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PREFACE

Chen: To have fun? Or, to be serious?

Backoff: How about be present to having playful seriousness and serious playfulness?

Chen: But, what about the "safe" zone?

Lather: Just try to fly a little bit and try to explore.

Chen: An exciting but slippery artistic endeavor, isn't it?

McCutcheon: And it's practical. Interest is the fuel and conflict is the engine.

Simple, but stimulating. Paradoxical, but transformative. This study, as the dialogical encounter echoes, is a trace of a personal and intellectual journey—one which has been made to locate the promised land where an inquisitive voyager can be freed to celebrate different ways of knowing and alternative forms of representation. It is dialectic in nature and dialogic in practice. To some extent, it is an innovation that attempts to create space for aesthetic appreciation and to develop voice as a form of ethical/political protest. The themes are gravitating toward the complex dynamics of educational praxis, concerning not only the character, dimensions, and texture
of human inquiry but also the orientation, assumptions (ideologies), and boundaries of pedagogical practice. Additionally, numerous lines of investigation are interwoven to delineate a type of artistry that is historically situated and practical, involving choice, deliberation, judgement, imagination, and transformation.

In print and image, this dissertation, as a medium, preserves written messages, visual artifacts, intellectual traces, and publicly available memory, reflecting my search for manifold instrumentation of human/educational inquiry. In this work I am not interested in any isms or the latest fashionable trends. Rather, I am content to compete with myself and to seek the meaning and the hope in education. I dare further adventures and variants, simply because:

There is no world without a stage and no one live for not-appearing.

Seeing of ears invites to speak, knowing of eyes invites to show.

Notice also, silence sounds listen to the voice of [imagery].

Semblance proves it can be truth as every form has sense and meaning.

(Josef Albers, 1976)
CHAPTER I

BEING IN THE HAPPENING

This study is an ongoing happening. There have been times to search and times to give up; times to embrace and times to refrain; times to tear down and times to build; times to get frustrated and times to dance, to celebrate. It all began with and will keep holding to the quest for a better way of doing education. Being in the paradoxical teaching/learning world--full of conflicts of values and perspectives that are relevant to much wider issues than that of education alone, I realize there are no simple solutions for educational dilemmas, such as the contrasts between freedom and constraint, individual and society, growth from within (psychological development) and imposition from the outside (socialization). Because education is an enactment of knowing, a political act, and an artistic event, it is important for us as educational practitioners to re-consider our pedagogical practices from a dialectical, deliberative perspective. We must become prepared, competent, and capable to think critically and to act passionately with aspiration for the improvement of our practices.
I believe the best way is to start with a more promising way of doing educational inquiry, a different way of "looking" into pedagogical practice, and an alternative way of presenting/sharing lived researching experience. Based on the notion of "research as praxis" (Carr & Kemmis, 1983; Lather, 1986) and the promises of "practice-centered inquiry" (Sanders & McCutcheon, 1986), in this study I encourage a co-operative inquiry approach to increase quality and improve communication about pedagogic reality between the researcher and the researched. In order to know more about the rhetoric of words and images, I advocate a photographic discourse approach to gain a different perspective on classroom life. Also, I demonstrate a more vivid way to present/share my knowledge about and experience in the field through story-telling and the juxtaposition of multiple forms of images. Finally, because I want to discover "the playfulness that verges on aesthetics" in teaching (Cherryholmes, 1988), and to exercise my "educational connoisseurship" with a public face—"educational criticism" (Eisner, 1991)—I place part of my emphases of this study on epistemological ruptures of traditional knowledge construction in educational praxis, and on methodological breaks of episteme and discursive practice of conventional conceptions of pedagogical reality.

Being aware of the zones of indeterminacy in educational practice that call for artistry (Eisner, 1985;
Schon, 1987), I render this study into an exploration of dialogical practice in two professional education sites--landscape architectural design studio and strategic leadership workshop--in which professional knowledge is institutionally embedded in curriculum for practice competence. I believe it is rewarding to look into these two unique sites to learn how the dialogical coaching of "knowledge-in-use" (Schon, 1987) is taking place in deliberation-action-reflection centered educational settings. In order to make the performance of my inquiry more meaningful, more humane, more educational, I intend to make this study more reflective upon the sources of the knowledge base for teaching, learning, and researching. In what ways can these sources be conceptualized? How do we, as educational practitioners, transform our understanding, performance skills, or desired attitudes or values into pedagogical/methodological representations and actions?

As for setting the context of displaying, this chapter is designed to delineate the background attributes of this study. Firstly, I will trace back what happened in the very beginning of this study to support my view that lived experience is prior and essential to language and "logical" inquiry. Then I will talk about the motifs and the composition of this study to show its characteristics of this non-traditional inquiry design and data display. In order to help grasp the essence of this study, a great
potion of this chapter discusses, with different perspectives, some familiar but fundamental concepts that are embedded in this inquiry. Also, the significance and the "non-purposive" purpose of this study will be delineated in the section of remarking the so-called "vision."

Basically, what will be sketched in this chapter are some of the embedded fundamental concerns and general research questions of this study. Because this study is an ongoing happening in two professional education sites with great differences, the more specific research questions in each site and the more precise significance of this study will be revealed as chapters unfold. However, since this study is somewhat an experiment of doing and presenting educational inquiry in a different way, I would urge whoever enters here to abandon the traditional knowledge about the dissertation to enjoy the music, the picture/image as well as the play that may be perceived in this presentation.

Situated within an unfolding and ever-changing web of interactive relations, this study embodies different ways of seeing, thinking and knowing. It is a kind of work that is a "happening of being" (a concept borrowed from Gadamer, 1989)—it enriches its being as if through a new event of being. In other words, by bringing what-is-to-be into the open, this study has the "bursting-open" belonging to "bring-forth" (Heidegger’s notion, in Halliburton, 1981) in itself as well as in the co-inquirers. Recognizing the fact
that every participant's experience helps corroborate the "happening of being," this study invites every-body, the researcher and the researched, the player and the audience, to participate in the process of the "coming into being of meaning."

ah yes,
We shall not cease from exploration
And the end of all our exploring
Will be to arrive where we started
And know the place for the first time.
Through the unknown, remembered gate
When the last of earth left to discover
Is that which was the beginning;
.....
(T. S. Eliot, in Eisner, 1985, p. 1)

Re-Visiting Genesis

1. INTRODUCTION: Representation of Chaos

2. RECITATIVE with CHORUS
   Raphael In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth; and the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep.
   Chorus And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters. And God said, Let there be light: and there was light.
   Uriel And God saw the light, that it was good: and God divided the light from the darkness.

3. ARIA with CHORUS
   Now vanish before the holy beams
   The gloomy shades of ancient night.
   The first of days appears.
   Now chaos ends, and order fair prevails.
   Affrighted fly hell's spirits black in throngs:
   Down they sink in the deep abyss
   To endless night.
   Chorus Despairing cursing rage attends their rapid fall.
   A new-created world springs up at God's command.

4. .....  
   (Haydn: Die Schopfung. The Creation, 1809)
This oratorio of Haydn, a musical composition for solo voices, chorus and orchestra, is a metaphoric, rhythmic representation of the happening of The Creation. Rooted in the need for expressive communication, this dramatic enactment preludes very well for me the happening of this study, from hiddenness to revelation, from chaos to celebration, from a lingering tone to a yearning timbre and to a reaching-out melody.

Scene 1: Giving up is to strive for the forth-coming. On a cold and cloudy afternoon in December 1989, I turned off the computer in the Instructional Research Lab in Harrington education building at Texas A&M University. I went back to my office next to the IR Lab and turned on the VCR and TV to watch an intern’s classroom teaching. Leaving the TV on, I took out the research proposal, just got back from my advisor/boss, entitled "The Relationship between Teaching Strategies and Teaching of Learning Strategies." I looked at the comment written in red ink again, "Excellent—You should do this study!! It could be the beginning of your dissertation research." I was upset by not feeling excited at all. I turned off the VCR and TV, put away the proposal and the observation scale I had developed, knowing that I was pursuing something else. But, what was it? I had no answer. I walked out of Harrington education building and got on my bike heading to buy something to comfort myself. In a bookstore I bought Edward de Bono’s little book New Thinking, and a poster with the wording—"Be still...and hear faith’s answer to the questioning heart."

Scene 2: Enacting is personal and situational. In January 1991, in my office at the Center for Teaching Excellence at OSU, in order to find a study site for my practicum course in qualitative research I re-viewed around twenty proposals of ongoing Instructional Enhancement Grant (IEG) projects funded by the center. Among them, I found the proposal of Norman in Landscape Architecture most appealing. In his proposal, Norman points out that the evaluation of students’ design projects is one of the critical aspects of design studio instruction. Favored in art and interested in the issues of subjectivity and objectivity involved in the evaluation of design projects, I made a contact with Norman through the introduction of my boss, the senior director of the center.
Scene 3: Being in the field is to become the world. In winter quarter 1991, after having a wonderful talk with Norman, I conducted a sort of "pilot study" in the landscape architecture design classroom, on the first floor of Brown Hall at OSU. Following what I had learned in the practicum course, I had a formal unstructured interview with Norman, an informal interview with another teacher, Debbi, and a focus group interview with students. Also, I designed a "grounded" survey to get students' opinions on evaluation of design projects. (The survey questionnaire was revised and administered in another class in Spring quarter.) In addition, I sat in the LARCH 243 design class for the following spring quarter in an attempt to know better the language and culture in the studio.

Scene 4: Writing is to rediscover the lived experience. A week before the final week of spring quarter 1991, in my room at Jones Graduate Student Hall, I spent days and nights working on a term paper for my action research course. I saw my playful experience in the landscape architecture design studio as a collaborative action research attempt. I revisited my experience in the studio and learned to put into words my experience. After I was done with my writing I was so happy that I not only found lots of new insights of my experience, but also came to own the language I learned from many other theorists. I felt I understood the world I'd lived in much better. Moreover, I was able to see and to show the meaning (the significance) of my experience. For example:

My pilot in-field experience in Landscape Architecture design studio started with the instructional problem perceived by Norman—both holistic and criterion-based evaluation approaches are being used in design studios without a thorough understanding about their effectiveness and influence on student learning. The methodology applied in my pilot experience was a naturalistic inquiry approach—to seek emerging grounded theory instead of having a priori defined assumptions. Basically, our goals were to contribute both to the practical concerns, and to join collaboration within a mutually acceptable ethical framework.

Scene 5: Sharing brings back the lived world and brings forth a new world. On a cold and sunny afternoon in December 1991, in Dr. B's office located on the second floor of Hagerty Hall, I shared the rough draft of my dissertation proposal (including my pilot experience in design studio) with Dr. B, who had a great impact on my research construction. I was asked if I was interested in adding another site, strategic leadership class, for study. Before
giving any promise, I took home with me, that day, sixteen video tapes of Dr. B's classroom teaching of strategic leadership class. During the winter break, I spent most of the nights in my room watching those video tapes. While I was watching I remembered the days I was doing the coding and analysis of teaching behaviors at Texas A&M University. Also, I remember the courses I took years ago at the Operational Impact Program (about leadership, organizational change, and human resources) sponsored by Azusa Pacific University. Impressed by the case-study based instructional design and interested in the collaborative learning in small group process, I decided to expand my inquiry into such an exciting but problematic site. Of course, then I had to start to revise, to re-say my proposal.

As we go through The Creation, we may be amazed by God's wisdom behind the exemplary order, process of His creation. We may also be moved to admiration for Haydn's intelligence embedded in his musical representation of the state of creating. But, how could God command "let there be light" before the "light" (language) was known as "the light" (entity)? How could He say (name) something in nothingness? Indeed, usually saying comes after conception, naming comes after existence, and knowing comes after happening. Maybe because "in the beginning was the Word (Logos), and the Word was with God," God was able to reveal the "light" and so forth. Thus, His "letting-be" command (saying) is a significant attribute to "the setting-up of a world and the setting-forth of earth" (a notion borrowed from Heidegger, in Halliburton, 1981).

In terms of going through my personal odyssey, the genesis of this study, I find that it is actually an ongoing unfolding of "what is already present but not yet seen" (Caputo, in Pinar & Reynolds, 1992). Before being put into
words, the authenticity of my search is merely something about which there is nothing to say. Through the entering-into the field, I am dealing with something which now carries "research" weight in that my work, embodied with my personal interest, holds forth in space and time the meaning imparted to it. When I start to talk about, speak of my in-field experience, I start to realize what I appreciate and am able to communicate the sense of what my study fundamentally is. The entities of my search are then taken out of their hiddenness. And the transformational path into my research world can be seen. "My" world thus becomes "Our" world. With active collaborators, antagonists, and audiences, the inquiry becomes an artform—a form of play that sets scenes in which open-ended dialogues are continuously unfolded.

This revisiting is not only to trace the beginning of this study, but also to help understand that "we live prior to language in a preconceptual substratum" (Pinar & Reynolds, 1992, p. 10). Thus, we can be aware that "bring to language means: to raise into words first of all what has previously never been spoken, and to let appear through saying what has so far been hidden" (Heidegger, quoted in Halliburton, 1981). The happening of any creation, this study too, does not start with techne or episteme but with logos. The logos, the linguistic dimension of human being-in-the-world, according to Gadamer (1986), fulfills itself
by making something visible so that the other sees it. There is always an inquiring mind anticipating the moment of enlightenment in the state of chaos. It is the revelation, unfolded or elicited in its own time, that constitutes the actual mind and makes the "Ah-Hah" and creation happen.

When the visible appears, the celebration begins. Then, the search for the order of things follows. Then, the knowledge of knowledge, of language, of power... There are people studying how things happen in the mind (e.g., psychologists) and there are people searching what make things happen from the outside world (e.g., sociologists). There are people explaining the happening through an empirical approach of logical reasoning and trying to generate universal laws that may serve their technical, controlling interests (e.g., logical positivists). There are people explaining the happening through a phenomenological approach of interpretation and trying to understand the historical/social meaning of experience for solving their practical problems (e.g., interpretivists). And there are people challenging "the happened" (the status quo) through a radical "consciousness-awakening" approach and trying to demystify hidden ideologies and to delineate human potentials in order to achieve their emancipatory goals (e.g., critical theorists). In term of the way I do my (re)search, I am influenced by all, not preceded by any particular one of these guides. Because the act of search
should be a daring venture, I would like to enter different territories to find whatever is beautiful that shines in itself. We cannot deny that, quite often, the "new" is in the "old" concealed, and the "old" is in the "new" revealed.

The Motifs and the Composition

...there should grow the most austere of all mental qualities; I mean the sense for style. It is an aesthetic sense, based on admiration for the direct attainment of a foreseen end, simply and without waste. Style in art, style in literature, style in science, style in logic, style in practical execution have fundamentally the same aesthetic qualities, namely, attainment and restraint. The love of a subject in itself and for itself, where it is not the sleepy pleasure of pacing a mental quarterdeck, is the love of style as manifested in [this] study.

(Alfred N. Whitehead, cited by Eisner, 1985, p. 109)

Because of my curiosity about and commitment to the joy of learning, the meaning of hope, and moments of passion or inspiration or comedy, I intend, in this study, to open and explore new horizons of questioning. It is my dream to promote a learning ambience where talk and dialogue are cultivated, where one feels comfortable to pursue issues and problems that transgress conventional academic boundaries, and where one directly experiences the challenges and encounters that come from the researched with all of their diverse concerns. Being confronted with "incommensurable" paradigms, theories, conceptual schemes, or forms of life (Bernstein, 1983, 1991), I expect, more or less, to redraw
the lines of educational inquiry with variations of tone, pace, and shape— to use alternative devices to reveal what words can never say— to help others hear, see, and understand. The strategy is an "empirical" approach to the text of different genres, e.g., philosophical prose, literature review, live dialogues, photographs, etc. Thus, this study speaks not only with words, but through the juxtaposition of its quotations, its commentary, its discourse— its images. I salute Eisner's (1991) dictations: "let different voices be heard in the text, alliteration allowed, and cadences encouraged," "let relevant allusions be employed and metaphor that adumbrates by suggestion used" (p. 3).

With the intention to explore and respect the fluidity and the complexity of multiple knowledge genres, recent trends in sociology of knowledge and philosophy of science have combined to encourage the interdependence of method, theory, and values, and to emphasize the importance of dialectical process and historical-cultural perspective in human inquiry (Berger & Luckmann, 1966; Carr & Kemmis, 1983; Guba, 1991; Lather, 1991; Rowan, 1981). Being born in this "post-" era, this study, in a certain respect, is a playful, serious experiment. It is so not only in the search for pedagogical alteration but also in the display of my own methodological evolvement. Unlike most traditional research approaches which silence the researched and establish an
alienating relationship between the researcher and the researched (Gitlin, 1990), this study is a "cooperative play" (a term borrowed from Gadamer, 1986), an inquiry that involves self-movements and communicative activities in the realm of freely chosen possibilities. It is an approach that provides the move to participatory and holistic knowing, to dialectical construction, to practical intersubjectivity, and to knowledge in action (Reason, 1988).

Recently, a number of theorists have reminded us about the important role of narratives in human inquiry (e.g., Bruner, 1985, 1986, 1990; Polkinghorne, 1988; Reason & Hawkins, 1988; van Maanen, 1988). When we situate our work by telling stories about what happened before we came along, we can see more clearly how we have been creating and recreating our own traditions and canons. In terms of bringing into existence new insights and new break-throughs of our understanding, it is important to outline some narrative sketches which themselves relate stories about the development of this study.

In order to demonstrate how rationalization provides a way of ordering experience, constructing reality, organizing representation, and filtering the perceptual world, in this study, I will analyze and explain my lived researching experience by going through some inevitable, "systematic" approaches. For example, I will try to rationalize my
inquiry process, method-in-use, data analysis approach, and so forth. But more importantly, I will share stories that appear to be vibrating with meaningful reflection of my lived (re)searching experience to help illustrate that a narrative way of knowing has something to do with the explication of human intentions in the context of action (Bruner, 1985). As Reason and Hawkin (1988) point out, human inquiry can work either to explain or to express, to analyze or to understand. Along these two paths of inquiry—from experience through explanation to general theory; and from experience through expression to myth and archetype—we can create between them a space for dialogue and for aesthetic appreciation. So we can find, in this study, a theme may be illuminated by a story, or a theory may clarify a myth. With the belief that a human being is her/his own metaphor (Hampden-Turner, 1981), I hope the dynamic and illuminating nature of human inquiry can be grasped in unforeseen ways. For example, we may see that the vividness of a narrative—which sets our intuitive capacities in motion—enlivens our "symbolic" or "conceptual" understanding (Gadamer, 1986).
Re-thinking the Familiar

[T]he history of a concept is not wholly and entirely that of its progressive refinement, its continuously increasing rationality, its abstraction gradient, but that of its various fields of constitution and validity, that of its successive rules of use, that of the many theoretical contexts in which it developed and matured.

(Foucault, 1972, p. 4)

There are always the "displacements and transformations of concepts" (Foucault, 1972). The central terms of my title, for example, are often seen, heard, and talked about in the academic arena in ways that take them for granted as self-evident. They, sometimes, need to be appreciated and grasped from an unusual vantage point. In order to disrupt and question our traditional understandings of these key concepts, it is important for us to be aware of the assumptions upon which our own perspectives are based, and to rethink these various concepts outside the realm of our own familiar domain. Only then can we unmask the falsehood and/or illusion and appreciate the precise nature of our understanding. And only then can we create and embrace the fascination embedded in the search for alternatives.

Knowledge

The nature of knowledge has been a central problem in philosophy from the earliest times. Like many features of a landscape, knowledge is viewed and experienced differently
from different angles. For logical positivism, knowledge is primarily an issue of objective nature, not social life. In other words, the ultimate reference for valid knowledge is the external reality of objective nature, where nature is seen as the embodiment of pure explanatory rationality, that is detached, and indifferent. For social constructivism, knowledge is a dimension of human life that involves agreement and disagreement, debate and negotiation. What is generated as knowledge and what is taken as knowledge reflects the values and the sociological features of the society.

In education, an enterprise for transmitting knowledge and modes of inquiry, knowledge is as much an issue of social life as of natural processes—in the sense that assertions of knowledge are the basis for organizing and legitimating social-natural interactions. Thus, the stance I adopt here, beyond the above two epistemological "isms," is an "ecological" conception of knowledge (Wright, 1992), which concerns both the nature and sources of knowledge. More importantly, such a conception requires that knowledge be understood as primarily an issue of language—the enabling ground for both social life and knowledge. As Foucault (1970) points out, knowledge and language are rigorously interwoven. They support one another, complement one another, and criticize one another continually. From an ecological perspective, according to Wright (1992), social
theory must become linguistic, with a commitment to sustaining social-natural interactions, as opposed to traditional science, with a commitment to mirroring objective reality. Also, as an aspect of an ecological knowledge, social theory becomes a necessary conceptual complement to the explanation of natural processes, instead of appearing only as a "befuddled, value-laden anomaly" (Wright, Ibid.).

Interestingly, in Chinese, knowledge is said as "jy-shyh" or "shyuer-Wehn." Both phrases are nouns of action, but each presents a different level of pursuing. "Jy-shyh," presenting the primary technical conception of knowledge, is composed by two verbs, "knowing" and "recognizing," that implies a collective sense of knowledge as possessive power. "Shyuer-wehn," delineating a more advanced ecological state of knowledge, consists of the verb "learning" and "inquiring," that suggests a constant, dynamic process of knowledge in action. As Bernstein (1991) claims, knowledge is not detached from our being but is determinative of what we are in the process of becoming. No matter that knowledge is divided by its structure as thought or by its topic as content (Mannheim's category of knowledge, in Dant, 1991), knowledge is created not only in the individual cognitive sphere but also by a community working more or less together. And the exercise of power itself creates and causes to emerge new objects of knowledge and accumulates
new bodies of information (Foucault, 1980). Based on Lao Tzu's teachings, "the Tao (close to Greek 'logos') that can be told is not the eternal Tao, the name can be named is not the eternal name," I advocate knowledge construction through learning, inquiring, and power exercising as endless, but playful.

Reflection

Reflection, in education, broadly speaking, is a way of thinking about educational practices. From a retrospective point of view, to reflect is to look back over what has been done to bring forth some constructive suggestions for future actions. Reflection involves not simply a sequence of ideas, but a "con-sequence" that calls for "active, persistent, and careful consideration of any belief or supposed form of knowledge in the light of the grounds that support it and the further conclusions to which it tends" (Dewey, 1933, p.9). The major concerns are centered around the effectiveness of applying technical skills, the clarification of personal assumptions, the implication for practical needs, and the worthiness of competing goals. From a critical perspective, reflection involves decision making in a socio-political context, investigating real lived experiences, and the dimensions of social and political accountability for those decisions. The most important task is then to cause the awareness of the
relationships among ideologies, interests and actions of the individual, and the roles that schools play in social reproduction.

However, what is emphasized in this study is Donald Schon’s view of "reflection-in-action." Unlike reflection on action, reflection-in-action is thinking about doing something while doing it. It is action generated and tested through "on-the-spot" experimenting (Schon, 1983, 1987). The individual monitors the effects of his or her actions and modifies or extends his or her appreciation system by attending to the situation rather than predetermined criteria. According to Schon, reflection-in-action has a critical function (1987). Thinking critically about the situation, the individual may, in the process, restructure strategies of action, understandings of phenomena, or ways of framing problems. In other words, the relationships between the practitioner and the situation are transactional. The processes of problem setting and problem solving are intimately connected to the practitioner’s "repertoire of exemplars" and "fundamental principles" (Schon, 1983). What a practitioner sees in a situation depends on both his or her basic appreciative system (values and belief) and his or her repertoire of examples as they are experiences within the dynamic action of the reflection. This view indeed pronounces an important dialectical relationship between thought and action, and can help build
"reciprocal reflexivity" (Lather, 1986) into research designs for the intention of encouraging mutual negotiation of meaning and power.

Basically, reflection has an evaluative aspect (Kemmis & McTaggart, 1988). According to Dewey (1933), reflective thinking makes possible action with a conscious aim and possible systematic preparations and inventions. Also, it enriches things with meanings and values. In the process of reflection, a state of doubt, hesitation, perplexity may occur, and an act of searching, inquiring, to find ways to resolve the doubt, to settle the perplexity is always needed. As Dewey suggests, three personal attitudes, open-mindedness, whole-heartedness, and responsibility in facing consequences, are essential constituents of the readiness to think reflectively. He says it well, "one can think reflectively only when one is willing to endure suspense and to undergo the trouble of searching" (Ibid., p. 16).

Dialectic

The term "dialectic" originates from the Greek expression for the art of conversation (dialektos). The role of dialectic, the interpretation of its nature, and the estimate of its importance alter widely in the course of the history of philosophy, depending on the epistemological position of the philosopher in question. So far as its great variety of meanings has anything in common, it is
perhaps that dialectic is a method of seeking and sometimes arriving at the truth by reasoning. But even this general description, which to fit the variety of cases is so vague as to be valueless, fails to do justice to the Hegelian and Marxist notion of dialectic as a historical process. According to Rescher (1977), since Hegel reestablished dialectic as a central theme of modern philosophy, dialectic has been viewed as: part of the causal pattern of historical development (the Marxists), a branch of philosophical ontology (contemporary German neo-Hegelianism), a sector of rhetorical tradition (the "New Rhetoric" of Chaim Perelman), or a way of systematizing the testing process for scientific theories (Karl Popper and his school). However, my discussion here is to seek to substantiate a view that dialectics, an art or practice of examining ideas in terms of opposite or polar positions, serves as both the means and the end of inquiry.

Dialectics emphasizes change and has its potential leading toward transformation (Basseches, 1984; Ford & Backoff, 1988). A dialectical view of knowledge helps foster awareness of novelty and of relations among things. It also helps promote the kinds of moves in thought necessary for the unconventional, form-breaking, and the synthesizing aspects of creativity (Benack, Basseches, and Swan, 1989). Moreover, in the process of disputation, debate, and rational controversy, the dialectic of things or
of experience has its contribution to the "authentication of claims to knowledge" (Rescher, 1977).

In the Western "either/or" tradition, if Foucault's Nietzschean observation is right, "neither the dialectic, as logic of contradictions, nor semiotics, as the structure of communication, can account for the intrinsic intelligibility of conflicts" (Foucault, 1980, p. 114). In his idea, dialectic is "a way of evading the always open and hazardous reality of conflict by reducing it to a Hegelian skeleton, and 'semiology' is a way of avoiding its violent, bloody and lethal character by reducing it to the calm Platonic form of language and dialogue" (Ibid, p. 115). Based on this, no wonder the "intelligibility of struggles, of strategies and tactics" (Ibid.) has played a fundamentally important role in Western dialectical practices.

However, among many different ways of illustrating dialectics, I found Chinese T'ai-Chi T'u (the diagram of the Supreme Ultimate) most captivating. It is a rotational symmetry arrangement which suggests a continuous cyclic movement as well as a dynamic, paradoxical, but harmonious relationship. The dark area is Yin and the white area is Yang. We can also find little tiny black Yin in white Yang, and little tiny white Yang in black Yin. This "Yin is Yang, Yang is Yin" is a "double-thinking" or "no-thinking" dialectics that opposites are the "essence" and the "shadow" of each other. (For example, peace is war, war is peace.)
In other words, the two are concerned with each other in a way that enables each to heighten the other—to bring the other to fulfillment. Interestingly, if I read Bernstein on Derrida correctly, this inclusion of the "otherness" both meets and interrupts Derrida's "both/and" logic very well. For Derrida, according to Bernstein (1991), "there is both sameness and radical alterity, symmetry and asymmetry, identity and difference in my relation with 'the Other,' and above all in the ethical relation" (p. 72).

There is a Chinese saying—"I-Yin i-Yang chih wei Tao" which means that a negative Yin together with a positive Yang constitutes Tao (logos). And this constant Tao cannot be conceptualized in words. We can only know it better through philosophizing our ways of life—gaining a heart of wisdom, and embodying humility, spontaneity, and generosity.

Dialogue

The term "dialogue" is from the same Greek root as "dialectic," meaning "discourse." It usually refers to the Socratic method of philosophizing through discussion as set forth in Plato's early dialogues featuring the Socratic figure. When we take a look at Plato's dialogues, we may find that the form consists of beginning with a random solution to a problem, and strengthening that solution through repeated criticism and reformulation. The instances of use of the dialogue form in Western philosophy are many.
Some view dialogue as an instrument of logical exposition that helps to "envisage" strategies of "proof development" (e.g., Rescher, 1977). Some regard it as the mutual revelation of self through an I-Thou relationship that helps to discover human image and to bring into existence a caring community that confirms otherness (e.g., Friedman, 1992).

Dialogue and its various processes are central to Bakhtin's theory (Bakhtin, 1981). According to him, a word, discourse, language, or culture undergoes "dialogization" when it becomes relativized, de-privileged, aware of competing definitions for the same things. Undialogized language is authoritative or absolute. In other words, in dialogical communication everything means, is understood, as a part of great whole—there is a constant interaction between meanings, all of which have the potential of conditioning others. Dialogue implies that every individual (the researcher or the researched) exists in relationship. Applied properly, dialogue can be a means of growth and maturation in the social sense, and it may encompass the processes of active assertion as well as interpersonal responsiveness and reactivity. As Friedman says, "dialogue can serve as a shaper of autonomous identity as long as a meaningful self–other confirmation keeps the process in motion" (1992, p. 93). Though openness in communication is an important part of genuine dialogue, dialogue always presupposes somewhat a "tacit sense of relevance" (Gitlin,
A precondition for dialogue is, according to Gitlin, that all participants see the discourse as important and have a say in determining its course. Dialogue does not pit one actor against another but rather enables participants to work together to understand the subject being discussed.

All dialectical practices require dialogues—a developing discussion. And genuine dialogue invites "reciprocal reflexivity and critique" that interrupts researcher tendencies toward the imposition and reification on the part of the researcher (Lather, 1986). With an anticipatory and open mind, the dialectic in dialogue has its own fulfillment not in definitive knowledge, but in that openness to dialogue that is encouraged by dialogue itself. I think Bernstein (1983) says it very well,

> What we desperately need today is to learn to think and act more like the fox than the hedgehog—to seize upon those experiences and struggles in which there are still the glimmerings of solidarity and the promise of dialogical communities in which there can be genuine mutual participation and where reciprocal wooing and persuasion can prevail (p. 228).

**Curriculum and Pedagogy**

Since curriculum and pedagogy denote separate but interrelated phenomena, the watershed between these two domains has always been somewhat fuzzy. Curriculum, as usually understood, refers to the substance or content of schooling, the course of study that specifies what is to be taught. Pedagogy, on the other hand, refers largely to the
processes or the "how" of schooling, the human interactions that occur during actual teaching episodes. As curriculum is intended to frame or guide teaching practice and cannot be achieved except during acts of teaching, teaching is always about something so it cannot escape curriculum, and teaching practices imply curricular assumptions and consequences. Eisner (1992) says it well, "like the systole and diastole of the beating heart, curriculum and teaching reside at the center of education" (p. 302).

However, the knowledge base of curriculum and pedagogy should not be limited to encompass only definitions, principles, values, facts, or formulaic procedures. We need to take into account the social constructivist view of knowledge (see chapter 2) to view both curriculum and pedagogy more as process/praxis than product. As critics argue, curriculum is a practical social endeavor. Many of its critical issues lie at the level of deliberation and tactic (Schwab, 1978; Walker, 1990; McCutcheon, in press). Pedagogy involves constant reflective acting in situations and relations. Its effectiveness, thoughtfulness, and possibility are beyond mere behavioral principles, techniques, or methods (Whitson, 1988; van Manen, 1991; Giroux, 1988a).

According to Doyle (1992), the "doing" of both curriculum and pedagogy involves transforming content in some way. A central issue for inquiry at the intersection
of curriculum and pedagogy is the grounds on which such transformations, especially at the classroom level, are made. Since curriculum is not simply content, but a theory of content, attention should be given to the theories of the content that drive the pedagogical and curricular decisions teachers make. In other words, what is needed is a framework for understanding these pedagogical transformations of curriculum. As Doyle suggests, we need to understand more fully the structure and operating processes of classroom activities and the ways in which interpretations of students and teachers contribute to and are shaped by their participation in these activities (Ibid.). But, this is not enough. From a critical perspective, we need also to go beyond the surface appearance of activities in order to understand in particular the ideologies and power relations that are integral to the models teachers use to guide their thinking and actions regarding pedagogical transformations of curriculum (Apple, 1985; Giroux, 1989).

Co-operative Action Inquiry and Educative Exploration

The ideal of co-operative action inquiry I have been pursuing has important implications for educational practitioners, in doing research, in curriculum decision making, and in teaching as well. Action inquiry is commonly known as "action research" in educational fields. It is a
form of self-reflective inquiry undertaken by practitioners in educational situations in order to improve the rationality, effectiveness, and justice of their own educational practices, as well as their understanding of these practices and the situations in which these practices are carried out. It is practice-centered, practical-oriented, and critical-enlivened. Its knowledge is grounded in experience and observation, supplemented in understanding the environment through interaction based upon a consensual interpretation of meaning, and furnished in engaging in autonomous action arising out of authentic, critical insights into the social construction of educational community (Grundy, 1987).

Action inquiry can help educational praxis be examined and improved through "a direct, intimate contact" (Eisner, 1991, p. 11). Though it can be undertaken by individuals, it is most rationally empowering when undertaken by practitioners collaboratively. Especially, education is a social enterprise. It is important to encourage applying a dialogical, co-operative approach for the "development of voice" (Gitlin, 1990) in educational praxis. According to Gitlin, the use of "educative research," a dialogical approach, is the best way to expand the authority to produce knowledge beyond the researcher, to foster the development of teachers' voices (I think students' voices as well), and to encourage "a more collective approach to research that
can mobilize groups typically left out of educational policy discourse" (Ibid., p. 449). Gitlin believes that the process of giving meaning to educational practices benefits from an examination of the assumptions about teaching and schooling that underlie those practices. The development of voice not only helps to give practitioners a say in question posing, but encourages them to examine the values they hold and the culture in which they work. It may not only help practitioners "reshape roles," but promote school structures to be altered to encourage proper political action and protest as well.

Ideally, in educational praxis thought and action, theory and practice are, as Carr and Kemmis (1983) suggest, dialectically related and understood as mutually constitutive. In the process of developing an adequate and coherent educative exploration through co-operative action inquiry, it will be helpful to provide ways of distinguishing ideas and interpretations that are distorted by ideology from those that are not, and to give concerns to identifying and exposing those aspects of the existing social order which frustrate rational change. Also, it is necessary to provide views/or theoretical accounts of how distorted self-understandings and social norms can be overcome. However, co-operative action inquiry must be based on an explicit recognition that it is practical, in
the sense that the question of its knowledge in and for action will be determined by the way it relates to practice.

**Practical Art and Praxis**

The practical, as Schwab (1978) points out, is marked by particularity. It is a complex discipline concerned with choice and action. The very fabric of the practical consists of "the richly endowed and variable particulars from which theory abstracts or idealizes its uniformities" (Schwab, Ibid., p. 324). Since we normally see only what we are instructed to "look for" and we are quite often instructed by theory, we seldom take note (see) that particularities of the practical are there nor appreciate them as possibly relevant to our concerns. In the determination of practice, we need the art of practical to bring a theory to its application.

Practical art is actually a matter of praxis. By praxis, it means informed, committed action that requires choice, deliberation, and decision about what to be done in concrete situations. Rooted in the commitment of the practitioner to wise and prudent action in a practical situation, such informed action may, by reflection on its character and consequence, reflexively change the practical knowledge-base which informs it (Carr & Kemmis, 1983). According to Carr & Kemmis, thought and action are dialectically related in praxis. "They are to be understood
as mutually constitutive, as in a process of interaction which is a continual reconstruction of thought and action in the living historical process which evidences itself in every social situation" (Ibid., p. 37). As Schwab (1969) describes, the very nature of practical is "concerned with the maintenance and improvement of patterns of the purposed action, and especially concerned that the effects of the pattern through time shall retain coherence and relevance to one another" (p. 599).

Since practical knowledge is personal, experiential and "social," and is tentative and subject to "change," the nature of praxis actually goes beyond the *techne* level (technical know-how). It involves a recovery and appropriation of the type of practical reasoning, knowledge, and wisdom that is characteristic of *phronesis* (ethical know-how) (Bernstein, 1983; 1986). When authentically fused with moral-practical disciplines, e.g., hermeneutic understanding, such *phronesis*-oriented praxis may help to "correct the peculiar falsehood of modern consciousness" and "to defend practical and political reason against the domination of technology based on science" (Gadamer, in Bernstein, 1986, p. 104).

As Carr and Kemmis (1983) point out, only the practitioner has access to the commitments and practical knowledge which inform praxis, thus only the practitioner can study praxis. Built upon the notion that praxis is
dialectical, dialogical, interactive, and reciprocal shaping of theory and practice (Gadamer, in Bernstein, 1983, 1986; Carr & Kemmis, 1983; Lather, 1986), this study of praxis is a joint (collaborative) exploration of co-operative inquiry as practical art. In the process of reconstruction and construction of action and understanding, we keep asking what is to be done, "what is feasible, what is possible, what is [appropriate], here and now" (Heidegger, in Bernstein, 1986), to make such a practical art a living reality?

Re-marking the Vision/Delineating the Inquiry

Where there is no vision, the people perish.  
(Scripture)

...with an empirically based, interpretively sensitive, and ethically illuminating research program that in turn may deliver to its students the promise of any critical sociological imagination: pragmatics with vision.

(John Forester, 1983, p. 246)

In education, quite often there are a lot of "big talks" but only a few genuine dialogues. There is seldom creative exertion, there is thus rarely exciting revival. Wondering how to die as a bureaucratized mind and to be born again as an open mind, a creative mind, I think we as educational practitioners need to re-know for ourselves what we are trying to conduct, to teach. We need to have passion
to know the world, be curious and critical. And we need to commit ourselves to a dialogical approach to teaching and inquiry. A central claim of my work is that dialogue, which requires dialectical thinking, is an essential way of generating critical thinking. As Freire says, "without dialogue there is no communication, and without communication there can be no true education" (1970, p. 81).

Based on the promises of inquiry in dialogical action, Schwab (1976) coined a "learning community," and Torbert (1976) created a "community of inquiry" to implement a collaborative, dialogical approach in their educational practices. They believed that a collaborative effort could help to create the social setting necessary to provide the broad range of perspectives/alternatives required for an adequate understanding of the problem and its potential solutions. More importantly, the dialogue among fully engaged participants in the community not only achieves understanding, it elicits commitment and resolve (Shulman, 1984). Participating in such a dynamic, dialectical community for learning and deliberation, practitioners may not only be ready to think more clearly, but also to act more wisely and, perhaps, even more justly.

Among different sorts of educational practitioners, the first members of the deliberative community are to be teachers. According to Shulman (1984), teachers must be involved in debate, deliberation and decision about what and
how to teach. "Such involvement constitutes the only language in which knowledge adequate to an art can arise" (p. 190). Basically, participation in "debate-deliberation-choice" is required for learning what is needed as well as for willingness to do it. Therefore, as Shulman has put it, there is an obvious moral here for teacher education. Practitioners involved in teacher education need to think deeply about it. Because teaching is "a source of aesthetic experience," "a heuristic or adventitious activity," "dependent on the perception and control of qualities," and "seeking emergent ends" (Eisner, 1985, pp. 175-177), teaching is not only a science but also an art. Teacher education curriculum must provide not only knowledge of rules, knowledge of particular cases, but also knowledge of ways to apply rules to cases. In other words, as Fenstermacher (1979, in Shulman, 1984) argues, educating a teacher is not a matter of inculcating through training a set of teaching skills or competencies. To educate a teacher is to influence the premises of the practical argument, derived from empirical inquiries and normative principles, in the teacher's mind. Then, the dimension of "how" is not merely a methodological one, but an artistic one as well.

As Schon (1987) points out, artistry is an exercise of intelligence, a kind of knowing that is fostered in a dialectical process, intrapersonally and interpersonally.
In the study of the relationship between practice competence and professional knowledge, Schon believes that we can learn from a careful examination of artistry, that is, the competence by which practitioners actually handle indeterminant zones of practice—situations of uncertainty, uniqueness, and value conflict. Built on Schon’s theory of the reflective practicum as a vehicle for education in artistry, and my concern about dialogical acts for meaning and sense making, in this study I look into landscape architectural design studio and strategic leadership workshop—"bimodal" professional educational settings involving coaching both technical rationality and professional artistry—to examine and compare the epistemology of practice and the pedagogical assumptions on which each curriculum is based. And I intend to apply a co-operative inquiry approach which is, in my view, likely to succeed in grasping the nature and issues of teaching and learning of "deliberative art" in individual design (design studio) as well as in group decision-making (leadership workshop).

Basically, I am interested in what/and how knowledge is produced and disseminated, how social relations are structured, and how students and teachers come to see their roles in design studio/or design like activities. By doing the study, I want to explore the dynamics of the reflective practicum, to find out how they are similar and different
from one field of practice to another, and to grasp the principle issues, processes, and competencies involved in doing the job of a reflective practicum. Moreover, I want to inquire into the reciprocal dialogues between teacher-and-student, student-and-me/research, and me/research-and-teacher to see how reflection-in-action works, what encourages/or prevents the development of reflectiveness, and what implications can be introduced for bridging the worlds of "theory" and "practice."

I believe that in the process of this study I will experience some productive serendipity, and be able to generate some ideas for the improvement of educational inquiry, for the possibility of dialogic pedagogy in higher education, and for the outlook on curriculum change in teacher education. However, the challenge lies in confronting the "Unresolved Bimodality" (a term borrowed from Willenbrock, 1991) in the "real world" and creating opportunities and alternatives for breaking through.

Overviewing the Becoming

In this chapter I have delineated the background attributes of this study. Also, I have touched on some of the embedded fundamental concerns and general research questions of this study. As I mentioned earlier, because this study is a co-operative play in two sites with great
differences, the more specific research questions in each site and the more precise significance of this study will be revealed as chapters unfold. In Chapter 2, through the review of curriculum and pedagogy literature, I suggest a pedagogical transformation of curriculum and propose a reshaped curricular discourse model. In Chapter 3, through the review of qualitative methodology literature, I trace out what has made a re-constituted co-operative inquiry possible and lay out the inquiry cycle and validation process of this study. In Chapter 4, I introduce a photographic approach to look into pedagogical practice and address my data analysis approaches toward documenting photographs, analyzing conversation, and writing narrative. Both Chapter 5 and Chapter 6 are data stories, written in a dramatic format. Chapter 5 tells my research findings in the landscape architecture design studio, and Chapter 6, in the strategic leadership workshop. In Chapter 7, through review of my researching experience, I disclose some tales in and on my inquiry actions with an attempt to seek the potential generativity out of my methodological learning. Finally, in summing up this study I put together, in Chapter 8, my hopes of having more thoughtful educational inquiry and pedagogical practices.
CHAPTER II

IN AND OUT OF THE PEDAGOGICAL MIRROR:
FROM BREAKING TO REFRAMING

As [she] gazed into the mirror [her] visage became first a blood red blob and then a death's head with slime dripping from it. [She] turned away from it in alarm. "[My dear,]" Shenkua said, "do not turn your head away. Those were just the beginning and the end of your life. Keep on looking, and you shall see everything that is and everything that may be. And when you have reached the highest point of rapture, the mirror will even show you things which cannot possibly be.

(Chin Nung, "All about Mirrors")

Look more closely! There might be a different world born in the mirror. Also, it is possible to suggest the interweaving of several different worlds by means of mirror reflections.

In Escher's lithograph "Magic Mirror" (1946), however, not only is there a reflected image but it is even suggested that the reflections come to life and continue their existence in another world...On the side of the mirror nearest to the viewer we can see, under the sloping stay, a tiny wing appearing together with its mirror image. As we look further along the mirror there gradually emerges a fully winged dog. Yet this is not all, for its mirror image is growing similarly; and as the real dog moves away from the mirror so does the mirror dog on the other side. On arrival at the edge of the glass this mirror image appears to take on reality. Each line of animals doubles itself twice as it moves forward and so these lines together make a regular space-filling in which white dogs develop into black ones, and vice versa. Both realities multiply and merge into the background.

(Bruno Ernst, "The Magic Mirror" p. 77)
With Escher, a graphic artist, optical illusion of his magic mirror is achieved by means of a representational logic that hardly anyone can evade. But, with us, educational practitioners, it is no longer a matter of downright optical illusion in the things that are being portrayed in our pedagogic mirror. The mirror image of pedagogical practice is far more complex than we can ever imagine. It is reflections of "educational notes"—what is the purpose of schooling, what curriculum, what instruction, what evaluation, and etc. It is set before us like some tangled skein. There are certainly "a lot" of actions taking place, but what they are is far from clear. As we look into the pedagogic mirror more closely, we will be surprised by what we see out of it—how thoughts, consciousness, values, feelings, actions, and purposes find their objectifications in languages, ideologies, curriculum organizations, classroom activities, and institutions.

In this chapter, through the review of literature, I will first examine different conceptions about knowledge in terms of their impact on educational praxis in general, and on curricular policies in particular. Then, I will discuss different thoughts about pedagogical practice with an attempt to break the traditional pedagogic image and to reframe a more thoughtful and reflexive one. By using rearticulated metaphors, I intend to introduce and to encourage an integrated conception— a transformation of
relations—of curriculum and pedagogy. Finally, I will propose a reshaped curricular discourse model to help explore, in this study, the dialogical, reciprocal relationships among teacher, student, content, and context.

Into Knowledge Conceptions and Educational Praxis

Analyzing the way that conceptions of knowledge have influenced educational thought and practices, some categories of epistemology, e.g., realism, idealism, experimentalism (see Schubert, 1986), may help us inspect the foundations for different approaches to curriculum and instruction. However, most conventional approaches of deriving educational implications from traditional epistemological "isms" are not really educationally illuminating. Even some current flushing approaches toward analyzing knowledge and human interest, e.g., the positivistic/technical, interpretive/practical, and critical/emancipatory approaches (see Bredo & Feinberg, 1982; Grundy, 1987; Schubert, 1986; Walker & Soltis, 1986; Cherryholmes, 1988; McCutcheon & Jung, 1990; Guba, 1991), may carry no practical educational implications if they are not confronted honestly within the context of educational issues and controversies.

What knowledge is most worthy of transmission? Where is it to be found? How is it to be communicated and
constructed? How do we identify and determine the relative import of domains of knowledge which lie neglected outside the traditional disciplines and subjects? How can curriculum be organized to reflect the interrelatedness of social-constructed, and culture-based reality? Consider, for example, that educational/curriculum ideologies embedded with diverse views about knowledge as religious orthodoxy, rational humanism, progressivism, critical theory, reconceptualism, and cognitive pluralism all appear to be influential in the deliberation about what curriculum should become and what pedagogy should be (Eisner, 1992). It is quite important to discern, though it is somewhat difficult, the alleged link between fundamental ontological or epistemological positions and curricular or pedagogical policies. In order to grasp the pedagogical reflections of knowledge conceptions, I attempt, in this section, to identify different epistemological views behind educational praxis by looking into traditional framing and mapping of knowledge. Also, I will introduce the social constructivist view of knowledge and discuss the political concerns about knowledge production from the new sociologists and the educational left.

**Educational Traditions and Knowledge**

According to Schrag’s analysis, there are six educational traditions of ways of knowing: apprenticeship,
philosophical, rhetorical, scientific, mystical, and psychotherapeutic traditions (1992, pp. 269-275). The principal mark of apprenticeship as a mode of education is its identification of knowledge with "know-how." A general feature of apprenticeship is its thoroughly utilitarian cast. It is normally a means of acquiring a livelihood from master practitioners. In the philosophical tradition, deriving from Socrates, Plato, and their successors, dialogue or dialectic provides pedagogical encounters and a particular mode of investigation. The most important assumption for this tradition about knowledge is that knowledge emerges from deep and sustained reflection on our belief and experiences. Developed side by side with the philosophical tradition, the rhetorical tradition emphasizes oratory and somewhat believes that worthy knowledge is found in conversing with those who speak well and in the habitual reading of the best stylists. Pursuing a different kind of knowledge from the abstract generalities that occupy the philosophers, this tradition asserts the centrality of human affairs—that people are creatures of flesh and blood, of passionate desire and aversion. The scientific tradition seeks fundamental truths about the world and has its dedication to the discovery of truth by means of experimentation. Knowledge, as this tradition views it, is ultimately "know-how," though know-how guided by theory. In this tradition, there is a strong commitment to the notion
that "the fruits of scientific discovery ought to issue in practical inventions that will improve the quality of life" (Schrag, Ibid., p. 273). In terms of psychotherapeutic and mystical traditions, though they have their impact on knowledge construction, according to Schrag, each has had no major influence on the schools, particularly in Western civilization. Basically, the psychotherapeutic tradition takes seriously the nonrational, passionate side of human existence and seeks to go beyond rigorous canons of logic to discover personal truths that reveal themselves in action. Finally, Schrag analyzes that knowledge in the mystical tradition is usually identified with enlightenment which is an intuitive comprehension beyond words and concepts. Through meditation, this tradition seeks a state of absolute identity in which the truth is realized in its inwardness, and a profound attunement with the universe may be engendered.

Though we may realize that such identification of complex phenomena risks the danger of oversimplification, it is useful to know different educational traditions that reflect distinctive orientations to knowledge. As Schrag points out, "education in any of [these] traditions entails more than acquisition of a specific corpus of knowledge or definite set of skills. It entails the assimilation of a worldview" (1992, p. 275). However, we need to be aware that these traditions are not necessarily parallel to the
conventional divisions of epistemology. For example, the scientific tradition in education is not quite the same as the empirist theory of knowledge in philosophy. We need also to be cautious about giving commitment only to one or another of these traditions. Since education is a social enterprise and a "people-making" endeavor, curriculum—an important instrument of reproducing social norms—should be more integrated; teaching—an influential conduct toward cultivating/nourishing human potentials—should be more thoughtful. More importantly, we need to get into the hidden dimensions of these traditions to understand in particular the driving forces that direct the mapping of knowledge—curriculum organization.

**Disciplines and the Mapping of Knowledge**

How do different "ways of knowing" link with "content knowing?" Forms of curriculum organization, as maps of territory represent different kinds of climatic or political features, impose or reflect various understandings about the nature and uses of knowledge. They are not uniform from place to place. They are tailored to meet special conditions and interests. In other words, assumptions about educational values and objectives (Hirst & Peters, 1975; Sockett, 1976; Walker, & Soltis, 1986), the content and structure of subject matters (Phenix, 1962; Schwab, 1975, 1978), and the concerns about learners and the requirements
of learning situations (Dewey, 1990) enter into curriculum organization accordingly. Basically, the arrangement of studies into subject matters is the oldest and the most widely accepted "mapping" of knowledge. Most subject designs are responsible for the traditional school courses in such familiar areas as history, mathematics, and English etc. The most well-known nature of this type of curriculum organization is that it serves as a convenient institutional means of systematizing knowledge for instruction, inventorying knowledge for academic credits, annexing new knowledge in the curriculum, and accommodating the curriculum to the growing specialization of knowledge (Tanner & Tanner, 1980).

Because of the assumption that certain concepts are essentially connected to certain disciplines, there have been different attempts made to identify or demarcate disciplines on the basis of different distinct "natures", for example, realms of meaning (Phenix, 1964) forms of knowledge (Hirst, 1972), and the conceptual and syntactical structures (Schwab, 1975). However, we need to realize that no demarcating effort can/should hold "disciplines" to arbitrary standard. As a matter of fact, any territorial divisions, as Schrag (1992) suggests, may distort the complex process resulting in the evolution, extinction of concepts, techniques, and modes of inquiry and expression. It is also true even for efforts like that of Habermas
(1971) to identify disciplines with particular cognitive interests.

Since curriculum organization, in part, is a study of what is valued and given priority, and what is disvalued and excluded (Eisner's notion of "null" curriculum, 1985), we need to know how to "select" and/or to "integrate" which versions of which disciplines to impart at a time when the number of versions of extant disciplines is constantly expanding. As Cherryholmes reminds, "the norm for curriculum...is not consensus, stability, and agreement but conflict, instability, and disagreement, because the process is one of construction followed by deconstruction by construction...of what students have an opportunity to learn" (1988, p. 149). The alternative mapping of knowledge should represent disciplines as incomplete, evolving, contested, collective enterprises.

Social Constructivist View of Knowledge

The traditional, foundationalist notion of knowledge has, until relatively recently, been taken as the only possible one. It has been considered to be a mental construct, and to be a universal truth, absolute and inevitable. Although the traditional, foundationalist theory of knowledge still underlies most current work in educational theory and practice and most other academic pursuits, in fact, there have been some ongoing efforts
devoted to reinterpretation of what we understand knowledge to be in relation to social science or education (e.g., Bernstein, 1971; Bloor, 1976; Geertz, 1983; Gergen, 1982; Young, 1971).

According to Bruffee (1986), the twentieth century challenge to the foundationalist theory of knowledge has been consolidated in the last quarter of a century by Thomas Kuhn and Richard Rorty following Dewey, Heidegger, Wittgenstein, and other early twentieth century philosophers and scientists. They believe that knowledge is not something that the mind discovers and refines, rather it is something generated, established, and maintained by a community of knowledge peers. In other words, they see knowledge as socially constructed and language plays a very important role in the dynamic and dialectic process of socialization (Berger & Luckmann, 1966, Bruffee, 1986). Thus, as Bruffee points out, knowledge actually draws its authority from the process of socially justifying belief, from the "normal discourse" of communities. Interestingly, any given community or society possesses its objective facticity and is at the same time built up by activity that expresses subjective meaning (Berger and Luckmann, 1966). Inquiring into this dual character, social constructivists begin with radical doubt in the taken-for-granted world. Because the process of understanding is the result of an active, cooperative enterprise of persons in relationship,
inquiry is invited into the historical and cultural bases of various forms of world construction (Gergen, 1985). And forms of negotiated understanding are of critical significance in social life, as they are integrally connected with many other activities in which people engage (Berger and Lukmann, 1966; Gergen, 1985). As Gergen points out, social constructivist views discourse about the world "not as a reflection or map of the world but as an artifact of communal interchange" (1985, p. 266).

Derived from this kind of "sociological awareness," people begin to realize that educational transactions involve more than interactions among teachers, students, and books. Rather, these interactions are actually taking place in institutional settings with distinctive characteristics and traditions, which cannot but influence student's knowledge construction and so forth. In consequence, people start to link social analysis to curriculum study and suggest changes in pedagogical attitudes and classroom practices (e.g., Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977; Bernstein, 1964, 1971; Young, 1971; Bruffee, 1984; van Manen, 1990).

Based on the social constructivist view of knowledge, it appears that it is important to encourage a more process-oriented pedagogy, e.g., collaborative learning (Bruffee, 1984), in which students participate in "making" knowledge rather than in the "passive" assimilation of "ready-made" knowledge. Also, it is important to be aware of how
language codes are used in curricula. With a special interest in sociology of language, Bernstein (1964) shows his concerns with the social class effects on the distribution of knowledge, and varying consequences of the institutionalization of elaborated codes. By pointing out the problem of the syntax of the discipline, Schwab (1975) reminds us that most statements of most disciplines take their most telling meanings, not from their dictionary sense nor from their sense in isolation, but from their context, their place in the syntax. More essentially, it is necessary to raise critical issues for inquiry in order to understand better how knowledge is socially organized and made available in curricula.

Knowledge, Politics, and Curriculum

Recent debates in epistemology, raising doubts about the traditional, functionalist ways of knowing in every field, have led many to search the hidden driving forces involved in the very creation of knowledge. As Foucault (1980) notes, every relation between forces is a power relation. Knowledge is created and transmitted through, to some extent, the exercise of power. We may say that knowledge production/construction involves social processes in which political and curricular issues are closely intertwined.
Influenced by Bourdieu and Passeron (1977), Bernstein (1964, 1971) in France, and Young (1971) in England, the study of the connections between the stratification of knowledge in society and school curricula has been the important theme of the new sociology of education, or more general the "educational left." Basically, the new sociologists and educational left seek to explain the sources of continuing social inequality. They look at the way knowledge itself becomes stratified and to the processes whereby curriculum selection, conceptualization, and organization tend to favor those who already control the resources of the society. For example, Bourdieu and Passeron (1977), in analyzing a particular system of pedagogic action in France, focus their study on the diverse ways in which cultural reproduction contributes to maintaining the power of dominant groups. Young (1971) examines the structural dimension of the social organization of educational knowledge, the "stratification of knowledge," and the ways in which variations in the stratification of knowledge may be expressed by educators. Bernstein (1971) explores the concept of boundary through analyzing educational codes to show both the power and control components in the structuring of transmitted educational knowledge. Apple (1990) and Giroux and McLaren (1989), the contemporary exponents of this view in the United States curriculum field, argue that the cultural, political
dimensions of pedagogy are so powerful that they constitute the hidden ideological hegemony embedded in curriculum decisions.

The new sociologists and the educational left vocally show their distaste for social stratification and give their commitment to a more egalitarian society. When critiquing curricular proposals emanating from other sources, they are fond of asking: Whose knowledge is it? Whose interest does it serve? But, when it comes to providing models or blueprints of egalitarian curricula, most of them show an "uncharacteristic reticence" (Schrag, 1992). As Eisner (1992) indicates, the major intellectual disposition of the left is critical—in the negative sense. The left is more interested in displaying the shortcomings—raising consciousness, they say—than providing aspiring models. What is needed for them is to move from text to action, to the reshaping of pedagogical practice.

The four themes about knowledge conceptions in relation to educational praxis I have discussed above carry forward not a single line of argument. They are pertinent to central curricular issues, including the selection, conceptualization, and organization of content, and the undergirded aspirations as well as ideologies of the selection/choice. We as educational practitioners can make use of what different views have to offer without allowing our agendas to be set or fossilized by any single view. As
the challenges become more sophisticated in educational praxis, we also need to have some "pedagogical awareness" to understand how pedagogical practices may imply curricular assumptions and consequences.

Out of Pedagogical Discordance

*Good & Brophy:* Teachers who possess both action system knowledge and subject matter knowledge will be more effective than teachers who are deficient in one of these area (1987, p. 3).

*van Manen:* All education is deeply normative, and precisely because of this ethical ground our pedagogical practice can be thoughtful and reflective (1991, p. xii).

*Giroux:* Students need to be introduced to a language of empowerment and radical ethics that permits them to think about how community life should be constructed around a project of possibility. (1988, pp. 257-258).

These quotes represent the unique tones of different demarcated bodies of pedagogic thoughts. They are used to introduce this section which is intended to discuss three major pedagogical orientations/concerns that I categorize as pedagogy of effectiveness, of thoughtfulness, and of possibility.

A Pedagogy of Effectiveness

Pedagogical effectiveness, according to Whitson (1988), depends on a developing ability to learn, which is essentially a semiotic competence for the reconstructive
understanding of things that are different from the learner's prior knowledge and experience. Conventionally, conceptions of pedagogical effectiveness have been, however, constructed around a set of psychological processes—learning, memory, motivation, rehearsal, reinforcement. It is believed that there are a set of defined techniques or treatments, e.g., classroom management skills, that teachers can use to improve their teaching and to help students make optimal progress (see Hunter, 1982; Gagne, 1985; Good & Brophy, 1987). Thus, most classroom studies of pedagogical effectiveness are "process-effect" design, focused on the correlation between teacher "behavior" and student "achievement." Also, the positivistic bias is clearly manifested in the programs for "effective teaching" and "mastery learning."

Ironically, regardless of what a teacher does, in the "measures of student outcomes," the "content variables" are commonly found to be robust for achieving the conventional pedagogical goal of "effectiveness" (see Brophy & Good, 1986). What is at issue here is not the specific techniques recommended by Hunter, Gagne, or Good and Brophy. The problem is the underlying positivist assumption that effective learning occurs through communication in which positive identities of "messages" and "receivers" are closed off from the risks of confusing self-reinterpretation. We need to recognize that ideas or messages cannot be
understood without "literacy founded on the more basic competence developed from reflective experience with dialogical transgredience and the differentiation of pragmatic stances as determinants of verbal meaning" (Whitson, 1988, p. 312). From a dialogical perspective, the "effective" pedagogical practices must not be designed to prevent the student from encountering controversial expressions which might challenge the student's beliefs and values. As Bruner (1986) says,

if [a student] fails to develop any sense of... reflective intervention in the knowledge he encounters, the young person will be operating continually from the outside in--knowledge will control and guide him [sic]. If he succeeds in developing such a sense, he will control and select knowledge as needed. If he develops a sense of self that is premised on his ability to penetrate knowledge for his own uses, and if he can share and negotiate the result of his penetrations, then he becomes a member of the culture-creating community (p. 132).

A Pedagogy of Thoughtfulness

As a technological (positivist) approach to pedagogy assumes that teaching can be improved by means of generalizations and general techniques, a phenomenological approach recognizes that pedagogy needs to turn back to the world of experience. As van Manen (1991) proclaims, "experience can open up understanding that restores a sense of embodied knowing" (p. 9). For van Manen, to define pedagogy is to identify ways of being in concrete situations. Pedagogy should refer to a relationship of
practical actions between the parent and the child (or the teacher and the student). Therefore, he suggests a pedagogy that stands in a relationship of thoughtfulness and openness to students/children rather than being governed by traditional beliefs, discarded values, old rules, and fixed impositions (van Manen, Ibid).

Since pedagogical thoughtfulness is a multifaceted and complex mindfulness toward students/children, it requires "tact" that goes beyond the technical strategies. It is a matter of "doing" that involves "an interpretive intelligence, a practical moral intuitiveness, a sensitivity toward the [student’s] subjectivity, and an improvisational resoluteness in dealing with [students]" (J. G. Henderson’s comment, in van Manen, 1991). In order to understand the phenomena of pedagogy fully, van Manen synthesizes contributions from the theoretical fields of phenomenology, hermeneutics, and semiotics. He advocates that pedagogy requires a phenomenological sensitivity to lived experience ([student’s] realities and lifeworlds). Pedagogy requires a hermeneutic ability to make interpretive sense of the phenomena of the lifeworld in order to see the pedagogic significance of situations and relations of living with [students]. And pedagogy requires a way with language in order to allow the research process of textual reflection to contribute to one’s pedagogic thoughtfulness and tact (1990, p. 2).

Though the major themes in van Manen’s work include the interconnection between theory and research, the place of tact in pedagogy, and the place of the child/student in pedagogy, we cannot find the content dimensions in his
conceptions of pedagogy. The meaning of van Manen’s phenomenological "pedagogy of thoughtfulness," according to Brown (1992), is however derived from its own ontological and anthropological nature, not from philosophy, politics, or culture. It may help act tactfully in "pedagogic situations" but may not be able to renew accordingly in a bigger socio-economic and socio-cultural world that is constantly changing around us. Also, most studies in pedagogy of thoughtfulness, for example van Manen’s work (1988, 1990, 1991) or Dewey’s advocacy (1990), are limited to the articulation of the young child’s voice as "the voice of the student." As Brown (1992) points out, there is a need of phenomenological research that describes pedagogy in the context of older students, for example, secondary, college, vocational, professional, and so forth.

A Pedagogy of Possibility

Starting with the struggle for "voice," critical pedagogy, proposed by the educational left, is a form that claims the experience of lived "difference" and the knowledge of socio-cultural alternatives as agendas for discussion and as central resources for a pedagogy of possibility (Giroux & Simon, 1988) or a pedagogy of mobilization (Wexler, 1988). Most critical pedagogical advocates suggest that popular culture, local knowledge, lived experience, should be viewed as significant
pedagogical terrains that raise important questions regarding such issues as the relevance of everyday life, the importance of student voice, the significance of meaning and pleasure in the learning process, and the relationship between knowledge and power in the curriculum (see Giroux, 1988a, 1988b, 1988c; Giroux & Simon, 1988; Wexler, 1988; Giroux & McLaren, 1989; McLaren, 1988; Dutton, 1991; Walsh, 1991). Simon expresses the critical pedagogy position very well. He says,

an education that empowers for possibility must raise questions of how we can work for the reconstruction of social imagination in the service of human freedom. What notions of knowing and what forms of learning will support this? I think the project of possibility requires an education rooted in a view of human freedom as the understanding of necessity and the transformation of necessity....Teaching and learning must be linked to the goal of educating students to take risks, to struggle with on-going relations of power, to critically appropriate forms of knowledge that exist outside of their immediate experience, and to envisage versions of a world which...is "not-yet"—in order to be able to alter the grounds on which life is lived (1987, in Giroux, 1988b, p. 258).

Critical pedagogy advocates believe that curriculum in the most fundamental sense is a battleground over whose forms of knowledge, history, visions, language, culture, and authority will prevail as a legitimate object of learning and analysis. Based on the emancipatory literacy model demonstrated by Freire (1970), Giroux suggests that teachers as intellectuals should help provide students with the opportunity to interrogate different languages or ideological discourses as they are developed in an
assortment of text and curriculum materials (Giroux, 1988b). In short, a pedagogy of possibility is ideally a pedagogy, as Giroux proclaims, "which links schooling to the imperatives of democracy, views teachers as engaged and transformative intellectuals, and makes the notion of democratic difference central to the organization of curriculum and the development of classroom practice" (1988c, p. 165).

Indeed, most ideas of the contemporary critical pedagogy advocates have been insightful. But, I doubt their work has exceeded by much what has already been discussed or done by the earlier "radical" or "progressive" advocates, such as Freire (1970), Bourdieu and Passeron (1977), Bernstein (1971), or even Dewey (1938, 1944, 1980). Also, it appears that they speak essentially to intellectuals. As Eisner has observed (1992), the debate of educational change has mainly been limited to scholars rather than to the reshaping of practice. I think Eisner's suggestion is quite fair that "if their material were less strident, more hopeful, more generous, and more concretely constructive with respect to options, it would be much more likely to influence practice" (Ibid, p. 316).

Each of the above pedagogical orientations—effectiveness, thoughtfulness, and possibility—has its own outstanding tone. For example, the pedagogy of effectiveness emphasizes teacher knowledge and teaching
strategies as important factors for effective teaching and learning. The pedagogy of thoughtfulness focuses on hermeneutic phenomenological understanding as the key for action sensitive teaching. And the pedagogy of possibility highlights the importance of the opportunity for students to engage the multiple references that constitute different cultural codes, experiences, and languages.

The pitch of each tone may be high or may be low. The tempo may be fast or slow. As educational practitioners, the task for us is not to decide which one we shall get rid of, but to decide how to grasp the tonality of each to compose a nice piece of pedagogical symphony based on our understanding of the educational notes. There may be notes representing conflicts over values or uncommensurables over focuses that may lead to discordance of pedagogic reality. But, that is where the challenge lies. Personally, I believe if there is anything that will ruin our pedagogic work, it would be the "arbitrariness"—by which I mean narrow-minded, one-dimension vision—embedded in our pedagogic thought. As in performing a dialogical concerto, we should be able to hear different sounds and make them enhance one another (not only voices between the teacher or the student, but voices between different paradigmatic talks as well). With listening ears, our pedagogic work will then be a reciprocal, open-minded interplay of rhapsody, instead of "noise-making". In order to let flow our pedagogic work
productively and beautifully, we need to let grow our pedagogic knowledge and creativity in discursive practice continuously. In other words, we need to learn to value the "creative tension" associated with pedagogic thoughts grounded in conflicting values and uncommensurable focuses. Also, we need to take the tension as a chance to expand our horizons of pedagogical practice outward in time and space.

Toward a Pedagogical Transformation of Curriculum

The reframing effort toward a pedagogical transformation of curriculum—an integrated conception of curriculum and pedagogy—is, in effect, a struggle for the change of concepts, metaphors, types of enunciation, strategic choices, rules, and most importantly the change of "discursive formation" (Foucault, 1972) to determine educational praxis. According to Shulman (1987), pedagogical transformation requires combining processes of (1) preparation and interpretation of the given text materials, (2) representation of the ideas in the form of new analogies, metaphors, (3) instructional selections from teaching methods and models, (4) adaptation of different representations to the general characteristics of the students to be taught, and (5) tailoring the adaptations to the specific students in the classroom. Instead of discussing different forms of transformation—aspects of the
process wherein one moves from personal comprehension to preparing for the comprehension of others, I explore, in this section, new discursive formations/different ways of thinking about pedagogic reality. However, we have to realize that

to say that one discursive formation [of pedagogic reality] is substituted for another is not to say that a whole [pedagogic] world of absolutely new objects, enunciations, concepts, and theoretical choices emerges fully armed and fully organized in a text that will place that [pedagogic] world once and for all; it is to say that a general transformation of relations has occurred, but that it does not necessarily alter all the elements; it is to say that statements are governed by new [understanding] of formation, it is not to say that all objects or concepts, all enunciations or all theoretical choices disappear (Foucault, 1972, p. 173).

Going through the process of surfing curriculum and pedagogy literatures, zeroing in on what speaks to me, and adding my own twist, I introduce here five rearticulated metaphors to show from different aspects how the conception of curriculum and pedagogy can and should be an integrated, transformed one. These metaphors are curriculum as living text, teacher as curriculum potential, classroom as interpretive community, aesthetic value as transformational premise, and curriculum deliberation as practicum. By advocating that we should take a new look at pedagogic reality, I hope we may appreciate the often ignored territories and frontiers that are important for meaningful, artful dialogical curricular discourses.
Curriculum as Living Text

The history of curriculum is a history of shifting perspectives and definitions. Most of the definitions of curriculum can be placed on such a continuum that at one extreme limits curriculum to the content of what is taught, and at the other extreme seems to include the whole of educational praxis. Most curriculum issues, as I indicated earlier, have been hotly debated around the priorities of the traditions of knowledge, the learner, and the communal-social context. No matter what orientation, what ideology, what argument, one thing people cannot deny is that curriculum, indeed, inevitably involves "literary text events" (Golden, 1989) in which participants create meaning in context.

In this sense, curriculum should be viewed as more than product--the published texts and teachers' manuals. The real curriculum is that experienced in classrooms. It should be viewed as process--"living text" that encompasses how teachers and students make sense of and to one another, and the language they use to make sense of texts and their subject-matter content. According to Golden (1989), understanding the text in terms of form and content, genre, and the channel (oral, written, graphic, etc.) in which it occurs helps to explore the nature of the language the student and the teacher (as reader and listener) encounter. Knowing the goals of the participants, the setting in which
the text event occurs, and the norms governing the interaction/interpretation of the text helps to grasp how the student/teacher may be evoked by the text. Based on a growing understanding of the social and academic importance of language use patterns in the classroom and the methods of discourse analysis, Lemke (1989) explores making text "talk" an essential teaching-learning process in the classroom. He believes that only through giving text a "voice," not just audible but also fully meaningful, can we truly bring the text to life. As Walker (1990) says, until the curriculum comes to life in the classroom, it remains only a plan, and unless it reaches the students there, it makes no difference in what they learn.

Moreover, in discussing what curriculum can bring to reading, Grumet (1988) senses that the text is a new territory for explorations with students. Recent studies of curriculum as phenomenological and deconstructed texts has presented the "multivocality," multiperspective," and "lived" aspects of textbooks and of classrooms (see Pinar & Reynolds, 1992). Instead of telling authoritative stories of others, to understand and to "do" curriculum as living text is to, as Pinar and Reynolds talk about deconstructing texts, "to tell stories that never end, stories in which the listener, the 'narratee,' may become a character or indeed the narrator, in which all structure is provisional,
momentary, a collection of twinkling stars in a firmament of flux" (Ibid., p. 7).

Teacher as Curriculum Potential

The notion of "curriculum potential," introduced by Ben-Peretz (1990), implies that more comprehensive curriculum materials may yield a richer array of possible uses. Limited materials may also be used to create exciting and motivating experiences. But, more than perceiving "curriculum materials as embodiments of potential" (Ben-Peretz, Ibid), I see "teacher" as embodiment of curriculum potential. As Ben-Peretz says in her own book, The Teacher-Curriculum Encounter: Freeing Teachers from the Tyranny of Texts,

the "reading" of curriculum potential depends not only on the inherent qualities of the materials, but also, to a large extent, on teachers' interpretive abilities and on their professional imagination (Ibid., pp. 47-48).

Indeed, curriculum materials only offer starting points. The scope, variety, and richness of the curriculum potential is determined by teachers' personal experiences, their practical, and pedagogical content knowledge. A growing body of literature (e.g., Shulman, 1986; Clark & Peterson, 1986; Clandinin, 1986; Calderhead, 1984; Ben-Peretz, 1990; Ross, Cornett & McCutcheon, 1992) has started to explore the complexity of teaching, the nature of teachers' thinking and planning, the development of teacher
personal theorizing, and the importance of teacher practical knowledge. Obviously, teachers’ actions, involving the participation of literary text events and the creation of complementary curricular elements, are reflections of their theories. They create their own versions of curricular ideas and activities.

Because the constitutive elements of curriculum praxis are action and reflection (Grundy 1989), curriculum is not simply a one-instance, temporary activity, nor a set of plans to be implemented. Rather, it is constituted through an active process in which planning, acting and evaluating are all reciprocally related and integrated into the praxis. Furthermore, the character of curriculum potential is dialogical not monological. It takes place and operates in the real world—the social and cultural world—of interaction. It also assumes a process of meaning-making which recognizes meaning as a social construction. This means that the notion of curriculum potential relies upon the reciprocal relationships among teacher, student, content, and context whereby theory and practice inform each other and are mutually interdependent.

Though teaching is often planned, it is actually adaptive, reflective and reactive. As Shulman points out, teaching, is "interactive, swift, episodic and spontaneous" (in Ben-Peretz, 1990, p. vii). Recently, naturalistic-qualitative-action research has become widely available,
encouraging practitioners to use practice-centered inquiry (Sanders and McCutcheon, 1986) as a tool for developing curriculum praxis. Since schooling is for "secondary socialization" (Berger & Luckmann, 1966), the classroom teacher, as a central agent in a dialectical community of learning, has the most unique set of responsibilities in the process of knowledge construction in the classroom. In order to keep classroom experiences as vital, creative and adaptive processes, it is important to remember the teacher as curriculum potential. Teacher’s personal practical knowledge and personal theorizing should be encouraged and honored (Clandinin, 1986; Sanders & McCutcheon, 1986; Ross, Cornett & McCutcheon, 1992).

Classroom as Interpretive Community

If teaching is understood as a curriculum process (Doyle, 1992), classrooms can be viewed as contexts in which teachers and students encounter interpretive events, that is, occasions in which they act/react with respect to different "texts." Teachers interpret curriculum materials, content knowledge, into learning experiences to achieve one or more effects on students (Ben-Peretz, 1990). As Doyle describes, "teachers frame their works during enactment in classroom situations by guiding students through the texts, shaping the interpretations that are allowed on the floor, and, importantly, by creating tasks that students are to
accomplish with respect to these texts" (1992, p. 508). At the same time, students contribute to the interpretive events as they react to teachers' enactments. The interpretive events in the classroom are, therefore, dynamic processes in which content knowledge is produced and transformed continuously through the struggle with meaning.

The main thrust of teachers' interpretive actions in the classroom is the transformation of curriculum materials, which generally present content knowledge, into "forms that are pedagogically powerful and yet adaptive to the variations in ability and background presented by the students" (Shulman, 1987, p. 15). According to Ben-Peretz (1990), there are subjective and objective modes of curriculum interpretation. Subjective interpretations may be "impressionistic and intuitive," guided by implicit criteria and by stated or unstated assumptions. A lot of this type of interpretations are based on personal knowledge and experiences. Objective interpretations are guided by "predetermined categories of analysis" which stem from sources other than the personal knowledge and experience. Thus, the use of structured schemes of curriculum analysis is quite often a prerequisite for objective interpretation.

In terms of students' interpretation, reader-response critics, very much influenced by Piaget's epistemology, contend that the meaning of a text lies with the reader, thus meaning in the classroom lies with the student (Doyle,
1992; Grumet, 1988). Acknowledging the classroom as an interpretive community of norms, expectations, and preferences that readers share, we may realize that the passages that lead teachers and students into and out of texts are forms of intentionality that they bring to the pedagogic world. Since interpretations, acts of meaning-making, can be acts that transform the text (written, oral, and/or behavioral texts), the world (classroom and/or societal context), and the interpreters (students and/or teachers), it is important to study the analysis of the codes and conventions that make curricular language intelligible.

Because openness to interpretation allows meaning to be "provisional, lively, fluttering," in designing curriculum it is important to provide "a stage where the possible worlds that the text points to can be identified and experienced as good places for grazing" (Grumet, 1988, p. 471). Because interpretive events operate within the uniquely human endeavor of conversation/dialogue, the "giving and receiving of the word at the frontiers of each other's being" (Huebner, 1975, p. 229), in planning classroom activities it is important to allow some room for the unformed to emerge into new awareness and the interchange to move both speaker and listener to new heights of being. It is quite true that "the educational activity
is life—and life's meanings are witnessed and lived in the classroom" (Huebner, Ibid., p. 228).

**Aesthetic Value as Transformational Premise**

Since education is the possibility of life, it can have beauty. However, the aesthetic valuing of pedagogical practice is often completely ignored. The possible vitality and significance of classroom life, symbolized by the excitement, fervor, and community of learning, are rarely found. In his analysis of curricular language and classroom meanings, Huebner (1975) points out that the insignificance and inferior quality of much teaching today may be a result of attempts to maximize only the technical and political and perhaps scientific values without adequate attention to the aesthetic and ethical values. Based on the notion that aesthetic values are that of symbolic meaning, that of psychical distance, and that of wholeness and design, Huebner suggests that pedagogical practice, like an art object, can be/needs to be valued in terms of its sense of wholeness, of balance, of design and of integrity, and its sense of peace or contentment, in addition, of truth as life is unveiled through the acting and speaking of the participants (teachers and students).

When pedagogical practice is valued from the aesthetic point of view, the intent throughout is then not a search for preconceived ends but a search for "imaginative
creation" (Rugg, in Rosario, 1988). Knowledge has then more than power; it has beauty (Huebner, 1975). As an aesthetic form, knowledge in pedagogical practice becomes symbolic of participants' meaning and of their discovered truths. Engaging in the creative evolution of new forms, the utterances and acts of teacher and student are targets of sympathetic but critical concerns. In other words, teacher and students, through their conversations, "engage in the mutual criticism of each other's orderings, and thus contribute to the continued transcendence of form over chaos" (Huebner, Ibid, p. 235). To some extent, to encourage an aesthetic sense in teaching and learning is to make the classroom a place where the purity and beauty of knowledge may be enjoyed for itself. Further, the teacher and the student can be freed to use knowledge to enlarge their own sensitivities to the world, and to realize what they could be.

To make the aesthetic value meaningful and practical rather than an empty category of experience, Broudy (1988) discusses the relation of images to language, to thought, and to feeling to show that aesthetic literacy is as basic as linguistic literacy. Rosario (1988) reviews Harold Rugg's view of aesthetics in relation to knowledge acquisition and suggests implications, derived from Rugg's imaginative creation model, for both theoretical and programmatic changes in curriculum. Also, jagodzinski
(1992) characterizes "curriculum as felt through layers of aesthetically embodied skin" through a radical restructuring of the curriculum.

Indeed, "reality is discursive" (Pinar & Reynolds, 1992); we learn, think, reflect, and so forth, through image constructing, reconstructing and/or deconstructing. Clandinin (1986) argues that images, constructed with moral, emotional, personal private and educational professional dimensions, are "coalescences" of an individual's experience. They are dynamic symbolic systems "capable of organizing and transforming perceptual information" (Paivio, in Ibid., p. 17), and they are expressed verbally and/or in action. Broudy (1988) in turn, indicates that images may come from actual sensory experience or by the exercise of the imagination. However, we seldom consciously notice that our thought, action, and feeling, at the moment of happening, are mostly guided or evoked by internal mental imagery, and external aesthetic clues, not by logical reasoning. It is not surprising that the intimate connection between imagination and the intellectual has quite often been overlooked and neglected. Since imagination is the source of created and articulated meaning in all areas of knowledge (Rugg, in Rosario, 1988), in pedagogical transformation of curriculum, knowledge must be organized in such a way that "the imaginative origins and
aesthetic of all knowledge are accentuated" (Rosario, Ibid., p. 353).

To change the traditional pedagogical practice and curricular language, as Huebner (1975) suggests, we must free ourselves from our self-confining schemata, in order that we may "listen anew" to the world pounding against our intellectual barriers. Pedagogical transformation of curriculum is somewhat like an aesthetic creation. The aesthetic frontier can provide us with a context wherein to proceed with a playful but serious artistic experience. As Rugg describes,

There is, first of all, that urge to create—hazy, intangible, it may manifest itself as a vague restlessness. There is, second the illuminating flash of insight which suddenly reveals to the artist a conception, perhaps indefinite, of the meaning toward which he is groping. There is, third, the mastery of the necessary techniques. And there is, fourth, a long grueling enterprise of the integrative process itself—the tenacious grip on application of the necessary techniques in shaping and reshaping the work as it develops; the successive stages of ruthless self-criticism; the rigorous sense of dissatisfaction with the work as it progresses; the insistence upon unsparing exactitude, precision; the constant polishing and changing (quoted in Rosario, 1988, p. 345).

Curriculum Deliberation as Practicum

Among the notions central to curriculum thought is the principle of rational deliberation as the key to renewed pedagogical practice. According to McCutcheon (in press), deliberation is a social enterprise and the central process of curriculum decision-making. In her study, she points out
that interest and conflict are two important characteristic elements that "interact to form the fuel for deliberation and drive its process" (p. 5). Walker (1990) suggests that curriculum decisions are multi-valued and collective choices, and curriculum deliberations are more nearly applied arts and humanities than applied human or behavioral sciences. With the notion that knowledge from different worldviews should all be honored, the constructivist view of knowledge has important implications for curriculum decisions generally, and in particular, for the way teachers exercise their own deliberative acts as humanists. The resources represented by the social constructivist view also seem promising in terms of teacher's professional knowledge in curriculum decision making (Sanders and McCutcheon, 1986).

Basically, constructivist inquiry is centered around "here" and "now" practical problems (Berger and Luckmann, 1966). Therefore, the social constructivist view is actually the major platform of curriculum deliberation. Built upon Schwab's notion of "the practical, a language for curriculum," Knitter (1985) establishes his point that critical pluralism and the associated arts of the eclectic are essential to curricular deliberation. He believes that curriculum deliberation can be enriched by the examination of problematic situations from a variety of perspectives, and the openness to differences in viewpoint is the key
constructive factor to deliberation. If we look into Schwab's theory of the practical arts (1969), it is not difficult at all to unveil the dynamic, constructive character of deliberation. By addressing the anticipatory generation of alternatives, Schwab claims:

Intimate knowledge of the existing state of affairs, early identification of problem situations, and effective formulation of problems are necessary to effective practical decision but not sufficient. It requires also that there be available to practical deliberation the greatest possible number and fresh diversity of alternative solutions to the problem (p. 602).

However, the conditions under which deliberation occurs are set by the social and institutional context, and the social and institutional context typically determine membership on the deliberative body, its change, its authority, and the resources at its command. According to Walker, "the problem for those who would achieve fuller and fairer deliberation is to extend, deepen, and correct these individual images and to reconcile conflicts among them to achieve a sufficiently common basis for judgment and action" (1990, p. 200). Based on the notion that interest is the fuel of deliberation and conflict the engine that drives the process of deliberation (McCutcheon, in press), I see curriculum deliberation as practicum that requires an "executive mind" to balance observation, strategy, and passion in artistic, timely, responsible, effective actions (Torbert, 1983).
Schon (1987) suggests that a reflective practicum can become a first step toward a new design for teaching and learning as well as remaking the curriculum. He believes that the development of a reflective practicum can join with new forms of research on practice, and education for it, to take on a momentum of its own. Generally, the classic and paradigmatic formulation of rational deliberation provided in Dewey’s *How We Think* (1933), is believed to be constitutive of reflective thought in dealing with complex problems and situations. There are five phases:

1. suggestions, in which the mind leaps forward to a possible solution; 
2. an intellectualization of the difficulty or perplexity that has been felt (directly experienced) into a problem to be solved, a question for which the answer must be sought; 
3. the use of one suggestion after another as a leading idea, or hypothesis, to initiate and guide observation and other operations in collection of factual material; 
4. the mental elaboration of the idea or supposition as an idea or supposition (reasoning, in the sense in which reasoning is a part, not the whole, of inference); and 
5. testing the hypothesis by overt or imaginative action (p. 107).

However, according to Rugg (in Rosario, 1988), Dewey’s formulation is overly "calculative" that it seems to call for a manipulation of situations or components requiring of the individual complete conscious control. There is a "meditative" quality that is not present in Dewey’s description of problem-solving. In Rugg’s view there is form of thought that may be said to involve more than mere calculation. Both science (thinker) and art (artist), as processes of acquiring and expressing meaning, are quite
often pervaded by intensity bordering on mediation. In his discussion of how we come to know, Rugg highlights the functions of metaphor and symbolic transformation to help understanding of the generation and apprehension of meaning. According to Rosario (Ibid.), the reflective use of Rugg's suggestions in curriculum discourse could be instrumental in reframing the essential features of deliberation process. By applying Rugg's ideas we might be able to conceptualize curriculum activity in terms of a three-stage process involving "essentially discovery of a problem and baffled struggle, transliminality and symbolic transformation" (p. 354).

It is important to note that deliberation is something teachers do, not something teachers talk about. In terms of "doing-deliberation" by building and using problem-centered groups, the literature has generally supported teacher participation on both philosophical and pragmatic levels. Since conflicts of interest are inevitable, practitioners need to learn how to handle them constructively. As Walker (1990) reminds, those who would master the arts of deliberation must develop sensitivity to the moral and legal rights and obligations of all affected by a decision and learn to arrange deliberation in ways that consider the particular human and institutional context without undue threat to those involved. In other words, they, like executives, need to have "a normative, synthetic,
theoretical perspective that reveals hidden complementaries among issues," and need to "establish priorities, provide a meaningful frame for activities, foresee and to respond in a measured fashion to the otherwise unexpected" (Torbert, 1983, p. 92).

As Eisner says, curriculum and teaching reside at the center of education. The central message of this section is that curriculum and teaching are the two major pedagogical resources. The study of these two must be grounded much more deeply than it has been in the curricular events that students and teachers jointly construct in classroom settings. The metaphors of curriculum as living text, teacher as curriculum potential, and the classroom as interpretive community have shown the ways in which interpretations of students and teachers contribute to and are shaped by their participation in the classroom events. The metaphor of aesthetic value as transformational premise has encouraged imaginative, aesthetic creation in doing pedagogical transformation of curriculum. Finally, based upon the notion that conflicts among interests are inevitable in curriculum decision making, the metaphor of curriculum deliberation as practicum has discussed that doing curriculum requires the cultivation of "calculative" work (strategy) as well as "meditative" work (intuition). All these have reformulated notions of curricular/pedagogic reality in one way or the other. Realizing the nature of
pedagogical transformed curriculum for both teachers and students at the classroom-floor level, we need to study further the different domains of classroom life, especially the dynamic, dialogic social relationships in the classroom. It is necessary, therefore, to propose creating "commonplaces" for curricular discourse.

Creating Commonplaces for Curricular Discourse

Since curriculum is praxis, it is possible and necessary to study the curriculum in motion as well as to understand better the structures and processes by which knowledge is experienced and constructed by teachers and students in classroom settings. Since a curriculum design usually reflects sources, major mediators, external influences, and designers' general philosophical/theoretical orientations, primary importance should be placed on situationally-unique interactions among teachers, learners, learning resources, and environment, not on the technique or technology for the ordering of human thought for the purpose of transmitting knowledge to others as shown in previous educational traditions. If we want to decide and act with greater understanding in a particular situation for curriculum decisions, we must develop insight by interacting with that situation. According to Schwab (1978), we need to grasp four bodies of knowledge—teachers, learners, subject
matter, and milieu—called as curriculum "commonplaces." To represent the "whole" plurality of educational inquiries, I borrow Schwab's categories of commonplaces, using in a different sense, to develop a three-dimension curricular discourse model (see Figure 2.1), as opposed to Walker's two-dimension model (Walker, 1990, p. 136). It is a model emphasizing the reciprocal communicative relationships among/within domains in curricular discourse. Therefore, my use of Schwab's commonplaces exceeds what he originally meant in many ways.

Figure 2.1: Curriculum Discourse Model
Each domain is represented by a sphere. These domains are (a) teacher, (b) student, (c) content, and (d) context. Together, they form a very dynamic, but solid "Curricular Discourse Realm." As the double-headed arrows between each constituent in the model indicate, there is a reciprocal relationship between each domain. The spheres of student, content, and context form a triangular base to serve as the platform for curricular discourse events. Three triangular faces meet at the top sphere of teacher, showing that teachers are thinking, deliberative agents, oriented toward pedagogical action, concerning the other three fundamental domains. All the little dotted elements inside the realm represents the interactive messages going back and forth between domains as well as within each domain. Teacher's relationships with other domains form three triangular faces that shape the curricular discourse realm and help people see the different facets of pedagogical reality. I will now briefly discuss the role of each elements in the construction of curricular discourse realm.

Teacher. Five major categories are encompassed within the teacher domain: (1) formative experience (e.g., social class, age, and gender), (2) educational/training experience (e.g., university attended, training program feature, or practice), (3) professional experience, (4) personality traits, (5) cognitive abilities and psychomotor skills, and
(6) personal beliefs and motivation in teaching. These categories reflect my conceptualization of all that which constitutes the teacher instead of categorization derived from empirical studies. Placing the teacher sphere on the top doesn't mean that curriculum should be teacher centered. Rather, the model shows that the teacher plays a leading role in curricular discourse--communicative teaching-learning events. As Clandinin (1986) points out, teachers should be seen as assuming a position of autonomy over instructional acts.

Indeed, teachers are the most significant human factors in the operation of curricular discourse. Teachers need to be well equipped to be able to act as an expert in helping students construct knowledge, to be able to build up a trusting relationship with students for meaningful communication, to be able to design learning plans for diverse students by applying appropriate materials, media, and methods in a given setting. Teachers need to be able to know each of the other domains well enough in order to gain the ownership of instruction and to excite the whole teaching-learning situation.

Student. The domain of the student should be discussed as individual and as group because of the importance of peer influence during the communicative teaching-learning events. Four of the five elements in this domain--formative
experience, educational background, abilities and skills, and personality traits—have a great impact on students' interpretations of the "text" events. The student's attitude, in turn, is the key factor influencing classroom learning climate. How much and how well students learn depend on what they bring to the teaching-learning setting. Research says that learning occurs through and is embedded in the interpersonal communication between teacher and students, and among students (Cazden, 1986). And, over time, students develop an interactional framework for what constitutes classroom learning. In order to have more effective teaching, teachers need to gain better insights on what students bring to the classroom, as well as what is occurring in the classroom by looking at the nature of classroom "talk."

Content. The domain of the content includes what I classified as subject-matter, curriculum material, task structure, language, illustration, and resource. I believe the knowledge within the content needs to be transmitted to and transacted between students through communicative "text" events. Teachers need "pedagogical content knowledge" to make the content friendly through the transforming efforts of modifying, structuring, illustrating and demonstrating the content in an appropriate language (Shulman, 1987; Doyle, 1992). Also, teachers need to improve students'
resources so they can be successful interacting with various texts.

**Context.** The list of elements of the context domain is long that includes class size, classroom setting, facility, media supplies, administrative decisions and policies, social forces, etc. We know that teachers' curricular decisions and pedagogical actions are often constrained by the physical setting or by external influences such as the state government, the school, the department, the community, or the administrators. Inevitably, the taught curriculum or the curriculum in use is shaped by broader social forces. Quite often, we can find its connection to political and economic inequalities that exist in the larger society (Apple, 1990; Giroux and McLaren, 1989). Thus, teacher's instruction may be more or less constrained. For example, teachers may have less flexibility in their planning because certain curriculum decisions have been already made by the school district or the department. Alternatively, some teachers may have given more flexibility and opportunity to engage in planning and decision making. The extent to which responsibility and participation in the decision making process are given to teachers has been shown to be important domain that defines effective teaching. Therefore, it is deemed that this domain is also an important one that needs to be included in any model of curriculum discourse.
In effect, this curricular discourse model must be seen as an educational organism, which means it is not a fixed monumental structure, but a dynamic growing body. I contend that transformations in pedagogical practices can be fully understood only when these domains are brought together and examined in "relation" to one another. I hope that this model will serve as a useful step toward achieving such a synoptic view of the process of pedagogical transformation of curriculum. Also, it will aid the understanding of how knowledge is or ought to be constructed in curricular discourse.

In this chapter, based on my review of curriculum and pedagogy literature, I examined some major conceptions about knowledge in terms of their impact on pedagogical practices and curriculum decisions. After discussing three different pedagogical orientations—effectiveness, thoughtfulness, and possibility—I rearticulated some curricular metaphors to show my reframing effort toward a pedagogical transformation of curriculum. Finally, I introduced my three-dimension curricular discourse model to help explore the reciprocal, communicative relationships in the classroom (design studio and leadership workshop). In this study, all four domains are looked into, but more emphases are placed on the relationships between/within the teacher and the student domains.
The movement of time has revealed the illusion; it exhibits as the work of inquiry the old and ever new undertaking of adjusting the body of traditions which constitute the actual mind of man to scientific tendencies and political aspirations which are novel and incompatible with received authorities. Inquirers are parts of history, caught in its movement; creators perhaps in some measure of its future, but also assuredly creatures of its past. (Dewey, in Bernstein, 1991, p. 29)

The world of social science is a world of controversy and paradox. Many theorists present their versions of reasoning with convictions. Many others express their accounts of thought with passion. Among all sorts of controversial issues, the epistemological questions are the ones that have been recently under feverish discussion within the circles of sociology of knowledge and philosophy of science (Berger & Luckmann, 1966; Burrell & Morgan, 1979; Gergen, 1985; Guba, 1991; Lather, 1991; Polkinghorne, 1983; Rorty, 1982). Resulting from this ongoing epistemological debate are references to the "paradigm shift" from old approaches to new approaches in human inquiry (Guba, 1991; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Reason & Rowan, 1981).
Observing the various transitions between paradigms, I do not see too many so-called "revolutions" (Kuhn, 1970). Rather, I find invisible interconnected lines stretched between one paradigm to another. For me, the shift of paradigms is actually an indispensable "gradual radicalization" (Gadamer, 1986) process in the development/history of human inquiry. As Bernstein says in his book, Restructuring of Social and Political Theory, "when individuals sense that they are living through a period of crisis, when foundations seem to be cracking and orthodoxies breaking up, then a public space is created in which basic questions about the human condition can be raised anew" (1975, p. xiii).

Thus, this chapter is about a "historical" digging—a digging into the "archaeological underpinnings" (Bernstein, 1992) that makes transformation of human inquiry possible. Such a historical digging will help us not only to see what we have become but also to perceive what we may become. It does not stop at the critique of our present condition like the work of many critical theorists. It continues to aim at opening new possibilities for thought and action that will lead to alternative paradigmatic building of inquiry, e.g., a re-constituted co-operative action inquiry model. It concludes with an overview of my research design as I look into landscape architecture design studio and strategic leadership workshop to examine and compare the epistemology
of practice and the pedagogical assumptions on which each curriculum is based.

Re-reading Paradigm Shifts

[My Exclamation: There is a marvellous place called SSS (Social Science Scholarship) Arena. No one knows exactly how long it has existed. In it are scholarly clans scattered here and there. Each clan is surrounded and identified by its ideology fence. Historically, there has been war after war between them. Most of them have their own shield of epistemology and sword of methodology to fight for themselves. When I first walked into the arena, I was so excited about watching the fights. I thought I might gain some wisdom. After wandering around for a while, I learned that those wars, or I should say "games," were governed by a law of process, ideal in direction, infinite in potentiality, but always finite in status and in point of view. Gradually, the war zones became blurred in my eyes. I started to wonder if those paradigm wars were necessary. However, it was imperative to learn enough basic rules and performance rules of the scholarly games in order to fight my way out. (Luckily enough, there was room for choices within the performance rules of the game.) Trying to keep alert in order not to be socialized into/devoured with a set of norms that define acceptable scholarship, I felt somewhat tired. I wanted to find a spot to rest, but there was no place in the arena for an unidentified "nobody." I thought it might be good for me to sneak between performance rules to find room for my own enjoyment, and to break some basic rules to fight for a good fight. Survive, or perish? I don’t know. I just hope for the best and prepare for the worst.]

Expanding Kuhn’s notion of "paradigm"—an object or approach stands out as exemplary for further articulation and specification under new or more stringent conditions (1970, p. 23), paradigms of inquiry can be viewed as the
creative ideologies of intellectuals in particular areas in the history of human thought (Bhola, 1990). As alternatives move/shift across paradigmatic boundaries, taking either gradual or dramatic forms, additive cultural change/s may occur and positions of attacks and counter-attacks may get hardened. Ruptures, fusions, revisions, and accommodations may be made on all sides of the philosophic argument, and be made at both the personal and the institutional levels (Fireston, 1991). The process of resolution or reconciliation may take years, decades or even centuries.

Since Kuhn, the nature and the history of paradigm shifts from the old to the new in social science has been ably described by Polkinghorne (1983), Burrell and Morgan (1979), and many others (see Bernstein, 1975; Guba, 1991; Reason & Rowan, 1981). It appears that there have been many slippery concepts, many incongruent categorizations, and many so-called "blurred genres" (Geertz, 1983). For example, Burrell and Morgan (1979) use categories like "functionalist," "interpretive," "radical humanist," and "radical structuralist," to illustrate four views of the social world based upon different meta-theoretical assumptions. Polkinghorne (1983) encourages the exploration of the human realm by looking into the methodological differences among paradigms labeled as "positivism," "anti-positivism," "existential-phenomenology," "hermeneutics," and so forth. But many other theorists and researchers
categorize the paradigms by Habermasian interests, such as prediction for the "positivist," understanding for the "interpretivist," emancipation for the "critical theory," etc. Also, Rowan (1981) suggests a "dialectical paradigm" for human inquiry; Park (1991) proposes a "dialectical ontology" in his inquiry into managerial action; Lincoln (1991) identifies the dialectical approach as one of the essential "methods" of the constructivist paradigm.

Moreover, anti-positivist and postpositivist positions are often intermingled, and some "rejected" positivist concepts or principles often reappear in a new guise. For example, we can see many postpositivist theorists busy formulating "standard" procedures for establishing validity in qualitative research (e.g., Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Patton, 1990). And we may find some postmodern theorists, while they are trying to encourage people to break the formality of the old, unintentionally create a new "form" for those who follow their lead. Interestingly, Rorty (1982) draws consequences from a pragmatist view about truth to re-evaluate the methodological stands of different paradigms (e.g., "value-free" social science and "hermeneutic" social science), and suggests that we need to turn our attentions from the quarrel about "method" to the distinction of "vocabulary."

Indeed, reviewing the social science research in the past several decades, it is, as Polkinghorne (1983) claims,
in constructive turmoil as a result of successful challenges by philosophers of science as well as sociologists. It is quite true that many social scientists have turned away from a laws and instances ideal of explanation toward a cases and interpretations one. And many have sought after a revision of social science and philosophy to stress alternatives as against the prevailing orthodoxies. Among all sorts of attempts, I found several approaches very interesting. For example, Hampden-Turner (1981) applies a map-making approach to minds that are deliberately selected and described to help illustrate the possible overall compatibility, complementarity and convergence among different schools of philosophical thought. Geertz (1983) refigures the recent social thought by analyzing three kinds of analogies—game (play-minded and strategy-minded), drama (experience and expression), and text (between/against-interpretation and symbolic-domination)—to demonstrate how analogies drawn from the humanities are coming to play a role in sociological understanding and how the style of discourse in social studies has been revised.

As Geertz indicates, matters of concern in human science are neither stable nor consensual. The question is not how all this muddle is going to come magnificently together, but what all this ferment means. We need to accept and appreciate that the matter at hand presents itself historically in different ways at different times or
when approached from a different standpoint. We also need to recognize that "our historical consciousness is always filled with a multiplicity of voices that echo the past" (Gadamer, 1989, p. 252). Situated in this "post" era, we cannot ignore the fact that emphases of recent paradigmatic thinking on plurality, otherness, difference, alterity and fragmentation are themselves expressions and reflections of what have already become forms of life in this era.

**Keeping "Tabs" on the "Sittings"**

Ways of thinking or patterns for research are often produced through the inquiries of "situated" practitioners, researchers, or theorists, posing questions and (re)framing issues, both conceptually and methodologically, in the context of an inquiry community seizing upon the latest trends in research. Polemically, most newly developed paradigms are quite difficult to label. They can not be called anti-logical nor anti-positivist, because they are not illogical nor are they against evidence. They can not be called post-positivist either, because logical-positivism is by no means (or should be) completely dead and forever gone. How about post-modernism? It is even more problematic. To be alert to what has been going on in the latest social/educational inquiry, we might need to know the supporting/influential forces behind the ongoing shifting of
research paradigms. Among various (timely) factors and forces, I think it is helpful to keep an account of three potential enduring "sittings," (a) language and social constructed reality, (b) observation as inquiry and method, and (c) the ethnographic turn.

Sitting I: Language and Social Constructed Reality

Essentially, new paradigms are different from the old paradigms in that they accept multiple realities in place of one single reality, reject the possibility of separating the knower from the known and value from fact, and so forth. Though there are several different positions with different interests/or emphases among new paradigms, the social constructivist knowledge base (introduced in Chapter 2) serves as an influential, dynamic core of most new paradigms. It is language that brings its symbolic interactions to and forms its boundaries of the representation of reality.

Basically, the view is that the world should more correctly be described as being in a state of change and uncertainty rather than as one amenable to description in law-like statements of prediction or probability. Further, it assumes a dialectical relationship between subject and object so that the world is both "found" and "created." Theory and data, fact and value, means and ends are inseparable. There are thus multiple realities as
individuals make their own constructions of their world. Human logic is not absolute but relative and there are serious limits to human rationality. As Berger and Luckmann (1966) analyze, entities we normally call reality, knowledge, thought, facts, signs, language, identities and so on are constructs co-generated by self and others within the same spatial and temporal sphere through a dialectical process. In other words, the core concepts about knowledge production in this social, linguistic constructed reality are holism and contextuality.

Berger and Luckmann particularly highlight the importance of language. They believe that language is the principal vehicle of the on-going translating process between objective and subjective reality. Also, based on Gergen’s notion, quite often descriptions and explanations of the world themselves constitute forms of social action and are intertwined with the full range of other human activities. And it is in this vein that many constructivists have been concerned with the prevailing images or metaphors of human action employed within the field of social sciences (Bruffee, 1986; Geertz, 1983; Gergen, 1985). Indeed, language is about daily interactions in the social construction of reality. As Wilden (1987) points out, language is a way of communicating "with" and "about" reality. It can be restructured, "in both form and
content, so as to deal with changing ecological, economic, and historical realities" (p. 132).

**Sitting II: Observation as Inquiry and Method**

Observation is an everyday event. As an approach to study educational processes and issues, it is then a systematic and deliberate act that seeks understanding from purposefully looking at or looking for matters of concern. Usually, to look, in terms of "EYE see," is to perceive, to apprehend what passes before our eyes by the power of sight. To understand, in terms of "I see," is to perceive and comprehend the significance of what is seen in the process of sense- and meaning-making. Making the turn from "EYE see" to "I see," observation, as the most fundamental process of human inquiry, creates a region of artifacts that concerns the status of language, of signs and symbols in their widest sense. It is not only part of the psychology of perception, but a tacit, deliberative behavior of individuals. In advocating observation as inquiry and method, Evertson and Green (1986) view observation as a multifaceted phenomenon, a research and decision-making approach, a means of representing reality, and a contextualized process. And Patton (1990) points out some variations in approaches to observations (e.g., participant vs. onlooker, overt vs. covert, and so forth), and suggests
that disciplined training and rigorous preparation are required for applying observational studies.

Inevitably, different purposes of inquiry lead to differences in strategies for observation, levels of systematization, and levels of formality. Conducting an observational study involves making a series of systematic decisions about who, what, when, and where to observe, in addition to answering the question of how. Also, it requires consideration of mechanisms or tools for recording and storing observations as well as issues related to units of observation, aggregation of data, sampling, and sources of error in the representational system or process (Evertson & Green, 1986; Patton, 1990). Because human perception is highly selective, what is captured usually reflects the theory, beliefs, assumptions, and/or past experiences of the person who is doing the observation. Thus, it is important to rethink, in observation, our ways of looking—looking "for" or looking "at" (Jackson, 1990), and to examine how our frames of reference are combined with methods/tools to capture and represent reality in different types of studies, for example, critical ethnographic studies in social science.

Sitting III: The Ethnographic Turn

Over the last decade there has been a growth of interest in ethnography among researchers in many different
fields, both theoretical and practical. In general, making, reporting, and evaluating the direct, participant observations of customary behaviors in a particular social context are the basic tasks of ethnography. As social sciences have become more critical of their source materials, more concerned with how data are recorded, verified, analyzed, interpreted, and shared, most theoretical debates in human inquiry have shifted from the level of substantive theoretical issues to the level of method, to problems of epistemology, interpretation, and discursive forms of representation (Anderson, 1989; Langer, 1985; Lather, 1991b; Woolgar, 1988). Consequently, interest has developed in ethnographic method and theory, and in the more technical and personal aspects of conducting ethnographic studies (Woolgar, 1988). In other words, ethnography, a form of representation and interpretation of social reality, has grown to receive more serious attention in the social sciences and humanities. In education, for example, Anderson (1988) traces the development of critical ethnography and relates it to Lather's (1986) notion of "openly ideological research." In discussing its current status as a research genre, Anderson points out that critical ethnography helps to unmask dominant social constructions and the interests they represent; to provide better understanding of reflexivity among theory, data, the researcher, and the researched; to expand the locus of
analysis through mass discourse; and to empower the researched by encouraging the concepts of "dialogue," "multivoicedness," and "collaboration."

Since our knowledge about the world is, as Woolgar (1988) argues, shaped by the technologies of representation involved in our apparently neutral observation of the world, the most essential need at this "ethnographic moment" (Marcus & Fisher in Lather, 1991b) is thus the reflexive exploration of our own practices of representation (Woolgar, 1988). Confronting the fact that science is a highly institutionalized form of representational practice, we need to "develop a perspective which begins to provide adequate and effective resistance to the rhetoric of realism without slipping back into realistic rhetoric in the course of our own 'research'" (Ibid., pp. 95-96). The cumulative efforts in ethnographic field research have focused on determining what constitutes a valid cultural description, on developing a theory that permits evaluation of alternative descriptions and accounts, and on formulating methods that may be most effective in deriving accurate/proper interpretation from recorded observations (Bellman & Jules-Rosette, 1977; Caldorola, 1985; Emerson & Pollner, 1988; Heider, 1983). Instruments for gathering, storing, retrieving, expressing, and using field data while still in the field have multiplied with technical developments. Tape recording, photographing, videotaping, filmmaking/cinematography, and
the use of computers in text and demographic analysis are only a few of the treatments of ethnographic data (see Bellman & Jules-Rosette, 1977; Blank, McCartney & Brent, 1989; Bogaart & Ketelaar, 1983; Caldarola, 1985; Collier, 1967; Heider, 1983; Wagner, 1979). As Collier (1967) points out, with the aid of technology we can see more, as well as see more accurately and more critically.

Toward a Re-constituted Co-operative Inquiry

Co-operative inquiry begins with the assumptions that knowledge is gained in action and for action. Research and action are in fact intertwined in practice. It is an approach to conduct action science. And it is a research that is with people and for people rather than on people. Reason and Rowan (1981) put together a series of articles in their collection Human Inquiry in Action to advocate that co-operative inquiry is not only a way of doing research, but a form of education, personal development, and social action. They suggest that it is based firmly on the real life "experience" of those who participate in the inquiry process. It involves a collaboration between the researcher and the researched so that they may work together as co-researchers. In other words, the essence of co-operative inquiry, as Reason (1988) points out, is "an aware and self-critical movement between experience and reflection which
goes through several cycles as ideas, practice, and experience are systematically honed and refined" (p. 6). Or, as Torbert (1991) describes, it derives from and cultivates the actual presence of such an "embracing consciousness" in all its participants. In his notion, "consciousness" in the midst of action is a widened attention that embraces intuition, reasoning, one's own action, and the outside world.

Basically, co-operative action inquiry provides a move to knowledge in action and offers a way to increase quality, bridge the gap between theory and practice, and improve communication between the researcher and the researched (Oja & Smulyan, 1989; Reason, 1988). Based on Torbert's (1976) notion, it is a practice of creating a community of inquiry in which personal inquiry, growth and liberation are reconciled with common celebration, ritual and commitment. By contrasting action inquiry with the conventional form of social science and addressing the strategy of creating communities of inquiry, Torbert (1991) points out several unique features that co-operative action inquiry may generate constructive forces for social transformation. For example, it is a dialectical, experiential process that treats vision, strategy, action, and the outside world as distinct but congruent. Unlike conventional inquiry that investigates the past in order to predict the future, co-operative action inquiry is a simultaneous study and
transformation of the present in a way that we understand something but by trying to change it. It is an explicit, liberating structure that challenges participants to test their implicit assumptions and to widen their attention intentionally, hence widening the scope of alternatives and bridging the validity of multiple perspectives. More importantly, in action inquiry the data is fed back to the participants, whenever possible, in order to heighten awareness of incongruities, to serve as a corrective to further practice, and to test the respondents' perceptions of the validity and usefulness of the results. Torbert writes:

As our mutual value thus appreciates through fraternal inquiry, so does the value of our works. Indeed, as we come to appreciate the full mystery and majesty of human being, we begin for the first time wholeheartedly to seek to craft goods—products, services, and celebrations in-formed by the openness, discipline, and inspiration of living inquiry. All craft—whether verbal or manual—requires an inquiry-in-action repeatedly reawakening us to the matter and the moment at hand (p. 235).

Furnishing a Critical Perspective

Critical theory is rooted in the sociology of knowledge and is part of the intellectual equipment of cultural Marxists, French structuralists, and many feminist theorists. Knowledge is conceived, in this alternative paradigm, as self-knowledge and as historically constructed within a set of social relations. Based on the notions of "enlightenment," "empowerment," and "emancipation," critical
theory seeks to transform the self-consciousness of individuals so as to make it possible for them to collectively determine the sort of life they wish to live and the sort of action they need to take in order to bring about the social conditions under which such a way of life is possible (Carr & Kemmis, 1983; Fay, 1987). Though it has some problems with its ontological concerns (e.g., neglecting human embodiment and embeddedness, etc.), its core contribution lies in its epistemological implications which make possible that a social theory can be all at once scientific, critical, and practical (Fay, 1987). According to Fay, such a social theory helps to provide comprehensive explanations in terms of some basic principles which are subject to public evidence; offers a sustained negative evaluation of the social order at hand; and stimulates members of a society to alter their lives by fostering in them the sort of self-knowledge and understanding of their conditions which can serve as the basis for such an alteration.

Given the implications of critical theory, the basis of co-operative action inquiry is its self-reflective and co-creative transformation of practice. More precisely, co-operative action inquiry requires the development of self-reflective communities of practitioner-theorists committed to examining critically their own practices and improving them in the interest of rationality and social justice. And
the development of practical theories is carried out collaboratively by practitioners as part of the process of change (Carr & Kemmis, 1983). One important feature is that co-operative action inquiry encourages a quality of awareness—critical subjectivity—that raises practitioners' subjective experience to a conscious level and uses it as part of the inquiry process (Reason, 1988). According to Reason, this may involve practices that free practitioners' attention from the constrictions and distortions of past distress, or from political oppression. Or it may involve exercises that expand practitioners' attention into multiple domains of experience.

As Torbert (1991) demonstrates, the action inquiry approach does not attempt to preclude bias about, or influence on, events by distancing. Instead, it recognizes and explicitly tests for the possibility of bias, and for the actual type of influence that is operating between "community of inquiry" and "community of social practice," at each point of action and interpretation. Based on his study, Torbert suggests the "observant participation" method—the researcher views herself or himself as a participant in the action to be studied—as most promising for exercising transforming power. According to him, the observant participation method can help to generate (a) social theory that treats everyone as having an ideology or worldview to be examined, (b) methodology that empirically
and experientially examines the interplay between the researcher's behavior and its effects, and (c) researcher's capabilities in acknowledging, presenting, examining, and evaluating feedback about their own actions and assumptions and those of other participants. However, it is important to note that a proper co-operative inquiry furnishing with a critical perspective is one which "possesses a stereoscopic vision which recognizes every situation as one both of gain and loss, of change and stasis, of possibility and limit" (Fay, 1987, p. 215).

Supplementing Hermeneutic Understanding

The most common meaning of the term hermeneutics formerly was "the art of interpretation" (Bleicher, 1980). Now the meaning of the term has changed into the theory and practice of interpretation and understanding in different kinds of human contexts. This implies, for instance, that hermeneutics has developed into more elaborate theories of interpretation and that the act of understanding has become more central in hermeneutical thought, though it always has been presented in interpretive practice. Hermeneutics is basically language oriented and directed toward in-depth study of meaning. Whereas phenomenology is primarily oriented towards the immediate phenomena of human experience, such as thinking and feeling, hermeneutics is more context directed (Burrell & Morgan, 1979; Polkinghorne,
1983). In interpreting human "traces," hermeneutics often tries to go beyond the observable in order to "read between the lines." Hermeneutics is often closely linked with other approaches, especially with that of critical theory. However, it is not preoccupied with the question of revealing the ideologies behind human actions, but rather with understanding their meaning. Unlike the purpose of critical theory, which is to put itself and its proponents in a perspective outside the phenomenon criticized, hermeneutics consequently brings about an understanding of a certain culture and still remains a part of it.

The task of hermeneutics is to increase comprehension as regards other cultures, groups, individuals, conditions, and life-styles, both in the present as well as the past. The process is mutual and dialectical, consisting of "circular and spiral relationships between whole and parts, between what is known and what is unknown, between the phenomenon itself and its wider context, between the knower and that which is known" (Rowan & Reason, 1981). Hermeneutics is considered adequate for practical co-operative inquiry. It emphasizes the significance of mutual understanding as a basis for interaction. It takes into account the cultural-historical context for interpretation. Also, it stresses, for instance, the importance of understanding various "voices" and then interpreting the "texts" of human experience. Here, "voice" can be referred
to the speaking personality, the speaking consciousness (Bakhtin, 1981). And "text" is not a fixed term. It can be broadly applied to social action, to people's behavior toward other people, involving "seeing-as" (Geertz, 1983).

Since the object of human inquiry is the reality of human experience, both that present in and that hidden from awareness, hermeneutic understanding is very constitutional for exploring human experience. According to Polkinghorne, narrative meaning, produced by human capacities of consciousness and language, organizes human experience into temporally meaningful episodes. Based on this notion, human experience can be considered as hermeneutically organized according to the figures of linguistic production. This also means that the linguistic domain and the human order of meaning are constructed according to a hermeneutic rationality and aligned on various interactive levels. On this basis, knowledge of human experience, therefore, requires the use of interpretive or hermeneutic approaches—approaches that resemble the techniques and rational procedures used for the exploration of meaning systems.

As far as co-operative action inquiry is concerned, the hermeneutic circle of "pre-understanding," "understanding," and "interpretation" is essentially an important mode of the development of knowledge in and for action. It is dialectically coupled with meaning-making of human experiences (Rowan & Reason, 1981). The interplay between
understanding and interpretation is determined and shaped by
the use of language. Though language is both interpretation
and a way of understanding, it forms the boundaries of
understanding and interpretation as well. In order to
minimize misunderstanding and misinterpretation, the
openness on the part of the interpreter is demanded.

Emergence of a Dialogical Approach

The notions of dialectical and dialogical approaches
are interchangeable to a certain degree. What one calls
dialectical may be labelled by another as dialogical. I
prefer to use the term "dialectical" for the ongoing
dynamics of intrapersonal as well as interpersonal critical
inquiry. Its characteristic is that it places the emphasis
on change that takes place through conflict and
contradictions (within people or situations). In the
dialectical realm, the elements, such as part and whole,
subject and object, knowledge and action, theory and
practice, and etc., are regarded as mutually constitutive,
not separate, clearly marked. Instead of talking about
static structures, it talks about process and movement.
Since dialectic is the basis of thinking and the primacy of
inquiry, dialectical process is essential for personal
growth and social transformation.
The term "dialogical" refers to a specific, reciprocal manner of exchange and communication during the inquiring interaction, between the researcher and the researched (Schrijvers, 1991). Though dialogue may be external (between two different people) or internal (between an earlier and a later self)—that can be distinguished as respectively spatial (A -> B) and temporal (A -> A'), the focus here is placed on the continuing process of actual communication between people who respect and value each others' contribution. Basically, precondition for dialogue is that all participants see the discourse as important and have a say in determining its course. As Srivastva (1988) suggests, dialogue is the transformation of mere interaction into participation, communication, and mutual empathy. It is not only an alternative research tactic, but also a natural part of the process of knowing. As a matter of fact, dialectical process is intentionally and overtly practiced through dialogical acts in co-operative action inquiry.

Based on the notion that knowledge is socially constructed, the intent of dialogical approach is not to come up with universal, absolute truth, but rather to identify and examine the normative truths that are embedded in a particular historical context (Gitlin, 1990). It is an approach that centers around the participants' interaction and uses the communication as a mode of "finding out." Its
aim is to test prejudgments/assumptions critically in the course of inquiry and to challenge taken-for-granted notions that influence the way participants see the world and judge their practice. It is important to note that dialogue that leads to understanding, co-operation, and accommodation does not eliminate differences nor impose one group's view on others. Rather, it can sustain differences within a broader compact of toleration and respect (Burbules & Rice, 1991).

According to Gitlin, most traditional research approaches establish an "alienating relationship" which silences those researched, disregards their personal knowledge, and strengthens the assumption that researchers own the authority of knowledge. To change this relationship, the use of a dialogical approach is most promising. On the basis of her experience in anthropological research, Schrijver (1991) distinguishes several characteristics of a dialogical approach from different aspects. She points out that in dialogical communication the terms "researcher" and "researched" are changing places continuously; both are ego and alter, subject and object, active and passive; and the interpretations of both are open for discussion. Through verbalizing the differences, more egalitarian relationships between the researcher and the researched are facilitated and developed in the process. The objectives and priorities of research are determined by all participants. Not only
the researcher but all participants are empowered to construct concepts and categories, discuss results and determine the course and outcome of the research. Therefore, the results can reflect vividly the dynamics of life rather than an artificial, static situation.

Development of Different Ways of Knowing

As I stated earlier, there are different ways of knowing and different forms of knowledge. In Western culture, following the tradition of Aristotelian logic, knowledge is principally defined and studied in a systematic manner. Not until encountering the newly developed sociology of knowledge has the exploration of the fluidity of multiple knowledge genres been encouraged and respected. Many theorists and practitioners start to rethink the orthodox ways of knowing and take into account different modes of knowing in a dialectical process. Holistic knowing becomes more favorable in pursuit than fragmented knowing (Argyris, Putnam, & Smith, 1985; Reason, 1988). And theoretical knowing that is separated from practice and from experience is less emphasized than before. As Reason indicates, the major shift is to the view that knowledge is formed in and for action.

Explicitly, propositional knowing, experiential knowing, and practical knowing, are valued as imperative, interdependent ways of making sense of the researched world.
in the process of co-operative action inquiry (Heron, 1988; Reason, 1988). By discussing the validity in co-operative inquiry, Heron points out that these three modes of knowing work together to help get the presented world and the posited world in active dialogue with each other and with the developing researched world.

Based on my understanding, propositional knowing takes the form of ideas, propositions, and theories. It is somewhat "contemplative," involving theoretical considerations. When formulated in research it helps participants understand the researched world. Experiential knowing occurs in face-to-face encounter with a person, place or thing. It is "operative," involving participative, dialogical interactions and communications. It helps participants construe the interplay between the posited world and the presented world. Practical knowing takes the form of skills and abilities, and deals with "how to" questions. It is "deliberative," involving pragmatic explanations and responsible decision making. It helps participants grasp the world-of-action. As Heron (1988) concludes, in a co-operative inquiry "the propositional knowledge asserted by the research conclusions is coherent with the experiential knowledge of the researchers as co-subjects, and their experiential knowledge is coherent with their practical knowledge in knowing how to act together in their researched world" (pp. 42-43).
Implicitly, narrative knowing, reflective knowing, and interpersonal knowing are encouraged (actually are embedded) in co-operative action inquiry. Because co-operative inquiry focuses its attention on the interactive mode as it is lived, experienced, and interpreted by the researcher and the researched, it involves the processes of language, as well as the processes of meaning-making. Thus, narrative is the discourse structure in which co-operative inquiry in action receives its form and through which it is meaningful. According to Polkinghorne (1988), narrative knowing is a primary scheme by means of which hermeneutic understanding is grasped. And it helps create meaning by noting the contributions that actions and events make to a particular outcome and then configure these parts into a whole inquiring-learning-acting episode. As "logos and praxis are culturally inseparable" (Bruner, 1990), narrative knowing and co-operative inquiry in action are culturally inseparable as well.

Also, knowledge in and for action is an integrated construction, produced by the realm of meaning, which interpretively links recollections, perceptions, and expectations (Polkinghorne, 1988). It is enlarged by a continuously configuring-refiguring process that is carried out through "reflection-in-action," or "double-loop learning" (Argyris et al., 1985; Schon, 1987). However, "one can think reflectively only when one is willing to
endure suspense and to undergo the trouble of searching" (Dewey, 1933) This reflective knowing is a way of making explicit some of the tacit knowledge as well as personal ideologies embedded in action so that alternatives may be emerged. It involves both self-evaluation and group-debriefing. And it can be tied together with a critical perspective. So, both the researcher and the researched can be enabled to construe what they are and where they are heading, and be provided with opportunities to give cohesion to shared beliefs, and to transmit values.

In addition, interpersonal knowing is a by-product of co-operative inquiry, built in the process of dialogical communication. It provides a kind of knowledge that fosters "social competence" and "social intelligence" (Berscheid, 1985). (In Berscheid's view, social competence is the ability to interact with others in ways that promote well-being. Social intelligence refers to the ability to produce the desired responses in interaction with another.) Because the essence of the concept of interpersonal relationship is "interdependence," both social intelligence and competence are the necessary ingredients for initiating and maintaining an effective "co-operative" practice. As Torbert (1991) points out, a truly practical "community of inquiry" is a group of practitioners committed to discovering propositions about the world, life, their practices, and themselves that they will test in their own actions "with others."
After addressing some of the characteristics of the reconstituted co-operative inquiry approach, it is helpful now to touch upon some implications for the character of action science and for the nature of educational inquiry more specifically. According to Argyris, Putnam, and Smith (1985), the central focus of action science is to seek knowledge that will serve action through creating conditions for valid inquiry in the context of practical deliberation by participants. In other words, it encourages dialogical inquiry that is collective, collaborative, reflective and critical. Basically, action science intends to understand the situation of the practice, to create alternatives to the status quo, and to promote learning at the level of normative values. Also, it aims at creating communities of inquiry (peer cultures) within communities of social practice (which are, according to Torbert (1991), typically characterized dominantly by superior and subordinate cultures.)

Since social inquiry is principally concerned with explicating the processes by which people come to describe, explain, or account for the world in which they live (Gergen, 1985), the constructivist knowledge base has provided fundamental implications for human inquiry in action generally, and for the way practitioners exercise
their own deliberative acts as humanists in particular. For example, Schon (1987) presents a number of essential constructivist features that need to be reflected in professional practices, such as: the need to move away from an over-dependence on rational knowledge seeking; recognition of "reflection-in-action" as a means to the solution of practical problem; acceptance of the notion that problem situations are open-ended and the search for solutions should not be limited by fixed views; and so forth. Also, as Rorty (1982) suggests, the pattern of all inquiry is "deliberation" concerning the relative attractions of various concrete alternatives. He argues that "the idea that in science or philosophy we can substitute method for deliberation between alternative results of speculation is just wishful thinking" (p. 164).

The resources represented by social constructivist view seem promising for concerning practice-centered inquiry in educational settings. Because education is a social enterprise and deals with "meaning-making" (ultimately with "people-making"), it is more than a "rationally managed process" in that it involves multi-valued and collective choices. Any decision making in a educational setting is more nearly applied arts and humanities than behavioral sciences. Educational practitioners need to be prepared to respond to the requirements of fluid, multiple knowledge structures negotiated at the local level. By "local," in
Geertz's (1983) interpretation, means not just as to place, time, class, and variety of issue, but as to accent—i.e., a "legal sensibility." As Dewey (1938) suggests from a constructivist point of view, the world of theory and of practice, of conflict and of controversy, of idea and action, of principle and policy, are related to one another and each of these worlds gains richness and clarity from the incursion of the other. He says:

All social movements involve conflicts which are reflected intellectually in controversies. It would not be a sign of health if such an important social interest as education were not also an arena of struggles, practical and theoretical. But for theory, at least for the theory that forms a philosophy of education, the practical conflicts and the controversies that are conducted upon the level of these conflicts, only set a problem. It is the business of an intelligent theory of education to ascertain the causes for the conflicts that exist and then, instead of taking one side or the other, to indicate a plan of operations proceeding from a level deeper and more inclusive than is represented by the practices and ideas of the contending parties (p. 5).

Considering the transforming social constructivist ideal in educational practice, I believe applying a practice-centered action inquiry approach is most promising. Based on Grundy's Action Research Spiral (1987, p. 147, which does not show reflection "in" action but "on" action) and Kolb's Learning Processes Model (1983, p. 120, which does not show synthetical nature in inquiry), I articulate a new action inquiry model (see Figure 3.1).
Figure 3.1: Action Inquiry Model
Basically, this model is a reflective action spiral of cycles of six stages: situation analysis, problem conceptualization, alternative development, condition synthesis, solution implementation, and outcome assessment. I believe that observation and reflection should not be regard as "stages" or "phases" in inquiry. They are and should be merged in active mode of the undertaking all the time. Also, reflection has an evaluative aspect to judge whether the observed are desirable, and suggest ways of proceeding. Action taken within the inquiry spiral both arises out of and allows for the development of insight about the construction of the educational practices under investigation. Each stage is reciprocally related to one another through the link of evaluative reflection. Overall this cyclical process is a dialogical practice that involves continuous retrospectivity and prospectivity, analysis and synthesis, in the light of developing understandings. In consequence, discourse and practice, construction and reconstruction are brought together for the rethinking, reframing, and reconstructing of educational practices.

Anyway, deliberative acts in educational practice can be enriched by the (re)examination of problematic situations form a variety of perspectives. The openness to differences and alternatives is essential in educational praxis. However, pluralism, relativism, and the associated arts of eclectic are quite critical to educational endeavor in many
cases. We need to synthetically concern the overall contextual factors (conditions). The challenge, as Shulman (1984) points out, is to communicate a sense of purpose and the need to generate criteria of relevance. It is not enough merely to "blur the genres." Only, if educational practitioners continue to reflectively assess their actions—to return to the question of why they wish to tell their stories in the first place, what goals or purposes motivate their efforts, in whose interests the inquiry is pursued, can questions of which alternatives/or what combinations will fit a particular situation be determined.

Overview of Research Design

[Self disclosure: On Enunciation: I don't like this section, a section that I have to use jargons to prove I know what I am doing in this "jargon-filled" research world. However, there is no such method as a "let-it-flow" approach. Before I'm freed from surveillance, I'd better behave and try to fulfill the "norm." Thus, by no choice, I have to tailor my "naturalistic," spontaneous inquiring experience into a sort of "factitious," formalistic statement of research design. Anyway, I'll explain, in this section, the general approaches and/or principles I have applied toward gathering my data. The implication of photographic discourse and its contexts for validation, as well as my strategic approaches toward data analysis of various kinds of texts/discourses will be addressed in Chapter 4. Detailed situation-specific research questions and rationality will be unfolded when the curtains are raised in Chapter 5 and Chapter 6.]

(Protestant: S. Chen)
Pilot In-Field Experience

As I mentioned in Chapter 1, to fulfill a course requirement in qualitative research, my pilot in-field experience in landscape architecture design studio started with an instructional problem perceived by the classroom teacher, Norman—which evaluation approach would provide students with better feedback—in Winter 1991. The methodology applied in the pilot study was a more structured collaborative inquiry approach. The basic goal was to contribute collaboratively to the practical concerns of pedagogical practice—evaluation of student design projects. In order to grasp a more complete picture of issues appeared in the evaluation of design projects, I tried to seek reflections not only from teachers but from students as well. I had a formal unstructured interview with Norman, an informal interview with another teacher, Debbi, and a focus group interview with students. Then, I conducted a "grounded" survey to get students' opinions on evaluation of design projects. Also, I had quite intensive observations of studio lecture sessions. During the process, the teacher and I had several discussions on our findings, reflective thoughts, and possible tryouts of further in-depth study. It is very rewarding that my playful pilot experience in the studio turned out to be a preparatory collaborative practice for this dissertation study.
Entry to the Field

My entry into this study was through the back door of an inquiry paradigm "in the making," not through the more grandiose entrance of "ready made" inquiry paradigms (a thought stimulated by Latour, 1987). In other words, this study, happening in landscape architecture design studio and in strategic leadership workshop, was actually elevated by the emerging amazement and attractions of the "already lived" experience in the field, not guided by the preset formulaic steps of the "supposed-to-live" experience in the field. Thus, I think it is more appropriate to introduce the fields I have been living in through opening the entry, instead of formulaically rationalizing them under the categorization of "site selection."

Landscape Architectural Design Studio. Compared to typical classroom scenarios, design studios are active sites where students and teachers are engaged intellectually and socially, shifting between analytic, synthetic, and evaluative modes of thinking in different sets of activities (Dutton, 1987, 1991). The studio design course is distinguished by the student's independent work on assigned tasks, and by the individual relationship with the teacher, who acts in many capacities as explicated by Schon (1987) and others following his lead. Schon points out that architectural designing is a prototype of the kind of
artistry that other professionals need most to acquire; and the design studio, with its characteristic pattern of learning by doing and coaching, exemplifies the predicaments inherent in any reflective practicum and the conditions and processes essential to its success.

According to Levy (1980), the design studio is the only environment in which all aspects of (landscape) architectural ideas and skills—formal aesthetics, construction technology, theory, history, and drawing—can be learned. This suggests that much learning be structured around, and reinforced through, comprehensive design problems where creative opportunities are revealed and design implications tested. Levy views the students as intensely motivated toward learning all aspects of (landscape) architectural subject matter and portrays the studio teachers as academically and professionally experienced generalists who possibly, but not necessarily, have different areas of interest. The studio assumes full responsibility for effecting the integration of design with every other area of content. Thus, the curriculum in landscape architecture can be centered around synthesis as represented by the studio method.

Based on many studies, a great amount of complex learning does occur in the studio (e.g., see Dinham, 1989, 1990; Dutton, 1991; Schon, 1987). Admittedly, it is focused on the specific problem being designed, but learning of a
substantial and often broad ranging nature occurs nevertheless. It is believed that students appear to learn best when they can combine theory and abstraction with perceptual experience--actually seeing, touching and acting. Dinham (1989, 1990) points out that two essential elements of evaluation for the improvement of pedagogy in the design studio are: (a) designing a good assignment, and (b) helping the students engage and learn from it through providing meaningful feedback.

To help students learn "reflection-in-action," Schon (1987) encourages extensive dialogues between teachers and students. But, we have to be aware that dialogue does not simply mean the often seen "question-response" type of conversation in the studio. It, in effect, values the creative tension in various interactions and it requires equal distributions of power. In Schon’s studio example, he fails to investigate if students have equal access to defining what should be known, or if students’ knowledge is valued. As Willenbrock (1991) points out, there are examples of a relationship of "disproportionate power" in Schon’s design studio "juxtaposed against" his claim that an ideal learning environment must contain dialogue (p. 106). Also, Schon somewhat fails to address if the paradox and predicament of "learning to design" results from particular pedagogies applied in the studio.
Dutton (1987, 1991) suggests that teachers need to help the students recognize the ideas and theories that are embedded in their work or make explicit their own ideas, or reflect about their own work and thinking in a way that would help the students understand the discovery-invention-production process. Referring back to her own studio learning experience, Willenbrock (1991) urges that teachers minimize the social distance between themselves and their students to make room for real dialogue. They need to familiarize themselves with the language of the student’s knowledge to meet halfway with a new common vocabulary. Also, Feigenberg (1991), based on his studio teaching experience, encourages students jointly to investigate, discover, and rediscover through both visual and verbal dialogue and debate. He believes that as co-investigators and co-learners, students can learn best by actively and critically exploring their environments, by discussing and collectively planning projects, and by conducting explorations and experiments based on their own hypotheses and their own interests.

Based on my pilot experience on the study of evaluation of design projects, it was interesting to see that teachers were concerned about which evaluation approach would provide students with better feedback and would be more valuable in terms of encouraging student creativity and design competence. Students were interested in having more one-on-
one based interactions with teachers and receiving more concrete feedback on "how to improve" their designs rather than concerned with which evaluation approach was applied or which grading system was better. Extending my pilot experience, my further study in the design studio was to investigate not only the issues involved in the evaluation of design projects, but also the social, dialogical, interactive nature of design studio.

Designing is a "creative deliberative process." My experience in the design studio then was not limited to knowing how knowledge was communicated and produced, and to how social relations were structured in the studio. I believed it would help understand, particularly, the nature of design process and the characteristics of teaching and learning of "individual deliberation in action."

**Strategic Leadership Workshop.** Leadership is a process that closely relates to group dynamics. It can be viewed as the performance of acts that help the group reach its goals, maintain itself in good working order, and adapt to changes in the environment. These "arts" are group functions. In other words it involves interpersonal influence, exercised in situation and directed, through the communicative acts, toward the attainment of a specified goal or goals. Further, leadership (and its companions, decision making and strategy formulation) which involves an intricate process of
multilateral brokerage (Bennis, 1983), is actually a design-like practice. Like teaching and learning to design, leadership cannot simply be taught or learned through lecture-recitation or Socratic dialogue. Since it involves technical rationality as well as professional artistry in practice, it can only be grasped by seeing, experiencing, and exercising the essential quality and necessary skills in groups or interpersonal interactions with actual tasks to accomplish.

Most MBA courses, particularly the ones related to management, policy making, and leadership, have a tradition of case teaching and practice-oriented research, in which students learn problem-solving, decision-making skills through analysis of numerous controvertible cases. It is commonly believed that case study/simulation can help students integrate specialized functional knowledge into management decisions that require wisdom and artistry. The fundamental theories used to advocate this kind of liberated case- and practice-oriented instruction are drawn from experiential learning (e.g., Kolb, 1983, 1984), adult development, (e.g., Kegan, 1982; Basseches, 1984), and action science/inquiry (e.g., Argyris, et al., 1985; Schon, 1987; Torbert, 1991).

In general, the primary goal of such a type of liberating curriculum structure in teaching leadership/or management is aimed at creating a phenomenology of practice
that will encourage reflection on knowledge-in-action
(Schon, 1987) and promote "continuous quality improvement"
(Torbert, 1991). However, most discussions of the practice
of educational leadership, experiential learning or
developmental transformation, are focused on/or limited to
reflection, action, and change at a personal level. Seldom
is attention given to the interpersonal "co-create" quality
embedded in group communicative process, though it is
admitted that leadership is closely related to group and
interpersonal dynamics. Also, many talks about creating
conditions for "performance-improving" learning indicate the
value of collaborative learning as a productive
instructional mode for professional curriculum. Seldom has
study been done to help understand the basis and structure
of collaborative learning and provide practical suggestions
for leading students to demonstrate an ability to work
productively together.

The strategic leadership workshop is a graduate level
course with a focus on the leadership of public agencies.
The workshop design is to engage participants (students) in
various learning experiences to build personal action skills
for strategic leadership competency areas. Particularly,
most in-class activities are designed to advance student
collaborative learning experiences through a series of group
tasks (case studies or simulations). Based on my review of
the videotapes from Spring 1991 leadership workshop,
compared to my own learning experience in courses on leadership, organizational change, and human resources in Operational Impact Program in 1985 and 1986, I found it would be quite interesting to re-examine some of the important leadership qualities and skills which I had almost forgotten. More importantly, since teaching and learning is a social act, I believe, it would be rewarding to study how knowledge of leadership, as a collaborative artifact, is co-constructed through or in "intellectual negotiations" among "knowledge-able peers" (Bruffee, 1984). My focus then was not only on how does the teacher, with the task laid out, implement the actual act of collaboration, but also on how do students, as group members, experience and practice the kinds of conversation that are appropriate to gaining competence in a collaborative context.

Based on the notion of functional leadership, any member of a group may become a leader by taking actions that serve group functions, and any leadership function may be fulfilled by different members performing a variety of relevant behaviors. Thus, it is important to note that collaborative learning is not merely a better pedagogy. It is also a better way of modeling how knowledge (about leadership in this study) is constructed and how it changes and grows in a learning community of status equals: peers.

Group decision-making or problem solving is a collaborative deliberation process which may foster the
growth of leadership, personally and professionally. It involves knowledgeable peers making effective reference in/through "knowledge-generating discourse" (Bruffee, 1984). I believed my study in the strategic leadership workshop would help me grasp the artform of leadership, the promises of collaborative learning and the characteristics of teaching and learning of "group deliberation in action."

Data Collection

Generally, the methods employed in my data-collecting include: "participant observation" (Patton, 1990), journals, documents (course syllabi, project assignments), focus group interviews with students and/or participating in classroom activities, reflective discussions with teachers, closed- and open-ended questionnaire on students' perceptions of studio/classroom learning, videotaping studio/classroom teaching, and photographing the studio life. Two of the unique features of this study are the application of photographic discourse and the ongoing dialogues in the field. In my study photographs of design studio life and videotapes of leadership classroom in real time served as an important subject matter for analysis (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982; Eisner, 1991) as well as an mediate means in reflective discussions. I believe it is important to involve stories, pictures, and other ways of giving voice to
aspects of experience which cannot be captured in propositions (Reason, 1988).

Since data involve the "particulars" about the aspects of life in the field (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982), the opportunities for possible methodological implementation and accessible materials/information are varied in different research worlds. Situated in the world of design studio and the world of leadership workshop, where the settings, the people, the matters of concerns, and so forth are so different, I adjust my methods accordingly.

**In Landscape Architecture Design Studio.** Following the co-operative inquiry cycle, I started my data collection in LARCH 253 design studio with "knowing teachers' concerns" in early Winter, 1992. I had two individual semi-structured, in-depth interviews with the co-inquirers, Norman and Debbi, who were co-teaching the LARCH 253 design studio. After knowing their concerns, and assumptions about studio teaching, I planned out, with Norman who put the course LARCH 253 together, a possible data collecting time frame and procedure. Though there were some changes, the overall data gathering tasks were carried out in three cycles and done by Spring, 1992.

In the first class session, I was introduced to the class, and I got a chance to talk a little bit about my study and to pass out an invitation letter (see Appendix A),
explaining the research purpose and methods, to each student. In the first cycle, built upon teachers' concerns and assumptions, I constructed a focus group interview with students (n=8, time=40 min., on voluntary basis) to talk about their studio life. Also, I videotaped both Norman and Debbi's group critique session in the studio. Then, having reflective discussions, with Norman and Debbi, on the summary of students' perspectives and on the tape of their studio-teaching, and so forth, the second cycle of inquiry was started. In this cycle, I not only videotaped both teachers' individual critique sessions, I also took pictures of the "studio life" in two different days. On those same days, I had two small group interviews (n=3, and n=2, time=10 min.) and seven individual interviews (time=5-8 min.) with students. Basically, they were invited to share their thoughts on design projects, teachers' teaching styles, evaluation approach, their own design style and competence, etc. Again, I shared my findings and my observations with Norman and Debbi to invite their reflective thoughts and to begin the third cycle. During the third cycle, I continued videotaping and taking photographs, but with a focus on students' presentations. Instead of doing interviews, this time I designed a grounded questionnaire and conducted a survey--student opinions on studio pedagogy--at the end of the quarter. Of course, then there came reflective discussion again. In addition to all
these, there are also some fieldnotes on my observations and the unrecorded "talks" with Norman and Debbi, and some documents related to the course structure (e.g., course syllabus, project assignments, etc.).

In Strategic Leadership Workshop. As I mentioned earlier, the situation is different, hence the methods applied in collecting data should not be the same. To fully exercise the "art" of co-operative inquiry, most reflective, inquiring actions taken in this site are grounded in experience, observation, and dialogue between co-inquirers. Thus, the fieldnotes of what I heard, saw, experienced, and thought in the course of collecting and reflecting are central to my data-collecting. Since videotaping the classroom activities (of every class session) is an "already-in-use" instrument by the teacher, the co-inquirer Dr. B., I did not expose myself (or was not exposed) to the students as a researcher in the first place. I entered the workshop as a participant doing "covert observation" (Patton, 1990) in Spring 1992. Though I was fascinated by my in-field experience, I was not satisfied with the data I got (due to technical problems with some videotapes, and due to some unsolved puzzles). I reentered the workshop (different class though) as an "on-looker" doing "overt observation" (Patton, Ibid.) in Winter, 1993. Not only did I keep a great deal of fieldnotes, I also got "a lot of"
materials, documents as well as videotapes. Also, another important supplement to all of these was the grounded survey of student opinions on group-based collaborative learning, which was administered in three classes (two in Spring 1992, n=17 each, one in Winter, 1993, n=16). In addition, keeping journals of practical-oriented, and "critical-enlivened" reflective dialogues between co-inquirers has always been challenging and rewarding in terms of eliciting useful data and eliminating unimportant ones.

**Inquiry Cycle and Validation Process**

This co-operative study actually is a "naturalistic" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) "grounded-theory" (Strauss & Corbin, 1992) approach. And it is "ethnographic" (Patton, 1990) in nature, in that it involves an intensive fieldwork in which I was "immersed in the culture" under study. Based on Reason's suggestions (1988), this study began with the development of "propositional knowledge"—a discussion of what it was we (the teacher and the researcher) would like to research; what ideas and theories we might bring to the inquiry; what kind of research action we would undertake to explore our ideas; how to observe, record, measure, etc. Then, this study involved a series of "practical knowing," "experiential knowing," and "reflective knowing" cycles elicited by the on-going dialogues (see Figure 3.2). At this stage we took research action into our lives, engaged
in activities which had been agreed upon, noted the outcomes, recorded our discoveries, became fully immersed in our practice, encountered each other directly about what was actually happening, reflected on our experience and attempted to make sense of our acts.

![Interactive Co-operative Inquiry Cycle](image)

**Figure 3.2: Interactive Co-operative Inquiry Cycle**

This cycle of reflective "knowledge-in-action" movement is constantly repeated in a dialogical mode between co-operative inquirers so that ideas or understandings may be clarified and refined. Also, co-operative inquirers, through the cycling process, may be more able to "adapt" to the developing researched world, and to "adopt" new
language, new methods that will enable them to be more effective or skilled in finding meaningful, helpful, and "valid" insights. In other words, this co-operative inquiry cycling is a "world of action." The dynamic, interactive process involved is, in effect, a dialogical validation practice that will lead co-operative inquirers to take needed pragmatic actions. What is essential, as Heron (1988) points out, is to ensure that each inquirer has a say in the reflection phase, and is to the degree possible involved in the researching experience.

In this study, an exploration of a co-operative inquiry cycle, I challenge formulaic approaches to validity in qualitative research through a synthesis of catalytic validity (Lather, 1986), pragmatic validity (Kvale, 1989), and my own proposed symbolic validity, to be developed in Chapter 7. In order to prevent the validation process from being merely self-fulfilling and circular, I will particularly look into the active three-way interaction/dynamics between (a) the explicit research ideas, (b) alternative conceptual frameworks drawn from different inquirers' language and background, and (c) the dynamic touchstone of linguistic understanding of conversation between co-inquirers.

In this "historical digging" chapter, I have dug into the methodological underpinnings of this co-operative study. I not only presented my view of reading about paradigm
shifts, but also examined three influential forces behind the ongoing shifting of research paradigms. They were language and the social constructed reality, observation as inquiry and method, and the ethnographic turn. Aiming at opening possibilities for thought and action that will lead to alternative pradigmatic building of inquiry, I examined some major theoretical grounds of co-operative action inquiry and introduced an action inquiry model that I rearticulated for and in this study. To help grasp my lived researching experience, I also provided in this chapter an overview of my "research design" to make known my pilot experience, entry to and data collection in the field, and the inquiry cycle and validation process of this study. As I mentioned earlier, the application of photographic discourse and the ongoing dialogues in the field are two unique features of this study. I will explore further, in Chapter 4, how photographic discourse approach might be used toward gaining different perspectives on classroom life and toward establishing validity in qualitative educational inquiry. With an attempt to advocate the notion that every form/image has sense and meaning, the forthcoming Chapter 4, of photographs and data analysis, is a chapter about different ways of seeing, analyzing, and interpreting the text/discourse of different genres in the crisis of representation.
CHAPTER IV
Of Photographs and Data Analysis:
From Incommensurable to Reconciliation/Rupture

New Think is old....Yet it is [our] newest need. New Think has to do with breaking out of the old, self-perpetuating patterns and generating new ways of looking at things....It is suggested that New Think involves a definite type of thinking and that this can be used deliberately and effectively. This type of thinking is not the prerogative of artists, but the practical need of everyone, for new ideas are everyone's business.

(de Bono, New Think, 1967, p. 11)

How do we know better about the developing researched world? How do we make sense of what we have seen and heard? To unlock the myth of our understanding of the researched world, we need to examine how we, as researchers, perceive things, re-present and interpret the perceived. It is my belief that, in this socially and psychologically constructed world, we need to look into the visible and the invisible, and listen to different voices, including the unsaid, the silent. We need to go beyond empirical facts to grapple with the problem of perception and representation, to know more about the rhetoric of words and images, to bring into existence new insights and new break-throughs of our understanding. A methodological innovation in research design is then necessary.
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If searching is a daring venture, breaking down the rigidity of a "certain" way of doing research is inevitable. If we see, listen, read, and feel in a different way, we may perceive, understand, and interpret things differently. It is my intent in this chapter to channel, make novel connections of, the seemingly incommensurable research approaches to increase the probability of new paths for educational inquiry. No method introduced is totally new. But the methodological thinking--ideas behind making alternative use of old methods--is new.

In this chapter, I first encourage an alternative way of "looking" at educational practice--a photographic approach--with a special attention given to issues related to photographic discourse and its contexts for validation. Then, I address ideas and possibilities for incorporating photography as a mediating means in co-operative educational inquiry. Finally, I describe in great length the process of how my data are analyzed and interpreted, and how my data stories are produced. The unique features of data analysis in this study include implementing different interpretation approaches, documenting photographs, analyzing conversation, and writing narrative. While the latter two are elaborated somewhat, the central move of this chapter is to position photo-data as a paradigmatic case of "reading" data in the crisis of representation.
New "Looking": A Photographic Approach

For in the immediate world, everything is to be discerned, for him [sic] who can discern it, and centrally and simply, without either dissection into science, or digestion into art, but with the whole of consciousness, seeking to perceive it as it stands: so that the aspect of a street in sunlight can roar in the heart of itself as a symphony, perhaps as no symphony can: and all of consciousness is shifted from the imagined, the revisive, to the effort to perceive simply the cruel radiance of what is....This is why... I feel such rage at [the camera's] misuse: which has spread so nearly universal a corruption of sight that I know of less than a dozen alive whose eyes I can trust even so much as my own.

(Agee and Evans, 1941, p. 11)

Inquiry with a Camera

The camera is an instrumental extension of our senses—an extension of our perception. No matter how selective a unit we might wish to photograph, the camera by its optical character faithfully records the whole vision within focus and scope of its lens. "The images with a memory" or "the slices of reality," especially with today's automated cameras, come into existence almost without effort. As Collier (1967) and Wagner (1979) have shown, the use of a camera in fieldwork provides greater promise in collecting holistic and consistent samples and records of critical phenomena.

Of course there are some possible distortions and limitations in using the camera as a research tool, for instance, the user's consciousness, use of equipment,
darkroom procedures, editorial processes, juxtaposition of photographs, and context (Ziller, 1990). However, Collier (1967) reminds us that the distortions or limitations of the camera are actually those of the user, and "the difficulty of photographic evidence is fundamentally the problem of scientific observation by any means—not some special fault of the camera record" (p. 135). Therefore, I believe, as long as we recognize who, what, when, where, and how to photograph—and why, and are able to find appropriate approaches of decoding photographic content, these limitations should not inhibit the use of the camera as a research tool. And if we use this valuable recording tool properly and honestly, we may enter into a new realm of understanding that continues to expand our social thinking and human inquiry.

Using cameras to record what has been observed, in the form of still or motion pictures, is not a new technique. We might well remember Margaret Mead's contribution in establishing visual anthropology (see Worth, 1980), or we might get amazed by the way Agee and Evans use motion pictures and musical forms of representation to confess their "spy-counterspy" strain in their journalistic data gathering mission (Agee & Evans, 1941; Quinby, 1991). However, only a small amount of research in the social sciences has employed this observation means. Not surprisingly, the viability of photography as a method of
inquiry has been well documented in anthropology and sociology (e.g., Bellman & Jules-Rosette, 1977; Bogaart, et al., 1983; Caldarola, 1985; Collier, 1967; Heider, 1983; Wagner, 1979), although photography has recently gained more attention in educational qualitative studies (e.g., Bogdan & Biklen, 1982; Dempsey & Tucker, 1991; English, 1988; Eisner, 1991; Patton, 1990).

Generally, research involving the use of photography can be grouped into five types: (a) documentary photography about groups and society, (b) film-based studies of physical and social movements, (c) photo-observation of social interaction, (d) photo-interviewing for inviting the actor’s points of view, and (e) observing being observed, in other words, observations involving the interaction of persons and camera (Ziller, 1990). Based on their fieldwork experience, Collier (1967) and Wagner (1979) believe that the camera should be used inductively in fieldwork. They view photographs as useful visual background, illustrations, data, and cross-cultural communicators, thus, photographs can be best used in interviewing to elicit responses that serve to unlock the content of the image. Concerning the "holism" issue, the insistence on studying and explaining human behavior in context, Heider (1983) has tried to work out "how the holistically based ethnography can best mesh with the contextualizing potential of film." Moreover, Worth (1980) encourages "doing the anthropology of visual
communication." He notes that we need to consider what the photograph has recorded "about" a certain culture, and to study how a photograph is used in the context of the recorded culture.

The Interpretation of Photographs

Indeed, photographs can be used in research in several different ways. How they are used is actually related to how they are interpreted by the researcher and/or the viewer. As Barrett (1990) pronounces, every photograph "embodies a particular way of seeing and showing the world" (p. 33), thus, all photographs "deserve to be read, explained, analyzed, and deconstructed" (p. 34). By the promise/power of "good" interpretations, the use of photographs becomes meaningful.

In considering the relationship between the researcher and the photo-data, how photographic data are managed by the researcher, we can sort out four approaches: the scientific mode, the narrative mode, the reflexive mode, and the phenomenological mode (Harper, 1989). According to Harper, in the scientific mode, the researcher looks outside her/his experience for data and categorizes parts of the photographic image based on observable phenomena. In the narrative mode, the researcher structures data to analyze social life as a process made up of social interaction. In terms of the reflexive mode, this visual method helps to
posit a relationship between the researcher, the image, and the researched, and to invite the researched to share in the definition of meaning. And in the phenomenologic mode, the researcher looks within to elicit her/his own knowledge through the analysis of photographs that have personal meaning.

These approaches are not mutually exclusive. Based on different research purposes and contexts, one approach may excel the others in function, but sometimes some of them may be interfused to serve the interest of the researcher and/or the researched. For example, using their photographic and verbal record of the daily living and environment of tenant farmers in the middle south of the United State, Agee and Evans (1941) first started with preparing a "documentary type" of article for a New York magazine. But later, because of their anti-authoritarian consciousness, instead of using the photographs illustratively, they used them, together with the text, in a "coequal, mutually independent, and fully collaborative" way (Ibid., xlvii). They published a book entitled Let Us Praise Famous Men, a milestone in documentary writing and photography.

Concerning the viewer's engagement with photo-"texts," a literacy scholar, Wells, writes of how a "repertoire of complementary approaches" illustrates very well how photographic texts are treated by the viewer (in Green, 1992). In Well's model, there are five modes of engagement:
the performative mode, the functional mode, the informational mode, the re-creational mode, and the epistemic mode. Based on Wells’ notion, photographic texts can be engaged to address how the camera sees and how to see with the camera at a technical level (the performative mode); to encourage the use of photo-texts as a means to an end, e.g., to help the viewer perform an intended task (the functional mode); to convey information accurately and clearly (the informational mode); to explore the world through one’s own or another’s photographic vision (the re-creational mode); and to interrogate the viewer in an extended process of making sense, in relation to viewer’s own experience (the epistemic mode).

As Wells points out, these approaches are not applied in a developmental sequence, but in a complementary manner. For example, in his examination of the contexts in which a photograph, say, the 1950s Doisneau’s Cafe photograph, has been placed, Barrett (1990) illustrated how the meaning of photo-texts was altered by how they were presented, and how viewers satisfied their expectations for aesthetic pleasure, for information about an issue devoted to cafes, for making an interpretation, and etc.
Issues Related to Photographic Discourse

We are all more or less alone. The extent to which we are paralyzed by this depends upon...societal, and cultural experiences. Our ability to integrate these experiences—to view them from an appropriate perspective—defines our identity, our ability to become autonomous.

(Becky Young, "The Nude as a Metaphor," 1983, p. 25)

Crisis of Representation

Representation, as defined by Woolgar (1988), is "the means by which we generate images (reflection, representations, reports) of the object 'out there'" (p. 30). Different methods/tools applied in observational studies lead to different modes of representation. Of all modes of representation, photography is the one most easily assimilated into the discourses of knowledge and truth, because it is commonly seen as a re-presentation of nature itself, as an unmediated copy of the real world (Shapiro, 1988). Yet, through the practice of photographing, the three-dimensional real world (I would say space) is reproduced on the flat, two-dimensional surface, and motion is frozen; thinking-in-action is not present. It can be "deceptive." Not to mention, in the "real" world, there, in fact, exist the forth dimension—time, the fifth dimension—consciousness, and etc.

Because of the challenge of contemporary philosophy of science and sociology of knowledge, the photograph becomes
seen as "a token of exchange" (Sekula, 1982) that is constituted within "social networks" (Woolgar, 1988). As Sekula has realized, a photographic discourse is a system within which "the culture harnesses photographs to various representational tasks." Every photographic message is necessarily "context-determined" and is characterized by a "tendentious rhetoric" of relationships. The photographic text should be seen not as a representation of the object/event, but as part of a continuing process of knowledge construction. Therefore, photography is not only to record, but to "enlighten" (Burgin, 1982), to "evoke" (Barrett, 1990).

At the crossroads of "representational turns" (Lather, 1991b), the inversion of the presumed relationship between representation and object has been advocated (Woolgar, 1988). The disruption of the practices of normalizing power/knowledge has been encouraged (Quinby, 1991). In consequence, many photographic communications are taking place within the conditions of a kind of binary folklore—a 'symbolist' folk-myth and a 'realist' folk-myth (Sekula, 1982). Indeed, every photograph tends, at any given moment of reading in any given context, toward one of two poles of meaning-making, for example, "photography as expression vs. photography as reportage, theories of imagination (and inner truth) vs. theories of empirical truth, affective value vs. informative value, and metaphoric signification vs.
metonymic signification" (Ibid., p. 108). As Dempsey and Tucker (1991) point out, every photograph has multiple meanings that are inevitably subject to cultural, contextual definition, and each photograph has the dual capacity to make reality manageable as well as opaque, continuous as well as discrete, and revealing as well as concealing.

Domain of Readability

Photographic readability, just like representation, is never isolated from its textual context. Though the photograph has its own language that is beyond speech, if we accept the fundamental premise that meaning is the outcome of a culturally determined relationship (Sekula, 1982), then it is important to inquire into the ideational force of both the image production and viewing practices (Shapiro, 1988). As Sekula argues, a photograph communicates by means of its association with some hidden, or implicit text; "it is this text, or system of hidden linguistic propositions, that carries the photograph into the domain of readability" (1982, p. 85). In reading and interpreting a photograph, it is important to grasp its intrinsic, primitive meaning (a level of denotation) as well as its invested, culturally determined meaning (a level of connotation) (Barrett, 1990; Sekula, 1982).

As I discussed earlier, the representational "verisimilitude" of a photograph can be deceptive. How can
we get to walk into the hidden dimensions to grasp the meaning from the represented world? I believe, we need to maximize our access to "contextual information"—internal, original, and external (Barrett, 1990) of the photograph. As Barrett suggests, it is difficult for us to have fruitful reading and/or trustworthy interpreting practices if we do not have prior knowledge of the photograph: who made it, when, where, how, and for what purpose. According to him, internal context is something that is "descriptively evident." To consider a photograph's internal context is to pay attention to the photograph's subject matter, medium, form, and the relations among these three. Original context is "history". To consider a photograph's original context means to consider certain information about the photographer and about the social times in which she/he is working. External context is the situation in which a photograph is presented. Because external contexts, or presentational environments, are forms of interpretation, they need to be put into account from the aspects of accuracy, fairness, reasonableness and their consequences.

Ethical Concerns

Photography speaks and thinks in a variety of ways, and there is no essential answer to how it tends to signify. I propose two levels of reading photo-data in qualitative research: the operational and the interrogative. Each has
implications for ethical practice. At an operational level, the basic ethical concerns include "accuracy," "informed consent," and "vulnerability" (Dempsey & Tucker, 1991; Gold, 1989). Given my earlier argument that photographic representation is context bound, accurate portrayal demands that the contexts be sampled in terms of time, activity, location, means, and ends. In terms of informed consent issues, according to Dempsey and Tucker, and Gold, because of both the public and private nature of photographs, it is not possible to conceal the identity of the photographed. The implementation of a photographic approach might be threatening to the researched, because the researched might be troubled by the feeling of being "under surveillance," or might be cautious about if there will be any "unpredictable" effects triggered by the use of photographs. Ideally, a consent informed contract, an ongoing communication, as well as a sensitive and respectful manner may more or less help to protect the photographed (Gold, 1989). In terms of vulnerability issues, the art of controlling situations and the flexibility of negotiating alternatives are the essential concerns (Dempsey & Tucker, 1991). It is important to apply some practical strategies in such a way that turns vulnerability to become a positive collaborative condition, for example, encouraging openness, preparing written annotative records, and so forth.
At an interrogating level, the major concerns are placed on "aesthetic" and "political" issues. Because the aesthetic mode is understood to function in relation to a feeling or state of mind, it is subjective in its focus (Polkinghorne, 1989). The "aestheticizing" tendency of photography is to outlast the relevance of the subject matter elegantly, therefore "the fascination with the photograph may be nuanced by implied imaginary relations with the viewed such as inferiority/superiority, culpability/moral distance, and so on" (Burgin, 1982, p. 191). As cameras "miniaturize experience, transform history into spectacle" (Sontag, in Barrett, 1990, p. 82), their output—photographs—may "cut sympathy, distance the emotions" (Ibid.), or to the contrary, encourage empathy, formulate new perspectives, for example, in Agee and Evans' case (Quinby, 1991).

Also, photography can partake of a typical political genre, the "photographic expose." It is noteworthy that photography can play a politically radical role when it "opens up forms of questions about power and authority which are closed or silence within the most frequently circulated and authoritative discursive practices" (Shapiro, 1988, p. 130). Applying the notion that "no text can signify without the complicity of the reader," Barthes (in Ibid., p. 128) argues that the reading of photographs is governed by the set of social codes with which the photograph and viewer
interact. Because there is a tendency for the photograph to be reconciled with the social order, and because photography may potentially become subversive and may awaken thought, more and more researchers as well as practitioners start to displace their attention from physical characteristics to social ones.

As Shapiro (1988) reminds, when we interrogate photographs from the point of view of how they speak/think aesthetically and/or politically, it is necessary to think of them as discursive practices situated within the general economy of societal practices. Referring back to representational issues, we may again be aware that "photographic rhetoric is a practice intimately tied to its discursive accompaniments" (Ibid., 163).

Technical Considerations

Photographic observation requires quick reflexes and a professional's familiarity with the equipment. I already discussed earlier some technical limitations and distortions of using cameras as a research tool. The purpose of this section is to introduce one of the recent developments in photographic technology that may affect the practice of photographic discourse—the evolution of "frame grabbing" programs which pull stills or short video segments off a videotape. "Made possible by innovations such as IBM's M-Motion Video card, stills or video may easily be
incorporated into custom software hypermedia programs such as Toolbox on the IBM or Supercard on the Macintosh" (Dempsey & Tucker, 1991). Because this development greatly simplifies the processes associated with capturing and inserting researcher-generated visuals, it increases the expediency and effectiveness of using the motion photographic data. Particularly, when there is a need for laying out some still images to discuss diverse or critical points, such "frame grabbing" programs make available the needed still images from motion ones. Yet, at the same time it arouses suspicion about representation. Undoubtedly, it is the time to cross-examine how and why and in what context a particular "articulator" structured her/his particular photo-text about the represented world.

Validation in Photographic Contexts

When all the world recognizes beauty as beauty, this in itself is ugliness. When all the world recognizes good as good, this in itself is evil. Indeed, the hidden and the manifest give birth to each other.

(Lao Tzu, Tao Teh Ching)

The celebration of abstract humanity becomes...the celebration of the dignity of the passive victim. This is the finial outcome of the appropriation of the photographic image for liberal political ends; the oppressed are granted a bogus 'subjecthood' when such status can be secured only from within, on their own terms.

(Sekula, 1982, P. 109)
The photographic approach in critical ethnographic studies is derived largely from the epistemological conception of photographic representation. With an attempt to create an approach to validity of visual descriptions, its epistemological mechanism consists of connecting the images to the context of observation and establishing a system of discourse that involves an image-constructing event. Such an imaging event is a socially interactive and communicative process that involves the mutual understanding and participation of both the researcher and the researched (Caldarola, 1985). In the process, just like Mishler (1990) has described about validation in inquiry-guided research, theory and analysis are in a continuing dialectic with each other and with the photo-data. I adapt here the Westley/MacLean model of communication (in Brecheen-Kirkton, 1989), to illustrate the specific aspects of photographic discourse (see Figure 4.1). It, simple as it may be, outlines the basic structural aspects of the dialectic process and suggests the most important point of interactions/relationships. We can see, from this model, an epistemologically connective meta-context that constitutes a photographic inquiry method by which to investigate the photographed phenomena through the connections between and among the camera, the object (the researched), the viewer, and the photographic image itself. This meta-context
reinforces the principle that photographic discourse is both a personal, and a communal endeavor.

Figure 4.1: Photographic Discourse

The camera, the object, and the viewer are in continual interaction mutually validating each other and encouraging further understanding of the photographic image. Among the associated data, the visual contents of the photographs, of each image-constructing event is included information about the contexts of research methodology, event conceptualization, event process and environment, the researcher point of view, and the researched response. In other words, image-constructing is a communication event in which the researcher and the researched are mutual participants in photographic discourse. The communicating
relationship is enhanced by the researched access to the photographs and the feedback response. Such an "epistemic conversation" (a term borrowed from Polkinghorne, 1989) nature of the photographic discourse reflects a contextual web necessary for increasing the information content of photographic images. More importantly, including in the process of research individuals from both sides of the camera, the photographic discourse, as epistemic conversation, enhances the validity of meaning constructing process.

The value of photography in critical ethnographic studies is then not that it can record "objective reality," but that it offers a "medium of communication" between the researcher and the researched, and between their respective communities (Caldarola, 1985). As the circumstances of the photographic interaction made explicit, the researcher no longer assumes the traditional "omniscient observer" role (Ibid.), but begins to appear more like an "observing participant" than a participant observer (Torbert, 1991, see Chapter 3). Not afraid to "disturb" nor "to be disturbed" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), the researcher makes possible "reformulating validation as the social construction of knowledge" (Mishler, 1990). Based on the notions that "to validate is to investigate" and "truth is constituted through a dialog" (Kvale, 1989), the photographic discourse demonstrates very well how knowledge claims can be created
and tested through a communicative image-constructing event, a built-in validation process—a contextual approach that is embedded in the continuous photographic event from observation to communication and action. As Emerson and Pollner (1988) suggest on the use of "member validation procedures," the emphasis is not the truth value of either the researcher’s or the researched’s versions, but rather the ways in which the researcher and the researched co-create the perceived reality.

In sum, a photographic approach in critical ethnographic studies is a dialectical and dialogical validation practice. It, in nature, creates a "self-enclosed" domain for "aesthetic understanding" (Polkinghorne, 1989), and sets a developmental zone for "connoisseurship" (Eisner, 1991). Also, it helps raise ethical-political awareness that might lead to needed "pragmatic" actions (Kvale, 1989). Indeed, the photographic discourse puts into practice Woolgar’s (1988) ideal polices, "inversion" and "feedbacking," for the study of social science. It provides room for presenting the web of "structure, sign and play" of social relations (Derrida, in Lather, 1991b). And it allows the exploration of validity as "reflexive/transgressive," "counter-practices of authority" (Lather, 1991b).
"Too much honor means no honor. It is not wise to shine like jade and resound like stone-chimes" (Lao Tzu). The preceding reformulation of validity is a celebration that validity is reframed as "multiple, partial, endlessly deferred" as we explore how "discourse/language worlds the world" (Lather, 1991b).

Reconciling Co-operative Inquiry with Photographic Discourse

If the development of perceptivity is one side of the qualitative coin, the development of skills of representation is the other. The preparation of qualitative researchers must include exposure to the various ways in which the world is revealed. (Eisner, The Enlightened Eye, 1991, p. 234)

The heart of qualitative educational inquiry is the development of "perceptivity" (Eisner, 1991). Conducting a co-operative action inquiry approach, I believe, is most promising in the description, interpretation, and appraisal of educational situations. It encourages the exploration of different ways of knowing, cultivation of shared perceptions, and development of theoretical sensitivity. Moreover, it creates a world of action driven by the emerging pragmatic visions (as detailed in Chapter 3). Basically, the major emphasis of validation in co-operative inquiry is placed on the "interplay of propositional and presentational construing" (Heron, 1988). It involves both
the researcher and the researched moving to and fro between reflection and experience, and attempts to manage unaware projections as well as to get balance between divergence and convergence (Ibid.). Based on my previous discussion on photographic discourse and its contexts for validation, it appears fruitful to incorporate educational action inquiry with the photographic approach.

I believe that using photography (including both still photographs and motion film or video) has the potential for multiple applications in the study of educational praxis. It helps to collect a series of "interactive episodes" (Corsaro, in Evertson & Green, 1985) that are representative of typical activities in the setting and has the potential for the development of theoretical propositions. These interactive episodes can serve not only as the subject matter for analysis, but as stimuli for reflective discussions which in turn generate more data. They help to trigger recall and focus the reflective discussion, enabling an in-depth look at intended as well as unintended aspects of an educational practice. However, it is impossible to record all interactions in a given setting, thus, it is important to insure representativeness by applying proper sampling procedures--collecting data across several dimensions including people, places, time and activities. Because the essence of co-operative inquiry is dialectical,
feedbacking and sampling procedures, in consequence, need to be constructed in a way to reflect its dialectical nature.

In educational studies, particularly in classroom research, the utilization of videotapes is most promising in capturing life interactions in terms of spatio-temporal wholes. It helps to yield richer data than that obtained from still photographs. The external memory of videotapes, together with the running notes obtained as a participant observer or observing participant, provide the researcher with "evidentiary resource" by using an "instant replay" (Erickson in Evertson & Green, 1985). This evidence can be shared with teachers and other participants in the inquiry community. In the process of this sharing, as Erickson suggests, the interpretation is no longer a matter of strictly private judgment and opinion. The whole process opens up the possibility of interactional inquiry that is not positivistic, yet is still rigorously empirical. In other words, the videotape and its "playback" capability allow participants to refer to the qualities on the tape that support their descriptions, interpretations, or evaluations of what they have seen. But, importantly, the primary function of this here is, as Eisner (1991) suggests, not to accommodate behaviorist criteria, but to increase caution and reflexivity.
Data Analysis

Qualitative data analysis, ambiguously signifying both process and product, is an extensible term that has been stretched to include not only the analysis of recorded data like interview segments, fieldnotes, observational comments and so forth, but organizations, plans, development of coding categories, strategies of coding, and theoretical constructs—in short, the entire range of artifacts made by researchers (see Bogdan & Biklen, 1982; Patton, 1990; Strauss & Corbin, 1990). In the very broadest sense, analyzing data is a process by which realities are constructed. In a sense only slightly less broad, researchers make representations of the perceived realities. They shape data to function in some context through a social web of deliberate moves and discovered consequences. Importantly, as Peshkin (1988) suggests, qualitative data analysis should resist standardization. There is always room for creative forms of representation and for the good to be done (e.g., Fine, 1991; Van Maanen, 1988; Sizer, 1984; Walsh, 1991).

In this study, following the dialectical principle, "we" (the teacher and I) made our analysis an ongoing part of data collection in that our observational findings as well as feelings/thoughts about the observed phenomena have always been "recycled" in our dialogues (formal/informal
reflective discussions). In consequence, these dialogues become both data and method of analysis. In terms of personal analytical work, basically, I applied a "selective coding" associated with a "discriminate sampling" approach (Strauss & Corbin, 1992) to write up story lines. The data used and the themes (categories) that emerged from the analysis and write up of the stories for both sites were selected, refined, and developed in the field. All the text re-cycling events—reflective discussions—had helped to "maximize opportunities for verifying" (validating) the story lines and relationships between themes (categories) and filling in poorly developed themes (Strauss & Corbin, Ibid.) Basically, my data analysis process and product (write-up) are guided by three basic questions: What do we want to write about? How do we write it? And for whom do we write (Richardson, 1988)? No matter which system/model is applied, data analysis is a kind of decision-making process that is more important and more complicated than data collection. It involves generating alternatives (options for decision, or so-called analysis proposals), and "selecting" alternatives according to situation-specific rationality.

In terms of writing up data stories, it is then a conscientious social process. Since both the researcher and the researched are within "knowledge-constitutive networks" (Nespor & Barylske, 1991), the write-up of data stories
(text) needs to reflect the dialogues among individuals in which different voices are expressed and heard. It is my belief that the qualitative data analysis process should not be encapsulated by the rather formulaic approaches in the qualitative literature (e.g., Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Patton, 1990). Thus, lots of the emphases of data analysis in this study are placed on documenting photographs, analyzing conversation, and writing the narrative, which show my effort of searching for "multiple discourses of playfulness and respect" to replace the "unitary discourse of domination and control" (Mulkay, in Nespor & Barylske, 1991).

Before I get into details of documenting photographs, analyzing conversation, and writing the narrative, I will explain three kinds of interpreting approaches that are purposively applied in analyzing the various data I had in hand. They are descriptive interpretations on design studio data, impressionist interpretations on leadership workshop data, and disclosive interpretation on inquiry experience. For me, making sense of the data is a mindful, synthetical analysis that always involves interpretive quality, no matter that the product is a descriptive play (Chapter 5), an impressionist play (Chapter 6), or a disclosive tale (Chapter 7).

Descriptive Interpretation on Studio Data. The purpose of "descriptive interpretation," the most familiar, popular,
and recognized approach of data analysis, is to produce accurate and representative "descriptions" of events, of participants' talk in interviews, and of their stories. Serving as the analytic framework for descriptive data stories, the participants' points of view are often put forward in writing, though they are asserted and shaped-up by the researcher, the "authorized" writer of the stories. Basically, descriptive interpretation involves analyzing "realist" narrative schemes (Van Maanen, 1988) in the situations that draw forth particular stories into interpretive explanation or expression.

Interpreting design studio life descriptively, the data used are mostly drawn from recordings of interviews and reflective discussions. Some are from photographs, survey data, and documents. Only a few are from fieldnotes. Each direct quote of comments transcribed from recordings or copied from questionnaires is ended with an annotative code, indicating the source. In my annotative system for studio data, Q stands for Questionnaire, I for Interview, D for Debbi, N for Norman, S for Students. Thus, for example, "IN1" means the source is from the Interview with Norman in the first inquiry cycle, "ID2" from the Interview with Debbi in the second inquiry cycle, and so forth. Basically, all the selected photographs and direct quotes from the field data are used as grounded constructs to exemplify the emerging co-generated themes of the descriptive play of
studio life. However, they are juxtaposed in accordance, more or less, with my (the researcher’s) personal preference and theoretical interest in such an "author-proclaimed" descriptive play.

Impressionist Interpretation on Workshop Data. The attempt toward impressionist interpretation is to provoke multiple views and to evoke a figurative, but open, participatory sense in the audience. Through the "dramatic recall" of in-field experience, it is to draw an audience into the researched world and allow it to see, hear, and feel as the researcher saw, heard, and felt (Van Maanen, 1988). In consequence, telling an impressionist story is not to tell what to "think of" research "findings" but to show the representational "impressions" of findings meditatively so that the audience may be attracted to relive the story and to work out its problems and puzzles as they unfold. As a way to reflect matters more dear to the researcher/writer's heart, interpretation of the impressionist sort, as Van Maanen describes, "seems to rest on the recall of forgotten details and the editing of remembered ones" (Ibid., 117).

Based on my extensive participatory experience in leadership workshop, I started analyzing data in the field by comprising a series of the remembered events and reflective themes, recorded in my fieldnotes and journals. Because our goals (the teacher's and mine) were not fixed,
our/or my choices in data analysis--ways of making data meaningful--have been guided more by situational, spontaneous "inchoate lore" (a term borrowed from Van Maanen, Ibid.) than by a systematic, technical logic. To a great extent, events and conversations of "findings" are interpreted and reinterpreted in light of new understandings and ongoing dialogues with the teacher. Presenting interpretation on leadership workshop data from an impressionist view, I use the materials of words, metaphors, phrasings, imageries (instead of concrete photographs), and the recall of in-field experience to reconstruct the observed particular scenes and the perceived notable findings. Data sources are annotated descriptively in the script and my critical reflective thoughts are woven into the interpretation of each described episodes. Though this sort of interpretation seems to suggest the possibility of imprecision, of ambiguity, of idiosyncracy, its narrated events are not deceptively random at all. They are fostered and chosen in inquiry actions, and influenced by language, ecology, and shared visions and interests between co-inquirers.

**Disclosive Interpretation on Inquiry Experience.** In order to unmask the fieldwork, disclosive interpretation is aimed at "coming clear" about the methodological struggles of an inquiry experience. It can be "confessional" in terms of
revealing accounts of what fieldwork did to the researcher and the researched (Van Maanen, 1988). It can also be critical in terms of surfacing larger social, political, symbolic, or economic issues entangled in the fieldwork. In this sort of practice, emotional involvement, new ways of seeing things, new things to see, and various unexpected "happenings" are disclosed to help grasp how the researcher came to understand and interpret the researched scene/s.

Attempting to explicitly demystify my co-operative inquiry experience, I put together some disclosive tales to show how my researching odyssey was undergone. The process of my analysis is not only dependent on the inquiry actions themselves, but also on the co-inquirers' reflective versions of the actions. In other words, disclosing my lived inquiry experience involves a dialectic between experience and interpretation, between private reflective thoughts and public debriefing. Some tales are confessional, and some are critical. But the predominant themes are basically centered around accounts of what we (co-inquirers) have learned methodologically from "doing" inquiry co-operatively, and of what the inquiry experience has done to the researcher and the researched.

**Documenting Photographs**

Photography is a form of discourse. An important and unique aspect of documenting photographs is to accumulate
visual information to make effective statements in order to influence people and events. The purpose of educational documentary photography is to learn about classroom life—how teachers and students interact, work, and play, their social structures, and their physical environment. The aim is to move educators/teachers to action, to change or prevent a situation, or to support or encourage one.

According to Rothstein (1986), the documentary approach has been created by the following traditions:

a. A straight, simple, realistic technique uncluttered with visual aesthetics and avoidance of manipulation.
b. The finding of significance in the commonplace and ordinary, implying a valid representation of conditions.
c. The revelation of slices of reality through the proof and evidence of the camera.
d. A concern for social issues and causes at all level of society.
e. The production of honest photographs that are useful, functional, and serve the purpose of education and information.
f. Photography that moves people and influences them to act positively (p. 18).

As Rothstein points out, a convincing photographer can transmit to the viewer a sense of involvement and concern. If a selection is made, it needs to be done in a balanced way to prevent misinterpretation of the truth. In order to make his point, Rothstein quotes what Agee says about documentary photography:

In the kind of [documentary] photography...the actual is not at all transformed; it is reflected and recorded within the limits of the camera, with all possible accuracy. The [researcher's] task is not to alter the world as the eye sees it into a world of aesthetic reality, but to perceive the aesthetic reality within the actual world and to make an undisturbed and
faithful record of the instant in which this movement of creativeness achieves its most expressive crystallization. Through his [sic] eye and through his instrument, the [researcher] has, thus, a leverage upon the materials of existence which is unique, opening to him a universe which has never before been so directly or so purely available to [researchers] and requiring of his creative intelligence and of his skill perceptions and disciplines no less deep than those required in any other act of aesthetic creation, though very differently derived and enriched (in Rothstein, Ibid., p. 34).

In documenting photographs, written annotations are helpful and important. The assigned significance and the operational guidelines together represent the first step in the annotation process and are best recorded in fieldnotes along with the numerical identification of the photograph series. The tasks of taking and documenting photographs of studio life in this study are quite simple. Whenever I took a picture I would jot down some annotative information, as suggested by Caldarola (1985): (a) my intention/interest of taking that specific scene, (b) the circumstances and arrangements of the encounter (e.g., project assigned and activities), and (c) observations and conversations while on the scene. The purpose of these notes is to provide certain necessary baseline information so that my photographic records may be accurately assessed. Very importantly, these annotative data along with the visual relationships recorded in the images, constitute the contextual elements pertaining to the specific photographic event and create a validative context for photographic discourse.
After all the photographs were processed, I looked through them over and over again to select the outstanding ones with particular, reportable quality. In documenting those selected photographs, I intended to present them in sorted groups. I tried to make sense out of each group—to use them not only to match and/or confront the themes that emerged from other kinds of data, but also to create new themes, new meaning to my data stories. I do believe that the sum total of a group of photographs is more convincing in terms of (re)presenting the perceived reality. As Bourke-White says, "one photograph might lie, but a group of pictures can't" (in Agee and Evans, 1941, p. 453).

Analyzing Conversation

Conversation is a specific genre of discourse. It is both a linguistic and social activity that consists in the production of particular sorts of interactional "units," such as speech acts, or moves, or turns, or sentences, etc. (Taylor & Cameron, 1987). As an interdisciplinary concern, conversational analysis is a fast growing field of inquiry. Many conversation analysis models have been made, from the disciplines of philosophy, psychology, sociology, anthropology, and linguistics, to define the constitutive interactional "rules" of a conversation. Primary approaches include pragmatics, speech act theory, interactional sociolinguistics, ethnomethodology, ethnography of
communication, and variation analysis (Schiffrin, 1991; Robert et al., 1992). But as Taylor and Cameron (1987) note, there are three key themes: (a) pragmatics, focusing on the interpretation of utterances and assuming a modular approach to generative grammar, (b) ethnography of speaking, focusing on societal conventions and seeking to describe the typical features of varied speech events, and (c) conversational structure, focusing on commonplace features of talk and seeking to describe conversation as a distinctive, highly organized level of language.

Despite the differences among various approaches, increasing attentions have been given to understanding conversation in "context." The disciplinary boundaries between sociology, anthropology, and sociolinguistics have been blurred in favor of a common interest for the detailed, ethnographical, multilevel analysis of actual language use in the sociocultural context (van Dijk, 1985; Gumperz, 1982a, 1982b; Mishler, 1979). In his latest work, Searle (1991) also argues that conversation does not have an intrinsic structure about which a relevant theory can be formulated, and conversations are not subject to constitutive rules. He suggests that conversation must be seen as an expression of "shared intentionality," and the "background" is necessary for the mutual understanding of a conversation. Indeed, conversations are a "paradigm of collective behavior" (Ibid., p. 21), that shared
intentionality and background knowledge are important factors in the explanation of any form of social behavior, and for the interpretation of conversational sequences and relevance. As Gumperz (1982b) proposes,

A general theory of [conversation] strategies must therefore begin by specifying the linguistic and socio-cultural knowledge that needs to be shared if conversational involvement is to be maintained, and then go on to deal with what it is about the nature of conversational inference that makes for cultural, subcultural and situational specificity of interpretation (p. 3).

Surveying the strengths and weaknesses of different approaches, paraphrasing Schiffrin’s (1991, pp. 9-10) suggestions, I find the following principles essential to conversational analysis:

1. The analysis of conversation is empirical. Data are about people using language, and data need to be explained both sequentially and distributionally.

2. Conversation is not just a sequence of linguistic units; attention cannot be limited just to linguistic form and meaning. Linguistic forms and meanings mutually contextualize one another, and work together with social meanings and interpretive schemata to create conversation.

3. The structures, meanings, and actions of talk are interactively negotiated and socially achieved.

4. Resources for coherence jointly contribute to participant achievement and understanding of what is said, meant, and done sequentially. Utterances are produced and interpreted in the local context of other utterances.

Thus, when analyzing a conversation, it is important to look into at least six "constraints" or "opportunities" such as:
a. speaker intentions;
b. conventionalized strategies for making intentions recognizable;
c. the meanings and functions of linguistic forms within their emerging context;
d. the sequential context of other utterances;
e. properties of the discourse mode, e.g., narration, description, exposition;
f. the social context, e.g., participant identities and relationships, structure of the situation, the setting.

In terms of analyzing conversations in the classroom (classroom talk), two research traditions in education have developed. One is the "positivistic" process-product category coding system (e.g., Flanders, 1970), and the other is "interpretive" sociolinguistic and ethnography of communication perspective (e.g., Green, Weade, & Graham, 1988). Influenced by but going beyond both traditions, this study involves a multilevel analysis of "theatrical layers of conversation" of strategic workshop data (details will be given in Chapter 6). Working from observational notes, classroom activity sequences of unfolding and evolving "cognitive text" and "social text" were recorded (see Table 4.1). Also from the notes and from reviews of video recordings of classroom activities, the most representative/insightful/impressive peer conversations were selected for further review and transcription.

The analysis includes frequency counts of interactional "moves," finding turn-taking pattern/s and topic control pattern/s (see Table 4.2), but central focus is given to qualitative accounts of excerpts of actual talk, showing linguistic phenomena as the peer conversation carried on
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Elapsed Time (min)</th>
<th>Activities (Social Text)</th>
<th>Learning Goals (Cognitive Text)</th>
<th>Resources Provided (Materials)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/2/93</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Teacher Presentation: Intro. new information. and relate it to last week activities.</td>
<td>Comparing management &amp; leadership</td>
<td>Transparencies on covered topics; Handouts on management study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher Presentation. Explain tasks for the night</td>
<td>Knowing core skills of leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>Individual Seat Work. In-basket exercise on personal action strategies</td>
<td>Making sense of competing values</td>
<td>Transparencies on objectives of the night; Handouts of mid-town in-basket info, group worksheets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td>Small Group Discussion I. Group decision-making on vision and action strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-town superintendent case &amp; individual worksheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Group Report I. Sharing group consensus &amp; hearing different group experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td>Personal strategies brought to the group; Group worksheets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher Presentation. Summing up &amp; reflecting upon various group conclusions; Relating back to competing values.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dead time. (Transition &amp; break)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td>Group Discussion II. Applying stakeholder analysis in considering action strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td>Handouts on stakeholder info.; Stakeholder analysis grid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Group Report II. (see group report I)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher Led Plenary Discussion. (&amp; announcement of the objectives of next week.)</td>
<td>Comparing different grids and showing the usefulness of the stakeholder chart.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

("This is just an example of one of the ten workshop sessions")
Table 4.2: Frequency Counts of Interactional Moves

Date: 2/2/93  Time: 9:15 - 9:25 pm  Seating:

Task: Mid-Town (Stakeholder Analysis)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>+/-</th>
<th>Turn-Adjacency</th>
<th>Topic Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3, 5</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2, 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>C, IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3, 0, 4</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>C, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4, 2, 4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2, 0, 3, 0, 4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C, IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4, 0, 2, 3, 2, 3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C, S, I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2, 0, 4, 0, 3, 0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>IN, S, IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1, 0, 2, 3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>IR, IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2, 1, 3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>IN, C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coding System:

* Coding unit - by minute (60 sec.)

*Speaker- Number/s in this column indicate talking person/s. They are coded according to the turn-taking sequences. When overlapping talking occurs, numbers are underlined.

*"+" or "-" shows the perceived climate within the minute as positive (+) or negative (-).

Task: Oakmont Case (3rd discussion)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>+/-</th>
<th>Turn-Adjacency</th>
<th>Topic Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1, 4, 1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>IR, B, IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2, 1, 4, 1, 2, 4</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>IR, B, S, IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4, 2, 1, 2, 3</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>IR, IR, S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1, 4, 1, 5, 1, 5, 4</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>IR, IR, S, IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1, 3, 2, 1, 2, 1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>IR, S, IR, IN, R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2, 1, 2, 1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>C, R, B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>S, P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2, 1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2, 1, 3, 2, 4</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>C, B, S, IN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Turn-Adjacency:

IR - Interrogative Request
C - Completion
IN - Interruption
S - Simultaneous Talking
B - Buffer/Stutter Starts
R - Reinforcers

* Topic Control:

C - Clarifying Concepts/ Tasks
S - Analyzing Situations
I - Identifying Problems/ Issues
A - Constructing Alternatives
P - Developing Action Plans
(see Table 4.3). The transcription of selected segments is offered as a heuristic device, not a literal record only. Analysis of transcripts is accompanied by the videotape record so that message delivery, nonverbal behaviors and actions of participants, and other contextual information can be considered. Basically, the minimal unit of transcription was the message unit. And message units are identified and segmented on the basis of contextualization cues (e.g., paralinguistic cues including pitch, stress, intonation, rhythm, nonverbal movement, etc.)

As van Dijk (1985) points out, conversation "not only reflexively organizes and defines its own role in social interaction and indicates its relevant place in the social setting, it also may explicitly express social members' understanding of social events" (pp. 5-6). Thus, my primary (emerging) interest of conversation analysis in this study is placed on how each verbal or nonverbal expression in group-based collaborative context can be given to its proper, situated, and unique meaning. I am also interested in finding out how peer talk might exceed the often used category systems in conversation analysis. The ultimate goal of this kind of effort is to gain insight, through linguistic forms, into the social and cognitive text events of the classroom/workshop and thereby into the understandings which both the researcher and the researched have achieved.
Table 4.3: Conventions of Transcription

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Layout</th>
<th>Each new utterance starts on a new line and, if more than one line is required to complete the utterance, continuation lines are indented.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incomplete utterance or false starts are shown with a dash, e.g., &quot;Well-er-&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pauses within speaker turns are indicated with a period. The number of periods corresponds to the number of seconds of pause, e.g., &quot;Oh...I see.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>= = When there are &quot;latched&quot; utterances, with no gap.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When two speakers speak at once, the overlapping portions of their utterances are underlined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>These punctuation marks are used to mark utterances judged to have an interrogative or exclamatory intention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passages that are impossible to transcribe are shown with asterisks, one for each word judged to have been spoken e.g., &quot;I'll go ***.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPS</td>
<td>Capitals are used for words spoken with emphasis, e.g., &quot;I really LOVE art.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>italics</td>
<td>Italics are used for words stressed by pitch and duration, e.g., &quot;I think I understand.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;&gt;</td>
<td>Angle brackets are used to enclose non-lexical phenomena, e.g., &lt;laugh&gt;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[]</td>
<td>Square brackets are used to enclose words or phrases about which the transcriber added to or paraphrased the utterance for clarification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Gloss)</td>
<td>Where it is judged necessary, an interpretation of what was said or of the way in which it was said is given in parentheses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{Sum}</td>
<td>Where it is judged not necessary to wrestle with the details, a summary of what was said is given in braces.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Writing the Narrative

Narrative is another form of discourse. Based on the phenomenological framework for narrative analysis, the casting of events into narrative can be viewed as a transformation of experience, a recovery of different realms—realm of conversation, storyrealm, and taleworld (Young, 1987). Narrative is an alternative mode of thinking and telling that shifts our attitude to lived experience from our engagement in it toward our reflection on it (Bruner, 1986; Mattingly, 1991). To narrate is to unfold, to summarize, to transcend, and to span discrete spheres of experienced/perceived reality. As Tannen (1988) says, storytelling (narrating) is an act of mind by which humans organize and understand the world, and feel connected to it and to each other.

Recently, narrative has increasingly been used in studies of educational experience. One essentialist theory in educational research holds that humans are storytelling organisms who, individually and socially, lead storied lives; education is the construction and reconstruction of personal and social stories; and teachers, learners, and researchers are storytellers and characters in their own and other’s stories (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990). In seeking what constitutes narrative thinking, Robinson and Hawpe (1986, in Ibid.) identify "economy," "selectivity," and "familiarity" as three useful writing criteria. And Spence
(1982, in Ibid.) believes that narrative truth consists of "continuity," "closure," "aesthetic finality," and a sense of "conviction." Basically, time and place, plot and scene, work together to create the experiential quality of narrative.

Given the nature of narrative, one of the primary tasks for "restorying" the lived narratives of this study is to design a strategy for continually assessing the shared narrative construction and reconstruction through co-operative inquiry. In general, the process involved can be characterized by movement from experience to fieldnotes, transcripts, documents, and storying of the experienced narrative and then to a mutual reconstruction of a narrative account. One of the main functions is to "foster reflection and restorying on the part of participants" (Clandinin & Connelly, 1992, p. 275). In order to offer constructs such as narrative unities, images, rhythms, and so forth as ways of giving an adequate, telling account, it is important for me as a narrator, in the re-telling (writing) of the shared stories, to have concerns for the moral, emotional, and aesthetic qualities of various forms of ongoing data. As Crites (1975) reminds,

...narrative is able to render the concrete particularities of experience. Its characteristic language is not conceptual but consists typically in the sort of verbal imagery we employ in referring to things as they appear to our senses or figure in our practical activities. Still more important the
narrative form aesthetically reproduces the temporal tensions of experience, a moving present tensed between and every moment embracing a memory of what has gone before and an activity projected, underway (quoted in Clandinin & Connelly, Ibid., p. 277).

In the interactive relations between the researcher and the researched, between the writer and the reader, my narrative account of pedagogical as well as methodological events in this study is not only to constitute a restorying of those events. My account is also aimed to capture some problematic scenes that may arouse participants and readers, in the process of "participating," to espy the potential for possible alternative stories. Indeed, writing the narrative is basically driven by the motive to "wrest meaning from experiences, especially powerful or disturbing ones" (Mattingly, 1991, p. 237). Such an effort is not only to give meaningful form to experiences that are rising out of a past but also to provide forward glance, helping us anticipate and envision possible experiences that are heading into a future. Hopefully, my writing/restorying of the lived pedagogical and methodological experiences may provoke a powerful consideration of the taken-for-granted constructs that inform practice, for example, beliefs, metaphors, images, strategies, values, and the like.

In sum, I believe that alternative ways of seeing, interpreting, and representing will help deepen/interrupt taken-for-granted dimensions of our understanding of the researched world. Being confronted with "incommensurable"
paradigms, theories, conceptual schemes, or forms of representation, I believe, we need to know more about the rhetoric of words and images, and we need to generate and select alternative approaches toward epistemological reconciliation/rupture of educational inquiry. As a paradigmatic case of data analysis in the crisis of representation, I believe, the photographic discourse approach is most stimulating and fruitful in the process of dialectic and emerging co-operative inquiry. And this is what this chapter was about.
The approach applied in this co-operative play was to seek the emerging grounded themes rather than to have prior defined assumptions. Together with the teachers I was working with, we established a sense of commitment, mutual understanding and framework for inquiry tasks. I shared with them the action inquiry model I have developed (see Figure 3.1) to address how our pedagogical inquiry can be seen as a process that moves in cycles. As a matter of fact, the actual inquiry process involved three cycling reflective discussions about studio teaching and learning. In order to make the teachers' "taken-for-granted" knowledge more explicit and to get a grip on what was going on in the studio, I viewed the use of photographs and/or videotapes as potentially effective media in promoting critical reflections on studio pedagogy.

Basically the overall collaborative investigation in this site was driven by several sources of theoretical work, some pertaining directly to action inquiry (e.g., Argyris, et al., 1985; Reason, 1988), and others more relevant to the
concept of reflective practitioner (Schon, 1987) and the
notion of critical pedagogy in design studios (e.g., Dutton,
1991; Feigenberg, 1991; Mann, 1991). Based on Commings and
Hustler's analysis of collaborative research (1986), there
are two features of this co-operative action inquiry
practice. First it starts with attempts to uncover
"problems" or "matters of concern" as perceived by the
teachers, rather than problems as perceived by those who are
not directly involved in the day-to-day business of
classroom life. Secondly it is not pre-planned or pre-
structured in the same way that experimental procedures
demand. Thus, this play starts with the concerns initiated
by the design studio teachers, Norman and Debbi, that I was
working with.

Norman's concerns:
* Do the students understand the language used to
  communicate design concepts and theories during a
  critique?
* Do the students hear what the faculty member thinks
  he/she is saying? That is, is the faculty member
  saying one thing while the student is hearing something
  different?
* When and why do students become frustrated during the
  process of a design project? When frustration occurs,
  is it the result of the nature of a design studio or
  does it result from behavior and communication of the
  faculty member?
* How does a faculty member know when he/she has helped
  the student too much or too little?
* What factors contribute to a student's motivation or
  lack of motivation in the design studio or on any given
  project?

Debbi's concerns:
* How can studio design be taught to nurture the
  intuitive growth and to support the creativity?
* How to convey a more effective way of communicating design principles that can reach broader base of students and respond to diversity in life?
* How to encourage investigating the alternative designs?

Obviously, these questions are similar to the concerns of those practitioners (insiders) who are actually "doing" the teaching in the design studio (e.g., Dutton, 1991; Feigenberg, 1991; Willenbrock, 1991), and are different from the interests of those researchers (outsiders) who are "studying" the teaching of studio design (e.g., Dinham, 1990). This reminds us that if we want to have deeper understanding of pedagogic reality in design studio we cannot just follow some "theoretical claims" and fulfill the "researcher's interest" only. We need to go beyond praising the gorgeous facade of studio teaching, by walking into the building to see what is inside. Maybe we also need to enter the backyard to find out what is out there that we seldom pay attention to.

In this chapter I will portray what I found behind the facade by walking through different scenes, different representational modes, in the studio pedagogical world. Through retelling stories told by teachers and students, I will juxtapose different voices to reflect the dialectic nature of interpretive events in the studio pedagogical world. Especially, I will present, in the script, some photographs I took in the studio to illustrate images that words cannot cover. I will also show some figures generated
from the survey results to indicate the points we often overlook. Basically, I am applying some sort of "macro" approach to portray my overall finding/understanding of the pedagogical life in design studio. As it will show, there are four interconnected scenes—the pedagogical setup, teachers' beliefs and assumptions, students' perceptions and interpretations, and studio culture and social relations—displaying not only the unique nature of design education but also the hidden dilemmas of studio pedagogy. In addition, I will include the researcher's notes as reflective epilogue to unfold my state of mind in this play. Finally, the curtain-call is added to address some of the absence of the present in my data analysis.

In this play, a series of design pedagogical accounts are offered. They are voices from the world of action in one single landscape architecture sophomore design studio, not representing the entire field of design education.
SETTING:

Two landscape architecture design studios on the second floor of Brown Hall, in which the action occurred, characters were formed and lived out their stories, and cultural and social context played constraining and enabling roles (see Figure 5.1 and Figure 5.2).

Figure 5.1: The Facade of Landscape Architecture

Figure 5.2: The Design Studio
PLAYERS:

Students - Sophomores in LARCH 253 studio design class. Based on the demographic data gathered from the survey (see Appendix A) conducted in this study, a majority of the students, among 26 respondents, are between eighteen to twenty-five years of age. Only three of them are over twenty-six, having work experience over five years (Figure 5.3). Half of them have been exposed to suburban environments mostly, one-third to rural areas, and only a few to urban areas (Figure 5.4). Basically, they have quite good performance in most of their academic work, and are confident of their design ability. Also, their attitude toward and impression of the course are quite positive (see Table 5.1).

![Figure 5.3: Design Studio Demographic Data on Age](image)

![Figure 5.4: Demographic Data on Exposure to Environment](image)
Table 5.1: Survey Results on Demographic Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Compared to other students in the design course, how would you rate your own ability?</th>
<th>(26)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Well above average (top 20%)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Above average (next 20%)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Average (middle 20%)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Below average (next 20%)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Far below average (bottom 20%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. How would you summarize your overall feelings toward your studio learning experience?</th>
<th>(26)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Very Positive</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Positive</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Neutral</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Negative</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Very Negative</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. N/A</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Norman - A distinguished faculty member with a national reputation in his specialty, the "master" teacher of LARCH 253 design course. He has taught design courses at various levels for 18 years and is particularly interested in developing a better approach for evaluating student solutions in landscape architectural studio design projects. He encourages students to apply new technology (computer graphic programs) to assist design. He puts together LARCH 253 course and is in charge of teaching both lecture and studio sessions. In students' eyes, he is very well-organized, and supportive.

Debbi - Another outstanding, experienced faculty member, the co-teacher of LARCH 253 studio session. Most of her teaching responsibilities are for advanced design courses. Since she hasn't taught the beginning level for quite a while, helping to co-teach LARCH 253 studio session, she thinks, is somewhat challenging. She is a teacher with great enthusiasm in encouraging students to develop a personal style of expression and to stretch for creativity in their designs. Some students think she is very understanding and inspiring, and some feel it is quite difficult to get to know what she expects.

Me - the researcher-learner and the narrator. I am very excited at this because of architecture design studio's unique place in higher education--its integrated nature in curricular structure, its "apprenticeship" character in pedagogical practice, and its strong ties to the practicum profession. Also, I have a strong personal interest in arts and crafts, and in architecture. Thus, a quarter long "sit-in" experience in LARCH 243 in spring 1991 was so rewarding not only for gaining prerequisite field knowledge for doing this study, but also for learning about something that I have been fond of for a long time.
The picture of how a human mind construes sense experience to build a coherent conception of external reality and constructs further conceptions of memory and imagination has many implications for design education. To enlarge the holistic perspective of design process as well as to encourage the dialogical practice in the design studio, it is possible to suggest a range of questions that any designer might ask. Based on a critical quest, design activity might provide a focus for discussing, expanding, reflecting and developing meaning.

What is the world like? What am I like?
How can I look at and analyze the world I live in and understand it?
How can I express or represent what I feel and know about the world?
What do I value? Why do I like what I like?
Can I make the world more like what I like?
How can I plan to improve the world or myself or both?
Do I need to work with others to improve the world?
How can I work with them?
How can I express or represent my plans?
How can I make my plans become reality?
What tools and materials can I use? How can I use them?
Must I change my plans because of what I know about tools and materials?
Is what I have made a success? What do I mean by success?
Do I think it is a success?
Do other people think it is a success?
Which is more important--their judgement or mine?
What have I learned from trying to change the world?
What do I value?
What is the world like? What am I like?

(Digested from Baynes & Roberts, 1984, p. 9)
SCENE I: The Pedagogical Setup

PLOT LINE: What knowledge/skills are transmitted? How are they transmitted?

As knowledge is not a neutral entity, neither is studio pedagogy. When I first looked into the studio pedagogical setup with my fresh eyes, I was stunned by its richness and vividness. All the curricular events, including lectures, assigned readings and design projects, and studio critiques, are so interrelated and complementary. They reflect not only a teachers' personal and professional competencies and responsibilities for the development of a "course," and the development of more appropriate ways of assessing and appraising students' activity, but also the consideration and action that is in reference to the range of students engaging in the design experience.

Curriculum Structure

The design studio, the core of most landscape architecture curricula, has been the focus of many design-process studies. Generally speaking, the considerations of curricular events in design studio are centered around the nature of design phenomena, the nature of the design "capacity" and its function, the nature of developing that capacity, the developmental "stages," the needs, the aspirations, of those engaged in learning-through-designing,
and the cultural context of design phenomena. As Norman describes in his Instructional Enhancement Grant proposal,

The majority of landscape architecture design courses are taught in a "studio" format in which the students undertake design projects with "hands-on" instruction, guidance, and criticism [critique] from the teacher. Within this studio setting, most of the design projects are studied and developed in either a graphic or model format. These projects typically address a multitude of issues and problems including aesthetics, function, environmental "fit," social appropriateness, and communication (1990).

He also points out, in the LARCH 253 course syllabus, that the emphasis of his studio activity is placed on

The creation of spatial compositions that are creative, functionally sound, visually pleasing, and ecologically and culturally appropriate as well as being responsive to the major form determinants of a given situation (1992).

Basically, in the department of landscape architecture, after a year of general studies, including study in the liberal arts and introductions to landscape architectural history and drawing, students are required to take consecutive design courses starting with the sophomore year. LARCH 253, which I observed, was an introductory level course for sophomores, utilizing and expanding the knowledge and skills learned previously in LARCH 151, 252, and 271 courses, that included the "basic sciences" of landscape architecture, ranging from site analysis to design materials to hands-on practice of using a unique palette of elements to compose outdoor space. Each week there were three
two-hour studio sessions following one-hour lectures.

According to Norman,

By means of studio exercises and projects, individual critiques and group reviews, lectures and discussions, and assigned readings, this course studies the genesis of landscape architectural form and space as created individually and collectively by landform, plant materials, pavement, site structures, buildings, and water (Course Syllabus, 1992).

Lecture

In Norman’s class, each lecture was actually a slide-show, reflecting Norman’s planning and organization of the content to be covered. Through showing students tens and hundreds of slides, Norman introduced, in ten weeks, spatial concepts in history, principles of space, design principles, plant materials and space, landform types, function of pavement, site structures, and buildings, water, sculpture, and light and sound in the landscape. Based on how he learned, he put together how he would help students to learn. He believes that showing students with concrete examples through visual aids is a better way to help students grasp the abstract concepts, design terminologies, and understand functional characteristics and design elements. He also believes that showing examples can help students get excited about the profession and can provide students opportunities to compare their work with others'.
Studio Design Projects

The studio assignments fit at a particular point into the course objectives and the department's larger curricular goals. All the assignments are arranged as a series of projects growing in complexity and differing according to approach, theme, context (real or fictitious), and technology. When teachers design the projects they are designing their best attempt to elicit student learning. In LARCH 253, there were four major design projects. Each project was built upon but distinct from earlier experiences.

The first project was a research-based project which was to develop an understanding of space that would serve as the basis for subsequent design projects. Students were asked to discuss the spatial philosophy and to prepare, by using hand-drawn plan oblique or Form-Z (computer graphic design), abstract 3-D diagrams and 2-D diagrams that identify and analyze the overall spatial organization of the project. Both projects #2 and #3 were to use plant materials to prepare a design solution that responds to the opportunities and constraints of the given site and its context. But project #3 involved students using not only plant materials but also landform to define space and spatial character. And it needed to be done in a model format. For both projects, students were required to work out a site analysis summary, functional diagram, design
rationale statement, and plan oblique and eye-level perspectives (project #2) or model (project #3). Built upon the previous experience, the last project asked students to include the concern of buildings in the landscape design. Unlike the previous ones, there were no restrictions nor specific guidelines for this project. It was an open-ended where students could do whatever they liked with the given buildings, site and context.

For each project, students were encouraged to exhibit professional attitudes and work methods by performing and completing studio projects within a given time frame. Also, they were encouraged to exercise their professional maturity by communicating their design with others in studio critique sessions (Figure 5.5 and Figure 5.6) as well as in group presentation (Figure 5.7 and Figure 5.8).

Figure 5.5: Studio Preliminary Critique on Project #2
Figure 5.6: Studio Preliminary Critique on Project #3

Figure 5.7: Group Presentation on Project #4—A
In designing projects to motivate greater student learning, Norman tried to communicate very clearly with students about the project objectives, the site, program, project requirements and limitations, process and schedule, as well as evaluation scale. He believes that providing clear guidelines for the beginning students will help ensure students' confidence that they can feel safe and be successful with new, more complex projects. He explained,

My philosophy is to start with more structured format, because otherwise they'll have nothing to work with. They are new students. Actually, they have no framework at all...if they know enough and they want something, they know how to ask for your help. So, I think you need to give them something, some kind of process, framework to work, to begin with. It's just a framework, which should not be rigid...Students need to start with something structured, then move away from it to do independent thinking. For example the last project is designed to encourage students to have independent thinking and to develop their own approach toward solution (IN2).
Studio Critique

Criticism is the dominant method of evaluation for student work in design education. Consequently, studio critique is the model most commonly utilized for communicating design principles with students in the progression of a project. There are individual critiques and group critiques. After students have done some preliminary work, they have opportunities to present and refine their projects in the process of confronting with public criticisms from teachers and sometimes from peers (see Figure 5.9 and Figure 5.10). Through this kind of exercise, students have a chance to know how other people, teachers as well as peers, think about the problem, and to learn to appreciate other people’s work and suggestions.

Figure 5.9: Public Criticisms from Teachers and Peers--A
In such a critical review process, teachers' comments, in particular, have great impact on student's perception of the problem, approach to the solution, and their confidence in design. It is important for teachers, as Norman pointed out, to help students not to take criticism personally, but positively in ways that they can learn from it and make progress in their design. Of course, then teachers need to be prepared, in critiquing, to deliver message/criticism that is constructive and educationally pertinent.
SCENE II: Teachers' Beliefs and Assumptions

PLOT LINE: Can design competence be taught? How to coach students to apply their knowledge in design? Whose knowledge should be encouraged?

"What are your assumptions about effective studio teaching?" I continued, "What constitutes student learning? Why do you teach as the way you do?" Norman paused for a while and said, "Gee, you make me really think hard about these. I guess they are so assumed that I can't really identify them....I've got to think about what I've taken for granted." Indeed, one major task of this collaborative effort is to make the hidden/taken-for-granted knowledge explicit and helpful to the enhancement of communication in the studio. Whatever the beliefs/assumptions, they are important contributors to a deeper understanding of pedagogical reality in the design studio. Though Norman and Debbi are the leading actor and actress in this scene, we may also find students as supporting actors/actresses posing some responsive lines to make this scene a dialectic whole.

The Varied Ideas

Though in design education it is generally believed that students learn best by hands-on experience, by examples illustrating the information that is presented, and so forth, ideas about how to teach design studio are actually
varied. Reflecting upon views on studio teaching among faculty members, Norman inferred some factors that might affect teachers' personal theory of pedagogical practice in the design studio.

If you go around and talk to each faculty member, you are going to find real diverse views. Part of it is because of the different philosophies people have about design and their own individual skills and ability in design... [How to teach studio design course] is an ongoing debate... Sometimes it has to do with content, and sometimes it has to do with method of teaching...

Debbi also described that the conceptions about design education are "radically varied." Faculty members from different schools, different background, may have totally different theory of design and of teaching design. "If you want to study the nature of design education," Debbi joked, "you will find different [academic blood lines] and you might establish a family tree on that" (ID1).

In terms of whether design competence can be taught, there are two diametrically opposed views: (a) that design is highly specialist, complex and esoteric— that the act of designing is something requiring an intuitive gift to do so; and (b) that design ability is something that everyone possesses at least to some degree. It is a fact that, as Norman pointed out, someone might be very knowledgeable about design from the cognitive standpoint, but still may be a poor designer. In the business of teaching design, Norman acknowledged that the business is "to help students start
from where they are and move forward to push them as far as each person can go" (INI).

In the program for preparing themselves to become adequate designers in landscape architecture, some students are attracted by its "career" potential; others are driven by their interest in landscape architectural design. Most of them believe that everyone is able to achieve a certain level of competence in design. They shared:

Some people might be more advanced or more gifted than others, but everybody is able to learn something. Some people might need more help than others. Some might take longer time. Teachers should realize the individual differences. What is good for one student might not be good for another student (IS1).

Similar Concerns, Different Methods

It is quite true that most students, particularly the beginning students, prefer knowing the facts, and like teachers telling them right or wrong. However, studio pedagogy is focused on the development of creative imagination and the encouragement of personal knowledge and personal styles. Norman pointed out,

Studio teaching should encourage individual exploration and personal approach. Students should create some degree of independence, not to rely too much on teachers... It is important for students to go beyond note-taking and to overcome the difficulty of application... and to stretch themselves (INI).

Similarly, Debbi expressed that, in studio teaching, she liked to encourage students to challenge some level of
Students should not be passive. They need to know it is OK to present their alternative ideas, and to understand there are multiple ways of solving problems...it is important to help students to break through their own wall, and to build into the environment with a certain level of trust and openness (ID1).

Debbi feels that quite often students are instructed in a rigid, structured mode where they are socialized to follow the ground rules and are afraid to take risks. Therefore,

...the greater value of creativity, personal style of expression and imagination are gone. I feel sorry that the tightness of curriculum, lots of times, devalues the intuitive and aesthetic way of knowing and has developed students to do the same type of design. I don’t believe that there is "the" way of problem solving...."Designing" actually is a rolling, and evolving process....Students should be encouraged to stretch their limits, creativity and imagination (ID1).

In her mind, Debbi believes that different ways toward the same end, or even toward different ends should be regarded as equally good. Overall, she is interested in promoting more effective communication that would go beyond talking about guidelines to supporting creativity and different approaches, and more importantly celebrating intuitive way of knowing as a group.

Watching Debbi’s teaching, I found that she liked to ask students to explain their design philosophy, to define and characterize their ideas in their designs. She also liked to encourage students to give themselves more credibility about their own thoughts. Moreover, she liked
to highlight the considerations of overall context and explain why such considerations are important in a design. She believes that before students start with their desired lines of their designs, they need to know what they are responding to. "Each student is unique and has their own style in learning and designing," she said, "I try to be a different teacher to different students--knowing their differences and teaching them based on their styles.... It is more meaningful for them to realize and think though what they want to achieve for themselves....teachers should keep alternative paths open" (ID1).

Compared to Debbi’s concerns, Norman responded that in many regards, they were similar, though their wordings might be somewhat different. He explained that

For example, the ideas about getting students to be their own guide, to be creative on their own grounds are actually the same. I think, maybe our methods are different in getting there (IN2).

Norman feels that at the beginning level it is easy for faculty to overlook what students know, what they bring to the course. Teachers sometimes might jump into the subject too fast and leave some students behind. He believes it is important for faculty to know if students have the proper foundation for learning new information. Thus, he was very concerned about if the students understood what he was trying to communicate with them, and if the students perceived the project the way he had intended. He sought to know when and why frustration occurred and what he could do
about it. Also, he liked to know how to help students to build their independence and confidence.

In terms of helping students to gain design competence, Norman believes that teachers can help advance students' design ability to a certain level by showing examples and clear guidelines and by teaching more "how-to" skills. Observing Norman's teaching, I found that when he looked over a student's design project, he liked to ask the student what the theme is, what the objectives are, and how the student come up with the theme. He would spend some time reviewing how each theme can be translated into form, organization, and design reality. He would also discuss precisely what was good, what was bad, and suggest what could be changed, and how it might be changed. Basically, he believes that a teacher's attitude in teaching is very critical in helping students to learn. As he construed,

Attitude in teaching shows up in a lot of ways. I think, for example, faculty members' enthusiasm, organization, how they present themselves, how they work with students, how open they are with students, how accessible they are in terms of being able to talk back and forth, also a degree of professionalism that exhibits. I think these are...tied up to suggest [teacher's] attitudes toward students (IN1).

In the studio, students were also aware that Norman and Debbi had very different teaching styles. Most students expressed that they were more comfortable with Norman's style because he was precise, very thorough, well organized and good at showing concrete visual examples and
suggestions. Some felt that Debbi’s approach was sometimes too abstract to them, that they did not know where to follow. One student admitted that

[Debbi] always starts the questions with "whys," tries to get the underlying principle going on and tries to make students think. That sometimes can be very frustrating because you don’t know why... (IS3)

As one student wrote in the questionnaire,

[Norman] gives direct answers about specific parts of a design, making it easier to see where a design needs work or is good. [Debbi] asks questions to try to get a student to see for him or herself what the answer to his or her own questions are. This can be good by getting the students to figure things out for themselves, but has generally resulted in frustration. (Q)

Some pointed out that they were frustrated sometimes by teachers’ different opinions which might lead their design toward opposite directions. But for those more experienced students (who are older and have more life experience), they appreciated the differences between Norman and Debbi more. They felt because of the unique differences among teachers they could actually be helped to look into their design projects from broader and more thorough aspects. One student commended,

The way [Norman] presented materials and suggestions is easy for me to understand....The way [Debbi] critiqued ...opens up a lot of things that I wasn’t looking at....She pointed out things sometimes I overlooked (IS3).

And one student shared that

Everyone is unique. I take little of both. But, sometimes I don’t do what they told me (IS2).
Criteria for Goodness, the Unsettled Zone

Though Norman and Debbi's teaching styles and emphases might be different, they both agree that letting students know the criteria of a good design is essential in helping them to improve their design. Teachers should begin with showing some criteria and demonstrating how those criteria are generated and defined, then help students to establish their own criteria. They believe that involving students in establishing their own criteria at the beginning stage of design, in addition to helping them through a solution, can help build students' confidence and self-esteem in terms of moving forward.

Putting an effort into achieving this goal, Norman made a study of the evaluation of design projects and developed a grade sheet that will show students in detail the strengths and weaknesses of their design. Most students held positive comments toward the use of the new grade sheet. They thought it was a helpful instrument in terms of corresponding to the information and requirements specified in each project, and providing feedback on the strengths and weaknesses of their project solutions. In general students felt the grades they got were fair to them.

Also, during the critique sessions Norman tried not only giving comments on students' solutions but also providing examples or alternatives to help students come up with a better design. Norman explained,
To show students examples with their own projects, students can learn by seeing directly what is happening before them. It is not to say that you should always give students the answer. The technique is to give students an answer and tell them the quality of the answer, but still want the student to seek their own (IN1).

Debbi, in turn, was concerned more about getting the students to consistently work on the context issues and involve themselves in a circular designing process.

It is important to help students to recognize and to define the clarity of what problem they are addressing, and to recognize their own approach to it. Once students come to that they not only get to understand how they are solving the problem and what their criteria are, but get to understand their own testing values. If students know what they are trying to achieve, then they can start building mechanisms knowing when they are approaching success (ID1).

But, the reality is somewhat perplexing. As one student described,

Everything is new. It's so hard to know what is good, what is bad. Just like the whole subjectivity issue. It's all frustrating. It's just like...I mean though it invites creative idea in a sense, it's still tunnel visioning us by saying this is what a good design involves, and this is the criterion a design must have in order to be good. I think, what if I put something there [in my design], it has nothing to do with the criteria, but simply because I like it (IS1)?

Many students pointed out that though they were encouraged to establish their own criteria, still they relied a lot on teachers' judgement "for the grade." Also, a lot of times they evaluate their solutions by comparing to each other's work. One student shared that

Quite often I base my progress on those people around me, which I think is not good...I just want to be sure that I'm on the right track, that I'm not doing
something worthless. Sometimes, I have an idea I want to produce. But it doesn't look like anyone else's. So I thought it might be not good... It's hard to know if you can rely on your own judgement or someone else's... (IS1).

Another student replied,

It's better to know what else other people are doing. Then you know you're not out of reality (IS1).

Anyway, it seems that evaluation is a kind of rational force to guide and to justify students' decision making in design. The discovery of an idea is always accompanied with the "justification" of the idea. And this justification "demands explicitness and precision in the formulation of design judgement" (Lera, 1984, p. 57). This increased "self-awareness," as advocated indirectly by Debbi as well as Norman, is in itself beneficial as it may help to stimulate and to direct creative intuition. However, facing sets of alternative designs, or sets of desirable qualities or attributes for a certain design, setting or communicating the criteria for goodness cannot be easily established. It is, however, a major purpose of this study, to begin to articulate these criteria.
SCENE III: Students' Perceptions and Interpretations

PLOT LINE: What is learned? Whose knowledge is encouraged? How do students learn to design?

"Do you understand what your teachers are trying to communicate with you?" "Yes," a student responded in the focus group interview, "but, I think they sometimes have difficulty understanding our points of view." It is quite true that teachers often try to make sure that their teaching/messages are heard and understood, but they seldom work on hearing and understanding students. In order to invite students' voices, students are the principle players in this scene. Debbi and Norman become the reflective guest players to help recollect some deep rooted pedagogical issues, and to keep the dynamic, and communicative spirit of this play.

Design Literacy

Design literacy here has little to do with the acquisition of knowledge or skills about design in a narrow sense. Rather it is about the growth of attitudes and confidence that will lead to participation—the ability to "take action" and be "able to appreciate." In the situation of coaching to design, it is something that involves the teacher and the student in an active partnership that they interact with one another to build up a set of philosophic, social values in design. Importantly, it requires the
development of shared languages and the ability to think new ideas and create personal styles.

Talking about their learning experience in LARCH 253 design studio, most students expressed in the focus group that they understood what their teachers were trying to communicate to them. They thought the course was very well-organized. The course syllabus and project instructions provided them enough information and examples of what they needed to do. Since everything was new, they felt the slides, pictures and graphic representations were very helpful. They appreciated the hands-on experiences which helped reinforce what they had learned. They were glad that they had plenty of opportunities to communicate with teachers and teachers who were good at providing helpful feedback.

Because they had to learn the new concepts and work on the project at the same time, however, they felt they could hardly fully understand the concepts and what the project was expected until two or three days before a project was due. Students somewhat complained that

Sometimes [teachers] talk in a way above us, at least me, especially, new concepts....They do explain. But you can’t understand new concepts unless you apply it. Usually we don’t understand till last minutes...(IS1)

Since this is very demanding type of curriculum, and the schedule is so compressed, we have to keep moving on to the next project. We don’t have enough time to really explore what we have learned or what we want to do (IS1).
I become frustrated at the end of a project because there never seems to be sufficient time to work out the details of a design and construct a model or board layouts (Q).

I am frustrated when its four o’clock in the morning and I am trying to create during a panic rush (Q).

We cannot do anything about that. We all have limited time. Everything is frustrating. You just have to learn to deal with that. It’s a learning process... (IS1).

In terms of biggest learning, some students felt the connective nature between projects was very helpful and valuable. Some other students were pleased to learn how to do things on their own, how to get what they want and how to put their ideas into reality. Most students pointed out that they have learned not only the concept of space, but the designing of space, the overall organization of plant materials and landform. Moreover, some of them mentioned something related to their personal growth and personal change. One student told her personal experience excitedly,

I was so amazed when I reviewed what I have learned...I thought at first the first project was just a "fun" one, but it ended up with an unexpected rich learning experience. It helped me to learn a lot, not only from my own search, but from somebody else’s as well (IS1).

One student talked about his rewarding struggle of the fourth project which he had to come up with a solution to the site located on downtown High street.

...[taking] the surrounding to apply to your site, I find it a lot more challenging. I’m a country boy. I’m not used to a city....[because of the project] I got to readapt myself to see how people react in the city, what they like, what they see... (IS3).
Another one shared that

...I am so proud that I can tell the good use of the space from the bad one now. And I am able to apply some concepts to judge what could have been done better when I drove through some areas. I felt I was an expert already (ISl).

These stories, for Norman and Debbi, of course were exciting and encouraging. They were happy that most students understood what they were trying to communicate with them. But, they somehow still felt frustrated that some students did not know how to translate concepts, ideas into actual design. As Norman described,

They came out with their personal goals that sometimes are quite different with what the faculty member had intended.... For example, this project is to learn about space, but student might think this project is to learn about how to use computers, how to make pretty drawings or something else... (IN1).

Moreover, Debbi sighed that though some students thought they understood a certain vocabulary, they actually did not have equivalent knowledge base or frame for that vocabulary. For example,

What is urban? It is part of our vocabulary that we don't realize our students don’t have as an experience base. Most of our students haven’t been into the city... (ID2).

A majority of the students favored the last project most, because, as students described, they "had the most leeway," they "were allowed all the creativity and options," and they "enjoyed not having the restrictions of not using this, not using that." However, based on the third informal reflective discussion with Norman and Debbi, they felt many
students were trapped by their "freedom" and forgot to consider the "reality" of a design for a "downtown" landscape. Many of them were competing for a better "appearance" and neglected the "core" of the design—its philosophical base and contextual considerations. The task, as Norman and Debbi both perceived, is then how to help students, by acknowledging where they are, to look at and to appreciate the outdoor environment from broader perspectives, and to help stretch their thoughts in design to both theoretical and social practical levels.

**Material/Tool Making and Using**

Material/tool making and using are fundamental origins of design and at the bases of design studio experience. Walking into the studio, it is easy to find that students, with materials and tools in hand, working individually or in groups to explore their capacity for taking action in and on the design world (see Figure 5.11 and Figure 5.12). Their capacity may be displayed in complex collective acts which employ technologies, and which may be both celebratory and functional-operational (Baynes & Robers, 1984). Their doing, making and being actually carry a necessary conjunction with artifacts that embody their intentional actions for idea creating and representing. In other words, the design capacity is constituted in the disposition towards taking mindful action with tools and materials.
Talking about their experience with making and using materials and tools, unexpectedly, lots of students pointed out one factor that is quite crucial in terms of producing a "good" design. That is "money" spent on design. Because they have to pay all the supplies out of their own pocket, some of them just cannot afford to get better materials or
they have to pay all the supplies out of their own pocket, some of them just cannot afford to get better materials or tools with their limited budget. But some of them, as some students described, are "more advantaged" in that they have all the "fancy stuff" to make a better looking design. Though they did acknowledge that Norman has a firm guideline asking students not to do so and so (i.e., not to put fancy things on their design), still they believed that better resources, more money in a narrower sense, has great impact on how their designs "look."

Sympathetically, Norman did recognize this issue. Yet he was frustrated too. In many cases students were busy putting things into the design to make it look "cool," and forgot to look at the "space" between things or the overall context. Though he tried to communicate the real objectives for each design project as clearly as possible, still as Norman pointed out, "[students] have completely different perceptions of what they were supposed to get out of it" (IN1). Indeed, students often tend to focus more on the appearance than the inside. But, as one student admitted, "it's impossible not to care about the appearance."

In addition, to keep up with the new trend, students in Norman's class were encouraged to work on computers and do their graphics on Form-2. Norman thought it was a privilege for them to learn new skills that previous students did not get a chance to learn. And the application of computers in
design can ease some tasks in their design process, e.g., drawing. Surprisingly, students expressed a lot of frustrations in using computers. Students felt that they had wasted too much time in getting to know how to operate the computers. One student described,

Every time when I use the computer to do the drawing, I focus more on getting the program to work rather than thinking about what was exactly going on in my design (IS1).

Another student added,

Like the last project, though I had good ideas, because I didn’t know how to get them on the screen, the results ended up with a totally different design....I felt I was limited by the computer (IS1).

Some believed they could do better by drawing, but some pointed out that computers did help a lot. They suggested that it would have been easier and less frustrating if teachers had shown them how to use Form-Z and how to operate the computer program before giving them the assignment. They also suggested it would be very helpful if they can have a command & procedure booklet/handout, or one or two class sessions showing them step-by-step and providing hands-on practice right away. Someone even mentioned that it might be good to have a class to cover what they need to know about applying computers in architectural design. During the quarter, Norman did take some actions to help students to overcome some problems they had with computer. But utilizing computers to assist design is still debated among students and some faculty members.
The Recto and Verso of Design

"To design is not to create something we have already seen, but to create something we have not yet seen," a guest critic reminded students in the presentation session of their last project. Indeed, to design is to involve a creative act by putting the elements of one's experiences into new combinations. In other words, "there is a need for both previous experience, ideas, content and for the mental capability to recombine" (Neuckermans, 1984, p. 61). To a great extent, insight and design stick together as do the recto and verso of a sheet of paper.

Describing their views on what helps their design most, many students pointed out that a person's maturity level and experience of life would help provide more depth to a person's design. They felt design seemed to become easier for those who were older and had more experience in life. They also pointed out that talent, practice, teachers' guidance, and ideas from other people's designs, were other important factors that might have an impact on producing a good design. Basically, most of them felt that choosing/deciding the theme was the most difficult and critical point throughout the project. Some would look for ideas/information from reference books suggested by teachers. Some got their ideas from other design courses. And some mentioned that they had to wait for the emerging theme by drawing something first.
Grounded in these points of view, three questionnaire items were designed to get a broader student opinion on what contributes to a good design most, what helps shape a design most, and which stage is most difficult during the design process (see Appendix A). Responding to those three questions, students were asked to rank order the options provided for each question starting with "1" as most significant, "2" as next most significant, and so forth. Basically, it was intended to grasp what priority of associations of concerns might emerge out of students' collective responses. For figuring out the general average ranking, different points were distributed to different ranks, e.g., 5 points for first rank, 4 points for second rank, and so forth. Since the averaged results sometimes do not portray the whole truth, the bar graphs showing students' raw ranking scales are displayed to contrast with the bar graphs presenting students' averaged ranking results. The key point is that reading the raw ranking scales allows diverse evidence to inform the complexity of views about design capacity and design process.

In terms of what factor helps to shape design most, the average results show that examples illustrated by the teacher during the lectures are the most significant factor; comments from teacher's critique, the second; ideas from supplementary readings, the third; and suggestions from peers and seniors, the fourth (see Figure 5.13). But the
raw ranking graph (Figure 5.14), in turn, indicates that more students regard comments from teacher's critique as the most important factors in shaping their designs, instead of examples illustrated by the teacher during lectures. This concurs with what most students had shared in interviews about the value of studio critique sessions.

Figure 5.13: Average Rating of Shaping Forces of a Design

Figure 5.14: Raw Rating of Shaping Forces of a Design
One student said:

[Teachers' critique] help me to construct my design... Like I have an idea I want to put on a piece of paper. They (teachers) come in and help me in a professional manner, alter that (my idea) to a better situation. In other words, they help to build my ideas. They put in a little piece of words or drawings...to set me into the direction...(IS3).

Interestingly the raw ranking graph shows that no one acknowledges the suggestions from peers or seniors as significant shaping force in their design, although many of them mentioned, in interview, that they got a lot of help and "practical suggestions" from seniors.

In terms of what factors (internal as well as external) contribute to a "good" design most, both the average results and the raw ranking data show that experience is the most important factor; practice second; clear guidelines third; talent forth; and dynamic interactions with other people as the least important factor (see Figures 5.15 & Figure 5.16).

![Figure 5.15: Average Rating of Constituents of Design](image)
But, one thing needs to be mentioned here is that this underestimated value of peer interactions contradicts the studio life captured by my camera (see Figures 5.17, 5.18, and 5.19). Maybe it is because the dynamic interactions—peer sharing and coaching—are so "natural" that students seldomly perceive or relate this type of knowledge construction as salutary.
In terms of which stage is most critical/difficult during the design process, the average ranking shows that deciding the theme and objectives is the most critical stage to most students. Actual design is next in difficulty. Then site analysis, diagraming the ideas, and, lastly, defining the problem (see Figure 5.20). Of course, the varied views about the difficulty involved in different design stages are shown very clearly in the raw ranking graph (see Figure 5.21).
Figure 5.20: Average Rating of Difficult Design Stage

Figure 5.21: Raw Rating of Difficult Design Stage

It may be quite true that since design involves a complex ongoing interplay of internal mental processes and external stimulating clues, it is somewhat difficult to have
a clear identification of so-called "stages". As one student pointed out,

To me they are kind of blended a little bit. I've trouble distinguishing one from the other. Before [teachers] were trying to teach us how to distinguish them, they were just kind of flowing. I just get it started and go through [whatever is necessary]. And I've never really been quite successful in [following the steps]. Now I still try to blend them. I'm more comfortable doing that. I'm doing a little bit here, a little bit there, then, I'll take all the pieces together... (IS3).

In spite of all these possible different perceptions about the difficult stages in design, one critical, frustrating moment remains the same. That is, as described by students, the moment of "mind block," or "creativity block." Based on analysis of students' responses to my questionnaire, it appears that a great amount of complex "learning to design" does occur in the studio. Admittedly, it is centered around the specific project assignments given by the teacher, but learning of a substantial and often broad ranging nature occurs nevertheless. Students are more active in learning and designing when they are motivated, when they are interested in the material and when they are able to grasp the information necessary for the resolution of the design problem. Also, students learn/design better when they can combine theory and abstraction with perceptual experience--actually seeing, touching, making and acting.
SCENE IV: Studio Culture and Social Relations

PLOT LINE: How is the culture of a studio formed? How are social relations structured? How do students come to see their roles in studio activities?

In my notes I write, "I've noticed that the climates in these two studios are so different." After I observed the studio group critique sessions and talked to students in different studios, I shared my impression with Norman, "one is more cooperative, and the other is more individualized."

"Yes, they do," Norman continued, "one (the smaller one) is more like a family, more like their second home....They all seem eager to share and feel capable to help each other....The other one (the bigger one) is just a place, a spot on campus....Most of them, except two or three, are more like commuters. They are coming for class, then they are gone..." (IN2).

One student who is, as described by himself, "one of three or four in the entire class with years of practical experience," wrote his comments in the questionnaire

Large studio is "cut-throat," full of tension, near zero interaction due to personality, and conflicts, and to be honest contains the less motivated elements of the class (with several exceptions). The smaller studio population is much more functional as a unit. Many things at a personal level have gone wrong in the large studio (Q).

Same class, same curriculum, same teachers, but the room, the physical setting, and the people (students) involved have made the differences. In effect, these have
created extremely different studio cultures, social relations, and teaching and learning experiences.

**Home or Workplace**

No corner in the studio is a static or neutral place.

Walking into the small studio, it was not difficult to find posters, notes, personal belongings, plants, or food. It was crowded, but warm. Many of the students in the studio told me that "this is my second home!" Some of them showed their personality through the decoration of their own "territory." Besides, some even expressed themselves through environmental traces (e.g., see Figure 5.22, someone wrote on the board "THOSE WHO LABOR ON THE EARTH ARE THE CHOSEN PEOPLE OF GOD. --Jefferson").

![Figure 5.22: Expression in Environmental Traces](image-url)
They together created "shared modes" of discourse, symbols, rituals, and customs through numerous dynamic interactions (see Figures 5.23 & 5.24). They felt the atmosphere there was relaxed, and enjoyable. Many of them even stayed there days and nights, whenever they were free from other necessary "business," e.g., going to classes, or work. One student had such a comment on the atmosphere in the studio, "Great! Active, always socializing" (Q).

Figure 5.23: Dynamic Interaction in Small Studio--A

Figure 5.24: Dynamic Interaction in Small Studio--B
In the big studio, there was a great openness/or I shall say "emptiness," though there were more students assigned to be in this studio. Most of them stayed in the studio only for critique sessions. A great portion of the wall was "clean." Only two corners were filled with "stuff" and live activities (see Figures 5.25 & 5.26).

Figure 5.25: The Atmosphere in Big Studio

Figure 5.26: One "Active" Corner in Big Studio
Many students in this studio held negative comments about the studio atmosphere. As students wrote,

The atmosphere in the studio has been pretty thin. Few people are in there at any given time. I tend to prefer working alone and have a drafting table in my apartment. I'm very passive in terms of my role in studio (Q).

The studio is...a little discouraging. The student-student relation is not as good as I expected. Almost everyone is involved in a small group and will not socialize with others (Q).

**Collaboration or Competition**

It is no doubt that the design action can be enhanced or hindered by the social context of the studio. In general, students having positive comments on their studio atmosphere seemed to enjoy interacting with teachers as well as peers. They saw both teachers and peers as helpful and found "possibilities to share ideas, problems, and reflections." As one student pointed out, "studio is a connection to understanding of what you've learned" and it nurtures "further enhancement of material by seeing others at work."

In the small studio, there had been more collaborations and peer coaching going on. Many students knew exactly what other people were doing and were not hesitant to exchange ideas. Also, because the studio was next to the senior's studio, they had developed friendships with seniors. Contrary to the self-reporting data in the survey, many students emphasized in individual interviews as well as in
focus group interview that they had learned a great deal from seniors. (This is against what was shown previously in the average rating results of shaping forces of a design—students saw peer suggestions as the least important factor.) They felt seniors understood their frustrations better, were able to talk to them at their level, and were able to provide them with very useful clues.

In the big "linear, walk through" studio, students tended to work on their project on their own. There were less live interactions between peers. A few of them felt the atmosphere was just too awful, thus they went to the small studio quite often. However, it will be misleading to say that there were more competitions going on in the big studio. As a matter of fact, no matter in which studio, competition existed as a motivator in design—everyone strove for showing the uniqueness of their ideas. Some competitions are visible, some are not. As one student pointed out,

The atmosphere is [somewhat] competitive due to how we got here in the first place (Q).

The so-called tension in the big studio may not necessarily have resulted from competition. Sometimes it might be because of varied personalities that hindered the constructive chemistry in the studio. A shy student described that,
...when I try [to interact] I seem to get shut out by both teachers and students....Watching the teachers attitudes and communication with the others (students) I felt neglected. The...relationship is not personal at all (Q).

**Dialogical or Hierarchical**

Interestingly, due to the different atmospheres, the teacher-student interaction modes were very different too. Based on what has been recorded on videotapes, in the small studio, no matter whether it was a group critique or an individual critique, quite often students were around the teacher providing their opinions (see Figure 5.27). The processes were more informal, more relaxed, and more student-centered. Students there were not passively answering teacher’s questions, but actively discussing with each other or questioning teachers about some ideas. As one student responded in the questionnaire, "the atmosphere is good—all equal with teacher."

![Figure 5.27: "Individual" Critique in Small Studio](image-url)
In the big studio, teacher and students seemed to be more distanced. The processes were more teacher-centered and the climate was tighter. During the group critique, students tended to follow presenting ideas, answering questions, and listening to feedback format. During individual critique, it had been really "one"-on-"one" based critique (see Figure 5.28). Seldom would any other student join the critique.

Figure 5.28: Individual Critique in Big Studio

Norman pointed out that different teacher-student interaction modes captured on the videotapes were not only because of the way teachers structured their sections. He shared,

That particular day I went there (the small studio) and at first my intention was more rigid, more organized... But when I saw the situation, I treated it more informal....They all seemed too eager to participate...
There is something to do with the room, the people involved in the climate. Because I know sometimes I go into the big room, I'm using a more structured based instruction...I treat in a way always in a question-answer fashion (IN2).

Yes, we have seen that the studio atmosphere or culture has something to do with the presence of dialogue or hierarchy in studio. Let's not neglect that students' design confidence and personal perception about a teacher's role in the studio also has an impact on how knowledge construction is happening in the studio. For example, even though most students perceived themselves as active learners, and they knew both Norman and Debbi encouraged new ideas and the exposure of personal insights and styles, still, many of them expressed that they had tried to "read" what teachers liked and to develop what teachers want to see. As they said,

A lot of time, I am trying to please the teacher instead of pleasing my own thoughts....(IS1)

Sometimes, we don't know what we want....it takes half a quarter to know what a professor likes, then try to come up with it. Every quarter we have different professors, we keep changing our ways and styles....we develop what the teacher wants to see (IS1).
EPILOGUE: The Researcher's Notes

Teaching and learning design at either "skill" or "artistry" level is not easy. The ways teachers structure and present content knowledge, and construct and communicate design tasks channel the ways in which students are learning to design. The ways students perceive and interpret their design tasks and studio experience also condition the ways in which they act, design and come to synthesis about their design capacity. Walking through these scenes, we have seen various pictures and have heard different voices about studio pedagogical life. There are so many paradoxical situations and so many unsettled issues between ideal and reality, whether in teaching design or in doing actual design. If this play is to stimulate broader responses for a transformative pedagogical design, then there is a need to act upon the basic elements of creativity reflected in this play, for example, "complexity," "diversity," "novelty," "incongruity," "ambiguity," and "surprise." How do we, like reflective practitioners in design professions, deal with the complexity, instability, uncertainty, uniqueness, and value conflicts involved in practical situations? Though criteria for a good design are complex and ambiguous, going from novelty to condensation, the "appropriateness" is always the key conjoint criterion to creativity. A design must fit the demands of the situation and the needs of the designer as well as the "client." And, the design capacity
is constituted in the capacity for and predisposition towards taking intentional and "mindful" actions.

A studio pedagogy that wants to stimulate creativity, to emancipate personal insight, and to be thoughtful for the diversity of life, I believe, needs to start with inducing a multiplicity of interpretation. Applying some design principles in pedagogical design, we may be able to see that "the more the solution induces stimuli, the less banal it will be; and the more it will leave traces in the mind, the more it becomes meaningful" (Neuckermans, 1984; p. 61). Probably this is also why, based on what we have perceived from the previous scenes, both Norman and Debbi believe that a curriculum for landscape architectural design should not exist in isolation. It has to have a background--links with history, culture and context--from which design decisions can be taken has to be understood and generated, and it has to start with acknowledging students' experience bases--valuing where they are, who they are.

To end up this play, let's listen to two more stories told earnestly by two design studio students. They were in the same class, taught by the same teachers, exposed to the same content knowledge, but they are different individuals.

ST1: I consider myself to be both an active learner and an active "teacher." I always need feedback and I always enjoy helping others with my opinions. The studio is where all these takes place....I would suggest that possibly [in the studio, we can have] group effort on organizing our site analysis and inventory, so at the beginning stages of design we are opened up to several different points of view....Possibly [we can] have
segments of the design process due at various intervals of the projects progression. So, we are forced to work at an even-pace throughout the project. This might take some stress off of the night before when everyone is cramming to finish everything (Q).

ST2: A lot of times I’ll have an idea and I’m so afraid to go through with it and present my idea, because I think the professor might not like it or think, "why the hell did she do that?" So, I really need to find confidence in myself and my talent....I do not like the atmosphere in the studio. My role in studio is passive, and I’m not going to say learner, because the more passive I am the less I learn. I want to ask questions, but I just don’t because I always think the question is stupid. So I sit there wondering and hand in a stupid design....I’m not quite sure what I would do to change the outlook I have on studio. I think that it simply is that my peers feel that I am different. I am on the outside, but I do the same things they do. I like to talk to people, listen to people and be a part of one group. (Be accepted). What makes them work harder and become better is the same thing that makes me work and become better (Q).

Hearing these two stories we may realize that the "differences" among individual students are the big challenge in classroom teaching. What can we, as educational practitioners, do to help, to make a change?

All these live dialectic stories I have been narrating so far are not arranged to thrust my personal judgement, but to make them provoke the audience to interpret, to ponder.

Again, let’s ask, what do I see out of the pictures? What do I hear out of the voices? What is the world like? What am I like? What do I value? What do I want to do to make it different?
CURTAIN-CALL: A Yearning toward the Absence of the Present

Treating more seriously the narrative, semiotic, and self-aware standards emerging from this play, there is always more to be recited in a reconceptionist's behalf. Indeed, there is a great deal of absence of the present in my analysis. To cite a couple of examples, (a) gender differences, and (b) time, the crucial issue. Through theses two largely unexplored aspects of this study, we may become more aware of the embedded critical substances of pedagogical practice and be able to grasp pedagogical reality from ethical, or political aspects.

Gender Differences

When I shared my data stories with my committee members and friends in a post-general support group, "several" of them, including both male and female, asked me about the gender identity of the two students appearing in the epilogue. "Is ST1 male? There is no doubt that ST2 is female." Some of them suggested that it would be quite rewarding to raise consciousness about gender issues in design studio.

As I think back on the interviews I had with students, the tone in ST1's story indeed sounds like a male student's talk. It is some measure of how I did not attend to gender issues that I did not even record how many of the 13
students that I interviewed were male or female. When I asked students if they are confident of their designs, most male students answered forthright, "Oh, yes! I'm very confident of my design." But, almost every female student I have talked to replied modestly. As one female student responded, "It's hard to say. I don't know. Sometimes I'm not sure if I'm on the right track." Listening to the teacher-student conversations in critique sessions, most male students showed more self-reliance on their ideas and invited teacher's suggestions actively. Most female students relied more on teacher's initiation and guidance. When the teacher questioned them about their design ideas, they would explain and add "I don't know. Can I...? What do you think if I..." Also, watching the peer interactions in the design studio, I saw more male students helping/coaching female students, seldom female students coaching male students (e.g., see Figures 5.17, 5.23 and 5.24).

If I want to do gender analysis, I can also find that gender differences may be shown through the physical "space" between teacher and students. Though Norman was viewed as supportive and easy to approach in students' eyes, Debbi had more postural closeness than Norman (see Figures 5.5, 5.27 and 5.28). More importantly, gender differences may have a great impact on teachers' teaching styles and their language of/in teaching. For example, in his teaching, Norman
focused more on the "how-to" skills that can be taught, but in her perception, Debbi emphasized the "nurturing" of intuition and creativity.

Gender, like issues of race, ethnicity, and class, can be raised in virtually any study. We don’t have to be a feminist or a woman to be responsive to gender issues. We all may be amenable to learning about gender differences but not necessarily in the same way. Our sensitivity of the "Other" will help us have the awareness of the various connections and openness to the diverse "Other."

**Time, the Critical Issue**

Starting with my pilot experience, I have realized that timing is crucial in studio teaching. Since the objective of the studio exercise is to teach the student spatial development using the relationships between landform, plant material, and "hardscape" in landscape architecture, the connections must be made during the design process. Technical exercises related to design projects are done before the final design review. The important element of learning through "seeing" is also stressed. All of these take time and careful planning, and the competition between studio and non-studio courses remains a complicating factor affecting the level of execution in curriculum decision making.
Further, the unique apprenticeship character of studio teaching is not easy. Talking to students and teachers I learned that students are hoping to have more one-on-one based interactions with teachers, but teachers feel they lack sufficient time to do more for so many students. Again, timing is the issue. In order to keep a lower student-teacher ratio to provide quality instruction, the department has instituted a portfolio review between freshman and sophomore years since 1991. Through the screening process, a smaller number of students are admitted into the sophomore year.

In the first focus group interview, many students expressed that they did not like this departmental policy because of the pressure placed on them. They argued that education should be for all, not only for the selected ones. Also, they believed that everybody is able to learn to design, though some might need a longer time than the gifted ones. But when Norman was asked about this, he pointed out that students have actually benefited from this policy because they could get more quality time with teachers. Both Norman and Debbi prefer a lower student-teacher ratio, not only because it helps ease their teaching load, but also because it provides a better chance to improve the quality of skilled, motivated students as they can come to a higher level of ability to learn to design.
One conclusion I would like to draw is that neither a new policy, nor different scheduling will resolve the crucial timing issue, or guarantee quality studio teaching and learning experiences. Still, a great deal can be explored, examined, and altered for the good of providing better opportunities for students to learn. I will talk about some emerging possibilities that Norman, Debbi, and I have shared in our reflective discussions in chapter 7.
CHAPTER VI
OPENING THE SECOND PLAY:
THE STAGE AND THE WINGS OF LEADERSHIP WORKSHOP

This co-operative play, following an action inquiry spirit (Argyris et al., 1985; Reason, 1988; Schon, 1987), is a "stretch" of seeing and exercising the power of dialogue and reflective practice in a collaborative learning classroom. Because the teacher I was working with (who sees himself as an "educator") is an enthusiastic reflective practitioner already, this exercise of co-operative inquiry as practical art is far more challenging to me than to the teacher. With no predefined problem but curiosity, I walked into the classroom as an investigator to learn to pose pedagogical questions in the field. The co-operative inquiry process was carried on in a cycling reflection in and on action manner rather than a pre-fixed methodological agenda. Most questions raised in dialogue became the agenda/s of the reflective practice in the field, pedagogically and methodologically.

Driven by the ideals of creating communities of inquiry (Torbert, 1976, 1991), constructing knowledge among knowledgeable peers (Bruffee, 1984; Wells & Chang-Wells,
1992), and learning from experience (Kolb, 1983, 1984), my investigation in this site was not only on the world of the teacher’s thinking (from the wing) but also on the world of collaborative peer talk (on the stage). The central concern is not with course content as such but with the learning environment, that is those aspects of teacher planning and of student interactions that affect the construction of knowledge in the classroom. The basic assumption is that the form that knowledge takes and access to it are both socially defined and interactively constrained and constructed by the teacher as well as by students themselves (Gumperz, 1986).

Built upon Green, Weade and Graham’s (1988) perspective of analyzing lesson construction and student participation, what is accomplished in the leadership workshop was studied as a function of what is communicated through the interplay of course design, pedagogical strategies, classroom activities, and what participants (teacher, students, and researcher) perceive over time. Knowing the power of language in collaborative learning, it is necessary to consider how knowledge is applied, created or constructed through communication in action (group decision making process). Thus, special attention in this study was given to analyzing the collaborative talk among peers.

Transformed from different perspectives on conversation analysis (e.g., Goffman, 1981; Gumperz, 1982a, 1982b;
Levinson, 1983; Schegloff, 1984, 1988; Schiffrin, 1990; Searle, 1991; Taylor & Cameron, 1982), the analysis of theatrical layers of conversation among peers was particularly intriguing and perplexing.

Through dramatic recall, I will portray, in this chapter, the scenes I have observed in the leadership workshop. In telling my impressions I will present some "authentic records" (e.g., notes from reflective discussions, teacher’s concept map, direct quotes from teacher’s talk, or students’ talk) to help build the "believability" of the script. Especially, in talking through my findings of theatrical layers in peer talk, I will present some "motion pictures in words" to evoke a sense of real classroom conversations in a way that invites the reader in as a co-interpreter. I will also present some figures generated from the survey results to address some of my pedagogical concerns in mind. Basically, the four scenes we are going to see in this play are: (a) watching from the wings, (b) the pedagogical property, (c) collaborative peer talk on the stage, and (d) meaning making in the betweenness. Each can pretty much stand alone. After the telling of my observations, in the epilogue, I will make a few reflective analytic points. Finally, I will also add some thoughts about the disturbing glances I got in the field.
SETTING:

Room 217 is selected and favored because its setting allows participants/students to sit in circles and see each other face to face. Unlike traditional classrooms, desks in rows, set in the middle of this room is a nice long conference table which takes up almost one-fourth the space of the room. Around the conference table are twelve nice maroon over-stuffed armchairs. Students who come in earlier usually sit around the conference table, called the inner ring. Those who come in later then take the seats, maroon plastic back-rest chairs, along two side walls, called the outer ring.

At the center of the front wall hangs a white square screen, about four feet each way. An overhead projector is placed on the conference table, sometimes on the floor, which is the most often used medium. By the screen, set to the left corner are two three-drawer steel file cabinets, and to the right corner an ordinary wooden table. Very often the table is covered with piles of materials that are going to be handed out to students.

Fixed on the back wall is a big old blackboard, fading into grey. It is seldom used by the teacher, but at times by students during group discussions.

Walking into the room, if possible, I liked to go across the conference table and pick up the very last seat by one of the two giant air-conditioners sticking out of two huge windows in the room. Paying no attention to what can be seen through the window, while I was waiting for the class to start, sometimes I said "Hello" to the students who passed by to hang their coats on the hooks between windows. Sometimes, I jotted down something to get myself ready for the observation. And sometimes, I just stared at the four huge portraits hanging on the opposite wall, wondering who those four gentlemen were.

When the class began, I started to pay close attention to what was going on in the room. Also, the video-camera and the taperecorder/s started to run, capturing the teaching and learning events. Whenever there was a group activity, students went to different rooms as assigned. The ones remained in room 217 were suggested to sit around one end of the conference table in order to be in the camera. In Winter 1992, I went with the group that I was in to different rooms. In Spring 1993, I always stayed in room 217, watching whoever was on the stage.
PLAYERS:

ST* - Graduate students, from various program areas, taking strategic leadership class in Spring 1992, or Winter, 1993. Fifty of them (17 from Monday class 1992; 17 from Wednesday class 1992; and 16 from Tuesday class 1993) responded to the survey questionnaire of student opinions on group-based collaborative learning. But only students in Monday class 1992 and students in Tuesday class 1993 are seen in this play. According to the survey results (see Appendix B), sixty percent of them are under thirty of age and forty percent above (see Figure 6.1). Thirty-eight percent have mostly worked in government environments, thirty-six percent in private non-profit or for-profit organizations, and twenty-six percent in educational settings (see Figure 6.2). More students in the 1992 classes had working experience in public sector than in the 1993 class. In the 1993 class, there are more students from an education background. Most students are confident about their performance in class and summarize their learning experience in the workshop as a very positive one (see Table 6.1).

![Figure 6.1: Demographic Data on Age](image-url)
**Figure 6.2: Demographic Data on Work Experience**

**Table 6.1: Survey Results on Demographic Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions and Options</th>
<th>Mon. '92</th>
<th>Wed. '92</th>
<th>Tue. '93</th>
<th>Total #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Your age?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. under 25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. 25 - 30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. 30 - 35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. 35 - 40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Above 40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What kind of working environment have you been exposed to most?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Government</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Private Non-Profit</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Private-For-Profit</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Educational</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Compared to other students in this class, how would you rate your own performance?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Well above average (top 20%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Above average (next 20%)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Average (middle 20%)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Below average (next 20%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Far below average (bottom 20%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How would you summarize your satisfaction with your learning experience?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Very Positive</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Positive</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Neutral</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Negative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Very Negative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dr. B - A true educator, well respected and beloved by students, not to mention how many outstanding teaching awards he has owned. Because of his love of learning, study, and life, he is always willing to make time for students outside the classroom and listen to students to meet their individual needs. Watching the way he "walk the talk" (a term borrowed from Torbert, 1991) in his teaching, he is quite a savant of becoming, out of himself and others. He has been teaching for about twenty years or so and has run the strategic leadership workshop for eight years. He is content-rich and relationally sensitive. Since he is not directive, is quite intuitive and spontaneous, and likes to open to the experience of students, some students may feel somewhat lost in class and expect to get from him clearer directions. Also, because of his desire to pass on information and values, he might sometimes, as some students describe, require too much reading and dump too many thoughts on them at one time.

Me - A vulnerable inquirer. Committing myself to this play as a participant, an "onlooker," a narrator, and a critic has never been easy. There are struggles at both the intellectual and personal levels, not only because of the challenge of interpretation and the hardship of discourse analysis, but also because of the question of "self-doubt" and the encounter with my almost buried dream—searching for higher human values in/through education—inspired from the Operational Impact Program I attended years ago. It is difficult, at the same time, to deal with role identity issues and to confront the values and interests that I treasure most but have been running away from. Often I question myself whether I should do more or less. Somehow I decide to do less with more. Anyway, to become powerfully vulnerable is to expose myself to possible wounds. Intellectually, I may create something valuable by taking this risk. Personally, I may be at my best, moving out of this re-lived experience healthy and strong.
PROLOGUE: Leadership in the Athenian Way

As Bennis (1983) pronounces, the extent to which leadership is truly effective is based on the extent to which individuals place symbolic value on the intentions and their expression—the aesthetic. And the dialectic of the oblique, resulting from aesthetically and compellingly presenting the vision/or intention to the specific is the artform of leadership. Entering this taleworld of teaching and learning of leadership, there are calls for dialogic inquiry, love of language, involvement in public affairs, and development of virtues and skills. I cannot help but remember the ideas of *polis* and *heroic self* (dependent more on sociocultural role than on personal preference) in the Athenian ideals of commitment and participation. Seizing them, we may understand better the spirit of leadership and the peculiarities of deliberateness in group process.

To be an Athenian...is to organize your life around a set of values.
An Athenian is an idea....
To be an Athenian is to hold knowledge and, especially, the quest for knowledge in high esteem. To contemplate, to reason, to experiment, to question—these are, to an Athenian, the most exalted activities a person can perform....
To be an Athenian is to cherish language because [we] believe it to be humankind's most precious gift...
To be an Athenian is to understand that the thread which holds civilized society together is thin and vulnerable....
To be an Athenian is to take an interest in public affairs and the improvement of public behavior....
And, finally, to be an Athenian is to esteem the discipline, skill, and taste that are required to produce enduring art....

(Digested from Postman, in Arnett, 1992, p. 159)
SCENE I: Watching from the Wings

PLOT LINE: What is in the teacher's mind, in terms of knowledge and beliefs brought to the workshop? What are the researcher's agendas, in terms of strategies for and interpretation of the study?

No stage without wings. And, no perceived scene without directing forces and perceiving eyes. I can make no denial that Dr. B and I both have something to do with what is "letting-be-seen" in this play. Working on and watching from different wings, Dr. B as the classroom teacher may have connoted more pedagogically constituted lines and I as the researcher may have denoted more methodologically reconstituted lines, though sometimes our co-operative effects are not mutually exclusive in either area. In order to help capture and appreciate the play/s on the stage more fully, I think it is necessary to unfold first the influential minds and matters in the wings.

Teacher's Schema, an Educator's Mind

No one can really enter another person's mind. But through sensitive listening to the verbalized we are able to read another person's mind more or less. I remember in the first Monday class of Spring 1992, after students introduced each other and talked about a "peak" or "best" personal leadership experience, Dr. B. addressed some of his thoughts about leadership and the workshop,

...In this turbulent environment, horizontally driven structure, we're finding all kinds of other leadership
that are very important....[There’s] another form of
relation management. Be open to that. Ugh, that’s a
possibility out there that’s really available to you.
One of the things I know was that ugh, I may be the
least capable leader around....I’m in awe of all the
things you have already accomplished. So, it’s clear
not only can we draw on each other, but you have so
much you already have to draw on. Maybe what the class
will do for some of you is to make sense of some of the
things you’ve done, or maybe push them a little further
so that you can play with them in another way as well,
or maybe just to see that what you did here actually
has some translatable qualities over [somewhere else]
...Just look at our experience, we have a very rich
background, don’t we? If you put it all together,
you’re about everything you’re ever going to read in
these books....So, one frame I would like you to get
rid of and that’s really part of the exercise here,
other than getting to know each other, is—"I don’t
know anything about leadership."....You’ve all had
wonderful moments of breakthrough as you shared it...
So, we’ll be throwing you every week into an
environment in which you will experience this sense of
"be consciously thinking your incompetence," Okay?
And like every one of these experiences, you came out
consciously competent on recall. Or, you’ve learned
something that maybe your unconscious is working for
you. You keep doing it over and over again....you may
be doing now just naturally every place you go, finding
ways to share power, or empower other people....It’s
the difference that makes a difference all of a sudden.
You try a little something different....

Learning and doing inquiry with Dr. B for about two
years, I find he believes knowledge is socially constructed
and he is pursuing a mindful/thoughtful pedagogy. He values
intuition, encourages creativity, and appreciates individual
difference and uniqueness. Basically, his teaching
philosophy is based upon experiential learning and
reflective double-loop learning. He believes that students
learn best when they are personally involved in the learning
experience and a commitment to learning is high when they
are free to set their own learning goals and actively pursue
them within a suggested framework. To help students learn about leadership experientially, for example, is to let them take part in exercises focusing upon leadership and then reflect upon it in order to build understanding of the nature of leadership and how they may engage in effective action skills. The responsibility for learning is on students, not the teacher. His role is to elicit what is inside a student and to facilitate, to structure, a safe experiential learning environment so that students can experiment with their actions, try things out, see what works, build skills, and generalize for themselves out of their own experience. Of course, he also believes that presenting appropriate theories is essential for helping students summarize their learning and construct frameworks of knowledge that generate what they know.

If concept mapping is a probe of knowledge (Elbaz et al., 1986), it can be used to study teacher’s thinking and knowledge structures. However, I find tracing Dr. B’s thinking is not easy, because his mind is intuitively complex, integratedly open, and ever changing. Without explanation, people seldom grasp the whole picture of what he has in mind. Since the complexity of his concept map is beyond what words can describe in short, I will simply show two maps he used a lot in class to illustrate the composition, organization and relationships of his intended teaching-learning goals. One is his own concept map,
showing his planning for the workshop in terms of leadership themes to be examined and exercises to be involved (see Figure 6.3). The other one is someone else's, which he adopted to encourage the try-out of double-loop learning (see Figure 6.4). Though both are very complex, reading closely, we can find the quality of concept groupings (structure of declarative knowledge), and the quality of links among concepts (structure of procedural knowledge).

When I listened to Dr. B talking, lots of times I felt I was meeting, in his talk, Jung, Kolb, Argyris, Schon, Quinn, Bennis, or Torbert. Sometimes I was encountering other students' experience in his talk, and once in a while I would hear myself too. How could he absorb, integrate, and transform other people's points of view in such a fast, seamless, and thoughtful manner?! Observing Dr. B's teaching, he indeed built into his strategic, open-minded instruction his appreciation/respect of the uniqueness of each individual and different theories. Though the overall structure, fundamental exercises, and key elements of the workshop have not changed much from Spring 1992 to Winter 1993, his understanding and interpretation of leadership and way/s of transacting important concepts have been evolving. For example, in Spring 1992, he pointed out upfront "vision," "value," and "action" as the key words to think about leadership, and used the Johari Window (see Figure
Figure 6.3: Dr. B, Concept Map of the Workshop Design

- **Strategic Situation**
- **Leader Roles**
- **Strategic Leadership Concepts**

- **Action & Reflection**
  - "Meaning and Communication"
  - "Trust through Positioning"
  - "Attention via Vision"

- **Deployment of Self**
  - "Act w/o Fear of Failure"
  - "Positive Self Regard"

- **Conflict Mgmt Styles**
- **Negotiation Styles**
- **Cognitive Skills**
- **Behavioral Skills**
- **Action Skills**
- **Competencies - MEI**

- **Stream of Experiences**
  - Experiential Exercises, etc.
  - "In-Baskets"
  - "San Francisco Case"
  - "Special Learning Projects"
  - "Negotiation"
  - "Time w/Leaders"
  - "Visions for Oakmont"

- **Unfolding Futures**
  - "Career Planning"
  - "Career Phases and Stages"
  - "Match w/Organization"
  - "Co-evolutionary Developmental Dynamics"
  - "Moral Development"
Figure 6.4: Double-loop Learning
(Bothwell’s Theoretical Model for theory-of-action, in Bothwell, 1983, p.140)
6.5) to emphasize the importance of communication, openness, and trust. In Winter 1993, these elements were still mentioned, but he started to pay more attention to psychoanalytical approach in leadership building. He emphasized more about seeking the inwardness, bringing the mind, emotions, and body back together, etc. What constituted the change? Students? New trend in the study of leadership and management? The shift of his interest? Or, a different state of mind? Maybe all, or maybe something else.

![The Johari Window](from D. Jaques, 1992, p. 56)

Researcher's Frame, an Inquirer's Ouest

Analyzing my own mind is not easy either, since it is always traveling and sometimes wandering. But for the sake of accomplishing a dissertation research, I have to keep
reminding and forcing myself to create a frame to stay within. No matter how wild my observation or thinking might go/jump, I have tried to focus my lens, in this play, on pedagogical practices. And I have kept one of my hidden principles very well which is not to be intrusive at any occasion of my investigation. Thus, my inquiry focused primarily on the public classroom curriculum events (e.g., lecture, group activity, presentation, and debriefing), not on the private personal learning experiences (e.g., journal, learning contract, and coaching). I believe it is not fair to the students, in the name of research, for them to lose the space and/or the trust they might have created with the teacher.

Since it is a practice-centered co-operative study, I have tried to open my concerns to Dr. B's and tried to know what he is interested in finding out about student learning or his own teaching. But the funny thing was that one open inquirer was defeated by the other open co-inquirer. Though I did see a lot of constructive reflections happening in our discussions/dialogues, in his teaching, and in my inquiry actions, there were times I was frustrated by Dr. B's kindness and got upset with my politeness/or passiveness. After some struggles, both of us have learned how to probe the concreteness from the other side. One strategy I tried was to set a concrete agenda periodically in order to help
myself be focused, and to invite Dr. B's concerns and suggestions.

Overall, my inquiry agendas have never been fixed to one single set of questions or concerns. They were in fact continuously shaped by or emerged from the reflective discussion/dialogues I had with Dr. B. The first shared agenda was the development of a survey questionnaire. Drawn upon my experience in design studio and Dr. B's knowledge and concerns of the workshop, we co-developed a concrete instrument to collect students' opinions on group-based collaborative learning (see Appendix B). The basic concerns were: What kind of learning experience benefitted the student most? In what way/s? What are the most important factors to effective group deliberation? Which stage is the most difficult one? What are the possible demographic factors that might influence student learning?

The second shared agenda was related to what I would like to find out in my observation. Getting some ideas from Stodolsky's (1988) work, I listed in detail all the questions and areas of focus I had in mind to discuss with Dr. B (see Figure 6.6 and Figure 6.7). Basically, the questions centered around: How is teaching and learning going on in the classroom? What knowledge, strategies, and skills do students apply in their collaborative learning experience? How is student involvement related to assigned tasks, given situations, and learning goals? From the
Figure 6.6: Discussion Notes on Observational Questions
Figure 6.7: Discussion Notes on Observational Categories
discussion, I found out Dr. B was interested in knowing more about student involvement, and conversation strategies, and looking into the catalytic aspect in conversation, e.g., when is the energy out and how the conversation is moved forward.

Focused on Dr. B’s concerns, I pushed myself forward to work out a new agenda for selecting and analyzing group conversation through the use of the video recordings. I started with a very greedy attempt to look into turn-adjacency, topic control, illocutionary acts, role functions, and non-verbal cues in conversation, also with a curiosity about the feeling stage and the moments of silence (see Figure 6.8). My observational and analytic goals were then set to see the visible aspects of human body motion, to hear the audible aspects of verbal information, and to feel the hidden but embedded aspects of atmospheric substance. After several painful, labor-consuming practices of both quantitative and qualitative approaches toward conversation analysis, I figured out an amended way of doing it without sacrificing too much of my energy as well as my interest and Dr. B’s concern. I used frequency counts of turn-taking to locate where/when energy danced most and least. Then, from reviewing how the conversation was moved forward, I selected the most representative segments to transcribe and study.
Figure 6.8: Discussion Notes on Possible Coding Categories
When I was approaching my way of doing conversation analysis, finding the appropriateness of form/expression and meaning in conversation, Douglas Barnes' agenda for "teaching as a linguistic process in a cultural setting" kept haunting my mind. He says,

The study of linguistic phenomena in [educational] settings should seek to answer educational questions. We are interested in linguistic forms only insofar as through them we can gain insight into the social events of the classroom and thereby into the understandings which students achieve. Our interest is in the social contexts of cognition: speech unites the cognitive and the social. The actual (as opposed to the intended) curriculum consists in the meanings enacted or realized by a particular teacher and class. In order to learn, students must use what they already know so as to give meaning to what the teacher presents to them. Speech makes available to reflection the processes by which they relate new knowledge to old. But this possibility depends on the social relationships, the communication system, which the teacher sets up [for them].

(Barnes, quoted in Cazden, 1986, p.432)
"I have no curriculum," Dr. B replied to my question about his curriculum structure. I said, "But, I see curriculum as a process, not a product. You do have your plan..." Both what Dr. B said and what I said are quite true. It depends on how, from which aspect, we view curriculum. In terms of studying curriculum in motion, then, there is no doubt that curriculum involves teachers using their expert knowledge to analyze and interpret the complex teaching-learning situation, making judgments and decisions as they formulate a course of action intended to benefit students. It also involves student involvement and dynamic interactions in the classroom. In this scene, we will see a central pedagogical property—"live" curriculum.

Teacher Planning and Knowledge-in-Action

Teacher planning is the soul of apparent curriculum events. Effective planning requires thoughtful deliberation and purposeful design of classroom processes. It involves a reflective knowledge-in-action process that can be characterized as a mental rehearsal of ideas and knowledge about students, teaching/learning goals, content, curriculum
materials, instructional strategies, etc. (Calderhead, 1987; Clark & Peterson, 1986; Clark & Yinger, 1987). There is planning in a pre-active sense which basically shapes the broad outlines of what is likely to occur in the classroom, and planning in an interactive mode that originates intuitive, spontaneous decision-making in action and in situation for the unpredictable.

The strategic workshop, as designed by Dr. B in a pre-active sense, was (a) to provide a comprehensive understanding of strategic leadership in the public sector; (b) to highlight important competencies needed for contemporary strategic leadership; (c) to build action skills in selected competency areas of strategic leadership (e.g., vision, communication of meaning, positioning, and deployment of self to learn); and (d) to complete a series of self-assessment exercises and to explore personal plans for career development and learning (Course Syllabus). He put together a series of parallel learning exercises in and outside class to help students learn and build personal action skills for strategic leadership competency areas, individually and collaboratively. Since he believes the appreciation of differences is the key to the success of the class in terms of learning leadership in group process, he started the class with understanding personality styles and problem solving. As he shared with the students,
One of the themes that you want to nail down, in this particular class, if nothing else, I want at the tenth week to be able to say, "You've learned how extraordinary differences are and what you can do with those as a leader." You'll see things happen because of your knowledge and differences. Okay. And drawing on those differences to make things happen....And, for this class, assume this is a work organization....We are going to try to find a way to make these twenty-odd people a productive work unit. And our goal is to co-empower so that we can co-learn about leadership and transfer it into our own personal lives, right now, and the next few weeks, as well as into those parallel processes that we are working on outside of these particular arenas [cases and simulations] when we get together here...

Indeed, in ten weeks, following Dr. B's pre-planned content coverage, grouping for instruction, and classroom processes, students got opportunities to explore themselves in self-assessment exercises, and to participate in group-based case studies and simulations. Each of them was required to keep a strategic leadership journal and to work out a learning contract with the teacher. In addition, students were invited to engage in one or more of the outside classroom learning experiences arranged by the teacher or by students themselves, e.g., labor management simulation, intuition development workshop, creativity workshop, individual coaching, etc.

But when the leadership workshop was underway, as partaken interactively by both the teacher and the students, the learning climate, the relational chemistry, and the details of classroom text events (e.g., specific verbal behavior) were unpredictable. Because the students were
different, the atmospheric constituents for knowledge construction were different from group to group and from class to class. Dr. B's pre-active plans moved to the background, and the emerging, interactive planning on "how" to say "what" began to play an important role in classroom discourse. His immediate reflective knowledge-in-action for managing transitions from one activity to another, adding or dropping elements for learning experiences, or encouraging students to "build on strengths, exploit opportunities," became the thread of the live curriculum. His role then was not only a task setter, but also a synthesizer, and a facilitator.

In his group-based collaborative learning classroom, Dr. B created social structures with given tasks, arranged from simple to complex, to help students gain the ability and confidence to take over the authority for their own learning. Every time after he explained the assigned tasks, groups were left pretty much to the students themselves. He put the students as the central figures in the learning process, and made himself as a seemingly idle teacher, busy with other tasks or going out of the room from time to time as the groups conduct their business. Once the groups finish their work within given time-frames, the recorder of each group would share the group's consensus with the rest of the class. Then, he would facilitate the class as a
whole to synthesize, make sense out of, and reflect upon the various conclusions or experiences of different groups, though sometimes, due to running out of time, he had to do it in a rush. Basically, he tried, in his (usually short) remarks, to lead students to perceive similarities and differences in their presented points of view and to grasp features of the task that they did not work out or realize on their own. If possible he would then try to link them all into a larger vision with broader considerations.

However, based on my observation, not every student was ready to appreciate or was able to take over the authority for learning collaboratively. Probably this is the reason why quite a few students suggest in the questionnaire that they would prefer Dr. B. giving more concrete feedback and providing clearer guidelines. If knowledge is a social construct, group activity followed by group reporting is no doubt an important means in advancing knowledge in the collaborative classroom. But, the teacher's thoughtful spontaneous teaching/guiding and constructive feedbacking in plenary discussions are far more influential in terms of maximizing the success of collaborative learning. Of course, having "sufficient time" for plenary reflective discussions is also very important.
Collaborative Learning in Group Tasks

Collaborative learning in group tasks is not unstructured learning. Rather, it replaces one structure, the vertical one, with another, a lateral structure. Group tasks in the collaborative classroom, in effect, create "participation structures" (Doyle & Carter, 1984) as well as processes for students to exercise social, and interpretive competence in collaborative events of knowledge construction. Because leadership can only be grasped in group dynamic, learning "literate consciousness" of leadership must take place in social environments through interactional exchanges—group tasks. By literate consciousness of leadership, I mean the appreciative awareness of "self," "self with others," and "self in actions." Because consciousness is always "transitive" (van Manen, 1990), to be conscious about leadership actions and/or virtues is to be aware of some aspect of "self in the world." So, what is to be learned in the leadership workshop is, to a great extent, a joint construction of students in group processes.

In the workshop, each of the group processes involves a communication approach more interested in the other's personhood and in finding the best solution for a given task/problem at a given time than in personal winning of an argument. Besides the sharing type of group discussions, self-assessment, career development, leadership dialogue,
there are five major task-oriented group activities, involving actual group deliberation (problem-solving, conflict-management, negotiation decision-making, etc.). They are arranged as a series of group tasks growing in complexity in terms of matters of concern, situated context, episodic constraints, and leadership action skills.

The first one, Kidney Machine Case, is a decision forcing task, that group members, through unfolding (personal) values and setting criteria, have to invent a process for their final decision. The second one, San Francisco Desegregation Case, is a reframing exercise for action alternatives of a historical event. Group members not only have to deal with issues of ambiguity and stress, they also have to be aware of how, in their change actions, history might effect their approach to a solution. Both the third and the fourth tasks are in-basket simulations, dealing with immediate issues and concerning leadership styles, competencies and performance. But the forth task, Mid-Town Superintendent Case, involves a greater amount of complexity than the third one, Mid-Town Public Education Center, in terms of background information, conflicting situations and levels of concerns. In both exercises, group members have to identify the significant issues, suggest and rationalize action strategies; but only the fourth exercise involves also the implementation of stakeholder analysis. And the last one, Oakmont City Simulation, is the biggy
among all. In three class sessions, group members with assigned roles, together as a task force, need to come up with a (creative but reasonable) development plan for the City of Oakmont and to present the plan in the press conference. With given situations/facts, this wide, open-ended task involves group members to exercise more thoroughly the action skills and communication strategies necessary for conflict management and negotiation, and strategic management.

Among these five group tasks, based on the survey results, the Oakmont Simulation was the most favorable one, particularly for those respondents in Monday class, Spring 1992. Describing what about the Oakmont simulation excited them most, students' comments/reasons (from three classes) include, for example:

- required a comprehensive and total commitment and implementation of leadership skills,
- its role playing and application of negotiation, group process, and strategic leadership/management techniques,
- required collaboration and creativity, and forced a reframing of issues,
- seemed more realistic—had to deal with the press,
- had a chance to be creative in designing a solution,
- presented real opportunity to enhance learning contract objectives,
- freedom, detail, enough time to get into,
- able to reflect on it over time, and
- able to develop a team and build a working relationship with people over time.

From what students have responded on their "Oakmont" learning experience, (or some students' experience on "Self Management Team," an outside classroom group learning
I find students' satisfaction with and/or confidence in collaborative learning depend on a number of factors. There include (a) the quality and level of challenge of the task, (b) the applicability of already-learned knowledge, (c) the enhancement of developing skills, (d) the linkage to the "real world," (d) the opportunity for creativity, (e) sufficient time for reflection, and (f) relationship/team building. Further, student involvement/commitment in collaborative learning is based on their understanding of a social constructivist view of knowledge and their desire to confront the tracional view of knowledge. Therefore, in the collaborative classroom it is important to recognize that the end is not simply to work in groups but to work in groups in an effort to reach consensus (either agreement or agreement to disagree) and be both creative and productive.

**Student Commitment to Personal and Professional Growth**

The meaning of a teacher's planning on learning experiences lies with the student. Students construct meaning by interpreting learning opportunities and committing themselves to accomplish the assigned or negotiated exercises. In leadership workshop, student commitment to stretch for personal and/or professional growth is one of the central concerns of Dr. B's teaching, and is the best asset and/or legacy of the course.
In terms of tracing student commitment to personal and professional growth, the best resources and indicators are strategic leadership journals, learning contracts, and individual coaching sessions. In the strategic learning journal students were asked to record and develop reflections on their leadership actions. Although one student expressed that the self produced in the required journal was not themself, I believe most students would be able to cultivate a critical consciousness through dialogical, double-loop exercises involving personal ongoing questioning, responding, reframing or reformulating earlier action strategies. For their learning contract, students were encouraged to stretch their own learning with direct experience of leadership situations or actions at workplace, in class, or outside of class. And in coaching sessions, each participant student posed individual needs, and engaged in conversation with the coach on the outcomes they wanted and the resources they could have to produce the outcomes.

From reading and tracing all these powerful, insightful sources, except for each particular individual, only Dr. B has the best idea of how much and how well each individual has committed to and got out of his/her own personal or professional stretch/growth. Respecting the private space of the student as well as of the teacher, I left these individualized learning experiences outside my inquiry, unless they were publicly shared by students themselves.
The last class, the tenth session, of the workshop is usually a celebration time for sharing what has been learned or experienced in the workshop. Besides sharing group learning experiences, some students would share their own personal learning experience. Among many action stories I heard, I remember a particular, reflective one told by a strong "withdrawal" student. She bashfully stood in front and shared her learning experience in the coaching session with Dr. B and two other co-coaches. Glancing at her notecards once in a while, the student described briefly how she was coached by the coaching team, and what she had learned from the experience in terms of finding a way to actually feel positive. She said,

...So, I found that I learned two things out of this experience. One was I started to get grasp on how to [use] the technique, how to actually feel good before a situation. The other thing I learned was--I went ahead to try this [during the coaching] in a specific conflict management situation that I had in mind. I successfully slipped into the mode and, tell you that, it felt like what [the coaches] had told me to weave--(At the same time she took out a white sweater out of a bag and put it on. On the sweater, weaved a lot of labels with positive word on each.)--weave a garment of good feelings that I just put on and I step into [the situation]. So, I was successfully doing that, but I didn’t actually resolve the conflict that I set out to when I did this. But I count that as a success because one of the things I have a lot of troubles with this quarter is actually risking failure. And so, I did fail. But I’m still here. I’m still alive and doing my...

It was the commitment in action that touched me. In learning I think there is nothing more beautiful than a fearful novice uneasily but willingly trying out the not yet
mastered skill/s. Nothing can be learned without committing one's self to explore the unknown, the unexperienced. For the student, I hope she remains brave. For the coaches, I hope they are always generous. But, I also hope for the "more" of teaching/coaching and learning that goes beyond finding a way to "feel good," because "feeling good" sometimes may be blind and this "garment" sometimes may be taken off or be taken away.
SCENE III: Collaborative Peer Talk on the Stage: Theatrical Layers of Conversation

PLOT LINE: What is the relational character of knowledge, conversation, and collaborative learning? What is the concerned and engaged nature of conversation in group activity? Can linguistic analyses illuminate the pedagogical significance of classroom discourse such as peer talk?

In a heating-up discussion, one student turned her head, glancing at the camera, and told the group, "I would say, by the way that little light is flashing." "Oh, yeah, you see it's on," another student added. Before continuing the discussion, one student joked, "turn it off." Yes, classroom life is but a stage. On the stage, the space of play, of exploration, of creativity, meaning existence, as thought in action, is always informed by the layers of aesthetic, ethical, cognitive, or technical experience in conversation. Rhythm followed by movement, mood in the color of voice, texture of the exposed massage, and space for the "Other" are all substantial and perceivable in the realm of talk. In the collaborative classroom, deeply incorporated into the nature of evolving peer talk are also the fundamental requirements of theatricality.

If knowledge is constructed in a state of continual negotiation or conversation, learning is then a process of taking a hand in what is going on by joining the talk/conversation of "knowledge-able peers" (Bruffee, 1984). The role of peer talk in collaborative learning is then likely
to be highly differentiated, and a powerful source of evidence for the other ongoing modes of participation.

In order to deal adequately with linguistic phenomena in classroom interaction, particularly in task-oriented group activity, the focus of this scene is on peer talk in collaborative situation, on how language works as part of an integrated system of communication with action. From seeing, hearing, and feeling through the different layers of theatrically embodied conversations, we may grasp what linguistic understanding of peer talk and group process can do to help the improvement of teaching and learning.

The upcoming acts are (re)presented in a way to help visit the conversational constellation from its macrocosm to its microcosm. To catch the underlying systems of knowledge, skills, and attitudes embedded in conversation, we need to prepare our ears, eyes, and state of mind for the following questions: What is verbally expressed, in terms of words, messages? What is bodily expressed, in terms of non-verbal cues? What is demonstrated, in terms of functional behaviors? What is accomplished, both interactionally and intellectually? And, what is aesthetically experienced, in terms of the spacial-temporal rhythm in conversation?
**Prelude:** Through a dramatic composition of cognitive performance, this opera is intended, in its showing, to contrast two climatically different group processes. In this collective presentation, music forms an essential part with particular scenery, consisting of recitatives, arias, and choruses in one group, but only recitatives and arias in the other.

**SCENERY:** Kidney Machine Case

**MUSIC:** How to decide who will get the machine?

**RECITATIVES and ARIAS with CHORUSES:**

(In a group of six, the energy of the conversation danced all over. Three of them, ST4, ST5, and ST6, decided to give up the machine at the very beginning.)

ST1: That's because you are uncomfortable making those decisions= (said to ST4, ST5, ST6)
ST6: =Are we?
ST1: I feel.. (with pondering look) uncomfortable making a life or death decision when I'm partially involved
ST3: **involved**
ST6: **Yeah..**
Don't tell me- Maybe this should be reframe ** uhm- Honestly, I think it would be kind to pick one of you.
ST2: Maybe
ST1: I would say- I'm sorry, go ahead.
ST2: Or, maybe we should try to think of- uhm- I mean take ourselves away from it and look at it objectively and come up with some criteria.

(The discussion was heating up. Lots of times there were multiple conversations. ST1 suggested to flip a coin. ST4, ST5, and ST6 were still not convinced to join the game.)

ST3: Is this martyrdom- uhm- trying to- (with smile)
ST6: **MARTYRDOM, no I wouldn't**
ST5: =accept martyrdom
ST6: I wouldn't say that at all.
ST3: Is self leadership **-
    Is that a stretch for you all? <laughter>
ST4: You see the point is that **
ST6: To me every day is a gift-
    {ST6 continued to share her personal experience and philosophy.}

(The debate on "how to decide who" went on in laughter with a great excitement. Criteria were discussed and personal values were shared and weighed. Ended with agreeing to disagree, ST5 flipped the coin for ST1, ST2 and ST3. ST3 got the machine and felt good about it.)

SCENERY: Mid-Town Superintendent In-Basket
MUSIC: As a superintendent, facing different issues and various conflicts what is the most important action to take? Who may affect/be affected by the action?

ARIA'S and RECITATIVES only:

(In a group of five, the tempo of the discussion went slowly. Frustration was on everybody's face and in everybody's voice. After an action was chosen, the discussion got stuck on deciding the stakeholder of the action.)

ST3: {Responding to another group member's point.} Well,
does it make sense to do it anymore particular-
At least school board ** you know-then, ugh-then obviously the discussion as I see it focused on other people on the list..
Vis-a-vie, who were decided how the, uh, you know, what kind of importance ranking we could come through and figure out for them. Uh-
ST1: So, do you want me to share the rankings that I have?
Or- then should we go around, everybody share their ranking, or should we be taking a look at- filling up the [stakeholder management] grid, or
ST3: I think the grid comes after what you thought of the columns= (worksheet for recording judgments, importance and disposition, about stakeholder)
=you know, it's just a matter of plotting, ugh-
ST2: But, do we have to come to a consensus on the importance..for the group?
ST5: {suggests what should be included as stakeholder}
ST2: Are we..include[ing] all of those?
ST1: Or do we need to drop some
So, we’re talking about using staff as a global term for a stakeholder, using board as a global term for stakeholder, and students, and parents—Is that what I hear people saying, at least hear ST5 saying that.

ST5: My point is maybe we should decide what stakeholder[s] [are], then we can sign up the importance=

ST3: =that makes sense.. (looking at the materials)
I don't know..
I think the way I was looking at the board ** together is to spell out separately, although I [think] that way you don't get, you know, you don’t get into the issue of who.

(Different levels of understanding, and varied opinions on the process, consensus seeking was never achieved till the end. The task was not accomplished, and everybody looked very tired.)

Postlude: The nature and/or the complexity of a task may have an effect on the group process and the performance.
But it is not the only reason. Message orientation is one of the other reasons. It reflects personal preference, and "knowledge" about the task and so forth. A constructive message is able to build upon what was just said by others and bring forth the catalytic effect of the conversation. Ideas and opinions can be different or conflicting, but messages have to be "inviting" and heading toward "shared understanding." For example, in the first episode, though there were different points of views, we can see there were many inviting tones and questions to invite others to join the conversation.

In a group process, if the "continuity" and the "directionality" of messages (which move forward the group
process along the cognitive "line/s") are not maintained, though there are many passionate arias or recitatives, there will be no chorus. For example, in the second episode, though ST3 was actively involved in the task, he cut off the flow of the conversation several times. In his language, there were a lot of "as I see it," "the way I was looking at...," "I think," "you know..." which shut off other members' responses. The talk might be "on-task," but might not be "on-target." Unnecessary noises might set in. The conversation might be lost. Deliberative operations (such as clarifying concepts, analyzing situations, identifying problems, constructing alternatives, and so forth) may be carried "around" but seldom carried "through." Thus, no "way" is created to the goal, and no "arc" is bridged with the Other.

Masque: From Role Function to Functional Role

Prelude: In a form of amateur histrionic exercise, five performers are masked and habited in character. Whether the given role creates the talk or the talk creates the performed role is difficult to distinguish. Seeing these as co-related and co-created aspects of over-all group function and production, special attention is given to the use of language in functional leader-member dynamics. Instead of
"looking for" the categorized task and maintenance functions in group process, we are going to "look at" what functional leadership roles are talked out of the performed roles.

**ACTION:** In the preparation for City of Oakmont Development press conference.

(Being aware of the time, ST1, the mayor, tried to get everybody in the task force to work on the final refinement of the proposal for the press conference.)

ST1: We really don't have a lot of time. May be next five minute or so, I would like to have something ironed out here as far as our own decision. Then we can work on the rest of the twenty-five minutes to prepare our presentation, uhm or my presentation that I think I certainly like to draw upon you to help out.

If you think that will fit into all {Continued to talk about and invite ideas about building a hotel.}

ST2: {Expressed why he liked the idea.}

ST4: {Brought up her caution about the idea.}

ST1: Let me ask the developer. (Turned to ST3 who had been quiet for a while,)

Do you have any *** whether a hotel will be willing to lease property from a city?

(Both ST2 and ST4 gave their opinions, but not ST3.)

ST1: Uhm, perhaps what we- I could do, or we could do as a proposal is to open up the *** to the developer to {ST1 provided some suggestions for ST3.}

ST4: {Gave some comments}

ST1: Right!

So, we all agree that's something worthwhile to explore as far as requesting uhm, our request for proposals... so to speak.

ST4: {Gave more comments.}

ST1: Great!

OK, we gotta, uhm, twenty-five... twenty-four minutes to get this ready...

Uhm, looks like we have ten minutes toward press release...

How do out action fit into here... (Delegation of different responsibilities continued.)
Interlude: Confronting with other groups in the press conference, everything has to be publicly tested. Both the assigned role and performative role have to be seriously played and the proposal has to be firmly addressed. My opinion about how well the "leader" member has been playing his role is not important. The important thing is how the group members (ST2, ST3, and ST4) think about their "leader" member (ST1), and think about themselves as "member" leaders (functional leadership). From their "sit back" reflection on actions, they, as well as we, may gain some appreciation of the blended fabric of leadership.

REFLECTION: After the press conference.

(ST2 left earlier. ST1 started the debriefing with inviting others to talk about his role.)

ST1: Is that what you thought my role would be as the mayor to get certain tasks accomplished and-

ST3: I like you're the mayor.
You have to organize ***
You say, Okay, well this is the way we're to-
You know, this is ****

<laughter>

ST1: Well, that was the problem=
=I was afraid I was stepping over too authoritarian.

ST4: No, not at all.
You just provided sound direction.
I mean even when you told us what you wanted us to have ready next=
=It wasn't like an assignment ** you know, like this is what we're gonna wanta look at, and basically, you need to be prepared because you're gonna have to have some input and that was..you know, and I think that everybody's input was regarded with respect and validity and only did we work our way out of it when we thought it could go into to something else or if it directly conflicted with our vision.
So, I think even though we didn’t have a VOTE, an official vote process, I think there was more democratic than it was anything else.

ST1: **** I think it would then be really challenging to have to play your roles though, because you had to be an expert... so to speak. <laughter>

ST1: How was that.. like ST5 was finance person
<laughter>
ST5: I thought we were ** to have some conflicts=
ST1: =Right. I think so, too.
ST5: I thought my role was to be antagonistic.

(The discussion about how each person played out their roles went on. They shared that they’ve seen a lot of intentional "role playing" going on, and pointed out that both freedom and hesitancy were involved.)

ST1: How would we have played our roles, I think, differently- how could we have done our whole project-
ST4: I think that if, you know, if we would have really been interested and absolutely being in conflict, I could have been a lot more difficult, and created, you know, some really stingy scenario {cites some examples}
<laughter>

ST1: And that would challenge you too, I think, because you got to play this ROLE as the devil’s advocate but then KNOW right when, that you want to step back and play the accommodator or whatever other negotiating role we want to play.
ST3: You guys all remember your [managerial skills profile] (a self-assessment instrument)?
ST4: (After each of them shared what they thought their type/s were) It depends on the situation, and I would be more accommodating to somebody that I liked, or someone that I feel pleasant with, **somebody who makes me mad, then, forget it. <laughter>

Postlude: We all are playing multiple roles, including given roles, and chosen roles. How we perform our roles depends on how we define our given roles or chosen roles. Quite often we play/act out, in "talking," our roles, no matter actual roles (e.g., teacher, student) or functional roles (e.g., leader, member). In group process, the use of
language plays the most essential role in demonstrating leadership. A group conversation reflects how the group operates with various degrees of diffusion of leadership functions in one member or a few members to create a sort of "multilaterally shared responsibility" (Benne & Sheats, 1976). In an effective and pleasant group collaboration, we can hear, for example in this "masque" exercise, more "we" language, less self-oriented messages, more invitational and appreciative tones, more positive reinforcement, and less judgmental criticism.

Though the use of language involves a kind of personal power exercise for "social identity" (see Gumperz, 1982a), the drama, in a group collaboration, is not just the person, or the individual, but the performance of an entire group. Getting the group task accomplished and developing or maintaining relationship among members, skills in using appropriate language in communication are the key. Grice's suggestions about co-operative principles of conversational interaction may be very applicable, such as (a) say no more or no less than is necessary (quantity), (b) do not say what is false or uncertain (quality), (c) be relevant (relation), and (d) be clear, brief, and orderly (manner) (see Taylor & Cameron, 1987; Robert et al., 1992). However, it is important to note that keeping the conversation going, in collaborative learning, needs to be done in a way to enliven every member to join the action to help the group accomplish
the task with knowledge and insight. A successful functional leader is able to stimulate in conversation playful but meaningful interactions for achieving group task/goal.

Melodrama: Illocutionary Acts in Expression

Prelude: In a conversation illocutionary acts (the social acts performed in speech, see Austin, 1962; Searle, 1979) are often interspersed in expression, accompanied by intentional moods appropriate to the situations. This melodrama is a collection of two dramatic pieces characterized by a sensational plot. With a combination of pathetic and humorous elements in the conversation, violence (resulted from confusion) may sometimes appeal to the emotions of the players, but with a happy ending. Chewing upon what has been expressed/said by the players, we may find, in each conversation, representatives of belief (RB), directives of desire (DD), commissives of commitment (CC), and reflectives of evaluation (RE) (see Searle, 1979; Fraser, 1983).

SITUATION 1: Life and death decision among six students. (Kidney Case)

PLOT: Why don't you join the drawing game?

(Facing the life and death decision, some wanted to give up their life, some suggested to do a lottery, and some suggested to go through a rational process.)
ST1: I'm going to suggest to draw straws..(DD)
   We have the same chance, type of situation, because I
don't know how we can rationally decide who's going to
get the opportunity (RB)
ST3: But just because you can't do it rationally doesn't
   mean you have to do it randomly. (RB)
ST2: Yeah. (RE)
ST6: You can do it..irrationally <laughter> (RB)

(Debate went on. The focus turned to emotional stage.)

ST4: You see we have too much fears to do this.. (RB, or RE)
   <laughter>
   We don't want to play the game. (CC) {Explained why he
   wanted to give up the life.}

(Question turned to so-called "quality life," and the
feeling stage of sacrificing other people's life.)

ST2: That's what I think is really important to set up some
   logical criteria so that you don't feel that guilt-
   (RB, and CC)

(Persuasion went on and on.)

ST2: No, why is it..why is it that we're not willing to, I
   mean, why is it we're not willing to be in the equal
   *** (DD)
ST6: Is it because you don't trust that we're being honest
   about bowing out? (RE)
ST2: No, (RE and RB)
ST1: Yes. (RE and RB)
ST6: Yes. (RE and RB)
ST1: I think.. -well-er- it's not-
ST6: You think it's like I'm fantasizing
   it so that I don't have to be in it? (RB)
ST1: No, no, no, no, no. I'm not. (RB) I might have the
   saying, if this is real.. and it's.. and, so it's
   hard... you know, to extract the game from what would
   really be real.. (DD)
   Ugh, I might feel the same way.. I don't know. (RE)

SITUATION 2: Reflection on action among four students.
   (Oakmont Case)

PLOT: Why don't you just confess?
Comparing with other groups, they started to dig out what they could have done differently. ST4 remained silent most of the time."

ST2: I had a sort of a secret agenda all along and, maybe, it was just because I had sort of an interest in mass transit and I think maybe I was conscious of it for the first two meetings. (DD and (CC)
But then like you said, (RE) I realized we've gotta get this task accomplished, or just, you know, let's do whatever is gonna be most amenable to everyone, or we can just get things- (DD and RB)
But when I read the case I didn't know what role I was gonna have, I thought how can I make mass transit look good= (RE)
ST1: =But you were reluctant when [city planner] questioned you about your *** (RE)
ST2: Right. (RE)
I think he was sort of probing me, you know, I think he accused me of making this whole proposal for a parking garage, and that's when he said whose decision was this. (RE)
ST3: Yeah, that's true. (RE)
ST2: That's the whole dialogue in the very beginning. (RE)

(Conversation turned to how personality types, introvert and extrovert, might have impact on performance.)

ST3: (an introvert) I sort of wondered if we were going to be intimidated, or well, I felt like I might be intimidated, especially since you were the mayor (said to ST2, an extrovert) and, you know, and, of course, you always think of the citizen's person (ST3 played citizen representative) as being the underdog= (RB)
ST2: =Right (RE)
ST3: ** and they're gonna be pressured into, you know, they're gonna tell you you can have a voice, but that's under condensation, you know, "We don't care what you say, shut-up and get out of here," you know, so, but I was really pleased that, and I know [city planner] rather facetiously said {ST3 described the situation}. (RB and RE)

Postlude: Language performs social acts/illocutionary acts.
There are hundreds of acts such as asserting, questioning, promising, requesting, and reporting, etc., but there appear to be four major attitudes which can be expressed by the
speaker as I have analyzed the two episodes in this melodrama. These embedded attitudes—the conversational intentionality through the expressions of belief (RB), of desire (DD), of commitment (CC), of evaluation/affirmation (RE)—create the "texture" of a conversation. And the texture of a conversation sensitizes and touches in ways that make people in the conversation "feel" the sense of belongingness or of alienation. In both episodes, most expressions, though passionate, were clothed with lively style, sincerity, politeness, or responsibility consistent with the ethics of the situation/context. Therefore, both conversations could lead to happy endings in different/or conflicting opinions.

When I was observing and analyzing the conversations, including other episodes, I realized that the flow and shift of appropriate attitude toward each other was part and parcel of a pleasant communication process. Attitudes gave a tone to conversation, accented it, and at times, if they were not carefully adjusted, might override the collaborative process. However, I also realized that this kind of afterward categorizing actually did not do much good to the conversation in action. For example, though I put codes of possible embedded attitude (e.g., RB, DD, CC, or RE) after each utterance, it only showed my "categorization" of what been said. It did not help change people's attitude at all. What is needed for making the study of
Illocutionary acts useful, I believe, is to prepare speakers (students) giving more careful consideration of the effects of the attitudes behind the illocutionary acts and to provide tasks for students to exercise/perform appropriate and constructive social acts.

Because language is multifunctional (a particular utterance may perform several speech acts simultaneously), the intentionality of an utterance need to be interpreted in the social context. If illocutionary effect is a matter of understanding the conversation, the identity of the speech act is determined in large part by a kind of feedback mechanism depending on how it is taken in the conversation. Thus, the conversational intentionality of a collaborative group cannot be reduced to the intentionality of the individual speech acts. It is the interactive conversation that structures the developing collective intention of the group. Our understanding of illocutionary acts in group deliberation then should emphasize "structure resulting from process, rather than the process simply being a function of an antecedently intended structure" (Searle, 1991, p. 139). And this understanding of illocutionary acts in expression will help create a realm for constructing or interpreting mutually shared knowledge in a proper manner.
Pantomime: Voices of Silence

Prelude: Like the white background in Chinese ink-drawings, the soundlessness (pauses and/or not speaking) in conversation is not empty. What is expressed in Chinese drawings can only be extracted with difficulty from the white surface of the sheet, and this white surface itself is the true reality of the picture, the unchanging ground from which the figures emerge like fleeting shapes. Also, silence is the ground from which all speech emerges and into which it falls back. The very silent moments that occur in conversation are, as Bollnow (1982) points out, "filled with reflexion on what has been said and on what remains to be said, even merely with a feeling of gratitude for the profundity achieved in the conversation" (p. 46). This pantomime is not simply to present how people express themselves by dumb shows, but to (re)present how silence exists in relation to speech.

ACT I: Silence in reframing Kidney Case situation among six.

ST1: I mean, if we...if we were family members, I wonder how that would change?
ST2: Yeah.
ST1: {Wondering how would that change if they were all related} how would that change your context of this decision?
ST2: That’s true
ST1: I mean it’s one thing to be strangers, or almost strangers, but-
ST4: {Confirmed what ST1 just said, and raised a new question about how the hidden transaction cost might have effect on the decision.} Is it ***?
(Everybody was leaning backward, and pondering look was on everybody’s face.)

ST1: I don’t know.

ST4: Or was within the consciousness you cannot accept such a gift?

(ST1 nodded his head.)

ST1: That’s might be true.

(Everyone kept pondering.)

ST2: Yeah, it would be hard... I’m not really— I’m not

Within the consciousness, I cannot accept it ***

ST2: It would be a very different thing if all six of us
just look for it. {Described how she felt}

(Then, the discussion continued.)

Interlude: Genuine fulfilled silence only sets in after an
intensively conducted conversation. The inwardness,
esential to fulfilled silence, is only achieved through
sincere conversation. It was these beautiful moments of
silence that drew my attention to the voices of silence. I
think I cannot describe any better than Bollnow (1982). He
says

It is more usual for a conversation, like the
hyperbolic orbit of a comet, to reach a stage of
highest intensity at which it approaches more closely
to the truth that is being sought, and then simply
fizzles out, either because a general feeling emerges
that no progress is being made. The give-and-take of
ideas slows down, longer pauses occur, until finally
the conversation lapses into silence, in the hope that
it will be taken up again later and yet with a sense of
satisfaction that the truth has been felt to be in it.
This truth, however, that is present in the
conversation is not the same thing as a conclusion; for
it is present only as long as the conversation lasts
and slips away again as soon as the conversation falls
back into silence (p. 45).

However, silence in conversation can be of many
different kinds. In the following act, we will see a few
more forms of silence where, though not pleasant, right and wrong are difficult to appraise.

ACT II: Silence in rethinking the Mid-Town Superintendent situation in a group of five.

ST4: (Was encouraged to speak up.) {Brought up an opinion which was not quite related to what was just been discussed.} (ST1 and ST2 looked lost and ST3 and ST4 were looking at the material at hand.)

ST2: Well (looked at ST1 with a frustrating expression)...so we have diversity of the importance.

ST3: {Opposed ST4’s consideration.} I’m not sure I agree with the way that-er-it’s an interesting concept and it- depending on the issues that we are involved..That might be involved, but I don’t see too many of those being..you know ***- (everybody looked at ST3, and ST5 was nodding head.)

ST4: {Continued to explain further, but did not finish.}

ST3: I’m not sure I got the same sense.

ST2: {Explain ST4’s point to ST3.}

ST3: {Gave opinion about the issue needed to be considered.}

ST2: I think that ST4 sees this as an opportunity.

ST4: {Haltingly groped forward.} (ST5 looked at the watch.)

ST3: (Broke the ice.) ST1, do you have anything to say?

ST1: I’m sitting here thinking what <cough>...***.<cough>. Let me, let me give you a little feedback on the process here. (everyone were looking at ST1)

ST2: (Turned to ST1) Immediately I think we need to *** and we have not really come up with any consensus yet.

ST3: No. although, I think it would be pretty easy to..
(The discussion continued among ST1, ST2, ST3, and ST5. For the rest of the time, ST4 said no more.)

Postlude: There are good silences and bad silences. In conversation, silence may occur as a naturally reflective flow that emerged from celebrating the awe and the understanding, or for meeting the unthought and the unsaid (as seen in first act). It may also occur as a deliberative act that is conducted for kindness, for laziness, for self-protection, or for reasons of pride or contempt for others (as seen in second act). Silence can be experienced positively as well as negatively. For example, in the first act, silence created space for deeper thoughts and brought an intimacy moment to the group. But, in the second act, it resulted from frustration, mistrust, refusal to communicate. Silence, as a wall, created distances between group members and poisoned the atmosphere for communication. Thus, in conversation the silences are as important as the words spoken. It is important, in conversation, to leave space for self and for others through the silence of listening ears, of patiently waiting, while sustaining an expectant, open, and trusting atmosphere.

According to van Manen (1990), there are three kinds of silence: (a) literal silence, as in the absence of speaking; (b) epistemological silence, as in facing the unspeakable; and (c) ontological silence, as the fulfilling silence of being in the presence of truth. In a good conversation, any
of these silences, I believe, is as important as the words spoken. They all can be granted and experienced in a positive, powerful way. The importance of granting positive silence is to leave reflective wordless space that provides self and others with a renewing experience in conversation. As the inward gaze, silence marks the time of reflection and nonparticipation in action. And as the outward reach, a well-intentioned silence creates the moment of understanding and accepting others in wordless.

Since silence is not just the absence of speech or language, knowing the forms and the voices of silence actually makes a whole of the ecological understanding of conversation. In analyzing/understanding conversation, it is important to be aware of the silence "out of which and against which all text is constructed" (van Manen, Ibid., p. 112). Silence, as a means of communication, carries a message that can stimulate sensorial activation and can provoke aesthetic responses. I believe only through sensitive observing of the expressions in soundless (facial, gestural, and postural) and sensitive listening to the unsaid or unspeakable in context can we have a "wholehearted attentiveness" (a term borrowed from van Manen, 1991) to the conversation as well as build our ecological understanding of conversation.
To sum up the study of classroom discourse, of collaborative learning, of conversation strategies, we need to consider granting more attention to the voices of silence. By doing so, we may find ways to penetrate the possible "wall of silence" in conversation and to establish a constructive "pedagogical link" (Bollnow, 1982; van Manen, 1990; 1991) to the improvement of communication. If conversation strategies can be mediated through silence, as van Manen (1991) suggests, we need to know the power of stillness, how to read silence as well as how to remain silent. In conversation, there are times to speak, to provide personal views, to give advice, to make comments, and/or to encourage speaking up. But there are also moments when it is more important to hold back opinions, to remain silent and to respect silence.
SCENE IV: Meaning Making in the Betweenness

PLOT LINE: What are "the taken" out of "the given," the perceived out of the performed in the workshop? How can pedagogical meaning be communicated textually between persons (students, teacher, and researcher)?

There is no passage between outside and inside without some "sustaining relation" between them, without some between, some reflexive threshold of consciousness, painful or joyful. I remember in a group debriefing one student asked the group, "Do you guys [after you've done something], do your minds start swimming with a million things you wished you've said?" The student continued to express how frustrating it was at the "crunch" moment. Another student added, "Like you think of a really neat insightful comment and then it comes out of a professor's mouth or..." Then the whole group laughed and talked about how they felt at these kind of "regretful" moments. Indeed, in the flow of learning, consciousness awakening or re-awakening is always heaving between the inner and the outer. Feeling "Aha!" "Yeah!" or "I should have..." is so true to many people in the breathing of meaning.

Constantly journeying to and fro, meaning is multi-dimensional and multi-layered. It can only be grasped in the process of knowledge construction. Out of experiences, expressions, actions, feelings and so forth, meaning is created and constructed in the realm of betweenness, between persons, through textual communication. In the crafting and
sharing of "texts," this scene is going to present how pedagogical meaning is communicated textually in the workshop.

**Seeing Between Layers of Collaborative Talk**

Collaborative talk in the workshop, as unfolding and evolving actions and messages of peers, not only facilitated group tasks via constructing cognitive text, it also empowered the student via constructing social text. The cognitive text (the content/concepts of "leadership") and the social text (expectations for participation) actually co-occurred and were interrelated and inter-tuned.

In the survey, responding to the question about possible frustrations during group exercise, students expressed that they felt frustrated when they could not get their ideas across, when feeling their insight was not valuable or their ideas was ignored, when being physically left out of the group (someone turning the body away) or being blocked out of the group, when not hearing from everybody, when someone dominated the conversation, when someone lost sight of the purpose of the exercise, or when someone could not focus on the issues/solutions. All of these are multi-layered. They are interactively produced (or allowed to happen). As one student said,
my personal feeling [was] that we weren't hearing from every person either through their choice or our neglect of inviting them to speak.

Thus, to change/improve the conversational situation for collaborative learning, it is actually every participant peer's responsibility, though there might be some struggles. In a group interview with students who have watched their own (group) performance on videotapes, one student shared that

...I've been in...situations where I was frustrated. I wasn't happy with the way we were progressing, but I didn't want to make it any worse. And I was afraid if I did anything, it would make it worse, and, you know, that would reflect on my performance as well as the group. So I don't think [watching myself in action] helped me with the strategy necessarily, but I think it definitely indicated that it would have been better off just trying anything, because, you know, you can adjust immediately from that point, and I think you would, you'd be able to sort of modify it and make some sort of progression, hopefully.

Because people usually perceive body language and voice quality (seeing and feeling) more and faster than words (hearing and thinking), there is no way that we can ignore the "feeling stage" in the conversation. It is true that in conversation how a message is expressed quite often has great effects on what message is actually heard or interpreted. As one student, in the interview, reflected upon what he learned from verbal and non-verbal cues in conversation,

...there had to be one particular person that, in my opinion, was the source of the tension in our group... I just perceived it as negative...the tone was
negative, even though the words weren't negative, and
the gestures were negative, negative and biased...[we]
got frustrated.

Another student shared that one time he heard someone say
some positive words to another group member, but he did not
feel positive at all. He said

It's almost like a routine, you know, it's like, okay,
I'm supposed to say..."you're important, we value your
opinion," but if it's really not the case, it's
obvious. And I think people aren't as naive to think
that, you know, they're not sincere.

Thus, in meaning making, the conversational layers of
attitude expressed through body and voice are more
influential than the layers of skill or knowledge expressed
through words. We need to note that, in considering how
collaborative talk unites the cognitive and the social,
being aware of theatrical layers in expressions may
contribute to increased understanding of the quality of
meaningful conversation. If mindfully exercised/or
intentionally practiced, the seeing of conversational layers
may help participant peers in collaborative talk not only
learn from each other's differing knowledge bases (cognitive
text), but also develop some of the conversation strategies
and action skills, beginning with attitude change/adjustment
(social text).

One more thing I have to mention (confess) is that in
looking into the collaborative talk, at the beginning, I
wished to examine the cognitive aspect in group process more
closely in order to identify those characteristics (stages)
that promote the sort of reflective and systematic thinking on which group deliberation depends. I hoped to identify cognitive categories and then to be able to specify the stages that "realized" the deliberative operations, but I found no such simple relationship between stages and deliberative operations. For example, I tried to set up an "index of deliberateness," using stages such as clarifying concepts, analyzing situations, identifying issues/problems, constructing goals/alternatives, developing plans. But, it turned out that tracing these stages could not serve my purpose. At times the identification of the stages ran counter to my intuition about what was really going on. The deliberateness was left implicit in my data more often than made explicit. Links between utterances are frequently carried out not at the Level of Cognitive Stages but via underlying propositions. Participant peers use their knowledge of both content (cognitive text) and interaction (social text) to attribute meaning to what is said. However, the end result was not bad at all. Getting ideas from Kolb’s problem management model (1983, p. 122), I kept revising the cognitive loops of group deliberation based on what I have observed from actual group process. Finally, I developed a quite satisfactory model, Group Deliberation as a Dialectic Process (see Figure 6.9), to explain the possible (ideal) cognitive aspect in a collaborative group process.
Group Deliberation as a Dialectic Process:

Figure 6.9: Group Deliberation as a Dialectic Process
Reading Between Differences

By experiencing different classes, I found different classes had different classroom climates (based on what I observed and experienced) and different learning outcomes (based on what students shared/presented in the last class session). Reading the survey results from three classes (in the survey students were invited to weigh the importance of different options by distributing a total of 100 points to the options of each question), I found the differences were also reflected through students' general views on their learning experience. It seems that students in the class which had a better collaborative atmosphere tend to be more confident with their performance and tend to be more satisfied with their learning experience (see for example Table 6.1). Based on my observation on students' performance in group activities as well as my reading from the survey results, I also found the age (and work experience) did create some differences on students' performance and learning.

For me, I think it is important to share with students what I have learned from/about them. In both Monday, 1992 and Tuesday 1993 strategic leadership classes, I tried to share my findings with the classes, as a public testing, in the last class session—the celebration time. In the Monday 1992 class, I shared the results from a self-reflection survey, which I conducted in the class but have not used in
this study. I also shared the action inquiry model I developed (see Figure 3.1) in reflection to Dr. B’s concept map of leadership in action (see Figure 6.3). In the Tuesday 1993 class, I shared my thoughts about observing and analyzing conversation in context. Besides, I showed the differences of the student opinions on group-based collaborative learning between classes (see Table 6.2) and between age groups (see Table 6.3) in which I also included Dr. B’s view to make a comparison with students’ views.

Table 6.2: Survey Results on Differences between Classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions and Options</th>
<th>Mon. ’92</th>
<th>Wed. ’92</th>
<th>Tue ’93</th>
<th>Dr. B’s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Which of the following benefited you most during the workshop/course?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of strategic leadership in public sector.</td>
<td>17.65</td>
<td>19.41</td>
<td>10.63</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of competencies needed for strategic leader.</td>
<td>17.94</td>
<td>22.06</td>
<td>22.68</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of action skills in management process.</td>
<td>15.89</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>14.84</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-assessment exercises.</td>
<td>30.29</td>
<td>27.65</td>
<td>28.63</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to explore personal career development</td>
<td>14.65</td>
<td>15.59</td>
<td>22.50</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Which of the following helped you learn most during the workshop/course?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concepts introduced by the teacher during the lecture.</td>
<td>17.12</td>
<td>19.12</td>
<td>12.81</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas from supplementary readings.</td>
<td>17.35</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>16.25</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Leadership Journal</td>
<td>13.53</td>
<td>15.88</td>
<td>15.94</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Contract</td>
<td>12.06</td>
<td>13.29</td>
<td>26.63</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group activities.</td>
<td>41.76</td>
<td>34.71</td>
<td>31.88</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Which of the following factors contributed the most to effective group deliberation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having a clear vision</td>
<td>19.44</td>
<td>23.83</td>
<td>19.69</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaningful communication.</td>
<td>33.13</td>
<td>22.65</td>
<td>26.25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to be open and trustful.</td>
<td>20.31</td>
<td>19.12</td>
<td>16.25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouragement of alternatives and creativity.</td>
<td>14.65</td>
<td>25.65</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructive conflict-management.</td>
<td>11.88</td>
<td>12.55</td>
<td>12.61</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*During the Oakmont exercise which of the following stages was most difficult for you personally?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation analysis</td>
<td>23.83</td>
<td>16.35</td>
<td>25.56</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defining the problems</td>
<td>18.82</td>
<td>20.59</td>
<td>22.81</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing solutions</td>
<td>15.88</td>
<td>17.35</td>
<td>23.89</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing conflicts</td>
<td>15.47</td>
<td>20.75</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiating final plan</td>
<td>20.29</td>
<td>22.24</td>
<td>15.31</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*During the Oakmont exercise which of the following stages was most difficult for the group as a whole?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation analysis</td>
<td>24.33</td>
<td>12.35</td>
<td>17.06</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defining the problems</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>17.82</td>
<td>22.19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing solutions</td>
<td>15.67</td>
<td>13.92</td>
<td>21.13</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing conflicts</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>23.41</td>
<td>10.94</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiating final plan</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>30.76</td>
<td>21.38</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.3: Survey Results on Differences between Ages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions and Options</th>
<th>Under 30</th>
<th>30-40</th>
<th>Above 40</th>
<th>Dr. B's</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Which of the following benefitted you most during the workshop/course?</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of strategic leadership in public sector</td>
<td>17.36</td>
<td>13.40</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of competencies needed for strategic leader</td>
<td>22.53</td>
<td>23.36</td>
<td>17.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of action skills in management process</td>
<td>15.75</td>
<td>13.13</td>
<td>15.56</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-assessment exercises</td>
<td>25.79</td>
<td>26.75</td>
<td>25.56</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to explore personal career development</td>
<td>19.19</td>
<td>21.57</td>
<td>16.11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Which of the following helped you learn most during the workshop/course?</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concepts introduced by the teacher during the lecture</td>
<td>15.14</td>
<td>12.96</td>
<td>13.39</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas from supplementary readings</td>
<td>11.92</td>
<td>22.15</td>
<td>23.93</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Leadership Journal</td>
<td>13.29</td>
<td>18.22</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Contract</td>
<td>15.76</td>
<td>9.92</td>
<td>18.89</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group activities</td>
<td>39.11</td>
<td>38.57</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Which of the following factors contributed the most to effective group deliberation?</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having a clear vision</td>
<td>24.76</td>
<td>18.13</td>
<td>17.78</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaningful communication</td>
<td>27.81</td>
<td>24.11</td>
<td>29.44</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to be open and trustful</td>
<td>15.49</td>
<td>24.56</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouragement of alternatives and creativity</td>
<td>20.21</td>
<td>19.29</td>
<td>18.33</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructive conflict-management</td>
<td>11.61</td>
<td>13.93</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>During the Oakmont exercise which of the following stages was most difficult for you personally?</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation analysis</td>
<td>22.58</td>
<td>18.40</td>
<td>24.44</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defining the problems</td>
<td>19.65</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>18.89</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing solutions</td>
<td>25.04</td>
<td>22.92</td>
<td>17.02</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing conflicts</td>
<td>19.98</td>
<td>15.36</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiating final plan</td>
<td>16.76</td>
<td>11.45</td>
<td>31.11</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>During the Oakmont exercise which of the following stages was most difficult for the group as a whole?</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation analysis</td>
<td>21.54</td>
<td>12.86</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defining the problems</td>
<td>20.74</td>
<td>20.18</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing solutions</td>
<td>18.81</td>
<td>15.90</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing conflicts</td>
<td>18.60</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>10.55</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiating final plan</td>
<td>27.42</td>
<td>33.32</td>
<td>42.22</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I think it is helpful to let students and Dr. B see together the differences between teacher’s view/expectation and student’s view/perception, between classes, and between age groups. Then they might find meanings out of these differences and find ways to communicate, to adjust accordingly.

I picked up some of the differences, which I think were interesting and meaningful, to share with the class. For example, the first graph (see Figure 6.10) shows what
students/Dr. B thought they benefitted/would benefit most from the workshop objectives. It is interesting to see Dr. B and students' views are quite different on development of action skills in strategic management process, self-assessment exercises. But Dr. B saw this was okay because self-assessment is fundamental to the development of actions skills.

![Figure 6.10: Diff. between Classes on Learning Outcomes](image)

Also it shows that students in the Tuesday 1993 class perceived benefitting more from having opportunities to explore personal plans for career development and learning than the other two 1992 classes but less from understanding strategic leadership in the public sector. Probably it was because more people in the 1993 class were at a transition stage, or more were from an education background though,
personally, I wonder if this also resulted from Dr. B's different emphasis on/or ways of transacting leadership concepts. This correlates to what shows on the second graph (see Figure 6.11) that students in the Tuesday 1993 class gave more weight to the individual learning contract, as a helpful learning approach, than the other two classes.

![Figure 6.11: Diff. between Classes on Favorable Delivery Mode](image)

It is interesting to see that, on every option, the 1993 class scores are closer to Dr. B's. Because Dr. B put down his view on Dec. 16 1992 and then got to compare the differences with the two 1992 classes, I don't know if that had anything to do with this end result of the 1993 class. But one thing I know is that Dr. B was happy to see the learning contract scoring higher than previous classes, because in the presentation before I mentioned the change
Dr. B already paid attention to it and pointed it out.

There was an interesting episode in the presentation. When we moved to talk about the second graph, after Dr. B explained how/why he saw the importance of the various delivery modes as the way he did (see Figure 6.11), a "young" student asked him,

I’m wondering why you view reading as a kind of low and so does the class. But, how come there are so many?"

Then Dr. B stood up and said,

It was the first night, Dr. B was here. What I said? This is the book that I want you to carry with you, don’t worry too much about it in this class. Don’t get bound up in it. This class we’re going to take actions. And then after it’s over, then tonight he said: Oh, by the way you might want me reading the package along the way...

This conversation led wonderfully into the discussion about age differences on the delivery modes (see Figure 6.12).

Figure 6.12: Diff. between Ages on Favorable Delivery Mode
The graph shows that younger students (under age of thirty, 60% of the sample) put reading as lowest. They scored lecture higher, reading lower, and group activity higher than the older ones. This result shows that "age" does make differences on learning (and performing).

The last graph I showed to the class was age differences on students perceptions about contributive factors to effective group deliberation (see Figure 6.13). Both Dr. B and I were surprised that constructive conflict-management showed in all three age groups as the least effective factor among five. It is interesting to see that younger students gave higher scores on having a clear vision and encouragement of alternatives and creativity than older students, but got lower scores on the factor of willingness to be open and trustful than the older ones.

Figure 6.13: Diff. between Ages on Contributive Factors to Effective Group Deliberation
Meeting in Feedbacking, the Live Betweenness

At the moment when meaning is created, or constructed in the betweenness, there is no need to put many words to reason why and how. We just feel we "meet" the "being," a person, a saying, or an idea. The meaning becomes "self-explanatory." Just like all of a sudden it all makes sense to "me" personally. I remember, in the Monday 1992 class, after I shared my action inquiry model a student came to me after class and told me that my "spiraling" action inquiry model helped remind her that exercising action skills is actually a "keep-wheeling" process. Then she went on to talk about her happiness and excitement in realizing her potential in performing herself as a functional leader in different situations.

Also, in the Tuesday 1993 class, after the final session, someone came to me to share her thoughts about what I had talked about concerning connecting observation and conversation analysis in context. That she would like to get more information about that to apply to her study of language in teaching, however, was not the most impressive thing I got at that night. What impressed me most was the emerging meaning-making in a natural co-feedbacking flow among students and the teacher. There was so much going on. To end this play, I will turn the spotlight back to the teacher, Dr. B, and his students.
After students shared/celebrated their learning experiences in different activities through various ways, Dr. B celebrated his. He said,

My goal in this class was to be as little present as possible as that in a way you won’t know that there was a quote "the teacher" in the class. Because you were in fact co-teaching each other, I want to see what happens to that. I must say I was extremely pleased to see what I heard tonight. It’s wonderful to see what came back here, that you’ve really empowered yourselves and each other. So that’s one of my little experiments to see what’s going on...

Then before the class was over, he gave honor to a gift, a creativity project, he had just received from a student during the break. The cover of the creativity book was a long computer print-out banner, says "sttrreettcchhh." He shared it page by page. Finally, he read out loud passionately the last page, a poem "The Road Not Taken" by Robert Frost:

Two roads diverged in a yellow wood,
And sorry I could not travel both
And be one traveler, long I stood
And looked down one as far as I could
To where it bent in the undergrowth;

Then took the other, as just as fair,
And having perhaps the better claim,
Because it was grassy and wanted wear;
Though as for that the passing there
Had worn them really about the same,

And both that morning equally lay
In leaves no step had trodden black.
Oh, I kept the first for another day!
Yet knowing how way leads on to way,
I doubted if I should ever come back.
I shall be telling this with a sigh  
Somewhere ages and ages hence:  
Two roads diverged in a wood, and I--  
I took the one less traveled by,  
And that has made all the difference.

There was a beautiful moment of quietness. Then he softly continued, "Remember, it is the difference makes a difference..."

"Is this the end or the beginning?" Dr. B asked. To some students it might be the end. To some it might be the beginning. To me, I have to continue the telling.
Teaching and learning leadership is most effective when it takes place in a group whose members carry out inquiries on alternatives/actions to which they have a personal commitment and who engage in collaborative, critical, and constructive conversation about the problems and issues that arise. It is in such collaborative peer talk that we see the true role of language in conversation, in learning. In providing the means for the co-construction of meaning, students appropriate what is currently most relevant to their own development, with the guidance and assistance of a teacher or more knowledgeable peer. In such a collaborative learning environment, the roles of teacher and student are interchangeable, for all are co-learning and co-teaching.

However, carrying out a liberated curriculum through collaborative learning is not easy. If students can really be empowered and be able to take the authority of their own learning it depends a great deal upon teacher planning, activity design, and student commitment. And the true effectiveness relies on if the teacher communicates well enough about the learning goals and sets the "zone of proximal development" (Vygotsky, 1978) appropriately. It is important to get balance between cognitive text and social text in activities, because students coming to so-called "formal education" need to be challenged intellectually and socially. Further, there is also a need to prepare
student's "readiness" for taking various challenges in independent collaborative studies. Teachers should not neglect their roles in guiding the "direction," not necessarily showing the way step by step. The strategic leadership workshop indeed was a great learning experience to many students. Lots of them expressed in the questionnaire that the workshop was a great course and they liked the design of the course and felt they had learned a great deal. But there are always more expectations, and there is always room for improvement, e.g., as requested by students, more preparations, more time and detail, more specific and designated sharing, more feedback, etc. One student wrote,

Great job! Personally, several time constraints did not allow me to maximize benefit. Keep this type of class mixed with "traditionals" to stimulate/prepare students!! Great job.

If this play is to bring attention to the potentially empowering nature of collaborative learning in group process/activity, we may already realize the importance of highlighting the concerns of problem solving, ownership, challenge, commitment, action skills, conversation strategies, and intersubjectivity of understanding. What is central is to take a more sensitive view of what it means to learn through collaborative learning, and how students can
be prepared and brought together to support and act as
catalysts to each other in their knowing and coming to know.

Since teaching and learning in the classroom emphasizes
spoken language, linguistic interaction plays a crucial role
in the process of knowledge construction. Analyzing
classroom discourse as a way to understand pedagogical
practice becomes essential. There is a cry for a more
thoughtful integrated approach to qualitative analysis of
classroom conversation. Because classrooms are also
contexts for interactions among peers, not only interactions
between teacher and student, to encourage collaborative
learning it is particularly important to study peer
conversations in the classroom though they are more
difficult to overhear and record. In this play I have
deliberately been eclectic, believing and demonstrating that
we have much to learn about modes and aspects of
conversation. Rethinking the analytical problem of relating
patterns of peer talk to patterns of cognitive as well as
social meaning, it is challenging and rewarding, but not
easy. As educational practitioners and/or researchers, in
the study of linguistic phenomena in teaching and learning,
we need to pay more attention to the forms and aspects that
can help us gain insight into the social events of the
classroom and thereby into the understandings which students
achieve.
Honesty is the best policy; quality, the best argument; diversity, the best method; experience, the best reference; example, the best teacher; reality, the best proof.


Confronting the "inner tension between illumination and concealment" (Gadamer, in Jardine, 1992), I am propelled to "lift the veil" of my participative presence more, for making sense of what has happened to me and to the researched, and for inviting an open appraisal (or public criticism) of the reality that I have constructed for the studied scenes. There are stories about experiences that are joyful, exciting, puzzling, or upsetting. In the telling, I may reveal who I am more, but I aspire more to seeking the potential "generativity" (Jardine, Ibid.) that will make educational inquiry hopeful. Through honestly unmasking and evaluative reframing, I may render my inquiry actions more sensible as well as return some debt to the missing data, and the incompleteness. In order to bring forth the possible worlds for ongoing dialogues, I would
like to break the bounds that I have intentionally or unintentionally created for the pedagogic reality described/interpreted.

Some Decisions about Methods

Much has been said explicitly in Chapters 3 and 4 and implicitly in Chapters 5 and 6 about methods. I am not going to repeat or summarize here, but merely highlight a few decisions, addressing them briefly to reflect my experiential learning of qualitative data management. From my experience, I learned that co-operative action inquiry is a "situated," emerging, "thinkingful" practice. The driving forces behind decisions about methods are better from the life/situation in the classroom, not from the researcher's "unworldly," "pre-secured" design. The appropriateness of the method-in-use is appraised by how well it is able to unfold the "life" in the classroom and to serve the classroom teachers' practical needs, not how well it can help support the researcher's hypothesis.

Interview or Observation

Interview and observation feed each other to increase sensitivity and aid understanding of classroom life. I applied both of them in both the landscape architecture
design studio and the strategic leadership workshop. But
how they were applied and weighed in each site differed.

In design studio, teachers and students were engaged in
an "apprenticeship" type of learning environment, and the
central concern was on how teachers, Norman and Debbi, and
students perceived their personal experience in
teaching/learning to design. Thus, interviews were most
informative in terms of getting to know students'
perceptions about studio life and teachers' assumptions
about design education. During the text recycling process,
I was not merely an interviewer, but an interpreter busy
translating perceived messages and phenomena between Norman,
Debbi, and students. My observations served as backing
sources that helped me to know the language and culture in
the studio, and to prepare my readiness for interviews as
well as sensitivity in interviews.

In strategic leadership workshop, a collaborative
learning environment, observing how students (and the
teacher, Dr. B) constructed knowledge together was the major
task. Though I could have done more interviews with
students to increase my understanding of their thoughts
behind their actions, I deliberately eschewed doing that
because I was in favor of discovering the meaning of actions
through analyses of teacher planning and classroom
"interactive text events." Also, I had my bias that
graduate students know too well to respond skillfully in
interviews, therefore I decided rather to find out some viewpoints from them in short casual chattings. Of course, my hidden researcher role in Spring 1992 somewhat hindered me from doing formal interviews with students as well.

Interestingly, I do not know why, in the leadership workshop I felt so awkward using a taperecorder during the reflective discussions/interviews with Dr. B. I only did taperecording of the discussion once. I remember there were two or three times that I intended to record the discussion and had a taperecorder with me but I never took it out. In landscape architecture design studio, however, I did not have this kind of hesitation at all. Probably it was because I was introduced to and walked into the design studio as a publicly defined/recognized "researcher" since the very beginning. Maybe I can put it this way: that "role identity" has an effect on method-in-use or technique-in-use.

Still Pictures or Motion Pictures

Both design studio and leadership workshop were so rich in visual and audio residues that only using a photographic discourse approach could help gain and present more complete pictures of the different interactive modes in the studio and workshop. However, I realized that there was no way I could apply the same approach toward my photographic discourse design in these two sites. In landscape
architecture design studio, because of its unique social and physical structure, I decided to take and juxtapose still pictures to help construct a visual reality of the studio life. Videotapes of studio teaching were only used as a mediating means in reflective discussions.

In strategic leadership workshop, though I was invited once to take still pictures of classroom activities, I made no response to Dr. B and never tried to do it. Personally, I felt having a still camera in hand would interrupt the flow of peer talk and might change the natural expressions of the people in camera. Also, because the focus of my analysis was on collaborative peer talk, I felt the already-in-use video camera, filming the group process, was sufficient enough in terms of helping reveal the conversational reality in the workshop. If there was a need for documenting some particular situations, I could just use the modern technique mentioned in Chapter 4 to take off the needed frames from the videotapes. Unfortunately, I could not afford the cost for doing so. Besides, I did not inform the students in leadership workshop, as I did to the students in design studio, that I might document their photographs. Thus, I only showed the text events in the workshop through verbal imagery (motion picture in words) due to these financial constraints and ethical concern.

No matter which imagery form I have been using to present the so-called pedagogical reality in this study, I
have to admit that the documented photographs (still or motion) are "spoken" within language and classroom culture. Their meanings are both produced and secured within the systems of representation (Solomon-Godeau, 1991) that a priori mark their uniqueness—and my relations (sensitivity) to the uniqueness—in somewhat dynamically preordained ways. The physical setting, the nature of the course design, the language and classroom culture, and I myself, etc., are the bounds of the presented, visualized world.

Descriptive or Interpretive or Critical

Originally, I planned to analyze my data from a critical perspective. But when I started to read my data whole heartedly, I came to converse with the data and realized that I’d better drop my original intent. I felt I could express how I felt/thought about the scenes observed but I had no right to criticize the world I was in. I knew so little about the big context as well as each individual in the context, including my co-inquirers. I came to supplement more hermeneutic understanding of the text events as the way they were presented/perceived. Also, I came to appreciate more the amusement of different data and their embedded personality/characteristic. They all spoke to me powerfully in their own unique styles/ways. The task for me was then how to make their individual as well as collective voices (stories) be heard in my voice (restoried stories)?
Since this study is a co-operative action inquiry practice, my data analysis should serve the teachers (and the students), to increase their practical resourcefulness through the perceiving of my third eye and third ear. Taking all the data in hand, I felt I had an ethical responsibility to Norman, Debbi, and Dr. B as well as students observed and interviewed. In the retelling of their stories I needed to remove myself more from the scenes, but still be honest to my feeling and thinking. In the telling of my personal experience I can then be more critical, but still take the social responsibility for the researched.

Because design studio data were basically centered around various perspectives, from Norman, Debbi, and students, I felt I could only respect different perspectives and present them descriptively. But, my interpretation was still stitched into the juxtaposition of quotations, commentary, and visual images. My critical thought was transfused in the dialectical, puzzling arrangement of the texts. Because the leadership workshop data were based upon the notes of the impressive scenes and talks, my personal interpretation of the perceived scenes or messages were heavily merged in the script. However, the descriptive technique was also applied to fabricate the ground for my impressionist talk. Reflective critiques were modestly woven into my impressionist interpretation to challenge
further thoughts on pedagogical practices. In terms of
telling my personal methodological learning, I see
confessional and/or critical self-reflection as a move from
text to action. Thus, telling disclosive tales in and on my
inquiry actions in this chapter is actually the beginning of
my practical effort to create and construct self-knowledge
for the reshaping of educational inquiry.

About Writing

As van Manen (1990) points out, writing mediates
reflection and action. It is the object of the research
process that exercises our ability to see. To write is not
only to show something but also to exercise self-
consciousness, and to "measure our thoughtfulness" (see van
Manen, 1990, pp. 111-131). For me, writing is also a self-
dialogizing process that helps me learn to read the world
and to read the word. Further, it helps me learn to speak
the word and then to speak the world. To tell the truth, it
has been frustrating but rewarding to see/challenge myself
going through the constructing process of making known the
knowledge that is not yet available to my linguistic
competency.

For whom do I write? I am writing for the classroom
teachers, Norman, Debbi, and Dr. B, that they may gain
new/fresh insights, out of the retold stories, to reflect
into their future pedagogic actions. I am writing for my
dissertation committee members that they may take comfort (and/or get released) in my "different but good" work. I am none of them, but they all are in the (re)presentation of me. Also, I am writing for myself, not only for gaining a degree but also for creating a portfolio to keep a piece of my life in (re)searching. If this study is a work of verbal artistic representation, I, as the speaking being in this work, have brought with me my own discourse (maybe more aesthetic), my own language, to touch myself. Hopefully, through the striving for potential language (discourses), this work will touch some other people.

I do not intend to do "postmodern" writing (some people think I do) because I don’t know postmodernism well and I am not smart enough. I simply write myself—where I am from (a modernized but still mystical eastern world), where I am in (an emancipated but chaotic western world), and where I am dreaming to go (the world in between, a little bit mystical, a little bit chaotic). Besides, I do not intend to break any form (sometimes I think I do) because every form has sense and meaning. I just do not want to be bound by any form. I am just writing in a way to protest that human/educational inquiry can be more humane, more enlightened, and more truly educational, data analysis as well as dissertation writing can be more creative (but truthful), more lively, and more meaningful.
Validation as "Second-Order" Inquiry

If my investigations into the pedagogical events in design studio and in leadership workshop were the "first-order" inquiry, my reflective discussions with the teachers, Norman, Debbi, and Dr. B, as well as my public reportings of my findings to the students were the "second-order" inquiry, a continual reframing, validating process. It was a process that was not simply for doing a "member-check," but for further investigating/inspecting the perceived, interpreted reality. It provided an opportunity to the researched to read or to hear my story, to see themselves portrayed in it, and to respond to me. More importantly, it helped me reflect upon my own interpretation and revise my conceptual framework. Sometimes I would have some intentional sayings that made myself vulnerable to the possibility of restructuring my own assumptions/beliefs. In this second-order perspective, new stories sometimes were generated, which are, as Lanzara labeled, stories of "shifting stories and shifting minds" (1991, p. 291). Basically, I believed that it was possible to gain insight into how the complex, evolving pedagogical reality is constructed through this kind of ongoing validation process, involving reflection, discovery, revision, and action.

Talking about issues of validity, personally, I have a problem with the notion of different "kinds" of validity.
For me, I believe validity is validity. It should be "ecological" in nature. Its "entity" can be recognized and experienced from different facets, in different phases of inquiry. Whether a study or a story is valid or not can not be judged by how many kinds or what kinds of validity it proclaims to have. Its validity is reached and should be assessed by its validating "process." In my study I have to confess that I did not spend too much energy "pre-constructing" what "kinds of validity" I wanted to achieve. Instead of busily categorizing or counting various kinds of validity, I simply committed myself to the reflective, ongoing, grounded dialogues with the researched, to the seeking or rejecting of validity in the making. Be open, be honest, and be responsible. The rhetorical construction of validity via the oftentimes mindless rehearsal of the conventional terms--content validity, face validity, construct validity, instrumental validity, etc.--is not adequate to the task. I believe it is important to provide room for "co-constructing" validity among the people involved (the researcher and the researched). I am confident that the validity of this study was established and accomplished in the "doing." I am also happy that in the doing I have experienced and learned to distinguished the entity of validity from different facets. Mention for three kinds: symbolic validity in discourse, catalytic validity in backtalk, and pragmatic validity in action.
By symbolic validity, I mean the capacity and the happening of "meaning making" in the inquiry "community," among the people involved in the studied scenes. An inquiry community, like any other community, is symbolically constructed. Symbols, as mental constructs, provide people in the community with the "means to make meaning" (Cohen, 1985). They are ideal media through which people can speak a "common" language and participate in discourses. They are vehicles of interpretation and understanding.

In this study because I had a great investment in knowing the symbolic receptacles (e.g., language and culture) of design studio and leadership workshop, I dared and was able to create shared meanings in the various discourses I was engaged in. In the process of meaning making, I realized that only through the use of common language could we (Norman, Debbi, Dr. B and I) bring our experiences and thoughts into a symbolic form to sustain a conversational relation, a discourse about pedagogic life. Engaged in various discourses, for example, conversational, photographic, and narrative, I found that these discourses themselves and everything in them, conceptual as well as material, verbal as well as visual, have a symbolic dimension, existing as something for me and my co-inquirers to "think with" and to make meaning together. I learned that as "language is part of human reality" (Wilden, 1987,
p. 130), symbolic validity is part of human inquiry that can be recognized and experienced in discourse.

**Catalytic Validity in Backtalk**

"Backtalk," a termed borrowed from Lanzara (1991), is the actual sayings in feedbacking, often involving reflective and evaluative forces. It was in many of this kind of backtalks that I experienced the effects of catalytic validity—as defined by Lather, "the degree to which the research process reorients, focuses, and energizes participant toward knowing reality in order to transform it" (1986, p. 272). In the reflective discussions I had with my co-inquirers, usually I would share or report first my perception of the observed pedagogical events. As a testing device, a strategic move, those shared/reported stories invited my co-inquirers to talk back to me to provide new contextual data. Then I would talked back to inquire further, and so forth. These back and forth, "two-way" backtalks were both extensive and penetrating, aiming at eliciting layers of meaning and extracting what was being "said" and meant about the perceived pedagogical events/phenomena. To a certain degree, I would say, this kind of feedbacking practice is a divergent searching for a concrete synthesis to satisfy or clarify the abstractly perceived/expressed pedagogic reality. Though most of the times we (both I and my co-inquirers) desired to
"consciously" channel our understanding and interpretations, I have to admit, there were also times that our reflections, leading to "self-understanding" or "self-determination" (Lather, Ibid.), were stimulated in ways that were beyond rationality and conscious control.

Pragmatic Validity in Action

According to Kvale (1989), pragmatic validation is "to make true" (p. 86) the reality and power of knowledge, in practice. Because "knowledge is action rather than observation" (Ibid., p. 86), pragmatic validity—the effectiveness of our knowledge or understanding—must be demonstrated by the effectiveness of our action. In this study, my co-operative experiences with Norman, Debbi and Dr. B did not end up with simply "talking about" our understanding of the pedagogic reality. We went beyond checking, questioning, and explaining to seek ways to theorize our emerging knowledge/belief in action. Some were already put into practice, and some are forthcoming. Quite often I was so touched by their (Norman, Debbi, and Dr. B's) decisive attitude toward change, making a difference, that I would like to take an attitude of commitment to further inquiry. As a matter of fact, my co-operative inquiry practices in both sites are "not finished."
The Unexpected

There are a few more stories I would like to share, some examples of the unexpected happenings. By doing so, I think I/we might also learn some lessons, do a little more reflection, and/or gain some more encouragement.

The Researcher's Self-Doubt
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Figure 7.1: Who is in the lens?

I happened to capture this scene in landscape architecture classroom. It makes me think about "who is looking at whom" in the studied scenes. Observing myself observing, sometimes I just felt I have seen more than I could ever describe and I have read more than I could ever
talk about. Sometimes I was afraid that I might be the disturbing one for those who were in the scenes. Particularly, in the leadership workshop, since my role was sort of "unclear," quite often I was lost in what I observed and experienced. There were times I became more interested in the content (leadership), or group process, than my pedagogical investigation. Also, doing a longitudinal observation in the workshop, I have gradually realized that the "conscious lens" I was using has regulated the transition of my seeing of the pedagogic world from the inside to the outside. The lens, like a window-pane, was both link and separation. The articulation of the transition (through the interposition of my "self" in the observed world, in-between spaces for the observed, barriers, points of control, etc.) reflected the mental and behavioral transition between the private and the public domain. Based on some past disappointing experiences of implementing leadership virtues and skills that I learned from the Operational Impact Program in summer 1985 and 1986, I was more cautious about the observed scenes than I should have been. Also, conditioned by social responsibility, what meaning was given to the perceived has vibrated between two poles, to be open or to be reserved, depending on the differing light intensity in- and outside my consciousness.
It was interesting that sometimes I was frustrated by not having confrontations with my co-inquirers. In our discussions, sometimes I was sort of expecting to have big differences in our views; then I could get to critically reexamine my perspectives. Somehow, I felt they, particularly Dr B. and Norman, were just too kind and too good to be true that I could hardly get to play tough or critical. But when I rethink the process, I have nothing to complain about our "peacefully" going discussions. They were actually very sincere, and honest about the shared stories as well as the inquiry process. Behind my politeness, I was just too eager to see some negativity for the confirmation of the positivity. Once in a while I would wonder if my expectation for the constructive confrontation was out of my "researcher ego" that I would like to prove or confirm that I, as a researcher, have done something good or something helpful to the researched. Thinking about this, I feel trembling at my self ego.

In addition, as a "person of color," with "not proficient" language skills, doing "qualitative" research of "professional" education in this "foreign" land is not easy. Though I decided to take the challenge bravely, there were still times that I felt emotionally tired of overcoming my own barriers for going out and taking actions. I would question myself why I did not choose something easier. Probably it was because of my past accumulated negative
experiences; sometimes I was too sensitive and too afraid to see anymore doubtful or merciful expressions from some proud Americans' eyes. However, I was lucky that I could get to work with lots of nice Americans. And I am pleased and proud that I have carried through this study in self-doubt.

The Technical Outage

From my research experience one costly lesson I learned was to never trust the machine too much. It goes wrong easily. We'd better check the machines we use frequently, and check or make copies of the data recorded right after we get them. In landscape architecture design studio I was using my own 8 mm camcorder to tape the studio teaching. Every time when I had the recording I would make a copy on regular 16 mm videotape in order to review it on regular VCR. Unfortunately, before I made a copy for the last tape I got, I broke my camcorder. Thus, I could not review the last tape. Also, a sad technical outage happened to the Spring 1992 leadership workshop data as well. Since in the workshop Dr. B set his camcorder to film the classroom activities every week, I never bothered to worry about videotaping, checking, or making copies. I was simply busy doing my "participant" observation. Not until the eighth week of the quarter did Dr. B realize his camcorder had some problems. After the quarter was over, I took home with me all the tapes and planned to start analyzing and
transcribing some events recorded on those tapes. Sadly enough, those ones taped after the fifth week were just too bad to use. This was one of the reasons why I continued my data collection in the leadership workshop in Winter 1993.

The Surprises

After I shared the play I wrote for landscape architecture design studio (chapter 5, including curtain-call), I had a reflective discussion with Norman as well as with Debbi. I was happy that my observation of the social structure in two studios had gained great attention from both Norman and Debbi. Based on Norman's own observation this year, he told me that the same patterns occurred again. Students in the small studio have deeper involvement and higher achievement. Both Norman and Debbi have tried to figure out the causes. They believe that they need to do something with the physical setting of the big studio.

Another encouraging, happy surprise was that of awareness of gender differences. Norman told me that he was surprised with the gender issues I mentioned in the curtain-call section. He said he never realized that those differences were actually there before. He agreed with my observation and recalled some more examples like the ones I have described. He also wondered about what he or other faculty could do to resolve the possible pedagogical problems that may result from gender differences. Debbi, in
turn, was happy that I included, in my stories, my observation of the gender differences in the studio. She also pointed out that gender issues might be reflected through/in the design projects that faculty gave to students as well. Both Norman and Debbi suggested that it would be helpful to have a broader investigation of gender issues in design education. Related to the concern of gender differences, one thing Debbi pointed out was a surprise to me, which I have never thought of before. She wondered if my presence as a young, attractive, female researcher in the studio would have made female students feel more comfortable talking about their frustrations and skewed the male students' responses in terms of expressing their confidence in design. I have no answer to that.

Co-operative Inquiry as Practical Art

In this "co-operative" inquiry practice, quite often, I have had difficulty making clear distinctions between the researcher and the researched. They interchanged continuously. Both are ego and alter, subject and object, active and passive; and the interpretations of and from both have been always open for reflective discussion. Through verbalizing/communicating different ways of knowing about the studied scenes, I have experienced that more egalitarian, reciprocal relationships between the researcher
and the researched are facilitated and developed in the ongoing reflective dialogical process. Because the objectives, matters of concerns, and priorities of inquiry were determined by all participants, the findings actually reflect vividly the dynamics of life rather than an artificial, static situation.

Though there have been baffled struggles, they were in fact constructive "creative tensions" for handling the indeterminant zones of inquiry practice. As a matter of praxis, I have exercised applying knowledge/theories (mostly grounded) in actions that require choice, deliberation, and decision about what is to be done in concrete situations. Centered around the concerns of what is feasible, what is possible, and what is appropriate here and now, I have experienced a recovery and appropriation of the type of practical artistry that is characteristic of "ethical know-how." I have realized that the methodological "fitness" requires a "tactful sensitivity" (a term borrowed from van Manen, 1991) toward the observed world and the co-inquirers' subjective states. It also involves "interpretive intelligence, a moral intuitiveness, an improvisational resoluteness" (Ibid., p.124) in dealing with others.

As an artistic endeavor, co-operative inquiry has both referential and aesthetic value. It is both expressive and referential that we (my co-inquirers and I) have kept communicating our findings and insights in ways that are
relevant and helpful to the practice of classroom teaching and learning. The underlying theories, procedures, and language that I used in my inquiry actions were basically centered around practitioners' practical concerns. Through anticipatory, interactive, and recollective reflections, I found co-operative inquiry indeed helps illuminate and penetrate, and provides visions/insights for pedagogical practice. I have also experienced that co-operative inquiry has aesthetic value in terms of creating symbolic forms and fostering catalytic effects in dialogues/communications about the emerging thematic understanding. It allowed me to demonstrate an intuitive feel for the phenomenon under study instead of playing by the rules of traditional research methodology. I believe that we, educational practitioners, as practical artists, must be free to bend and to shape the medium/tool/method in order to yield novel and engaging findings about the pedagogical world we are in.

From my experience, I also found co-operative inquiry to be very promising in terms of bringing forth ecological understanding of pedagogical practices. It is an inquiry approach that has helped me to pay attention to the reciprocal interactions between persons and their environments. It has also helped me to see the context of classroom/inquiry community as nested with/in other contexts which might influence what I observed in the studied scenes. In the inquiry process I have learned to value and treat as
important sources of data the thoughts, attitudes, feelings, and perceptions of the participants as well as of my own.

Disclosing my lived researching experiences critically and confessionally, I have exposed in this chapter, the joys and hardships, expectations and disappointments, frustrations and celebrations in the doing of this study. Learning from my decisions about methods, perspectives of validation processes, wonders about the unexpected happenings, and experience of co-operative inquiry as practical art, I hope that I/we may take more sensible inquiry actions later on. I think the most rewarding thing for me through/out this study was/will be the continuing dialogues around "if this is the situation, what I/we can do to make a difference?"
CHAPTER VIII
FETCHING TOMORROW

Hope rises with the number of trustworthy directions envisioned. Hope is imagining, choosing, trusting that there is another way. Hope opens the options, hope welcomes the future, hope sets us free to choose.... Hope offers tomorrow.
(Ausgsburger, quoted in Arnett, 1992, p. 33)

Based on a philosophy of hope, this study has been dedicated to fetching a chance—not only to discuss the promises of a reflective, dialogic action inquiry approach, but to put it into practice in the study of classroom life; not only to demonstrate that every form of representation has sense and meaning, but to invite every body into co-creation of meaning.

Out of my lived co-operative inquiry experiences, I have been overwhelmed by the emerging themes that were embodied and dramatized in the evolving meanings and imagery of knowledge/reflection-in-dialogue/action. In a deliberative process of invention, by way of metaphor and imagery, my analyses have been performed as a textual artifact of grasping and formulating a thematic understanding of indeterminant zones of pedagogical practice.
in professional education. Devoting myself to dialogical acts of "seeing" pedagogical meaning from a "classroom life" perspective, I have contemplated different sets of questions in relation to knowledge construction in communicative text events between teacher-student and student-student. To engage findings about teaching and learning of "deliberative art" through both apprenticeship (design studio) and group-based collaboration (leadership workshop), the discursive themes, with different emphases, were moving from teacher personal theorizing/planning to curricular language, to classroom social relations, and to student involvement and interpretation of text events.

As a course of discovery, recovery, and rediscovery of meaning/sense in educational praxis, this study has merged "theory" and "practice" in a world of "narrative knowing." Through communicating my understanding of perceived pedagogical scenes via text, photographic discourse of classroom life and conversation analysis of theatrical layers of classroom talk, each has been substantiated, in my try-out, as heuristic and promising in revealing the aesthetic dimension in teaching and learning. To open/mediate alternative ways of educational inquiry to a more flexible, ecological understanding of the pedagogic world, I have raised, in this study, more questions than I have answered. There are so many emerging puzzles that require further investigation. What follow are examples of
questions for further research that emerged out of this study, though some tentative findings for each of them have already been addressed in Chapters 5 and 6. How to encourage creating an inquiry community and/or academic "home" in which teachers and students, young and old, male and female, have equal access to defining what should be known? If genuine dialogues encourage critical thinking and lead to more just education, how can teaching-learning environments be structured to foster the reciprocal communicative relationships between/among teachers and students? How to prepare students to be able/ready to take the authority of their own learning and to be willing to take the risk of exploring the unexperienced? If collaborative learning is a better pedagogy, how can learning tasks be designed to help students value and model the social construction of knowledge among peers? Which evaluative/reflective approach will provide students with better feedback and foster student creativity and competence in the pursuit of knowledge-in-action? If one-on-one based evaluation/feedback or individualized coaching is most helpful/valuable to the student, how can curriculum events (cognitive and social) be restructured to overcome the crucial timing issue? What can linguistic understanding of peer talk do to help the improvement of teaching and learning? If pedagogical tact can be mediated through
conversation, how to increase the sensitivity for ecological understanding of conversation, the verbal and the nonverbal expressions, the said and unsaid messages, and the voices of silence? Also, how to keep classroom (peer) conversation going in a constructive, playful way, with knowledge and insight, that would enliven student learning in a collaborative mode of accomplishing academic and/or social tasks?

Facing the challenge of experiencing/ knowing the "more" of pedagogical life, there are all sorts of new meanings, new understandings that can be sought. I feel there is no need for me to preach the so-called "implications," because lip-service will not do any good to educational practices in the battlefield. Also, there have already been so many big talks out there that I need not embroider any further. Rather, I would like to continue my "experience prompted/grounded" telling--a telling of an ordinary, half-grown practitioner in hopes of exhilarating the ozone for educational inquiry, of embracing the "more" in dialogic pedagogy, and of thawing out the frozen dream of curriculum change.

Yes, I have the desire to fetch tomorrow. Succeed, or fail? I do not know. But, it is a life worth living. If education is not hopeful, what is left then?
Exhilarating the Ozone for Educational Inquiry

When we as educational practitioners look ahead for a more promising educational inquiry, I hope we appreciate more the deliberative "arts of eclectic" (Schwab, 1978) in educational praxis. I believe such deliberative arts help compare incommensurables for methodological reconciliation or rupture in educational inquiry. Drawing together theory and practice, it "has value as ground for expectation and comprehension of pluralities of inquiries and as leading toward facility and flexibility in inquiry" (Schwab, Ibid., p. 34). When we look ahead for implementing/disseminating alternative approaches toward educational inquiry, I hope we think more, as Dewey (1938) urges, "in terms of Education itself rather than in terms of some ism about education" (p. 6). I also hope we are able to avoid the situations that Benjamin (1939) has satirized years ago, advocating alternatives "with new purposes and old machines," "with new machines and old purposes," or "with old machines and purposes plus a few new verbalizations to make them less forlorn" (p. 46).

Based upon my lived researching experience, I believe co-operative action inquiry, as a way of knowing and a "hermeneutics of practice" (Carson, 1992), is one of the most promising inquiry alternatives, opening up, and keeping open, possibilities toward what research can "do" in the
improvement of practice. Instead of repeating what co-operative action inquiry is, I would like to rethink educational inquiry from two final experience grounded perspectives—inquiry with/in appreciative space, and inquiry with/in reflective action.

Inquiry with/in Appreciative Space

When I sat in landscape architecture classroom the first lesson I learned was the concept of space from a historical perspective. I learned that Greeks used the natural-given space, based on their appreciation of the uniqueness of different vantage points, to build objects in it with respect to the spirit of the landscape. All the architectures scattered in the "open space" looked somewhat chaotic at first glance. But tracing carefully, they were actually all in geometric order in terms of relation to each other. The Roman concept of space was contrarily different. Roman architects built huge walls to "create space within" objects. Within this created, "closed" space, the path from entry to exit was linear and regulated.

As educational practitioners, I believe we are the architects of our own educational fortunes. What kind of space concept we apply in our educational inquiry will result in different appreciation and different experiences of pedagogical life. We can do a "territorial" type of inquiry within fixed paradigmatic boundaries, following
certain guidelines to get certain foreseeable, predictable results. Or, we can do a type of inquiry that transgresses paradigms in order to venture into the unexplored, dealing with uncertainty, risk, or discomfort to hope for experiencing surprises and creating possibilities. Personally, I would like to open up our inquiry space to allow more productive serendipity in our research journey. I believe in educational inquiry we need more comprehensive, constructive understanding of actual needs, problems, and possibilities scattered in the landscape of our pedagogical world. Like Greek architects, we need to know "how" to build "what" at "where," based on our holistic/ecological appreciation of and earnest respect for the "uniqueness" of different educational vantage points.

Inquiry with/in Reflective Action

Human inquiry in general, and educational inquiry in particular, is "communicative praxis" (a term borrowed from Schrag's elaboration of Habermas, 1986). The meaning/effect of an inquiry is actually constructed through/in the process of reflective interplay of communication and "action." If an inquiry is not carried on with/in action or does not bring forth change/action, it is but a costly intellectual verbal game. I hope we can get the notion of "inquiry with/in action" (not limited to the narrowed paradigmatic notion of "action research") across the whole educational
field, because it shows inquiry is not only "a matter of language" (Gauthier, 1992) but also "a matter of doing." In the reflective interplay of discourse and action, language and nondiscursive practices, speech and embodiment, we may yield a holistic space of expressive intentionality for possible actions. What is needed then, as Schrag (1986) points out is the balance of "metaphors of discourse" with the "metaphors of action."

In the leadership workshop the most impressive and rewarding lesson I learned was the stretching experience of seeing and exercising the power of dialogue and reflective practice through doing inquiry with/in action. Based on my lived experience, I cannot agree more that inquiry with/in action helps "cast the theory and practice problem into a new light" (Carson, 1992, p. 113). I have experienced that doing inquiry with/in reflective action (mindful reframing and reconstructing) helps facilitate the use of pedagogical as well as methodological knowledge, revealing new meanings in theory and new strategies for practice. I believe that doing inquiry with/in reflective action is most promising to bring us the hope of exhilarating the ozone for educational inquiry. Hopefully, there will be more and more exhilarated inquiry approaches, providing novel frames with appropriate rigor and relevance, that would help us "read" pedagogical life more carefully and attentively, develop our ability to
hear different voices more openly, and then change our way of seeing and doing education.

Embracing the "More" in Dialogic Pedagogy

Though sharing the same "empowering" spirit, instead of disputing the struggle for emancipatory pedagogies (Giroux & McLaren, 1989; Gore, 1990; Lather, 1991c), I would like to advocate the hope of dialogic pedagogy. It is a pedagogy that can be effective, thoughtful, and critical. Based on my lived researching experience, I found this pedagogy can possibly be put into practice in both apprenticeship as well as collaborative settings as long as the teacher and the student are willing to counter-practice the authority of knowledge together. Basically, dialogic pedagogy is based on the interplay of information/content (cognitive text), relationship building (social text), value discussion, and the development of student competence in handling the indeterminant zones of real life situations. It involves, as Arnett (1992) describes, the creative blending of content and relationship between teacher and student. Through an invitation to conversation about content knowledge, relationships between persons are also developed.

Based on my field experience (particularly my experience in the leadership workshop), and Freire's (1974) understanding of dialogic education, dialogic pedagogy
requires knowingly inviting the "active" interaction of teacher and student in the learning process. Such "action" has the following ingredients: (a) humility to learn from others; (b) mutual trust between the learning partners (teacher or peer); (c) a concerted effort to broaden each other's horizons by permitting self and others to see as well as to express the world through multiple paradigms; (d) a sense of hope in education; (e) and a willingness to invest time and energy in a collaborative pursuit of knowledge-in-action. For the shaping of future (higher) education, we need to encourage creating a dialogic learning environment that is person-sensitive and inquiry-centered. How do we prepare the readiness of teachers, of students, as well as of administrators for a dialogical pedagogical practice? It is a challenging task. In the hope of embracing the more that dialogic pedagogy can bring us, I would like to elaborate a bit here about some features in dialogic pedagogy, such as building each "other" in dialogue, learning in inquiry community/academic "home," and time and space for dialogues.

Building Each "Other" in Dialogue

As Arnett (1992) states, dialogue with (the) "other" is the foundation of a quality pedagogical life. Based on the notion that different bodies/voices need to be invited into the conversation about ideas, values, and relationships,
dialogue, as a form of inquiry, involves the hope that appreciation of multivoicedness will bring students as well as teachers and researchers a broader worldview and assist the quality of life for them and for us. In other words, it emphasizes a commitment to respect oneself, others, and other cultures in a way that permits diversity to coexist, to continue inquiry and conversation for knowledge construction, and to mature personal and professional life.

Dialogue is a means of growth and maturation in the social sense. According to Friedman (1992), it encompasses the processes of "active assertion" as well as interpersonal "responsiveness" and "reactivity", and it serves as a shaper of autonomous identity as long as a "meaningful self-other confirmation keeps the process in motion" (p. 93). Engaging in dialogic pedagogy, I hope we can relate to each other "as persons (unique, capable of choice, having feelings, being of inherent worth, and self-reflective) rather than as objects or things (interchangeable, measurable, responding automatically to stimuli, and lacking self-awareness)" (Johannesen, in Arnett, Ibid., p. 139). Since dialogic pedagogy is based on knowledge and language, however, I also hope we place content as the center of classroom discourse, along with our sensitivity to the quality of conversation and relationship.
A sense of community or of "home" is best understood as psychologically and symbolically enveloping, maybe immersing. Feeling belongingness to an inquiry community or academic "home" helps students to act out of responsibility, care, acceptance, respect, and knowledge. Dialogic pedagogy invites a sense of community and of home for a campus, a department, a classroom, or a group of people willing to commit to one another and to the common task of inquiry. And this kind of inviting is not just an old fashioned effort at sentimentality, but a way to encourage creativity, productivity, and a sense of meaning (Arnett, Ibid.). If a sense of community and of home is established among students and teachers, a campus, a department, or a classroom can become a place of critical inquiry, supporting one another's learning concretely and fruitfully.

I believe that a student's intention to learn is engaged and the meaning of learning is configured through the process of becoming a full participant in the inquiry community. Thus, I hope that every classroom can be an academic home for students. Students are happy to come to construct knowledge with teachers and peers and to improve themselves by "stretching" one another into action and productivity. I believe dialogic pedagogy is facilitated by a "relational sensitivity." Student's achievement and aspiration levels are often influenced by the accessibility
of faculty and the importance they place on interaction with students. Thus, I also hope, in the academic home, every teacher sees her/himself as an eliciting educator, a guiding mentor, and as willing to teach with a vision of hope for the future. I believe it is important to open the eyes of students to the importance of lifelong learning, to the confidence that they can make a difference, and to the possibility of reaching into the unexperienced.

**Time and Space for Dialogue**

Time and space are not just luxuries, but necessities in dialogic pedagogy. It is no doubt that the importance of time to converse with one another about the significance of ideas, the value of a particular theory, the skill of an intended action, is central to the fundamental core of dialogic pedagogy. Since time has both a quantitative and qualitative dimension, I hope students and teachers are alert to take good stewardship of time when they come to think and talk about ideas together. Also, I hope administrators are willing to lower/or keep manageable student-teacher ratio for better opportunity, attentiveness and quality of one-on-one based interactions.

Utilization of classroom space reflects teachers and students priorities and/or involvement in learning. We need to be aware that how space is used and made available on campus, or in a classroom, is both a symbolic and a
practical result of teachers' desire toward teaching and students' intention toward learning. I hope we are willing to take time and find spaces for conversation to alter the functional result of the time spent together. Space can be meant physically and mentally. In creating space for dialogic others, based on Arnett's (1992) suggestions, while we are putting a high priority on relationship, we also need to give opportunities for some distance. While we are showing our care for students, we also need to prepare them for meeting some possible disappointment. In addition, there is always a need to avoid the danger of relational-overload.

Thawing out the Frozen Dream of Curriculum Change

I have a frozen dream about curriculum change. This study gives me a hope that I might take it out, thaw it out and boil it up. I dream that one day school curriculum can be changed in a way that students can free their mind from bureaucratized "encapsulation" (Zais, 1986) and have the opportunities to enjoy learning, to deal better with the indeterminant elements of life, such as creativity, imagination, appreciation, aspirations, hopes, values, and dilemmas. I dream to encourage a view--individual students are actually in the process of creating and constructing knowledge and culture--that we need to reconsider what
should be seen as central to the purposes of curriculum and redesign curricular events that have liberating potentials. I dream that school curriculum can be integrated with new light, new elements that will help students learn aesthetic perception, creative expression, historical and cultural information, as well as help students use skills in analysis, interpretation, judgment, and communication. I believe we all have the potential to become a competent recipient of aesthetic spirituality, if we open up the opportunity to explore the aesthetic dimension in teaching and learning.

**Curricular Discourse Beyond Stability**

From what I have observed/learned in landscape architecture design studio and in strategic leadership workshop, I am even more of an advocate for the kind of pedagogical transformation that I delineated in Chapter 2. Indeed, curriculum is living, co-created texts. We need to provide students with opportunities to engage appropriately with texts of different types (cognitive and social) in order to empower action, thinking, and feeling in the context of purposeful communicative events. The teacher is a curriculum decision maker and thus embodies curriculum potential. Through planning thoughtful classroom activities and project assignments, and providing meaningful feedback, we as teachers will be able to create curriculum materials
and/or events and expand the learning zone of proximal development. And students' interpretation and the classroom culture are at the center of knowledge construction in a classroom inquiry community. Students construct meaning by interpreting text events that are deeply embedded in or influenced by the fabric and culture of the classroom they are in. Thus, we need to have more thorough understandings of event structures in classroom settings.

All of these research-based insights lead to the artistic, problematic, "unstable" state of the aesthetic, symbolic dimensions of teaching and learning, mostly of classroom conversations. Confronting the instability and uncertainty in curricular discourse is frightening. What can we do? Ecological understanding of the curricular discourse is necessary. But as Doll (1988) suggests, a major "attitudinal change" toward pedagogical transformation of curriculum is far more essential and important. We need to have a willingness to open the curriculum, as well as methods of instruction, toward a new teacher-student relationship, toward alternative notions of knowledge construction, toward a collaborative mode of learning. We need to let curriculum undergo change to embrace the idea that no end of education can be or should be absolute. I believe that our competence in handling the instability and uncertainty is developed and demonstrated, experientially, in situation after situation.
Rethinking (Teacher) Professional Curriculum

This study gives something of a picture of the practitioners' world, or at any rate parts of a picture of the world as seen by particular practitioners in two professional education sites. So it is worth observing that if we seek to engage in curricular discourse, if we seek to appreciate better the state of the (teacher) professional education field as revealed through some practitioners' utterances, some potential dilemmas appear to resolve themselves (though some still remain puzzling). To achieve a faithful and hopeful rendering of the state of the practitioners' world, it is necessary to listen and to take action. We might need to learn to accommodate various accounts/instances of what practitioners (might) have perceived in/about their professional world. If we wish to speak with each other and develop curricular discourse we attend to what others say, rather than inform others of what they should have said and instruct them in what they ought to believe. I believe that (teacher) professional curricular discourse needs to encourage the practitioner to look—intuitively, metaphorically, personally—at the situation at hand, and to reflect on the action in process, changing ends and means in midstream (Doll, 1988). Hopefully, through this study, practitioners' accounts, including mine, may lead us to a better understanding of the complexity, the diversity, and the ambiguities of action;
may point to the relations between theory and practice, and to the nature of the linguistics of discourse in relation to the world of action.

**(In)conclusion**

In this study I have put into practice a reflective, dialogic co-operative inquiry with/in action. Instead of rationally "talking about" the artistry of handling complex, problematic educational practices, I have demonstrated an aesthetic appreciation of sense/meaning making in the dialectic "doing" process of co-operative inquiry and of data analysis. By way of metaphor and imagery, I have presented a narrative/textual/visual artifact to help grasp and formulate a thematic understanding of indeterminant zones of pedagogical practices in two professional education sites. Not that I have already obtained all perspectives for ecological understanding of the pedagogical worlds that I was in, nor that this (re)presentation of my study has been made perfect, but I press on to take hold of the hope and the meaning in education for which education took hold of me. I will live up to what I have attained and strain toward what is ahead. I believe knowledge/reflection-in-dialogue/action will always be a playful ongoing exercise in my educational practices.
Appendix A
Design Studio Survey Questionnaire
Student Opinions on Design Studio Pedagogy

This survey invites you to express anonymously your opinions on design studio pedagogy. Please indicate the response closest to your view and try to respond to all items so that a complete set of data can be obtained. Also, feel free to make suggestions or raise questions about what should be addressed in the study of design studio pedagogy. The results will be used to provide a basis for the improvement of teaching and learning not only in design studios but in other professional education settings as well.

Please circle the option that best represents your situation of view.

1. Your age?

2. What kind of living environment have you been exposed to most?
   A. Metropolitan  B. Urban  C. Suburban  D. Rural

3. Which of the following best describes your typical grades?
   A. Almost all As  B. Mostly As and Bs  C. Mostly Bs and Cs  D. Mostly Cs or lower

4. Compared to other students in the design course, how would you rate your own ability?
   A. Well above average (top 20%)  B. Above average (next 20%)  C. Average (middle 20%)
   D. Below average (next 20%)  E. Far below average (bottom 20%)

5. How would you summarize your overall feelings toward your studio learning experience?
   A. Very Positive  B. Positive  C. Neutral  D. Negative  E. Very Negative

Please rank order the options as to how well they represent your situation of view.
(1 = most significant, 2 = next most, etc.)

6. Which of the following helps to shape your design most?
   ___ Examples illustrated by the teacher during the lecture.
   ___ Ideas from supplementary readings.
   ___ Comments from teacher's critique.
   ___ Suggestions from peers, including classmates and seniors.
   ___ Other

7. Which of the following stages is most critical/difficult to you during the design process?
   ___ Site analysis.
   ___ Defining the problem.
   ___ Deciding the theme and objectives.
   ___ Diagraming the ideas.
   ___ Actual Design.
   ___ Other

8. Which of the following factors contribute to a "good" design most?
   ___ Talent
   ___ Experience
   ___ Practice
   ___ Clear guidelines
   ___ Dynamic interactions with other people
   ___ Other

(Don't forget to complete the section on the other side!)
Please write your personal comments.

9. Which project do you like most? Why? (What excites you most?)

10. When and why do you become frustrated during the process of a design project?

11. How do you like the atmosphere in your design studio? How do you see your role in the studio in terms of teacher-student and student-student relationships? (e.g., active/passive learner, etc.)

12. In what ways does the teacher's teaching style have an impact on your learning?

13. What would you suggest to improve the studio teaching? (What aspects of an ideal learning experience would be most beneficial to you?)

14. Any other general comments or suggestions?

Thank you for your participation!
January 24, 1992

Dear fellow LARCH 253 student:

The design studio is the heart of architectural education. It is a unique site to study the educational value of learning by doing and coaching. I am currently conducting a co-operative inquiry to examine the characteristics of studio pedagogy. I believe that your perspective on design studio teaching and learning will help contribute my understanding of the nature of design education.

The research activities to be involved in this study include: group interviews, open-ended questionnaire, story-telling, videotaping and photographing. You are invited to join this collaborative effort to share with me your successes and hardships in your studio-life. (However, you are not under an obligation to this study.) All your responses will remain confidential. Please feel free to make suggestions or raise questions about what should be addressed in this study. The results will be used to provide a basis for the improvement of teaching and learning not only in design studios but in other professional education setting as well.

Thank you for your support and your participation.

Sincerely,

Sharon Chen
Graduate Student
Educational Policy & Leadership
College of Education
Appendix B
Leadership Workshop Survey Questionnaire
Student Opinions on Group-Based Collaborative Learning

This survey invites you to express anonymously your opinions on group-based collaborative learning. Please indicate the response closest to your view and try to respond to all items so that a complete set of data can be obtained. Also, feel free to make suggestions or raise questions about what should be addressed in the study of group-based collaborative learning. The results will be used to provide a basis for the improvement of teaching and learning in other professional education settings.

Please circle the option that best represents your situation of view.

1. Your age?
   A. under 25  B. 25 - 30  C. 30 - 35  D. 35 - 40  E. Above 40

2. What kind of working environment have you been exposed to most?
   A. Government  B. Private Non-Profit  C. Private-For-Profit  D. Educational  E. Other

3. Compared to other students in this class, how would you rate your own performance?
   A. Well above average (top 20%)  B. Above average (next 20%)  C. Average (middle 20%)
   D. Below average (next 20%)  E. Far below average (bottom 20%)

4. How would you summarize your satisfaction with your learning experience in this class?
   A. Very Positive  B. Positive  C. Neutral  D. Negative  E. Very Negative

Please distribute points to the options as to how well they represent your view of the course.

5. Which of the following benefited you most during the workshop/course?
   ___ Understanding of strategic leadership in the public sector.
   ___ Awareness of important competencies needed for strategic leadership.
   ___ Development of action skills in strategic management process.
   ___ Self-assessment exercises.
   ___ Opportunities to explore personal plans for career development and learning.
   ___ Other

6. Which of the following helped you learn most during the workshop/course?
   ___ Concepts introduced by the teacher during the lecture.
   ___ Ideas from supplementary readings.
   ___ Strategic Leadership Journal.
   ___ Learning Contract.
   ___ Group activities.
   ___ Other

7. Which of the following factors contributed the most to effective group deliberation?
   ___ Having a clear vision.
   ___ Meaningful communication.
   ___ Willingness to be open and trustful.
   ___ Encouragement of alternatives and creativity.
   ___ Constructive conflict-management.
   ___ Other

8. During the Oakmont exercise which of the following stages was most difficult for you personally, and for the group as a whole?
   Ind.  Group
   ___ Situation analysis.
   ___ Defining the problems.
   ___ Developing solutions.
   ___ Managing conflicts.
   ___ Negotiating final plan.
   ___ Other

(Don't forget to complete the section on the other side!)
Please write your personal comments.

9. Which workshop exercise was your favorite and what about it excited you the most?

10. In general, during group exercise, what if anything, frustrated you the most? When did it occur? And what produced it?

11. What would you suggest to improve the group learning experiences for this workshop/course? (What aspects of an ideal learning experience would be most beneficial to you?)

12. Any other general comments or suggestions?

Thank you for your participation!
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