negative responses. (See Chapter Two for descriptions of the Holmes’ documents.) However, the Holmes group was uniting research institutions to discuss, listen, and act on behalf of teacher education. These institutions wanted to directly work with schools in developing reforms.

Stallings and Kowalski (1990) reported on the importance of carrying out research on reform movements. Research documents aid others in understanding growth, accomplishments, and deterioration of reform movements. As research establishments, a priority for these Holmes institutions was a planned and reported research agenda.

The major institutions of the Holmes group made it clear that they were not willing to "go-it-alone" with reforms in education. University-based and school-based people recognized the importance of both theory and
practice and the need to bring theory and practice together. It was recognized that there are different cultures at the university and school levels (Sarason, 1982). Universities were to be directly involved with elementary and secondary schools, and these schools directly involved with universities. This involvement between schools and university made Lampert's "boundary-blurring" possible (1991, p. 672). Working together collaboratively between two cultures that did not have a history of doing cooperative work smoothly, however, can be problematic. The Holmes group encouraged its members to take an active stance in crossing the boundaries of school and universities.

Statement of the Research Problem and Questions

Based on historical precedent, educational reforms of the 1980s and 1990s faced a certain future of little research reporting. When one looked back to the laboratory school movement or portal schools, one found limited research detailing the schools' growth, development, accomplishments, misinterpretations, and demise (Stallings & Kowalski, 1990). (Chapter Two reports the historical traditions of educational reforms.) Systematic case studies on educational reforms were necessary. This dissertation examined relationships
between university and school cultures as they were explicated through personnel who were a part of these cultures. This inquiry contributed a case study about one attempt to implement the agenda of the Holmes movement.

The central purpose of this inquiry was to examine the influence of collaboratively teaching a social studies methods course on the co-teaching participants. The participants included a university professor, a graduate assistant, and two elementary school teachers. The social studies methods course was taught on the main campus of the Ohio State University. The university was in the first year of developing professional development schools, sites where university-based and school-based personnel worked together.

The task of describing a process by which the participants interpreted the happenings of a social studies methods course was conducted within the naturalistic paradigm. The study was concerned with shared meaning making and how this influenced the participants' relationships and understandings of self and other participants. Through my positions as researcher and participant, I was involved in this dialectical process. I recognized that the data that I reported were not some objectified entity; but, rather were mutually constructed by the people in the study. In our
interactions with one another, we aimed to bring from "behind our backs" (Gadamer, 1976) our own traditions that influenced our interpretations. We constructed knowledge that "fused the horizons" (Gadamer, 1976) of our individual understandings.

Four questions guided the study. They were:

1) What is the nature of co-teaching?

2) How do the university-based and school-based professionals modify their teaching of and rationale for the course? of their classroom?

3) What influence does co-teaching have on the participants' conception of social studies?

4) How does collaboration influence the participants’ perspectives of each other and of themselves?

Methodology

This study was based on an interpretive approach to human science research (Gadamer, 1976a, 1976b; Linge, 1976; Rabinow & Sullivan, 1987; Van Manen, 1990). The study was methodologically embedded in the naturalistic paradigm (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Patton, 1990). The naturalistic paradigm was appropriate for this research as both the paradigm and research addressed the question of meaning making (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982; Gadamer, 1976; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Patton, 1990; Van Manen, 1990). A primary concern of someone using a naturalistic paradigm is one of meaning making embedded in
a particular human lived experience. "From a phenomenological point of view, to do research is always to question the way we experience the world, to want to know the world in which we live as human beings" (Van Manen, 1990, p. 5). This meaning making is influenced by the person's own history, culture, and perspective.

The purpose of this study was to examine the influence of collaboratively teaching a social studies method's course on the co-teachers. A case study focusing on the interpretations, actions and understandings of the participants was conducted. According to Van Manen (1990) "A good phenomenological description is collected by lived experience and recollects lived experience - is validated by lived experience and it validates lived experience" (p. 27).

Definitions of Terms

For the purpose of this research the terms listed below are defined as follows:

Collaboration:

implies the parties involved share responsibility and authority for basic policy decision making. (Hord, 1986, p. 22; citing Hoyt, 1978)

Cooperation:

assumes two or more parties, each with separate and autonomous programs, agree to work together
in making all such programs more successful. (Hord, 1986, p. 22; citing Hoyt, 1978)

**Co-teaching:**

involves parties working together to organize, plan, and teach a course or class. Co-teaching in this study refers to university-based and school-based personnel teaching a university course. The purpose was to bring university-based and school-based perspectives to bear on the subject matter in order to address both theory and practice issues.

**Culture:**

is the acquired knowledge people use to interpret experience and generate behavior. (Spradley, 1980, p. 6)

Geertz (1973) further develops this classic definition:

The culture concept to which I adhere has neither multiple referents nor, so far as I can see, any unusual ambiguity: it denotes an historically transmitted patterns of meanings embodied in symbols, a system of inherited conceptions expressed in symbolic forms by means of which men [sic] communicate, perpetuate, and develop their knowledge about and attitudes toward life. (p. 89)

**Holmes:**

is a consortium of nearly 100 American research universities committed to making the program of teacher preparation more rigorous and connected -- to liberal arts education, to research on learning and teaching, and to wise practice in the schools. (Holmes, 1986, preface)

**Naturalistic paradigm:**

is a world view that acknowledges that realities are multiple, constructed and holistic. Research is conducted within the natural environment of the problem under study.
Professional development schools:

is the term used to describe the connection between a university-based education school to one or more public [private, parochial] elementary and secondary schools. (Holmes, 1990, viii)

Reform:

refers to efforts aimed at improving the quality of teacher preparation or teaching in general.

Assumptions

In a description of any inquiry it was important to explicate any assumptions. As participant in this study, I assumed that it was possible to be both a participant and a researcher. Rather than biasing my interpretations during the study, these dual roles gave me insight into the workings of the co-teaching process which I would not have had were I not a participant. Yet, I recognized that problems were connected with these dual roles as well. As I analyzed and then triangulated the data, I had my interpretations, as did others. When these interpretations were different, I could not rest the case on the "participant’s experience." Was I not involved in the experience, too? Nor, could I rely on the "outsider’s perspective," not directly involved, thus seeing a broader
picture. Was I not as enmeshed in the experience as they were? (The discussion of subjectivity is continued in Chapter Three.)

I also made the assumption that the other participants in the study would help me both construct the interpretations and validate interpretations I made. I was both responsible for and yet depending on interpretations of my co-teachers.

Organization of the Study

This study was designed to examine the influence of collaboratively teaching social studies methods on the co-teachers. Using an interpretive approach to address meaning making in particular lived experiences, the participants' conversations, journals, and interviews were used to uncover patterns, trends, and influences.

Chapter One gave the overview of the study. Chapter Two describes the related literature for this study. It provides the theoretical and philosophical background for the study. Chapter Two also presents an overview of the reform documents in teacher education and research on collaboration. Chapter Three is an explanation of the research methodology including a rationale for the case study approach within the interpretative paradigm. Also included in this chapter is an explication of the
role of the researcher and data analysis. Beginning with chapter Four the analysis of data is presented. Chapter Four is a jointly told tale constructed around three themes which emerged from participants' discussions. Chapter Five continues the analysis of the data. It is a presentation of my interpretation of the data. Chapter Six concludes the document with a summary of the study, findings, implications, and recommendations for further study.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter, a review of the literature, examines four topics related to this inquiry: interpretive theory, concepts of culture, reforms in teacher education, and collaboration. The focus of each section is twofold. First, an overview of major contributions to the area are cited, followed by a description of how the scholarship has influenced the study. This review is not intended to be comprehensive of all relevant literature in each area. Rather, the literature presented are parts of the "web" (Geertz, 1973, p. 5) which I constructed to provide a theoretical framework for this study.

The chapter begins with a focus on interpretive theory and the ways in which interpretive theory informs this investigation of shared meaning making. It then proceeds to an examination of how certain constructs of culture expanded my understanding of culture in this study. Next, the periods of reform in teacher education are reviewed, noting in detail present reforms and how
they have influenced the study. Chapter II concludes with a discussion about collaboration and its central role in the present reform movements in teacher education.

Interpretive Theory

The first section of Chapter Two describes a theoretical basis for the study. First, some of the ideas of Hans-Georg Gadamer (1975, 1976, 1976, 1987, 1988) are described to provide a theoretical perspective. Following this philosophical background is a section on how interpretive theory has influenced anthropology. Lastly, these two sections are considered as they have influenced interpretative research methods.

Interpretive Theory and Philosophy

Gadamer (1976) provided a description of how people create meaning in their lives. It was his thesis that "the thing which hermeneutics teaches us is to see through the dogmatism of asserting an opposition and separation between the ongoing natural 'tradition' and the reflective appropriation of it" (p. 28). For Gadamer, there was no separation between the person and his/her historical self. One could not remove oneself from one's own "prejudices" or perspectives. Rather, these prejudices directed our experiencing the world. They grounded the person in the
past allowing for a "situatedness" in the present. The concept of prejudice was central to Gadamer's philosophy. It was the way Gadamer sought to acknowledge "the unsuspendable finitude and historicity of understanding and to exhibit the positive role they actually play in every human transmission of meaning" (Linge, 1976, p. xv). Gadamer (1988) described this as:

Far from it being the case that whoever listens to someone else or approaches a literary text must bring along no pre-opinion about the content and must forget all his [sic] own opinions, it is rather the case that openness for the opinion of the other or of the text will always include setting it in relation to the whole of one's own opinions or setting oneself to it. (p. 72)

One always participates in one's own understanding, thus, Gadamer believed that dogmatic objectivism askewed the intention of understanding.

Gadamer (1987) discussed that bringing one's historical self to meaning making allows for "verstehen" (understanding) rather than objective knowledge (also see Connolly & Keutner, 1988; Weinsheimer, 1985). Coming to "verstehen" is fulfilled only by a reality which is socially constructed through the interaction and actions of others. It is fundamentally important to note that interpretative theory is in direct opposition to seeing the world as univocal. When one believes that all meaning is socially constructed, the importance of conversation in
many voices is no longer viewed as an opponent to understanding but as necessary for it (Rabinow & Sullivan, 1987).

The capacity to discern the questionable is a strength of the hermeneutical consciousness (Gadamer, 1976). It is not the actions or the methods that matter in understanding but rather "what happens beyond our willing and doing;" what Gadamer called "imagination" (1976, p. 12). The bridging of this gap, between the familiar and strange, is a central ingredient of interpretive theory.

Summarizing the focus of interpretive theory, Gadamer (1987) wrote:

it is indispensable that through practice and education the listener may have already formed a 'habitudo' which he [sic] takes into the concrete situations of his [sic] life, a 'habitudo' which will be confirmed and solidified by each new action. (p. 117)

"Habitudo" or traditions are part of the make-up of a person's cultural life and enter into all understandings. Traditions are not external forces or past forces. Rather each person "lives through the process of tradition and provides it with its force" (Gallagher, 1992, p. 86). The hidden aspects of traditions are also part of meaning making.
Interpretations, according to Gadamer, could only occur within one's historical understanding of tradition. This process of examining one's historical assumptions, Gadamer called a reflexive action. Interpretative theory espouses that the only way to future understandings is the continual connecting of present interpretations with the past. Rabinow and Sullivan (1987) explained tradition, (Gadamer's "habitudo") as necessary for understanding because it "ties such habits intimately to the need for criticism, both theoretical and political, of received values, practices, and institutions" (p. 20). One must critically revisit one's prejudices throughout one's lifetime. Rabinow and Sullivan claimed that the interpretive approach could be seen as "condemning the person to remain open, both to the past and to the future" (p. 20). Gadamer wrote more favorably about the reflexive aspect of interpretative theory. He stated, "Reflection on a given preunderstanding brings before me something that otherwise happens 'behind my back'" (1976, p. 38). Gadamer recognized the importance of seeing what was "behind my back" because it provided an interplay between "habitudo" (traditions) and understanding. Traditions are an infinite reservoir of possibilities of meaning, giving life to, rather than stifling, understanding (Gadamer, 1976).
Hermeneutics first became popular as an area of study working with texts, especially biblical texts. Questions for hermeneuticists were: How did one understand written text from many years ago? Did one look to the author? The times? The context? Biblical hermeneuticist attempted to understand text by trying to understand the words and people within the context of the historical time. They sought to remove themselves from this meaning search. For Gadamer (1976), the meaning of the text went beyond the author and included the researcher. He embraced the idea that understanding was not out there, objectively waiting to be grasped but, rather, each person brought with him/herself a tradition (habitudo) which personalized interpretation for understanding.

Interpretation was a part of everything. One spoke of interpreting past incidents, spiritual experiences, verbal and non-verbal communication, laws, and direction. "Fusion of horizons" was the description Gadamer (1975, 1976) preferred to use for this transmission of meaning or convergence of worlds.

Understanding is about shared meaning. A person's horizon (their personal understandings) is not static. Horizons are constantly changing through encounters with the present and the past. It is part of understanding to be aware of the tensions of past and present in one's
horizon. It is important to recognize this tension and continually develop it for a better understanding of one’s own horizon. Gadamer argued that an openness for understanding was expanded when present horizons left gulfs between experience and the object of understanding (Linge, 1976). When a person understood, it was not only through her/his own horizon. Gadamer discussed coming to a shared understanding as "rising to a higher universality that overcomes not only our own particularity but that of the other as well" (Weinsheimer, 1985, p. 183).

Historicity was a part of Gadamer’s construction of meaning in language. According to Gadamer, (1976) "Language is the fundamental mode of operation of our being-in-the-world and the all-embracing form of the constitution of the world" (p. 3). Language and understanding were inseparable. Gadamer argued that understanding which evolved in the fusion of horizons was linked more by a "game," than by "objective knowing." When speaking to one another there was a constant passing back and forth into one another’s worlds. Rather than an objective knowing, the concept of fusion of horizons allowed for a limitless source of possibilities (Linge, 1976).

An understanding through interaction was an active definition for the fusion of horizons and transmission of
meaning used in this study. As Gadamer stated, "It suffices to say that one understands differently when one understands at all" (Linge, 1976, p. xxv, emphasis in original). This concept of understanding was important to the study as participants interacted with one another. Meaning was constructed not through a uni-vocal understanding of the experience of co-teaching, but rather a multi-voiced construction of meaning.

**Interpretive Theory and Anthropology**

Geertz (1973) in *The Interpretation of Cultures* discussed the use of interpretative theory in anthropology especially as it related to ethnography. For Geertz, ethnographies are interpretations. Literally, ethnography means "writing about the nations," or a writing about "a number of people accustomed to living together, a company" (Erickson, 1984, p. 52). More simply, Spradley (1979, 1980) defined ethnography as "the work of describing a culture" and, as part of his explanation of ethnography, quoted Malinowski’s goal of ethnography: "to grasp the native’s point of view, his [sic] relation to life, to realize his [sic] vision of his [sic] world" (p. 3; emphasis in original). It was this making sense of and writing another’s culture which lent itself to interpretative theory in anthropology. Geertz (1983)
presented this working of interpretative theory in anthropology as "an attempt somehow to understand how it is we understand understanding not our own" (p. 5). "Understanding of understanding" was what Geertz used as his description of cultural hermeneutics or cultural interpretative theory.

For Geertz (1973) ethnographies were a second person interpretation because, at best, the anthropologist could only make an interpretation of the participant's interpretation of her/his culture. Geertz discussed the difficulty of ever having a "first order" (from the member's perspective) ethnography because everyone in the culture interprets the culture. As Geertz maintained:

It is this maneuver, usually too casually referred to as "seeing things from the actor's point of view," too bookishly as "the verstehen approach," or too technically as "emic analysis," that [must be understood]. ... Nothing is more necessary to comprehending what anthropological interpretation is, and the degree to which it is interpretation, than an exact understanding of what it means - and what it does not mean - to say that our formulations of other people's symbol systems must be actor-oriented. (p. 14)

The "writing" of people's cultures, whether labeled first, second, or third order, could not be known "out there" or objectifiable. Interpretations of a culture could only be illustrated through thick description, which were "formations of other people's symbol systems" by the
anthropologist (Geertz, 1973, p. 14).

Coming to understand another's culture through interpretative action must not be confused with "knowing" the culture. Culture is something that can be described, (Geertz, 1973) but one never finalizes the writing about a culture because it can not be objectified. The ethnography or anthropological writing that occurred from an interpretative description is from the "actor's eye" interpreted by the ethnographer, it is not a description of the actual culture.

Geertz (1983) developed the importance of the idea of "cultural hermeneutics" in his text *Local Knowledge*. According to Geertz, "What is knowledge?" was no longer the central question. Rather, "What is it we want to know?" (p. 34) was the question to explore. Geertz inferred that the product was (or was becoming) less important than the process. From a hermeneutic point of view, one was not searching for a result, "How all this muddle is going to come together?" but, becoming comfortable with an open-ended inquiry, "What does all this ferment mean" (p. 34)? Geertz believed that this "refiguration of social theory" provided an expanded understanding in the social sciences of how to relate data to theory. Neutrality or "finding the facts" was not of central importance. Meaning making was.
That thought is spectacularly multiple as product and wondrously singular as process has thus not only come to be a more and more powerful animating paradox within the social sciences, driving theory in all sorts of directions, some of them reasonable, but the nature of that paradox has more and more come to be regarded as having to do with puzzles of translation, with how meaning in one system of expression is expressed in another, - cultural hermeneutics, not conceptive mechanics. (1983, p. 151)

For Geertz, cultural hermeneutics made us all natives, because we were all making interpretations of the culture. The area of study now became how "the other" (whether "the other" was around the world or around the corner) made sense of his/her world. Geertz's (1983) central point to cultural hermeneutics was in the endeavor to understand the variety of ways people organized their lives.

It was essential to follow a systematic analysis of data to produce a document that enhanced the understanding of how meaning making takes place. The next section treats how interpretive theory informs research methodology.

**Interpretive Theory and Research Methodology**

According to Patton (1990), "Hermeneutics ask, 'What are the conditions under which a human act takes place or a product is produced that makes it possible to interpret
its meaning" (p. 84)? He quoted Eichelberger to present how the hermeneutic researcher constructs meaning:

Hermeneutists are much clearer [than researchers from other perspectives] about the fact that they are constructing the "reality" on the basis of their interpretation of data with the help of the participants who provided the data in the study. (p. 85; emphasis in the original)

Bogdan and Biklen (1982) agreed with Patton that it was through social interaction that meaning was constructed. Researchers argued that the hermeneutic approach must probe directly the actual group life of the people participating in the study. In this way the construction of reality happens with the participants rather than on or to the participants.

Both Geertz (1973) and Smith (1992) discussed the importance of seeing researchers as "interpreters of interpretations" already made by the people. The central feature of this methodology was the research focus on individuals and groups in their natural context. The interpretative researcher wishes to take part in the participants' development of making sense of their lives (See Bogdan, Biklen, 1982; Geertz, 1973; Lincoln, Guba, 1985; Powdermaker, 1966; Van Manen, 1990; Wax, 1971). An interpretation is not looking to or trying to establish objective truth or scientific laws. The interpretive theorist simply attempts to understand
Both Gadamer (1975) and Geertz (1983) emphasized that no single method prevails in the interpretative frame, "for I do not believe that what 'hermeneutics' needs is to be reified into a para-science" (Geertz, 1983, p. 5). While agreeing with Gadamer and Geertz that the "hermeneutical method is no method," Van Manen (1990) discussed a set of "guides and recommendations for a principled form of inquiry that neither simply rejects or ignores tradition, nor slavishly follows or kneels in front of it" (p. 30). In other words, Van Manen wanted to make explicit those "subtle," implicit assumptions that frame interpretive studies.

Van Manen (1990) considered six practical approaches to hermeneutical human science research. These activities were described as ways to stimulate the researcher in the areas of "inventiveness and insight" rather than being prescriptive or mechanistic. They were:

1) turning to a phenomenon which seriously interests us and commits us to the world;
2) investigating experience as we live it rather than as we conceptualize it;
3) reflecting on the essential themes which characterize the phenomenon;
4) describing the phenomenon through the art of writing and rewriting;
5) maintaining a strong and oriented pedagogical relation to the phenomenon;
6) balancing the research context by considering parts and whole. (p. 30-31)
These activities were present in my study. This inquiry has imploded my experiences as researcher, theorist, and thinker. From the beginning this study was a part of a larger project. It was not formulated just as "my study" but rather emerged from my involvement with a school/university project which later became a professional development school. I "lived" this study, not only as a researcher, but also as a participant. Throughout the entire study the importance of themes, subjectivity, and methodology were considered. (The discussion of research methods is continued and described in more detail in Chapter Three.)

**Summary**

The phenomenon of understanding, then, shows the universality of human linguisticality as a limitless medium that carries everything within it - not only the "culture" that has been handed down to us through language, but absolutely everything - because everything (in the world and out of it) is included in the realm of "understandings" and understandability in which we move. (Gadamer, 1976, p. 25)

Through interpretation, my understanding of events was expanded. In reflection on my own prejudices, encountering a gulf between understanding and experience, I brought before myself what otherwise happened behind my back. It was in this sense that interpretive theory informs this study. As the participants and I interacted,
permitting and gaining access to each other's horizons, we were involved in forming interpretations of each other's meaning and culture. Both the participants and I were pushed and pulled to look "behind our backs" to see the "habitudos" that informed our actions.

Culture

This section of the literature review defines culture as it is used in this study, surveys some analogies used to define culture, and relates them to Gadamer's concept of a fusion of horizons. Secondly, it discusses how an understanding of culture is necessary to this study.

Definition

Culture, as defined in this study, is the "the acquired knowledge people use to interpret experience and generate behavior" (Spradley, 1980, p. 6). Stated another way, culture "is a system of inherited conceptions expressed in symbolic forms [which people] communicate, perpetuate, and develop their knowledge about and attitudes toward life" (Geertz, 1973, p. 89). Culture is public because meaning is public (Geertz, 1973). We continuously are influenced by our "cultural" contexts.
Cultural Analogies

An understanding of culture is difficult to articulate because there is no "final form" (Van Maanen, 1988). Van Maanen described culture as being similar to a black hole from which no light could escape. Culture is changing. One only knows culture by experience or "by conjecture, inference, and a great deal of faith" (p. 3). This can leave one with the feeling that it is futile to attempt to understand culture because it may be ultimately unknowable. Culture is so dense that even a native can only "interpret" his/her own culture. Van Maanen's portrayal of culture as a "black hole" suggests that culture is immense and impenetrable.

Geertz (1973) described culture as "webs of significance." Using the conceptual frame of Max Weber, "that man [sic] is an animal suspended in webs of significance he himself [sic] has spun" (p. 5), Geertz proposed that these webs are the culture of each person. It is in creating the webs and living the webs, that each person searches for and interprets meaning within his or her culture. As this view suggests, culture is multifaceted, not having any "one" way or description. Geertz's "webs of significance" highlights culture as dynamic and complex.
Lastly, Tierney (1991) and Rosaldo (1989) compared culture to a concept of borders. People are familiar with the idea of borders in their lives. One only has to think of a fenced back yard, city boundaries, state lines, or country demarcations, to immediately picture containment, ownership, and/or neighbors. However, cultural borders can appear not only within officially recognized lines; but also as borders that are implicitly embedded in lives, such as, status, age, life experiences, and gender (Rosaldo, 1989). These "borders" can be crossed, shared, and/or protected. "Borders," used as an analogy for culture, features culture as part of daily sustenance and activity.

These three descriptions of culture -- black hole, webs, and borders -- suggest that it may be difficult to participate in or understand another's culture, or maybe even our own. These analogies also describe the lived experience of how people in cultures encounter one another. This encountering between people of different cultures is part of the "fusion of horizons," which Gadamer described. It is at this point, the fusion of horizons, that limits are experienced, questions are begged, and assumptions are broken. Gadamer suggested this when he wrote, "Collision with the other's horizons makes us aware of assumptions so deep-seated that they
would otherwise remain unnoticed" (Linge, 1976, p. xxi). The meeting of cultures may provide a "behind my back" experience for participants. It is to a description of school and university cultures represented in this study that follows.

School and University Culture

Some see schools and universities as only part of a larger culture called education and that this is their only culture. This misconception is easy to understand. Schools are places where teachers, who are taught at the university, teach. Schools are places where university people come to do research. Universities are places where students, who are taught by teachers, come to be taught by university professors in order to be teachers. One gains a sense of the circular nature of education in this confusing description. In this way it is easy to think of all education as "one big happy family." It is not. There are significant differences in school and university cultures that need to be recognized.

Those who are at home in the world of ideas and theory usually have never experienced the creating of a setting. They're interested in what is, has been, and should be. But they themselves have rarely, if ever, put themselves in a situation where the center of action has moved to the creation of what should be, where they will experience the problems as participants rather than as observers, and where
theory and practice take on new relationships, the artist and the art critic, the person of action and the person of theory, the participant and the observer. People of action know that it's a fantastically complicated affair; people of ideas and theory know neither the game nor the score. People of ideas and theory know that most settings go seriously astray, that people of action are devoid of the "right ideas," and that the major task is how to wed practice to theory. There is some truth to both pictures, but neither group can understand this, perhaps because the people of action know they will have to think differently and the people of theory know they will have to act differently. (Sarason, 1972)

This description of school and university cultures related to different orientations toward theory and practice began to expose the differences in these institutional cultures. Schools and universities were dissimilar in their approaches to everything from administration to time commitments to academic freedom. As schools and universities began to "blur boundaries" (Lampert, 1991), these dissimilar approaches became meeting places for collisions and/or encounters, or, Gadamer's "fusion of horizons."

There was no single definition of school culture or university culture. Many "cultures" were present within each institution, thus it was not possible to entirely define each (Cuban, 1984; Feiman-Nemser & Floden, 1986; Goodlad, 1975, 1987; Heckman, 1987; Lortie, 1975; Sarason, 1971, 1982, 1983; Tierney, 1991). The delay in
recognizing dissimilar cultures in education was encouraged by this difficulty in definition and an overall refusal to see the distinctiveness of educational programs.

Sarason (1971) and later Goodlad (1975) were the first to discuss the idea of school cultures. The idea of school cultures emerged as they considered the question of why school reforms so often failed. Sarason and Goodlad charged that change efforts commonly used a top-down approach, paying little attention to those who would have to carry out the program, or to those who would experience it (See also Cuban, 1984; Sarason, 1982).

Sarason's (1972) hallmark book, *Culture of the School and the Problem of Change*, challenged this traditional and repetitive way of implementing school change. He predicted that the difficulty of change in schools was made worse by a lack of understanding the culture of schools: "Many people having a role in, or concern for, educational planning and change possess no intimate knowledge of the culture of the setting they wish to influence and change" (p. 8). Sarason emphasized that the role or position a person has in relation to the culture influences his/her perception of culture and of change. Whether one was "from" the school culture, university culture or general public, would modify how one thought
about an issue. Secondly, Sarason found that many in the school culture did not seek or want change. He surmised that change did not take place in schools because there was little risk-taking promoted in schools. Sarason believed that it was difficult to see new ways of acting when only old actions were mandated.

Goodlad (1975) agreed with Sarason's description of the problem of school change. He proposed two corollaries that matched Sarason's points. First, Goodlad saw a need for participants to form new views of their world. He felt that the world of school persons was much too narrow, and, in turn, so was their view of schools. This limited their view of the possibilities of change. Secondly, Goodlad wanted to create a renewing culture, one that enabled its participants to make decisions. He saw this as instrumental to participants' ownership of change.

Both Sarason (1971) and Goodlad (1975) saw the devastating consequences of isolation in school culture. On the whole, participants in schools did their job "by themselves" with little or no discussion about strategies, problems, or what works. There was little or no collegial solutions. Isolation was a factor in keeping the school world view narrow.

Conant (1963) did not use the word "culture" when he aptly described the teacher education environment at
the university level. He discussed the low esteem of teacher educators because many believed they were not needed:

I shared the views of the majority of my colleagues on the faculty of arts and sciences that there was no excuse for the existence of people who sought to teach others how to teach. (1963, p. 1)

Conant inferred that there was a need for an understanding of the teacher education university culture by those participating in it, as well as those who were outside of it. Whatever one's role was in relation to university culture did influence one's perception of the culture and of self. Conant implied a need for a renewing culture. Teacher education programs were not meeting the expectations of the times, nor did reform movements have any lasting outcomes. Goodlad (1975, 1990) lent support to Conant's claims that university faculty do not understand their culture and that universities need a renewing culture.

Summary

The elements of culture described above and the connection to interpretative theory informed this study. Only through interpretation, and shared meaning making, does one come to a dynamic understanding of one's own culture or another's culture.
An understanding of culture was necessary for this study as the participants came from different cultures. Even though I used school and university culture very generally, I recognized that there were also many differences and subcultures within the school and university cultures. However, for this study, I used only the larger cultural contexts.

The differences between school and university cultures were central to the study. Participants had to work through their perceptions of their own culture and one another's cultures. Both the school and university cultures involved in this study were influenced by the current proposals for reform in teacher education. An overview of these reforms follows.

Periods of Reform in Teacher Education

Educational historians identify three major periods of educational reform in this country (Rippa, 1984; Tyack & Hansot, 1982; Tyack, Kirst & Hansot, 1980; Urban, 1990). Using the dates established by Tyack and Hansot (1982) these periods are: 1820-1890; 1890-1954; and 1954-present. Included in these reform periods are calls for revisions in teacher education. This section of the literature review will focus on giving an overview of reforms in
teacher education. It does not review all reforms that influenced teacher education. Rather, my purpose is to provide a sense of the length of time and number of reforms which have been a part of teacher education.

The reform documents of the first and second periods lay a foundation for subsequent reforms. Since the study takes place during the third period of educational reform (1954-present), a more indepth overview of the reform accounts for that period will be given, followed by a detailed explanation of the Holmes group reform reports that most affect this study.

1820 - 1890 An Aristocracy of Character

The mainstream public schools of the mid-nineteenth century were the product of an institution-building social movement led by men and women who shared a similar ideology and interests and who helped to build a common school system by persuading and mobilizing their fellow citizens, mostly at the local level. (Tyack & Hansot, 1982, p. 19)

This period was best known for the development of the common school. Two distinct areas of concern surfaced during this period. First, as advocated by Horace Mann, the common school was to have public control and support. He wanted attendance as a right for everyone, no distinction made to race, color or creed (Tyack, Kirst & Hansot, 1980). The outward appearance of the common
school took on a protestant, conservative look. The system supplied the needed education of the masses, as well as the acculturation for the rising population of immigrants (Kaestle, 1983). The building of this public institution was an immense undertaking for the nation during the middle of the nineteenth century.

The second area that demanded attention during this period was a direct result of the common school. The rise and progression of the common school movement brought more and more children to school and caused a constant demand for teachers. At first these teaching positions were filled by those who had finished an elementary education (Herbst, 1989). With the establishment of normal schools, education reformers hoped to refine and systematize the teaching in the common schools (Spring, 1990). Spring described normal schools as "marking the beginning of the study of pedagogy and the investigation of various methods of instruction" (p. 125).

Normal schools were established to prepare teachers better, turning a part-time occupation into a professional career (Herbst, 1989). However, for a multitude of reasons varying from state to state, this focused agenda was seldom to be the case. For example, Herbst (1980) described Wisconsin's disagreement between normal school leaders' definition of the school for teacher training and
the state legislators' idea:

Not only were they [normal schools] to offer instruction in the theory and art of teaching and in all the subjects of a common school education, but also in agriculture, chemistry, husbandry, mechanic arts, constitutional law and citizenship, and ... medicine, astronomy, and other branches of science and literature. (p. 135)

People who wanted the normal school located in their locality agreed with the legislature. It was the community's ideal to send their sons and daughters on for a post-elementary or post-secondary education (Urban, 1990; Herbst, 1989). Even though normal schools became known best as schools where female students were trained to be elementary teachers (Kaestle, 1983; Spring, 1990); the end result was that they were seldom solely "just" teacher training institutions. This was especially true in the rural areas. Course work was added to the curriculum of the normal school to meet the needs to further the education of the local population. The first battle to professionalize teacher education, with its own school, was lost during this time of establishing normal schools.

1890 - 1954 Schooling by Design in a Corporate Society

The reformers of Mann’s generation had believed that they were the chosen agents of a providential deity. The administrative progressives were certain that they possessed
the instruments of scientific progress that would enable them to shape society toward "ever nobler ends." (Tyack & Hansot, 1982, p. 106)

Three different themes were apparent in this period. First, the growth and subsequent decline of normal schools was recorded. Second, it was a period for beginning teacher education programs in colleges and universities. Lastly, as teacher education programs began, reforms of the programs immediately followed.

By the end of the nineteenth century changes were happening in teacher education that precipitated changes in normal schools. The requirements for admission into normal school became more stringent (Spring, 1990). Earlier, one attended normal schools with as little as an elementary education, in 1905, The Department of Normal Schools of the National Education Association accepted the proposal that required a high school diploma for acceptance (Spring, 1990).

New requirements and expansion of the normal school curriculum soon brought about their petitioning for college (and, in some cases, university) status. One argument for this change was that "the two-year normal school course did not provide the teacher with a broad enough liberal education" (Spring, 1990, p. 253). During the 1920s many normal schools became or were replaced by four-year teachers colleges.
As normal schools were expanding to four-year teacher colleges and from teacher education to other fields, universities were beginning to include departments of education. The first permanent department of education was established at the University of Iowa in 1873; by 1899 244 universities had education departments (Spring, 1990). Normal schools were known for elementary education (or common school) training; the liberal arts college or university became known for the training of secondary school teachers and administrations, most of whom were male (Kaestle, 1983; Tyack & Hansot, 1982; Spring, 1990). This split in teacher education programs, location, length of time involved (two years versus four years), and differentiated sexes, helped to divide rather than unify teacher education.

During this time period (1890-1954) the predicament of a teacher shortage became a central focus of the reform movements. Teacher preparation was not keeping pace with the number of students attending schools. The combination of free public education and a desire to socialize a large immigration population filled schools (Spring, 1990; Tyack & Hansot, 1982). Reforms of teacher education advocated for more preparation for teacher, yet the need for teachers demanded less time for preparation.
Not losing sight of the need for teachers, Kilpatrick also saw the importance of reforming how teaching was done. In *The Educational Frontier* (1933), he described the significance of developing teacher education programs which would challenge the prospective teacher to see schools and the country differently. He argued that teacher education courses should challenge students with issues such as: how should the school deal with social improvements through indoctrination or critical thinking (Kliebard, 1987; Zeichner & Liston, 1990)? Kilpatrick believed it was as important for the "teachers of teachers" to have this social consciousness as it was for students.

The socially unenlightened teaching too often found in the ordinary college or normal school can hardly have any other result than turning out teachers ignorant of our social situation and with no intelligent concern about it. ... Each staff member should be encouraged to know first hand how the less favored among us live and feel. (Kilpatrick, 1933, p. 266)

Kilpatrick and Rugg designed a two-semester course, Social Foundations of Education, in the 1930s. The primary purpose of this course was to develop a social and educational philosophy for prospective teachers so that indoctrination would not be the mode of teaching. The content and the working together of faculty from different disciplines (history, philosophy, sociology, education)
made this course significant in the 1930s and 1940s (Urban, 1990; Zeichner & Liston, 1990).

It was during the early part of the twentieth century when educators became interested in the scientific method. Great confidence was placed in the science of education. Leaving behind the theories of Pestalozzi, Herbart, and Dewey, graduate programs in school administration emphasized statistical procedures to gather data and produce findings to improve teaching (Tyack & Hansot, 1982; Urban, 1990). While the survey style of scientific method served the purpose of locating departments of education in a research area, it also further separated university professors from the classroom.

In this way, psychologists devised intelligence and achievement tests that profoundly shaped the destiny of students; university professors at leading institutions like Teachers College, Columbia, trained and placed superintendents in major cities; educators from foundations and higher education made surveys of states and cities that told citizens what was approved practice and how well their schools matched this new professional wisdom; and a accreditation agencies made such standards criteria for good standing. It was a time of great confidence in a new "science of education" that would reshape schooling in such a way that public education could engineer a smoothly running, "socially efficient" society. (Tyack, Kirst & Hansot, 1980, p. 258)

Former normal schools, now teachers colleges, looked to legitimate their existence by taking on this university model (Urban, 1990). Rather than follow Dewey’s concept
of university research developing within a school setting, the teachers colleges further separated themselves from the school by using the scientific method. Using a scientific method resulted in the discussion and development of research problems outside of the school setting and minimal time was needed at the actual school site.

By the middle of the twentieth century the problems in teacher education fueled calls for reforms. One response to these problems was that teacher unions developed, leading the way for improved salaries, working conditions, and attaining a voice in educational policy making (Spring, 1990). Unions were responsible for drawing teachers together. Even though the union's primary purpose was not professionalization of teaching, it was obvious that these circumstances had to be addressed if teaching was to become a profession.

In 1950, Elliott of Cornell University wrote "A long-range program to relieve the teacher shortage" in which he described what he saw as needed reforms in teaching and teacher education. Elliott believed that teachers needed to be held in more esteem and the positive side of teaching should be developed. He wanted recruitment of teacher education students to begin early, even in high school, so the best students would be admitted. Finally,
Elliott asserted the need for a more unified teacher education program at the university level where students would not have to "feed on the crumbs which are promiscuously scattered by the waiters at other intellectual tables" (p. 178).

Others who wrote in the early 1950s about the needed reforms of teaching and teacher education addressed similar issues as reported by the National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards (1953). Concerned about the shortage of teachers, the National Commission issued recommendations which impacted teaching and teacher education. Some of the most significant recommendations for teaching were: scholarship opportunities, broad experiences for children to discover teaching as a career, adequate salary recognition for a professional service, a working environment proper to professional service, professional development through a program of teachers visiting other classrooms, and teachers' opportunities to be involved in programs of improvement. The Commission also made suggestions to improve teacher education; extending and improving facilities of teacher education departments, improving the curriculum, and preparing liberal arts graduates for a teaching profession (p. 281-287).
These reforms had barely begun to circulate before two important happenings sent education, in all its forms, into another crisis. First was the court desegregation order (1954) of schools, followed closely by the controversy over the Russian Sputnik shot (1957). Both helped to propel education (and the world) into a new era.

1954 - Present Dreams Deferred

What happens to a dream deferred?  
Does it dry up  
like a raisin in the sun?  
Or fester like a sore -  
and then run?  
Does it stink like rotten meat? Or  
crust and sugar over -  
like a syrupy sweet?  
Maybe it just sags like a heavy load.  
Or does it explode?  

(Langston Hughes as printed in Tyack, Hansot, 1982, p. 213)

Before 1954, a "newness" seemed applicable to the reform documents of education. Now, one had to admit "we" had been "doing" organized public education for over one hundred years, and problems were greater than ever. Response to these problems were more reforms.

This period in educational history had been termed the "reform generation" because of the number of reform movements and documents that were produced during this time (Tyack, Kirst & Hansot, 1980). Using California as an example, in less than a twenty year period (1958-1975)
there were fifty-two reform initiatives recorded.
Throughout the country reforms were introduced in almost
every area conceivable. Some examples were:

- new curricula in science and math
- compensatory education for the "disadvantaged"
- ethnic studies
- programs to eliminate sexual bias in athletics
- desegregation
- bilingual, bicultural programs
- performance contracting
- head-start
- open classrooms
- team teaching
- minimum competency testing
- affective education
- creation of alternative schools
- legal protection of student rights
- management by objectives
- provision for the handicapped
- experiments in parental choice of education.

(Tyack & Hansot, 1980, p. 260-261)

The reforms influential to teacher education were
also numerous. Two common threads of improvement were
woven throughout the reform documents: recommendations to
encourage more talented young people into the field of
teaching and to professionalize the teaching field. A
description of the main documents follows.

Arthur Bestor (1956) in The Restoration of Learning
recommended two avenues for reform. First, he believed
teaching should have the commitment from the entire
university. To do this, Bestor suggested establishing a
distinct faculty of teacher training where members would
be drawn from the entire university and propose their own
administration. Second, he advocated that it was necessary for the professionalization of teaching to establish a more rigorous set of standards in knowledge and scholarship. Bestor argued, that, as a profession, teaching must have and claim their own body of knowledge. "A profession presupposes and draws upon a vast reservoir of organized knowledge, theoretical reasoning, and developed intellectual power, which each member of the profession individually must command" (p. 270). Bestor desired a strong grounding in the liberal arts and sciences as important for teachers, viewing the professional pedagogical courses as "highly specialized training" that should come only at the very end of the program.

The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) (1957), and the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) (1958), agreed with Bestor that teacher education programs should have rigorous admission requirements; offer a solid general, liberal arts education with a subject matter focus; and be the concern of the entire university faculty (Armstrong, 1957, p. 232-243). NCATE and AACTE recommended a strong tie with the schools advising well-organized professional laboratory experience including student teaching. This component should have teachers and
administrators in the schools playing a significant role. Lastly NCATE suggested a minimum of five years of college studies and laboratory experience for individuals to become teachers. They chided society to offer better salaries, social prestige, and status in order to make teaching a more attractive profession.

The 1960s began with Conant's landmark book, *The Education of American Teachers* (1963). Conant traveled twenty-two states visiting seventy-seven institutions carefully observing the way teacher education programs were designed by colleges and universities. He examined the state mandates and held discussions with professors, students and teachers about both the education programs and state mandates. Conant's book outlined twenty-six recommendations for the improvement of teacher education. He believed that two words best characterized these recommendations, "freedom" and "responsibility." Freedom for colleges and universities to design and carry out programs of teacher education with the least amount of interference from state legislatures and accreditation boards. Responsibility should be placed on each college and university to produce competent teachers.

What is needed is on the one hand for the state to allow freedom for institutions to experiment, and on the other for the academic professors and professors of education in each institution to take joint responsibility for the reputation of
their college or university in training teachers. (Conant, 1963, p. 210)

Conant's recommendations were combined in five groups according to who most likely could bring about its adoption (p. 210-217). The first two groups dealt with state responsibilities for certification and finances. Conant believed the state should only be involved minimally with teacher education but these two areas were both part of their responsibility. The last group had to do with accrediting agencies. Conant suggested that these bodies be broadened with representatives of scholarly disciplines and the informed public, as well as professional educators.

Conant also recommended reforms for public schools and colleges, describing both groups as having major responsibilities for teacher education. Conant recommended that school systems which entered into contracts with colleges and universities had to provide only cooperating teachers who were competent teachers, leaders and evaluators as models during practice teaching. These teachers should have a higher salary and fewer responsibilities. Conant saw it necessary to provide teachers with a revision of salary schedules, financial assistance for study in summer, leaves of absence for continued study, and a development of the inservice
education. His last recommendation for schools was a development of an initial probationary period for new teachers. Conant suggested a five-step procedure:

1. limited teaching responsibility;
2. aid in gathering instructional materials;
3. advice of experienced teachers whose own load is reduced so that they can work with the new teacher in his own classroom;
4. shifting to more experienced teacher those pupils who create problems beyond the ability of the novice to handle effectively; and
5. specialized instruction concerning the characteristics of the community, the neighborhood, and the students he is likely to encounter.

The college/university responsibilities were the most numerous. As stated earlier, Conant believed colleges should have the freedom to establish the teacher education program they saw most fitting and should justify choice of course work to the board of trustees. He suggested a strong liberal arts curriculum for teacher education with an all-university involvement. Conant addressed the problem of small colleges training teachers. He believed that fewer teacher education institutions were needed. If small colleges could not provide the necessary expertise for teacher education through the equivalent of three or four professors in elementary education, they should cease to have a program.

Conant suggested that colleges establish a clinical professor for both elementary and secondary programs.
This person would be analogous to that of a clinical person in the medical field. The elementary and secondary programs would consist of a period of basic preparation differing for each teaching period (K-3), (4-6) and (7-12), more broadly defined for (K-3) and a single focus needed for the other areas. Conant saw diplomas, without grade designation, as necessary for art, music, and physical education. Lastly, Conant asked that all colleges of education evaluate their master degree programs to increase the competency of teachers.

Koerner (1963) agreed with the major approaches to reform in teacher education as discussed by Conant (1963) and Bestor (1956). He strengthened the position of not having "education courses" describing them as "vague, insipid, time-wasting, and probably irrelevant" (p. 56). Koerner wanted non-education organizations to have a greater influence on teacher education programs. This seemed to work against Conant's idea of freedom and responsibility for the university. Basically, Koerner (1963), Conant (1963) and Bestor (1956) all followed a more traditional academic reforms to teacher education. Other reform documents of the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s followed other traditions (Zeichner & Liston, 1990).

The competency based teacher education programs relied on the earlier scientific studies in education and
the social efficiency tradition (Zeichner & Liston, 1990). An example of this type of reform proposal could be seen in studies by Houston and Howsam (1972) and work done by Gage (1972, 1978). Gage called for a strong link between those in teacher education and those doing research. He discussed breaking knowledge down and labeling it "available and used, available and not used, and not available and not used" (p. 145). By 1978, Gage expanded these ideas by calling for microteaching and minicourses. Gage proposed "with microteaching and minicourses, teacher educators acquired tools that seemed to have demonstrable effectiveness in improving the teachers' 'knowledge how'" (p. 50). Gage believed that better teacher education was dependent on helping teachers understand and act in their roles.

Houston and Howsam (1972) informed competency-based education by encouraging explicit objectives, giving more direction for instruction and effective evaluation. These objectives allowed for program developers to examine energy output, resources required, and time needed to complete various requirements. Houston and Howsam listed different kinds of objectives as important for teacher preparation programs to focus on: cognitive, performance, consequence, affective, and exploratory. These objectives focused teaching on the student rather than the teacher.
Zeichner and Liston (1990) discussed two other traditions that have produced reforms in teacher education. The developmentalist tradition proceeded from "the assumption that the natural order of development in the child was the most significant and scientifically defensible basis for determining what should be taught" (Kliebard, 1987, p. 13). The 1960s and 1970s were times of renewed interest in child-centered pedagogy and "open classroom" education (Zeichner, Liston, 1990). This "open education" movement in teacher education shared a number of themes:

- a commitment to involvement in one's own learning, an active approach to learning in terms of direct experience with materials, an encouragement of children's communication and prospective teachers' communication with children using skills of observing, reading, speaking, and writing; early field experiences, offerings in the expressive arts as well as in academic areas, and an understanding of children's development which reflects the writings of Jean Piaget. (Crook, 1974, as quoted in Zeichner & Liston, 1990, p. 11)

The final movement was the social reconstructionists. Kliebard (1987) described this tradition as "deriving its central thrust from the undercurrent of discontent about American economic and social system .. and saw curriculum as the vehicle by which social injustice would be redressed and the evils of capitalism corrected" (p. 183). The 1970s and 1980s had a number of documents connected
with social reconstruction; for example, Apple’s (1971) "The Hidden Curriculum and the Nature of Conflict," and Giroux and McLaren (1986) "Teacher Education and the Politics of Engagement: The Case for Democratic Schooling." However, according to Zeichner and Liston (1990) what was most characteristic of the social reconstructionist was "its marginal status among teacher education programs in the U.S." (p. 15). This marginal status had been true of this tradition since the early part of the century (Zeichner & Liston, 1990).

Darling-Hammond and Berry (1988) divided the time period, 1980s to present, into first and second wave reform. There were several major reform documents during the first wave of reform in teacher education. In 1983 the National Commission on Excellence in Education published their report, A Nation at Risk. Rather than discuss reforms for teacher education, this document emphasized risk factors which were evident in the nation’s students, namely, illiteracy, declining scores, and falling behind students overseas. Although A Nation at Risk was often cited as the impetus for renewed standardization in state policies, Darling-Hammond and Berry (1988) contended that most of the policies immediately enacted, were in fact policies that had their beginnings between 1969 and 1974.
By 1979, 21 states had adopted measures of basic skills proficiency as requirements for student graduation, and all 50 states had undertaken some legislative or state board activity in the area of setting standards for schools or students. (p. 2)

A document addressing reform of teacher education was Smith, Silverman, Borg, and Fry's (1980) *A Design for a School of Pedagogy* published by the United States Department of Education. The recommendations made by Smith, et. al., in this document represented what other documents of the early 80s called for in teacher education reform. Smith called for professionalization of teaching and used the medical profession as an example. "If medical schools, in comparable circumstances, raised themselves to admirable levels of quality in less than a century, there is reason to hope that schools of pedagogy can at least establish themselves as a genuine professional institution" (p. 18).

The major emphasis in *A Design for a School of Pedagogy* was to create a school which would have university, community and school districts providing laboratories for teacher training. Smith, et. al., saw the importance of clinical positions, describing them as practicing teachers who were also given faculty status in the school of pedagogy. They focused on developing a six-year teacher education program; four-year baccalaureate
degree in a discipline, followed by a two-year master degree of pedagogy. Smith, et. al., (1980) believed concepts and principles were taught most effectively by using protocols and minicourses. They saw laboratory experience as important and should be connected with coursework and supervision, both of which would have university instructors and clinical teachers. They wanted to eliminate courses that they saw as not relevant to success in the classroom, namely, history of education, philosophy of education, and social foundations of education. Finally, Smith, et. al., discussed the importance of both practitioners and researchers. They called for the development of programs for the degrees of Doctor of Pedagogy and a Doctor of Philosophy.

The reforms of the 1980s took on a different outlook. Whereas in the 1960s and 1970s the focus seemed to be on schools and changing finances, management, and curriculum, the 1980s shifted that focus to teacher policies (Darling-Hammond, Berry, 1988). "Specifically, tighter entry requirements to weed out incompetents and incentives to attract and retain talented individuals in the [teaching] profession" (p. 4) became the "new" area of concern ... again.

The second wave of reform identified by Darling-Hammond and Berry (1988) began in 1985 with many new
documents on teacher education reports being produced. A representative document of this time is the National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education report (1985) *A Call for Change in Teacher Education*. This document called for a development of a national academy for continuing faculty development and for states to maintain rigorous review programs in the profession. The commission asked for increased teacher salaries and sufficient funds for teacher education programs. Teacher education programs would adopt rigorous academic standards for admittance into the profession. The commission asked for special programs to attract minorities into teaching. They believed new teachers needed an induction year or internship where there would be a program which permitted continual learning. Lastly, the commission cautioned the use of emergency certificates for teachers, but did encourage the development of alternative teacher education programs for certification.

**Holmes Group: Tomorrow's Teachers**

The Holmes document (1986), *Tomorrow's Teachers*, featured many of the same recommendations for teacher education as proposed by the other reports during the "second wave of reform." One significant difference of Holmes was its membership. In 1983, twenty-four education
deans and a number of chief academic officers of major research universities began to discuss ways to improve teacher education (Holmes, 1986). This group saw the importance of reform in teacher education and were a part of the one hundred and twenty-six institutions eventually invited to join the consortium.

The issue of university-based and school-based personnel working together became a primary concern of the consortium. The Holmes members stated, "We have become convinced that university officials and professors must join with schools, and with the teacher organizations and state and local governments that shape the schools, to change the teaching profession" (1986, p. 5). Tomorrow's Teachers outlined five broad, major goals in a program of action to enable this coming together of schools and universities:

1. To make the education of teachers intellectually more solid. The Holmes group encouraged a strong liberal arts background with an academic major.

2. To recognize differences in teachers' knowledge, skill, and commitment, in their education, certification, and work. The consortium worked on trying to find ways to promote and reward teaching expertise.

3. To create standards of entry to the profession - examinations and educational requirements - that are
professionally relevant and intellectually defensible. The call to create standards of entrance for the profession of teaching has been an historical reform demand. Holmes recognized, again, its need.

4. To connect our own institutions to schools. The consortium wished to address the issue of separation of research institutions and schools.

5. To make schools better places for teachers to work, and to learn. Holmes recognized the need for teachers to have more autonomy and leadership with less bureaucracy (Holmes, 1986, p. 4).

Tomorrow’s Teachers primarily addressed problems surrounding entry and retention in the teaching field. Related to entry level issues the Holmes group proposed doing away with an undergraduate degree in education. They supported a broad general, liberal education with an academic major, followed by a year of professional courses leading to a masters in education. They advised the membership to include in their teacher education programs areas that would help students develop knowledge of the subject matter of the teaching field and literature of education but not forgetting to include a reflective practical experience. Finally, Holmes called for increasing the numbers of minority students in teacher education programs.
The Holmes group anticipated a move towards "professionalizing" the teaching field. They called for changes in rewards and opportunities for teachers, featuring a differentiated structure of teacher certification. Holmes supported the development of a professional teacher examination to provide a basis for issuing teaching credentials and licenses. These teachers would then teach in professional development schools similar to teaching hospitals of the medical profession.

Reactions to Tomorrow's Teachers were immediate and varied. Almost simultaneously with the publishing of Tomorrow's Teachers, The Journal of Teacher Education (1986) published a section about the Holmes Report in its July-August issue. Articles appeared calling the Holmes Group Report, "impetus for gaining professional status for teachers" (Case, Lanier & Miskel, 1986, p. 36); "sophisticated analysis, simplistic solutions" (Tom, 1986, p. 44); and "lacking in research" (Smith, 1986, p. 51). Other scholars noted that Tomorrow's Teachers lacked an understanding of reform history (Cuban, 1987; Johnson, 1987), was insufficient in addressing equity issues, and, specifically, how minorities and working-class students would be able to pay for additional costs, (Apple, 1987; Gordon, 1988, Grant, 1990), and was deficient in its justification for dropping the undergraduate program
(Engel, 1989; Raywid, 1987; Tom, 1987; Travers & Sacks, 1989). On a more favorable side, Howey and Zimpher (1986) "applauded the efforts ... to take leadership in the reform of teacher education programs" (p. 47) and Devaney, (1990), described the influence of the Holmes group as:

Interesting, varied, and vital interpretations and applications of the Holmes manifesto are seen in new and developing programs. ... Holmes appears to be both a means of persuasion and a lever to use to rethink the academic and practical in teachers' education. (p. 2)

Holmes Group: Tomorrow's Schools

Shortly after the Holmes manifesto, Tomorrow's Teachers was published, the Holmes group made the task of describing the new endeavor of professional development schools their priority. Omitted or not featured in this new document were the two more controversial recommendations of Tomorrow's Teachers: eliminating undergraduate degrees and forming career ladders. Based on the principles described in Tomorrow's Teachers, reciprocity, experimentation, systematic inquiry, and student diversity, Tomorrow's Schools (1990) illustrated what the university/school partnership might look like. There were six ways these professional development schools (PDS) were to assist the teaching profession:

1. By promoting much more ambitious conceptions of teaching and learning on the part of
prospective teachers in universities and students in schools.

2. By adding to and reorganizing the collections of knowledge we have about teaching and learning.

3. By ensuring that enterprising, relevant, responsible research and development is done in schools.

4. By linking experienced teachers' efforts to renew their knowledge and advance their status with efforts to improve their schools and to prepare new teachers.

5. By creating incentives for faculties in the public schools and faculties in education schools to work mutually.

6. By strengthening the relationship between schools and the broader political, social, and economic communities in which they reside. (Holmes, 1990, p. 1-2)

Zimpher (1990) described four challenges faced by those creating these PDSs. Resources would not be easy to come by, both at the university and school level. Collaboration between schools, system administration, colleges, and college administration would necessitate different approaches and understandings. A change in how field placements were done, with less attention on equity of placements. What were now broad suggestions and assumptions may in the future become more standard ways of beginning PDSs.

The idea behind PDSs that Holmes suggested was not new. Goodlad (1975, 1984, 1985) reported many similar
projects that have afforded university and schools working together. However, an emphasis on the process of collaboration was. In 1988, Goodlad recounted what he referred to as "partnerships." He used Clark's (1988) definition to describe what a partnership was: "a deliberately designed, collaborative arrangement between different institutions working together to advance self-interests and solve common problems" (p. 13). Goodlad's experience of partnerships since 1947 led him to describe partnership as an "intent to create a process and an accompanying structure" (p. 26) having three central purposes:

1. The exemplary performance by universities of their educational responsibility to those seeking to become educators or to enhance their present performance as educators.

2. The exemplary performance by schools of their educational function and the accompanying exemplary performance of school districts in providing the necessary support.

3. The exemplary performance of both universities and schools (and their school districts) in collaborative arrangements and processes that promote both of the above purposes. (p. 26)

The history of school/university working together goes beyond Goodlad. As long ago as 1896 laboratory schools were part of the university setting. Dewey (1896) compared scientist and medical professionals need for laboratory experience with the need for teachers to have a
similar developmental program. The laboratory school usually was defined as a school located in or near a college campus, with the college of education guiding its progress. The laboratory school had two main purposes, first "to exhibit, test, verify, and criticize theoretical statements and principles; second, to add to the sum of facts and principles in its special line" (Stallings & Kowalski, 1990, p. 251). The long history of laboratory schools have high peaks in its early years of development. However, by the 1940s less money was made available to the lab school for research projects and they became schools for colleges of education to use for observations and for student teachers (Stallings & Kowalski, 1990).

Another similar movement to the PDS were portal schools. Begun in the 1960s, portal schools were developed because of a "perceived need for improving the quality of education at all levels" (Stallings & Kowalski, 1990, p. 254). Even more similar in makeup to professional development schools than laboratory schools, portal schools were part of a school system. The school had to be especially interested in improving curriculum and learning. There was no definite plan for a portal school, though, some common arrangements were found:

1. An advisory council established at the beginning with representatives from each group (i.e. teachers, pre-service students,
administration, community, university). The principal retained the chief administrative responsibilities.

2. Selection of portal schools made with firm support from the teachers and administrators in the schools, as well as the top administrations of the university and school system.

3. Planning time provided for developing projected goals and for designing programs to meet those goals. This planning involved teachers, union, community, college faculty, and school system staff from the beginning.

4. Agreements made among the schools, colleges, state departments of education, community, and teachers for the administration, evaluation, and revision of education programs. (Lutonsky, 1972, p. 8)

Considering the similarities of portal schools and laboratory schools to professional development schools it would make sense not to make the same mistakes that led to their demise. According to Stallings and Kowalski (1990) areas to consider are finances, especially in the area of funding, possible research agendas and dissemination of research, and communication between classroom teachers and university professors (p. 252-255).

Stallings and Kowalski (1990) described the importance of planned, carried out, and reported research agendas to continue the work of experimental programs like PDSs.

Review of the literature on professional development schools suggests that the laboratory schools became too far removed from the mainstream of school life to be credible, and
the portal schools spent too much time designing elaborate relationships between schools and colleges that never really got started before their window of opportunity closed. The designers of laboratory and portal schools paid little attention to evaluation or to reporting the effects of their efforts upon teachers or students; thus, little but rhetoric remains to indicate their value. In the 1980s there were many conceptualizations of professional development schools, and, at the time of this writing, only a few have been implemented. Only 3 could be found to have collected systematic qualitative and/or quantitative baseline data, so that they could estimate changes resulting from model intervention. Such evaluations must be planned and carried out if there is to develop a body of knowledge about teacher preparation through professional development schools. (p. 262)

The professional development schools are vital links between the university-based and school-based cultures. The Holmes group realized that alone, universities or schools, reform is difficult and probably impossible. Only together, school and university, would reform be possible. It is not an "either/or" but a "both/and" which would make the difference and bring about educational reform.

This both/and was evident in the clinical faculty position which Holmes also espoused. Tomorrow's Schools described clinical faculty as "new positions that span institutional boundaries" (p. 82). These "new" positions were considered earlier by Conant (1963). Conant discussed the necessity of having "clinical professors."
He believed that clinical professors would be master teachers, who would "be the person responsible for teaching the 'methods' course" (p. 62). Conant warned, however, that clinical professors should not be treated as second class citizens of the university.

The Clinical Professorship in Teacher Education (Hazard, 1967) was published after a conference at Northwestern University. During this conference it was noted that clinical professors were more than student teaching supervisors, but how much more was yet to be decided. Called a "radically new approach to teacher education," the clinical professorship was discussed only from the university/college and administrative perspective through such topics as "The Clinical Professor in Education," "Administrative Arrangements," and "Variations on the Clinical Professorship." No conclusions were drawn except that the clinical professor program was worth while and should be continued.

Lynchburg College developed a clinical faculty program in 1987 (Wolfe, Schewel & Bickham, 1989). This program stated that the clinical faculty role was an emerging one with a "careful selection process, training for the role to be filled, the granting of faculty status and prerequisites by a college or university, and involvement in a preservice teacher preparation program"
As necessary for changing from a cooperating teacher to a clinical role.

Zimpher (1990) discussed clinical faculty members as a response to teacher leadership roles. She suggested that schools could reciprocate with giving a special title to the university person who spent significant time in a particular school.

One caution of Tomorrow's Schools (and PDSs) confronted in the literature was whose reform would be given the priority (Cherryholmes, 1987; Johnson, 1987)? Colleges/universities already asked schools to participate in research projects and aid in working with field experience students and student teachers. A primary aim of Holmes centered on strengthening school-based teachers and university-based teachers involvement with one another. It stated:

A primary aim of professional development schools will be to contribute to intellectually solid programs of teacher education that intertwine the wisdom of theory and practice; that encourage shared conceptions among university and school faculty; that assist novices in evaluating, integrating, and using knowledge from multiple sources; that convey the moral basis of teaching; and that recruit and keep imaginative and interesting teachers in the profession. (1990, p. 48)

However, this aim seemed primarily to stress gains by the university, an improved teacher education program and grounded research. School systems might have perceived an
implicit gain of well-prepared teachers, teachers that would stay in the profession. Immediate and explicit gains were not clear for the school system.

Establishing education as a profession was a critical area for Holmes. Holmes (1990) discussed that to be a profession one must be a part of the training at the entry level of the profession. *Tomorrow's Schools* aided in establishing the connection between practitioners and entry level participants.

Zimpher (1990) discussed the necessity for the university to be involved in the problems and advantages with which the schools must cope. Research on learning and teaching must emerge through on site discussions with and observations of teachers, parents, and children.

**Summary**

This review of teacher education reforms described the cyclic nature of these documents. For example, professional development schools, in some form, had been espoused since 1896. A unified university faculty (academic areas and education) was a necessary condition for reform since Normal Schools. A working together of schools and universities for reform and change in education had been discussed for over one hundred years. However, while they have been advocated, few efforts to do
This study takes heed of Stallings and Kowalski's (1990) advice to advance a research agenda on reform. Unless we examine systematically all aspects of developing PDSs, their future looks no brighter than that of lab schools at the beginning of the century, or portal schools in the 1960s. If we do not plan research agendas on the Holmes movement, what have we learned from history? If we do not plan research agendas on the Holmes movement its future can be predicted from the reform writings of Dewey (1896) to Smith, et. al., (1980).

The working together (collaboration) of university and school has been demanded by many reformers, Dewey (1896), Kilpatrick (1933), Elliott (1950), Bestor (1956), Conant (1963) and Smith et al., (1980) as well as agencies such as NCATE and AACTE. An overview of collaboration follows.

Collaboration: Getting from Here to There

In Tomorrow's Schools, the Holmes group asked "How can we design professional development schools if we've never seen one" (p. 85)? The question was answered not with a product but a process - collaboration. A description of this wonder process and its development is the subject of this part of the literature review.
Following the work of Clark, (1988), this section is divided into three parts: (1) an historical overview of collaborative efforts related to school/university relationships, (2) a look at the terminology and definition, and (3) a review of collaboration's practicalities, problems, and benefits as found in the literature pertaining to university/school relationships.

Historical Overview

Collaborative efforts were documented as early as the 1890's when the "committee of ten" was assembled to make recommendations about school curriculum (Brookhart & Loadman, 1990; Clark, 1988). These school/university collaboratives continued usually with an emphasis on the university setting entrance requirements which in turn set prerequisites of the lower schools (Clark, 1988). As teacher education thrived, the need for continued work between universities and schools expanded. Often this took place with student teachers' placement in schools, or with combined work on developing, experimenting, and producing curriculum (Clark, 1988; Corrigan, 1992).

Maeroff (1983) described this time period as unhealthy:

Colleges would often take the schools for granted. In paternalistic fashion, curricula would be packaged and teacher training programs planned with little or no consultation with the schools. (p. 2)
There were not many school/university collaborative efforts (exemplary, satisfactory, or deficient) but always a few were in progress.

Education was not the only area that was interested in collaboration. Business, sociology, and psychology all worked with collaboration to some extent (Appley & Winder 1977; Clark, 1988; Hord, 1986; Oja & Smulyan 1989). Studies in these areas were used to inform the terminology, definition and organizational structure of collaboration in its educational use.

In educational research, collaboration developed first in the area of action research under the influence of Kurt Lewin beginning in the early 1940s (Oja & Smulyan, 1989). McCutcheon and Jung (1990) discussed action research as "systematic inquiry that is collective, collaborative, self-reflective, critical, and undertaken by the participants of the inquiry" (p. 148). It was in the area of action research that many of the principles of collaboration developed and, indeed, how collaboration is often used today. Lewin used the term action research to describe a combination of the experimental research approach of social science with social action programs. He stated, "Research that produces nothing but books will not suffice" (Lewin, 1948, p. 203 as quoted in Oja &
Smulyan, 1989, p. 2). Lewin maintained that group decision making was meaningful in producing social changes. He argued that participants should be included in every part of the action research (Carr & Kemmis, 1986).

Practitioners had to be involved in action research not only to use the tools of social science in addressing their concerns, but also because their participation would make them more aware of the need for the action program chosen, and more personally invested in the process of change. (Oja & Smulyan, 1989, p. 3)

Lewin believed that it was in the power of the group interactions and decisions that commitment and change were produced.

Action research was used in education in the early 1950s (Corey, 1953). Researchers using action research claimed that the scientific method did not meet the needs for educational change (Oja & Smulyan, 1989). However, the difficulty of using traditionally defined definitions of research while producing action research was troublesome for action researchers of this time period. Oja and Smulyan (1988) reported that action research was described by the university community as only looking at the practical problems. Opponents argued that action research was not rigorous because the researchers were not trained to look for broad generalizations or to relate the research to theory. By 1957 university scholars were
calling action research methodologically poor and unscientific. Not wishing to be associated with this nemesis, educational researchers went back to the ways of the university.

In the 1970s there was a renewal of interest in action research when researchers questioned the "applicability of quantitative, experimental methodologies to educational settings and problems" (Oja & Smulyan, 1989, p. 8). An area of concern centered around research that was not accessible to practitioners (McCutcheon, 1981). The goals of action research focused on working with the practitioners aiding their understanding of practice and building a rationale to improve practice (McCutcheon & Jung, 1990). Action research, with its built in connection with practitioners, seemed to be a viable option for research that would contribute to the knowledge base while also improving practice. During this time, research done by Elliott, (1977), Kemmis (1982), Stenhouse (1975), and Ward and Tikunoff (1982) helped action research in education to gain respectability. With key components of mutual understanding, democratic decision making, building on concensus, and common action, collaboration was an important element in action research (Carr & Kemmis, 1986). In the 1980s, collaborative projects, action research and partnerships, were more
numerous (Carr & Kemmis, 1986; Sirotnik & Goodlad, 1988). In the 1990s, collaboration became a buzz word. It was used when discussing research between schools and university, (Johnston, 1990; Lampert, 1991; Miller, 1990) and studies between researchers and teachers (Florio & Walsh, 1981; Hunsaker & Johnston, 1992; Rosaen & Hoekwater 1990). These documents recorded the positive influence collaboration had on school-based teachers, as well as the difficulties and challenges. Collaboration was addressed in writings on teacher education reform, professional development schools (Holmes, 1990), and federal research and development funding (AACTE, 1990).

**Terminology and Definition**

In recent years the term, collaboration, was used interchangeably with numerous synonyms. Authors spoke of "partnerships, collaborations, consortiums, networks, clusters, interorganizational agreements, collectives, and cooperatives," seemingly, all in the same breath. (Clark, 1988, p. 33). Clark’s conclusions about this cluster of terms were three. First, no one should assume they understand the meaning of any of these words, definitions for the terms vary from author to author. Second, Clark suggested that titles like partnership and consortium were appropriate for dissimilar clusters, while the use of
"network" should be used for similar groups, individuals, or organizations. He saw more similarity between collaboration and partnership, than the two terms had with network. Third, Clark, agreed with Turk (1970) that none of these terms should be given a value position. Collaboration could be used for "good" and "bad" reasons.

As discussed in chapter 1, Hord's (1986) definition of collaboration was used for this study. Collaboration implied that those involved shared responsibility and authority for decision making. The literature enhanced this basic definition of collaboration. Appley and Winder (1977) discussed a three-part relational definition, which aided in the understanding of the meaning of "shared responsibility" and "authority for decision making."

1. Individuals in a group share mutual aspirations and a common conceptual framework.

2. The interactions among individuals are characterized by "justice as fairness."

3. These aspirations and conceptualizations are characterized by each individual's consciousness of his or her motives toward the other; by caring or concern for the other; and by commitment to work with the other over time provided that this commitment is a choice. (p. 281)

In this light, one could see the importance of collaborative research being research that was "working with, not working on" (Lieberman, 1986; Noffke, 1990; Ward & Tikunoff, 1982); and had well defined and articulated...
goals that were negotiated from the outset (Campbell, 1988; Hord, 1986; Oja & Smulyan, 1989). However, it was also noted that "communication between university researchers and teachers can often break down due to differences in language, perceptions, and expectation which result from their different positions in the field" (Oja & Smulyan, 1989, p. 17). These communication difficulties could result in a rupture in the collaborative project due to misunderstandings.

University/School Collaboration

Extensive literature described cultural differences between school and university (DeMarco, 1991; Feiman-Nemser & Floden, 1986; Lampert, 1991; Sarason, 1971, 1982, 1990). As discussed earlier in this chapter, school and university cultures are distinctly different, "cultures so different that professionals working within them have difficulty understanding one another's needs and values" (Clark, 1988, p. 32). This last section of the literature review examines recent developments in bridging these cultures in collaborative work.

Numerous research studies described differences in the assumptions and expectations of school-based and university-based collaborators in their working relationships (See Brookhart & Loadman, 1992; Campbell,
1988; Corbett, Firestone & Rossman, 1987; Smith & Auger, 1986). The difficulties and benefits of collaborative endeavors between university and school cultures may be partially explained by the different assumptions held by participants in the two cultures. Oakes, Hare, and Sirotnik (1986), in "Collaborative Inquiry: A Congenial Paradigm in a Cantankerous World" list twelve "interrelated contrasts" which describe the experience they had of collaboration: (1) process means vs. product ends, (2) goal-free vs. goal-oriented, (3) exploration vs. confirmation, (4) thinking vs. doing, (5) long-term vs. short-term "payoff," (6) generalist vs. specialist, (7) internal vs. external motivation and reward, (8) responsibility vs. accountability, (9) trust vs. working relationships, (10) communication vs. conversation, (11) working consensus vs. line authority, (12) ambiguity vs. closure (556-559). The above listing was not expected to provide a detailed explanation of problems in collaboration; rather, it was reproduced here as a beginning look at difficulties which could be part of collaboration. Contradictions were a routine part of collaborative projects. Similarity in lists from numerous studies suggested four important aspects of collaboration: time, trust, power, and rewards (Brookhart & Loadman, 1990; Hord, 1986; Lieberman, 1986b; Miller, 1990). The
lists fostered an awareness that collaborations of any sort have uncertainties centering around communication, relationships, and assumptions.

Shared ownership was seen as one of the key ingredients in establishing a collaborative project (Hord, 1986, Oakes, Hare, & Sirotnik, 1986; Oja & Smulyan, 1989). When a leadership role was needed, terms such as "chief worrier" were used (Oakes, Hare, & Sirotnik, 1986). Defining the concept of shared ownership, however, was not consistently done. A number of terms were used synonymously with shared ownership: parity, equality, equal, mutuality, and mutual aspirations (Tikunoff, Ward, & Griffin as sited in Oakes, Hare & Sirotnik, 1986; Oakes, Hare, & Sirotnik, 1986). The terms most often equated were parity and equal.

Other issues connected with ownership were power and positioning. Romer and Whipple (1991) discussed the importance of the university-based person recognizing his/her acquired power related to position and knowledge. Collaborative literature deals with the struggle between collaboration and ownership/leadership in an on-going manner (Labaree, 1992; Romer & Whipple, 1991; Seely, 1984; Short, 1992).

Language, perspective, and expectations were elements that were part of "positioning" (Davies & Harre, 1990).
Davies and Harre described positioning as "the discursive process whereby selves are located in conversations as observably and subjectively coherent participants in jointly produced story lines" (p. 48). People take part in positioning themselves and one another in all aspects of life.

A second approach taken in the collaborative literature was to use stages or phases to address the areas of communication and relationship in collaboration (DeBevoise, 1986; Rosaen & Hoekwater, 1990; Oja & Smulyan, 1989; Trubowitz, 1986). Using research by Tuckman and Jensen’s (1977) "Stages of Small-Group Development Revisited," Oja and Smulyan (1989) described five stages of collaborative projects.

In the first state, ‘forming’, group members orient themselves to each other and the task, testing to identify the limits of interpersonal and task behaviors. Stage two, ‘storming’, is characterized by conflict, polarization, and resistance. The initial dependence on a leader may be challenged as members resist group influence and task requirements. In the third stage, ‘norming’, the group overcomes resistance, resolves interpersonal conflict, and establishes cohesiveness, standards of behavior and new roles. In the fourth stage, ‘performing’, the interpersonal structure becomes a tool of the task activities as the group channels its energy into task performance, and in the fifth and final stage, ‘adjourning’, the group deals with issues of separation. (p. 56)
The use of stages and phases assisted in understanding some of the difficulties and successes in communication, group dynamics, and relationships of collaboration. However, personal interpretations of what was happening, why, and outcomes were not easily understood in a stage. The tendency was to over-simplify the stages and have everyone stage oriented, whether they "fit" or not.

Lastly, a third set of documents about school and university collaboration described how interpretations might be made by collaborative participants (See Bruffee, 1983; Lakoff & Johnson, 1980; Maloy, 1985; Weade & Ernst, 1990). In some cases, metaphors were used to define collaboration (McGowan & Powell, 1990; Weade & Ernst, 1990).

McGowan and Powell (1990) used a metaphor of the brain as a holograph to illustrate collaboration (Morgan, 1986, as used in McGowan & Powell, 1990). Collaborative projects usually were not bound by traditional structures and guidelines, and were able to more readily question practices and develop new and/or different approaches as possible solutions. Collaborative projects, like the brain, allowed participants to assess problems, consider processes and solutions, and select possible actions. McGowan and Powell (1990) related the brain's holographic tendencies to "illuminate its mutuality and
interdependence" (p. 114) to the mutuality necessary in collaboration. These holographs represented four aspects of collaboration. First, the success and/or failure of the project was not dependent on an institution, but rather, on the individual participants. Recognizing this interdependence helped build trust, respect, and communication. Secondly, it was important for the project to create connectivity and redundancy. No one person should take on a role as the person for the responsibility. This assumption of many roles building a collective web, aided the growth of organic problem solving within a collaborative project.

The third holographic aspect which was related to collaboration was messiness. Collaborative projects sometimes defied what seemed to be "logical order." Thus, members of a project were generalists, but they also were specialists. And in a process that described leadership as "everyone's part," also espoused that long-term involvement "will allow collaborators to overcome prejudices and assume the leadership roles of which they are capable" (McGowan & Powell, 1990, p. 115). These examples appeared to be messy, even impossible for an "either/or" type of thinking, but for "both/and" thinking, they could be possible.
Lastly, self-organization was an important holograph of collaboration. Following no set patterns, rules, or hierarchy, collaboration was constantly approaching problems and benefits from a fresh mode.

These four attributes combine to make partnerships powerful change agents. A collaborative must acquire each attribute in turn, a process forcing participants to take risks and build trusts. Then like the brain, the partnership is not limited to reacting to past events, but grows capable of evolving to meet and create its future. (McGowan & Powell, 1990, p. 115)

As McGowan and Powell (1990) pointed out, metaphors help to eliminate the perplexity and complication of a new issue by promoting understanding through an existing frame. But metaphors could also narrow our sights. "The longer one's view is shaped by a particular metaphor the more difficult it becomes to interpret information differently or seek new sources of data" (p. 112). Metaphors could be one method which helps to continue to broaden the sights of collaboration.

The literature on projects of collaboration has imploded during this past decade (Sims, Canales, 1990; Sirotnik, Goodlad, 1988; Ullrich, 1992; Vivian, 1986). Brookhart and Loadman (1992) reference fifty-three sources of project descriptions and Jacobson (1992) describes sixty-nine university/school collaboration in an annotated guide, only one of all of these begun before 1980. A
description of the collaborative project used in this study is given in chapter three of this document.

Summary

Collaboration follows a similar path of reform as occurred in teacher education. Unless there are systematic research agendas planned which continue to inform the workings of school/university collaboration, the expectant life of this work is not long.

Literature on collaboration informed this study in three ways. First, the study was embedded in a collaborative project. The discussion of issues which surround collaborative projects was important. Communication and shared goals could break down into miserable disarray, unless participants were cognizant of their's and other's actions. The awareness of collaborative literature informed participants' discussions of issues that other projects had experienced. Second, the participants in co-teaching looked to the collaborative research when discussing possibilities of working with one another and when trying to solve problem situations. Last, there were many studies that document the work between university-based and school-based professionals working within a school context and describing the difficulties and influences these studies
had on both the university-based and school-based persons. However, there were few studies that began at the university, collaborating with the university-based professional, documenting difficulties, changes, and influences. This study adds to this latter area of inquiry.

A description of the collaborative project which this research is embedded is included in the next chapter on research methodology.
END NOTES FOR CHAPTER TWO

1 Prejudices - Gadamer explicates his positive position on the term prejudices by saying: "prejudices are biases of our openness to the world. They are simply conditions whereby we experience something - whereby what we encounter says something to us" (p. 9).

2 Headings are taken from Tyack and Hansot (1982).

3 Others who wrote about educational reforms in the early 1950's were Wilson (1951) and Rice (1951) who both wanted to entice young people into the teaching profession. They urged teachers to be models for their students. McGrath (1953) discussed the need for better salaries.

4 Adler (1982) in the Paideia Proposal favored a liberal arts background. Darling-Hammond (1984) in Beyond the Commission Reports discussed a more rigorous program for teacher educators; more professional freedom, and career ladders. The Excellence In Our Schools' Teacher Education (1982) by the National Education Association, while including many of the same recommendations for reforms; especially noted, "One essential factor has always been missing from the decision-making process about teacher education: the expertise of the practicing teacher" (p. 7). Other documents in the time period which had similar reform issues were by American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Educating a Profession: Profile of a Beginning Teacher; and by the Council of Chief State School Officers, Staffing the Nation's Schools: A National Emergency.

5 A Nation Prepared: Teacher for the 21st Century from the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy focused upon the profession of teaching. Their recommendations which directly related to teacher education were: create a national board for professional teaching standards; require a B.A. in the arts and sciences and; develop a new Master in Teaching degree. Other reports which focused on the teaching profession were Time for Results: The Governors' 1991 Report on Education from the National Governors' Association (1986) and Visions of Reform: Implications for the Education Profession from the Association of teacher Educators (1986)
CHAPTER III
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The central purpose of this research was to examine the influence of collaboratively teaching a social studies methods course on the co-teaching participants. The study focused on how four participants from two institutional cultures and four personal perspectives constructed some shared meanings and how these meanings influenced each participant and the social studies methods course. In our interactions with one another, we aimed to bring from "behind our backs" (Gadamer, 1976) our own traditions that influenced our interpretations. We constructed knowledge that "fused the horizons" (Gadamer, 1975, 1976) of our individual understandings. A research design and methodology were required in order to explicate these interpretations and constructions of knowledge.

In this chapter the philosophical assumptions for the research methodology and the particular inquiry methods used to guide the case study are given. In the first part, a general description of the interpretative paradigm is presented, including a rationale for the study’s focus.
on meaning making. The role of the researcher and research design are detailed next. Included in this section are descriptions of the setting and population and the methods of data collection. The next sections are the procedures for analysis and the establishment of trustworthiness. The last section of the chapter discusses the ethics and the limitations of the study.

Design Choice
This research, the influence of collaboratively teaching social studies methods, was embedded in the interpretive paradigm of the social sciences. Following the work of Gadamer (1975, 1976, 1987), I concentrated on the importance of developing an understanding of human events and actions through the social construction of knowledge (See also Bruner, 1990; Erickson, 1986; and Geertz, 1973). As stated in the literature review, creation of meaning making and shared understanding undergirds interpretive theory. Gadamer (1976) discussed that coming to understanding was fulfilled only by a reality which was socially constructed through the interaction and actions of others. Interpretive theory supported the inclusion of multivoiced perspectives rather than univocal perceptions or fixed traditions.
Interpretive theory, as used in this study, was enhanced by an anthropological viewpoint. Geertz (1973) discussed making culture more explicit through "thick description." He contended that it was necessary to interpret the culture from the native's point of view. However, he argued, even a native interpreted her/his own culture.

Two characteristics of ethnographic methodology are the researcher's attention to individuals and groups in their lived situations; and the development of common-sense understandings which is how people share meaning and make sense of their daily lives (See, for example, Bogdan & Biklen, 1982; Geertz, 1973; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Rosaldo, 1989; Powdermaker, 1966; and Wax, 1971; Van Maanen, 1988). The work of naturalistic inquiry is enhanced when aspects of ethnography are added to it. Even though this study was an interpretive one, not an ethnography, the ethnographic understanding of culture and meaning making and its methodology informed the research.

Spradley (1979, 1980) defined ethnography simply as "the work of describing a culture" (p. 3). Wolcott (1987, 1988) made it clear that ethnography must be "oriented to cultural interpretation" (1987, p. 41). Since the study was looking across cultures at some shared meanings, I wanted to be able, "to grasp the native's point of view,
his [her] relation to life, to realize his [her] vision of his [her] world" (Malinowski's goal as stated by Spradley, 1980; p. 3; emphasis in original).

Geertz (1973, 1983) added to the understanding of ethnographic methodology with his perspective of both culture and the way it might be studied:

Believing with Max Weber, that man [sic] is an animal suspended in webs of significance he himself [she herself] has spun, I take culture to be those webs, and the analysis of it to be therefore not an experimental science in search of law but an interpretive one in search of meaning (Geertz, 1973, p. 5).

According to Geertz (1973), this search for meaning (or understanding of webs) was part of the data, which in turn, needed to be fleshed out through the use of "thick description." Geertz continued the description of the difficulties this cultural understanding and meaning making entails by describing the researcher as one faced with

a multiplicity of complex conceptual structures, many of them superimposed upon or knotted into one another, which are at once strange, irregular, and inexplicit, and which he [she] must contrive somehow first to grasp and then to render. (Geertz, 1973, p. 10)

A researcher must deal with the difficulty of shared meaning making when there is a coming together of cultural worlds. Chapter Two described some of the analogies used for this sharing of cultural worlds and coming to a common
sense meaning making, as "webs of significance" (Geertz, 1973), "black holes" (Van Maanen, 1988), "fusion of horizons" (Gadamer, 1976), or "borders" (Rosaldo, 1989; Tierney, 1991).

The two cultural worlds which were a part of this study were the university and school cultures. Embedded in the research problem was my interpreting the perspectives of participants' "web" as they wove together (and separately) the cultures of school and university. It was also noted that my own "web of significance" was woven and as such, I was not able to claim (or wanted to claim) a neutral stance.

The design of the study was emergent. Following the methodology of naturalistic studies, the data were used to guide the developing design (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Patton, 1990; Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Emphasizing this point, Lincoln and Guba (1985) proposed:

Designs must be emergent rather than preordain: because meaning is determined by context to such a great extent; because the existence of multiple realities constrains the development of a design based on only one (the investigator's) construction; because what will be learned at a site is always dependent on the interaction between investigator and context, and the interaction is also not fully predictable; and because the nature of mutual shapings cannot be known until they are witnessed. All of these factors underscore the indeterminacy under which the naturalistic
inquirer functions; the design must therefore be "played by ear"; it must unfold, cascade, roll, emerge. (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 208-209; emphasis in original)

Or, as Strauss and Corbin (1990) added, "One does not begin with a theory, then prove it. Rather, one begins with an area of study and what is relevant to that area is allowed to emerge" (p. 23). The emergent design was important for the study because it allowed for my participation in the dual roles of researcher and participant.

**Case study**

Stake (1988) described the case study as unique because it focuses on a particular instance or "bounded system." That bounded system can be a "person, classroom, institution; usually in natural conditions ... The case is something deemed worthy of close watch. It is a complex, dynamic system. We want to understand its complexity" (p. 255). Bogdan and Biklen (1982) offered a similar definition of case study as a "detailed examination of one setting, or one single subject, or one single depository of documents, or one particular event" (p. 58). They explained that the way case studies are conducted as representing an emergent design.
The general design of a case study is best represented by a funnel. The start of the study is the wide end: the researchers scout for possible places and people that might be the subject or the source of data, find the location they think they want to study, and then cast a net widely trying to judge the feasibility of the site or data source for their purposes. They look for clues on how they might proceed and what might be feasible to do. They begin to collect data, reviewing and exploring it, and making decisions about where to go with the study. They decide how to distribute their time, who to interview and what to explore in depth. They may throw aside old ideas and plans and develop new ones. They continually modify the design and choose procedures as they learn more about the topic of study. In time, they make specific decisions on what aspect of the setting, subject, or data source they will study. Their work develops a focus. (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982, p. 59)

Another aspect of case study is the reporting method. Lincoln and Guba (1985) discussed three main purposes for using the case study reporting method. Each of these support the present study.

1) The case report is ideal for providing the "thick description" thought to be so essential for enabling transferability. ... It may read like a novel...in order to make clear the complexities of the context and the ways these interact to form whatever it is that the case report portrays.

2) The case report is the form most responsive to the axioms of the naturalistic paradigm. Multiple realities are difficult to communicate in scientific report form, as are the interactions of investigator and respondents, the values of the investigator and of the context, and the many mutual shapings that are seen to occur.
3. The case report provides an ideal vehicle for communicating with the consumer. The aim of the case report is to so orient readers that if they could be magically transported to the inquiry site, they would experience a feeling of déjà vu - of having been there before and of being thoroughly familiar with all of its details. (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 214)

A case study was appropriate for this naturalistic study as it was focused on a particular "bounded system" - the social studies methods co-teaching participants. The case study reporting method was appropriate for this study as it provided the format for the writing of "thick description," and allowing for multiple realities to be displayed for the reader.

Generalizability

Among researchers the query most asked about case study research is whether there can be "generalizability" (Eisner & Peshkin, 1990; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Patton, 1990; Stake, 1978). Generalizability, as defined by the positivist paradigm, means that the study had sufficient numbers (subjects) connected to it to reliably show that it could be applied again when the site and subjects were similar. The frame for generalizability changes when working within an interpretive paradigm. Numbers are not a concern for naturalistic studies, rather, the goal is to develop an understanding of human events and actions, and
to interpret what meaning can be made of human events and actions and interactions in their socially constructed world (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Patton, 1990; Van Manen, 1990). However, there are varying opinions about what to do with generalizability in a naturalistic study.

Both Lincoln and Guba (1985) and Patton (1990) argued that generalizability is a non-concern for post-positivist research, replacing it with other terms. Lincoln and Guba's (1985) term was "transferability," the necessariness of the researcher "to provide thick description to enable someone interested in making a transfer to reach a conclusion about whether transfer can be contemplated as a possibility" (p. 316). Patton (1990) asked the researcher to consider the term "extrapolation," "the modest speculation on the likely applicability of findings to other situations under similar, but not identical, conditions" (p. 489).

Geertz (1973) believed that the primary responsibility of theory building within the interpretive paradigm "is not to codify abstract regularities but to make thick description possible, not to generalize across cases, but to generalize within them" (p. 26).

Finally, Donmoyer (1990) offered another position on generalizability. He suggested that the traditional concept of generalizability is too restrictive for applied
fields or for cases and that all research need not have the same "ends." "Case study research might be used to expand and enrich the repertoire of social constructions available to practitioners ... it may help in the forming of questions rather than in the finding of answers" (p. 182). Donmoyer’s conception of generalizability is similar to Stake’s (1978) idea of "naturalistic generalizability, rooted in the experiential knowledge" (Donmoyer, 1990, p. 186). Donmoyer used Piaget’s schema theory to explicate his conception of naturalistic generalizability. As Piaget discussed, knowledge is filtered through cognitive structures; assimilation (shaping process), accommodation (reshaping process), integrated (accommodate more), and differentiated (more sub-structures). And, so too, for generalizability, said Donmoyer. We all go through similar processes when trying to make sense of information in our lives. Donmoyer stated that "when generalizability is thought of in this way, the diversity between school settings becomes an asset rather than a liability" (p. 191). An attractive aspect to Donmoyer’s concept of naturalistic generalizability is that we practice it all the time. As Eisner and Peshkin (1990) commented, Donmoyer’s generalizations "emerge as a form of personal knowledge often revealed in the narrative of the parable
or story; we generalize each time we try to learn lessons from the past" (p. 172).

In my exploration of these different perspectives, I found Donmoyer’s position on generalizability to be the most helpful for this study. His consideration of generalizability as similar to personal knowledge was consistent with the view of shared meaning making of interpretive theory. The application of Donmoyer’s naturalistic generalizability in case study research was through understanding how vicarious experiences can foster growth in personal knowledge. Donmoyer listed three advantages of naturalistic generalizability for case studies. 1) Accessibility: we have the possibility to take part in unusual situations, meeting unique people, which we would not ordinarily have the opportunity to do. 2) Seeing through the researcher’s eyes, we are able to see the world differently from eyes not our own; a different perspective is opened up to us. 3) Decreased defensiveness; we are less likely to become defensive and resist learning when the case study is not personal (Donmoyer, 1990, p. 192-197).

Role of the Researcher

Two aspects of the role of the researcher are addressed in this section. The first is subjectivity in
doing research. The second are the "positions" (Davies & Harré, 1990) the researcher takes while collecting data and participating in the study. Included in this second aspect are 1) the positions in which the researcher is placed by the other participants while doing the research and, 2) the positions in which the researcher may place other participants during the research.

Subjectivity

Continuing the theme that knowledge is constructed rather than found, it was my belief that interpretations in this study were mutually constructed by the participants. The results were understandings that were dependent on the individual's participation in the conversation. This process stands in contrast to the claim that research results can be objectively described by the research or researcher. In this case study, it was essential for me to look closely for the subjective ways that my perspective influenced the research (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Peshkin, 1988, 1982). It was hoped that by examining closely my own subjectivity, I might avoid the pitfall of which Peshkin warns:

Investigators of social phenomena, which we are, always run the risk of finding in their data not what is there but what is in their beholding eye. Though the risk never can be reduced to zero, it can be minimized by the effort to "know
thyself." (Peshkin, 1982, p. 51)

Peshkin (1988) discussed the need to be aware of one's "subjective I's" (p. 18). He discovered how subjectivity influenced his writing when he was "no more or no less aware" of subjectivity. "I had indeed discovered my subjectivity at work, caught red-handed with my values at the very end of my pen" (p. 18). It was Peshkin's point that claiming to be subjective was not enough, rather researchers "should systematically identify their subjectivity throughout the course of their research" (1988, p. 17).

Each of my subjective "I's" were an ongoing strand weaving in and out of the collection and analysis of data. Sometimes I was vividly aware that I was "in" a particular "I"; other times it was only after I stood back and looked, or another participant said something, or my peer debriefer pointed out a discrepancy, that it became evident which "I," I was in. There were several "subjective I's" that were a part of the study:

- the "I" of a student in search of a dissertation
- the "I" as interviewer
- the "I" standing back to observe
- the "I" of my participant role
- the "I" interpreting the data
- the "I" of the advisee
-the "I" of wanting to be liked
-the "I" in friendship
-the "I" as a woman

These "I's" impacted the study in various ways. At the beginning of the study, I was more concerned with producing a dissertation. I wanted to be sure I was listening to the other participants so I would be able to interpret the data. Later, I was concerned about working with my advisor in the multiple positions of co-teaching, co-participating in a dissertation, and writing/directing a dissertation. Throughout the study I examined how personal and professional relationships were a part of the ongoing interactions.

Positioning

During the search for my "subjective I's," I became aware that this was similar to the issue of "positioning" as developed by Davies and Harré (1990).

Positioning, as we will use it, is the discursive process whereby selves are located in conversations as observably and subjectively coherent participants in jointly produced story lines. There can be interactive positioning in which what one person says positions another. And there can be reflexive positioning in which one positions oneself. However it would be a mistake to assume that, in either case, positioning is necessarily intentional. One lives one's life in terms of one's ongoingly produced self, whoever might be responsible for its production (p. 48).
This "positioning" was important in four specific ways to this research. The first two ways directly involved me as researcher (collecting data)/participant. How did I position myself within the co-teaching? And how was I positioned by the other participants? In retrospect it seemed clear that my position in the study was often more of a collector of the data, rather than a participant in the conversations. I often asked the questions and allowed others to discuss the answers. I was fully involved in planning and teaching the course, but pulled back from the conversations when I was trying to get at the others' interpretations related to the dissertation study. I participated fully in the co-teaching; hesitantly in the reflections and analysis of our work together. The other participants, at times, asked about my participation but I was somewhat hesitant to become too involved. Marilyn, as the advisor, had questions about whether I was fully participating in both my roles as participant and researcher.

A third positioning occurred as we co-taught. Our discussions during meetings and interviews involved our positioning one another and ourselves. Thus, not having Marilyn begin class was a way to position her away from ownership (or at least seen as leader); or having someone
else besides Marilyn be first to speak on a topic at an interview or deciding about a specific reading for class. These were ways to give others equal influence.

The last positioning involved me not only as researcher (analyzing data)/participant but as a writer:

Once having taken up a particular position as one's own, a person inevitably sees the world from the vantage point of that position and in terms of the particular images, metaphors, story lines and concepts which are made relevant within the particular discursive practice in which they are positioned. (Davies & Harré, 1990, p. 46)

It was important to use the trustworthiness checks established by Lincoln and Guba (1985) to lessen the influence of this position. Triangulation, member checks, and peer de-briefing were a part of this study (developed later in this chapter).

Research Design

Setting and Population of the Study

The Ohio State University was at the beginning stages of implementation of the Holmes project and formation of professional development schools. The opportunity to co-teach collaboratively a social studies methods course to a group of post-baccalaureate degree, pre-service students at the university was afforded the participants at the beginning of Autumn quarter, 1991. However, even though
co-teaching was a new project, the schools working in the Educators for Collaborative Change/Professional Development School (ECC/PDS) were not new to one another and working together.

The planning for the ECC/PDS had begun in November of 1990 with meetings of faculty and graduate students at The Ohio State University (OSU). They discussed how best to go about setting up a collaborative school project between the university and schools. Since the Columbian Quincentenary was approaching, it was decided to approach schools with the idea of developing model school sites to be open during the Quincentenary observances in Columbus. The model schools would develop projects dealing with the issues and controversies of the cultural encounters of 1492. A core group of teachers and the principals from five schools joined the project, three schools from the Columbus Public District, and one school each from the Worthington Public District and Columbus Catholic Diocese. During both Winter and Spring quarter (1991), the school members and teaching assistants from Ohio State, participated in course work, research projects, and development of the Quincentenary projects.

In April, 1991, this group of schools and OSU representatives applied to OSU to become a Professional Development School (PDS) and were accepted as one of seven
Ohio State PDS projects. With this acceptance as a PDS, the model schools' project became a multilayered endeavor working on many of the Holmes group goals in addition to the Quincentenary projects. (See Chapter Two for description of the Holmes group goals). This designation as a PDS brought with it a group of post-baccalaureate, certification students who were to do their field and student teaching in our school sites (see figure 1).

To plan for these students, we met during the summer to begin to address ways for the university and schools to work collaboratively to "reform teacher education" (Holmes, 1990). One innovation we discussed was the possibility of restructuring the teacher education methods classes. ECC/PDS asked the school districts involved to support five teachers one-half day a week to co-teach in each of the method classes. Teachers and teaching assistants, who were active members of ECC/PDS, were invited to volunteer to work with a co-teaching team. The co-teaching was described as a way to further the collaboration between school-based and university-based people.

Four teachers, a principal, and a teaching assistant expressed an interest in co-teaching the five methods classes to be taught autumn quarter. Difficulties immediately arose. First, within days the teacher
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interested in co-teaching math methods decided not to be involved because other commitments surfaced. Second, the literacy professor seemed to be overextended and did not contact the teacher interested in co-teaching with her. Marilyn Johnston, the OSU faculty member teaching the social studies methods course and coordinator of ECC encouraged this teacher to join the social studies co-teaching team, even though that team already had a teacher involved.

The final difficulty was a political one. Columbus School District had a tax issue on the levy which had been defeated the previous year. After an initial go-ahead for the professional leave days for the classroom teachers, the superintendent stated that only if the tax issue passed would the Columbus District support the co-teaching. At first the university thought about paying for the teachers' substitutes with university monies. However, they decided this was counter productive to the goals of establishing a collaborative working relationship with the schools. When the tax levy passed in November, two teachers from Columbus became part of the co-teaching. Thus, during Autumn quarter there were three teachers and one principal involved in three classes: science, pedagogy, and social studies. However the two teachers
from the Columbus district participated only part-time during the Autumn quarter (see table 1).

Table 1
Co-teaching Methods Courses
Autumn quarter, 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Grad. Asst.</th>
<th>Classroom Teach.</th>
<th>District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soc.St.</td>
<td>Johnston</td>
<td>Hohenbrink</td>
<td>Westhoven</td>
<td>Worthington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.S. TA</td>
<td>Gilboy (part time)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Columbus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher (part time)</td>
<td>Columbus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social studies co-teaching

The dissertation study started at the beginning of the Winter quarter (1992) and focused on the social studies methods co-teaching participants. The study was a retrospective look at the Autumn quarter social studies methods class through the eyes of the four co-teaching participants. The study continued during the Winter quarter documenting in detail the second quarter of social studies methods as it was planned and taught by two school-based teachers (one from an urban school district, one from a suburban district) and two university-based teachers (a teaching assistant and professor). These participants were:
Carol Gilboy

Carol is a fourth grade teacher at an urban school in the Columbus School District in her twenty-fourth year of teaching. She joined the professional development school (PDS) at the beginning and had been an active member of her school group. Carol had a B.S. degree in education and took courses for credit within the PDS during her first year. She described social studies as one of her favorite areas in the school curriculum.

JoAnn Hohenbrink

I am the graduate teaching assistant involved in the study as participant and researcher. I was part of the PDS from the beginning. Prior to this, I had taught social studies methods to undergraduate students five of the first six quarters I taught for OSU as a teaching assistant. My areas of concentration in my doctoral studies program were curriculum, foundations, and issues related to school/university collaboration.

Marilyn Johnston

Marilyn had been an associate professor in the Early and Middle Childhood Program, Department of Education Theory and Practice at OSU for two years when she began the collaborative Columbian Quincentenary project.
Previous to her time at OSU, Marilyn’s research interests at the University of Utah, where she taught for seven years, were in teachers’ professional development and collaborative research. She teaches in the area of social studies methods and social foundations.

Lisa Westhoven

Lisa is a third grade teacher at a suburban school in the Worthington district in her eighth year of teaching. She joined the PDS at its beginning and was an active member in both her school PDS group and the research group. Lisa had a B.S. in education and began working on her masters degree in education as part of her involvement in the PDS. (She completed her M.A. in September, 1992.) She initially described social studies as her least favorite subject in the school curriculum.

Other co-teaching groups

An invitation to interested school-based teachers and graduate teaching assistants to co-teach methods courses was offered again for Winter quarter. The science co-teaching participants continued their work together. Two new university-based/school-based co-teaching teams Children’s Literature and Language/Literacy began in Winter quarter (see table 2). The other co-teaching
groups were important to this study of co-teaching of the social studies methods because we had common meetings to discuss our involvement as co-teachers.

Table 2
Co-Teaching Methods Courses
Winter quarter, 1992

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Grad.Asst.</th>
<th>Class.Teacher</th>
<th>District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soc.St. Johnston</td>
<td>Hohenbrink</td>
<td>Westhoven</td>
<td>Gilboy</td>
<td>Worthington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lang/Lit Professor</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td>Worthington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. Lit. Professor</td>
<td>T.A.</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Professor</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Collection
Data were collected over a period of fifteen weeks. This included the ten weeks of Winter quarter when the social studies methods course was co-taught, as well as three weeks before and two weeks after the quarter when interviews of the participants were done. The data took the form of individual and group interviews, journal recordings by participants, audio taped planning meetings, and participant observation.

The primary source of data was collected from the social studies methods co-teachers. The focus of this case study was to look at the interactions between these participants. The social studies methods co-teachers were
in their second quarter of co-teaching. Following Bogdan and Biklen's (1982) approach of beginning a case study at the wide end of a funnel; data were also collected to study the three co-teaching teams that had school-based teachers involved. Science methods participants had some experience of working together during Autumn quarter. The other two co-teaching courses were in the first quarter of co-teaching during the Winter quarter. I perceived this as a way of documenting similarities and/or differences in co-teaching which might aid in the analysis of the data collected with the social studies participants. At first I was interested in writing a multiple case study.

After the initial interviews, I began to realize the complexity of the issues I was studying and decided that a multiple case study would be too large for a single dissertation. There was some thought about writing a single case study and using the data from the other co-teachers to show aspects of similarities and differences. By the end of Winter quarter, it was obvious that a single case study on the social studies methods co-teachers would be the document.

A description of the methods used in data collection follows.
Interviews

Unstructured interviews (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) were used to begin purposeful conversations with each participant (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982). It was important to establish a relationship of mutual trust during these interviews. As Oakley (1981) commented "Interviewees are people with considerable potential for sabotaging the attempt to research them" (p. 56). Since the interview was a principle source of data for this study the establishment of trust both during individual and group interviews was important. My being a participant and the researcher, aided the development of building trust in relationships. When interviewing participants both of us could readily use examples from class and meetings, knowing each would understand the context of the situation. As stated in Chapter Two, this shared meaning making was the framework for this study. The interviews, both individual and group, provided a social opportunity for participants to construct shared meanings allowing them to expand their personal perspectives.

Individual interviews

I interviewed each participant and facilitated the group interviews. I was aided in establishing "mutual trust" (Oakley, 1981, p. 56) with the social studies co-
teachers through having a prior relationship with each of them. I had known Marilyn Johnston for over a year, taking course work with her, working on the school collaboration project, and finally, as my advisor. I met Carol Gilboy when I was a graduate assistant at her school during the Spring of 1991. I worked with Carol on the school collaborative project and was a university supervisor for field experience students in her classroom. I was acquainted with Lisa Westhoven through the school collaboration project and through working on research presentations. Having these previous contacts with each of the participants assisted in forming relationships with them.

I was also a participant in the study and, thus, my responses to the interview questions were as important as responses from other participants. At first I tried to write responses to the questions that I used in the initial unstructured interview. My attempt at this was sparse, completing the interview protocol in three pages. After Lisa’s first interview, she asked who was going to interview me. She volunteered to do the unstructured protocol with me and became my interviewer.

Extensive data were collected from this study. Because social studies was co-taught during the Autumn quarter as well as the case-study Winter quarter, it
seemed imprudent to begin this study without making reference to the work that was done during this first quarter. Thus, during the initial interviews with the social studies co-teaching participants, I asked a series of questions about the first quarter. The interviews also covered participant’s goals and direction for the second quarter of co-teaching. At the end of Winter quarter, exiting interviews were held with each participant to discuss the co-teaching experience. Interviews lasted from forty-five minutes to one hour and fifteen minutes. Although an interview protocol was used, each interview resembled a conversation, where both interviewer and interviewee asked and answered questions, told stories, and gave examples. (See Appendices for interview protocol)

Initial and exiting interviews also were done with each member of the other co-teaching teams.

**Group interviews**

Continuing with the intention of documenting participants’ knowledge, feelings, and goals for the co-teaching project, we engaged in three group interviews. All four Winter-quarter-social-studies co-teaching participants were involved in each of these interviews. The first group conversation explored the terms "collaboration" and "hierarchy." The second interview was
more generic, evaluating the co-teaching during Autumn quarter and discussing possibilities for a more collaborative approach during Winter quarter. Both of these interchanges occurred during the first two weeks of Winter quarter. The last conversation was held at the end of Winter quarter and was used to gain insight on what we did throughout the quarter.

Journals

Each social studies co-teacher kept a journal for the Winter quarter describing her participation, thoughts, and goals. The length of these journals, both in individual entries and as a total document, varied. The shortest journal document was three, typed, single-spaced pages (Carol), the longest thirty, typed, single-spaced pages (JoAnn). A variety of reminders were given to participants throughout the quarter to encourage them to document thoughts and re-actions about the co-teaching. These reminders included: giving each person a journal notebook, giving verbal reminders at all meetings, handing out one written note, and collecting journals at mid-point. I also reminded participants informally when I saw them.

Other co-teaching participants were also asked to keep a log or journal. Each person was given a notebook
at the beginning of the quarter to use as a journal. Reminders, similar to those given to the social studies co-teachers, were issued to participants throughout the quarter to record their ideas and experiences. Of the seven beginning co-teaching participants, four gave me some documentation in journal or log form at the end of Winter quarter. These journals were not used as part of the study.

Audio taping meetings

The social studies methods co-teachers met weekly for a planning period. The shortest of these meetings was one and one-half hours, the longest six hours. All meetings were audio taped.

All co-teaching methods instructors met for a weekly meeting the first half of the quarter, and for three meetings the second half of the quarter. These meetings were scheduled to consider the problems, students, and/or issues that were necessary to discuss. The methods instructors' meetings were audio taped as well.

Participant observation

As a member of the social studies methods co-teaching, as well as the researcher in the study, I was involved directly in all observations. I facilitated the
group and individual interviews and participated in all social studies planning meetings and group methods meetings. I was present and participated in all social studies classes and observed at least two classes of each of the other co-teaching teams. I believed this participation in the study helped me to develop an indepth insider perspective (Wolcott, 1988; Geertz, 1973) to co-teaching in general and to the social studies co-teaching specifically. Field notes of these observations were included as part of my journal entries.

Data Analysis

An inductive process was used to analyze the data. Lincoln and Guba (1985) described the inductive process as appropriate for a naturalistic study as it allows for "the multiple realities to be found in the data" and was "more likely to identify the mutually shaping influences" (p. 40). The inductive process of the study began with the collection of data through individual and group interviews and meetings. As stated earlier, the funnel approach to case studies was used (Bogdan and Biklen, 1982). This approach allowed for a wide sweep of information at the beginning, which was continually narrowed as data were simultaneously collected and analyzed. Lincoln and Guba (1985, p. 188) developed a diagram of this inductive
approach, which I have modified using the outline of a funnel. Lincoln and Guba (1985) identified twelve areas of inductive analysis in a naturalistic study. This study combines many of these areas with Bogdan and Biklen's (1982) funnel approach and Donmoyer's (1990) naturalistic generalizability (see figure 2)

1) Natural setting: The study took place during a social studies methods course at Ohio State.

2) Human instrument: The study had a human person collecting the data.

3) Tacit knowledge: The study began with a look at what collaboration meant to the members of the Educators for Collaborative Change/Professional Development School. Co-teaching the methods courses began as a way to encourage more collaboration between university-based and school-based personnel.

4) Qualitative methods: As described above, the methods used for this study were individual and group interviews, journals, meetings, and participatory observations.

5) Participants: The data collection began with all members who were co-teaching methods courses. The number was reduced when it was decided to write a single case study. The study focused on the participants of the social studies methods course.
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6) Inductive data analysis: Coding and then categorizing of data were used to "uncover embedded information and make it explicit" (p. 203).

7) Grounded theory: There was no a priori theory for this study to prove. Rather, this study developed theory that "fit" the situation being researched, and work when put into use. By "fit" we mean that the categories must be readily (not forcibly) applicable to and indicated by the data under study; by "work" we mean that they must be meaningfully relevant to and be able to explain the behavior under study. (Glasser & Strauss, 1967, as cited in Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 205)

8) Emergent design: The funnel approach to designing the study (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982) was used.

9) Negotiated outcomes: Member checks were used while the data were collected and written, as well as after the document was constructed.

10) The case study: This study focused on the influence of collaboratively teaching social studies methods and is reported as a case study.

11) Naturalistic generalizations: The application of naturalistic generalizability to this case study research was through understanding how vicarious experiences can foster growth in personal knowledge. This study was about looking at issues, problems, and meaning making in order to raise questions about how university-based and school-
based work together.

Establishing Trustworthiness

Wolcott questioned, "When it really matters, does validity really matter?" (1990, p. 135). He, however, when hard pressed, offered the following list as "validity-giving-criteria" which he used in his own work: "talk little, listen a lot; record accurately; begin writing early; let readers 'see' for themselves; report freely; be candid; seek feedback; try to achieve balance; and write accurately" (p. 127-134). Or, as Jackson (1990) as respondent to Wolcott’s article, wrote: "be credible, balanced, fair, complete, sensitive, rigorously subjective, coherent, internally consistent, appropriate, plausible, and helpful as possible" (p. 154). Both Wolcott and Jackson, by their very description of validity and choice of words, made the point that validity, in the traditional sense, was difficult, probably impossible, to establish. For naturalistic studies, it may not even be desirable.

Lincoln and Guba (1985) dismissed validity as a non-issue for a naturalistic study and replaced it with trustworthiness. Lather (1986), too, discounted validity and called for "reconceptualizing validity" (p. 67).
Once we recognize that just as there is no neutral education there is no neutral research, we no longer need apologize for unabashedly ideological research and its open commitment to using research to criticize and change the status quo. (1986, p. 67)

Lincoln and Guba (1985) and Lather (1986) both called for the elaboration of data credibility checks "to guard against research biases distorting the logic of evidence within openly ideological research" (Lather, 1986, p. 67). In establishing trustworthiness in this study, I used five criteria suggested by Lincoln and Guba (1985) and Lather (1986): prolonged engagement, progressive subjectivity, triangulation, face validity, and catalytic validity.

The first criterion, prolonged engagement, was established in this study by my being a part of the study. I was present for every meeting, class, and interview which were a part of social studies methods.

Progressive subjectivity, the second criterion, was an important part of this study. I kept a methodological journal from January 1992 until January of 1993. The journal served two very important purposes. First, I was able to record questions about different happenings while collecting data (e.g. Why did Marilyn cancel the methods meeting the week I asked participants to bring in their mid-point journals?). Also, I recorded questions about data analysis (e.g. Be sure to ask Carol what she meant
when she wrote about "knowing us better.") The second way the methodological journal served me was as a place to record my feelings about the study, especially when I was feeling anxious. Both of these ways kept me more cognizant of what I needed for the study and aided in my asking questions of my participants, advisor, and peer debriefer.

Lincoln and Guba (1985) suggested that the significance of a peer debriefer is to assist in the curbing of enthusiasm to create data. The peer debriefer serves as a "devil’s advocate" in order to: 1) to ask the hard questions; 2) test out emerging working hypotheses; 3) consider next steps in the unfolding design; and 4) provide catharsis for the confusing emotions of the lonely inquirer (1985, p. 308). It was important for me to have a consistent person (along with my advisor) to talk with since my advisor and I were involved in the study. My debriefer was a fellow graduate student in education, but in a different department and program. The peer debriefer knew enough about education, research, and my study to be able to take an active part in discussions. It was not unusual for her to ask questions that clarified my thinking. Our interests were similar enough that we could share some common literature sources but different enough to continually require me to be specific about the topic.
Lincoln and Guba (1985) suggested triangulation as the third criterion used to establish trustworthiness. This was the use of many methods to collect data and comparison of data collected from each source. I used data collected from group and individual interviews, journal entries, audio recorded meetings and participant observation field notes to look for patterns, establish codes, and formulate questions which needed to be clarified.

Face validity, the fourth criterion, was established by the on-going involvement of the participants in the study after the data collection. Since I was a participant in the study, member checks were carried out immediately by checking understandings of what individuals said through re-statements or questions. In our meetings, the other participants also took part in member checks as they were able to clarify with co-teaching members when they did not understand something. These member checks were reflected in our group interviews, as well as some participants' journals and individual interviews. They recorded or talked about how it clarified their thinking when they were able to ask questions of one another. All writing about individuals was given back to the individual for her feedback. The data analysis section was given to each participant to read and comment on before submitting
it to the dissertation committee.

The last criterion, catalytic validity, referred to the degree that the participants were moved to change because of their experience in the study. Change can only be seen in retrospect. Catalytic validity was assessed as participants reflected about their change in their interviews, journals, or meetings. Participants were able to analyze their change when we talked with one another, helped one another clarify questions, and wrote in their journals.

Displaying data

As I began to listen, to read, and to discuss the data, I made decisions about displaying the data. First, because all the participants in the social studies co-teaching were women, rather than use the inclusive pronouns, she/he, I determined to use only the female pronouns throughout the rest of the study.

Second, I began the data display (Chapter Four) by using a "jointly told tale" (Van Maanen, 1988). This decision to include the participants' voices in the study was jointly made with the participants. We discussed the need to allow all of us to partake in the construction of some shared meaning. After all, all four of us were making sense of our co-teaching.
Last, in the second part of the data display (Chapter Five), a metaphor is used to aid the building of my interpretations of the data. Metaphors, "as a resource for communicating, take us beyond the particular, the literal, and the moment-to-moment details of everyday experience" (Weade & Ernst, 1990, p. 133). The metaphor is used in this study to make the meaning graphic (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980).

Ethics

Ethics in qualitative research are important issues when a study concentrates on developing an understanding of human events and actions. Ethical issues that seemed to need immediate care were:

Participants

Involvement:

All participants volunteered to be part of the study. I talked with each person in depth about the study. I explained in as much detail as possible about the time demands of the study and what was expected from each in the way of documentation. Time was allowed for each person to reflect and ask questions. Each person signed a participation agreement. However, no amount of preparation can ever prepare a person for the actual
amount of time that the study consumed. Neither did I anticipate the amount of time that would be involved.

Audio taping

Interviews:

Before each person was interviewed, I asked their permission to audio tape the conversation. At any point that the participant wished the tape could be turned off or re-wound to hear what was said. We discussed how the interviews would be used for the dissertation and if any part of their interview was written in the dissertation, the participant would be made aware of this. I clarified that I would be the only person to listen or read a transcription unless they gave their permission. Participants had the right to change anything they did not like in their interviews.

Meetings:

Every meeting was audio taped. At the beginning of each meeting I asked if I could audio tape the meeting. The equipment I used was always in the center of the table so participants could see it. If a particular subject came up that people were uncomfortable with recording, I turned off the tape.
Data

Ownership of the data was a particularly difficult topic since I was also involved in the study. When constructing meaning, whose meaning does the researcher use if there is disagreement? Lincoln and Guba (1985) suggest negotiated outcomes. Each participant had a right to have a say in what was written about them. Some participants asked for word changes in parts of the interview that were used in Chapter Five. These word changes were not substantive, usually helping to clarify what was said. When there were differences, we talked about them until we had an agreed upon understanding.

Limits of the study

1) The very fact that we were doing the study, influenced the study. Similar to the "Hawthorne effect," I had to be constantly aware of and ask questions about how much the influence I saw happening in the co-teaching teams was a consequence of the study. Were the participants working harder individually or together because they were being studied? If there was no study, would the co-teaching participants be willing to donate so much time? Were participants inhibited or intimidated in their co-teaching participation because they were being studied?
2) Even though I believe no study can be "objective" (Wolcott, 1990), what can be said about a study where the researcher is a major participant? Were there areas missed or avoided because I was involved? Would participants have responded differently to the "researcher" asking questions if I had not been a participant? These were questions I tried to keep constantly before me. My advisor and the other participants also were helpful in looking for these missed or avoided areas.

3) A person, who might have assisted in probing some of these important questions, was my major advisor. However, in this study, she was a major participant, too. Did she avoid asking questions because she was involved? By asking questions, did she unduly influence the study? Marilyn and I discussed these questions many times. The teacher participants were also made aware of these issues. Finally, we both wrote in our journals about how we tried to ask questions, rather than stifle them.

4) As professor, graduate student, and teachers we had to be aware that power could be an issue in our discussions, interviews, and meetings. There was always the possibility of intimidation because of the implied hierarchy of our institutional roles. We tried to keep this issue on the table for on-going discussion.
5) Whose meaning is it anyway? By writing the jointly told tale, I tried to address this meaning issue. Because the study was done by a university-based person was it my construction of meaning that would be used? Marilyn’s? Ours together? Or could teachers have a say in what would be written?

Summary

In this chapter, the research methodology was explicated. I discussed the philosophical assumptions of the study. A general description of the paradigm and rationale for the study were given. A section on the role of the researcher was deemed important in a methodology chapter since I was involved in the study. The analysis procedures were detailed, including a description of the setting and population, the data collection, the data analysis, and the establishment of trustworthiness. The last section of the chapter discussed the ethics and perceived limits of the study.

Chapter Four presents a jointly told tale where each participants writes about three themes. Chapter Five continues the presentation of the data utilizing a metaphor to aid in the displaying of the data.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY - I

INTRODUCTION

This study focused on the influence of co-teaching social studies methods on the participants. It sought to uncover how four participants from two institutional cultures and four personal perspectives constructed some shared meanings. The influence participants had on one another was studied by interpreting the perspectives of participants' "webs" as we wove together (and separately) the cultures of school and university. I noted that my own "web of significance" was woven and as such, I was not able to claim (or wanted to claim) a "neutral" stance (see Chapter Three). My use of interpretative theory as a theoretical framing for the study helped me to notice that the writing of this story would be my story. I was aware that dissertations are single-authored texts and would not allow for the participants to speak in their own voices, to share their own stories. As such, this was limiting the "shared" meaning-making. The writing of the document became "my" meaning-making.
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Shared meaning-making as described in Chapter Two was a guiding factor for the development of Chapter Four as a jointly told tale. Van Maanen (1988) describes jointly told tales as a way to open the text for participants to speak for themselves. As I began my work of collecting and analyzing data, the four co-teaching participants discussed the need to allow all of us to partake in the construction of some shared meaning. After all, all four of us were making sense of our co-teaching. It did not seem to matter whether we were discussing co-teaching matters (i.e. What type of exam should be given to our students?) or our experience of co-teaching (i.e. Could we have another group interview?), we all felt free to make comments and help in the decision making. Since I was a researcher as well as a participant, it seemed necessary to include "the others." Lincoln and Guba (1985) consider member checks as an appropriate way to include the participants' feedback, but we felt it was an example of "after-the-fact." I would have made decisions about which ideas, issues, and feelings would be displayed. They would already be in print. All the participants would have to do in a member check was comment on what I had written. I do not disagree with the importance of member checks in qualitative research. However, because of our collaborative co-teaching experience, Carol, Lisa, and
Marilyn were willing to participate to a fuller degree. Our experience in co-teaching was one in which all of us shared our ideas and issues. I wanted to continue with that format.

This chapter, a jointly told tale, originated as part of a paper presentation on co-teaching. We had earlier submitted a proposal to the National Council for the Social Studies to do a presentation at the national meeting the following November. When the proposal was accepted, we began working on the paper. Because of her schedule, Carol was unable to join Marilyn, Lisa, and me in the development of this paper. The three of us discussed our co-teaching experiences and decided on the three themes, knowledge, time/relationship, and change. Carol agreed to write on each of these themes to include her perspective in this chapter. We met to provide feedback to one another about our sections.

**Jointly Told Tale**

The tale was constructed around parallel narratives in order to capture the perspectives of each of the participants. The narratives were centered around three themes; knowledge (where we were when we started co-teaching), time/relationship, and change, that emerged from our discussions about co-teaching. As we talked
about our experience of co-teaching, these themes were the ones that were most often repeated.

Knowledge

Lisa Westhoven, classroom teacher. I began my co-teaching experience the first quarter with much apprehension and one big question: How will I ever contribute to the learning of university students in a social studies methods course when I don’t particularly like to teach social studies to my third grade class and don’t consider it to be a very important subject? I wanted to co-teach language and literacy but the professor did not have time to do the co-teaching. Language and literacy are areas I’m much more able and qualified to teach. What do I know about history, geography, government? I didn’t even do that well as an undergraduate in my social studies methods course. I felt that I was starting this experience with a lot less knowledge than the students who would be in the class. There were even undergraduate history majors in our post-degree student group. What had I gotten myself into? What did I have to offer?

The first planning meeting didn’t do anything to make me feel like I had made the right decision. I was going to teach with a professor, and not one but two PhD
students (one of whom was a social studies major). Another important factor was that I didn’t know any of these people very well and one not at all. I didn’t know what they expected of me and I didn’t know what to expect of myself or anyone else.

As the quarter progressed and we continued to meet before class, I became more convinced that I didn’t know much about social studies. The academic vocabulary (i.e. post-modern, reflective inquiry, positivism) everyone else used, kept me in the dark. The three others seemed to be having this very interesting and intense conversation about which I knew nothing; I didn’t even know what questions to ask. However, I still looked forward to Monday mornings partly because it was a change of pace, something different, and it gave me a break from the demands of my third grade classroom. The other co-teachers were very good about allowing me to just sit and watch when I wasn’t comfortable taking a part, but at the same time pushed me to try in areas they perceived I could be successful. All the while I was doing the readings for class trying to be "prepared" for class. I was also sure that I was learning much more about social studies than any of the students because I had a context in which to place my new learning.
The next quarter started and we were going to make an effort to make the teaching more collaborative. We lost one of the GTA’s (the one in social studies) and picked up an additional classroom teacher. I was feeling a little better about teaching mostly because I was experimenting a little in my classroom and was building a contextual experience from which to talk.

We planned during the week before class and this helped me feel better prepared. I had an opportunity to ask questions about the readings before class. Contributing to "how" class was taught also gave me a better sense of ownership. I was beginning to feel that I might have something of value to contribute to class, and was not just learning everything as the students did. Planning earlier in the week gave me time to think about what I knew or didn’t know before class. During this quarter I was genuinely excited about social studies. The process was becoming addicting. I was beginning to integrate social studies in all parts of my school day. I wasn’t an expert in social studies but I was learning a great deal.

Carol Gilboy, classroom teacher. As I began working with the social studies methods co-teaching participants, I found much of the vocabulary/terminology, "buzz" words
foreign to me. Though I read the course material, when Marilyn discussed her ideas or points of view, if I couldn’t pick up the meaning from the context of the sentences, I felt a bit lost. Of course, as time went by and we were working together I better understood Marilyn’s point of view. As a teacher I have always enjoyed learning just for the sake of expanding my views on various subjects. The other members, JoAnn, Lisa, and Jim, have rich backgrounds of personal and professional knowledge that they shared during our time together.

Any new experience takes adjustment. Experience makes things more understandable. The comfort level increases as risks are tried, failed, succeeded, and learned from.

I appreciated the broad background of knowledge that the participants had and shared in our planning and teaching time. The teaching time with the post-degree students was also a fine learning experience for me. The varied backgrounds of all the graduate students was very intellectually stimulating as we shared and discussed issues in class.

Marilyn Johnston, university faculty member. I had been teaching university methods courses for 11 years before we began this co-teaching experience. I had even
done some co-teaching with classroom teachers before, but this time it was different. My experience in the Professional Development School (PDS) project and a collaborative research project I had just completed with a classroom teacher raised doubts about my earlier definition of collaboration. I had previously thought that if you cooperated on a project you were working collaboratively. But collaboration, from my present understanding, is much more demanding than just helping each other out on one or the other’s project. Collaboration requires shared decision-making about goals, processes, and evaluation and a sense of parity across different institutional roles and expertise. I was uncertain how we could do this in teaching a methods course.

My route to teaching social studies was a bit unusual. After 13 years of elementary classroom teaching, I took a job at the University of Utah to teach aesthetic education. Eight years later, I took a job at Ohio State (OSU) to teach social studies. On the surface this might look like a significant switch in content, but it was in my mind quite continuous. My doctoral work had been in social foundations with a dissertation in aesthetic development. I was intrigued with developmental issues and the social construction of knowledge. I was
preoccupied with issues of cultural differences, multicultural issues, and the reciprocal nature of schools and society. Whether the class was about the arts or social studies, consistent issues captivated my interests and grounded my teaching. In one sense, all my courses were social foundations courses.

After being hired, I had worked hard to design my social studies course (during the 3 years before we began the co-teaching). I had done a lot of reading in social studies while developing the undergraduate and graduate methods courses and was enjoying the challenge of integrating what I brought from my background with new things I was learning. I sat in on a couple courses of my OSU social studies colleagues to learn more about global education—a strong emphasis in the secondary social studies program.

And then we decided to do the co-teaching. Suddenly there were two doctoral students (one of them from the secondary social studies program) and two classroom teachers watching and asking questions. Unexpectedly, I felt positioned under a microscope. How would my approach to social studies look to others? I realized how isolated we are as teachers as we develop our courses and teaching approaches. Suddenly I began to wonder how idiosyncratic I looked to others. I was apprehensive, but I also was
quite invested in the way the course was presently structured. I wasn’t sure that I wanted others fooling around with it when I was finally getting it to a place where I was happy with much of it.

JoAnn Hohenbrink, graduate teaching assistant. I had taught social studies methods during 5 of the 6 quarters I had been a graduate teaching assistant (GTA) at OSU. I thought it would be great to co-teach the course, to see how others would teach. Plus, I wanted to teach with Marilyn who was my advisor.

By the time I started to meet with the co-teaching team, after completing my general exams, I was surprised to learn that another GTA was joining us and another teacher, who really wanted to be co-teaching with someone else! Five seemed to be a large number. All of a sudden this idea of co-teaching became threatening.

I came at social studies from the back door. I had an undeclared minor in social studies in my B.A. work and taught it for a few years during my nine years of elementary experience. I supervised teachers in this area when I was a principal. But, did I know what I was doing? Yes and no. One thing for sure, I knew I didn’t teach social studies the way Marilyn did.
This thought alone preyed on my mind from the first moment of the first planning meeting. What was I doing working in a co-teaching environment with my advisor? After all Marilyn seemed to have much broader views of social studies than I did. My views of social studies came from my traditional upbringing, traditional schooling, and traditional teaching.

When I taught social studies methods my main goal was to be sure pre-service teachers would have a positive experience with social studies. Too often I heard elementary students call social studies boring. Even more frequently elementary school teachers lamented how the subject was their least liked area. I made it part of my classes to (1) allow students time to talk about their past and present experiences with social studies; (2) link how these experiences could improve social studies in the classroom; (3) begin to have students see how social studies could be integrated with other areas; and, finally (4) look at different approaches to teach social studies. I used a social studies methods textbook as a springboard for these discussions and chose articles from practitioner types of magazines (*Instructor, Teacher, Social Studies and the Young Learner*) to inform and improve the text. I thought I did a great job, and my evaluations from my students seemed to say the same thing.
However, the more classes I took at the university, the more I felt my teaching to be too narrow, too "practioner-y." Not only did I want students to begin to look at how social studies teaching could be different but I also wanted them to look at some of the "whys" that went with those differences. I wanted students to look at - the what and how they were going to teach - more critically. I knew from my coursework and conversations with Marilyn that I could reflect on these questions more seriously when teaching with her, but it still felt threatening.

Time/Relationships

Marilyn Johnston, university faculty member. The first quarter of the co-teaching didn't take much more time than usual for me. We met before class to talk about the readings and what we would do in class. By and large, however, it was my class done much like it would have been done without the co-teaching; others added their perspectives or examples to my topics. I did less teaching in class because others were also contributing. I did all the grading and evaluation which took the usual amount of time.

By the second quarter when we decided that we wanted the course to be more collaborative, we started meeting
weekly to plan and evaluate our teaching. Sometimes these were two or three hour-long meetings. Also, JoAnn had decided to do her dissertation study on the influence of co-teaching on each of us. So there were additional meetings, both individual interviews and group conversations to help JoAnn understand what was happening to each of us. In addition, we each kept a detailed journal of our attitudes, questions, and the ways we were changing our minds about things. Although all this was much more time consuming than the previous quarter, it became increasingly intriguing. As a result of our conversations, I was learning much about my teaching colleagues—their beliefs, interests and anxieties about teaching at the university, and the ways in which we were influencing one another. I was fascinated with the problems and issues that emerged. I was also critiquing my own teaching with others, and this felt different, and more challenging, than doing it by oneself.

There were a couple unexpected outcomes from this time investment. First, I had always prided myself that I used my classroom teaching experience to make my methods courses practical. I felt I was sensitive to teaching issues and to the complexities of classrooms. I wanted my courses to be practical as well as theoretical. I wanted my students to be ready to teach social studies but also
grounded in some theoretical considerations and an awareness of their own beliefs. The classroom teachers helped me see the limits of the way in which practice was handled in my course. This was partly due to the legitimation that was evident when a classroom teacher talked directly about her teaching. She talked about yesterday in her classroom; I talked about strategies and activities I had used but could not contextualize them in the same way. Classroom teachers put issues into a real context; I had to speak more generally. This contrast also made me realize the impact of my present isolation from classrooms. In my previous job I had been supervising in classrooms weekly and taught in my children’s parent cooperative alternative school for half a day a week. Since coming to Ohio State, I was rarely in a classroom. Graduate assistants did the supervising and my other responsibilities were so demanding that I rarely got out to a school building. Also, in my previous experience, I had taught in urban schools but worked with Hispanic and Native American children; OSU students in urban schools worked primarily with African American students. My own experience, in contrast with the teachers, was less relevant and fading. Through our many hours of talking and teaching together, I came to appreciate and rely on the complementarity of our
different worlds and expertise.

The second thing that I had not expected was the friendships that developed. I enjoy many of my university colleagues. We talk in the halls, we have lunch occasionally, I participate in a weekly faculty reading group, and we work together on university committees. However, few of these relationships take up much time, and the level of interaction stays rather formal. In the co-teaching experience, we became friends. Part of this had to do with the amount of time we spent together. We met over breakfasts, lunches, and dinners. We spent time in each other’s homes. A mixture of personal and professional topics began to permeate our conversations. We became a support system for each other as a great deal of conversation and learning took place.

Carol Gilboy, classroom teacher. Time spent working with the co-teaching members was necessary to do effective planning for the methods course. Juggling four people’s schedules for meeting times was hectic at times. I recall Marilyn and perhaps the other members expressing the thought that fewer members on a team would make it easier to arrange get-togethers. Also, the thought was expressed that a common or mutual philosophy would make it easier to work together. I, however, think that diversity is a
great key to learning and sharing ideas! It seems especially so to me as I think of a social studies methods course where so many different points of view of culture, religion, country, and race, etc. are presented. It hopefully teaches respect for other's outlook on life.

Changes in my thinking and in my life style can be subtle or dramatic. Some of the readings for the course reinforced my beliefs, while others challenged my concepts.

As Marilyn, JoAnn, Lisa, and I met to discuss co-teaching, opposing and mutual views intertwined. Time for reflection occurred each week as we met, planned, and executed the course materials. The pre-service students had input on topics that affected change in my thinking.

JoAnn Hohenbrink, graduate teaching assistant. As a third year graduate student I had become accustomed to my time not necessarily being appreciated at the university. That feeling came primarily from my experience of entering a doctoral program. I had taught elementary schools for nine years, had been a principal for three years, and had experience for a year teaching at a small liberal arts college. Then I started graduate school, where the feeling was soon conveyed that what you did before didn't really matter much. Some of these feelings of not being
appreciated came from actual experiences I had in class and the hallways (I didn’t experience OSU as all that friendly). But also some of this was the "graduate folklore" which was passed from one group of students to another. After all didn’t we all know that graduate students were the "flunkees" who did what the professors didn’t want to do. Thus, by the third year, it didn’t seem odd to me that I would put in 50 to 100 extra hours above the 200 that was expected of me for my assistantship.

Beginning winter quarter, when the co-teaching became a part of my dissertation, the extra time seemed to be justified. Besides, I couldn’t separate what was work and what was for the dissertation. And, yet, because of my involvement, I wanted to be even more involved. It was hard to know what was happening and not want to be there. Not only because it might influence my dissertation in some way but because the PDS project had become part of my life, my work. I wanted it to succeed and I wanted to be involved. The more I was involved with GTAs, teachers, students, professors, the more there was a reason to have a 5 or 10 minute chat in the hallway (what formally would have been a quick wave or "hi"); a lunch or dinner conversation (before this would not have happened); a phone call about the next meeting, which would end up with
talk about the latest gossip, news item, or family problem (who shared about personal items before?); or discussions and sharing about elementary classrooms, graduate courses, and resources by all of us (is it common for professors and GTAs to be interested in 3rd or 4th grade stories, and vice versa?). Yes, time does build relationships.

Lisa Westhoven, classroom teacher. Time. Co-teaching takes a lot of it! By the time we got to the second quarter we spent more time planning and talking (processing) about class than actually teaching class. All the conversations were interesting and stimulating and that is probably one of the reasons I didn’t mind spending as much time as was required. I enjoyed getting to know the people co-teaching the class. Being a part of a PDS became a part-time job for me. Co-teaching was just one of the parts. It seemed as though there was a meeting to attend every night after a full day of teaching. The meetings were all optional and done only on a volunteer bases. From my perspective, however, only through attending most of the meetings was I able to understand what PDS was all about. It was also a way to be able to express ideas and therefore have an influence on the direction our PDS would take. PDS work (the development of one) is very complex and I found if I didn’t attend
meetings I didn’t understand the whys about what we were doing. But all of these meetings took time. The more meetings I attended the more meetings I felt I didn’t want to miss out on. The whole process became addicting. The more I knew the more I needed to know.

Co-teaching social studies was just a continuation of the rest of PDS work. The problem was I was still responsible for a classroom of 25 children and this needed to be my priority. Each Friday night I stayed late to be sure I left plans for the substitute the next Monday when I was at the university. At first this didn’t seem so hard but as time went on I wanted my room to function as usual rather than with lessons that typically would be found in substitute folders. This meant leaving detailed plans. That was not so easy. Then, returning Monday afternoon after co-teaching social studies in the morning, I had to deal with lessons that were interpreted differently than I intended and all kinds of little problem (or big problems) with kids. I also had to face piles of papers to grade and now had no time in the day to grade them. So I had to stay late on Monday night as well. Although I was sometimes overwhelmed with these time demands, I still felt co-teaching and PDS work were well worth the extra energy.
I could see strong relationships were being built as a result of spending the amount of time necessary to co-teach. We had established respect for one another. Although I didn’t teach social studies in my class the way we were teaching the students, my way was accepted. The topics were new and different for me but we had established an environment where I felt it was safe to ask questions. I felt I was valued for what I had to offer. We were all different. We were trying to understand our differences and to learn from them. We could each accept or reject new ideas and understandings based on our evolving perspectives.

In my school the teachers rarely talk outside of a "hi" in the hall or pass along a message in the office, mostly because we have a very small faculty room and split lunch periods. The teachers stay pretty isolated. The co-teaching gave me an opportunity to talk with other professionals, bounce ideas off them, and learn new ways of teaching. I could try something new in my classroom come back and get some feedback and encouragement. I began to depend on these people to de-isolate myself. As time went on I would bring ideas I wanted to try and the co-teaching team would help me think through my ideas. These kinds of interactions didn’t just happen over night, but emerged gradually as our relationships grew. We were
not only a co-teaching team but friends that were concerned with one another’s professional and personal lives.

Change

JoAnn Hohenbrink, graduate teaching assistant. When I think of how I have changed based on my co-teaching experience, I reflect on my attitudes and beliefs. This past summer, Marilyn, Lisa and I planned for 1992-93 social studies methods class. Last summer this planning time would have been a job and/or a bother. I like to teach. My experience is teaching by myself. Planning this summer, helped me to recognize the differences in my thinking from last year to this year. It was natural to plan for planning sessions. It was natural to have more than one person as teacher. In fact, I realized that now it would be difficult to teach by myself (at least social studies methods). Yes, it takes much more time to do this co-teaching, but a broader view is presented to the students and to us as teachers when co-teaching takes place. I now understand better how isolating teaching is. I experienced how this isolation can be a part of closing down one’s seeing different options. Only by doing the teaching differently have I been able to reflect on and better understand my previous experiences. Co-teaching
challenged me to think about how others see it.

Lisa Westhoven, classroom teacher. I could probably fill a book if I were to describe all the changes that have taken place in my classroom and in myself since becoming a part of co-teaching team. I have questioned my whole approach to teaching. Because change demands time, thought, planning, and risk taking, I have only begun to make the changes I want. I have gone from being a very traditional teacher who is/was very teacher centered, moving to a classroom where children are more involved in their own learning. I now focus less on facts and more on critical thinking, inquiry, and process. I make fewer classroom decisions without first having a conversation with the class in order to have a better understanding of their wants and needs. For example, at the beginning of this school year instead of having the room "set-up" when students walked in, we discussed the physical arrangement of our classroom and what makes one way work better than the next. Students were involved in the decision about the room. We do less individual, isolated work and more group, cooperative work. These changes have not always been easy and I find myself a lot more unsure about what I'm doing then when "I was the teacher and this is how and what we are going to do." I'm never sure if I am giving
too much input and therefore having too much influence. I’m also not sure exactly when to step in and be "the" teacher. These emerging ideas, like classroom ownership and child input, make my job less predictable and more ambiguous. In many ways I feel like a first year teacher again; I have more questions than answers.

Carol Gilboy, classroom teacher. Life is change. I found myself struggling to understand the other participants’ points of view and also share my concepts on what we were discussing. I tried to push myself to relate to thinking patterns that were unfamiliar to me, but expressed by others in the social studies methods course.

One dramatic change has been my physical move from a suburban area to a small town in the country. A lot of forces came to bear on this relocation. I once needed a fine school system for my children, now as they mature my needs have changed. Also, the status I once enjoyed living in the suburbs doesn’t seem important to me any longer. I now enjoy more space, physically and mentally, outside the city. Though this town is conservative in nature, my personal growth continues in the privacy of my mind. I try to be more embracing of others. The coming together of different thought, cultures, religions, and concepts is very broadening.
The nature of working collaboratively means communicating, sharing and being flexible. Reflecting on the hours spent together, even though I was tired at times, co-teaching forced me into different opportunities to learn. The collaborative approach is similar to cooperative learning. It's "each one teach one."

Although research shows the cooperative learning approach to be most effective, I am reminded of a phrase that an administrator once shared with me. It states that "a person convinced against his/her will is of the same opinion still!" So, it is very important to see working with others and viewing new and different concepts as a learning process.

Other changes that occurred happened in my classroom, as I brought back materials and ideas from the co-teaching participants, class, and readings.

It was exciting to work with other intelligent, creative souls and be part of furthering the learning process of novice teachers. I was enriched by this experience and challenged to continue to strive for change and excellence in my career and life.

It was also a change to be out of the classroom and be part of a bigger picture for awhile. I felt happy to be both out of the classroom and be back in with new experiences to share.
Marilyn Johnston, university faculty member. One of the major changes in my thinking about co-teaching is related to the issue of authority. In the beginning, I was happy with the way my methods courses were going. I was not sure how open I was going to be to different approaches to teaching social studies or sharing airtime in class. Yet, I knew if I didn’t give up some of my authority over what happened in class, it would never become a collaborative venture. In order to encourage collaboration, I thought that I had to give up my authority and let others have their way. This was particularly true as we tried at the beginning of the second quarter to work more "collaboratively." I worked hard not to dominate the conversations or prescribe how everything should go. This often left me with feelings of guilt if I talked too much or my suggestions were adopted.

My discomfort with my role and authority led to many conversations. Lisa eventually assumed, what we jokingly labeled, the role of "watchdog of hierarchy." She helped us to identify ways in which hierarchical institutional roles and expectations were interfering with more genuinely collaborative ways of working together. In order to combat the tendency I had to control things, we purposely tried to plan and teach in ways that defied typical expectations. I rarely began a class session;
rather Lisa gave directions for an assignment or JoAnn would lead the class evaluation. This "role switching" was helpful in our own interactions because it took us out of our typical positions and helped us see each other's perspectives and issues. It helped me to see how many of the things I do in class are tied to my role rather than my needs, and that my basic objectives for teaching social studies can be accomplished regardless of what kind of topic or activity I'm leading in class.

Eventually we lost the need for this kind of clear role demarcation. By the end of the second quarter, we typically sat in circles with the students, and while assigning responsibility to each other to begin particular discussions or activities, we shared equal responsibility for facilitating these.

In our on-going co-teaching experience, we are building a set of mutual goals and shared vocabulary. We are also each building our background in different areas and are more aware and appreciative of our differing expertise. We have not lost a sense of our differences where they exist, nor do we think it advantageous that we necessarily agree on everything. One of the purposes for co-teaching is that students see different points of view and appreciate the contributions that each of us can offer from our classroom and university perspectives. I no
longer feel like I'm imposing my ideas because I trust that both Lisa and JoAnn will offer their ideas and critique mine. We each gain in our own empowerment within the group to the extent that we are able to contribute fully without fear of intimidating or being intimidated. Silencing oneself for fear of intimidating or for fear or being intimidated both inhibit collaborative work. And yet the issues of power and intimidation are never settled once and for all. Lisa must continue her watchdog efforts, and each of us must struggle to trust and take risks necessary for this kind of working together. I've changed from thinking I had to pull back and give up to enjoying the ways in which the group process enhances my learning and full participation.

Summary

This chapter is a jointly told tale by the participants of the study. Each person gave voice to how she experienced her own "web" being woven through writing about three themes which emerged from our discussions: knowledge, time/relationship, and change. In our interactions with one another, we aimed to bring from "behind our backs" (Gadamer, 1976) our own perspectives which influenced our interpretations.
Chapter Five discusses the interpretations I made when I analyzed the data collected about co-teaching.
CHAPTER V
FINDINGS OF THE STUDY - II

Introduction

Chapter Five continues the story of the influences of collaborative teaching on the participants. In chapter Four, each participant wrote her own narrative about three themes we jointly agreed upon: knowledge, time/relationship, and change. The purpose of these separate narratives was to allow each participant to share her own perspective. As noted in Chapter Two, an assumption of interpretive theory is that meaning is socially constructed and thus is not univocal. In interpretive theory, conversation in many voices is seen as necessary for understanding (Rabinow & Sullivan, 1987).

Chapter Five tells the story about co-teaching as interpreted by the author. It reflects my meaning-making. I bring my "prejudices, - my openness to the world" (Gadamer, 1976, p. 9) and tell the story as I interpreted the data. It is a process of bringing together my "horizon" with the horizon of the data to come to an understanding, a "truth" (Gadamer, 1976; Weinsheimer, 1985). It is a truth that is true from my viewpoint,
within my horizon, as well as within the horizon of the others and the data (Weinsheimer, 1985). "Understanding is always the fusion of these horizons supposedly existing in themselves" (Gadamer, 1976 as quoted in Weinsheimer, 1985, p. 183). Thus, this chapter records the author's interpretations of the influences of co-teaching on the participants.

The findings of the study are presented as a narrative organized around the experience of co-teaching. Embedded in the story about co-teaching are three connected vignettes about ownership, mentoring and learning, and cultural boundary-blurring. The story and vignettes are drawn from the data and are focused around the four broad questions which framed the study:

1) What is the nature of co-teaching?

2) How do the university-based and school-based professionals modify their rationale of and teaching for the course? of their classroom?

3) What influence does co-teaching have on the participants' conception of social studies?

4) How does collaboration influence the participants' perspectives of each other and of themselves?

The use of the literary device of a metaphor influenced my construction of the narrative. It assisted me in building my interpretations of the data.

Metaphors conjure up images of what they describe. As verbal/linguistic phenomena, they
are pervasive in our ordinary language and conceptual systems. As a resource for communicating, they take us beyond the particular, the literal, and the moment-to-moment details of everyday experience. Metaphors enable us to create graphic and figurative illusions that convey meaning and contribute to our sense-making abilities (cf. Lakoff & Johnson, 1980; Ortony, 1979). In short, the metaphors we use paint portraits of others. (Weade & Ernst, 1990, p. 133)

Metaphors aid in understanding the data by allowing a picturing to happen (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980; Van Manen, 1990). However, by using a metaphor other pictures are not permitted to develop (McGowan & Powell, 1990), hence, the necessity for the participants’ narratives in Chapter Four. Described here are the pictures I saw in the data as I discussed our experiences, listened to the sharing of stories in our conversations, and read about our experiences in the data.

The metaphoric image of a dinner party came to mind as I analyzed the data. Two kinds of dinner parties are used metaphorically to differentiate two ways in which we (the co-teaching participants) worked together. Historically we moved from a cooperative potluck dinner to a more collaborative one. A cooperative potluck dinner has each participant bringing her own favorite dish. During the Autumn quarter Marilyn (university professor) organized our "potluck" social studies methods co-teaching. The theme was planned around the course packet
of readings she had chosen and syllabus she had designed. Each volunteer (Carol - classroom teacher, Lisa - classroom teacher, JoAnn - graduate student) brought to the course what they were most comfortable with in their own teaching.

A collaborative dinner party has each participant involved in all aspects of the dinner. During Winter quarter, the co-teachers desired to use the principles of collaboration in all aspects of our "collaborative dinner," i.e., social studies methods co-teaching. Important to us was Hord's (1986) definition of collaboration which implies that those involved in collaboration share responsibility and authority for decision making.

The metaphor of a dinner party is used to describe the participants' experiences of the co-teaching project. Following the section describing co-teaching, I use elements from the dinner party metaphor to develop three vignettes related to the topics of ownership, mentoring and learning, and cultural boundary-blurring. The connection of the vignettes with the dinner party metaphor reinforces an argument that the data are a united "lived-experience" (Van Manen, 1990) during our co-teaching experience.
Co-teaching: A Dinner Party

Research question: What is the nature of co-teaching?

The collection of data for this study on co-teaching began between Autumn and Winter quarters, 1991-92. It was during this time period that the participants discussed how they enjoyed their first encounter with co-teaching but saw it as a cooperative venture. They wanted this second occurrence of co-teaching to be a more collaborative experience. In my first individual interview, I said that I began to feel differently about co-teaching during the middle of Autumn quarter:

Lisa: What went well [during Autumn quarter]?

JoAnn: I began to appreciate in a different way what we were doing. It wasn’t just Marilyn’s course and we were kind of sitting in. After about the 5th or 6th week, I began to want to do more [in class] and I knew I couldn’t the way I felt it had been set up. Now, I allowed it to go that way and probably helped it to go that way because of my attitude for the first five weeks. I can’t blame Marilyn for that. But by the 5th or 6th week, I could see that it could be different. That’s why when we had the [end-of-the-quarter] evaluation meeting, I was in there pushing for a change too. (JoAnn, first individual interview, 1/6/92; interviewer: Lisa)

It was a shared desire for a change that led to our reforming the way co-teaching was to take place.

The experience of co-teaching proceeded from a cooperative activity to a more collaborative undertaking.
The co-teachers wanted to move from our Autumn quarter experience of a pot-luck, cooperative dinner party where we each brought a favorite dish; to an experience during winter quarter of a collaborative dinner party where all decisions would be made together, from the buying, cooking, and table arranging, to taking out the garbage.

**Beginning Co-teaching: An Invitation**

Co-teaching became an option for elementary teachers, professors, and teaching assistants in the Educators for Collaborative Change Professional Development School (ECC/PDS) during the Autumn quarter of the 1991-92 academic year. Co-teaching was described in the PDS as an opportunity for teachers to work collaboratively with university faculty to teach the methods courses. Qualifications for participation as a co-teacher were very general, focusing on a willingness to work in a particular methods course with its assigned university-based faculty. An agreement between school districts and university related to releasing teachers and paying for substitutes was delayed, therefore decisions about volunteers for co-teaching were not finalized until the end of the summer. These late decisions meant there was little time to plan a collaborative syllabus. In social studies methods, the syllabus which Marilyn had designed was used. Volunteers
for co-teaching social studies methods were asked to bring their expertise in the subject matter and in the area of practical examples from the classroom. The pot-luck, cooperative dinner party was arranged.

In the initial interviews done between Autumn and Winter quarter, I asked each person to discuss why they took part in co-teaching during the Autumn quarter. Even though each participant volunteered to co-teach social studies methods, none of the volunteers seemed to have a clear understanding about what co-teaching might mean. Rather, like a potluck dinner where each person brings a dish of her choice, each person came into the project of co-teaching with her own agenda and motivation.

Carol, a teacher in an urban classroom, saw co-teaching as a chance for both professional and personal growth.

I joined the co-teaching team for two professional reasons: professional growth and to learn something I could use hands-on in the classroom. ... I thought it was good for personal growth. It sounded interesting and challenging—learning something current that I could use in the classroom. (Carol, first individual interview, 12/17/91)

Lisa, a teacher in a suburban setting, felt that she might need to make a change in her career. At the time of the study she was not sure if she wanted to stay in the classroom and was leaning toward moving away from the
teaching profession. Lisa saw co-teaching as an opportunity to do something different.

I must be honest, the reason for getting into teaching methods courses is that I saw it as a way to get out of the classroom. The classroom lacks that stimulation I crave during the year. Being in the project has helped that to some degree. Now there are at least a few teachers to talk to about things other than the usual teacher talk—i.e. aggravations of a certain kid, something cute someone did, or just complaining about petty things. Some people can do 30 years of that but I can’t. Co-teaching gave me an opportunity to do something else. (Lisa, journal, 1/5/92)

Personally, I (JoAnn) did not give a great deal of consideration to the meaning of co-teaching in general when deciding to participate. My reasons for doing the co-teaching had a lot to do with wanting to improve my own learning and teaching at the university level.

There were two reasons to join in co-teaching methods. First, I wanted to use my teaching assistant time. Second, and more importantly, I joined to see how Marilyn teaches social studies methods. I’ve taught social studies methods during five quarters and I wanted to see how she did it. I thought that would be a good way to find out. (JoAnn, first individual interview, 1/6/92; Interviewer: Lisa)

Only Marilyn seemed to have given co-teaching much thought prior to participating.

Well, I think there are two reasons. One is historical. When I worked at Utah, I worked with some clinical faculty and we did some co-teaching, not in this same way, but in the sense that I had a teacher who was with me, usually for a quarter at a time getting ready to teach a methods course. I tried to do it as collaboratively as possible.
My interest then which is similar to now was to bring a classroom perspective to the methods course. While I consider myself also a teacher, someone who is in the classroom every day has a different perspective than I do in my daily life. So that's one reason; I did it before. I found it very interesting and it did add something to a class. The other reason is because, in principle, I would like collaboration to permeate everything that we do and if we're going to try and be collaborative in the teachers' classrooms; that is, the university is going to go to the school and work collaboratively in that setting; it seems it also ought to be reversed. That people from the school ought to be on our turf and that the collaborative norms and procedures ought also to work at the university. So it seemed in the spirit of the program to do that. (Marilyn, first individual interview, 12/30/91)

Marilyn was the only person who had done any co-teaching before; her response showed her reflection of what co-teaching might mean to her: a teacher's voice and active presence in a university classroom. She saw co-teaching as another way to cross school and university cultures (Holmes, 1990; Sarason, 1982), a possible boundary blurring experience (Lampert, 1990) in our PDS.

Lisa, Marilyn, Carol, and I decided at an end-of-the-Autumn-quarter evaluation meeting that our social studies methods course had a very limited level of collaboration; as Lisa stated, "I think it was Marilyn's class with us helping" (12/23/91). Marilyn's class it was and we expected it to be Marilyn's class.

Well I think I basically thought it was going to be Marilyn's baby because it was her course. (Carol, first individual interview, 12/17/92)
I expected the course to be Marilyn's... I didn't think I would say a lot because I don't teach it [social studies] Marilyn's way.
(JoAnn, first individual interview, 1/6/92)

Carol's response to a question about problems during the first quarter of co-teaching, also, was an example of how members were hesitant to participate, "I don't know if it's really a problem but I guess one teaching assistant and one teacher felt more comfortable sitting on the side and the professor wanted them to intermingle" (Carol, 12/17/91).

Besides the expectations on the part of the participants that the social studies methods course would be Marilyn's, Marilyn herself was uncertain about how to proceed with collaborative co-teaching. During her initial interview, Marilyn discussed how her previous experience of co-teaching with one teacher in Utah would have influenced her working in a similar situation at Ohio State:

Well, I think what would have happened is I would just sort of model it off of what I did at Utah which I realize now was not very collaborative. It was more a modeling and training session than it was a collaborative. I did try and plan with the teacher and I tried to integrate anything that they had skills or expertise in but many times they didn't. They were coming in new to this and they were in many cases a student just like the undergraduates that I was working with. So it wasn't collaborative in the sense that we sat down and
said okay, what should we do in this class? It was my class and they were sitting in and helping in any way that they could. I probably, having not thought much more about it, would have expected that to be the case. It was my class and someone else was coming in to do whatever they could add to it. Rather than a much more collaborative approach which would have been to sit down and say okay, what shall we do in this class and construct it together. I think in the beginning we had a little sense of that in that we tried to do some planning together and tried to bring in separate interests or perspectives but in retrospect we didn't do much of that. (Marilyn, first individual interview, 12/30/91)

Marilyn's previous experiences of course ownership and mentoring of teachers rather than shared ownership and collaborating with teachers also played a part in this co-teaching effort (see vignettes one & two, following). Marilyn's insight during this interview revealed that she began to see a difference between what she had done before and what she wanted to do now. Marilyn said she wanted co-teaching to be "a sharing of turf," and, yet, what had actually been taking place during Autumn quarter was a type of mentoring.

The volunteers' involvement in this potluck co-teaching was a cooperative venture of trying to bring what we did best to the social studies methods class. Carol explained, "To begin with I mostly listened. I would put in comments that I thought were relevant both during planning and in class" (12/17/91). Lisa experienced her
involvement as relevant but one that was not necessary:

I think it’s true that I could say things and it does make it a little more valid to come from a classroom teacher. But I don’t think that I said a whole lot that Marilyn couldn’t have said. She’s got all the experience that I have [in classroom teaching]. She could say the same exact kind of things that I said, but coming from a practicing teacher makes ‘em sit up and listen a little more carefully. (Lisa, first individual interview, 12/23/91)

Members enjoyed our potluck, cooperative co-teaching experience. All participants, when asked what went well said something about relationship building and fun. Carol summed-up this common "good feeling:"

But at least when we sit down to talk on a certain meeting we have a focus. We have a certain date coming up and this will be our theme or our topic. I think that’s pretty focused. I like the element that since we’ve been together and we’re sorting through all the elements of this, there’s a feeling of trust and it grows with people. It’s a risk. You have to take risks in life and I just feel fortunate to be working with three intelligent, kind-hearted, caring collaborative kind of people. I think it’s always nice to break bread together. I think being in each other’s environments - all these things, I think are very supportive. (Carol, first group interview, 1/16/92)

Our decision at the end of the quarter was to try and make some changes in the arrangements of the dinner party. The goal was to change the cooperative potluck to a more collaborative dinner party.
Re-working an invitation

By the end of Autumn quarter, participants began to recognize that while they enjoyed co-teaching, it was not collaborative. Lisa, when reflecting on the first quarter of co-teaching, said:

When we decided that I would do social studies, I thought it would be more collaborative because of Marilyn. I thought it would be more true co-teaching. (Lisa, first individual interview, 12/23/91)

Marilyn’s response to the Autumn quarter co-teaching experience had a similar tone:

That is far from what I would say is an ideal situation if you’re going to collaboratively teach methods courses and genuinely try to bring in both the classroom and a university perspective to that. It has got to be much more. Much more setting up from the beginning what’s going to happen and much more sharing of the norm. (Marilyn, first individual interview, 12/39/91)

It was this "more" of co-teaching that the participants wanted to develop during their second quarter experience.

In their first interview, participants talked about what was necessary to re-shape co-teaching during Winter quarter. I (JoAnn) felt we had to spend more time together.

I would just say that if we were really talking about collaboratively doing methods I don’t think we spent enough time doing it. We needed the time at the beginning to really clarify where we all were coming from. So in some ways
we needed to have a meeting like we did Sunday [general planning meeting for the quarter] way back in September and to have said, "Okay, where are you, JoAnn, coming into this?" And I could have said, if I could have been that honest at that point, "I'm frightened and scared because I don't want to find out that the way I've done social studies methods for five quarters has been wrong." (JoAnn, first individual interview, 1/6/92)

One essential component was time. It was necessary to spend time together so we could plan for the course and come to some common understandings about co-teaching.

Not having the time to plan before co-teaching began in Autumn quarter meant that we used Marilyn's syllabus in social studies methods. Lisa felt a lack of planning limited her ability to participate.

I'm sure I would have liked to have actually taught more. But I don't know how that would have been done the way we did it; it was Marilyn's class. I don't know any of the things that she was teaching. I was learning as I was going. So I couldn't 't have talked about global or multicultural education from an academic point of view. I think the class could be a lot more practical. (Lisa, first individual interview, 12/23/91)

Planning was an important issue because it helped to foster how participants could share their expertise in co-teaching.

Marilyn combined both the time and planning aspects when she talked about what was needed:

I think there was not near enough time for planning nor did I like the way we did the planning right before class. It sort of left
everybody to either jump in and do something on the cuff or even if you had planned something it got rearranged. You didn’t have the time before you went into class which I desperately need for myself. So I often went in to do something and it had to be different than what I thought it might be. It just felt very impromptu. (Marilyn, first individual interview, 12/30/91)

She recognized that the class was set up to do the things she preferred rather than the things teachers would have preferred. The lack of time and planning kept school-based people from active participation. One concern for Winter quarter was to plan further in advance. We all agreed that it was impossible to co-teach and only plan two hours before class.

Carol thought the Winter quarter would improve greatly if she were able to participate on a regular basis, since she was unable to come to all the classes during Autumn quarter and, thus, had an "incomplete version" (12/17/91). She looked forward to a more consistent experience, "I think that I would have had much more of a chance to be part of this if I had gone every single time because I would have taken up my own responsibility" (12/17/91).

A new start

We began the winter quarter with a determination to make the co-teaching more collaborative. We wanted to
change our cooperative potluck to a collaborative dinner party. Our preparation for this change was simplistic. We seemed to think all that was necessary to make this change come about was an awareness about last quarter (Marilyn’s course, we helped) and a willingness to do the present quarter differently (our course). At first that meant being conscious of how we organized our social studies class sessions. I recorded after an early planning meeting an example of our reorganization and how we thought it would aid our plans for change: "We had to organize differently, so Marilyn would not be positioned as the 'leader,' 'the professor,' 'the one-in-charge’" (1/5/92). It was as if we believed that an external change in how we did social studies classes would bring about a more collaborative co-teaching. If Marilyn was no longer in a leader position, our co-teaching would be more collaborative. Only one week had passed when we began to recognize our naive attitude and the complexity of changing our cooperative form of co-teaching into a collaborative work; the potluck dinner into a collaborative dinner.

JoAnn: I think what we’re looking at or trying to help Marilyn look at is whether she has ownership in this or sole ownership of the class or how that works at a university level.

Lisa: No.
Marilyn: No? No, what?

Carol: I think you put the packet together and this was your idea and you’re open-minded and you’re willing to learn and to grow and to share all this with us and it’s just evolving as we talk it over.

M: Yeah, but evolving toward what? Is the goal to reach at some point a course that has no one’s identity but a group identity? Would that be the ideal?

C: I guess if all four of us are talking these things over and that’s what we’re aiming for that’s one thing we’re working on. In actuality you are the professor and your name is on the course and you give the grades and you’re ultimately responsible.

M: That’s sort of like saying you [as teachers] have to agree with what the principal wants. ... We can give the grades. We can plan the course. There’s nobody that says that somehow I have to direct the course. If I feel comfortable with it, it doesn’t matter how it works.

C: But you were saying when we started out you have all these questions so you’re not sure how comfortable you feel.

M: I’m only asking the questions. I don’t know.

C: I’m just feeling the way.

M: Well we all are. We’re just trying to say what our questions are, right?

C: I just think as an adult when I look at history and the different things that we’re involved in our life, I think it’s better when change is a little slower because I think you can sort things out as you go along.

L: I think if we did this over longer periods of time, if we’re going to teach for more quarters in a row that it would become less of an issue being in your [Marilyn’s] class. I would have more knowledge to teach the parts that you teach
and so it would feel less like just your class because I would have some of this too.

M: But that sounds like what you would eventually do is become me doing my thing.
(first group interview, 1/16/92)

Surfacing all around us were points that needed to be addressed about co-teaching, such as, ownership, mentoring and learning, and cultural boundary-blurring; all which left unattended would keep us from engaging in a fully collaborative co-teaching venture.

The issues of ownership, mentoring and learning, and boundary-blurring were intertwined throughout the data from the fourteen weeks of this study. An analysis of the data that sets up categories creates a sense of separateness of each issue. In the data, however, these points were barely distinguishable. It was only through careful coding and analysis that these issues were identified and then interpreted.

Each of the following three vignettes, ownership, mentoring and learning, and boundary-blurring, continue the story of co-teaching. We first turn to how ownership influenced our co-teaching.
Vignette One

Ownership: Whose Party?

Research question: What is the nature of co-teaching?

Parity

Ownership was an issue that Marilyn, Carol, Lisa and I had to deal with throughout the co-teaching experience. The cooperative potluck dinner of the first quarter would remain, each of us bringing something to the co-teaching, unless we began to collaborate on the dinner party all of us planning, making decisions, and participating in the co-teaching. The literature argues that parity is a requirement for collaboration (Oakes, Hare & Sirotnik, 1986). However, it is not clear what is meant by parity. Oakes, Hare, and Sirotnik (1986) use the term "equal" in place of parity. Erickson (1989) and Appley & Winder (1977) both define collaboration in terms of "mutuality." Tikunoff, Ward and Griffin's (1979) equate parity with equal responsibility.

Collaboration is viewed as teachers, researchers, and trainer developers working with parity and assuming equal responsibility to identify, inquire into, and resolve the problems/concerns of classroom teachers. Such collaboration recognizes and utilizes the unique insights and skills provided by each participant while, at the same time, demanding that no set of capabilities is assigned a superior status (quoted in Oakes, Hare and Sirotnik, 1986, p. 547)
Could the four of us be a part of a similar process within
the framework of co-teaching? Marilyn, Carol, Lisa, and I
talked about parity as a possible goal for our co-
teaching.

Carol: Ultimately it's your [Marilyn] course because you've got the Ph. D.

Marilyn: I think one of the things we've been
struggling with all along and trying to figure out about collaboration is whether or not you
can collaborate when it's not equal. Does it require equity or what we've been calling parity
rather than equality in order to collaborate?

Lisa: I think that's an ideal world. I don't think anybody is ever going to find that unless you start a school from scratch.

JoAnn: Is there a hierarchy automatically set up for us? And then my question is do we buy that?

Lisa: I think that we're really trying to work to change that [looking to Marilyn for answers] and so when we do that, we have to consciously say, "okay, that's her perspective" and think of her as more of a teacher than to think of her as the university professor so we're always consistently working on trying to keep us all at parity. I think it's really easy to fall into that especially when you get down to the university and her setting. But when we plan, I think it's really important to remember that that's what we are trying to do differently.

Lisa: And Marilyn is going to have to do the same thing. She's going to have to say "Well, I really have to listen to what they have to say too." It's got to be equal working on each part. (interview role/definition, 1/5/92)
***

Marilyn: Well, we don't even know among ourselves whether we have shared expectations and definitions. We do sort of in some kinds of contexts because we worked that out but we don't know about how to do this [co-teaching]. That's part of what we're struggling with. What does it look like when you collaborate in this situation as opposed to our research group or our individual schools? The roles change and the sense of how it works changes. We don't know much about this co-teaching stuff.

... 

JoAnn: My question is are we asking teachers and professors to collaborate and neither one have had the time to work that out? So really we're asking what is impossible to do.

Carol: I think it's part of the process. I think that's what makes it exciting even though Marilyn had the idea to begin with. If we're collaborating then we have equal input. We try to respect each other's point of view. We negotiate things. We set our objectives and then we each take part to reach the objectives. (first group interview, 1/16/92)

Parity - Equality - Equal - Mutuality. This was a complex topic that the literature did not clarify. In this study, each participant had a slightly different conception of what collaboration might mean for co-teaching and that influenced how we interacted with one another. While our discussions seemed to be endless about issues surrounding parity/equality, we never formulated a consensual definition. Lisa pushed for an operational definition of parity in collaboration as being "equal", especially an attitude of equal time. Carol, Marilyn, and I were not as
clear and/or not as vocal about our operational definitions. Carol said things should be equal but when pushed, thought it was Marilyn’s course and Marilyn was ultimately responsible. At least in the beginning, Marilyn tried to help us clarify our thinking about parity. She tended to ask probing questions but did not share where she was on the issue. The question about parity for me was focused on the wider context of university and whether within the university frame it was possible to have parity. Thus, there was confusion around what we meant by "more collaborative".

**Marilyn on ownership**

Social studies methods was Marilyn’s course during Autumn quarter. Even though Marilyn saw the need for "more setting up ... more sharing of the norms" (12/30/91) as necessary to collaboratively co-teach; these "mores" also meant less ownership for her.

The issue of ownership was heightened during the second quarter because we continued to use Marilyn’s syllabus. Lack of time and the fact that the class was in its second quarter prevented us from starting over. An outcome of using Marilyn’s syllabus was that the planning how to teach the class became the collaborative aspect of our co-teaching, rather than decisions about content.
JoAnn: When you have a social studies methods course that has really been put together by one person and that person has taught it before, then the collaboration is really how that [the course] is going to be taught.

Marilyn: One way to say that is - the planning is more important than the teaching. Especially now that we don’t have an exact plan for each session and we’re sort of having to negotiate things as we go along. I would much rather people miss class than miss planning. It seems to me it’s in the planning where we do the negotiating and sort of figuring out what we’re about and the reflection about it. In class we’re just doing it and that’s fine. (first group interview, 1/16/92)

I briefly recorded in an early journal entry how we planned for class and divided the parts.

We discussed what to do for class on Monday for two and a half hours! We talked about the material for multicultural and global education—what our ideas were and what to do. ... When we finished we had class planned and everybody was doing something.

Second social studies methods class

8:57 Have students write about what’s Realistic/Unrealistic in the Anderson—Anderson article (JoAnn)
9:05 Some distinctions between multicultural and global, introduction to role-play using Hanvey’s 5 dimensions (Marilyn)
9:40 Introduction to making a symbol for a definition of community — 6 students in a group (Lisa)
10:10 Brainstorming to generate questions to ask kids – large group (Carol)
10:25 Discuss reading—Anderson/Anderson (JoAnn)
10:45 Instructions for unit groups (Lisa) (JoAnn, journal, 1/10/92)

We decided that it was important to have each participant doing something each class session.
However, using Marilyn’s syllabus and material made it difficult for her to give up ownership of the course.

Marilyn: One of the questions I think I’m struggling with most is the question of how much it can and should be my class. How much I should give up in terms of what my perspective is or things I think are important in teaching about social studies.

Lisa: What have you come up with?

Marilyn: More questions than answers. I find myself every time one of you says something like JoAnn said, "It’s hard for me to teach a reading that you’ve taught." I think that’s really interesting but also very complicated. One response is "Well, then you should choose your own readings. And you should teach what you want to teach." But then I chose those readings because I wanted to accomplish certain kinds of goals and what if you want different kinds of goals.

JoAnn: But that’s one of the problems I think of not having time to plan. Because you did choose the topics. You did choose the goals and you did choose the readings and so that’s how we’re involved in this. I do think that puts some different kinds of pressures on different people. (first group interview, 1/16/92)

Using Marilyn’s syllabus made it problematic for the co-teachers to participate.

Marilyn was unsettled about her ownership of the course from the very beginning. She was unclear about how much ownership should be afforded the collaborative group and how much she should keep herself. In her first interview before Winter quarter, Marilyn stated:

It has puzzled me all quarter how much leadership and ownership I should take of the
class and how much I shouldn’t. I mean when I think of the opposite situation — say I was going to go into Lisa’s classroom and work collaboratively with her or I were going to be a part of Carol’s classroom. How much would I expect them to change their classrooms because I was there? And would we then be genuinely collaborating or would I just be there filling in or doing a little something now and then? So I have lots of puzzles about this and lots of puzzles about what it means to have someone come into my class or what it means on the other hand to say we’re reconstructing in a collaborative way this methods course. (Marilyn, first individual interview, 12/30/91)

Winter quarter began with a whole new emphasis on collaboration and with that emphasis an increased concern about ownership for Marilyn.

I’m really struggling with how much to suggest things—whether I’m imposing too much. (Journal, 1/10/92)

I’m feeling guilty when it feels like my class or when elements come up that check my sense that it is too much my class. (First group interview, 1/16/92)

I wondered afterwards, however, whether I was more comfortable with it [plan for class] because it seemed more typical of how I would have done class. (Journal, 2/3/92)

I feel like I’m taking more than my share of the time lately. I’m not sure whether it’s just my apprehension about taking too much air time, or whether it seems to the others that they aren’t getting their share. (Journal, 3/9/92)

In her last interview, Marilyn discussed the loss of course ownership as a disadvantage to co-teaching:

Loss of control, loss of having the class all to yourself. I like teaching, you know it’s hard to sit there. You get to shape it. ...
I mean if someone actually were to do it, it is their responsibility, but when it’s my class, you find that sometimes it’s a struggle. I want more time to do things that I like to do. That’s not to say that what’s going on is not very positive or that I really wanted to change the class in any particular kind of way. I mean like it took off in some directions I was comfortable with and other times I wasn’t. I really like what we did because we did a lot, but there’s still a sense of loss. You know you don’t get the same kind of air time. (Marilyn, last individual interview, 3/19/92)

But Marilyn also saw progress in our working toward collaborative co-teaching. By the end of the quarter she felt that she was treated like any other participant during the planning times, not as the university professor. Marilyn’s ideas about planning were considered along with the rest of the co-teachers’ ideas.

It feels more equitable especially with the planning. ... I feel freer to say what I want to say and I know that if somebody disagrees with me, I would get told or that just because I say something, it’s not going to necessarily fly. So it feels more comfortable. (last group interview, 3/18/92)

The problem of who had ownership of the course never went away for Marilyn. However, we were able to make social studies methods more collaborative, especially during the planning times.
Carol on ownership

Marilyn was not alone in her ambivalent thoughts about ownership. There was a quandary set-up between Marilyn's ownership of the course and the groups' desire for collaboration. Carol's view of Marilyn and collaboratively co-teaching social studies methods seemed to waiver back and forth. When we talked about the person, Marilyn, Carol believed there was a need for collaboration. But when we talked about the course, there was a change of heart. The fact that it was now a course set-up by the university, the final say must be Marilyn's, a university person. In a group interview at the beginning of the quarter Carol made these statements:

I think now that we are into this more it's getting to be more of our course and less of Marilyn's course and from what you said before, you wanted that; that's the way we should be heading-for collaboration, period.

...Well she's got her name on it. I just think that she's the one ultimately responsible for this. (Carol, interview role/definition, 1/5/92)

By the end of the quarter Carol seemed to resolve her dilemma about ownership by putting all the components together and continued to see a hierarchy in our relations.

Well I think the way it was set up it was supposed to be as equal as we could possible
JoAnn on ownership

Lisa and I both began the quarter with a determined stance to make the social studies methods course collaborative. However, I found it difficult to make sense out of two different issues. I was committed to making the quarter more collaborative; yet, there was such different knowledge bases among the participants. During the first group interview (1/16/92), I asked Marilyn if it were possible for her to call the course, our course, rather than, her course? I wanted collaboration to permeate everything we did, all decisions, grading, and planning. On the other hand, in my first interview I stressed the difference in university-based and school-based knowledge sources. "What I think we have to be very careful about is that collaboration doesn’t mean everybody has to have the same knowledge" (1/6/92). I struggled with trying to balance these two issues. However, we did not accomplish a balance and this lead to some frustrations. I sometimes saw our collaboration becoming
simply "no one in charge." After one planning session, I wrote:

It's times like tonight that I feel the lack of leadership or chief worrier. Does collaborative co-teaching mean no one can be in charge? We all tend to hang back as if to see what will happen? It's a bit "irritating" when we are unplanned, the confusion, the not knowing. We just talk, many times with no focus. We all talk about how time consuming collaboration is. Yet we take MORE time by, what seems to me, just having rambling conversation. (JoAnn, journal, 1/27/92)

At the end of co-teaching I continued to question issues around ownership, leadership, and accomplishing goals.

Some reflection after the meeting: Isn't it great that we plan so quickly!? Or are we just tired? Less reflective? Why don't we carry through? - community units, professional groups, generalizations - all good ideas that we did for a week or two and then fizzled out. Is the "chief worrier" position not being filled because we are SO conscious about the hierarchy (watchdog of hierarchy!) that no one takes that position on? (JoAnn, journal, 3/2/92)

...  

It depends. When I listen to people who want co-teaching to be totally collaborative, I agree with them. However, when I listen to Marilyn and others about ownership, I think, she has a really good point. Who has the knowledge to do this? Are classroom teachers to become "mini-professors"? Or can they remain classroom teachers and bring what they know and do best to a collaborative course? (last individual interview, 3/24/92)

Sometimes I felt that the collaborative process generated more questions than answers.
Lisa on ownership

Lisa maintained her stance toward full collaboration throughout the quarter. At the beginning of the Winter quarter co-teaching, Lisa dubbed herself as the "watchdog of hierarchy" (group interview, 1/16/92). Her view of co-teaching was the collaborative dinner party - immediately. Lisa saw ownership (or power) of the course as a major stumbling block for collaboration. "I want Marilyn really to be just one of the teachers bringing with her strengths and weaknesses just like the rest of us" (journal, 1/5/92). In her last interview, Lisa explained how she began Winter quarter with a changed attitude:

JoAnn: Lisa, in the last group interview, you said you were more actively involved in co-teaching [winter quarter]. I would like you to talk more about why that was.

Lisa: Because we had set it up that way. We talked about it at the restaurant [evaluation meeting] that we were going to do things differently. It meant I had to be more involved or it wouldn’t have been different. It would’ve stayed the same and it would’ve been Marilyn’s class. ... But by doing it radically different meant that I had to be more involved. It could have been radically different; it could’ve been all mine, but I think we were trying to come up with a happy medium. (Lisa, last individual interview, 3/22/92)

At the end of the quarter, Lisa was still discussing hierarchy:

Well, I think we are still working on breaking hierarchy. I thought for a while we had done it, but I don’t think that’s necessarily true.
I think there are still parts of it that pop up. ... Marilyn should have no more ownership than we should have. (Lisa, last individual interview, 3/22/92)

Lisa was not comfortable with hierarchy in collaboration. However, she never resolved the question around what would be a way to replace the hierarchy especially considering our different knowledge bases.

Ideal conceptions on Ownership

Co-teaching had become more collaborative in some noticeable ways during Winter quarter. Lisa discussed this in our last group interview, when she stated she would not want to be a part of an uncollaborative arrangement. She felt that the collaboration made it more comfortable for her to share her ideas and gave her a sense of involvement.

Lisa: I think that if we didn’t do it collaboratively, that I don’t think it would be worth the teachers time to be there. I think it would just end up being Marilyn’s class and then eventually you wouldn’t feel ... I wouldn’t have felt comfortable piping in at all. If that were a key pattern where she is standing up there being the expert all the time and I’m sitting off to the side. I know I would have something that I probably could say, but I don’t think I would be as willing or as comfortable probably more so than willing, but comfortable to say something.

Marilyn: So you think that there is a level of involvement necessary to really feel some ownership or to feel like it’s worth while.
Lisa: I wouldn't know the difference then between going and sitting if you are not going to participate in some way other than to say something every once in a while. I wouldn't see the difference in just taking the classes. (last group interview, 3/18/92)

After working ten weeks in a collaborative co-teaching process, each co-teacher talked about what she saw as her ideal form of co-teaching. Marilyn described two versions of co-teaching. She saw that what we tried to do in co-teaching as a "romantic version" of collaborative co-teaching.

I started out thinking that the ideal case was where university and school and whoever was in this collaborative group would from the ground up be a collaborative group. That we would negotiate all aspects of the course and we would feel equal ownership. If that didn't happen right away, it would happen over time. That was clearly our goal. (Marilyn, last individual interview, 3/19/92)

Marilyn's other version was comparing co-teaching to her going into a teacher's classroom. Rather than collaboration, she would be invited in to an elementary classroom to enhance some aspect of the curriculum, make some contribution. Marilyn wondered if that would not be a more realistic picture for co-teaching at the university. She added, "It begins to sound on the edge of not being collaborative, on the edge of being more cooperative" (3/19/92). However, expecting the same knowledge from all was equally unrealistic and
Lisa described two ways she saw co-teaching: "tandem teaching or interlaced teaching." She felt that we were trying to be interlaced, when the expectation was for all to know the material; a shared knowledge. Lisa's second example of co-teaching was tandem teaching. She thought this way was more possible to accomplish. "Tandem teaching means that you are an expert here and I'm an expert there and we bring those together" (3/22/92).

Carol described an ideal form of co-teaching as having the time to carry out the plans.

Ideally, people have the time that they say they have. They say, here is a topic, what are our objectives, what are our goals and then we carve them out together so we have ownership. Then we each bring in subject matter, resources, consultants, visual aids whatever that fits those objectives and goals and map it out. Then we'd have total ownership all the way through. (last individual interview, 3/22/92)

My ideal form of co-teaching was similar to Carol's. I wanted to have plenty of time to plan, beginning in the summer. This would allow time to write to other social study method instructors to see their syllabus and look through social study method textbooks. "The people that are teaching it, actually sit down and look at things together and decide. It becomes everybody's ownership and nobody has more ownership than someone else" (JoAnn, last individual interview, 3/24/92)
The volunteers of co-teaching spoke about co-ownership as part of the ideal circumstances for co-teaching. Marilyn, who started co-teaching with more of an idea about co-ownership, thought about changing her attitude on co-ownership to one of maintaining a professor's ownership. All participants recognized the importance of "willingness" to take part in co-teaching as essential.

**Conclusion**

All of us recognized that ownership, as an essential ingredient to a collaborative dinner party, was an area of concern. We agreed with Oakes, Hare, and Sirotnik, (1986) that "A first step in collaborative inquiry would be to push and extend the practitioner's actual involvement to the point of equal and genuinely collegial participation" (p. 547); and, yet we found in a co-teaching environment that carrying this advice out was very complex indeed.

Vignette Two continues the story of co-teaching and describes how the co-teachers are influenced by the issues of mentoring and learning.
Vignette Two

Mentoring and Learning: Whose Recipes?

Research questions:

1. What is the nature of co-teaching?

2. How do the university-based and school-based professionals modify their teaching of and rationale for their course/classroom?

3. What influence does co-teaching have on the participants’ conception of social studies?

Mentoring and learning were other issues that Carol, Marilyn, Lisa and I had to deal with throughout Winter quarter. If we were to move to a collaborative dinner party, we had to discuss whose recipes were going to be used. Otherwise, our cooperative potluck co-teaching would remain, with Marilyn having major responsibilities for the course. As we began to work together more collaboratively, we constantly faced problems about our varied knowledge-bases related to social studies. Since the course was developed around Marilyn’s expertise; Carol, Lisa, and I had a difficult time knowing where or how we were to participate. Our desire for collaboration did not necessarily mean it would happen. We knew that, "The contradictions between the collaborative paradigm and the ‘real’ world are powerful enough to seriously impair the efforts of even enthusiastic and well-intentioned
collaborators" (Oakes, Hare & Sirotnik, 1986, p. 545). We tried to incorporate Hord's (1986) definition of collaboration as part of our co-teaching; "Collaboration implies that the parties involved share responsibility and authority for basic policy decision making" (p. 22). This definition seemed to help us with our ownership dilemma. Where before Carol, Lisa, and I seemed willing to accept that social studies methods was Marilyn's course, using Marilyn's recipes; now we wanted to have some say in planning the classes. Could some of our recipes be used too? Increased participation was the volunteers' way of "sharing responsibility and decision making."

Mentoring and learning

In our first group interview Marilyn was convinced that collaboration does not just happen, rather it must unfold over time (1/16/92). As an example of this unfolding, Lisa's new stance for Winter quarter co-teaching was to replace her "sit and back see" approach with a "watchdog of hierarchy" stance. She was the one always saying, "that's not too collaborative" (1/16/92). Lisa wanted to be sure that we shared responsibilities and decision making.

Mentoring and learning were aspects of co-teaching that Lisa, Marilyn, Carol, and I recognized as part of our
working together. Mentoring and learning could be part of the process if the goals were parity and mutuality. One person mentored in one area, another person mentored in another area. Learning was done by all. Mentoring and learning were multi-directional. They were consonant with mutuality and parity.

Marilyn, Lisa, Carol, and I originally had a hierarchial attitude toward mentoring and learning. Ownership of the course (Marilyn’s) and disparity in participants’ knowledge bases (professor, teaching assistant, classroom teachers) made it difficult to recognize mentoring and learning that was happening in a multi-directional way. It seemed that Marilyn had to first teach the volunteers the material. Romer and Whipple (1991) described how this unequal knowledge-base confuses the issue of collaboration:

When a faculty member collaborates with a student, he or she needs to be conscious of the distinction between the organic authority rooted in knowledge and inherent in one’s person and the authority of power that the condition of being learned gives one over others. It is the latter that has the most negative potential for collaboration between faculty and students because educational goals involve drawing forth from students their own knowledge and understanding and empowering them. (p. 68)

The participants experienced a similar situation when classroom teachers and graduate student had different knowledge bases than the professor’s. Marilyn’s knowledge
and her ownership of the course, gave her power over the
volunteers. Lisa, Carol, and I, also, "positioned" (Davies & Harre, 1990) Marilyn in this power place.

At first, we did not see the contradictions that our hierarchial views presented to our desire to change from a cooperative potluck environment to a collaborative dinner experience in co-teaching. Marilyn’s beginning sense of mentoring was patterned after what she had done in her previous co-teaching experience (see vignette 1) where teachers were involved in co-teaching to learn how to teach her course. Marilyn’s responsibility was to mentor the co-teacher. Mentoring and learning was uni-directional. She recognized that she learned from the teachers as well, however, this was not an explicit part of their co-teaching.

Carol, Lisa, and I had as our frame for collaboration, "being equal." It was difficult to situate being mentored in this frame. It was easy to observe the learning that was part of Carol’s, Lisa’s, and my experience. Even though Marilyn talked about what she was learning from us and the co-teaching experience, it was not easily observable.

While both mentoring and learning were a part of our co-teaching; Lisa, Carol, Marilyn, and I had a more traditional view of them. Our attitude toward mentoring
and learning situated us more in the cooperative potluck atmosphere rather than a collaborative dinner party. It took time to recognize these attitudes and figure out ways to change them.

**Mentoring and power examples**

An example of Marilyn's mentoring could be seen in the following excerpt from a planning meeting. Carol and Lisa were beginning community units in their classrooms. Carol had started a topic about Columbus as a community. Lisa was looking for ways to connect the communities unit to a unit she taught about Washington D.C. Marilyn, Lisa, and Carol discussed how monuments might be a link between Columbus, communities, and Washington D.C.

Marilyn: What is it about Washington D.C. that's both similar and different to Columbus? The things you want to talk about Washington D.C., how are they similar to Columbus? Here's all this government stuff and monuments, do we have any of that? They have city problems and crime and we have city problems and crime. What do you do with your Washington unit?

Carol: Yeah. We have monuments. In fact there is a tour given through the community about them.

Lisa: We go over the monuments. Groups of students pick one, research it, build it, and then we do a theater in the round.

Marilyn: Oh, interesting.

[Marilyn, Lisa, and Carol discuss the Vietnam memorial and the fact that there are two of
them. The monuments are different; one looks at all the loss of human life, the other tries to glorify war. They begin to discuss using monuments as a way to connect communities.]

Marilyn: Monuments typically have been used to glorify especially great men and war. It is only recently that there has been a change in that purpose. So you can do a unit on monuments which is more generic. What are monuments for? Why do people make them? If you were going to create a monument for something in your life, or for something in this community what would you want to glorify. What kinds of problems might you want to put in the monument that help people think about issues, like poverty or homelessness.

Lisa and Carol comment about Marilyn being able to teach in their classrooms. Marilyn agrees but wants Lisa and Carol to teach the background information.]

Lisa: Do you do this mostly through discussion [with children], or activity, or what?

Marilyn: I often iike to start with just one example and get them to talk about it. I can raise issues and we can talk about it. Then I let them do one of their own. After they've done that we can go back and try to draw some generalizations. Did anyone study a monument that wasn't about men or about very important people? Why are so many monuments about men? Why not many on women? When a monument is for a woman, why is she doing man like things? But before we do this, children need background about real monuments. (planning meeting tape, 1/16/92)

This example showed Marilyn mentoring Carol and Lisa about connecting a community unit to some larger issues. By suggesting questions they might use in their classroom, Marilyn facilitated the teachers to think about big ideas, different questions, and even different ways to present
materials. This example illustrated how Marilyn encouraged us to think about distinctions or questions we might not have considered otherwise.

An example of Marilyn taking less time to mentor and using more of her "university authority" (Romer & Whipple, 1991) could be seen at another meeting. Carol described how a group of her students were role playing "drug dealers" one lunch recess in her classroom (planning meeting tape; 1/22/92). She talked to the co-teaching participants about how she wanted to problem solve with her students, having them look at what was wrong with drug dealing. Carol thought that this predicament in her classroom could be used as an example of a controversial issue, a topic we were planning for the next methods class. Marilyn's response to this description was to tell Carol different ways the situation could be handled, and then why the way it was handled was directive rather than an example of controversial issues.

Marilyn: Do you think you are teaching problem solving or just that it's [drug dealing] bad?

[Carol describes again her talking with students.]

Marilyn: From a social studies point of view you're imposing middle class values in a way that doesn't get kids to think about what choices there are. We scare them, tell them it's bad, ... rather than think through the problem with them. For instance, why do people do that? Why is that a big thing to do in a community like
ours? What reasons are there that might find us facing similar situations? My concern is whether we validate them [the children] or just come down as they are bad.

Carol: Yes. I let them talk about these issues all the time. They live with it and need to talk.

Marilyn: They live with it all the time but that doesn't mean they understand it or that they feel like there are legitimate choices for them in that community. Or that they understand why those kinds of things have occurred in a context of poverty and why they might not occur in other kinds of places. A much bigger task [allowing students to think about their circumstances] than bringing in a DARE officer.

Carol: Well, the reason I brought this up was because I thought we could use it as an example of using controversial issues in the classroom.

Marilyn: I wonder if it's an example of a controversial issue or indoctrination. (planning meeting tape, 1/22/92)

In this example, Marilyn used her perspective and authority to implicitly criticize Carol's approach and label it in her own way, rather than talking with Carol about how to use the situation as an example of classroom practice related to a controversial issue. Because the course was based on Marilyn's expertise, Carol, Lisa, and I at times, had to grapple with the dilemma of how what we did fit into the course. These situations of finding a fit, were especially ripe for mentoring and/or power opportunities.
Mentoring recipes

Mentoring, as a process, allowed members to share their expertise with one another. Lisa, Carol, Marilyn, and I found mentoring one way we could share recipes for our collaborative co-teaching dinner. Mentoring aided the co-teachers in taking more responsibility for the course. They were more willing and able to share in decision making.

Marilyn on mentoring

In addition to the co-teaching, Lisa, Carol, and I were students at Ohio State, and were in classes Marilyn taught. Marilyn was both Lisa's masters advisor and my doctoral advisor. All of us, including Marilyn, had reason to "position" (Davies & Harre, 1990) Marilyn as mentor.

Marilyn wondered about her role as mentor. She seemed to recognize a contradiction between uni-directional mentoring and collaboration. Marilyn was more hesitant to mentor as we tried to increase our equal-time sharing in co-teaching. She described some of this ambiguity in her journal after our first planning and class session:

How does all this feel? I liked the interaction and ideas that were generated during the planning. I like the level of collaboration that was going on. Last quarter planning time was enjoyable and interesting but a lot more guarded.
[Today’s] class felt a bit more uncomfortable. I didn’t have anything to do during the substantive or decision-making parts and I was reticent to say anything; yet there were clearly times when I would have liked to have dug into something deeper and/or controlled the flow of time, particularly during the decision-making time. Yet I think it went well although maybe a little choppy because we kept changing actors/teachers. I feel like maybe I’ve moved from a teaching role to the mentoring role. This is going to be thought provoking -- if nothing else. (Marilyn, journal, 1/6/92)

Lisa, Carol, and I now wanted a greater share in the academic preparation and decision making, where before we were willing to allow Marilyn to carry most of the responsibilities. Marilyn recognized that this sharing meant she had to be careful not to push her ideas and willing to allow other ways to surface.

Mentoring and ownership were intertwined for Marilyn. Should she mentor her co-teaching colleagues so they would be able to teach her course; or negotiate what was happening in social studies methods so all participants could do what they do best?

JoAnn clearly brings a level of expertise in social studies, but then we have different perspectives about the goals of a methods course. Lisa and Carol bring classroom expertise but in ways that don’t get well integrated into what we are doing in class. Maybe as we get the units started in their classrooms this will change. Lisa seems unclear about social studies and wants to try new things; Carol likes social studies a lot but seems not explicitly aware of her approach or how it fits into what I’m doing in class. It may be that her social studies curriculum fits well with what I would like to
see in classrooms, or maybe it’s too fragmented to feel good to me. Maybe none of this makes any difference. It’s all just part of what occurs when any group would get together—we are bound to have differences of opinion and these need to be negotiated. The question is, am I feeling like negotiating major parts of what I would normally do in ways that would change goals and procedures in significant ways. Ideally we would learn from each other by my sharing what I know and everyone also sharing what they know. But I don’t know how to share what I know in the context of differences and in the spirit of collaboration. Am I to be a mentor or a peer? How much should I impose my ideas? (Marilyn, journal, 1/16/92)

Marilyn recognized the dilemma set up by her mentoring participants while trying to share ownership in the course early in the collaborative co-teaching.

Carol on being mentored

Carol felt that part of mentoring for her was to find out how the university did things.

Well, I learned more on a university level, how that teaching is conducted. Plus, just meeting new people on the team and learning to work with them was informative. I think that we were all very cooperative. I think we really tried to have a legitimate give and take, and it was, from my point of view, it was just as though I were signing up for a college course because this was all brand new to me. The certain strategies that say Marilyn would work on, or you [JoAnn] would work on or even Lisa coming in. It was all a new experience. (Carol, last individual interview, 3/27/92)

Carol’s need to understand the university’s norms was important for her comfort level in co-teaching. The
newness of the co-teaching situation prevented Carol from taking a more active part in co-teaching.

Carol described an uneasy feeling that she had with course material, especially the university readings:

So much of the stuff we are dealing with is just so abstract which is fine, very intellectual. But, just personally, it is easier for me to understand all these things if it's a little more grounded. (Carol, last group interview, 3/18/92)

"Grounded," for Carol, meant knowing more about Marilyn, Lisa, and me. Carol talked again about the university readings in her last individual interview. She felt that even though she did not understand the readings, that if Marilyn chose them for the class then they must have a purpose.

Sometimes I didn’t feel like I had a handle on what we were doing, even though I read those things. I thought, well, there’s merit for it to be here. I mean, that’s why it’s part of the course, so I didn’t worry so much about the resources. It just took me a while to get a handle on some of these concepts that Marilyn had. I was learning because a lot of the things that she was doing were new to me. Some of things that you would submit on feminism, I mean I read these articles and then I agree or disagree. And I think all of us have our biases. I just try to get along with people in this world and try to be respectful and since we are a nation, hopefully, based on freedom, I would fight for your right to have whatever your choices are [even] if they are different from mine. As long as one person isn’t stepping on another person. I feel free about that.

(Carol, last individual interview, 3/27/92)
Carol felt less comfortable with the academic and theoretical part of co-teaching. She enjoyed the relationships and wanted to know more about each participant. Carol seldom asked questions about the reading material and was hesitant to participate in conversations about the readings.

**Lisa on being mentored**

Lisa felt that mentoring was necessary because she did not know the subject matter. In an overview of Winter quarter, Lisa reported that she felt everyone did some teaching. "But I think that it's only natural that there was academic learning mostly from Marilyn or from you [JoAnn] until I've been through it enough times that I can do it" (last individual interview, 3/22/92). Lisa felt that if she was to teach the course content, she first needed to learn it herself. Lisa called this "training". She saw this as one of the few disadvantages for the university person.

Actually I guess I can't really see disadvantages other than the time it takes for them [university faculty] to do it [co-teach]. I think that having to train a person, so to speak, is a disadvantage. But you know, I struggle a little bit with that training business now because I don't know that we should be in there to be trained, but I don't know how else to put that because in some respects we are. I mean I've learned an incredible amount, but I think using the idea of training makes it
a hierarchy. I don’t know that Marilyn thinks of coming and learning from me as much as I think of going and learning from her. (Lisa, last individual interview, 3/22/92)

Lisa’s uncomfortableness with "training" or mentoring again revealed her overriding desire for collaboration; to be seen as equal with Marilyn in the course. Lisa concluded that equality is very hard to maintain when one person is in the position of learning from the other.

JoAnn on being mentored

Marilyn’s mentoring of me came naturally because she was my doctoral advisor. I had taken course work from her and appreciated the foundation’s perspective she brought to educational issues and to social studies. I was quite frank from the very beginning of co-teaching that I was there "to learn how Marilyn organized and taught her course" (first group interview; 1/16/92). When we decided as a group to be more collaborative, I felt that I was the one that could share the "academic teaching" with Marilyn. However, I was not comfortable doing this as was seen in one of my journal entries.

My part of the day was the Anderson/Anderson piece. I wanted students to be involved in discussion. Because of the time frame, I couldn’t (or didn’t feel I had time) to do the outline of the article that I had worked on the night before. I was uncomfortable with Marilyn there. She taught me this article! I didn’t want to put her on the spot but I wanted Marilyn
to talk about how she thought the article was realistic. I remember her doing that when I took the class. I thought students had a good discussion; I was uncomfortable not telling or pushing something. I thought that was expected of me by Marilyn. It's not what I would do in my own class though. I think Marilyn uses these articles to make a point and thus when that particular point's not made she must be disappointed. I like to teach. However, if I'm to use Marilyn's material, I wonder if we should talk about the reasons these materials were chosen. (JoAnn, journal, 1/13/92)

At times, instead of doing the teaching "my way," I tried to teach the way I thought Marilyn would teach, "Sometimes I feel like a teaching assistant [student teacher] rather than a teacher! I'm not sure how I would have done the article on my own, but felt I tried to do it more like Marilyn would have done it" (journal, 2/10/92). This was frustrating and did not work.

Marilyn noticed an uncomfortableness when I taught and, at one point, offered to leave the classroom when I taught.

JoAnn did the discussion of the article and seemed uncomfortable. I've wondered whether I should leave when she's doing her part sometime just to give her some space. She's said she doesn't feel comfortable sometimes because it's about social studies and I'm her advisor. It may also be that she's trying to do things in the way I would, but it's not how she would do it. She runs a discussion in a very open way asking students to respond to other students' ideas without focusing the questions or pushing for an idea to be discussed at any length. It made me think how much I try to get students to think through an issue in a way that may not be responsive to their interests. I'm very excited
in a discussion when students bring up something I haven’t thought about, but then maybe I’m not allowing enough fluidity in the choice of topics and issues. I think I’m particularly directive when I think time is short. JoAnn’s discussion, even though she was also VERY pushed for time, ... was free flowing. I’m sure there are some advantages to this approach that maybe I should experiment with a bit more. (Marilyn, journal, 1/13/92)

This ambivalent predicament of advisor/advisee - co-teacher, I shared with Marilyn, remained throughout the collaborative teaching.

Marilyn on being mentored

As the above journal entry suggests, Marilyn also was mentored. However, this mentoring was less recognizable because it was her course and her syllabus. The influence of mentoring on Marilyn was intrinsic as seen in this journal entry:

Maybe more than some strong change in my beliefs or teaching practice, it’s the change in arrangements that are most influential. Trying something in a new way makes you think harder about what you’re doing. It provides space for experimentation, it’s ambiguous and thought provoking, like anything new it presents new challenges and opportunities. It makes it impossible to do it exactly like you’ve done before, but rather requires that you translate practices into new forms. The new forms typically have some advantages and some disadvantages. You gain some things; you lose some others. In the process some things get clearer. I don’t feel so much like this process is changing me as much as it is clarifying. Old questions get cast in new lights, they can be observed in a new context, and tested in
different ways. (Marilyn, journal, 3/2/92)

JoAnn on mentoring

Mentoring was a position that was attributed to Marilyn. However, the relationship between Lisa and me also held some mentoring characteristics. Marilyn made reference to this point in her journal:

It's really great to see Lisa's growing assertiveness. She has questions, is pushy about them, and has opinions that are forming about what she wants to try in her classroom. She seems willing to take some big risks and seems to have some real skills in pushing issues in discussions. In the beginning I thought she was maybe so conservative in her views and so structured in her approach to teaching, that my approach to social studies would be much too ambiguous. Instead, she seems to be thriving within the challenges. I think JoAnn's support and feedback is also critical here. JoAnn's perspective may help to moderate my excesses by providing helpful insights and practical strategies. In fact, it may be that JoAnn is the major influence in Lisa's changes. (Marilyn, journal, 3/2/92)

Lisa and I commented on this mentoring circumstance also.

JoAnn: I wonder how much of an influence I have been in your coming to an understanding of co-teaching and more involvement at the university level. ... I think you would be involved differently if it were just you and Marilyn.

Lisa: If it were just Marilyn and I? It probably would take longer to trust myself.

JoAnn: I guess part of it is, when I look back, I think of the times that I sat down with you and would talk you through what was happening or
your ability to say to me how nervous you were or that you couldn't or didn't think you could do it. (JoAnn; last individual interview; 3/24/92; Interviewer: Lisa)

Or as Lisa commented in her journal at the end of the quarter: "I'm glad I have the chance to run ideas and get feedback from JoAnn before actually having to teach. This really helps build my sense of confidence" (journal, 2/26/92).

Learning recipes

Another way that we found to share about collaboration was through our learning. Marilyn, Lisa, Carol and I discussed the importance of our sharing our learning recipes with one another. These learning recipes aided us in recognizing how we influenced one another.

Social studies learning

Lisa's social studies perspective changed as a result of the co-teaching. From the beginning, Lisa talked about herself as not being strong in social studies content or teaching. Social studies was not her first choice to co-teach. However, when the opportunity to co-teach language did not materialize, her desire to do something different won out and she went with the social studies. In the first individual interview, I asked Lisa if she were
disappointed that she "had" to teach social studies:

I might have been disappointed had I not been doing it with Marilyn but there's also that security in doing something with someone you know. So not really and as it turned out it probably was for the best because it actually developed me in social studies and that's probably an area that I needed it far more than language. I think we all could use developing in all areas but I wouldn't say I was a really strong social studies teacher. (Lisa, first individual interview, 12/23/91)

Lisa summarized her learning about social studies during her co-teaching in a paper she wrote for course credit in a seminar on collaboration she took with Marilyn during Spring quarter.

Taking part in social studies methods... introduced me to an excitement about social studies I had not known previously....Having greater understanding of the theory that guided my practice facilitated making sense of the material I was teaching....Now the practice doesn't make sense without the theory. Learning the stages of moral development gave me a clearer understanding of students and new ways to relate to my students, and therefore promoted more positive interaction in my classroom. Being exposed to multicultural issues encouraged me to be more sensitive to those who come from a culturally different background. Finally, heightened awareness to gender issues forced me to evaluate my assumptions and practices regarding boys and girls. (Course paper, Spring, 1992)

University Course / Elementary Classroom Learning

All participants spoke about how co-teaching helped them to see their course and/or classes in a new way.
Each participant learned from the experience of co-teaching.

**Marilyn on learning**

Marilyn wrote that she wondered what Lisa, Carol, and I thought about her teaching: "I often wonder what they think, what doesn't make sense, how my biases appear to them. There's rarely any negotiation ... " (Marilyn, journal, 3/2/92). Even though there was no explicit discussion about style of teaching, by the end of Winter quarter, Marilyn thought that an advantage to co-teaching was that it made her think about what she did.

Marilyn: I think an advantage for me, since this was my class by myself before, is that it makes me think all the time about what I used to do and what I am doing now. I mean, it calls into question all the time - my choices, my values, my concepts about what's good to do in social studies and makes me rethink. If I had to start next quarter by myself it would be a different class. I've learned some things about social studies, too. [I would have to ask myself] so what do I want to do now?

Lisa: But how would you do the course without another person? How would it be different?

Marilyn: Well I think I would teach out of a textbook. Maybe the students would have to buy a 4th grade social studies book, and that would be the text. Then we can take and build some sort of unit with them right away and use that all the way through the quarter. I don't know exactly how that would work. I just find myself sort of waking up in the middle of the night and having these new ideas. So I know something is rattling around in here that is calling into
Marilyn's learning focused on ways to make social studies methods more practical. "I've relearned a lot about what classroom teaching is like. ... it feels like a connection and a perspective that I lost the detail of, so it [classroom teaching] feels much more real to me" (individual, 3/19/92).

Lisa on learning

Throughout the two quarters of co-teaching, Lisa said, "I learned more than the [pre-service] students learned." This comment often referred to the fact that social studies methods for Lisa was like taking a course, rather than teaching one. Lisa had to read and learn the course material before she could be part of the teaching. However, co-teaching also influenced the way Lisa worked in her classroom with her third grade students. In an early journal entry she described some different ways she had begun to think about children:

I think a reason I never tried anything different is I thought I had to do all the prep work and who has that kind of time. Now I know the kids can be responsible for some if not most of that. It's more I think through how to get them started and kids go in a direction -- not necessarily my direction. They do the foot work. Go to it, not come to it! I used to think if kids had a question they should skip it and go on until I could
help. Well, kids don't work like that naturally. What do they do? Ask a friend or neighbor. I have come to see that to be okay and it gives me some breathing space. Who knows a student may reach another student better than I can! (journal, 1/5/92)

Lisa commented during her last interview on other developments in her thinking about teaching and children:

JoAnn: Did co-teaching influence the way you organize and teach?

Lisa: Oh yeah. That’s what I’ve been ranting and raving about for months. I think I talk to my kids a lot more. We have a lot more discussions. I’m much better at listening rather than always telling.

J: Did it influence what you taught?

L: Yes. It changed my whole Basil reader section in reading to a gender unit. It changed my communities section in social studies from a three day lesson to a one month unit. It didn’t change my Washington D.C. unit, though. I like what I do with that.

... 

J: So you thought it was good to raise gender kinds of questions with them [third grade students] and have them start thinking about that.

L: Yeah, I don’t know that they’ll think about it for very long.

J: But you never thought they could think about it before.

L: I don’t think they would have; it’s not that they couldn’t have, I don’t think they would have.

J: But why didn’t you do something like this before in social studies?
L: Because I didn’t think about it either.  
(Lisa, last individual interview, 3/22/92)

Lisa not only learned social studies content during co-teaching but also worked with what she learned to improve her own teaching.

Carol on learning

Carol always had a positive attitude when asked about changes that she made because of co-teaching.

Lisa: Has it changed anything in your classroom Carol? Are you doing anything differently because of doing this co-teaching?

Carol: Oh, I think about all these things we talk about all the time. I think I try to do things differently. I try to get people’s opinions and so forth and so on and I try to do it more democratically. If I think something is a good idea, I try it out and if it doesn’t work then either discard it or modify it. I think that’s the way we grow through our whole life.  
(last group interview, 3/18/92)

Carol identified re-acquainting herself with cooperative learning and a unit approach as influences of co-teaching that helped her in her urban classroom (individual interview, 3/22/92).

JoAnn on learning

My learning during co-teaching was to observe and participate in a different way to organize a social studies methods course. When I first started teaching at
Ohio State, I went to see Marilyn to discuss what she used and how she taught social studies methods. We discussed how we came at the course differently; she by using a more foundational approach and I by using a more practical/skill orientation. After taking two foundation courses from Marilyn, I liked what I saw and learned. I wondered how she dealt with these same or similar topics with pre-service teachers. I felt throughout the quarter that Marilyn knew social studies better than I did.

JoAnn: Even today I would find it difficult to teach in front of Marilyn.

Lisa: Why?

JoAnn: Because I think she knows social studies much better than I do. I like what we do with Marilyn, but it's not the same things that I've done. What I've learned is I think I skim too many topics. I do too much surface stuff where maybe I need to do fewer things and do some things in more detail. (JoAnn, last individual interview, 3/22/92. Interviewer: Lisa)

I was not only looking at content differences but also the style of Marilyn’s teaching. In our first group interview, Marilyn and I discussed our different approaches:

JoAnn: My view of social studies is that it can be said three different ways. So it's looking at the different perspectives but I come at that in a back door way. You seem to come at it right through the front door.

Marilyn: Bull doze
(first group interview, 1/16/92)
Our styles were as different as our approach to social studies methods content. I believed that content choice made a difference in a methods course. I experienced how different it was when topics were chosen for social studies methods using a foundational approach. However, I wanted to include a practical view in a methods course as well.

I think that we have to look carefully at how things can be moved around. Even though Marilyn thought that topics were shortened, I can see areas that haven’t been include, for instance, how do teachers deal with map, globe, and time skills. Are these important and what do pre-service teachers know about them? Or how to teach them? My question becomes "What is social studies methods?" Actually, I think, Marilyn looks at social studies methods more as a foundations course. Topics we used in social studies methods, I had in Foundations of Elementary Education and History of Modern Education, both foundation courses. Those are topics for a foundations course. Now what are the topics for social studies methods? I don’t think the topics are mutually exclusive but nor do I think they are all the same. When I think of methods courses, I think of how to teach not necessary perspective taking, but yet you can’t do one without the other. (JoAnn, last individual interview, 3/22/92)

I valued Marilyn’s foundational approach to social studies methods as a way to assist pre-service students to see other perspectives. Even though this foundations approach also included some practicalities (e.g. lesson planning), I was not willing to discard my way of planning the course.
around the practicalities. During the time of co-teaching, I did not solve the quandary about how to combine a foundational and practical approach to social studies. But knew that the next time I taught social studies methods, there would be a foundations component.

Conclusion

Mentoring and learning were real world concerns that were part of the shaping of our collaborative co-teaching project. We recognized that mentoring and learning could both extend and hinder our involvement in collaborative co-teaching. As co-teachers, we participated in the planning and teaching of social studies methods, and discussed ways that working together extended our understandings about social studies and teaching. We noted changes in our teaching, course, and classes. We also had experiences of being less knowledgeable. The differences in knowledge-bases between us sometimes hindered our collaborative teaching.

Vignette three is focused on cultural boundary-blurring. We now turn to consider how it influenced co-teaching.
Vignette Three
Cultural Boundary-blurring: Whose Place?

Research questions:
1. What is the nature of co-teaching?
2. How does collaboration influence the participants’ perspectives of each other and of themselves?

As the participants in co-teaching searched for possible strategies to reconstruct our cooperative potluck dinner into a collaborative dinner party; we were able to catch glimpses of one another and ourselves in the school and university milieu. As a cooperative potluck dinner planned by Marilyn, co-teaching was situated within university norms and professor’s preference. The co-teachers felt that as a beginning collaborative dinner party, norms and preferences for a course should be negotiated with the co-teachers. More importantly, this collaborative co-teaching adventure became a "boundary-blurring" (Lampert, 1991) project. Participants molded new working relationships between school-based and university-based people that reshaped the customary ways of relating between the two cultures. Typically school-based and university-based educators had different orientations, lived in different cultural contexts, and were situated in implied hierarchical roles. As Lampert
(1991) discussed, this was no easy task:

School reformers have advocated many changes in roles and in the relationships between them that would blur the boundaries between teaching, teacher education, and research. I believe that schools can foster a more productive relationship among these three activities and that this new relationship can enhance the quality of schooling. But I suspect that it will be difficult to find people who can work productively in the boundary-blurring roles that institutional restructuring creates. (p. 672, emphasis added)

Carol, Lisa, Marilyn, and I became a part of a "boundary-blurring" co-teaching experience, blurring the boundaries between elementary schools and universities. We each were situated in our individual cultures but were also enmeshed in each other's cultures as well.

**School-based boundary-blurring**

Lisa and Carol had released time each week from their respective schools to co-teach. They both commented on the problems this created in their classrooms.

Lisa: I think a disadvantage is initially setting up [the classroom] to leave for co-teaching. It's hard on your classroom during the first quarter, especially if you don't have a consistent sub. There's a disadvantage in that I carefully leave lesson plans so that each Monday I know a sub can do them. I know there have been times where I have done a filler lesson because I was ready to start a new unit on Monday and I didn't want the sub to start it. (last individual interview, 3/22/92)

*****
Carol: I have difficulty with having different subs in my classroom, preparing the sub and my children for constant change. Then I have difficulty regrouping the children when I come back. (journal, 3/11/92)

Both teachers were supported by their school districts with released time. Lisa had one-half day each week; Carol had one day each week. Since co-teaching took only half-a-day, Carol shared some of her half-days with the other teachers in her building, giving other teachers a chance for professional development time. Carol had to deal with an administrator who was not supportive and who "would throw up road blocks. When the administrator had the dates well in advance of when I needed a sub for my classroom, there was no sub available" (first individual interview, 12/17/92). Neither Carol nor Lisa had administrators who asked them about co-teaching or encouraged them to share at faculty meetings about the experience.

Carol and Lisa found cultural boundary-blurring especially difficult to handle at the university setting because they were not familiar with the ways of the university. Oja and Smulyan (1989) warned of possible barriers in communication when undertaking collaborative work between university and school. They claimed that "Communication between university researchers and teachers can often break down due to differences in language,
perceptions, and expectations which result from their
different positions in the field" (p. 17). We learned
in our co-teaching that there can be communication
difficulties between university-based and school-based
persons participating in the common experience of
teaching. Social studies methods was a university course.
Carol and Lisa did not have prior experience with
university level teaching. They experienced difficulties
with the different knowledge-base needed (See "knowledge"
chapter 4, and vignette 2, "mentoring and learning," this
chapter), and with the university language.

Lisa: Maybe I’m not as sensitive to it, but the
first quarter [Autumn] I sat in [the coffee shop
while we planned] and I felt really stupid.

Marilyn: You kept saying that.

Lisa: You would have this conversation about all
this stuff that I would have no idea what you
were talking about. I don’t know if I’ve just
gotten comfortable enough just to ask; or if
it’s that I just know a little more; or since
it’s you that knows that kind of stuff maybe you
talk about it less or use less formal language
about it.

... 

Carol: It’s educational jargon. It’s buzz
words. I felt the same way to begin with. I
mean I think it’s great you’ve got a wonderful
vocabulary, but it’s like you walk into this
from another planet.

... 

Carol: I could sit down and read the reading and
understand and have some questions to come back
and not feel as though I were floundering; but if I sit in on the conversation from the get go, it's like, "what is going on!" (last group interview, 3/18/92)

The "educational jargon" was an example of a boundary that restricted the way school-based and university-based people worked together. Carol and Lisa had different responses to boundary-blurring experiences that surfaced during co-teaching. During the Winter quarter, Lisa began to thrive on reading new material, discussing it, and making applications to her classroom. Carol was more reticent when discussing the readings. She experienced the readings as a barrier in our conversations.

**Carol on boundary-blurring**

Carol described her dilemma with understanding the university jargon and co-teaching in general as exacerbated by not really knowing the participants personally or their perspectives.

The initial disadvantage was I didn't know any of the material that had been presented. So even though I can be basically outgoing, I was still learning all of that. I didn't know where people were coming from so I didn't know Marilyn as a person, I didn't know what her views were. I could listen to what she had to say and I knew she was trying to be objective about anything that she introduced, but I couldn't get a handle on it which personally helps me on where I'm going on this journey, so I just didn't know the material; didn't know where she was coming from. I was learning new people, new material, new approaches, new strategies, new methods and
interacting with the PDs [post-degree, certification students] and trying to be professional and realistic with them. I wanted to be honest with them, but try not to be pessimistic with some of the problems we have to deal with. (Carol, last individual interview, 3/27/92)

Carol clarified that "knowing where we [other co-teaching members] were coming from," would have made co-teaching more palatable for her. She felt that she knew the most about me [JoAnn] because I had shared some personal comments during our planning meetings. Also, I was the teaching assistant at Carol’s school, so she saw me most frequently. Carol described how knowing about a person helped her understand what that person said.

I think personally, I would have enjoyed it... well, I’m going to smile here on the recorder ... It’s just like you and I both being Christian. It says somewhere in the bible about breaking bread together, so I think it’s really important in human relationships that people have a chance to break bread, to have tea, to have a drink, whatever and just talk; you just kind of get acquainted. I think it cuts through a lot of things. Like that first time when I said well I really don’t know how to talk to you because I’m Protestant and you’re Catholic and you’re a nun. I didn’t go through any of that. I always knew you were supposed to be respectful, but then you wear regular, everyday clothes and so, it’s all different to me. ... You just said, "Well, I’m just this regular person, just like you" and I said, "okay." I think things like that are nice when people can have exchanges like that and just cut through a lot of stuff. I think that’s why I felt the closest to you. That one time when you said you were stressed out and you did this and you did that because it’s like talking to anybody else
that I would know that's going through all this stuff we are going through. So I think that breaking bread and talking about life is important. ... I just think that all these things help you carve out who this person you are dealing with is. Otherwise, it's just somebody you see on Wednesday morning or Thursday afternoon. You are nice and you are polite and they are educated and they are working for a degree and they've got a busy schedule. (Carol, last individual interview, 3/27/92)

Carol felt on the fringe of the co-teaching experience because she felt she had little or no personal relationship with Marilyn, Lisa, and/or me. She described this feeling as, "I guess sometimes I just felt like odd man [sic] out" (Carol, last individual interview, 3/27/92).

JoAnn: Can you give an example of when you felt that way?

Carol: Well sometimes I would just read body language. I would perceive that you all [Marilyn and JoAnn] knew what you were doing and I was trying to get a handle on it. I didn't know sometimes if it was just the words or maybe the stuff was so lofty or sometimes it was like, "okay, I got the point here, can we move on." It was like we were beating a dead horse. It was just all of these things.

JoAnn: Would you give an example of us "beating a dead horse?"

Carol: I don't know if I can give you a concrete example, but I can talk to the subject. I think this is where some of this elitism, intellectualism comes up. I'll be talking something over with someone and I've gotten the idea and even though the other person is acting like he or she is broadminded about this and looking at it from all points of view; it's kind
of like this kind of smugness like, well this is really the right answer, this is really the way we should proceed. ... It's just like the cliche, you know, you think of the absent minded professor who gets to the office, left the brief case at home, he calls his wife or she calls her husband or whatever, I mean that's just a wild example that okay there great from the ears up, but for practicality ... [that] does not seem important. (Carol, last individual interview, 3/27/92)

Carol seemed to become frustrated with the academic discussions that Marilyn, Lisa, and I had regarding the readings for class. During the middle of Winter quarter, both Marilyn ("Carol seems more and more quiet" 2/17/92.) and I ("I wonder how Carol is with participation" 2/19/92.) commented in our journals about Carol's diminishing participation. Carol's willingness to become involved in the discussions may have been curtailed by her interpretations of interactions between members. In her journal, Carol described a situation where she felt Marilyn and I non-verbally disagreed with her.

After the formal meeting Marilyn, JoAnn, Lisa, and I talked. I told of the "drug dealers" (role playing) incident in my classroom. I spoke of my comments and listened for input. Marilyn felt a "middle class value" approach was preaching and a "perspective" approach to problem solving would be a more effective way to problem solve and actually help the students learn. Looks between JoAnn and Marilyn told me I wasn't on target. Lisa had an insightful comment on calling parents in a similar suburban situation. I thought the incident could be an example of a controversial issue and how it could be handled. Marilyn said it was more of a moral issue. (Carol, journal, 1/22/92)
Carol’s feeling of being "odd man [sic] out" was evident by her becoming less involved in co-teaching. She saw her participation as a "plugging in where and when I could" (3/27/92).

Carol also described benefits that she received by participating in the boundary-blurring experience of co-teaching. Carol considered her experience as being "very empowering. I think especially in the environment that I’m working in and with the administrator that I work with, we need all the help we can get" (3/27/92). Carol felt little support from her administrator and usually experienced him as "throwing up road blocks" to her co-teaching (first individual interview, 12/17/91).

Finally, Carol felt that co-teaching helped form a "network among teachers, school, and university" which benefited all. She discussed networking and community relations in her last interview.

Well hopefully I have grown as a person and as a teacher. I can bring it [what I have learned] back to my classroom. I can also share the comments with the staff. I think that has helped with communication here at the staff level; so that when we are learning different things and we can say or I can say, "research is showing that." In our building we have a problem with the community, with a lot of low social skills and anti-feelings [for school]. Research is showing get the community involved with your school, with education, be open, be non-threatening, let’s talk [parents and teachers] and it’s validated [by research] and I can buy into that and we have been trying to do
that at school. ... I think all of this [co-teaching] has helped bring us to this point. So I thank Marilyn for her input and I thank you for your input and Lisa and the whole thing. I think that it's exciting that we can do something new. (Carol, last individual interview, 3/27/92)

Lisa on boundary-blurring

Lisa discussed how she experienced the cultural differences at the university in an early group interview:

I would say it is next to impossible to do it [be able to negotiate about a university course] the first quarter because I have absolutely no knowledge. You at least have some knowledge about how schools work and so you know a little bit of what goes on in my world. I don't know what goes on in your world so I think it's unfair to think that we're going to bring our worlds together when one has no idea about one world. I think ideally I thought that, but I think after I sat there [planning and teaching sessions], I thought this is not going to be what I thought it was going to be. Also it makes it a little bit different when three of you can sit there and spout off literature and I can't do that. I can't pipe in. I don't know what you are talking about some of the time. (Lisa, interview role/definition, 1/5/92)

At the end of Winter quarter, Lisa felt that her comfort level increased because we planned further in advance for class and she had time to reflect on what she had to do.

We planned more. I felt more comfortable because I had a chance to think about what I was going to do before I had to do it. I had a chance to call and ask questions of people if I needed to do that, to read the material ahead of time, so all that builds a little safety net for me. I think when we first started I wasn't thrown in to do anything for very long. (Lisa,
Lisa’s positive response to the boundary-blurring setting was motivated by her desire for collaboration in co-teaching. She was the "watchdog of hierarchy;" collaboration meant school-based and university-based people had to be equal. "I think it [co-teaching] was done more collaboratively [during Winter quarter]. There was more equal involvement" (Lisa, last group interview, 3/22/92). Lisa had to be willing to blur boundaries if she wanted hierarchy to break down. In her last interview Lisa commented on hierarchy and being equal:

I would have to say I still have that feeling of hierarchy because I believe either Marilyn or you should do the academic teaching. ... Ideally I would like to have as much content knowledge as you and Marilyn have so that when we talk about things I might come up with different ideas because I would have more knowledge about it. I would like to be able to, if need be, to teach an article if I had to. If I had to do that, if Marilyn or you couldn’t be there, I could really teach that and do it well. I think it would be nice to come with a feeling of truly equal footing. I think I try to work on equal footing, but I don’t know that I have that just because of lack of content. (last individual interview, 3/22/92)

Lisa did not want a boundary-blurring in the area of content knowledge. She thought that to break down hierarchy and to be equal with Marilyn and me, she had to have the same or similar content knowledge.
Lisa added another dimension to boundary-blurring when she discussed some of her classroom difficulties with the co-teachers. She tried some of our social studies methods practices in her classroom and reported to us how they worked.

What I appreciate the most this week is the time we spent talking about [a child in her class]. To have people that are away from him/her and have had experiences with kids like him/her and able to give suggestions is so helpful. Learning as I teach seems to be most beneficial. Reading the article on Moral Education, I learned something I could try on [a child in class]. (Lisa, journal, 2/20/92)

*****

Now I'd like to comment on how this week social studies has impacted my classroom. After reading the articles on stages of Moral development, I started to try to use the ideas. I have been able to reason better with [a child in class]. He/She is a kid thinking like a person in stage 2 and into what is fair. I also tried it with [another child] but not with quite the same success. Social Studies continues to make subtle differences on my class. (journal, 2/24/92)

Lisa used these times with the co-teachers as a chance to learn about her classroom and how to change it. She found that co-teaching gave her a chance to have support and to break down some of the teaching isolation she had experienced (12/23/91). "It gives you a new way to look at your classroom and ideas to try in the classroom. It gives you actual time to think about your teaching. It gives you a sense of pride" (Lisa, last individual
University-based boundary-blurring

Co-teaching social studies methods was situated at the university. The course was held on campus and was initially planned by Marilyn. It was difficult to include both university and school perspectives. Marilyn commented about this lack of sharing perspectives related to the Autumn quarter, "I think we only did it a tiny bit. I think one of the reasons is maybe that we're always working off the papers or articles rather than working off the classroom activity" (group interview, 3/18/92).

Marilyn on boundary-blurring

Marilyn believed strongly in the need for boundary-blurring between university and school. She perceived that working together across cultures "generated ideas and stimulated thinking and negotiating" (3/19/92) about teacher education. Marilyn felt that a benefit of co-teaching was this dynamic interplay:

I want to figure out new ways to do teacher education. I think we have to do that. Colleges of Education are in trouble and there's good reason. I don't think we have done a good job educating new teachers. So if you are going to make those kinds of changes, you just can't teach your little classes in your little rooms at the university and expect that that's going to move you in new directions, so it all needs
to be put up for grabs and we need to experiment with new ways of doing things. (last individual interview, 3/19/92)

Marilyn experienced co-teaching as professionally advantageous. She felt that having school-based teachers sharing in a university co-teaching project pushed her to be more reflective about her own teaching (3/19/92). Marilyn was beginning to find it difficult to look at her own teaching, "I just can’t look at it anymore by myself and learn much more. I need some other eyes or some other perspective" (group interview, 3/18/92). This she received during co-teaching:

You have other eyes watching even when they don’t ask questions. It’s as if you also have to watch yourself more carefully through their eyes. It’s less easy to just go about doing the same old thing or even if you think you were reflective about your teaching, you usually think about it from your own point of view; whereas, when Lisa and Carol are sitting there, I have to think about what this looks like to a classroom teacher, especially when I know Lisa teaches very differently than how I’m talking. I find myself wanting to convince her as well as really hungry to know what it looks like to her, whether this makes sense. I know many times it doesn’t make sense to new teachers/students because they don’t have the experience. But I know that Lisa is sorting and critiquing and connecting with her classroom and it seems a valuable kind of perspective to know whether or not what I’m saying can make sense to an experienced teacher. It’s a kind of a reflection and feedback that you can’t do by yourself or you don’t. Even if she doesn’t talk very much to me about it, I still have different questions in my head that I would not have if she had not been there. (last individual interview, 3/19/92).
There was valuable learning for all involved in the co-teaching. However, at times, the extra time it took to plan was a burden for Marilyn. During our last group interview, I commented about how the group planning sometimes took two hours for one class period and that Marilyn "probably could've pulled it together in thirty minutes because you have taught it before. How do you feel about that, especially since you are so busy" (3/18/92)?

Yeah, if my life weren't so busy, it would feel a little different. Sometimes it has felt like cumulatively it's too much. I always enjoy being here and I always enjoy doing it, but I'm just over loaded so it has felt like sometimes if I could've done it by myself, I would have gotten it done. (last group interview, 3/18/92)

The time factor involved in co-teaching was an issue for each participant (see "time/relationship," chapter 4).

What boundary-blurring took place, took place at the university. The collaborative co-teaching project did not provide any schedule for Marilyn to be a part of Carol's or Lisa's culture. The university did not provide released time for professors to work in the schools. Thus, any time Marilyn spent at the schools was an addition to her already full schedule. Marilyn offered to teach a class for both Lisa and Carol at the beginning of Winter quarter. It was not until the end of the quarter
that she was able to find time to visit both classrooms. However negligible, this boundary-blurring experience influenced both Marilyn and the teachers. Insight about each other and self was evident as each thought about "the professor" coming to the classroom:

Marilyn: I've puzzled a bit about why it's taken me so long to get out in the classrooms. When we talked about this in the methods meeting it was clear that my coming out to Lisa's classroom bothers her. It's hard to tell about Carol. She doesn't say much but it appears to me that it's not a problem for her. I also may be overly sensitive about this, but I know that my presence is threatening. I suppose I would feel the same way if I were co-teaching in someone else's methods course. I get set up as the authority and therefore a critical eye. (journal, 3/2/92)

*****

Lisa: I need to write about Marilyn's visit to teach in my room. At first I worried about what her first impressions of my room would be [seating arrangement, the fact I have desks, wall decorations, the fact I bought bulletin board stuff pre-made]. Once she got there I worried about what she would think of my kids. Would they demonstrate having the "right" or developed thinking compared to other kids she has had in the past? What would she think about the way I handle my kids? Would this "way" be developing the kids morally? Her lesson went very well especially for not knowing the kids. It made me feel good because I thought she asked the same kinds of questions I ask them. I think the lesson went similar to the way it would have gone if I had known how to do the lesson. I guess I thought she would have every child sitting on the edge of his/her seat and they would all be wrapped around her finger. At the end of the lesson, I wanted Marilyn to talk to me about everything she saw, felt, thought -- lots of feedback about my class. I think she
might have wanted some of the same. (journal, 3/6/92)

*****

Marilyn: It’s a retouching of my former experience and making it real again rather than a memory. Memory clogs and distorts and you loose the little bits and pieces. ... Even though I spent very little time actually in the classroom. It’s remembering the problems and the issues and full press of the day. It’s weird too because I spent so long in classrooms and I didn’t think I could ever lose that. I didn’t think that I would lose my senses and my intuitions about it and maybe it would come back very quickly. I don’t know if it was just that afternoon in Lisa’s [classroom], but my dream dimmed. It didn’t feel like that in Carol’s classroom at all. While it felt okay ... [in Lisa’s classroom] it [teaching] didn’t feel like it was coming from my toes anymore. It felt like I had to do a lot of head stuff. It [teaching] felt confusing at times and I didn’t like it. [The experience] re-affirms some of the commitments I have [to spend time in classrooms]. But it’s easy to lose how you make connections and particularly how you make them [as] a teacher. (last individual interview, 3/19/92)

Marilyn’s experience in the elementary classrooms encouraged her to critique her perspectives about and practice of teaching. She perceived her examination of her own teaching similar to what she asked of teachers when doing research with them: "It was just getting them [me] to think more about why they [I] did what they [I] did and whether or not that’s what they [I] want to do" (last individual interview, 3/19/92).
JoAnn on boundary-blurring

My position as graduate student kept me from being either fully university-based or school-based. I felt that I straddled two cultures. It was not "my" course that we were co-teaching, I was one of the volunteers. However, I took course work in foundations and taught social studies methods before, so I came into the co-teaching with a knowledge-base and experience-base that the elementary teachers did not have.

When I was asked to describe any differences between Autumn quarter and Winter quarter’s co-teaching experience, two reasons came quickly to mind. First, our evaluation meeting at the end of the Autumn quarter when Carol, Marilyn, Lisa, and I talked about changing from a cooperative mode of co-teaching to a more collaborative experience. I felt this discussion "freed all the participants, including Marilyn, to act differently during the next quarter" (3/24/92).

The second reason hinged on the first, shortly after the decision to work differently in co-teaching, Marilyn and I decided it would make a good dissertation topic. From that moment on, I was influenced by this project. This began another boundary blurring experience for me; participant and researcher. I made reference to this in my journal; I wanted our collaborative social studies
methods to work "so I [would] have a dissertation when we finish" (journal, 1/5/92). "I know it is important to keep focused at these meetings so I can ask appropriate questions for data collection" (journal, 1/16/92).

Marilyn also commented on what she felt was a dissertation influence:

JoAnn participates but is somewhat quiet. I don’t know whether she is more quiet or I’m more conscious of her not participating equally. I also wonder whether she’s hesitant about participating because she’s collecting data. I think there’s a bit of stress about this dissertation with proposals, committee members and the like hanging over her head. (Marilyn, journal, 1/15/92)

Another boundary-blurring experience for me was the many relationships that Marilyn and I had: advisor-advisee, co-participants, co-teachers (see vignette one, "ownership"), mentor-mentoree (see vignette two, "mentoring and learning"). I grappled throughout the study with these relationships and the nuances that each created. It was difficult for me to co-teach with my advisor.

I really am intimidated by Marilyn and how she thinks and how differently we come at things. Sometimes I wonder if I’m actually more open because this is all so new to me and I haven’t made any decisions about the readings. I’m not sure that is true of Marilyn. Also she has had more interaction with the topics we are teaching. She has taught them. - (to me!) I see her (I think) struggling with not taking control of what has to be done. It must be frustrating for someone who has too much to do to take 2 1/2
hours to plan something she has done so often! She could probably do the planning in a 15-30 minute span. So instead of backing away and thinking I may look stupid I really need to charge in and on, so things can get accomplished. (JoAnn, journal, 1/10/92)

Marilyn and JoAnn questioned how much our interaction between advisor-advisor might influence the dissertation.

JoAnn: When I met with Marilyn [about the dissertation] we discussed how much she should say. I really think that is a good question. I don't want to be too influenced by her since she is in the study. But, on the other hand, she IS my advisor and in that capacity her role is to help direct the study. I don't feel all that confident with Marilyn when it comes to teaching social studies, however, I think that a dissertation is different. I respect her research ethics and feel that she would not deliberately try to sway my thoughts. Nor do I plan to let her. I also think that our very being aware of it helps. (journal, 1/29/92)

*****

Marilyn: I found myself hesitant to ask JoAnn questions about her emergent theories and ideas related to the study in a way that I would with another advisee doing this kind of work. I had a funny feeling that if I asked questions about interpretations that they might then influence how I'm participating—(or, as I thought of later) it might make JoAnn hesitant about saying certain kinds of things that involve me personally.... Maybe I have to be an ordinary advisor as well as a participant in the study. (Marilyn, journal, 1/22/92)

Marilyn and I decided that all interactions, whether between Marilyn and I, or one of us and one of the teachers, or between teachers, should be treated in their context. It would be disruptive to the study to change
our regular interactions because of the dissertation.

For me, boundary blurring occurred in several contexts and exceeded the school/university boundaries. I was neither firmly situated in either the university or school cultures, and, thus, sometimes was in one and the next time in the other. There were also times when I felt I was in neither. The dissertation, even though a different boundary-blurring, set up a similar situation. By being both researcher and participant, I was balancing duel roles. Lastly, the many relationships Marilyn and I had (advisor-advisee, co-participants, co-teachers, mentor-mentoree) created boundary blurrings.

Co-teachers on boundary-blurring

A final boundary-blurring example involved issues related to parity, equality, and knowledge-bases. Our discussions from beginning to end were filled with issues about these issues. A related topic emerged for the school-based teachers. They became vitally concerned with their lack of knowledge related to the university participants. They felt this was the most important difference among the co-teachers.

Lisa: Unless I become an expert on an article, I can’t get up there and talk about it. I think they [students] think of those articles as academic and when you get up there and talk about them, you are taking on a role of some
sort. It would be really nice for me to be able to get up there and talk about that article because I think that would really start to break hierarchy down in their perceptions.

JoAnn: But does co-teaching mean that we all have to take on each others' roles?

Lisa: Well I think that in co-teaching, students have to see everybody as an equal and I'm not sure that students do, in their eyes everybody isn't equal.

Marilyn: But what's equal?

Lisa: Well I don't know.

Carol: Academically, I don't think so. I don't think they see it that way because it isn't that way.

JoAnn: I personally don't think that's what I would want from co-teaching. I don't want to co-teach with teachers and then want them to do the same thing I can do. (last group interview, 3/18/92)

Lisa, and sometimes Carol, continued to argue for equality, partly because of their perceptions of how they were viewed by the post-degree, certification students.

Lisa: I think students see you as experts in academics, but they also see you as knowledgeable in practice too, where they see us, maybe as experts in the practical knowledge, but they don't see us as experts in academics.

Marilyn: Do you think the students are seeing that or that's your own insecurities or something?

Lisa: That could be it.

Marilyn: I'm talking about the assumptions underlying your statement and assuming that the students are going to think that the theory is more important than the practice. What the
students always say is that the university is not practical enough. So from their point of view, they may well be valuing more what you are doing than what I’m doing because you are the real world, you’re legitimate, you’re dealing with kids every day, you know how it really is. (last group interview, 3/18/92)

There was a greater sense of boundary-blurring for the classroom teachers since co-teaching was situated in a university course on university campus. The perceptions of the certification students about their involvement in co-teaching was important to the school-based teachers, especially Lisa. She wanted to know that her involvement made a difference in the course and was respected by others. Lisa felt one way to recognize those attributes was to be seen as equal to the professor.

Summary of Chapter V

This chapter was a narrative of my interpretation of the influence of collaborative co-teaching on the participants. The narrative was enhanced by the use of the metaphoric image of a dinner party. Described here were the pictures I saw in the data as I discussed our experiences with the co-teachers, listened to the sharing of stories in our conversations, and read about our experiences during co-teaching. The narrative was divided into three vignettes on ownership, mentor and learning, and cultural boundary-blurring.
At the beginning of Winter quarter our desire was to collaboratively co-teach. We wanted co-teaching to be university-based and school-based people planning and executing a course together and deciding what was needed for the course and who best could do each part. This view featured co-teaching as a collaborative dinner party where participants decided on a menu based on the talents and specialties of the participants; the dinner’s final look depended on what those talents and specialties were.

The actuality of our working together was much different from the above desire. Each participant had her own version of co-teaching. It was clear that Lisa felt that participants had to be equal, to be collaborative. She wanted ownership to be shared with all co-teachers only to be thwarted by what she saw as her own lack of knowledge of the content and university norms. Lisa felt that she learned "more than the pre-service students" during co-teaching and was able to apply what she learned to her third grade classroom. In her thinking, she characterized co-teaching as every person able to do every job; if someone missed, the course could go on as usual. Lisa's co-teaching resembled a collaborative dinner party where each participant had the same or similar recipes; no matter who brought what, it would have the same look and flavor.
Carol had a hierarchial view of co-teaching. She appeared comfortable with the idea that Marilyn, as the professor, was in charge of the class; and volunteers, who wished to co-teach, added what they could to Marilyn's agenda. Carol discussed how what she learned during co-teaching was especially helpful in dealing with communication at her elementary school. She felt she never was able to get to know the co-teachers and, thus, could not be as involved in the co-teaching project. Carol viewed co-teaching as the professor's course. If the professor was not able to come to class, the class would be canceled or the agenda would have to change dramatically. Carol's co-teaching favored the cooperative potluck, where the host provides the main entree and each guest brings a favorite dish to compliment the entree; without the host there could be no dinner.

Marilyn began the co-teaching project with questions about ownership and collaboration. She struggled throughout the quarter with these question. In the end, Marilyn questioned whether her conception of co-teaching was possible in practice. From the beginning, she valued co-teaching because it brought university-based and school-based people together who had different expertise. Parity/equity in this kind of collaborative work was important. Equality was achieved when each
person's expertise was valued, shared, and used. By the end of the quarter, Marilyn sensed that this view of collaborative co-teaching was quite romantic and wondered if it was ever possible. She saw it as unrealistic because of three main issues: time, trust, and relationship building. She questioned whether a university-based or school-based educator should consider giving up ownership of their course or classroom.

Marilyn's other view of co-teaching was more similar to a cooperative co-teaching experience. The struggle for ownership, and the time spent in decision making and planning called into question collaborative co-teaching. Marilyn's second view of co-teaching was for the professor to retain ownership of her course and invite significant participation by other people. This potluck type of co-teaching would eliminate discussion on issues surrounding ownership, but questions about teacher participation becomes greater. Marilyn began to consider co-teaching as cooperation between professor and teacher(s), with the professor maintaining ownership. The professor invites teachers to the course when and where they can offer their expertise. Depending on the topic, the teacher could teach an entire class period. Marilyn's co-teaching was a cooperative pot-luck, where the host is in control of the planning. The host invites assistance where and when
needed, sometimes needing little or no aid, and other times requesting a main course.

I (JoAnn) had a difficult time deciding where to stand on the issues surrounding collaboration. This was because I had expertise at the university level but it was different from Marilyn’s expertise. Social studies methods was organized around Marilyn’s expertise. I felt the ownership was hers. On the other hand, I thought of myself as a practitioner, but had been away from schools for four years. I no longer had first-hand examples. I spoke from my past or what I saw as a graduate assistant in a school. These examples hardly could compare with a classroom teacher’s examples. Other circumstances pressed in on me; being a graduate student and graduate assistant, doing a dissertation, and working in these areas with my advisor. I related to Marilyn’s view of parity as different expertise, and felt it was how collaboration was able to value each person’s contribution. However, I had first hand experience about how it felt not having the same knowledge-base as Marilyn’s. Without a sense of being equal, I did not have a sense of ownership.

The collaborative co-teaching experience in this document seemed to feature characteristics that were similar to Lisa’s and Carol’s views of collaboration. Co-teaching began during the Autumn quarter with Marilyn’s
sole ownership and volunteers helping. During Winter quarter, the co-teachers looked to the principles of collaboration to aid their becoming more collaborative in their working together. We knew that sole ownership was not collaborative. We pursued how best to resolve the issue of being "collaborative" during Winter-quarter-co-teaching. We wanted to find where ownership should rest and what kind of ownership was necessary for a collaborative project. We discovered that no-ownership in collaboration was as uncollaborative as sole ownership.

Throughout the Winter-quarter-data collection period, the co-teachers struggled with applying the principles of collaboration to our working together. When planning classes, we shared responsibilities and decision making (Appley & Winder, 1977; Hord, 1986). Both university-based and school-based participants were conscious of working with one another rather than on one another (Lieberman, 1986; Ward & Tikunoff, 1982). And yet, as Lampert (1991) warned we found that it was "difficult ... to work productively in the boundary-blurring roles" (p. 672) of co-teaching. Each vignette told a story about a particular aspect of co-teaching. Participants had strong feelings around the issues of ownership, mentoring and learning, and cultural boundary-blurring. We did not resolve the quandaries surrounding these issues but gained
in our understandings.

In the next chapter I will first give an overview of the study. I will then describe the findings and implications of the study. Lastly, I will make recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER VI
CONCLUSION

The final chapter is divided into four sections. The first part is a summary of the dissertation study. This is followed by the findings. Section three suggests the implications of the study and possibilities for further study.

Summary of the study

This case study examined the influence of collaboratively teaching a social studies methods course on the co-teaching participants. The participants included a university professor, a graduate student, and two elementary classroom teachers. The social studies methods course was taught on the university campus. Collaboration, the sharing of responsibility and decision making, was a guide for the participants' understanding of co-teaching. The research sought the interaction among the participants. It described the importance of shared meaning making as related to the participants' relationship and understanding of self and other participants.
This study was based on an interpretive approach to human science research. The concern of interpretive research was one of meaning making as it was embedded in particular lived experiences (Gadamer, 1976; Linge, 1976; Rabinow & Sullivan, 1987). In the interpretive paradigm, to do research "is always to question the way we experience the world, to want to know the world in which we live as human beings" (Van Manen, 1990, p. 5). This meaning making was influenced by the researcher’s and participants’ history, culture, and perspective.

The case study was dependent methodologically on the naturalistic paradigm (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Stake, 1978), which stressed understanding the meanings people gave to the experiences that made up their world. I employed qualitative methods to address the four research questions which framed this study:

1. What is the nature of co-teaching?

2. How do the university-based and school-based professionals modify their rationale for and teaching of the course? of their classroom?

3. What influence does co-teaching have on the participants’ conception of social studies?

4. How does collaboration influence the participants’ perspectives of each other and of themselves?

The data for this study were collected during a fifteen week period during Winter quarter of 1992.
However, the participants' engagement with the issues surrounding collaboration began one year earlier with their involvement in a Professional Development School (Holmes, 1986; 1990). One of the goals in the PDS was to collaborate in all aspects of the project. The aim was shared ownership. To accomplish this goal, we agreed that the university-based persons should not have any more ownership of discussions or program than school-based people (Hord, 1986). The original goal for co-teaching was to extend this collaboration to the teaching of a social studies methods course.

Participating in, as well as conducting the study, I was present during all group meetings to plan the social studies methods course. I conducted beginning and exiting individual interviews with each participant and held group interviews to develop an understanding of how the participants (including myself) collaborated and viewed their experiences of co-teaching. Participants recorded their feelings and insights about co-teaching in journals, which they kept throughout the fifteen weeks of the study.

Analysis of data was on-going during the study. Earlier interviews and transcripts of meetings were used to formulate questions that were used for the subsequent discussion and the exit interviews. This funnel approach to the analytic induction method (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982;
Lincoln & Guba, 1985) was especially helpful because I participated in the study. I used on-going member checks as part of the process of examination so that the analysis of the data, like the study itself, was a collaborative effort. This process permitted the participants to interact with me as we made an effort to identify patterns and themes that influenced our lived experience of collaboration and co-teaching. My research included the additional step of a peer debriefer (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The peer debriefer helped me examine my data and interpretations by asking the hard questions that helped to test the emerging hypotheses, to consider next steps in the unfolding design, and to provide an opportunity for venting.

The jointly told tale (Van Maanen, 1988) of Chapter Four became a part of this study as the participants shared their insights about the data. I felt it was necessary to recreate the multi-dimensional, collaborative process I experienced during data collection and analysis by presenting the data in a manner in which the reader could become acquainted with the participants and their sense of meaning in the study. My interaction with the data and the participants' perceptions were explicated through the metaphor of a dinner party in Chapter Five.
The dissertation concluded with a discussion of the findings, implications, and questions for further research.

Summary of the findings

Donmoyer (1990), when discussing naturalistic generalizability, argued that one purpose of doing case study research was to produce questions rather than find answers. This was consistent with the interpretive paradigm which the research was embedded. Geertz (1983) described interpretive research as not searching for a result, "How all this muddle is going to come together?" but rather, as becoming comfortable with open-ended inquiry, "What does all this ferment mean" (p. 34)? In the following description of the findings of the study, I use both a narrative and question format to suggest larger issues from this study. I want to offer general ideas that might be useful to others in order that they can check their experience against ours. The findings are organized around the four questions that guided the study.

1. What is the nature of co-teaching?

Co-teaching, in this study, involved school-based and university-based personnel working together to organize, plan, and teach a university course. The purpose was to
bring university-based and school-based perspectives to bear on social studies methods in order to address both theory and practice issues. A second purpose of co-teaching was to extend the Educators for Collaborative Change/Professional Development School's commitment to collaboration into the university context. The study made manifest the promises and difficulties of the lived experiences of collaborative co-teaching. Four salient issues of co-teaching became apparent during the study.

The first issue was TIME. We did not have time to plan before the course began nor to discuss how we were going to make collaboration a part of our co-teaching. The experience of co-teaching made it clear that discussions about the process of collaboration were essential if the co-teaching was going to be more than teachers helping out in the university person's course. The co-teachers in this study had some previous relationships with one another because of our PDS work. However, we had little time to plan for social studies methods before it began. Thus, the course syllabus and readings were set by the university person.

We did not initially plan conversations around the issues of collaboration, partly because we were so involved in doing the course. Also, except for Marilyn, we had no previous experience doing this kind of teaching.
Initially we did not know what the problems were, and once identified, some of them were difficult to discuss openly. We were not able to talk explicitly about: how different relationships affected our working together; how our different styles of learning and teaching were to be incorporated into the co-teaching; and, how we felt about the time demands. The conversations we did have focused on the meaning of collaboration and the problems of working collaboratively. The planned conversations conducted for data collection provided time and motivation to discuss these issues more than we would have done otherwise.

We each felt that the time we spent in this co-teaching project was worthwhile. Marilyn could have done the course alone in much less time, but she found the time spent was worth what she gained in self-understanding and insights into her teaching choices and values. Co-teaching challenged Marilyn to think about what she considered important in social studies methods. Lisa referred to her co-teaching experience as a time when she learned more than the students. As she read and discussed the articles for class, her attitude toward social studies became more positive. Lisa also used these learnings to make changes in her classroom teaching. Carol talked less than the rest of us about how she
benefitted from co-teaching. She valued being re-acquainted with cooperative learning and a unit approach as influences of co-teaching that helped her in her urban classroom. My gains from the co-teaching had to do with learning a new foundations approach to teaching social studies methods.

The study raised a number of questions about time related issues. Is it practical to expect people who do not know one another well to talk about these issues? Or would it be easier to talk about them if there had been no previous relationship? Is there enough time available to university-based and school-based personnel to do collaborative teaching? How do people deal with the mundane problems of schedule differences between university-based and school-based personnel?

A second issue that we faced as co-teachers was the ambiguity of co-teaching, not having A SHARED DEFINITION. We were initially influenced by definitions of collaboration that were guiding the PDS project and were especially influenced by Hord's definition of collaboration as shared responsibility and decision making. According to this definition, no one participant was to have more control or ownership than others. Parity across different roles and responsibilities was required. But, we found this was difficult to put
into practice.

Along with the definitional issue in general, our co-teaching pushed us to look critically at our understandings of parity. We began co-teaching with different interpretations of this ambiguous word and this led to confusion within the group. We initially thought of parity as equality. We did not come to a shared understanding about parity and how it related to our co-teaching. Carol wanted equal participation, but when pushed, thought ultimately the course was Marilyn's. Lisa never waivered on the fact that collaboration meant equal responsibility. She wanted it to be equal in all aspects of co-teaching, but was unable to reconcile knowledge and power differences. Marilyn talked about equity and parity, however, she was hesitant to give up the course entirely. I felt parity was important, but could not figure out how to deal with the unequal knowledge bases between Marilyn and myself, and different knowledge bases between university-based and school-based personnel.

We came to see the importance of talking together about our different purposes and expectations. We knew that our different understandings about collaboration and parity influenced how we operated in the group. We talked vaguely about collaboration and the possibilities of working within the ambiguity of our various definitions of
parity/equality. While we talked about our differences, we did not reach a shared understanding. Once again, time was an issue. It takes time and experience to figure out these kinds of complex issues. In two quarters, a consensus was an unrealistic goal.

Questions raised from the study were: In any group will everyone interpret definitions the same way? How do you build a common definition of collaboration without common experiences and time? Is it necessary to have a common definition of collaboration? How do participants negotiate moving from different meanings to shared definitions? While co-teaching, can some members work more collaboratively than others? Is there ever a the way to collaborate? Are there ways that are not collaborative? At what point does it become non-collaborative?

Our experience with the third issue of OWNERSHIP forced us to examine our perceptions about co-teaching and collaboration. We began our collaborative co-teaching believing that we all had to share equal ownership for the course. We were hesitant to discard this ideal. However, we began to see collaboration, not as a uni-definitional process (no ownership), but, rather a multi-definitional one that must have a shared sense of ownership. At the end of the study, Marilyn began to see problems in giving
up major ownership of the course. The university-based person has expertise to offer. She ought to be free to contribute this without fearing undue control of the course. I struggled with how university-based and school-based people could equitably share ownership of a university course. We both acknowledged the need to recognize the importance of the classroom teacher’s involvement. Carol wanted a collaborative co-teaching experience but held that the bottom line had to be Marilyn’s, the university person. Lisa was uncomfortable with university ownership of the course because she saw it as hierarchical. However, she struggled with a sense of how to claim ownership without first acquiring university-based knowledge.

The study raised a number of questions. If individuals are not allowed primary ownership, how does a group share ownership? How is common ownership promoted? How are decisions to be made? Who has a final say? Or even, is there a "final say?" Is there a certain amount of "wasted time" that must be a part of collaboration? If one person, or a small group, has ownership and makes decisions will other people feel left out? Is expediency more important than consensus at times? Is consensus more important than expediency generally? Is it important to have an agreed upon definition of collaboration? Is it
necessary to have an agreed upon plan to deal with both expediency and consensus?

Our last issue surrounded our different KNOWLEDGE BASES related to power. We concluded that when there were different knowledge bases there were different power positions as well. To ignore the implication of these power inequalities seemed problematic. Some inequalities arose because of the implied hierarchies of theoretical knowledge (university) over practical knowledge (school). However, we found that the power gained through knowledge could be valued in two different ways. It is as possible for the school-based person to de-value the information from the university (too ivory tower) as it is for the university-based person to shun the information from the school (too practical). An implied hierarchy in one direction could be seen when Lisa and Carol anticipated that the certification students would value university theoretical knowledge over their practical knowledge. Yet what Marilyn more often heard from students were complaints about methods courses not being "practical" enough.

Lisa felt intimidated by the university people’s knowledge. She felt that she needed to be as knowledgeable about social studies as Marilyn for parity to be achieved. Carol stated that she was comfortable
allowing the university people to do the academic teaching and she adding examples from her classroom. She saw students as interested in her examples from the "real world." Working in a social studies methods course with my advisor, made me insecure about my own knowledge. Our goals were different enough that I continually felt uneasy. Marilyn encouraged participation from all of us. She struggled with how to share her knowledge without intimidating the other co-teachers.

Several questions emerged from this study: How can participants learn to value differences? Are hierarchies inevitable? How do participants begin to share decision making and planning when there are implied inequities? How does one build relationships from "unequal" positions? Is there time to build these relationships?

2. How do the university-based and school-based professionals modify their rationale for and teaching of the course? of their classroom?

3. What influence does co-teaching have on the participants' conception of social studies?

As the co-teachers participated in the planning and teaching, they discussed ways that working together influenced their understandings about social studies and teaching. Lisa redefined the meaning of social studies and changed how she taught social studies in her
classroom. All participants, to some extent, reframed their understandings about teaching. Carol tried cooperative learning in her urban classroom. She talked about the problems in the urban classroom (discipline and inconsistent attendance) and how these made it difficult for her to try what we did in social studies methods class in her classroom. Carol seldom asked questions of the co-teaching group about her situation. Lisa began a new phase in her teaching when she started to emphasize a more child-centered approach, and had many questions. No longer did she feel it necessary that she make all the decisions or answer all the questions for her students. She tried almost everything we discussed in the class.

I discovered that adding a foundations approach to social studies methods provided a frame for thinking about practical examples, and encouraged critical thinking about the issues. Marilyn perceived that she no longer had the same connection to the elementary classroom. She was confirmed in her foundations approach to social studies, but saw ways that more practical examples needed to be added.

A willingness to take risks and expose one’s opinions was essential to co-teaching to deal with issues such as ambiguity, different perspectives, and scarcity of time. Can one participate in co-teaching without risk taking?
How do co-teachers support one another in risk taking? Are different perspectives treated equally at the university setting? Are teachers' responses valued if it is a university course set up by the professor?

Lisa, Marilyn, and I discussed how the co-teaching helped to de-isolate us. We began to see how individual areas of weakness were supported by co-teachers' strengths. We noted that an openness to change and gaining new knowledge was necessary for co-teachers to benefit from the project. Co-teaching was risky business. Marilyn, Lisa, and I enjoyed discussing the readings. Lisa changed her mind about the potential of theory to inform her practice. She used the principles of Dewey's democratic society, which we studied in social studies methods class, to begin a democratic classroom. Marilyn enjoyed talking to what seemed like colleagues rather than just talking to students about the readings. She was pushed to consider alternative ways to bring teaching practicalities into her courses. I found that co-teaching broadened my perspective of social studies methods teaching. I used the opportunity of co-teaching to consider alternative definitions. Carol was not as vocal in discussions. It was not that she did not appreciate the readings, but that she was more focused on the need to form better relationships so she could have a better
understanding of each co-teacher. Carol seemed more interested in discussing classroom practicalities and how change could occur and less interested in discussing the articles and how they might lead to classroom change.

How do you co-teach if participants come from philosophically different perspectives, or have different interests and needs? What conditions are conducive to change during co-teaching? Would classroom teachers be more willing to participate in co-teaching if the course was more practical?

4. How does collaboration influence the participants' perspectives of each other and of themselves?

Participants spoke of how important relationships were to collaborative co-teaching. Relationships among co-teachers helped to build trust which encouraged risk taking and learning. Relationships between school-based and university-based people aided in beginning to develop different ways to envision teacher education.

Is it possible to collaborate when there are not positive relationships between people? How does co-teaching begin when there is no prior relationship between the co-teachers? What happens in the co-teaching when some relationships grow stronger than others? or at different rates? Can collaborative co-teaching take
place? How does university jargon keep these relationships from forming? Are there ways we can learn to talk across cultures? To build a common vocabulary? How can negative stereotypes and perceptions of one another be broken? Do teachers need to have expertise in the academic area they are willing to co-teach?

**Implications**

Case study research might be used to expand and enrich the repertoire of social constructions available to practitioners and others; it may help, in other words, in the forming of questions rather than in the finding of answers. (Donmoyer, 1990, p. 182)

Naturalistic generalizability was not about telling others what they need or might need to do. Rather, naturalistic generalizability offers possible topics, issues, and questions for others to consider when doing similar research or work.

As stated in Chapter Three, Donmoyer (1990) described three advantages to naturalistic generalizability of case studies. First was accessibility. Case studies provide the opportunity to go where one would not or could not go because of time or resources. This expands one’s range of understanding. Second, seeing through the researcher’s eyes, allows for an interpretation to be seen that one might miss if one was participating in the study.
Decreased defensiveness was the third value of naturalistic generalizability in a case study. When one is not directly involved in the study, there can be an openness to learning and a lack of defensiveness that might not appear if one was directly involved (Donmoyer, 1990, p. 192-197).

While findings from a naturalistic study were necessarily bound by their context, naturalistic generalizations (Donmoyer, 1990) can still be made which may be applicable to other settings. The analysis of data provided some topics for consideration that are relevant to professional development work generally. Other readers must consider these questions within their specific context to assess the extent to which they are viable for them.

1) How is time valued at the university when professors work in professional development schools; specifically in co-teaching projects, school classroom settings, and with teachers?

   How is time valued in the school districts when teachers’ work include professional development schools, co-teaching, university situations, and pre-service students?
This study indicated that both professors and teachers benefit from working together. The professor became reflective about her teaching and tried to see her teaching through classroom teachers' eyes. She made changes in her thinking about how she teaches social studies methods. The professor realized that even though she was a practitioner for many years, that she had lost some of the feelings of intensity and pressures surrounding teaching.

Participating in co-teaching and directly relating to a professor encouraged classroom teachers to look at their teaching and to make changes. Classroom teachers, who had been away from the university setting for a number of years, benefitted by being able to look at university readings and to see how they applied to their classrooms. Through this process, changes were made in teachers' classrooms during this study.

This all took time. The professor spent hours mentoring teachers and planning coursework which would have taken less time, possibly much less time, without the co-teachers. However, this extra time was not recognized at the university. Even though teachers received some time away from schools (half-days) this only covered the time they actually co-taught. Readings, preparing for meetings, planning for the course, and grading all had to
be done on their own time.

If time is not in some way recognized, allotted, and rewarded, it is possible that both professors and classroom teachers will be hesitant to be a part of Professional Development Schools and the time consuming projects that are part of PDS work (co-teaching). School-based and university-based people who are willing to take part in professional development schools and co-teaching may do so for shorter periods of time. This study shows that both the university and school systems will find that they are not as strong without the other’s involvement.

2) **Will working together on a course syllabus facilitate university-based and school-based ownership of the course?**

This study showed that prior planning was essential to mutual ownership. Participants needed to have time to explore and discuss what their views were about collaboration, co-teaching, and the methods course. This would have a clarifying influence at the beginning of the co-teaching. A syllabus that was developed by one of the participants gave the ownership of the course to that person, especially when this person was associated with the course on a regular basis.
3) **In what ways can boundary-blurring happen between school-based and university-based people?**

In this study the methods course was offered at the university. Classroom teachers came to the university to participate in the teaching. Other ways this boundary-blurring might also happen is if the university course was site-based in a school. Just as the classroom teacher assisted the university-based person in teaching a course, the university person might consider giving some kind of classroom assistance to the school-based person. These boundary-blurring measures began to de-isolate classroom and university teachers.

4) **Are there ways to incorporate both theory and practice in methods courses where neither are seen as less important?**

Our approach to social studies methods began with reading articles about concepts which were later supported by classroom examples. This seemed to stress the importance of theory and regulated practice to a sub-level position. It seemed it would be equally as important to begin classes with examples of practice and how practice informs theory. We tried to this with a communities unit in social studies methods, but this was not extensive enough to assess the full range of possibilities this
might provide.

5) Which relationship issues between school-based and university-based people need to be addressed prior to co-teaching? during co-teaching?

Teachers had much to offer university-based people. Professors had much to offer school-based people. This study described how teachers, professors, and teaching assistants mutually benefited from building collaborative relationships. Issues about relationships that surfaced in this study had to do with, time, knowledge, power, and support-in-change. Other groups and different personalities might find other issues more salient. We experienced in this study how time consuming relationship building can be, however, without the close relationships, collaboration would not have felt as positive as it did.

6) How might conversations about ownership and power be encouraged in a collaborative co-teaching effort?

Individual ownership or unequal power deterred collaboration. Sole ownership was not collaborative. Lack of ownership or power may be just as detrimental to collaboration. This study demonstrated that participants' positioning one another could have power implications. Only through conversation did the participants become
aware of how ownership and power influenced their participation and how they could work to change this.

7) **In what ways is the study strengthened when the researcher is also a participant?**

In chapter three I discussed the limitations of being in my own study. Would I be hesitant to ask questions of the other participants? What I came to see was that I was somewhat unwilling to become a full participant because I wanted to be sure others were given a full opportunity to express themselves. I felt this would help me recognize the participants’ influence on one another. While this may be true, it also limited my full participation. More positively, many times participants described how comfortable they were in talking with me. My relationships with Marilyn and Lisa encouraged their willingness to keep complete, detailed, and honest journals which strengthened my data collection. Carol, Lisa, and Marilyn were willing to participate in endless member-checks which they might not have been willing to do if I had not also been a participant with them. Also, I was willing to ask for these endless member checks, which I might have been more hesitant to do in a more traditional study.
8) In what ways is the study strengthened when the advisor is also a participant?

In Chapter Three, I discussed how the advisor's participation could impair the study. Would she unduly influence the study by asking or not asking questions? However, we found that Marilyn's participation in the study made her role as advisor more helpful to me. She became like an "insider" peer de-briefer. Being familiar with the data, Marilyn was able to ask more in depth and particular questions about my interpretations and to argue her own interpretation. These questions, rather than skewing the data, clarified many issues as I was writing. Of course, being an insider to the study meant that Marilyn was not able to ask questions which might have occurred to someone looking at the study from the outside.

Implications for further study

The research for this study was done by a participant. A future study could be done by someone who is not a participant in the study.

The study did not take into consideration whether co-teaching had an influence on the post-degree, certification students. A study to interpret their perspective of co-teachers would be valuable.
Another question that might be explored is parity in collaboration as seen from the post-degree, certification students' perspective.

Questions about both the university and school systems are not addressed in this study. The influence of these institutional contexts on collaboration could be explored.

Further studies might consider questions of how group dynamics and processes influence relationships within a collaborative project.
APPENDIX A

INITIAL INTERVIEW PROTOCOL
FOR SOCIAL STUDIES CO-TEACHERS
Protocol for Social Studies Methods Co-teachers

Begin:
Why did you want to join the social studies methods co-teaching?

Probe for: When did you decide to do this? How did your school support you?

How is what happened during Autumn quarter, what you expected?

Probe for: What went well? Didn’t go well? What would you like to have done that you didn’t get to do? Problems?

How were you involved?

What / who / how did the grading get done?

Has the Autumn quarter co-teaching influenced your teaching?

Probe for: How did/do you teach ss in your class? Examples

What are you taking into the next quarter?

Probe for: What have you learned? Confidence level? increase? decrease?

Talk about teachers teaching at the university.

What do you anticipate will be different about co-teaching during Winter quarter?

What do you see as advantages to co-teaching? disadvantages?
APPENDIX B

EXIT INTERVIEW PROTOCOL
Exit Protocol

Describe what you know about co-teaching.

Probe: What did you like?
What did you not like?
Their perspective of Winter quarter.

What is your ideal form of co-teaching?

Probe: What did we do to capture this ideal?
What didn’t happen? Why?

Has co-teaching been an influence on your classroom/course?

Probe: Examples.
What have you learned?

What were some differences between last quarter and this quarter?

What are advantages to co-teaching? Disadvantages?

Would you talk a bit about your experience with grading?

What do you feel about teachers teaching at the university?

Would you do this again?
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