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ABSTRACT

How do we begin to improve education? Where do reform efforts begin? How do they become a part of the fabric of education? Winitzky, Stoddart and O'Keefe (1992) talked about a systems view and identified the concept of circularity as a major obstacle in educational reform. Others have also discussed the existence of the need for simultaneous reform (Goodlad, 1994; Teitel, 1994). Teitel, (1994) asked whether school-university partnerships can successfully reform both schools and teacher education. In answer he described the “powerful contradictory pulls” (p.245) that each institution faces. In order to work this tension, the construction of bridges between both institutions is recommended. Strong bridges with deep roots in each organization are needed. Teitel (1994) went on to describe the effectiveness of Professional Development Schools (PDS), especially those that are part of the regional or national networks.

Issues of circularity and the need for simultaneous reform are also in the background of discussions about democratic change in education (Kreisberg, 1992). Societies are composed of many institutions and for democratic change to take hold “changes must occur simultaneously throughout them all, or at least among several at once” (Kreisberg, 1992, p.207)
When we look at the reform of teacher education, in the context of civic education reform, issues related to the need for simultaneous reform also rise to the surface. This study is placed in the historical and political context of the transition to democracy in Poland. Remy and Strzemieczny (1997) have said, “This obstacle (reforming teacher education) is compounded in civic education, where the subject matter and appropriate pedagogy is entirely new for teachers and for most teacher educators” (p.49). How do we alter curriculum and instructional decision-making? How do we alter teacher choices from the ‘way we always have done it,’ while we continue to have teachers whose primary experience has been within the traditional status quo? Again Winitsky, Stoddart and O’Keefe’s(1992) concept of circularity appears to apply. Looking at the problem of circularity within the social and historical context of Central and Eastern Europe we are again forcefully reminded of the struggle to decide where to begin. Civic education can be reformed when we have teachers, curriculum developers and the materials needed. We will have teachers and curriculum developers and materials when we have people trained to work and develop such aspects of instruction.

In this dissertation I report on a case study of Polish teachers and teacher educators where questions of how to begin partnerships were central. I propose three strategies for dealing building educational partnerships and explore their application. Each strategy focused on one small aspect of the work of reforming teacher education and schools at the same time. Each dealt with one possible means of breaking through barriers within these systems.
The first strategy involves crossing cultural borders to exchange and learn from individuals in other contexts. These borders can include those between teacher and teacher educator and those between individuals in different countries.

Collaborative work, the second strategy, involves collaboration between school and university. It can also involve collaboration that is cross-cultural in nature. These similar, yet different forms of collaboration force us into situations of deliberation on common issues of importance. Given the opportunity to share tasks and experiences individuals grow and learn from the interaction. If successful, Teitel’s (1994) bridges are the result.

The third strategy is comparison—the use of discrepant events to build deep understanding. Constructivist theories tell us to build understanding by providing opportunities to examine and test conceptions and mis-conceptions (Scheurmann, 1998). As a tool for dealing building relationships, comparative experiences allow us to come to deep understanding of how other individuals in very different contexts are attempting to answer questions of reform.

All three strategies; crossing cultural borders, collaboration, and comparison emerged in this study as an influence on the process and success of reform efforts working to improve both teacher education and schools. In this case, Polish teachers and teacher educators beliefs and actions were influenced by their experience with a cross-cultural collaborative project, Education for Democratic Citizenship in Poland. Their experiences led to a deeper understanding of the possibilities found at the intersection of citizenship and teacher education reform.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Overview of the Study
In a unique way, two reform efforts—school/university collaboration and cross-cultural collaboration—come together in this study. As part of an ongoing cross-cultural collaborative effort, a group of Polish educators were involved in projects which attempted to build school and university partnerships as one part of civic teacher education reform in Poland. This complex collaborative project raised many questions.

How do Polish classroom teachers and Polish teacher educators begin building relationships? What do they hope to gain? What benefits do partnerships bring to the process of democratic educational reform? And how do democratic educational reforms, reforms that bring democratic practice into the classroom and teacher empowerment to the process of reform, contribute to a fuller democracy? This study examined these questions with a small group of educators as they spent time in the United States viewing and experiencing programs involved in school and university partnerships. Their exposure to these programs both modeled and brought into question assumptions about teacher education and the effect of democratic reforms on the preparation of civic education teachers in emerging democracies.
Exposure to teacher education projects in collaboration took place within the context of ongoing cross-cultural collaboration between Polish civic educators and American social studies educators (Remy and Strzemieczny, 1996). This cross-cultural collaboration was designed to support civic education reform efforts in Poland. Opportunities for cross-cultural interaction both within the group of Polish educators and between the Poles and us, their American colleagues, served to broaden perspectives that were shared about the nature of civic education, teacher education reform, and school/university partnerships.

I served an evolving role in the work. At first in my position as a member of the Ohio State University’s Mershon Center office of Citizenship Development, I was a participant in the planning of a visit of five Polish educators. As a researcher I hoped to observe and participate in their experiences, and to use their experiences as a case study of the beginning stages of educational partnerships. Eventually my role evolved. I became a facilitator, peer, negotiator, and friend. I planned to use this study to chronicle efforts at building school and university partnerships. The discussions and interviews of this study, the process of doing the research, became the context or place where collaboration was discussed, debated, debriefed and ultimately identified as one avenue of democratic educational change.

Educational Reform and Building Relationships

How do we begin to improve education? Where do reform efforts begin? How do they become a part of the fabric of education? Winitzky, Stoddart and O’Keefe
(1992) talk about a systems view and identified the concept of circularity as a major obstacle in educational reform. While specifically speaking of teacher education reform, they identified the crux of the problem this way: we can improve teacher candidates by placing them in schools where they will see and experience good teaching, but we can't find these places until we begin to train teachers who can produce such deep educational environments. Others have also discussed the existence of the need for simultaneous reform (Goodlad, 1994). Teitel (1994) asked whether school-university partnerships can successfully reform both schools and teacher education. In answer he described the "powerful contradictory pulls" (p.245) that each institution faces. In order to work this tension, the construction of bridges between both institutions is recommended. Strong bridges with deep roots in each organization are needed. Teitel (1994) goes on to describe the effectiveness of Professional Development Schools, especially those that are part of the regional or national networks. These networks, operating as third parties, are able to keep systemic change as the main target of the collaboration.

Issues of circularity and the need for simultaneous reform are also in the background of discussions about democratic change in education (Kreisberg, 1992). Societies are composed of many institutions and for democratic change to take hold "changes must occur simultaneously throughout them all, or at least among several at once" (Kreisberg, 1992, p.207)
Partnerships and Civic Education Reform

When we look at the reform of teacher education in the context of civic education reform, issues related to the need for simultaneous reform emerge. Remy and Strzemieczny (1997) have said, "This obstacle (reforming teacher education) is compounded in civic education, where the subject matter and appropriate pedagogy is entirely new for teachers and for most teacher educators" (p.49). How do we alter curriculum and instructional decision-making? How do we alter teacher choices from the 'way we have always done it,' while we continue to have teachers whose primary experience has been within the traditional status quo? Again Winitsky, Stoddart and O'Keefe's (1992) concept of circularity appears to apply. When we look at the problem of circularity within the social and historical context of Central and Eastern Europe, we are again forcefully reminded of the struggle to decide where to begin. Civic education can be reformed when we have teachers, curriculum developers and materials ready to create rich educational environments. We will have teachers, curriculum developers, and materials when we have people trained to work and develop such aspects of instruction.

The need to build relationships and partnerships, then serves as a common problem, theme or issue in reform efforts. Its existence serves as a limiting force on the scope and possibility of both teacher education and civic education reform. Struggling with how to break cycles of circularity serves as an important goal for those of us who are interested in moving forward towards a more democratic educational system in this country and others.
Three Strategies for Building Relationships

In this dissertation I report on a case study where the need to build educational partnerships was central. Three strategies emerged as findings. These strategies help us build relationships between schools and universities. Each strategy focused on one small aspect of the work of reforming teacher education and schools at the same time. Each dealt with one possible means of breaking through barriers that systems, including educational systems, erect.

The first strategy involves crossing cultural borders to exchange and learn from individuals in other contexts. These borders can include those between teacher and teacher educator and those between individuals in different countries. Collaborative work, the second strategy, involves work on issues involving schools and universities (Darling-Hammond, 1996). It also involves collaboration, or work, that is cross-cultural in nature. These similar, yet different forms of collaboration force us into situations of deliberation on common issues of importance. Given the opportunity to share tasks and experiences, individuals grow and learn from the interaction. If successful, Teitel’s (1994) bridges are the result. The third strategy is comparison, the use of discrepant events to build deep understanding. Constructivist theories tell us to build understanding by providing opportunities to examine and test conceptions and misconceptions (Scheurmann, 1998). As a tool for dealing with simultaneous reform, comparative experiences allow us to come to deep understanding of how other individuals in very different contexts are attempting to answer questions of
reform. All three strategies—crossing cultural borders, collaboration, and comparison—can influence the process and destination of reform efforts working to improve both teacher education and schools.

**Rationale for the Study**

Armento (1996) has called for case studies related to collaboration, especially collaborative structures related to social studies teacher development. Such partnerships are currently taking many forms in teacher education (Whitford, Schlechty, and Shelor, 1987). One form among these is the professional development school (PDS) approach (Holmes, 1986; Zeichner, 1992). Professional development schools are often sites involved in "linking theory with practice" (Winitzky, Stoddart, O'Keefe, 1992; Powell and McGowan, 1996). Collaboration has been central to the development of professional development schools (Shapiro and Merryfield, 1995; Powell and McGowan, 1996; Johnston, 1996; and Gibson, 1993). A case study, focused on partnerships then, may have something to teach us about such relationships more generally as well as teaching us how to go about simultaneously reforming schools and teacher education programs.

A focus on the unique Polish context, as well as the United States, offers us new insights as well. As an educator interested ultimately in the creation of a democratic education I focused on our efforts to reform teacher education in the United States along with those in Poland. I built my conceptual framework for this study on the work of other individuals (Parker, 1996; Miller, 1990; Kreisberg, 1992; Greene, 1994) who have focused attention on the work left to be done in the United
States if we are to achieve our own democratic ideals. Entering the Polish context of this study allowed me to participate, observe, and record the efforts of other educators involved with similar issues in a context very different from the one in the United States.

Richardson (1996) has said that ultimately research is about our own personal interaction and reaction to the context, the participants and the events as they unfold. Entering and negotiating meaning in a cross-cultural context, then, served to heighten my understandings of the issues at play in my own cultural context, to make me more sensitized to my everyday surroundings (Patton, 1990).

**Context of the Study**

**Education for Democratic Citizenship in Poland**

Education for Democratic Citizenship in Poland (EDCP) provided the organizational context of the study. EDCP was created at the request of the Polish Ministry of National Education in February 1991. It was a cooperative effort of the Mershon Center, The Ohio State University, and the ministry. Since then it has evolved to include the Center for Citizenship Education, Warsaw and The Ohio State University College of Education. Since 1991 numerous trips between Poland and the United States have occurred. These trips included seven groups of educators who have participated in the efforts. The project is directed by Dr. Jacek Strzemieczny, director of the Center for Citizenship Education and Dr. Richard C. Remy, The Ohio State University.
While the program housed this case study in an organizational sense, the case study was not an official aspect of the program's work. The co-directors were asked and granted their permission for the study to occur. My emphasis on school/university collaboration was in fact one of the three foci of EDCP's work at the time. The goals of the project have included the generation of curriculum materials designed to support the reform of teaching methodology and the content of citizenship education classes. EDCP's efforts have also included teacher education reform. As part of these efforts, EDCP participated in the International Civic Education Exchange (ICCE), a program that allowed EDCP to design a focus to meet its needs.

The Research Questions

In this case study I began with a proposal that focused on the perceptions and experiences of a group of Polish educators involved in reform efforts. I asked questions such as: How do Polish classroom teachers and teacher educators begin building relationships? I collected and examined data with a small group of educators as they spent time experiencing American programs in school and university collaboration. These relationships were structured to center on the intersections of theory and practice. Their participation in these programs modeled the strategies and issues involved. Their involvement brought into question assumptions about teacher preparation. Attempts to build such relationships within

---

1 The International Civic Education Exchange (ICEE) funded by the United States Department of
the project raised issues about the influence of democratic reforms each individual brought to the experience.

**Initial Questions**

In the early proposal, I described the purpose of this study this way: "To record and mark the development of collaborative relationships as Polish and American participants attempt to make the voice of teachers heard in teacher education." To do so I began the study with the following questions as a guide:

- How has the Polish classroom teacher’s role been altered in the transition to democracy and what are the implications for the education and training of future teachers, especially those involved in civic education?
- How do teachers and teacher educators view each other’s role in the education of preservice teachers in Poland?
- How do Polish participants define collaboration and begin to construct connections between classroom and teacher training programs? How do these constructions reflect the benefits of collaboration that participants identify?
- What perceptions of teacher education reform in the American experience do Polish participants acquire as a result of their cross-cultural interaction?

**Epistemological Shift**

Looking back, I realize that I was somewhat naive in believing a few weeks with the small group would begin to answer these questions. The group had their

Education provided the funds that actually brought the participants in the study together. ICEE has
own questions and their own concerns. However, I set out with these questions as my
guide. During the previous year, I had spent three months total in Poland and another
five months working with Polish educators who had come to work in residence at The
Ohio State University. My experience the previous year had informed my thinking
about the changing role of the Polish teacher. The Poles I spoke with talked about
changes in jobs, decision-making, and their relationship with society. I also knew this
group of Poles was coming to discuss collaboration. How would they define this
term? What did they think they were coming to investigate and how would an aspect
of teacher education reform efforts in the United States look when it was translated to
the Polish Civic Education context? Finally, because this group of educators would
be involved in cross-cultural work, the question of the Polish educators' perceptions
of American efforts at teacher education reform became central to where I expected
the study to be headed.

As the study progressed it was clear that the Polish participants were gaining a
new understanding of the issues involved in university and school partnerships in
general and in professional development school models more specifically. I began to
focus more and more on the strategies that appeared to be altering their conceptions.
Rather than focusing on how their perceptions were changing (although this still
played a part), I began to focus on why their perceptions were changing. What
experiences were they having? How were different types of experiences affecting

involved civic educators from the United States and other Central and Eastern European nations.
their understanding? These new questions became the central focus. Eisner (1999) has said,

...research questions often are the result of the observational process rather than their predecessor. This is not to say that research questions could not be raised at the outset of a qualitative research process; it is to say that in doing research of this kind, you may not know what the questions are until you are well into the research (p.20)

As the study proceeded new questions emerged. These new questions focused on the program, experiences and beliefs I was participating in and observing. Rather than just the beliefs of the participants, the study became more and more reflexive. My interactions, reflections and conceptual categories slowly became the narrative. Richardson (1990) had told me that the study would be about my interactions with the "field." This proved to be true.

Participants

In this study, access was gained by virtue of my role as graduate research assistant in the project. My continuing participation in various aspects of the Polish educators' site visit to The Ohio State University and the June 1997 conference, Teachers for Democracy in Poland prepared me to work with the Poles. The participants were five teachers and teacher educators chosen to participate in an exchange visit to The Ohio State University. They were chosen during the application process for a set of incentive grants given to Polish teams of teachers and
teacher educators interested in beginning collaborative work designed to prepare future teachers of civic education.

Recruitment of Participants

The project co-director in Poland had control over who would participate in the exchange visit. The participants in the exchange were selected through a process that involved three steps. First, all had participated in the conference, Teachers for Democracy held in Poland in September, 1996. As an aspect of the conference, each had been offered the opportunity to submit a proposal detailing plans for a collaborative project between a classroom teacher and a teacher educator. Second, each wrote a letter stating their interest in being part of the exchange visit to the United States. Finally, the director of the Center for Citizenship Education chose those individuals whose background, involvement, and language abilities indicated the possibility of a successful trip.

I asked the Poles to participate in two steps. First, I sent each participant a letter explaining the research, the methodology and the time requirement for participation prior to their arrival in Ohio (see Appendix A). In January of 1997 the group of five Polish teacher educators and teachers came to The Ohio State University to discuss and explore the issues involved in building school/university linkages. These educators were presented the opportunity to join as participants in the study. The presentation included the plans and timelines of the study. It also involved negotiation as to their involvement. Their early questions dealt with the process of conducting qualitative research and time commitments. The presentation
also included discussion about confidentiality in a group setting, anonymity, and a research process that was designed to respect and record their voices. All were given the opportunity to decline participation. Following the discussion with me all five chose to participate.

**Background of the Participants**

Polish teachers of civic education have been at the forefront of the goals and work of EDCP. By forming networks of teachers interested in creating curriculum, exploring new teaching methods, and investigating forms of classroom organization, Polish teachers are affecting the pace and direction of educational reform. Most lived through and participated in the movements that altered the shape of the Polish government in 1989. All have been affected by the changes that have resulted from these events.

In Poland, Center for Citizenship Education, a non-governmental organization located in Warsaw, has involved classroom teachers and other educators in (re)creating civic education. American participation has included support of various projects and has provided Polish participants access to experiences in civic education, teacher education, and school/university collaboration in the United States and especially at The Ohio State University. The work to date has also included numerous visits to Poland. One product of another group of Poles on a 1996 visit was the planning for a conference, *Teachers for Democracy*. The conference, held in September of 1996 in Poland, brought together university and pedagogical institution-
based teacher educators with classroom teachers involved in civic education reform efforts. The conclusion of the conference provided an opportunity for the participants to apply for incentive grants to support the building of relationships between teachers of civic education and teacher educators involved in preparing future teachers in this area of specialization. The participants in this study all received grants for their proposals involving collaborative work.

Background of the Researcher

This research project has offered the opportunity to draw on two different experiences in my life. I have been both a classroom teacher and a teacher educator. As I interacted with the Polish participants whose interests are in many ways similar to mine, but whose life experiences are far removed from mine as a middle class teacher born, raised and working in Ohio I viewed my life through a comparative lens. My position and background was brought to the foreground in this study. By exploring the juncture of my experiences as a classroom teacher and teacher educator, I questioned my own assumptions about knowledge and the value of experience in teacher education.

I served as a seminar coordinator for one cohort of the Social Studies and Global Education Professional Development School Network at the Ohio State University. In that role I wore the varied hats of instructor, moderator and organizer. I sought to use the relationships to educate future Social Studies teachers. Through research into the Poles processes of designing teacher education programs to prepare
teachers of civic education, I gained a better understanding of the core values and beliefs I hold. This case study served as a mirror for me through which I examined the socially constructed definitions of collaboration and teacher education.

Limitations

There are three important limitations in this study. First, language was a problem when conducting interviews of the Polish participants. I do not speak Polish. All Polish participants were recruited for the trip to Columbus, Ohio in part because of they were identified as able to speak English. Throughout the study various terms became road blocks to understanding. For example, one of the teacher educators was from a university, the other from a teacher training institution. There was no agreement amongst the group as to what to call this second institution. Some called it a pedagogical university, others called it a pedagogical institute. Even the term pedagogy carried many different meanings. I viewed issues of language as a tool that forced me to pay careful attention to the construction of meaning during the data collection process. Careful explanation, prolonged engagement, and research methodologies such as charting, were used to deal with issues of language.

Second, my role as a member of the Citizenship Development Program team could have been seen as placing me in a position to judge the efforts of the participants. In the past, informal discussions about the participants had been held.

---

2 The office of Professor Richard Remy, the Citizenship Development Program was housed in the Mershon Center, The Ohio State University. The work of the program includes the planning and coordination of professional development opportunities for international civic educators and curriculum development in both Poland and the United States.
with the project directors. These discussions appeared to influence invitations to future activities and involvement. My knowledge of these past actions convinced me to consciously avoid any appearance of evaluation. I believed this stance helped me avoid a judgemental relationship with the participants. I did not believe adversarial relationships between researcher and researched were conducive to data collection, and so, efforts were made to clearly identify myself as a peer with experience as both a classroom teacher and as someone who had been involved in teacher education. I sought to clearly establish my role not as one of evaluation but as an individual who was seeking to understand the case under study. Only time would tell if my intimate involvement complicated the work. Assurances that these data were not part of any evaluation project were made repeatedly.

Third, time and distance were limitations in this study. I had direct access over an extended period of time with the five individuals involved. This access was, however, limited to short periods of time while in Poland and the longer (five weeks) period of travel with the Polish participants while they were in the United States. After a last opportunity to meet face to face with the participants in June of 1997, I maintained contact with some of the group by mail and others by e-mail. This limited contact in no way made up for the distance and difficulty of researching a group of Polish educators who are now back in Poland.

Limitations are often described as hindrances in the process of conducting research. In this case they served to spotlight potential problems and focus the work toward addressing those concerns. The limitations supported the conducting of the
research and the generation of the findings. In all cases, language, my roles, time, and distance, forced extra attention and effort on my part. Conducting research with participants outside of the United States means that American researchers must be willing to struggle with the issues of language. It also means we must be willing to design methods that meet the needs of our participants and our questions.

Judge (1992) discussed the ambivalence American educational researchers have toward educational inquiry within an international context. He urged that Americans work in international contexts, asserting, "...that to understand teacher education, above all in a cross-national framework is to understand much more than teacher education. How are teachers educated, and where and by whom, reflect beliefs about what teachers are for and why society employs them" (p.9). Negotiating the obstacles of cross-cultural research may, in fact, be a tool that brings the insights sought by this study.

Organization of the Narrative

This study identified three conceptual categories that emerged from observing, participating with and interviewing a small group of Polish educators who came to the United States to explore school and university collaboration in the field of civic teacher education. Set in the context of Education for Democratic Citizenship in Poland's ongoing efforts, this work was situated in the vertex of a collaborative project that bridges Polish and American educational reform efforts. Democracy can be seen as both a means and a goal in educational reform (Gutmann, 1994). In both
countries the relationship between the schools and the democratic society in which they are situated is debated. Developing educational practices that contribute to the development of democratic civic culture was one goal of this work. Preparing teachers to implement such practices was another goal of this research and the project that brought the Poles to Columbus, Ohio.

In Chapter Two I describe the methodology and methods of the study. By doing a qualitative interpretivist case study (Merriam, 1988, p.27), I set out to investigate the interaction between the participants, the program and myself. I believe this kind of methodology assisted me in addressing issues related to cross-cultural research. By describing data collection methods, analysis and the trustworthiness of the study in Chapter Two, I prepare readers for the description of the case that follows.

Chapter Three describes the beginnings of the EDCP project that brought the participants to the United States. EDCP's work in the area of civic teacher education reform resulted in grant awards and the selection of the participants. An earlier conference in Poland laid the groundwork for the participants' conceptual understanding of collaboration and the professional development school model. This chapter describes the beginning of the data collection. Starting with the group's arrival in Columbus, Ohio, I began to observe and participate as the Polish educators encountered their first experiences in the United States.

In Chapter Four I describe the possibilities of collaborative work as a strategy for dealing with issues of circularity (Winitzky, Stoddart and O'Keefe, 1992). I lay
out two ways to begin collaboration—shared tasks and deliberation. By following the experiences of the participants and using illustrations that arose from the program and the interview process, readers see the power of collaboration in a cross-cultural context.

Chapter Five arises from data collected as I followed the participants to the central Michigan area. The power of comparison was seen in the deepening understanding that was evidenced. Participants experienced a second model of professional development schools. They asked questions and they theorized about the preparations of teachers in a democracy. The roles of memory, experience and comparison all emerged as critical to the understanding participants gained during their time in the United States.

Finally, in Chapter Six I review the findings and relate them again to the goal of breaking through issues of circularity in educational reform. By first reviewing what it is we learn from qualitative research (Patton, 1990; Eisner, 1991; Guba and Lincoln, 1989), I show the reader how this study might contribute to our growing understanding of the value of school/university collaboration and collaboration across cultures. I argue that the three strategies that emerged in this study—crossing cultural borders, building collaborative structures, and embedding comparison—help us to deal with the need for simultaneous reform (Goodlad, 1994).

Chapters 3, 4, 5 and 6 are all set in the timeframe and context of the cross-cultural work itself. Issues emerged and drew the focus of both the participants and me. Locations changed and heightened new interests and concerns. I suggest that the
reader 'observe' the events unfold in order to develop an understanding of the complexity of issues involved in this attempt at introducing professional development schools as one method of civic education reform in Poland. Readers will be able to follow the time and location through two methods. First, readers are presented 'signposts' throughout Chapters Three through Six. Each signpost indicates the location and timeframe of the section in which it is placed. Signposts are followed by journal entries that have been inserted at various points in the chapters. These journal entries originated in my research journal (Richardson, 1990).

Throughout the text readers will also see connections made to literature in the fields of school/university relationships, civic education and the preparation of teachers. Found in footnotes, these connections show how this case study demonstrated real world perspectives on issues under discussion within the field of education. During the data collection and analysis phase of this study, I spent time reading various pieces of literature. As I read, connections were made between what I was reading and the participant observations and interview data that were being collected. I believe these connections will help readers build an understanding of the conceptual categories that emerged in this study.

Conclusion

Ultimately, this case study helped me to question, view, model and investigate how one group of individuals encountered one form of school/university partnering in the United States. The study made the assumptions I held about teacher education
and how to break through issues of circularity clearer. Collaboration appeared to have benefits for democratic educational reform and society as a whole. As it brings diverse groups in society to bear on common issues of concern, collaboration involves people in the deliberative process— a critical skill if we are going to succeed in civic education reform and the democratic experiment.
CHAPTER 2
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This qualitative case study (Merriam, 1988) attempts to investigate and interpret a case bounded by participation in a cross-cultural collaborative project. Two reform efforts—school/university collaboration and cross-cultural collaboration—come together in this study. Both forms of collaboration might serve as tools in our attempts to attack the issue of circularity in educational reform. As part of an ongoing cross-cultural collaborative effort a group of Polish educators were involved in projects, which attempted to build school and university collaboration as one part of civic teacher education reform in Poland. I examined questions with a small group of educators as they spent time in the United States viewing and experiencing programs in school and university collaboration. Their exposure to collaboration both modeled and brought into question assumptions about teacher education and the effect of democratic reforms on the preparation of civic education teachers in emerging democracies.

My assumption of the need for constructivist-interpretivist research in a case such as this centered on the belief that knowledge is constructed (Eisner, 1991). My
assumptions and epistemological beliefs forced me to identify a methodology that aligned with my need for research to be a social act. The characteristics or goals of qualitative case studies (Merriam, 1988) were congruent with my need to observe, question and participate in a unique human endeavor.

Special concerns arise in cross-cultural research. Concerns about language, researcher bias, internal validity, reliability and external validity highlighted the unique nature of the case. For each concern, my careful attention to multiple methods of data collection, the use of peer exams and an open, emergent process provided the opportunity to construct a narrative that presents a case reflective of my perception of its reality.

This chapter lays out the key issues, methodology and methods used to collect the data. I constructed a narrative that allows the reader to gain new images and understanding (Eisner, 1991). The narrative resulted from the many decisions recorded in the chapter. My assumptions, my methodology (qualitative case study), my methods (my data, timeline, data collection techniques, and analysis) and issues of validity, reliability and ethics drove this case study.

Assumptions and Epistemology

In this study, a constructivist/interpretivist stance served as my epistemological base because it provided an opportunity to gain from my experiences and to determine meaning in collaboration with the research participants. My assumptions included the belief that “human knowledge is a constructed form of
experience and therefore a reflection of mind as well as nature: knowledge is made, not simply discovered" (Eisner, 1991, p.7). I believe that research in education is contextualized by the nature of the field of education. As such, the researcher must have as his/her ultimate goal the improvement of teaching and learning.

I acted as assistant, escort, debriefer, planner and commentator during this case study. My purpose in each of these roles was to advocate both for the field of civic education and for the increase of collaboration between university and school. I sought to share the promise I believed both areas held with the participants. In my role I tried to use the research process as a means of stepping in and out to both observe and critique what I both assisted with and experienced. These attempts to both see the world through eyes of the research participants and to problematize my actions did, I believe, force and identify assumptions.

**Methodology**

I chose qualitative research (Patton, 1990; Eisner, 1991) to serve as the theoretical framework. As a research methodology it offered me the opportunity to spend time, delve deeply, and mark the variety of perspectives present in living, breathing efforts such as that undertaken by the educators in this study. Within qualitative research a constructivist-interpretivist stance (Schwandt, 1994) was seen as the most appropriate and useful to the tasks the way I perceived them to be. The case study approach (Merriam, 1988; Preissle-Goetz and LeCompte, 1991; Patton, 1990) offered the best methodology for trying to interpret what I was planning on seeing and discussing.
with the research participants. All three frames; qualitative--constructivist-interpretavist and case study—matched my assumptions and epistemological beliefs. If knowledge is socially constructed (Schwandt, 1994), then I believe research must proceed in ways that gather data through social interaction. Case study is defined as investigation on any phenomenon clearly separable from other phenomena (programs, persons, processes, institutions, groups....) (Preissle-Goetz and LeCompte, 1991,p.57). Case studies can use ethnographic tools and methods to reconstruct the cultural scene and experiences of a group, the facilitators, those who worked with them and myself as researcher.

Merriam (1988) classifies this type of case study as an “interpretive case study”(p.27) and describes it as having the following key features. An interpretive case study must contain rich, thick description. Next, these descriptive data are used to develop conceptual categories (p.27). In an interpretive case study the analysis moves in an inductive manner from the large sea of data to the specific conceptual categories (p.28).

As the unit of analysis, the case “can be an individual, a program, an institution, a group, an event, a concept” (p.44). In this example of case study research my unit of analysis was a group. I investigated the impact of a cross-cultural experience on a group of Polish educators working on civic education and teacher education reform. The study began with a conference in Poland during the fall of 1996 and ended with a conference and visit to Poland in June of 1997. Although this timeframe has natural beginnings and ends, it does not mark the beginning and end of
the work of which it is a part. It is rather an example of researching "midstream" (Miller, 1990) and cuts a small piece of the fabric of time for more in-depth investigation and case study.

Armento (1996), in her review of teacher education in the social studies, called for research on social studies teacher preparation. She identified it as a field in need of deeper, more complete analysis through a variety of techniques including case studies. “Case studies are needed of successful school-university collaboration for social studies teacher development and for collaborative work with teacher educators, children and teachers” (p.499). Case studies provide the opportunity to look inmost at particulars, and center on essential elements imbedded in a unique context.

This case was located in a context quite different from any that I had experienced before. I designed it to chronicle and support the beginnings of collaborative work in the preparation of civic educators in Poland’s emerging democracy. The case gave me the opportunity to delve into the intersections between civic education, teacher education reforms such as school and university collaboration, and the transition to democracy in Central and Eastern Europe, all of which face the problem of circularity.

Methods

Qualitative research with the collection of “thick description” (Gertz, 1973), rich personal experiences, and constructs, results in the accumulation of large
amounts of data. The voices of those involved become co-constructors of knowledge. By creating analysis that is detailed and descriptive, I hoped to allow the readers to construct their own insight into how this case can inform their experiences with teacher education reform and the value of collaboration.

Data

Data are information gathered as part of the research process. They can be simple obvious details or more difficult items that have to be carefully extracted from an experience or group (Merriam, 1988, p. 67). Qualitative data "includes descriptions of the people, events and interactions" (Patton, 1980, p.22). In this study, frequent descriptions of the locations, individuals and actions as they occurred were recorded. Logs, research journals and jot lists all provided places where data such as these were found.

Data can also be "direct quotations from people about their experiences, attitudes, beliefs, and thoughts..." (Patton, 1980, p.22). In this study, transcripts and the opportunity for member checks provided participants the chance to inform the process, comment on emerging themes, and discuss their perspectives on the events that occurred. Perhaps most importantly, the reflections participants had about their experiences in Michigan and Ohio pointed to the effect of the activities on their understanding. Each gained new understanding of the concepts of school/university collaboration and civic education reform. Finally, in this study dialog—active engagement—on the various concepts and actions was one of the methods used to
gather data. These dialogs showed how individuals grappled with the concepts and often disagreed with each other.

Multiple data collection techniques provided for rich, descriptive data in this case study. As the data were analyzed and constructed into a narrative, another piece of data was generated. The early pieces of writing served as a last piece of data (Richardson, 1990). The process of writing and displaying various pieces of data served to provide another piece of information about how I as the researcher was seeing this case and the particulars that were moving within it.

Data Collection Techniques

Data collection was varied and ongoing in this case. There were six techniques used to collect data in this study. They occurred over the period of approximately six months although they were concentrated on a twenty-six day period during which the Polish participants were in the United States. (See Table 2.1) Other pieces of data were collected during the member check period in Poland.

A Research Journal

A research journal (Richardson, 1990) was kept during the process of designing the study, collecting and analyzing data, and constructing the narrative. The journal became my place to record impressions, quickly jot notes, or make a comment on some emerging theme. Included in the journal were descriptions of locations and events that
had occurred. It was the place where notes from my participant-observations were recorded. Importantly, the journal became the place where I recorded the process of conducting the study.

**Participant Observation**

I collected participant-observations of each activity, school visit, meeting, and social activity occurred. I acted as a participant-observer throughout the study. My role as a member of the staff of the Citizenship Development program put me into daily contact with the research participants. The process of participant-observation occurred within the context of actions and activities that occupied the majority of the participant’s time while here in the United States. The Holmes Group (1986) (now Partnership) identified the value of working across borders and cultural divides that separate university and school. I believe there is value in Americans working with colleagues in other parts of the world. Lieberman (1986) in her discussions of collaborative work said, “initially activities propel the collaboration not goals” (p.6). The group of Polish teacher educators and classroom teachers used the development of presentations and participation in the exchange as the foundation for their deeper dialog on collaboration. Participating in and observing their activities provided rich data in this case study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Data Collection Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September, 1996 (Four days)</td>
<td>First Teachers for Democracy Conference, Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November/December 1996</td>
<td>Proposal and Institutional Review Board Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 13 and 14, 1997 (Two days)</td>
<td>Individual Interviews Conducted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 19, 1997 (One day)</td>
<td>Teacher Educator Group Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 22, 1997 (One day)</td>
<td>Classroom Teacher Group Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 25, 1997 (One day)</td>
<td>Whole Group Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 1, 1997 (One day)</td>
<td>Whole Group Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 13-21, 1997 (One week)</td>
<td>Second Teachers for Democracy Conference and member Check in Poland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1 Timeline for Data Collection

*Single Interviews*

I conducted an individual interview (Patton, 1990; Guba and Lincoln, 1989) with each participant. Originally, I planned to use a structured interview technique.
for these initial encounters. I planned to hold these interviews within a day or two of the group’s arrival. I wanted to get basic information from the participants and also have a chance to begin exploring the concepts and topics that I expected to be the focus for my work. In my list of original questions (See Appendix B) I planned to ask questions such as:

Can you tell me about your job?

What is it you do? Where? For how long?

How did you end up in that institution?

Tell me about the preparation of teachers be in Poland (Specific to History, civics, the Knowledge About Society course.) Is it the same everywhere?

I had chosen structured interviews because I wanted to make interviews as trouble free for the participants as possible. I also thought I would want similar information from each participant. I believed I could deliberately phrase the questions and the sequence of the interview. As I had read and thought about the process of doing cross-cultural research, I believed that this technique would suit the purposes of gathering data. The interviews were designed to last approximately 45 minutes and were intended to gain an understanding of the participants’ perceptions of teacher education and the role of university and classroom educators in the preparation of teachers.

“Qualitative interviewing begins with the assumption that the perspective of others is meaningful, knowable, and able to be made explicit” (Patton, 1990). I hoped
to use the intersection between conversation and interrogation to provide context for what would be collected in the group interviews that were to follow. The first interviews needed to occur immediately. I wanted to get the early thoughts from the group and to capture some of the insights they brought with them. I wanted to quickly move on to group interviews.

When the schedule of interviews was set, some group members requested the chance to see the questions I would ask. I think they felt more comfortable knowing what I was going to ask. But as the interviews began to occur, I struggled within the constraints of an interview schedule. Like Ladson-Billings (1994), my interview style in the past tended to be less structured, open-ended, free flowing and conversational (p.149). I fought within my own head whether to follow the interview schedule or free myself to ask the questions I wanted to ask as one curious human being listening to another.

As the participants arrived for their individual interviews, they carried many things with them. Each walked into the room nervous; many brought dictionaries, translator machines, and paper on which they had written extensive notes in answer to each question. They too recognized the negotiation of meaning that was to follow and that our attempts to cross the boundaries between cultures, languages and discourse would not be easy. The decision of how to deal with the structured/unstructured interview dichotomy forced me in an instant to change my original plan. Would I alter my personal style of ‘conversation as interview?’
As the interviews proceeded, in each situation I decided to leave the unnatural/artificial structure by the wayside. In its place we talked about the issues embedded in the questions. We used the dictionaries, translation machines and our patience to figure out what we were trying to say and what we meant. Chart paper came off the easel and diagrams, arrows and terminology were often literally written out. (See figure 2.1)

The chart shows an explanation of the organizational structure of the work in which the classroom teachers were involved. As civic education teacher trainers, they left their schools at the end of the day and provided 'courses' to others interested in civic education. New participants came from both the universities and schools. By chance I decided to use these pieces of chart paper. In the end they helped us all to understand and construct meaning from our interviews. As one technique in cross-cultural research, it served to provide a mechanism for conveying understanding.
In retrospect, if I wanted personal details to provide depth, I should have trusted the nature of open-ended interviews. Open-ended and unstructured interviews are more informal, and conversational. I should have remembered that my own personality, curiosity and manner would in fact be my greatest resource. While what played out was, I am sure, more difficult and frustrating, I believe it was also more valuable. Lather (1991) discussed the concept of “reciprocity”. She defined it as, "...give and take, a mutual negotiation of meaning and power" (p. 57). The
questions I had planned were not all asked. Different interviews reflected the personal information and interest of the participants. The individual nature provides another reminder not to force my research participants into one mold or image. The process must reflect the individual, the particular and explore the world each person inhabits. This is what Ursula, one of the participants, called during our discussions “the science of talk.”

**Group interviews**

Group interviews (Patton, 1990; Morgan, 1997) also played a large role in this work. Group interviews carry with them strengths and weaknesses. A large amount of interaction on a topic can happen as a result of the facilitator’s ability to direct the group sessions (Morgan, 1997, p.8). The technique also brings with it the ability to observe interaction on a topic. Patton (1990) identifies “quality control” as the strength. During the group’s visit we participated in a welcoming dinner the second night in Ohio. While engaging in conversation at the dining room table, group members challenged each other’s answers. They questioned assumptions and conclusions. The data I was collecting during the conversation was made more particular and more diverse.

As a method, group interviews do carry some concerns. They are “driven by the researcher’s interests” (Morgan, 1997, p.14), and for me, the realization that my position and power would drive the group to discuss my issues was a concern. However, I was not looking for objective methods. I wanted the group to engage in
dialog around and about the issue of collaboration. The literature on group interviews made it clear, I would have to carefully facilitate and manage the discussion and dialog. Knowing how to keep a few of the individuals from dominating the discussions would be important. I planned to direct questions at each participant. I planned to ask specific participants for their reaction to what others were saying. I planned to interrogate the 'silences'. I consciously made efforts to manage and direct the dialog.

I held the first group interview with the classroom teachers, then a second one with the teacher educators. I organized them in this fashion so that each of the stakeholder groups (Guba and Lincoln, 1989) represented could discuss the issues about which they had the strongest feelings. After the earlier individual interviews, I began to transcribe the interview tapes. From these early transcripts and notes, I began to generate new follow-up questions to use in the group interviews. (See Appendix C) Again, the participants completed written answers. I did not feel comfortable with them doing this. I mentioned often that they did not have to write answers, that our discussion would be sufficient information.

As each session progressed, it was obvious that I had more questions than would be possible to answer. Morgan (1997) had warned me in his writing that fewer questions would be explored in-depth using the technique of group interviews. I left the first meeting with the teachers and shortened the list for the teacher educators. Questions that did not appear to me to be focused on the topic of collaboration were removed.
A group interview with all of the participants took place at the end of their stay in Columbus, Ohio. This group interview took place at my house. Because it would be the first time the whole group would speak together, I feared that it would be contentious. In the earlier interviews, both group and individual, discussions about the 'other' group emerged. I continued to generate rough transcripts of the sessions and, as before, again helped inform the questions for discussion.

I consciously sought to create an atmosphere that was relaxed and conversational. Wine, cheese, crackers and fruit were laid out as a first step. After their arrival, the group was asked to assist in the preparation of the food and drinks. A mood was created around the dining room table, a place where, in my cultural context, friends shared views and debate. The list of questions included a discussion of our views about teacher education, collaboration and possible roles for the school and teacher in a democracy. (See Appendix D). The night ended with the group helping to prepare a dinner of lasagna, salad and bread.

A final opportunity for face to face discussion and a group interview took place while I escorted the group to Washington, D.C. Falling at the conclusion of their time in the United States, this final group interview was designed to offer one more opportunity to revisit issues and discuss reflections. It offered the chance to gain new insights especially related to changes in beliefs and plans based on the experiences of the group on a post-Ohio State University site visit to Michigan University. At MU issues about professional development schools and
school/university collaboration were explored and occupied one full day of the schedule.

Again, my notes and the rough transcripts allowed me to generate new questions and follow-ups to earlier discussions. The discussion was intense, heated and involved. The session lasted almost two hours. For me, it was clear that this was the last opportunity to visit these issues while they were fresh. For the group, it was clear they had a lot to say. The visit to Michigan had put things through a comparative lens and sharpened issues and plans for the future.

**Document/Drawing Collection and Analysis**

As the research continued, it became clear that the documents of the case would be good sources of data. I collected each article, handout and piece of information the participants received during their experience. I also collected notes that the participants wrote in preparation for the individual and group interviews. These written answers to the questions were used to confirm what emerged from the interviews. As data analysis continued, I read the notes an individual made to see if my description of their answer matched the same kind of analysis of their written answer.

During the course of the study the use of chart paper to draw and chart various concepts under discussion became one of the key techniques for dealing with the cross-cultural aspect of the study. These pieces of chart paper were noted and filed for me to access during the data analysis.
Individual Member Checks With Each Participant

Finally, during a member check in Poland, participants were asked to read transcripts and make notations, change answers and alter the transcripts to better reflect what they wanted to say. These transcripts also became pieces of data. Frequently, participants expanded on a point they had made during the interviews. They often wanted to change a word or phrase to something they felt better reflected their intent. This process continued throughout the fall of 1997 as some participants continued to send materials and notes in response to questions or requests. I received letters that included reflection on the events, documents and changes to transcripts. These letters and e-mails also joined the pool of documents for analysis.

Data Analysis

Data analysis occurred in three phases (Huberman and Miles, 1994, p.428). The three steps were:

- Data reduction
- Data display
- Drawing conclusions

First data reduction occurred. During this phase, initial transcripts were generated from taped interviews, notes and jot lists. During each interview I kept running notes of the answers and small reflections on what participants seemed to be saying. As
these transcripts were compiled, reading and rereading resulted in a list of emerging themes or ideas.

A second aspect of data reduction was the research journal. Notes relating to the process of the case study, reflections on emerging issues, and lists of things to do all were entered into the text. By keeping detailed descriptions of locations and events surrounding interviews and other activities, the research journal helped to set a context for the study.

Following the departure of the group from the United States, each of the transcripts was transferred to 5 by 7 index cards. Statements, thoughts, quotes, and segments of dialog each received one card and a code indicating its origin.

Interview #2 (Isa)

John—"In the university and in both...?"

Isa—"That both need to learn more knowledge about teaching... a complicated sentence. At Polish university things are very complicated... because in 21 universities... they know nothing about other faculty... in the same building... for example that faculty in history and modern history and European history do not have contact between them. Like a closet..."
I read and reread each of the cards. One task involved creating a large web on a piece of chart paper and sorting the cards into various piles. Connections were noted in the piles and lines drawn connecting the themes. I sorted the cards into themes and sub-themes (Huberman and Miles, 1994, p.432). The themes reflected the questions I had asked but also identified areas that had not been planned. For example, I expected a theme centered on their own teacher preparation to emerge. I did not expect a theme called ‘history’ to emerge, but as the sorting continued, it was clear that discussions about World War II and the transition to democracy in 1989 had played an important role. The themes that emerged at this point were:

- Own teacher preparation
- Where teacher preparation is going
- School/university collaboration
- Methods
- Educational change
- Self-image
- Why they became a teacher
- Schooling
- Teacher career
- History (World War II, Transition in 1989)
- Language
Looking at the themes that emerged it was clear that my questions had been the starting point for most of them.

The second phase, data display, began with the act of writing. In an attempt to deal with the complexity of the case, I wrote initial drafts and chapters. By describing what it was that happened and what there was to learn from it, I tried to share my emerging organizational themes with colleagues and peers. Richardson (1990) has said, "In progress papers might be academically minor, but literarily major because they help you find your frame, tone, narrative, stance, metaphors and audience" (p.49). The data display process continued as I began to get reaction from various audiences. Their questions and issues forced me to go back to the writing task and think again and again about what it was this case was teaching me and what I wanted to teach others through it.

The third phase of data analysis occurred as the chapters took shape and the findings became evident. Drawing conclusions involved reading and rereading the text, original data sorts, and notes generated in the research journal. The writing up of these findings and conclusions both completed the analysis and identified areas in need of further research.

Constructing the Narrative

As I began to construct the narrative, I hoped to come to a greater understanding of the actions I observed, the patterns and themes that evolved, and the voices I heard and continue to hear as I move the knowledge learned out to the wider
world. Denzin (1994) says that interpretivist researchers, "as storytellers, tell narrative tales with beginnings, middles and ends" (p.500). Van Maanen (1988) said that in impressionist tales "events are recounted roughly in the order in which they are said to have occurred..." (p.103). And Miller (1990) described the need to reflect time constraints of an ongoing project. This narrative stays true to the time constraints imposed by the case. To report this case study, I have constructed a narrative that shares the new understanding I gained as I experienced and interacted with the context of the study. Richardson (1990) calls these "analytical chronologies" and describes them as narratives that are both time and perspective sensitive.

Chapters 3, 4, 5 and 6 each present their emerging themes within the ongoing events of the case. The data have been clustered, sorted and linked over time (Huberman and Miles, 1994, p.429). I begin with my arrival at a conference in Poland during September of 1996 and end at another conference in June of 1997.

The narrative I constructed is composed of three main features: journal entries, an infused literature review, and findings presented in three time-specific chapters (3, 4 and 5). Throughout the narrative, journal entries are written in bold text. These entries are constructed from actual entries in my research journal (Richardson, 1990). They appear as signposts of the process of the study. They help to mark the changes in location that accompanied the study. The journals help the reader to follow the time sequence that bounded the events of this study. As I traveled between two countries, two states, and the District of Columbia, issues and understandings were raised in my journal and recorded to capture the emerging nature
of qualitative research. In addition to journal entries, I have also used a technique I call an ‘infused literature review. In a traditional dissertation, the literature review would stand-alone and represent a review of the literature in the area under study. In this dissertation the literature is interspersed within the text.

Over the course of the study I continued to read and experience the literatures represented in this case. Interviews and focus group discussions offered the opportunity to raise issues from the literature with participants and so the literature and the case are presented in an interwoven manner. Finally, I present three unique sets of findings: Chapters 3, 4 and 5 each represent a segment of the case and one of the emerging themes from the case. Each relates to the central question, “How do we deal with issues of circularity in educational reform?” Each chapter reviews the events and emerging understandings of one segment of the time period under study.

Stake (1994) has said, “It is not uncommon for qualitative case researchers to call for letting the case “tell its own story” (p.239). By including excerpts of my research journal, infusing the review of literature, and organizing the data from the case in a unique way, I believe readers will best be able to experience the case study. By leading the reader through the experience as the participants and I lived it, readers will build new understandings of the power of cross-cultural work to answer the problem of circularity in educational reform.
Trustworthiness

In any form of research one of our main goals is to establish the credibility and trustworthiness of the results. "All research is concerned with producing valid and reliable knowledge in an ethical manner" (Merriam, 1988, p.163). In qualitative case study research we seek to understand an aspect of the world we live in. We must question and respond to the three traditional aspects of the trustworthiness of research: internal validity, reliability and external validity. Each forces us to answer concerns. Each forces us as researchers to identify how our work will fit into the broader picture of human knowledge.

By approaching the case from a multiplicity of directions, I hoped to get a deeper and more complex perception of the processes and voices involved in the participants work. Lincoln and Guba (1985) would have me deal with the notion of 'truth-value'.

In order to demonstrate 'truth-value' the naturalist must show that he or she has represented those multiple constructions adequately, that is, that the reconstructions (for findings and interpretations are also constructions, it should never be forgotten) that have been arrived at via the inquiry and are credible to the constructors of the original multiple realities (p.296).

Whose 'truth' must be negotiated? Greene (1994), in citing Gadamer, again spoke to my struggle. "There is always a tension when it comes to interpretation. The interpreter experiences two claims: one from the object of interpretation (the text, the dialogue, even the mode of action) and one from the interpreter's own lived
circumstances"(p.438). In cross-cultural research I believe this to be most definitely true. I must negotiate meaning between what happened in this study and my ability to understand it based on my experiences and life.

Internal Validity

Internal validity—"how one’s findings match reality" (Merriam, 1988, p.166) —is used as one check on the quality of research. Eisner (1991) has previously discussed validity in qualitative research. He concurs with the description that qualitative research does not try to describe reality "as it really is" (p.109); rather, the researcher gives their judgement of the evidence. This judgment can be evaluated as more or less sound (p.109). We work to be sure "that we have good grounds for the judgements we make" (p.109). In answer to the question "How do you know that you know?" (p.107), he answered with three criteria--structural corroboration, consensual validation and referential adequacy.

Merriam (1988) suggests six other ways of ensuring internal validity (p.169-170). Her suggestions—triangulation, member checks, long-term observation, peer examination, participatory modes of research and clarifying research bias—offer a significant bar for which researchers may strive. This case used triangulation, member checks, peer examination, and a clarification of my bias to clarify and confirm my perception of the case.
Reliability

Reliability is the "extent to which one's findings can be replicated" (Merriam, 1988, p.170). In qualitative research there are problems deciding how reliability relates to such work and what should be done as a result. In qualitative research the researcher is not testing a treatment, or even seeking to predict how a group of individuals will act. "Rather, it seeks to describe and explain the world as those in the world interpret it" (Merriam, 1988, p.170). The world we are studying is assumed to be changing, assumed to be socially constructed and assumed to be contextual (p.171). In place of reliability Merriam (1988) cites Lincoln and Guba (1985) and their terms "dependability" or "consistency." In studies that have these two features we would expect that, given the data, the description of reality makes sense (p.172).

To ensure dependability the researcher must do three things: explain the investigator's position, provide evidence of triangulation, and provide an audit trail (Merriam, 1988, p.173). Eisner (1991) recommends referential adequacy as the criterion for reliability. Qualitative research has referential adequacy when readers can leave the experience with the text "able to locate in its subject matter the qualities the critic addresses and the meanings he or she ascribes to them" (p.114). This form of research then, deals with the empirical world and the ability to interpret it for others so that they can experience and gain new understanding from it. As Eisner said, "an educational critic's work is referentially adequate when readers are able to see what they would have missed without the critic's observations" (p.114).
In this study the ability to follow and participate with the group of Polish educators made my perspective unique. I was able to both comment on the intentions of their American hosts and see how the Poles perceived actions in the short and long term. Finally, by spending a large amount of time on one small aspect of the EDCP work I was able to focus on its many layers and shadings. I believe this study exhibits dependability.

External Validity

External validity is "concerned with the extent to which the findings of one study can be applied to other situations" (Merriam, 1988, p. 173). Similarly, Eisner (1991), in describing the lessons qualitative case studies have to teach, speaks of creating images. Images provide us clear views of lived experience and "can become a prototype" (p. 199). These images can be used to look at other unique situations and evaluate, compare and describe anew the unique human experiences that are part of each society's attempts to educate itself. This case study will, I believe, provide a vivid picture of another group of human beings attempting to answer the questions of educational reform and using cross-cultural work to break through the problem of circularity.

Merriam (1988) suggested three ways case study research can improve the external validity of the work: rich thick description, describing how typical the program actually is, and conducting a cross-site or cross-case analysis (p. 177). I believe this case study provides that rich description. Journal entries and participant-
observation provided sufficient detail for readers to follow events as they progressed. The project is typical in the sense that it mirrors the multiple groups engaged in exchanges across the United States. This project was unique in the level of shared decision making occurring between the American and Polish co-directors of the work. In the future, cross-case analysis will be possible to conduct as other researchers begin to explore and investigate other cross-cultural collaborative projects.

**Triangulation**

One tool to provide evidence of internal validity, reliability, and external validity is the use of triangulation. Triangulation of data (Guba and Lincoln, 1989; Merriam, 1988) is one of the strengths of case study research (Merriam, 1988, p.69). It is sometimes called “structural corroboration” (Eisner, 1991, p.110), and occurs through the collection and cross comparison of interview transcripts and notes, field notes and observations, logs and documents. In structural corroboration (Eisner, 1991, p.110) the multiple types of data that are collected in qualitative research are reviewed and used to argue for supporting evidence across all types—interviews, participant observation, documents, and focus groups. By looking for repeated behaviors, evidence of “contradictory interpretations” (p.111), and evidence that might prove the researcher’s analysis incomplete, we seek to gain confidence that what has been said reflects the interaction between the researcher and the participants in the case.
In this study triangulation of data occurred by collecting data from multiple participants in multiple ways. Interview transcripts, participant-observation notes and logs, and document analysis all were used to triangulate the data. Multiple means of gathering answers to the same questions was one technique. I conducted oral interviews with each participant. Without me asking, they independently answered the interview questions in written form. The written responses and interview transcripts were compared for differences in answers. Participants were given the opportunity to read and comment on transcripts. Many chose to expand answers, and no one altered the initial meaning they had expressed. By using multiple means of data gathering, multiple data sources for participant interpretations, and frequent opportunities for reflection and comment on emerging texts, I am confident in saying the work of this case represents the reality as I experienced it.

**Member Checks**

Member checks served as both an opportunity for data collection and a place to assure the "rightness" of the study and the conclusions I was drawing from it. I positioned myself as a constructivist/interpretivist and "for constructivists...reality has to be understood as interpreted experience. The modes of interpretation arise from a community" (Schwandt, 1994, p.437). The community that composed this case continued to influence my direction and emerging themes. Through member checks (Huberman and Miles, 1994, p.438)—opportunities for participants to comment, edit, question transcripts and narrative—the participants continued to affect
and direct the construction of knowledge that was a result of both the process and products of this work.

Researcher Bias

My life, self and position are complicated by the many voices with which I could speak. Do I choose to speak with the voice of classroom experience? Do I speak from the voice of academia (a research voice)? Do I speak solely as an American or do I attempt to emphasize the global nature of my experiences? I chose to speak by drawing on all of the multiple vantage points my experience provided. I chose to speak as a member of academia with roots in the classroom, an American concerned and curious about other societies, as a white, male, middle-class Midwesterner. In short I spoke as myself.

This issue also played out in my experiences with the research participants. I clearly felt more comfortable with the teachers. They were more similar in age, in temperament, and in outlook. Yet, I often felt empathy for the position of the teacher educators. I had taught pre-service teachers. I dealt with the struggles of time and coverage and the question of what a student must know before they were ready to try something out in the classroom. My positionality complicated and yet reflected the multiple perspectives at play in this study. Acknowledging this positionality helped to assure the trustworthiness of this study.
Merriam (1998) called for peer examination as one way of judging the trustworthiness of a qualitative case study. Eisner called this consensual validation. Eisner (1991) called consensual validation, "agreement among competent others" (p.112) that what has been described and interpreted is 'right'. Rightness might be found in the description of the environment, the interpretation, or the findings. It can be specific to individual parts of the text and must recognize that each individual will bring their own background to the reading. I worked diligently to share the emerging text with a variety of audiences-- seminar sessions, dissertation committee members, colleagues and friends all read parts of the narrative as it was constructed. Each brought a particular lens to the task. Committee members appeared most concerned about the preservation of my authorial voice. Seminar presentation participants and colleagues seemed to question the unique Polish context. One Polish colleague who had experienced a similar cross-cultural project read and commented on every chapter. His notes highlighted some of the unique interpretations that rise in cross-cultural situations. The text sounded 'right' to him. The issues and struggles between Polish teachers and teacher educators appeared to reflect his experiences. What he wanted to discuss was the implications of the participants' work, the perspectives they had ignored in their discussions. He was also most concerned about the translation of Polish cultural actions (e.g. flowers in the airport, spelling of names, language used between individuals of different social groups). His interest and questions were evidence for me that my interpretations were well grounded.
Consensual validation then is "a consensus won from readers who are persuaded by what the critic has had to say" (Eisner, 1991, p.113). I believe this study meets that goal.

Audit trail

Audit trails (Merriam, 1988, p.173) are apparent in a study if others can identify the methods of data collection and forms of analysis. If others are able to identify and understand these methods of data collection and analysis then they can, in fact, repeat the study with another group in another program. In this study a description of the data collection methods is included in this chapter. But more importantly, a description of the data collection process is also highlighted in the narrative of the case study (ch.3, 4, 5 and 6). I presented readers the data collection process as the case emerges through the narrative.

Ethical Issues

Cross-cultural research, like all research, carries risks. Risk, however, has many connotations. In qualitative case studies ethical dilemmas are likely to arise at two points: during the collection of data and in the dissemination of findings (Merriam, 1988, p.179). Merriam (1988) cited Walker (1980) and identified five specific problems:

- Researcher involvement in the situation or events under study;
- Problems with the confidentiality of the data;
• Problems stemming from competition between different interest groups for access to and control over the data;

• Problems with publication (such as concern for privacy);

• Problems arising from the audience struggling to distinguish between data and the researcher's interpretation.

Dealing with each of these areas meant working to assure the participants were informed and understood what they were being asked to do and what would be done with the data collected. Dealing with the concerns could mean dealing simply with the concerns of an ethics panel/human review board or in the case of this study the 'Institutional Review Board' (IRB). They wrote to me “Include a statement indicating that confidentiality cannot be ensured in a group setting....”. Merriam (1988) has even suggested that it is “nearly impossible to protect the identity of people involved”(p.183). I struggled in the narrative to shade and alter the identities of participants and yet stay true to the case and its social context. Where the participants came from affected the data and the social interactions in the group, yet referencing the origins of the group members would make them easily identifiable.

The IRB wanted to be assured that participants could withdraw at anytime. “Include a statement indicating that participation is voluntary and that participants may withdraw at any time without prejudice...” I made it clear to the participants that they could, but could they really? I could say it to the group (and did). It would be written in any communication to the group. But if I was to be honest, I didn’t want the group to withdraw, I wanted them to participate. I wanted them to stay involved.
until the end. Issues of power perceived or real could not be summarized or cleared by the inclusion of statements matching the IRB concern. My position as a member of the Education for Democratic Citizenship in Poland staff also meant if they quit this research project their relationship to the program and the office as a whole would be complicated. The program was paying for their experience. The members of the staff, especially the director, were heavily involved in the planning and operation of activities in Poland. It was in the best interest of each participant to continue to participate.

Another area where I had ethical concerns involved my understanding of group dynamics, the politics of job security, and ‘dangerous speech’. We were to work most often in a group interview situation. I had to be concerned about the freedom individuals would have to speak their opinion. The IRB raised a concern early in the approval process. “Revise the following phrase: “Tell me about your experiences in the 1980’s” to reflect wording similar to the following, “Would you be willing to share with me about your experiences in the 1980’s?” I wanted to use this question to discuss the changes that had occurred as a result of the 1980’s in Poland. These individuals were involved in civic education reform. I could not discuss the changes in their professional lives if I could not discuss what their professional lives were like in the 1980’s. I assumed that asking them to participate in the study was
sufficient permission to ask them about the impact of the transition in 1989. I changed the wording to reflect the IRB's concern.

This case highlighted two issues related to language and its use in cross-cultural research. These two issues were the literal use of language in the data collection process and the interpretation of the meaning of the language used.

Concern about the literal use of language was one aspect of the study as it progressed. Communication, including the question of translation, arose again and again. Could I use a translator for the study? I chose not to in large part based on the participants being presented as successful speakers of English. Our daily communication involved struggles with terminology, attempts to describe questions in detail, and frequent use of a dictionary or translation machine. We attempted to construct meaning across our cultural borders.

Interpretation of the meaning of language was also a concern. In many cross-cultural studies issues of language are problematic. Hamot (1995) talks about the constant need to negotiate meaning (p. 89). Patton (1990) also talks about this stating that "The data from interviews are words. It is tricky enough to be sure what a person means when they are using common language, but words can take on a very different meaning in other cultures" (p. 337). Words served as a focus of the study and words serve as an example of the complicated nature of language in this case. In Polish the

---

1 As an example of the severity of events in Poland during the 1980's Thomas Swick's (1991) book, "Unquiet Days" revealed from a Western perspective some of the tensions of that time.

"Around mid-afternoon, after the third game, Hania and I left to get a taxi to Stengy, a housing complex across town where Jadzia was staying for a few days. The driver took us down the airport road until we ran into a road blockade. Soldiers in fatigues stood in the middle of the avenue."
word is 'kolaboracja' (collaboration). It carries a negative connotation based on the use of the term for those Poles who worked with Nazis in World War II. Yet the American term became the term used by project participants in this study. What does it mean for them? Projects such as this force our (American) terminology on the Polish participants. As McLaren (1992) has said, "debates over issues of meaning construction become inexorably bound up with questions of language..." (p. 77).

As the study began and I first met the participants, my field notes indicated that language was an issue in the front of my mind. From the journal entry that recorded their arrival I said, "I am curious about her English?" "...Sure of his English?" As the study progressed and interviews were conducted the methods used to collect and record the data were affected by issues of language both literal and interpretation. While reading one night in the midst of the data collection I revisited Patton's (1990) admonitions about language,

The value of such experiences is that they will make us more effective domestic researchers... The heightened sensitivity we expect to need in exotic, cross-cultural settings can serve us well in our own cultures. Sensitivity to respect for other people's values, norms and worldviews is needed at home and abroad (p. 340).

Two other aspects of the study concerned me. First the use of interviews--and especially group interviews--meant the participants had little control over the
presentation of the topics, flow and content of the interviews or how I represented the results (Merriam, 1988, p. 180). I tried to protect their interests in this area by providing them multiple opportunities to respond to drafts of transcripts, notes and early information on emerging themes. A second area of concern with the methods was observation. The degree to which my presence was changing what was being observed had to be taken into account (Merriam, 1988, p. 181). My presence and the presence of this study altered the schedule of the participants. It altered the discussions they had in the evenings and the topic of discussion in vans moving from one location to the next. I knew the group had come here to discuss and investigate collaboration between schools and universities. I believe that this case study helped provide deliberation for the group on their topic of investigation.

Critical issues are involved when writing about collaboration. The words in this narrative must respect the ongoing and fragile nature of the work. The participants have read and will read these words. Humbly, it is their stories that I share. Their arguments are held up for consideration. While the primary focus of the narrative will be on my interaction with the participants and their issues (Richardson, 1990; Denzin, 1994), I will seek to support their collaborative efforts and not destroy them. In this work I was both insider and outsider (Cochran-Smith and Lytle, 1992). My varied positions informed and deepened the work but cannot be used to destroy the conversation into which I was quietly invited. Issues of representation and voice played out through the process of creating this text.
Conclusion

This qualitative case study (Merriam, 1988) attempts to investigate and interpret a case bounded by participation in a cross-cultural collaborative project. In a unique way, both reform efforts—school/university collaboration and cross-cultural collaboration—come together in this study. Both forms of collaboration might serve as tools in our attempts to attack the issue of circularity in educational reform. As part of an ongoing cross-cultural collaborative effort a group of Polish educators were involved in projects, which attempted to build, school and university collaboration as one part of civic teacher education reform in Poland. This study examined these questions with a small group of educators as they spent time in the United States viewing and experiencing programs involved in school and university collaboration. Their exposure to collaboration both modeled and brought into question assumptions about teacher education and the effect of democratic reforms on the preparation of civic education teachers in emerging democracies.

My assumptions for constructivist-interpretivist research centered on the belief that knowledge is constructed (Eisner, 1991) and forced me to identify a methodology and methods that aligned with my assumptions and epistemology. Qualitative case study (Merriam, 1988) matched my need to observe, question and participate in a unique human endeavor.

Concerns about language, researcher bias, internal validity, reliability and external validity arise in cross-cultural research. For each concern careful attention to
multiple methods of data collection, the use of peer exams and an open, emergent process provided the opportunity to construct a narrative that presents a case reflective of my perception of its reality

Maxine Greene (1998) argues for the use of storytelling as a tool in sense making. This narrative will tell the stories of events, issues and individuals from different positions in life and different parts of our world. It will provide a chance to view lived experience while also defamiliarizing the topic of school university collaboration. Defamiliarizing--to look from another perspective--provides an opportunity for digging deeper to the heart of issues involved in improving teacher education, schooling, and ultimately democratic societies.

In the next chapter the case begins. The use of journal 'signposts' to mark the location and time will help the reader to navigate the text. Infused will be literature references that connect the issues in this study to those in the broader literature of the fields represented. The analysis of the case identified three strategies that appeared to help to propel reform efforts and allow the participants to break out of the typical problem of circularity. Chapter Three will describe the use of cross-cultural border crossings as a first step. Chapter Four describes the use of collaboration and how it can begin. Chapter Five identifies the use of comparison as a powerful strategy to deal with what Goodlad (1994) calls simultaneous reform.

Ultimately Chapter Six concludes with the opportunity for a member check, reflection and the opportunity to revisit issues that arose during the limited time frame of the study. The criteria in Table 2.2 may help readers in evaluating the text in
Chapters 3-6. The end of the narrative will bring readers to the conclusion that this study was a trustworthy description of the events as they occurred. As well, readers will conclude (see Table 2.2) that this study's findings are legitimate given the data collected and that the information or images (Eisner, 1991) I generate just might prove useful in the next location or with the next group of educators involved in building cross-cultural collaborative projects.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria for Judging the Merit and Worth of the Findings (Chapters Three – Six)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did I use multiple data collection techniques?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have I used an open process—for example: Triangulation, Member Checks, Peer Examination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have I represented the multiple constructions of issues and events adequately? (Lincoln and Guba, 1985, p.296)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have I given sufficient grounds for the conceptual categories I generated?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could the study’s methods and questions be used with another group in another context?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the narrative appear to be consistent (Lincoln and Guba, 1985, p.172) with the data collected?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have I worked to ensure a research process that provided participants the opportunity to explore common issues in a challenging but non-threatening way?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have I generated images of events or processes that could be taken into a new context or program and used?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.2 Criteria for Judging the Merit and Worth of the Findings
CHAPTER 3

TRAVELING BETWEEN CULTURES: A STRATEGY
FOR BUILDING EDUCATIONAL PARTNERSHIPS

Introduction

In this chapter I show how this case demonstrated that crossing borders between cultures helps to build educational partnerships. I posit that cross-cultural learning is one way to support educational reform efforts. First, I describe the multiple borders crossed in this study (Poles to the United States, Americans to Poland, teachers to university and teacher educators to schools). In this study I identified benefits for participants, programs and institutions that support crossing borders. Second, to demonstrate these benefits, I discuss the nature of cross-cultural work by discussing culture, power issues and the negotiation of control. Third, I outline the beginnings of Education for Democratic Citizenship's (EDCP)¹ work on civic teacher education reform and the use of professional development schools within the context of a conference on civic teacher education reform. Finally, I begin the case study of a group of Polish educators involved in civic teacher education reform with the arrival of a small group to The Ohio State University, and the chapter concludes with the end of the first full day in the United States. This case serves as a model of international collaboration

¹ Education for Democratic Citizenship in Poland (EDCP) was created at the request of the Polish Ministry of Education in February 1991. It was a cooperative effort of the Mershon Center, The Ohio State University, and the ministry. Since then it has evolved to include the Center for Citizenship Education, Warsaw and The Ohio State University College of Education. The project is directed by Dr. Jacek Strzemieczny, director of the Center for Citizenship Education and Dr. Richard C. Remy, The Ohio State University.
where individuals in two counties share the planning, control, and the goal of supporting democracy in Poland.

The chapter is constructed within the chronology of the project events. The chronology is indicated by “signposts”—boxes with dates and locations bolded. Those are included to help the reader follow the unfolding flow of events. In the footnotes the reader will find references to literature that comments on the events of the case. The authors and researchers cited helped me to build connections between the conceptual categories in this case study and the broader literature of the field.

Participation in collaborative projects provides an opportunity to exchange ideas. Cross-cultural research and collaboration necessitates crossing borders. Borders can be between nations. They can also be between groups of individuals. They can even be between institutions such as schools and universities. These borders mark the socially constructed cultures of which we all are a part. In this study I found that crossing borders was one way of breaking through the problem of circularity (Winitzky, Stoddart and O'Keefe, 1992; Goodlad, 1994; Teitel, 1994).

One border crossed in the study is between universities and schools. Educational reform often relies on the exchange of ideas between school and university (Goodlad, 1994). A second border crossed was between the United States and Poland. With some exceptions educational reform efforts in the United States have come about without collaboration with other parts of the world. Yet, other countries have reform issues similar to those in the United States. Janowski (1992) described Poland's need to go outside the country's borders for ideas and assistance in order to build effective civic education programs.

Democracy benefits from building relationships across divides that separate people. Dewey (1916) told us that “emphasis (in education) should be upon whatever bind's people together in cooperative human pursuits and results, a part from geographical limitations” (p.98). Efforts in civic education reform in emerging democracies seek to develop educational programs that will strengthen and consolidate democracy. Parker (1996), Putman (1993), and Gutmann (1994) have agreed that relationships and associations at the local level are what give democratic governance its strength. Working to develop horizontal linkages will better establish these relationships.

In emerging democracies such as Poland, as well as in the United States, democracy is made stronger when individuals from different positions and interests are brought to deliberation (Gutmann, 1994). Time for personal reflection, communication and shared experience empowered me. Ultimately work that crosses borders tries to strengthen democracy, a democracy based on forging links and connections across groups and individuals. Dewey (1996) told us that, “Every expansive era in the history of mankind has coincided with the operation of factors which have tended to eliminate distance between peoples and classes previously hemmed off from one another” (Parker, 1996, p.30). The opening up of connections, the crossing of borders between individuals and groups previously separate, such as the efforts in Polish civic education, offers a clear example of what might come about.
The Nature of Cross-Cultural Work in this Case

In this study I have struggled with multiple dichotomies. The struggle to become perspective conscious (Hanvey, 1982) and to reconcile the diminishing role of borders (Merryfield, 1997) reflected my own personal dichotomies. I did not fit into any one role. I was a teacher, researcher, observer, and foreign consultant. Borders between these roles merged, shifted, and re-aligned. Crossing borders forced me to question my beliefs and knowledge about culture3). When moving across national and cultural borders problems have arisen in the past. These problems have occurred in Central and Eastern Europe. One problem has been work that focuses on moving things from the U.S. to other countries. Another problem has been work that tries to take a 'cookie cutter' approach. In other words, taking methods that work in the United States and applying them in a different country 4.

The work often brought me in contact with opinions, attitudes, and questions that both reinforced and destroyed the stereotypes of the cultures of teachers and teacher

---

3 Kreisberg(1992), for example, discussed the uneven access and choices various individuals have within the practices, ideologies and values. Others such as Freire and Macedo (1995) defined culture as "a terrain of lived experiences and institutional forms organized around diverse elements of struggle and domination. In other words, culture embodies the lived experiences and behaviors that are the result of unequal distribution of power along such lines as race, gender, class, ethnicity, age, and sexual orientation". In both definitions the common elements of power and ideology play out. The practices and institutional norms impact the way we each chose to live our lives.

Using the definitions of Giroux and McLaren (1996), Freire and Macedo (1995) and others it becomes clear that there are practices, values and norms in both classrooms and universities. These manners of living then are cultures, separate and distinct. Leming (1992) and others (Holmes Group, 1986, 1990) have described the struggle between the classroom and universities, especially university-based teacher educators. For example In the field of Social Studies Leming (1992) has identified a "ideological chasm" between classroom teachers and university/college professors of Social Studies. Crossing between these 'two worlds' then involves crossing borders. Kreisberg (1992) used McLaren's description of culture as a "set of practices, ideologies and values from which different groups draw to make sense of the world" (p.13).

4 In the years since Poland's transition to democratic forms of governance, Rekosh (1996) identified a few problems when groups cross borders to engage in reform efforts. In cross-cultural efforts in Central and Eastern Europe, Rekosh (1996) has said that too often "formal training sessions focus on transferring a rigid, pre-digested set of techniques from one context to another" (p.43). Instead when programs are focused on a two way learning process they result in a "genuine exchange of knowledge and skills" (p.43).
educators, the cultures of Poles and Americans. Cross-cultural research served to disrupt, complicate and defamiliarize individuals in other countries and cultures.

Power is another issue that must be confronted in this case study. My work in Poland involved walking the complicated minefield of an American foreign assistance program. The Implications of power became clearer as I crossed into Poland and faced issues of language and cultural competence, and the issues highlighted cultural differences and reinforced the yearning and need to learn from others. I was also faced with the evolving nature of my position. Classroom teacher, graduate associate, consultant, researcher all defined and complicated my crossings. Each role gave me tools and perspectives from which to approach this work.

The Context of the Project

When I arrived in Okecie, the Warsaw airport, the first thing that greeted me as I left the baggage claims area was a sea of people waiting to greet loved ones. In their hands they carried large bunches of flowers, usually hung petals down. As passengers departed the baggage area they were warmly embraced, kissed on the cheek, first to the right, then left, then right again. The sea of people parted and family and friends

---

5 Lazar (1996) has pointed out that non-governmental organizations have been the most heavily involved in democratization efforts in Central and Eastern Europe (p.13). Over the last five years program evaluations have indicated the following concerns or issues (p.14): Concern for the long-term sustainability of the program; Ensuring the involvement of beneficiaries in the project development and implementation; Projects seem to be moving from ‘assistance’ to ‘cooperation’; Experience with US and other foreign expertise in the region has been mixed
6 My work in many of these positions had been centered in the field of Social Studies and Global Education. Global education includes the development of what Hanvey (1982) calls “perspective consciousness,” the ability to see things from a variety of perspectives and to realize that others will have different perspectives. One of the goals of global education is to prepare students to “interact with and learn from people different from themselves” (Tyson, et.al. 1997). My border crossings were rooted in the notion that by working with individuals in other countries and other cultures I learn and grow from the interaction. Life is increasingly impacted by the exchange, movement, and influence of ideas across traditional state borders.
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moved towards the door and off into the countryside or to the city traffic of the Warsaw metropolitan area.

From the moment that I crossed the border between the familiar territory of my home in Columbus and entered Poland I was in an environment where the language and manner of living was not my own. Crossing that border raised a level of tension and heightened the sensations of sight and sound and smell. I wanted to do things “right”, and not to stand out as a stranger. But I was conscious of every step, turn, look, and question. This unnatural, conscious way of living and moving made me different, foreign. I found myself participating in the movement of ideas across borders and yet my culture traveled with me. There were many signs of globalization around me. They included ads for Pepsi, Fiat, and the BBC. There were signs advertising the next Rotary club meeting and copies of USA Today for sale at a newsstand. I was struck by the struggle between the movement toward globalization and the belief that “ideas such as democracy, participation, community and citizenship education are rooted in culture” (Angell and Hahn, 1996, p.337).

We also exist in other cultures. Teachers and teacher educators occupy some of these cultures. They are found most often in institutions that rarely come in contact. The manner in which they speak, question, act can be generalized as separate cultures. Yet each individual has an unique position, background, and experiences. Cultures are continually evolving. Universities and other teacher training institutions in Poland and the rest of Central and Eastern Europe are in reform. They are changing from what they were under communist regimes to something new and yet undefined in a democratic society.

---

7 Lock and Churkian (1997) after gathering essays and reflections from teacher educators around the world, including a large number from Central and Eastern Europe, identified two themes in the work they received. First participants stated that important changes were occurring and second that the social mission of education was moving to the forefront (Lock and Churkian, 1997, p. 26). They concluded
Participation in this project had begun almost a year earlier while in a conference in a small town northeast of Warsaw. The first "Teachers for Democracy" conference set the stage for the visit to the United States. The meeting in September of 1996 set the stage for the study. When I arrived I was not sure what would happen between the teachers and teacher educators who had been brought together to discuss educational reform.

**SIGNPOST—**
**September 1996: “Teachers for Democracy I”, Jachranka, Poland**

Jachranka is a small resort community on lake/reservoir. I came here to participate in a small conference entitled "Teachers for Democracy" and planned on spending a few days presenting, discussing and sharing experiences around questions of school/university collaboration.

The conference brought together teachers of civics and history, specialists involved in teacher education and others. Together they explored how new primary and secondary school civics course, developed by the Center for Citizenship Education might be addressed in teacher education. They discussed the possibility of projects that could involve teacher educators, teachers, and schools working together.

Although I did not know it at the time, the Poles who would be in my study were present at the conference in Jachranka. I was there in my usual role of helping with logistics and assisting the American teachers and teacher educators the Citizenship that the teacher educators in these countries viewed education as one of the means by which their countries will become better places to live.
Development program at The Ohio State University had brought to the conference. I worked with members of both the Center for Citizenship Education (CCE) in Warsaw and the Mershon Center staff to ensure the smooth operation of the small conference.

The conference sought to address needs in civic education that had been identified in previous discussions with the Polish partners in this work. Civic education, if it is going to succeed in supporting the development of a self-rejuvenating democracy, needs materials, knowledgeable teachers, and teacher preparation programs (Remy, 1996).

Preservice teacher education is an important component of building civic education for democracy in Poland. Those concerned with teacher education are seeking ways to educate succeeding generations of new teachers in essential ideas and skills of democracy and the best pedagogy for enabling students to learn (Conference Report, 1996).

At the conference, the assistant director of the Polish Center for Citizenship Education described the need for continued efforts in civic education and the sense of being lost as the civic curriculum content changed following the 1989 transition in the Polish government. Many of the teachers spoke of being lost as they tried to define and construct the new civic education curriculum and as they attempted to develop methods other than lecture. The Center's new materials included not only "knowledge, but attitude and skills" (Pacewicz, September, 1996, unpublished presentation). The methods discussed at the conference included simulations, role plays and others. They were not presented as just American methods, instead "many [were] old and well known 'games' from Poland" (Pacewicz, September, 1996, unpublished presentation). The difference between the methods discussed and the tradition of
games in Polish schools was seen in the openness of the methods and “what has been done with them” (Pacewicz, September, 1996, unpublished presentation). The methods, including debates and group work, were integrated into lessons that focused on democracy, local government and decision making.

The conference included a variety of presentations, many from American teachers, professors, graduate assistants. Language was handled through simultaneous translation. When a Pole spoke the translation moved from Polish to English. When an American spoke it moved from English to Polish. For much of the time, presenters discussed arguments for collaboration with the Polish teachers and teacher educators. Professional Development Schools (PDS) were the models referenced most often by the Americans.

At that time Ohio State University had a coordinator for it’s professional development schools. During her presentation about collaboration she described the essence of the PDS approach as close collaboration between universities and schools as true partners in all aspects of teacher education. She presented information about the essential characteristics of school-university collaboration in teacher education and identified seven reasons why collaboration is vital to reform of teacher education:

- Collaboration is vital because jobs require collaborative decision making and understanding of complex processes
- Collaboration is vital because it models citizen participation in democratic processes
- Collaboration is vital because it helps develop relationships with people
- Collaboration is vital because it helps schools and universities inform each others practice
- Collaboration is vital because it provides networking efficiency
• Collaboration is vital because it helps schools and universities merge resources toward common goals

• Collaboration is vital because schools can help improve the teaching profession (Brosnan, September, 1996, unpublished presentation)

She said conceptualizations of the teaching and learning process need to become more complex and ambitious. Teachers and schools can help to reorganize and recognize the knowledge base of the teaching profession. Schools and teachers can also ensure that relevant and responsible research and curricular development is done in schools (Brosnan, 1996, unpublished presentation).

A team of an American Social Studies teacher and a university professor shared details about their work in a collaborative project. While the teacher introduced the structure of a PDS developed to train Social Studies teachers, the professor discussed what PDS means for the university professor, for research, and for the courses in teacher education programs. The university professor said PDS means giving up control over parts of the teacher education program, especially courses. PDS means more work, but it also leads to an increased knowledge of good teaching practice and opportunities for research. The American team's model of a 'professional development school' served as one example of school/university collaboration for the group of Polish teacher educators and teachers.

Conferences have been a way of disseminating the curriculum materials generated as a part of the Center for Citizenship Education's work. A primary (7-8 grade) level course in civic education was one of the first products of EDCP. Demonstration lessons were presented by a university level educator and a Polish classroom teacher. The demonstrations were one example of collaboration present at the conference. A simulation of the Polish Sejm (legislature) involved participants in
active role playing. In another model lesson presenters discussed how the public influences government and in turn government is influenced by public opinion. Throughout the model lessons the professor and teacher worked together and taught together. For most Poles, accustomed to little interaction between professors and teachers, these activities were symbolic of what was being discussed at the conference.

Most sessions at the conference centered on the importance of school-university collaboration in pre-service teacher education. The theme of democratization was evident in the sessions. Both teams of just Poles and those composed of Poles and Americans modeled a variety of methods for active learning. The conference also provided Polish classroom teachers and teacher educators with the opportunity to engage in professional conversation. Participants spoke about how little they actually talk with those in other institutions. At this conference teacher educators and teachers were often in the same groups, eating at the same table, and debating various issues about teaching. It is not clear that everyone took advantage of this opportunity to work and talk with colleagues from other institutions, but the conference did provide momentum in the efforts to bridge the gap between university and school cultures.

The conference ended with discussions of teacher education in civic education and the announcement of incentive grants for innovative projects involving teacher educators and schools in collaborative projects. The Center for Citizenship Education proposed a program "Partnerships in Civics Teacher Education" to support collaboration between universities, primary and secondary schools. Collaboration in preservice civic teacher education could take many forms. The most promising projects were to be given small grants and a study visit to the United States. The projects were based on the teachers' use of course materials generated by the previous EDCP work. (Center for Citizenship Education, September, 1996, unpublished). The teachers were expected to use them with preservice teachers. The project applications included:
• a description of the project (program of the teacher preparation course, amount of hours, nature of the lessons, number and form of "partnership" meetings),
• the role of the individuals applying for the grants,
• the formal acceptance of the project on the part of principals of the school and student practicum supervisors (Center for Citizenship Education, September, 1996, unpublished).

The project laid out an ambitious agenda that encouraged teacher educators to seek out the teachers at the conference and learn more about the materials and about the teacher training that had been ongoing with the dissemination of the materials.

SIGNPOST— Conference for Polish and American Educators September, 1996 Jachranka, Poland

A teacher stood at the end of the conference as participants around the room shared their reflections on the last few days. Her body was visibly shaking and her voice cracking. In Polish accented English she said that she would leave the conference with knowledge that she knew things of value to the teacher educators present in the room.

"I know I have something to share" was how she ended her words. I was moved. Often I think we assume the emotions of individuals will be hidden at events such as this but here they were for all to see. "I know I have something to share."

For me, the words of this teacher touched an emotional cord. They provided evidence for me that notions of collaboration had been introduced at the conference. In
her voice I heard the passion for her work. She was struggling to be heard in the midst of reform efforts in a country that provided little in the way of monetary payment or societal respect for teachers. I left the session awed by the affect of the last few days. I hoped that the words had struck others with the same force.

Individual teachers and teacher educators began to talk with each other at this meeting. They were ready to begin collaborating. The stage was set for collaborative projects to take shape. Teachers involved in civic education reform were advocating for classrooms where democracy was both content and process, where students were actively engaged in the construction of meaning, where teachers motivated and involved students in an education designed to prepare them for life in a democracy. The personal attempts of teachers to cross the borders between teachers and teacher educators served the broader societal goal of raising the status of those who choose the classroom as their life’s work.

The next time I would see some of the conference participants they would be walking down the steps of a bed and breakfast in Columbus, Ohio.

SIGNPOST—
Saturday, January 11 and Sunday, January 12, 1997, The Polish Educators Arrive in Ohio

Today the group flew from Poland to the United States by way of Cincinnati. Ultimately they landed here in Columbus. When they arrived at Columbus International Airport they saw a crowd of people waiting at the end of a long tunnel. There are no lines for a passport

---

Janet Miller (1990) has talked about the possibilities of teachers and how to support their efforts. "What are the links between personal and social change? How can teachers become challengers not only of their individually constructed assumptions but also of the larger social and political context that frame and often shape their work" (1990, p.20).
check, no doors that have to be passed through or guards watching your entrance. There are fewer people waiting for arriving passengers than in Poland. The emotions that accompany the greeting could be seen in the way some received hugs, kisses and smiles. Most of the travelers, however, are business people on their way to or from points of commerce. The only indication that people from other countries pass through Columbus is the sign above the escalator "Bienvenue! Wilkommen! Hola!"

Sunday Morning, January 12, 1997

As I write it is now 4:30 and I haven't had much to eat but I am functioning. At 1:00 I went to the bed and breakfast down the street and met the Poles. The group straggled down the stairs after a while. Agnes is a large woman who is beaming as she comes toward me. She has dark hair and a pleasant smile. She seems very pleased to be here but she doesn't say much in English. Magda has reddish hair and speaks a great deal of English. She was willing to have a conversation from the very beginning. I may want to consider her as one of the key informants for my study. She is very interested in the university, the students and in the kind of work they do. Isa looks like she studies a lot. She also seems quiet. She is dressed in a skirt and heels to walk around. She has blond hair and wears glasses. Ursula is shorter with dark hair, a rounded face. She is very quiet and yet seems very warm with a nice smile. I am curious about her English. Andrzej has blond hair. He works at a NGO and is a classroom teacher. He seems very connected to the work and sure of his English. He was very comfortable.
Many things stayed with me after the conference in Jacharanka, Poland. Thoughts from September of 1996 were vivid images in my mind. Hearing the teacher say “I know I have something to share...” made an impact on all of us who had heard the words and felt the emotion they conveyed. As I developed a plan for the study, I used her words and the other notes I had from the conference to refresh my thinking and help me decide the direction. Now I wondered what the group would take from their time in the United States? How had they begun to construct meaning of the term collaboration? How would they describe the roles of teachers and teacher educators in civic education reform?

**Introduction of the Participants**

My study began as the Poles walked down those stairs the first morning in Columbus. My initial assumptions would prove to be both true and false. During the initial interviews I would learn more about each and what motivated them to come to the United States.

Andrzej had been a primary teacher for ten years. He finished his study of philosophy at the University of Warsaw, then went back to teaching in the primary school (grades 1-8). He taught Polish language and ethics. While teaching he heard about a new course, ‘civic education.’ He finished the course for those who wanted to be teachers of civic education. In this course the teachers were exposed to lessons (they called them scenarios) that incorporated active teaching methods and content about life in democratic societies. The courses included lots of time participating in the actual

---

9 The individuals in this study were given the option of remaining anonymous. Some wanted to use their own names, others did not. All names have been changed to meet their request. Some other biographical information has also been altered. The names of institutions, sometimes locations, have been moved slightly so that the identity of the individuals involved remains unclear.
lessons, what the teachers called ‘pretending they were students.’ Ultimately, they left with a set of lesson scenarios and new skills as a teacher.

Andrzej had been very impressed by the possibilities of this work and so he came back again, this time to take the course for those who wanted to be teacher trainers. Teacher trainers worked with a small group of teachers involved in the first level courses. Since September he had been working with the center as a teacher advisor and helping write lesson scenarios. He spent time creating plans and cooperating with various parts of the work.

Agnes taught History at the University of Olzstyn, an affiliated campus with the University of Warsaw. She was in a collaborative project with Ursula, a civic education teacher. Her university campus had 14,000 students, and she had been there 22 years.

Ursula taught history and civics in a primary school. She was in the first course on civic education with Andrzej and fifty other teachers. She was involved in the civic education project ‘KOSS’ (Elementary Teachers of Civic Education). She had completed her degree in law and history at the University at Olzstyn. She was a teacher trainer in civic education in Olzstyn. In April 1996 she organized a foundation for teachers who taught civic education in the area.

Magda was from the Pedagogical Institute in Wroclaw. She was a history teacher until 16 years ago. She had been a classroom teacher in primary and secondary schools for ten years. Now she is a lecturer in didactics and history. She also conducted exercises with students who do field experiences and lessons in primary and secondary schools. These exercises, sample lessons, lectures, and seminar sessions were designed to support the preservice teachers during their time in the classroom. After this visit Magda planned to conduct research. She was going to write a piece
about ethnic groups in the first and second world wars. She said she enjoyed teaching about history in the primary and secondary schools.

Isa was a teacher of history and civic education. She worked with the Center for Citizenship Education and Poznan University while teaching in a secondary and a primary school. She was a teacher in both primary and secondary education at the university. She helped in conversation and exercises, especially conducting lessons about civic education.

I had expected the Poles to be in pairs of one teacher with one teacher educator. I had expected that the individuals who had previously agreed to work together on collaborative projects would come to Columbus. Instead two of the Poles would work together and the rest of the individuals would collaborate with others when they got back to Poland. I had also expected six people. The sixth was a teacher educator with whom I had previously worked. But she was too sick to travel at the time.

I didn't have control over the participants. I did, however, request that each become a respondent in my research study. The Center for Citizenship Education in Warsaw chose who came on the study visit to the United States. Once I learned who had come, I found that they did not match my initial expectations, and I felt some trepidation. I wanted my study to go smoothly. This change in plans altered my level of comfort. Yet the situation forced me to deal with both the uniqueness of each individual and their work together as a group participating in a particular set of experiences.

After meeting the entire group in the lobby of the bed and breakfast, a colleague and I took the group for a short drive around the campus. It was 5 degrees outside, a true winter's day. We walked past the nursing school, Victorian structures sub-divided

---

10 What Janet Miller (1990) calls a case made up of cases. In her work she struggled with looking at both the individual participants and not losing her focus on the group as a whole. She chose to highlight the individual in the context of the group's experiences.
into rooming houses and shops along one of the main streets of campus. After walking around the campus we entered the Mershon Center. The entrance has windows three stories high that surround an atrium. Entering the Mershon Center the Poles looked up at three levels of balconies on three sides. Lots of light entered the building. They entered the Citizenship Development Project's offices, which would serve as the home base for our time together.

SIGNPOST—Poles and Americans Eat Dinner at Professor Remy's House, January 12, 1997

I picked up the Poles for the short drive to Professor Remy's house. Professor Remy was the American co-director of EDCP. The program always includes a welcoming dinner for the Poles and program staff. The temperature was zero degrees, a cold brisk night. During the drive to the house, we talked about the city, forests, the "spread out" nature of American cities. We discussed about how Columbus compared with Warsaw as they both have a population of about one million people, but they have very different shapes and atmosphere.

Dinner was over candlelight. At the table I sat with Magda and Andrej. In our conversation and discussions we talked about how directors (the name in English that the Poles called principals) are chosen and if they had all been replaced since 1989. Andrej says yes, Magda says no and added you "must not look at problems only through Warsaw's eyes". It was an important point to remember. We also talked about EDCP's Local government project and its significance to the Center for Citizenship Education. The upcoming elections were
another topic. According to Agnes the biggest chance was seen for the “old ones”. I took her comment to mean the communists. There was plenty of conversation at all tables and my concerns about the Poles’ English language abilities were lessened. Everyone seemed to be functioning well and getting along. Last year’s group had individuals who talked little at the welcoming dinner, but not this year’s.

Later during individual interviews I found out in greater detail about where they were from and what they did. As they described in English the schools and institutions they had traveled from, the context in which they worked became clearer.

I taught in multiple schools. The current school I teach in is a large school, rather old for one thousand pupils but the building is very small. Children go to school from eight till three and another group from ten till five. It is very hard and crowded. We have a huge new gymnasium. This school building is new, only ten years old. My first year in the job at this school was the first year for the whole school. I became a teacher because I finished my studies in philosophy and Polish language. They were my favorite subjects when I was a student.

My father was a teacher too. He was a director (principal), a headmaster of the school. He taught Math and when I was a teenager I always said teachers are very silly. And, ‘I never will be teacher’ but later when I finished my studies I didn’t have a choice because I lived in a town 100 km from Warsaw and finished my studies in philosophy. It isn’t a good profession to find a job.

(Andrzej)
I work at the University of Warsaw affiliate in Olzstyn. I work in the Institute of History. Before 1968 year I went to work in schools. I finished the university in 1974. After I finished the university I worked at the University Warsaw in Olzstyn. I am assistant at the university in contemporary history. In 1984 I finished a doctorate of contemporary history. Next, in 1996 I became a professor of Polish history and didactic history. I was a teacher for six years. I was in an elementary school then changed to the university. Now I am training teachers of history. (Agnes)

I work at the Pedagogical University in Wroclaw. I am in the Institute of History, Department of Didactic History. I started working in 1980. I was a teacher of history in elementary school. I conducted lessons for students. I started working at the pedagogical university in 1991. I am lecturer. In this work, I am interested in training of teachers in my university, a pedagogical university... I like to teach. I like to teach small children and students too. It is very nice, very hard work, hard work. I was a good teacher; I was a good teacher of History. I wanted to change my job because I was advisor (supervisor) and a teacher of history. I like to grow, develop. I like to change jobs. I thought that I would like to teach students too. (Magda)

I finished my studies in 1993 and in 1994 I started my job in a secondary school in Poznan. Now I teach history and civic education. My career has not been very long, only three years. The pay is low and the job is not expansive, but I thought about it when I was very small. It was my dream and I believed and now believe that the material position for the teacher in Poland will change.
After 1989, when communism stopped in Poland, my country had hope, hope that Poland will come into Europe, Western Europe. (Isa)

My school is not normal. My school belongs to the Society of Creative Schools. In Poland there are many schools. We are a modern school. In my school are two computer classrooms and the Internet. In my school there is very good headmaster (principal). Every year she talks with my colleagues and I and tells us that we must learn, and participate in other courses. We are appreciated, teachers in my school. We must, must, and must learn. My school is very old. The building is small. But there are many students. In my school there are 900 students, in this way my school is normal. (Ursula)

Looking through their descriptions of themselves and their work it was clear that I did not have a complete picture of them. At this point in the study my knowledge of the group was incomplete, preliminary. As the case study continued I would come to know them better. However, in these early descriptions a few interesting points did appear. First, none of these individuals had been originally trained as a teacher of civic education. Each had come to the field from some other discipline, in most instances history. Their schools and institutions were different and unique. Yet each had seen something to gain from participation in collaborative work. I would need to explore their goals further in later discussions.

During our discussions Andrzej talked about his involvement with KOSS and civic education. KOSS, a civic education teacher network has played a large role in supporting teachers of civics. The group sponsors workshops and teacher institutes. During the sessions teachers are presented with the lessons ('scenarios') and participate in role plays, simulations and other forms of active learning. Andrzej discussed the
excitement of the sessions. He said, “I like to learn...explore.” The workshops involved participating in sample lessons and simulations. Andrzej identified participants in the civic education reform project as being people with similar interests in both civics and new methods of teaching and in talking about them.

In the new methods, we are really, we are teachers and we are playing like children. I like the kind of teaching. I like to learn. I like to do something interesting and I thought it (KOSS) would be something interesting. I spend time with different people and later I became really interested in it because for me it is something wonderful. I think that one thing is important. Our headmaster wasn’t interested in our course, because when the teacher is on the course someone else has to teach. When I study the new course they wonder what for? You are going to have someone teach your classes. You have a family and students and how long will you be gone? Are you crazy?

As I met each of these individuals I found myself wanting to ask many questions. I discovered much in common with each of the Poles and much that was unique. They were all involved in civic education at some level. All except Isa had been teaching for many years. They came from very different regions of Poland--from the Northeast, Warsaw, South Central and West Central. In their answers there was a ring of the familiar to me. My previous trips and work with Poles let me hear similar stories and yet each had experienced a lifetime of events I couldn’t imagine. In the last fifteen years their country had been through massive strikes, protests, marshal law, secret police crackdowns, and worse. Ultimately the transformation of the government in 1989 had opened up enormous, new possibilities. These individuals seized the chance to come to the United States and work to improve civic education in Poland. They also crossed borders to work with educators from different institutions within
Poland. In both cases they demonstrated their belief that these forms of work would improve the preparation of teachers in civic education.

As a researcher/teacher I found myself participating in what Tyson, et.al. (1997) call “cross-cultural experiential education.” I was a learner in this experience. I shared my knowledge of school and university collaboration and civic education. As inevitably happens in such situations, I learned as much as I taught.

As I collected data I sought to gain an understanding of the issues at play in Polish civic education reform. Crossing borders raised issues of language and cultural competence. Our struggles to construct meaning strengthened the goal of the research—to detail and defamiliarize the everyday. The process of crossing borders involved all of us in a deliberative process. Personal reflection on the issues of society, especially the role of schools in emerging democracies, brought us into deliberation. As seen by the early discussions in Jahranka we discussed the possibilities of school and university collaboration. The process of deliberation helped to form bridges, links and and associations across the borders all of the participants represented: teachers, teacher educators, Poles, Americans. In doing so democracy can be strengthened and reflected. In forming associations Dewey’s (1916) call to create linkages in society was answered. To me the evidence of border crossings in this study showed one possible strategy for the process of reforming civic education and teacher education. Ultimately both might contribute to the reform of education in democratic societies.

SIGNPOST—
January 12, 1997--Dinner, cont.

The evening ended with an Australian graduate student playing her guitar by the fireplace. The candles were glowing, the wind
howling and the music was beautiful. The last song of the night was “Blowing in the Wind” by Bob Dylan. As the music approached the chorus the Poles picked up the melody and refrain. Both Americans and Poles began to sing in their own language simultaneously. The words, sung in both Polish and English hung in the air as the evening ended and the first day of my data collection was brought to a close,

“How many times must one people exist before their allowed to be free...The answer my friend is blowing in the wind, the answer is blowing in the wind....” (Dylan, 1985).

The Role of Americans in International Projects

I struggled with the question of my role as an American in this international project11. Until this project my work had been influenced by arguments for cultural sensitivity, arguments that did not identify one country’s people as more knowledgeable than another’s. Their knowledge was simply different. As I began working with many of the Polish civic educators I realized they were often as knowledgeable as I was about a particular topic. Often they were more knowledgeable. When we spoke about teaching methodologies the teachers had used more of a variety than I had. They knew particular simulations quite well and described them in detail. The teacher educators had spent their whole careers teaching others how to construct and give a lecture. They knew particular aspects of the lecture method that I hadn’t

11 The role of Americans in international collaboration and cross-national projects continued to play out as a question in need of answers. In newly emerging democracies such as Poland and the other countries of Central and Eastern Europe the sharing of international learning and understanding is viewed as an essential activity. Janowski (1992) explains this by saying, Because pedagogy as a science was heavily dependent on the party and its ideologists, it is wrong to presume that present-day educationists will be able to write something new. We must therefore rely on translations of books written in the West. This is why we need to find out what program models and
thought about. Why did they want us to help in Poland? I wanted to ask them, ‘what role do we serve’? The answers came back in the questions of the Poles about education in the United States. They talked about wanting to be accepted as part of NATO, and the European Union. I thought that the Poles wanted the project with Americans by the way they listened and asked questions during our presentations. I came to believe that the Poles we worked with wanted us to help them.

which books should be made widely known in Poland. Our intention is to do all this while responding to the requirements of uniting Europe....

12 When describing the role of Americans in the Education for Democratic Citizenship in Poland project, Strzemieczny (1996) said,

As the events of 1989 in Central and Eastern Europe have unleashed many efforts at educational reform, some have asked, “Can education for democracy be exported?” My experience with EDCP since 1991 leads me to believe that this is the wrong question. For those of us in Central and Eastern Europe the question is “How can we help ourselves?” As I have repeatedly emphasized, the Polish participants in EDCP have been, and continue to be, the only authors of the produced curriculum guides, primary school civics course, and new products under development. For Poles there could be no other way and -to their great credit- our American partners have believed exactly the same thing. This belief has been the most fundamental assumption of the entire enterprise.

Of course, the ability and willingness of one national group to draw upon the resources of another in an area as potentially sensitive as that of civic education does not happen automatically. Rather, as I believe our experience with EDCP illustrates, this kind of transference of ideas results from two groups working in an atmosphere of mutual respect and trust over an extended period of time, a practice we hope to continue (p.173).

Sharing experiences by Americans was considered useful by the participants in the workshops. It seemed to me that Americans gained as much as the Polish participants in their interaction. This was seen best in the increased interest American participants showed in active teaching methods. The work of the project has been set up to emphasize a participatory approach, avoid top down directives and involve classroom teachers in all phases of the effort. The project that Strzemieczny spoke of might be seen as one example of what Craddock (1997) and Lazar (1996) call the ‘cooperative model’ of international aid. Shared leadership and decision making, negotiated plans, control of funds not exclusively one or the others.

EDCP.... demonstrates the cooperative method for promoting democracy in post-communist societies. It is based upon developing partnerships between organizations from both the donor and recipient countries in order to achieve clearly specified goals (Craddock, 1997, p.62).

Craddock compared three constructions or models of aid for post-communist societies. First the ‘institutional model’ where most aid dollars go to an American institution to provide services to the local groups or agencies in the Central or Eastern European country. This model has been criticized because it doesn’t seem to build local capacity to lead efforts and seems to benefit the American institution more than the local in country participants.

A second method is the ‘localist model’. In it, money is funneled to local organizations in countries such as Hungary, Latvia, or Poland, with local leadership and local decision making. Often held up as the most culturally sensitive model it also comes with concerns as local groups go in often-different directions, with little interaction across borders, languages, or institutions.
Collaboration was apparent in the events and scenes of this case. The work involved shared decision-making between individuals in the country being helped, in this case Poland, and the United States. It demonstrates, on an international level, the deliberative process of individuals and groups from multiple perspectives working together. The Polish director was helping to set the agenda. He was helping to design the itinerary and the work that would be accomplished. By doing these activities the participants from both countries negotiated the cultural and power divisions that could have destroyed the eventual success of the project.

**Conclusion**

Merriam (1988) describes this kind of case study as an “interpretive case study” (p.27). As such the researcher is asked to look at the vast amounts of data and develop conceptual categories from it. As this case begins the activities around border crossings indicate that there is value in encouraging efforts that bring individuals and groups across national and cultural borders. In the first part of this case I saw multiple border crossings. Americans crossed to Poland, Poles crossed to the United States and teachers and teacher educators began to plan and dialog across their traditional institutional borders. The collaboration also showed that long range work over time could support social change in emerging democracies. A project, EDCP, that had started in 1991 with basic discussions about the possible shape of civic education reform, had evolved to discussions of civic teacher education. Ultimately, the evidence found in the beginning of this case serves as one possible model for Americans in international collaborative projects. The evidence—movement across borders, shared planning and control, shared learning—showed what might be possible in cross-

---

13 Much like Craddock’s (1997) third model, the “cooperative model”. 87
cultural work. A model of collaboration, shared decision making and common purpose was the result of the years of work.

Each activity involved an exchange of ideas. By crossing from Poland to the United States and vice versa, participants believed they would gain new understandings. They believed their knowledge about how to conduct civic teacher education reform would be strengthened. The description of EDCP's early efforts to introduce civic teacher education reform and the use of professional development schools outlined in this chapter appeared to bear fruit in the continued efforts of the participants in the study. By working to build bridges between universities and schools the project planners appeared to recognize the need to link institutions in order to strengthen reform efforts.

Cross-cultural work in this case meant sharing control over key aspects of the project. For example, the selection of participants was largely the responsibility of the directors of the center in Warsaw, Poland. Second, the design of the itinerary was shared by planners in the United States and Poland. Both co-directors influenced the tasks to be completed while the participants were in the United States. Power appeared to be shared between centers in both countries. Cultural sensitivity, developed over time in EDCP, allowed negotiation and deliberation to move the work of the project forward.

It was apparent at this early stage that the earlier work of EDCP—the Teachers for Democracy conference and the grant program—was paying off. Participants had been introduced to school and university collaboration as a civic teacher education reform effort. Early efforts begun at the Teachers for Democracy conference resulted in

---

14 Planners included the staffs and project co-directors in both the Mershon Center and the Center for Citizenship Education in Warsaw.
project proposals and the planning of activities between a number of universities, pedagogical institutions and schools. Only time would tell if they would be successful.

Finally, Poles' interaction in Columbus seemed to demonstrate one possible role for Americans in international projects. Collaboration across nations and cultures, shared decision making and long term commitments of time meant that the participants in this case entered the United States as part of a six year history of exchanges. Their goal of building collaborative projects seemed to benefit by the crossing of borders from the United States to Poland, from Poland to the United States, and from teacher to teacher educator. The next days and events of the experience in the United States would give rise to a number of issues, but at this time I believed success would be the result of these efforts.
CHAPTER 4
COLLABORATIVE WORK AS A STRATEGY IN BUILDING RELATIONSHIPS

I am stubborn
and submissive in my stubbornness
like wax
only thus can I
impress the world

("Solution", Tadeusz Rozewicz, 1994)

What are the stages collaborative projects go through? Some have argued that deliberation on issues of mutual importance and common concern sets the stage for collaboration (Button, 1996; Miller, 1990). In this case of Polish civic education teachers and teacher educators, I saw the Polish educators struggle to deal with collaboration in their context, a context very different from that of the United States. Collaboration may involve individuals and institutions working across traditional borders. As we move across those lines of power we struggle to defend our ideas and yet compromise so as to learn from each other. Rozewicz (1994) perhaps said it when he said that the way to impress the world was to be submissive in our stubbornness. When we engage in collaboration we often find ourselves defending our beliefs and at the same time working with others to create new beliefs.

In this chapter I first describe the democratic imperative for collaboration. Linkages across different interests strengthen democracies (Putnam, 1993; Dewey, 1996) and in this case collaborative work was a tool to help individuals interested in
strengthening the emerging democracy of Poland\(^1\). I describe in this chapter the roles that collaboration can play in reforming education. Collaboration can serve to empower teachers; especially teachers already involved in well-established curriculum development projects (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, 1996). Collaboration can also serve to alter the "traditional" roles of university–based and classroom–based educators (Cochran-Smith, M. and Lytle, S.L., 1992). Collaboration serves to heighten awareness of and alter the parameters of personal beliefs related to teaching and the collaboration itself.

I describe the work that occurred during the first few days of the participants' experiences in the United States and use it to highlight two ways of beginning collaborative projects. Leming (1992) and Lieberman (1992) have recommended beginning collaboration with shared tasks/ productive activities, work that serves to bring the participants' perspectives to bear on common efforts. In this case the development of presentations and papers on active teaching strategies such as simulations and gathering information on alternative assessments served as the common task. Upon their return to Poland they would give these presentations, but for now my participant observation focused on the development of presentations and articles. Others (Button, 1996; Miller, 1990) have indicated that collaboration begins with the sharing of knowledge, stories, dialog and action. This case is as an example of the uses of productive activities and dialog to develop collaboration.

As an example of cross-national/cross-cultural work, this case highlighted recommendations from a variety of sources on working for collaboration. Tyson, Benton, Christenson, Golloh, and Traore (1997) have called for cross-cultural

\(^1\) These linkages help to form a vibrant civil society (Putnam, 1993). School is one aspect of civil society, an aspect that naturally brings the varied interests of a society into contact (Patrick, 1996; Parker, 1996). Also, I described the role of collaboration in creating education for democracy, especially in emerging democracies such as Poland. Many have discussed the role of schools in developing and supporting a democratic society (Dewey, 1916; Parker, 1996; Patrick, 1996).
experiences to include both content and process goals, to "develop projects and assessments that bring together goals in content and pedagogy". The sharing of efforts helped build education for democracy and brought Poles and Americans together in this work.

The collaboration involved a slowly evolving role for me. In the beginning I planned to observe and question, but eventually my role changed. I became more involved in these efforts. As a result of this work third-party teacher/experts (OECD, 1996) were seen as knowledgeable professionals who could impact and alter the direction of teacher education reforms in Poland.

SIGNPOST— First Organizational Meeting in Columbus, January 13, 1997

This morning was to be the first "official meeting of the program." Already the group has spent a day in Columbus touring campus, some walking around town and dining at Professor Remy's welcoming dinner. After a late night, the group walked over to the Mershon Center this morning from their bed and breakfast. They had eaten a large breakfast at 9:00 am. We were going to start at 10:00 am. For those of us from Columbus the weather is very cold and the conditions harsh. The Poles seem to be handling things quite well. As

---

2 OECD (1996) identified two areas in education that needed to receive concentrated attention. They were environmental education and civic education. They also recommended the use of third party teacher networks to push systemic reform efforts. Third party teacher networks are based on groups of teachers operating separately from schools and other educational institutions.

Schools, and those who work in them, contribute to the development of democracy (Parker, 1996; Patrick, 1996). Collaborative projects mirror the already existing diversity and common interests, "the bedrock of a democracy strong enough to deal with modernity" (Parker, 1996, p.6). The transition to democracy in Poland is made stronger as individuals in society deliberate on issues of importance such as how to reform schools and the associated programs designed to prepare teachers (Patrick, 1996).
they arrived at the Citizenship Development offices we were greeted and welcomed. I think we are all excited to get to work. I know for me the day has finally arrived and the work I have been planning for so long is here.

We met in a small conference room on the second floor of the center. With a clear blue sky and three-story glass atrium, the sun poured in. The group gathered around a circular conference table with eight chairs. As people prepared themselves it appears that they have come for "work." They placed dictionaries at their side, and carefully arranged their papers, pens and materials. Agnes even had an electronic translator....

Explaining School and University Collaboration

The need for collaboration has been well described by a variety of authors and groups (Book, 1996; Darling-Hammond, 1996; Dixon and Ishler, 1992). The reasons for collaborating, however, are less often discussed. Collaboration appears to be crucial for educators in emerging democracies. One reason for collaboration can be

---

3 Reasons for collaboration vary greatly and involve a number of possible reasons. Many theories are given in answer to the question 'Why collaborate'? Johnston and Kirschner (1996) argue, "Educators claim collaboration will not only provide the means to redesign schooling but will counter the isolation, hierarchies, and competitive aspects of schooling and society" (p.146). Others have also talked about building a new knowledge base for teaching, one based on theoretical and practical experiences (Holmes, 1986). Still others have made the teacher role in reform efforts the core reason for participation in collaboration. When teachers play an active role in shaping the agenda and the implementation of school reform efforts, it is inevitable that reform itself will become a contested notion. As teachers are called to play increasingly important roles in school-based and district level decision making, their research provides systematic evidence for and serious questions about, what goes on in schools (Cochran-Smith and Lytle, p.320). Lieberman (1995) described the "need to understand not only the variety of collaborative arrangements, but what people get from these relationships and what it takes to sustain them" (p.6).
the ability of projects such as school/university collaboration to contribute to education for democracy and ultimately to the strengthening of democracy itself⁴. As the participants entered the first official meeting a variety of reasons were held up as justifying the time and effort needed for collaboration to succeed.

The Organizational Meeting of Participants

The first organizational meeting of the group of Polish educators with their American collaborators reflected efforts to create new courses and teachers to teach them. The meeting began with the Polish participants introducing themselves and to talking about what they hoped to do with the information they gathered. Each person was responsible for preparing a presentation for the Center for Citizenship Education in Warsaw. As the meeting began, the director of the program shared the early history of Education for Democratic Citizenship in Poland's efforts.

⁴ In describing civil society and its role in strengthening democracy Putnam (1993) described the importance of creating multiple allegiances in a democratic society. He posited that it was the existence of horizontal, non-hierarchical linkages that generated "social capital" (p.170). Solving the dilemmas of society in horizontally structured organizations fostered institutional success in the broader community. He called for those interested in supporting the development of democracy to work at "building a more civic community" (p.185). The work of Putnam (1993) has shown the importance of relationships and linkages across traditional barriers of institution, class, and culture in the development of a well functioning democracy. Patrick (1996) has previously linked descriptive work on the role of civil society to the role of schools and educators. Clearly schools have a role to play and it is related to the development of a well functioning civil society (Patrick, 1996)

Education as a public policy issue quickly arose during the transformation from communism in Central and Eastern Europe. Elites in positions of authority schools seem to believe this offers the opportunity to institutionalize and consolidate practices and the change in governmental forms. To local populations the transformation has brought with it a chance to acquire a measure of control over the schools their children attend.

Control over schools usually plays out in a variety of ways: the content of curriculum, authority to hire and fire teachers, financing and facilities. Devolution to local control is a common attribute of educational change in democratic transitions (OECD, 1996) Transformations result in the pull and tug of three spheres of authority (parental, professional, and political) rather than a centralized political elite. As such they serve as one example of civil society and reflect the methods of deliberation so important to democratic consolidation.
As with any cross-cultural program or collaborative, discussion and clarification of terms is an important part of the beginning of the meeting. It was crucial that our conversation began with defining the terms of collaborative work. We had learned from a conference in the fall of 1996 the problems of direct translation. A rather confused group of Polish participants sat and listened as the translator told them about ‘field professors,’ which in Polish translated to ‘professors standing out in fields’. Today during this session Professor Remy defined the term. Professor Remy, an Ohio State University professor and co-director of EDCP, began by discussing his experience. In the Social Studies and Global Education PDS ‘field professors’ were classroom teachers who shared the planning and teacher with professors. They taught seminars, supervised preservice students during their experiences in schools and assessed their progress. Field professors, along with other cooperating teachers in the schools make up the schools’ contribution to school/university collaboration.

As the session continued I listened as a researcher to the discussion. I also observed the actions of the Polish participants, their body language and the way they handled themselves. As a member of the Citizenship Development team, I had given this presentation before. I knew this presentation yet today I tried to listen with new ears. I had given this presentation before. I believed in the assumption that history and civic education can improve democracy and help create a democratic culture. I believed that this work, school and university collaboration, would help the teaching and learning that occurred in the classrooms of participants. During the meeting I sat and listened as the group of Polish educators heard these words from Professor Remy.

Remy continued, “In Poland we have always believed the tremendous need for new, good teaching materials. Good instructional materials are needed to improve

---

5 Patrick (1996) has previously discussed the damage done to the terms used to describe democratic governance. Communist parties and governments used the same terms but twisted their meaning so as to destroy their essence.
teaching. We also have to be concerned that we get the materials into the hands of the teachers, which is why the second component has been teacher education.”

He described that the teacher education components involved both inservice and preservice aspects. That education in universities and pedagogical institutions was in the long run very important. Trying to do a better job in the first place, rather than retraining after graduation was identified as the core reason for a concentration on teacher education. The key to changing teaching/learning was described as good materials and “people such as yourself who can educate teachers”. The group was told “This is where you fit in....” (Remy, 1997, unpublished presentation)

Use of Teacher Created Curriculum Materials

Remy described the major challenge and opportunity for this group as making use of lesson scenarios and materials to help Polish teachers strengthen their capabilities, to serve as a bridge. As pedagogical specialists, they were told of the importance of understanding the theory and concepts behind the ideas and work.

The meeting continued with a description of the assumption that PDS is good for both teacher education and inservice education. They heard that PDS was a better way to connect theory and practice. That PDS helps both teachers and teacher educators to do a better job in teacher education. “In fact theory is based on practice.... it is practice that generates theory....” (Remy, 1997, unpublished, presentation).

Next Remy told the group about the work of the Holmes group. In 1990 the Holmes group (1986), expanded. It included 100 universities whose Deans came together to talk about teacher education reform. They were concerned about the separation of theory and practice, of universities and schools. The conventional way of

---

6 Cochran-Smith and Lytle (1992) describe the competing notions of insider/outsider perspectives and this first session of participant observation brought this out.
learning to teach was for the preservice teachers to go to the school and be told ‘forget what the university told you. I (the classroom teacher) will teach you’.

Some have described their attempts at reforming the situation as resulting in a third ‘institution,’ an institution composed of people not places. The Social Studies and Global Education PDS of The Ohio State University was such an example of a Professional Development School both in practice and theory. Using the recommendations of the Holmes Group, the teacher education program in Social Studies at The Ohio State University began to adopt the professional development school model.

Some ideas will work in Poland and some won’t. We can show you what we do; you decide what you can use. Each subject area at Ohio State began to organize reform efforts in their own way. Our program started what is now called ‘The Social Studies PDS Network…

What we do in our program is not a perfect land or a fantasyland. We hope as a result of practice, that teachers involved will improve their teaching. It would be ideal if they were all interested in refining and developing their skills. We count on them to recruit teachers with similar interests and commitment. Through the interaction we hope they learn from each other. Included in the program are three university professors and 27 field professors. These individuals come together to plan what the preservice courses look like (Remy, presentation).

The group wondered how the field professors (teachers) were selected? He told them the field professors are selected by reputation and observation. If individuals involved

---

7 Other professors in the OSU PDS in Social Studies and Global education have selected teachers to become field professors on these criteria: their excellence in teaching, their knowledge and practice of global education, and their leadership in their school districts. (See Merryfield and Chase, In press 1999; Dove, Norris, and Shinew, 1997; Shapiro and Merryfield, 1995; Merryfield, 1998) Professor Remy seemed to be trying to convince the Poles that they would be able to find teachers who could do
know someone at a conference or by reputation the group will ask him or her to participate. A teacher will say, “I know someone...” Field professors are interested and willing to do this. The Poles were told they don’t get a lot of money, just $500. The field professors have to want to do this for other reasons. They were told it ends up being twenty-seven people and twenty-seven reasons. The reasons Dr. Remy listed included the opportunity to learn from each other, hear lectures from national experts in various areas of the social studies, even trips to Poland. Recognition letters were sent to the principal or to the superintendent. The program tried to give rewards so the field professors feel like they get something out of this.

As I listened to the presentation I summarized the key ideas and concepts presented in my notes. I listed them as:

1) a realization that the collaborative work is evolving and imperfect,
2) recruitment of teachers was presented as a complex process,
3) forms of compensation differ but reinforce the need of participants to gain something from their efforts even if the ‘compensation’ is the exchange of ideas.

These issues described the formation of one example of a PDS. For the Polish educators it represented significant differences from their expectations. They expected that only the “best” teachers would be chosen. They believed that only ‘perfect’ teachers were prepared to participate. They expected that compensation would be higher for the work required. And they were surprised to hear that there were in fact many different models of professional development schools.

this work. The Poles appeared to want the ‘perfect’ teacher. They wanted to find people who already exhibited the qualities of a well prepared teachers. By using the words “not necessarily the best”, I believe he opened the door for them to proceed. By making them feel comfortable beginning with “imperfect” individuals they could feel more confidence about beginning the work. Also much of this information was specific to one cohort of the Social Studies PDS and has since changed.
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School/University Collaboration as a Means for Changing Roles

One goal of a PDS is to change how college professors and classroom teachers think of themselves. What does being a teacher mean? Does it mean being a colleague? Does it mean reading journals? Meeting with other educators? It is the difference between this type of description and the image of the teacher in the classroom, who closes the door and enters their own world. It can be rewarding but not the same. During this meeting and presentation Remy described attempts at involving classroom teachers in activities that occur outside the classroom.

I sat and listened as the presentation continued. I took notes on what the group was being told. The Polish educators were very serious and listening intently. While talking about Dewey’s notion of democracy as associated living, Parker (1996) has said “interaction among a group’s members entails numerous and varied interests that are consciously shared... Interplay between and among groups is wide ranging... Common interests and multiple reference points are joined and nurtured” (p.5). The description of a professional development school may fit the essential underpinnings of Dewey’s notion of democracy as associated living. However, at this point the Poles did not interact or react much to the information they were hearing.

Personal Descriptions and Beliefs of Participants Related to Collaboration

Later during the first interviews I had the opportunity to discuss each participant’s understanding of school and university collaboration. Many of these individuals had been present at the fall 1996 conference in Poland where Americans described professional development schools in detail. The Poles had agreed to participate in collaborative projects involving teachers from the Center for Citizenship Education. These projects were to involve work with teacher preparation programs.
The Poles shared their views of collaboration with me. Isa drew a diagram (See Figure 4.1).

During the discussions it became clear to me that there were very large differences in opinion as to what would come from collaboration and who would benefit. Andrzej and Magda seemed to hold views farthest apart. Over the course of our time together, each had served as the major speaker or spokesperson for the group. They obviously were involved in a tug of war related to their ideas. Both seemed concerned as to whose ideas would take primacy in the discussions.

![Diagram](image)

Figure 4.1 Isa's View of Collaboration

While interviewing Andrzej I asked him about his conceptualization of collaboration. He answered,
"In the past there were many layers of people in charge who came down from the ministry and said here is what you have to do and so the change with democracy eliminated those layers or just changed their authority, because the layers are still there...."

I continued, "And so what do you think schools get from working with universities?"

"I think (schools get ) new methods....new ways...." He paused and a look of concern came across his face, "but now I don’t know....it is my opinion that our professors at universities....I think they are very old and they don’t know a lot. They are thinking only about their careers, only about books, only about theory and about money.

I then asked, "And do the universities learn anything from the schools?"

He answered, "How to work with children. Teachers have a lot of experience and they show the universities how the real school is like.

Finally I asked, "What should the relationship be between universities and schools?"

He answered, "I think that they should organize meetings and exchange views and ideas. Students should go to schools and observe a teacher teach."

The interview concluded soon after. In this short period of time he had raised one of the critical issues for school and university collaboration in the Polish context. Did Polish teacher educators have something to offer classroom-based teachers? Would it help improve education? Clearly, Andrzej was not sure there was a benefit for schools.

Soon after I talked to Magda, a teacher educator from the Pedagogical University. Her first words said it all,
I asked, "Why do you think schools and universities working together is good?"

"I don't know if it is good (laugh)" she answered. She continued in a few minutes later, "I try to ask why? why? I think that I can learn more than I know at this moment about methodology and active methods and about other problems that I speak about. I was interested in this program. I would like to change, to change the system of education in my way, my university. I decided to write a program of civic education and I decided to try to do it. I don't know what we'll do.

I asked her, "What does school/university collaboration mean?"

She answered, "Schools come in and help in improving training in the profession. [They] link experience. It is very good for students. I like students to practice [lessons] in civic education. I like students [to see] active methods in this playing. It is playing..."

During the session with Magda and Agnes, the two teacher educators, I went to the board and drew... "University.....school when you have collaboration between these two and you have a student who goes from here to here and comes back and goes back and forth....what does the school gain from this work?

Magda--Yes, I was a teacher I know what the teacher receives --knowledge, knowledge. What knowledge? She learns more, teachers learn more.... because the teacher reads and reads. When he conducts his lesson teacher advisor is there watching first.... but every teacher is a very important person in the school. (See Figure 4.2) The other teacher [is] an important person. The teacher has knowledge, not only of subject but it is the knowledge of the subject of history. It is also the knowledge of methodology. And another, I think that
the teacher takes [to the] university a modern conception about the teacher profession....

In these three brief explanations I saw three different views of collaboration. Isa believed each institution brought something. Universities had “knowledge of methods” and schools had the experience of “put[ting] theory to the test”. In Andrzej’s description he questioned what it was universities had to offer. He raised concerns. “but now I don’t know... it is my opinion ....they don’t know a lot.” In his experience the benefits appeared to be largely one way. The teachers had knowledge that they could bring to the university. Finally, Magda told me that the teacher receives “knowledge” from participation in collaborative activities. She also identified benefits for the university. “The teacher takes (to the) university a modern conception about the teacher profession...”
Figure 4.2 Magda’s View of Collaboration

These brief excerpts highlighted some of the feelings shared by the participants as they discussed issues of collaboration. The honest words of Madga (“I don’t know if it is good...”) set the stage for a struggle to find common ground that would occupy much of the meetings and discussions. Knowledge continued to rise up as an area of greatest concern for these individuals. Who has it? How is it shared? For them the ideas and issues related to ‘active teaching methods’ were crucial. What Magda and others called “playing” was viewed as essential to civic education in Poland.
During these discussions I found myself wanting to engage in the discussion and share my views. I would run to the chart paper as an aid in constructing meaning and we would draw and discuss the images that appeared on the paper. Ultimately we came back again and again to the need for collaboration. That despite the struggle we agreed that there was something to be gained from the efforts of all of us.

Beginning Collaborative Work

SIGNPOST— Organizational Meeting (cont.)
January 13, 1997, Columbus, Ohio

The meeting ended with a discussion of the program of the visit. Each of the teachers and teacher educators, individually or together will develop a "presentation". They will gather materials, ideas, and suggestions for an article.

The idea of university and school people working together to create these presentations will provide them an opportunity to discuss what would be important for teachers to know. What would be important for teacher educators to know? The whole group will be involved in the dialogue about teaching methodologies. They will make decisions about the forms of the presentations; how long, what kinds of activities.

For me the meeting had been overwhelming. But clearly the Poles had not talked very much. Today had been their day to sit and listen....

---

8 Janet Miller (1990) in her writings told me that she felt a "need to grapple with portrayals of concrete situations in which teachers grappled with contradictions and constraints that inhibited or blurred their desires to participate in the reciprocity of dialogue and action" (p.5-6).
Through Shared Tasks

How do you begin collaboration? The Polish educators did not have the luxury of simply arguing this issue. They had to begin the work of preparing presentations. Over and over again individuals have pointed out the need for trust, for time, and in many cases suggested the development of products as a way of entering collaboration. Issues of power, and control and authority play heavily within the concept of collaboration.

SIGNPOST—January, 14, 1997—Session with Dr. Laben (simulations)

Today we spent the day in Rm. 320 of the Mershon Center. The weather was stormy and cold (matching the feelings and actions in the room). In the course of the day I saw frustration and anxiety as the Poles listened and questioned one of the American experts who had

9 “Issues of authority and power also surround our own collaboration with them.... How do we make sure we work with teachers and not on them?” (Pappas, et. al. 1993). In her (Pappas, et. al., 1993) work she identifies three interrelated themes on collaboration:
1) “we found that it is important that all of us claim and acknowledge our expertise.” Teachers are experts on their constructions of teaching learning, students and practice, and university based have their own expertise to share.... “We have access to theories and practices in.... that can be used, not as accepted wisdom, but as rich generative conceptual frameworks....” (p.302).
2) As collaborators weave these understandings constructed from their worlds and experiences the power arrangements must move forward. “Thus, we believe that the differing power/knowledge relationships that we bring from our respective social networks (Nespor & Brayske, 1991) need to be acknowledged as an unresolvable paradox....” (p.302).
3) In their experience they learned how important a sense of community and community responsibility are to teachers and their work.... in classrooms and in the other aspects of their lives.
come to share his expertise on the use of simulations. The requirement that the group write articles or activities based on what they heard about simulations seemed to translate into a very serious attitude on this day. The seriousness also seemed to ratchet the antagonism between the classroom teachers and the teacher educators...

Dr. Laben began the day by setting the stage for his work. He described his considerable experience in Central and Eastern Europe working with political scientists who are in process of developing new constitutions. Early in his career he was interested in mediation and the use of simulations. He described simulations as valuable in large part due to the sociological effects he believed they had. Now he serves as a constitutional consultant, where he has also been interested in simulations. Dr. Laben described using a simulation as a way of teaching Central and Eastern European constitutional scholars about issues that arise in the process of constitution building. He also spends a lot of time working with teachers at institutes and conferences on constitutional issues and simulations.

He began laying out the particulars of the use of simulations in education. The essential element of a simulation is being a role player in the simulation itself. The best simulations are repetitive and simplistic. These Polish educators are not new to simulations. As Ursula said during the session “I have (lesson) scenarios with constitutions....”

The group members took a lot of notes, including, for the first time, the teacher educators Magda and Agnes. It appeared to me that it was one of the first times they heard something new, something they wanted to remember. The seating arrangement in the room again found that Magda and Agnes sat next to each other at the long rectangular table.
Agnes (speaking to Dr. Laben) “my students are going to school and will learn with students and they will learn with exercises of active teaching methods... [in partnership with Ursula.]”

Dr. Laben commented on the effect this group of Poles was having on other individuals. He described it as fairly new to have work between university and schools. Isa told him that they are now working on presentations so that they can work with and teach future teachers.

The simulation Magda is working on is her first lesson scenario. Andrej mentions the individuals he is working with back in Poland. He is a teacher trainer of teachers who teach with a new curriculum program designed by the center in Warsaw. He is working with group of teachers of history and other subjects who want to become teachers of civic education.

Dr. Laben. “One learns by doing. When you are teaching teachers you must tell them to evaluate the results of their teaching. If you don’t you have not engaged in role playing. The people who participate must engage in evaluation of their evaluation and their participation...leading to revision of the simulation.

Students can’t be expected to become “mayor” and know what to do. As teacher part ( of the job) is the preparation. If you don’t do preparation you’ll get a naïve response. The essential part of role-playing technique is preparation of information base for teachers to use. Other wise you will teach them something other than what you want to. It is essential to say “now we play roles... 

Preparation -----evaluation (without evaluation you have fun but not education)

This engages their mind and their imagination. As Plato said, if you can get

---

10 ‘Lesson scenarios’ was the name for the lessons the Center for Citizenship Education in Warsaw used in their materials and training.
their imagination the rest will follow. You will have to pick useful, possible games. One never apologizes for first, second, third attempts. You have to establish borders, students have to have something manageable, simulations are therefore always simplified—efficiency and optimally. Social and political systems do not have predetermined outcomes....
The outside observer has to ask, for my own consumption, what do I see? How are they doing on what they say they want. How do I assist them to know what happened?"

Dr. Laben quickly laid out key ideas for the Poles to consider. Simulations require preparation. Simulations require repetition. The simulation must provide information and details to the teacher and the students before it will be successful. During the course of the work sessions with Dr. Laben Andrzej directed most of the interaction. Over the two days of sessions and activities all of the Poles seemed to stay engaged and involved. While they all are taking lots of notes, it is Andrzej who I see directing questions, probing for greater depth on the topic—asking for examples, and discussing types of simulations.

During the second session a translator was hired to join the group and participate in the activities. The group had decided against simultaneous translation. Dr. Laben felt that the group was understanding him well enough and that the translation would slow down his efforts. The translator sat next to Magda and Agnes quietly translating for them. While lots of new information was flying around the room, the translator went to the board and began to write down a few terms related to simulations for the group. At one point she stopped and turned and spoke to the project staff and to Dr. Laben. "(paraphrased) They are teacher trainers [with the center in Warsaw].... they have been doing these [simulations]. For Magda and Agnes
everything is very new, not the idea itself, but the process of adopting it into schools. What may be good for the teacher educators might be review for the teachers.'

Dr. Laben responded "this is why they should be talking to each other." This point, that teachers and teacher educators needed to exchange views with each other, was a crucial one and highlighted these two days. The teachers had experience with active teaching methods and wanted to sharpen their skills. The teacher educators wanted to be introduced to the methods and to ask questions at a very basic level. Perhaps collaboration begins when participants on both sides begin to realize the differences in their knowledge base.

The session continued with the Poles discussing an imaginary situation that is to be created. As the discussion went on, Magda and Agnes begin to ask lots of questions about how to build the context for what will occur. The group began to set up a simulation they would all participate in Saturday morning. Dr. Laben assigned tasks and each of us began to read and hear about their role. Magda became a Japanese Catholic inhabitant of an island nation with a fictional name. Others will represent the varied interests of the new island nation.

During a break, the teachers went downstairs to the kitchen to get hot water for tea. They were quietly whispering to each other and seemed somewhat stressed about something. I walked in and the conversation did not stop.

"They know nothing...." one of them said,

I responded "That is why you are here...."

They went on about the teacher educators complete lack of knowledge about the questions being asked. The questions being asked in Polish indicated that they did not understand what is being discussed. The teachers felt their time was being wasted and they were angry and mad.
When we got back upstairs the teacher educators were with the translator at the board discussing terminology from simulations and clarifying various points about how to run one. When we returned to the discussion of warm-ups and particulars about directing simulations it was Agnes who was asking most of the questions.

In my notes I asked "how could we have created a situation that validated the teachers knowledge, and asked them to share their expertise? Could we have adjusted roles here? While Magda and Agnes continue to take a lot of notes, Isa shared her experiences based on her attempts in the classroom back in Poland to use simulations.

Again I wrote in my notes about how this discussion was a wasted opportunity to develop trust in the teachers' knowledge base. In a second discussion during the next break, some of the project staff, reminded me that there seems to be animosity in the body language being generated by the teachers in the group. I was reminded to think about how many of the teachers may in fact have become close minded. Are they trying to stretch their knowledge? Or to expand what they know based on Dr. Laben's experiences? Could Magda and Agnes be playing a role with a peer or a fellow professor? Later I asked Andrzej about the sessions,

The difference was huge. Teachers know activity, methods. They know the possibilities of students, their ways of thinking. Teachers live in the reality of school life. I needed (personally) only support. I would like to meet a lot of people who are working with education and be able to exchange our views. Teacher educators from the universities need someone to break their indifference. I hope future networks will bring better understanding for both groups [theory and practice are integral] and will help in preparing the preservice teacher education program. I wanted to show educators effective strategies needed to help teacher education students make connections from what they learn in methods courses to what is happening in the classroom.
As I listened to Andrzej’s words I felt both agreement and anger. It appeared to me that Andrzej was unwilling to see the growth he was still capable of. Instead, he claimed that his knowledge was complete. It was only the teacher educators who needed to ‘learn’ something. At the same time I knew what he meant. He knew about the methods being discussed. He had trained other people on how to use them. I found his struggle with the process we were engaged in to be representative of the struggle to acknowledge and yet further the knowledge of teachers.

Through Dialog and Deliberation
The time in Columbus flew by quickly. The days were filled with visits to schools, observations of PDS seminars, and the shopping, dining and entertaining that goes with cross-cultural collaboration. At the end of the time in Columbus the entire group sat down to talk. It was the first time I had brought the whole group to one table to talk about the issues we found emerging through our discussions on collaboration. In my original plans I modeled this after the work of Guba and Lincoln (1989) who talk about stakeholder groups sharing their views with each other. In order to make this discussion less threatening, I moved our discussion to my home. I planned an evening where we would hold a discussion over wine, cheese, crackers and coffee. After the discussion we would fix a lasagna dinner together. In my own way I hoped that the act of breaking bread would help to deal with the high emotions I feared would happen.

This final discussion centered on the time in Columbus. It pointed out the difficulties of trying to convey the sense of a model (PDS) in a very short period of

---

11 Gitlin (1990) has talked about something he calls the “productive model” (p.538) of educational reform. It uses what teachers know and works to help them express this knowledge. Then, in order to work with the teachers on improving instruction new methods emerge from the teachers and their understanding of schooling. Walker (1997) calls this type of work border crossings (p.138). Educators from both cultures use language, both everyday and academic to learn, describe and analyze “what practitioners know and do in their classrooms” (p.138).
time. The group had been exposed to a professional development school model very briefly. They had been introduced to it during the conference in September of 1996 in Poland and they had heard about professional development schools during these three weeks. It wasn’t the only model at Ohio State. It wasn’t the only model in the Social Studies and Global Education program. The discussions of the theory made a great deal of sense to the group, and the chance to hear about the operation of the PDS excited them. The group struggled to identify results of the efforts during the time at The Ohio State University. They did not accept everything they were told by the various groups associated with the PDS. They wanted proof of what worked.

When asked about their impressions of what they had seen in Columbus, the group raised concerns. They had observed a session of the methods course for pre-service teachers involved in the Social Studies and Global Education PDS. Andrzej and others were not impressed with the activities they saw.

Andrzej— ....the teachers were only sitting and hearing. They haven’t any active methods at all. Our teachers in our course have something like a workshop. They are working, together with the trainer, only on active methods. I think that is the best way because they are with somebody working. Only hearing... it isn’t a good thing. That’s my opinion....”

---

12 “Deliberation is not taking positions and scoring points to win. Deliberation is the act of weighing carefully; it implies stepping back in reflection so we can really see what is before us....”(Mathews, 1996, p.279).

13 I refer you to the work of Merryfield (1992), Johnston, M. and Kirschner, B. (1996), and others from the Ohio State University who have written about their efforts... In reporting the results of the Social Studies and Global Education Professional Development School at The Ohio State University, Shapiro and Merryfield (1995) identified the following results, “Preservice teachers become better able to appreciate the complexity of teaching and synthesize their field and seminar experiences in new and profound ways;... learn to focus more on the processes and factors affecting how their students learn;... become more critical in their own planning and current practice, and importantly for long-term collaboration and growth;... get in habit of seeking out multiple perspectives on their planning, teaching, and assessment” (p.43)

The Holmes Group (1986) said that the concept of PDS relies on the belief that improving teaching ultimately rests on the ability of teachers to contribute “to the development of knowledge in their profession...” (p.56).
We then discussed what would be one possible defense for the fact that very little "active" teaching went on during the methods course. I described the balance between the three hours of in-school experience each day and the two hours twice a week of seminar sessions, mainly lecture and discussion. I agreed with their impression. They saw little involved, engaging instruction. I was rather defensive at this point and wanted to come up with a reason why this might be acceptable. My attempts sounded hollow.

Eventually the discussion moved in as to how to form a balance in a teacher preparation program between theory and practice. During the discussion Andrzej spoke up:

Andrzej--Little theory and big practice...

Magda-- I think about this problem, with knowledge and theory. How to give knowledge to the students? What is the way? I try to give knowledge in other (active) ways... I am surprised that the teachers (in the PDS) give knowledge (using) traditional methods...speaking to students.

Agnes-- My students like active methods with the university teacher. They like being in practice classrooms and in schools...

Andrzej-- Theory I can always find, can learn myself and pass exams... no where can you find experience.

Magda-- I am not sure because it seems to me that theory is very important. Because of this I think students have to learn theory. After this he can have practice watching. The student learns theory from two ways. One, student themselves study theory but they study theory with professor, then in school with active methods...but theory before practice.

Isa-- My opinion is we need a balance.

What is the balance? I asked.
Isa— Optimal...my students and professors practice in schools.... I think that practice is important. I will be at the university I want knowledge and the local students....

Agnes— Right now (in teacher training programs) theory, and more theory. Very, very, small practice...

Andrzej— I think the best solution is one teacher practices with a teacher at primary or secondary school. Two or three students for each teacher... (They work on how to teach.) And one year he must work with their students...

Eventually I turned the topic of the conversation back to collaboration. As we began we quickly moved to drawing for meaning. Ursula asked for a marker and paper. She began to draw what she called collaboration. She drew practice on one side of the paper. Then she drew theory on the other. She kept drawing and in the middle placed a river.

Andrzej— Collaboration is like a bridge.

Ursula— No, no...one foot...up and one foot swim, swim, swim, swim, swim... and ahh

She drew a person on one side of the paper and pretended to lift her foot and have her jump into the water. Then she drew a person on the other side and again pretended to lift a foot and have the person swim into the current of the river. They met in the middle. To my eyes the meeting doesn't look friendly.

I asked—And what are they doing? Fighting in the middle? Are they fighting in the middle or are they helping each other in the middle?

Ursula— No, but....

Andrzej— If they can't swim....

Ursula— Next, next, example, example, one people one people, swim, swim, swim
She continued to draw individuals on each side of the paper, the theory and practice side. The individuals climbed into the water and swam to the middle. It didn’t look like they were helping each other much. It doesn’t look like there is an exchange going on, but as she draws it becomes very difficult to tell which side of the river the individual jumped in on and the current seems to move them farther down the flow of water.

John— And what can collaboration do?
Ursula-- AHHHHHHHHHHH
John-- Build the bridge that Andrzej described?
Ursula-- Yes, yes, yes...
Andrzej-- Maybe like PDS.....

The group laughed about Ursula’s drawing, but in the laughter there seemed to be recognition of what was being attempted. The struggle to link theory and practice had begun. This group of individuals seemed set on a course that recognized that they each needed the other. They were talking with each other. They were deliberating on issues of importance. They were sharing experiences and knowledge with each other. They seemed to recognize that if the goal was to have well prepared teachers of civic education, both classroom teachers and teacher educators would need to be involved.\(^1\)

**Conclusion**

During the first few weeks of this case study the group remained in Columbus, Ohio. While they were here they heard much about the theory of collaboration between

\(^1\) Christenson, et. al. (1996) described, "Collaboration in short, is a powerful means of significant and lasting personal growth that may, through our other relationships, lead to substantial organizational change." The lessons learned from collaboration include, "If the PDS project has done anything extraordinary, it is that it has put people in difficult circumstances and also provided a separate, supportive space for dealing with the consequences of those circumstances.... I have now come to understand collaboration as creating more power rather than sharing a given quantity of power (Christenson, et.al., 1996).
schools and universities. They listened to descriptions of why groups at The Ohio State University have also been involved in these discussions and they observed the activities of one Professional Development School. They also experienced a simulation and found that the knowledge the teachers and teacher educators brought to this project was different and substantial. Teacher and teacher educators involved themselves in deliberation and left the city with a broad understanding of the issue. Would they agree to continue their collaborative projects? What would they take with them? Would they be willing to continue swimming in the river that Ursula had held up as metaphor.

Rozewicz’s (1994) poem from the beginning of this chapter comes back to me when I think about the difficulties of collaboration. As individuals we enter collaborative work sure of things, set in our beliefs and collaboration forces us to be both stubborn in those beliefs and submissive within our stubbornness.

This group’s experience with deliberation had left us tired, confused and unsure about what the next step would be. The next stop on our trip was in the center of Michigan where we would have a chance to put these issues under the light of comparison.

I am
stubborn
and submissive in my stubbornness
like wax
only thus can I
impress the world

(“Solution” by Tadeusz Rozewicz, 1994)
CHAPTER 5
COMPARISON: A THIRD STRATEGY

Introduction

In the winter of 1997 the group of Polish teachers and teacher educators continued their travels around the United States by flying from Columbus, Ohio to Detroit and other areas of central Michigan. Ultimately, they concluded their visit by spending a few days in Washington, D.C. By interacting with civic educators and professors engaged in collaborative projects in Michigan they hoped to gain a better understanding of the choices available as they planned reform efforts in Poland.

In this chapter I describe the role of memory, experience and comparison for participants in this study. The participants seemed to be influenced by history. I describe how memory, experience and comparison influenced the planning of reform efforts in civic teacher education in Poland. Memories included the experiences of societal change in the transition to democracy in 1989 and the broader cultural memory of World War II and its aftermath. These two major events emerged in our discussions and interviews as critical influences on their teaching, on their beliefs as to the role of schools in a democracy, and on their beliefs about how teacher education should be constructed in the future. In the history of Poland the attainment of “nationhood” has been a saga played out on the international stage.

Experience for the participants included the events and activities of the previous two weeks in the United States. It also included the experiences of each participant in Poland. Last of all, comparison was the opportunity to view a different way of
organizing professional development schools. It was also the opportunity to see how another university organized Social Studies teacher education.

Memories, experience and comparison also played a part in the personal theorizing participants shared (Grant, 1996). Participants from both the classroom and teacher education institutions entered the project with theories developed from their own beliefs, study, and memories. They also entered with theories developed from their own personal experiences. In this case the theories focused on the broad topic of teacher education. Many of their theories focused on the role of schools in a democracy. The theories had implications for the training and preparation of new teachers of civic education. As participants encountered the comparative experiences of the exchange, their personal theories were altered.

Finally, throughout these discussions the process of cross-cultural collaboration continued as the Polish educators and I traveled from Ohio, Michigan and Washington D.C. In this case, the travel to other sites provided another piece of evidence for the importance of comparison and the value of experience as one means of building deeper understanding of school/university collaboration. The comparative experiences helped the international collaborators identify what to take home to their own context.

Building Understanding

The individuals in this study found themselves at the center of a sea of influences. Each of these individuals had personal experiences with the transition to

---

1 Kreisberg (1992) has discussed the concept of “reciprocal influences”, influences that involve “the complex interactions and interdependent relationships among parts of a whole” (p.79).
2 Constructivist theory describes a model of learning based on three components (Scheurmann, 1998). First there is what is already known by the individual. These bits of information lay connected to a context and structure or framework. Second, as individuals have new experiences, the experiences cause the person to reevaluate what they “knew”. Finally, they construct new meaning and new understandings.

For teachers there are two major impacts of this theory on our craft. First is the way in which constructivist teaching theory affects the way we design units of practice in the classroom or lessons when working with our students. Second, and perhaps more important in the context of this study, is
democracy in 1989. Each of these individuals spoke of the impact of World War II on teaching, education and teacher education. Each person had particular experiences and beliefs related to democratic educational reform. From these influences they had constructed images of the roles for schools in a democracy and civic teacher education. By providing discrepant experiences, experiences different from their conceptualization of school/university collaboration, the cross-cultural work had begun to alter beliefs, alter assumptions and lead to new constructions of the possibilities of teacher education reform.

Memories of Change

How do we identify the key aspects of a person’s life or experiences? What would this group of Polish civic educators leave as the mark of their time and their work and their words, arguments and vision? Would anyone look on the events of these few weeks and what would they make of it?

The group of teachers and teacher educators moved to a partner site in Michigan, The Center for Education through Law. While there, the group visited many museums. At one point, while walking out of the Michigan State Museum of History, Andrej turned and began reciting a stanza from a poem. Later in Washington D.C. he would help me find a collection of works by the same author and in the collection we found the poem that spoke so strongly.

Scheurman (1998) has said that constructivism is most compatible with teaching approaches that encourage “creative reflection on objects, events and cultural experience” (p.6). I believe this case serves to expand this notion to include design of cross-cultural experiences and collaborative work. For participants in this work, open-ended inquiry into problems and creative reflection strengthened understanding of the issues of school/university collaboration and civic education teacher education reform. Inquiry and experience helped participants create their own unique understandings.
Here are the plates but no appetite
And weddings rings, but the requited love
Has been gone for some three hundred years.

Here's a fan -- where is the maiden's blush?
Here are swords -- where is ire?
Nor will the lute sound at the twilight hour.....

...The crown has outlasted the head.
The hand has lost out to the glove.
The right shoe has defeated the foot....

(Wisława Szymborska, 1995)

The individuals in this group had lived through the experience of the transitions of 1989. They had strong family/personal memories of World War Two and its impact on Poland. And in this context of memory Andrej questioned what was to be left behind when we are all gone. What will we leave to show that we tried to make things better.

The transition to democracy altered all aspects of life in Poland. As a communist country, the state had tried to control as many aspects of everyday life as possible. After experiencing social movements during the 1970's and 80's that resulted in strikes, shortages of goods, and eventually martial law, the Poles had found ways to make sense of the unimaginable. Events of that time affected the thinking of each individual. These events contributed to the national memory of pain and anguish the Poles spoke of as they recounted the struggle to create a nation.

On the trip in Michigan the group visited an example of Polish cultural life and memory in the United States. The College of St. Mary's (Orchard Lake St. Mary's) included many aspects of life from Poland. The attempt to preserve immigrant culture was popular with the group. The presentation of a narrative history largely from the church's point of view was not. The chance to see Polish culture and attempts at
preservation for the first time brought out feelings and questions of what it meant to be part of the Polish nation.

National/Cultural Identity

The College of St. Marys (Orchard Lake St. Marys) has become a cultural center for descendants and Polish immigrants themselves. On the campus of the college are many small buildings. They house a seminary, a high school, an art museum, and a series of rooms devoted to exhibits of Polish national history.

SIGNPOST— Orchard Lake St. Marys
Tuesday, January 28, 1997

Today was our first day in Michigan. With the wind howling, frigid below zero temperatures and snow piled on the ground, we ventured to the grounds of Orchard Lake St. Marys. As we unloaded from the large van that would serve as our transportation for the next few days the group walked up to the doors of a large Catholic church. The soaring, bleached wood ceiling seemed to touch the clouds blowing past off the frozen lake. We walked up the icy sidewalk. The doors opened and out stepped a small group, three individuals dressed in traditional Polish costume and two seminarians in floor-length cassocks. In the hands of the two costumed individuals were trays of wine, bread and salt: the traditional Polish greetings. With sounds of 'Witamy' we were offered a piece of bread, a bit of salt and a glass to raise and toast our arrival.
The individuals in this location spoke Polish, a welcome change and break for the group after its time in Ohio. We proceeded inside and began to discuss the church. In the back of the church were small chapels. One for Maximilian Kolbe, a priest who had died in the Holocaust. Another small chapel had a candle burning for the victims in the forest of Katyn, and a last chapel had reminders of World War II and the Russian deportations.

Later in the day we entered the archives of the center. Occupying an entire floor of what looked like old classrooms, individual rooms contained large amounts of materials, books, pictures, maps, and informative displays about Poland, World War II and special rooms for a collection of Pope John Paul II memorabilia. Our main guide was a third generation Pole born in Hamtramck, Michigan. Over lunch we met with a group of Polish exchange students studying here. Our day ended with a short visit to the cyclorama: a moving/revolving display of Polish history (church history) that retold important events and individuals in the history of the country. Individual figures representing historical persons in the country went rolling past while a narrator intoned in Polish of their glory. The group found it a bit overbearing. The history was what they called 19th century history. It came mainly from the Catholic Church’s perspective. We eventually walked on tip toe out of the room.....

Later on the trip, when we sat and discussed the events of our travel, the day at St. Mary’s would be one of the group’s fondest memories. The relationship between culture and history, between the excitement immigrants had felt about arrival in a new
place and the memories of home, family, country was important to the Poles. As they revisited the events they talked of the surprise they felt as they learned more about the extent of immigration to the United States. They discussed the relationship between being an American and not being “ashamed of Polish culture”. And they related the sense they had of the importance of identity for Americans. “Identity is important...I can be a citizen of America, USA, but I ought to know about my, about the country of my parents, or my grandparents” Isa said.

They also made connections between phrases such as E Pluribus Unum, and the discussion that was going on in Europe as the European Union tried to forge a “Europe of nations, equality but difference” (Isa).

As we continued talking, Andrej spoke, “At one time people in Poland were ashamed of their history... but they were never ashamed here [St. Marys]. It was very important for us, this meeting with Polish culture.”

Memories of World War II

In the hotel before leaving for dinner one night, I was visiting with a few members of the group. Those present in the room seemed very interested in sharing more information from their own personal lives. As Isa, and Ursula listened, Andrej discussed the story of his mother’s family. When his mother was three years old the Nazi’s emptied the street in the town where they lived. All were sent aboard a train. The train traveled for one week across occupied Poland. They traveled and then the train sat in a siding. Individuals gave them water, bread, and milk by handing it through the small bars in the corners of the car. At the end of the week the Germans said they could leave the train. They could go. The family found a small hovel or “poor conditions” in Andrzej’s words. Eventually, his grandfather, who spoke German, got a job administering a farm. Because of his abilities they had food and
better conditions. The war ended, and they went to Warsaw. But Warsaw was
destroyed. Next they went to Wroclaw, but it was also destroyed. Finally, they went
to a small town outside the city. His grandfather was the first post-war “president” of
this town.

I was not used to people referencing historical experiences as a major part of
their life. It seemed clear to me that many of these individuals felt that I could not know
them without knowing more about their families’ experiences in Poland. The memories
of these eras came out in both general conversation and in response to specific
questions. It seemed that these events were influencing the decisions about what path
schools should follow. Family histories interacted with the beliefs members of the
group had constructed.

In the country of Poland, the struggle with historical transitions was very
apparent. Schools and the system of education in Poland had not been immune to
history. The partitioning of the country in the 18th and 19th Centuries, reunification at
the turn of this century, and the turmoil and agony of World War II had all affected the
discourse and path of educational reform efforts.

World War II itself had disastrous effects on the schools. Connelly (1996) wrote of the horrors of
this time.

In 1939 universities were closed in both Poland and the Protectorates of Bohemia and Moravia. On 6 November, the Gestapo summoned the professors of Jagiellonian University in Krakow
to a lecture entitled ‘Policies of the Third Reich and National Socialism toward Questions of
Science and Higher Education.’ Instead of hearing a lecture, the professors were arrested and
deported to Sachsenhausen. Polish higher education and secondary education were disabled for
the duration of the occupation; Nazi — and in the East, Soviet — authorities so brutalized the
Polish intelligentsia that more than one-quarter of all Polish academics failed to survive the
war.”

After the war, the schools, already suffering by the tragic events, were caught in power struggles as the
communist government took control of the state and its educational system.

During the short period between the two World Wars, Poland remained clearly opposed to
Soviet educational theories. World War II changed the situation drastically. Poland emerged
as a Communist state under growing Soviet political, social and economic influences. Since
then the population has been subjects to influences which have often clashed with the Polish
national tradition (Singer, 1965, p.7).

The end of the war and the installation of a communist government brought with it reform efforts.
Singer (1965) discussed the materials the communist authorities needed for classrooms in the post-war
school system.
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For me the reading of these events had a profound impact. I read Singer (1965) while the group was here. I had read Malak-Minkewicz (1996) before their arrival. Janowski (1992) and Putkewicz (1993) also played a part in the reading I was doing during the data collection process. The discussions of national struggle played out in both the printed words I was reading and in the issues being debated by the group.

Agnes said to us while discussing the transition, "history has changed, especially since 1989. There are more and more ‘blank’ spots discovered...". The transition to democratic governance influenced and was influenced by the individuals in this group. Their choices and decisions would be small parts of the grand drama playing out as Poles struggled to define nationhood and freedom.

**Issues of Transition**

The Polish participants in this group shared their impressions of the 1980's.

The transition from a communist to democratic government had occurred during those years. They were years of severe struggles for food. They were also years during which ideas and beliefs were battlegrounds. During our discussions Isa talked of her experiences.

In a doctrinaire system, especially the History faculty must conform. It is Marx, Lenin... And the students they too must be conformist. But I can tell

---

The books had to be rewritten because the Polish prewar textbooks could not be used in the new Communist state. But the difficulties were not strong enough to soften the spirit of rebellion and nearly all the textbooks translated from Russian disappeared from the schools. This became especially noticeable in subjects such as history, literature and pedagogical subjects (p.64)."

---

4 Many individuals have discussed the schools of the communist era (Hamot, 1996; Janowski, 1992, 1996; Malak-Minkiewicz, 1996; Putkewicz, 1993). Schools reflected political realities. The fundamental feature of the Polish school system under communism was uniformity; uniform types of schools throughout the country, a uniform curriculum for all schools of a given type, curriculum requirements equally obligatory of all students, and uniform textbooks for every subject and every grade level. The students had to master the same knowledge regardless of the school they attended (Malak-Minkiewicz, 1996, p.94).

The effects of communist educational reform efforts were not as clear as most expect. Discrepancy between the stated ideal and reality in life was important to remember. "Some teachers
you a lot of graduates of history faculty were exactly non-conformist. The word is contestation... They met together and talked about democracy, tolerance, human rights, and when they wanted to tell their students something... it was very big theatre. It was different for some teachers. They teach only the official, only the official. But especially young teachers would want to say something about Western Europe, the USA, NATO. Books passed underground and passed from one colleague to another and another and another...

Isa's description of a system of "theatre" didn't deny the attempts made to bring the system into line. The Ministry of Education and Communist Party made attempts to direct the results. "Wholly dependent on Soviet pedagogy, teacher education at the universities, teacher colleges, and teacher high schools [were] used as a system of indoctrination and a tool of political selection by the communist regime" (Malak-Minkiewicz, 1996, p.96).

Attempts to raise the level of teacher candidates had limited success (Putkiewicz, 1996; Malak-Minkewicz, 1996). Despite the lack of complete adherence to all communist reform efforts, schools and teachers were looked on with suspicion. They were viewed as a tool of the government. Since the change in government there employed slight variations of teaching styles...." was how Hamot (1996) stated it. Another researcher (Putkiewicz, 1996) said, "Communist theory was never complete in Poland". Individuals admitted to so called "teachers courses" in various university departments were those who acquired insufficiently good marks to be admitted to other professions" (Malak-Minkiewicz, 1996, p.96). Many experts today reflecting on the actions talk of a situation of "negative selection" seen in those who chose to become teachers. The perception and discourse following the 1989 in politics has continued this struggle.

The organization and curriculum of schools, however, was not simply a result of communist reforms. Janowski (1992) reminded us that it is important not to attribute the look of the educational system just to the communists. The situation and the system between WWI and WWII "was state-controlled and the state had a strong say in the design of sylabusses and the selection of teaching content." Still, the communist eras' Polish schools lived a history of being an instrument of ideological indoctrination (Malak-Minkiewicz, 1996, p.85).

The totalitarian model failed to be implemented however, for two reasons: the diversity of Polish life "inconsistent with the socialist ideal" (Malak-Minkiewicz, 1996, p.94) and "similar to other spheres
has been a struggle to show that teachers and schools were often playing a role. Many in this group of Poles said that given the new freedom of post-1989 Poland their words and actions could be closer to their own beliefs. The transition brought change but it was incomplete at best. Magda, during one conversation explained,

I have a problem to ask you because I don't see a large, great change. Yes, why? Because in my pedagogical institution the same professor, the same lecturer, the same people, the change is students. It is very slow I think.

For educators involved in civic education these two major events: the memories of World War II and the experiences with the events of 1989, influenced their beliefs about the purpose and direction of civic education reform efforts in the country. The Poles talked about trying to design a system of education that provided students skills, attitudes and knowledge necessary to critically analyze the choices Polish society was making. The role of schools in a democracy and the direction of teacher education reform played out in these beliefs and experiences. If teachers were going to be prepared to educate students so that they were active citizens, then the teachers must master these skills first.

**Personal Theorizing**

The memories of historical, political and social events emerged as our discussions continued. Experiences with the transition to democracy were a major influence on the groups' discussions. In this study the personal experiences and

---

of life education was driven less by ideological principles than by the interests of successive ruling elites ((Malak-Minkiewicz, 1996, p.94).

4 Many scholars (Ross, Cornett and McCutcheon, 1992; Featherstone, Munby and Russell, 1997) have identified the concept of personal theorizing—how individuals create a conceptualization, how ideas fit together—as influencing what teachers and other educators do as they construct curriculum. Featherstone, et. al. (1997) described the connection between experience and authority. They cited Munby and Russell in saying that “giving authority to one’s personal experiences while learning to teach is central to understanding how and what one is learning from the experience” (p.3). Mayer
memories of the group often seemed to be in the foreground of our discussions. As
they discussed issues of teacher education, collaboration, and reforming citizenship
education they became a “community of reflective practitioners who openly deliberate
about what knowledge is of worth and what processes help stimulate the
democratization of schools and society” (Ross, E.W.; Cornett, J. and McCutcheon,
G., 1992, p.xi). Personal theorizing on this topic brought connections between the
historical events of these individuals and the cultures of which they are a part and the
futures they were attempting to form.

Teacher Education Reform

At points during our time together the conversation and discussion turned to the
preparation of teachers. Their views became quite apparent when we discussed the
experiences with teacher education and their beliefs of what should happen. As they
talked they focused on four major areas; course work focused on theory, short
experiences as an observer in schools, few chances to teach lessons, and the
expectation of many students that they were not going to be teachers.

All of the participants identified course work in didactics and theory as the
primary if not only teacher preparation course work encountered in their training. Over
and over again the classroom teachers identified these courses as not important,
containing too much theory and disconnected from the reality of classrooms. The
teacher educators, however, continued to insist that knowledge of the pedagogical
theories, psychology of children and an understanding of the ways students learn was
essential before teachers entered the classroom.

(1997) talked about this role and has concluded that “knowledge can only be constructed through an
individual process which gives meaning and value to experience and communication” (p. 114).
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Classroom Experiences

The time participants spent observing and teaching in schools was very short in comparison to current practice in the United States. Most preservice teachers in the United States spend eight to ten weeks in a classroom working with a teacher. Most of the Poles mentioned only a month observing at each level (elementary and secondary). During their preservice experience in schools their time was spent watching and, once in a while, teaching a lesson. For one of the participants even this limited time spent practicing the craft of teaching was of limited value. Isa discussed in detail the experience she had,

Yes, I was in school observing and I made about twenty hours of lessons. In the primary school I was teaching but the teacher went out (of the room). And when I finished my practice the teacher gave me a good mark for the work. He gave me a good mark but he didn’t know me, he knew nothing about my teaching. He went out and he sat in teacher’s room and he drank tea and drank coffee....

Often the participants mentioned the expectations of students. Students assumed that they were going to become historians, editors of historical material or other more well respected careers. “Most students in my studies didn’t expect to be a teacher” was how Andrej described the situation. Teachers were those who often realized that they were not going to be successful in a particular field. Teaching provided them an opportunity for a job but little else. As I listened to his words I understood them to mean that teaching wasn’t seen as a career that provided room for advancement, or even necessarily a good living.
Changing the Preparation of Teachers

When asked if they would change the preparation of teachers, the Poles said, "Change it". It was clear that all felt that something had to be changed. There was not however, agreement about how the teacher education programs should be changed. For example Magda and Isa spoke from their own perspectives of the kinds of teaching and classrooms we were preparing individuals for.

Magda—Yes students in doing lecture can solve a very important problem. Lecture is a good method. Why? I don’t think about lecture where the teacher says and the students listen. The lecture the teacher conducts can use maps, computer, students writing, students doing everything... It is an active method...yes?

Isa—Because in the VOM [regional in-service teacher training institution] office it is too bureaucratic, too [much] bureaucracy. Often advisors know nothing about active teaching methods, nothing. In the Polish system often the king is knowledge and lecture and lecture, lecture, and lecture... I saw... in Polish system teachers too often much give knowledge to students and when students are finished with their school they do not know what to do in life... (It is) not a life system...

These were not new arguments. It was an example of the why professional development schools have been discussed, debated and designed⁷. Teachers and teacher educators held different opinions about the needs of classroom teachers. They

---

⁷ In answering the question of why to begin organizing professional development schools, Dixon and Ishler (1992) answer "The goal of the professional development schools (PDS) movement is inventing of a new institution mixing the best of theory, research, and practice at the precollege level and among teacher preparatory programs" (p.28). Zimpher (1990) adds, when referencing the Holmes agenda. "Such schools. The Holmes Group contends, would recognize the independence of teaching and teacher education and the creation of a partnership to improve teaching and learning for both students in schools and for prospective teacher education candidates" (p.42).
believed different forms of preparation were necessary. By talking to each other, working together, perhaps both would gain new knowledge. I told the Poles that we have the same argument in the United States. We discussed that some scholars say a university should not train teachers, but rather a university is for creating new knowledge of subject content and that there should be separate places for the training of teachers. These scholars believe that a person should get a university degree and then go on to be educated as a teacher.

SIGNPOST--
January 30, 1997 Harrison High School

We arrived at Harrison High school at approximately 7:15am. There we met a professor from MU who is involved in their PDS program. The school has 1,100 students in grades 10-12. It is not a rich district or a poor one and it is located in an area experiencing a great deal of suburban growth. About 40% of its students go on to college.

Dr. Littel taught high school in Chicago and has been at MU for 26 years. He talked to us about his work and what he is trying to do. His job is split, part time at the university teaching classes and the other part (in his words... the happy part) co-teaching and working at Harrison High School. He has been working at this for 6 years, trying to create a global studies course. He decided to create a course with an informal structure that reflects the informal nature of global studies.

---
8 That is one of the reasons why the Holmes Group (1986, 1990) started the discussions about Professional Development Schools. Giroux and McLaren (1994) also raised concerns and asked “what kind of teaching and pedagogy can be developed and legitimated by a view of authority that takes democracy and critical citizenship seriously?” (1996, p.313).

9 The name of Harrison High School has been altered from its actual name.
In the course the students learn about framing issues. By exploring dichotomies such as thesis--antithesis he tries to teach students how to find alternatives. He wants them to learn how to use data as a persuasive tool, to identify if materials help them to feel more persuaded or less persuaded and then to make decisions for themselves...

The high school teacher who co-taught the course with Dr. Littel talked to us that day about how they worked to implement the collaborative project. To design the course they had identified topics they want included. For example they worked on deconstructing the arguments related to global warming. They also asked the students what issues they wanted to study. Dr. Little explained that the students entered the class expecting to hear 'the truth'. Instead he spent his time showing them that civic issues\footnote{Civic issues are issues debated by various stakeholder groups in society. Often they involve competing interests and limited resources.} are complex, never clear-cut, even though the students have been given clear-cut answers in the past.

Dr. Littel discussed the methods used in high school courses “if we teach students to challenge everything...an unintended lesson is that they become cynical, they don’t believe anything.... “I don’t want to create students who disagree with everything, hate their county and feel alienated. This [working to develop students who are critical thinkers but not cynical] is a delicate balance.”

Andrej answered that this is the same problem with his students. I want to “show them everything and let them make a choice...” Dr. Littel’s teacher partner added that for the students the bad choice is not to participate, not to think about (issues).

\footnote{The name of MU has also be changed from its actual name.}
The day at Harrision High School gave the group an opportunity to see a different arrangement of a Professional Development School. Many different structures for professional development schools had emerged at The Ohio State University. At MU, at least in this situation, a different arrangement, one that placed the professor in the school building half of the time, was created. This was very different from what the group had encountered in their time in Columbus.

The Polish educators listened about how the project worked. They heard Dr. Little’s focus on the creation of a Global Studies course and the intensive work with one, main, teacher partner. They also observed a class and had the chance to speak in the lounge about various issues with Dr. Littel. They discussed the struggles of working between schools and universities. They eventually focused on the concept of collaboration.

Andrej raised an issue, (paraphrased) ‘Now it is important to have real collaboration. Our students from pedagogical institutes, teach for a short time at schools. Our professors don’t know real conditions in schools’. He described his opinion that professors don’t go into schools. Dr. Littel responded with information about their current program. He told the Polish educators that in this site they have the students from the university [preservice teachers] working with them at some point during 3 out of 4 years in the education program. The students spend a lot of time in public schools (from 1 semester to 3 years). Sometimes teachers from the high school help to teach at the university. Sometimes they share responsibility. Dr. Littel did not go into more detail about their relationship. The Poles accepted his answers and moved on to other concerns.

The discussion continued and centered on the operation of a professional development site. Over the course of the session the group heard about a professional development school that looked nothing like the ones they had discussed at Ohio State.
This discrepant experience caused them to question their understanding of the concept of professional development schools. As part of the cross-cultural experience they assumed the information in Columbus could be generalized to much of the country. Michigan University taught them otherwise.

The day ended with questions to Dr. Littel about the six year collaboration, the project he had been involved in here, its purpose and its success. Eventually we left Harrison High School and went back to the hotel. Along the way some of the group discussed the interesting arrangement and the opportunity for the professor to see school life. The Poles were impressed by the professor's willingness to take on the responsibility of planning a course in a High School while also conducting his lessons at the university. To the group the fact that Dr. Littel worked in the school made it an enormously valuable model.

| SIGNPOST—Airport, Detroit, Michigan |
| Saturday February 1, 1997 |

_Leaving the Detroit Airport for Washington D.C. proved to be a struggle. The bags of the group had grown larger with gifts and purchases. The pace of the past week had made us all weary and the early hour of our flight made it all the more problematic. As we waited in the line for the ticket counter the clothing of the tourists bound for warmer climates mocked the sub-zero temperatures outside. Slowly the line wound to the counter. As the first of the group checked in, worried expressions and hurried conversation in Polish told me something was wrong. For reasons only airline companies know, the computer was saying that the group had already checked in. We hadn't, but I found_
myself in the position of serving as translator for the group, and it was clear that they now looked to me to help them. They were at this point "my group," and they jokingly called me dad and looked to me when a stranger asked them a question. When we boarded the flight it was immediately noticeable that not many people were heading to Washington D.C. early on a Saturday morning. The plane was empty. Only 20 people occupied the plane, most seated in the mid-section over the wings. For whatever reason, maybe my telepathic message to the ticket counter agent that I really needed sometime to myself, alone, to think, I was seated in the back section of the plane. The only person in the entire section, I had my own private steward and spent the time reading...

Arrival in Washington was smooth and the view of the city as the plane comes in for the landing at National Airport was inspiring as always. We took a taxi to a Dupont Circle area hotel and found a representative of a national teachers association who would serve as host. That day was spent touring the Mall, seeing museums, and then stopping for lunch and rest. In the evening we stopped in a small shop and picked up some bread, cheese and wine. During registration I had asked for a room big enough for us to meet in as a group. The hotel had graciously given me a large room with a table, a couch, chairs and plenty of room. That night we sat again and talked over bread, wine and cheese. We revisited the trip and the topics that had occupied most of our conversations since their arrival.

As they talked, it was clear that our time in Michigan had served to provide a point of comparison.12 The time in Columbus had been brought into clearer focus by

---

12 I described comparison in an earlier piece of writing when quoting Kermit Hall (1996) and his description of the "virtue of a comparative approach" (Shinew and Fischer, 1997). Comparison serves
our excursion to Michigan. In Michigan PDS were similar, yet very different. The vocabulary and language of collaboration sounded and felt familiar and yet differences came to light as the particulars were explored, inspected and put into group discussion.

When we talked about what the group viewed as the important parts of the visit to Michigan they listed a few things. They relayed their amazement at the model of ‘Professional Development Schools’ Michigan University had created at Harrison High School. The groups’ comments centered on the opportunity to discuss a model of PDS that involved the university professor co-teaching courses with high school teachers. The professor was on site, present and involved in the school, its direction, its planning process and its students. The individuals in the school knew him very well, and he was as much at home in this place as he was in the halls of his university up the highway.

At one point, the conversation took an interesting turn. The tone of the group and the possibilities in their voices changed from raising problems to talking about solutions. It was a fitting conclusion to our group discussions. As we approached the end of our time together the following dialog\textsuperscript{13} illustrated how far the issues had come. The power of comparison, the ability to deepen understanding and expand generalizations, was evidenced by the points raised. We no longer were debating what are PDS’s, now we were talking about how to institute them. Their dialog speaks for itself:

\begin{quote}
Magda— I understand that in Michigan [University] they haven’t PDS? Yes?
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{13} Gitlin (1990) said that dialog is different from conversation, that it doesn’t pit one side against the other but rather shows multiple perspectives working together to understand the subject being discussed (p.540).
John— What he does is another example of PDS... it is still PDS.... if you remember from our discussion... all PDS means is the university and school working together...

Magda-- This isn’t called PDS

John-- Oh yes, it is called PDS. Professor Littel would say he is in a PDS at Harrison High school although it is a quite different situation from Ohio.....

Magda-- What are the strengths about PDS? What is good about organizing it in that way?

Isa-- Thought it was a very good idea because people from the university work at schools. This is very good. They have very good relations... It teaches paths between practice and theory.

Ursula—There are more ideas, more notions collaboration of university with schools. Ohio another way and Michigan another way.... This collaboration (was) very interesting for me.... I think that in Poland maybe it would be similar because in Wroclaw another way, collaboration in Warsaw another, Bialystok another, and you each can create your own.

Andrej—We should identify but only the best way for us....

Ursula—I think it is the best idea, but we haven’t any money. Professional Development Schools have a big problem to work in the schools..... Because in this kind of work it is not possible, this teacher, professor collaborate. The university in Poland (would) send ten students, here two were sent. So in Poland it would mean finding more schools.

Andrej—Wow, working voluntary, he enjoyed taking one, two hours to prepare everything. I suppose, I don’t suppose we could find numbers who want to do the same thing. We have now, we have, I think about the condition
of the university. And when I think about the condition of my school and the
United States....

Magda—We haven't more materials to conduct our lessons with students. At
the university it is a problem. Materials are a problem, money too....

Isa—If the professors I know said they want to work in schools he (would) say
'oh my god I hate this...' And another example if I want to teach in schools for
no money the director of the school will think... he will say I am crazy....

Magda—Who is this crazy woman????

At the same time a conversation developed, in Polish on the sidelines. As had
become my habit, I interrupted them and asked them to share their discussion with me
in English.

Andrzej—We discuss how, about how to organize collaboration between
university and school. This kind of work if it would be compared with our
compulsory hours it will be all right.

Compulsory hours were the number of hours teachers were expected to teach in the
Polish system. Andrzej was arguing that the work at the university would have to
'count' toward the teacher’s normal work hours. He continued,

This is a wonderful idea because if the teachers, academic teachers, I for
example, I haven’t two hours ... In high schools and primary schools it is
necessary for this to work at the university. It depended for me on a different,
to have a different situation and different pedagogic school, different university
setting....

John—And I agree with you we have to find something that works for you and
what you want to do. One reason it was different at Michigan University is the
same reason...that the university is organized differently and the school is organized differently.

Magda—I think about Gdansk, I think about how to organize in Wroclaw, I think you know very well, people always looking for the problems... I think the students (pupils) in America always looking too or for the benefit...when I am a very important person is it a benefit for me....yes?

Andrej—A Polish model of PDS. Sometimes from the most crazy ideas is one good idea for everyone. Sometimes for those people who where earlier named crazy will be good work for the future. I can't think about another solution, but now I know in this moment yes...it is one. Now we discuss about how. I said already, we should bring the best with us.

As participant, facilitator, and leader of the discussion it was clear that we had for the first time crossed a threshold. The conversation this night was animated. It was the most in depth conversation about collaboration I had seen the group engage in. They were debating, raising issues and problems. They seemed to talk from the perspective of “I want to do this.... how will I bring this concept back and what will it look like.”

Individuals, especially teachers come to teacher education programs knowing what teachers do. In large part they know this from their own lived experience. Their experience is one that has been “saturated with relationships of domination” (Kreisberg, 1992, p.199). Collaboration, as this group of Polish educators seemed to conclude, offers one way to break the cycle of personal beliefs and explore new possibilities. Collaboration begins in these moments, when we cross from what is it to how will we do it? As the group had previously discussed, collaboration seems to have stages and for this group, at this time, we moved from a beginning stage, a stage of exploration, to
a new, second level. The second level was defined by deeper, richer, more honest, and open discussion of options. Perhaps the time in comparison pushed the group to this next level. The first few discussions in Columbus had centered on problems. Maybe the first step of collaboration is to identify that there are problems. The second step of collaboration is to begin a dialog. During the evening in the hotel in Washington I sat there listening as they talked about problems. They also, however, talked about possibilities. It was, as one member of the group, Ursula, put it, "A night to imagine how to do it." Civic education is important to the development of a democratic society and it is made stronger by the act of deliberation\(^{14}\). The experiences of this group from collaborative tasks, dialog, to comparative experiences created opportunities to expand their understanding of teacher education, civic education and ultimately democracy itself.

**SIGNPOST—Washington, D.C.**

**Tuesday, February 4, 1997**

*Early in the morning the group met with me to say their goodbyes before we moved into another meeting. The discussion of evaluations took place at this time and the decision was made to hold off until the end of the visit to D.C. We walked over to our next meeting site across the street. Upon arrival we entered the conference room and sat waiting for the executive director. While waiting, the director of civic education discussed the contributions of Political Science faculty to civic education. The group was given copies of the book *Ideas of the Founders on Constitutional Government*. The director described the responsibility of the teacher. It is, she said, to make sure the students have information, [that teachers] not just

\(^{14}\) See (Ridley, Hidveghi, Pitts, 1997, p.62),(Gutmann, 1994) and (Parker, 1996)
lecture. [They are] responsible even [when students are in] small
groups, [working collaboratively]. It is dependent on the teacher and
the students. What do they do best? When do they get excited? The
teacher, however, must always know more. The teacher must identify
what is important, to set up structure, and make goals. We know we
know more. We know enough more that our best will go beyond us, but
won't go without us. We still need our authority, and still.....

After she finished the group looked at the materials, participated
in a discussion on technology and returned to the room where a lunch
buffet had been set up. We had been joined by individuals representing
the various organizations who were part of the organizing team of the
exchange. Over lunch a member of an aid organization discussed a
study he was beginning to create, a survey to evaluate the effectiveness
of civic education in Poland. He was there, he said, to gain some
information for the context of his work. He asked a few small
questions and got little response. The group didn't know who he was,
the purpose for his evaluation, or the general organization of his work.
I tried to give him a little information by asking the group one or two
leading questions. The silence of the group made me concerned. I tried
to give the group a few ideas what they might say to him, what they
could talk about. No one said much of anything.

After some time, the discussion at the table broke into two parts;
a conversation among a few of the organizing team members at one end
of the table and another conversation among a few of the others at the
opposite. I sat in the middle of the table, next to and across from my
colleagues/friends/participants. Most of the discussions going on
centered on funding. Very quickly they became small and private. The Poles and I sat in the middle of the long conference table and looked at each other in various stages of agony. I signaled to them that it was time for me to leave. I had a plane to catch back to Ohio. They signaled they wanted to come, too. I announced to the table that I had a plane to catch, stood up and bid farewell. The members of the group came one at a time and kissed me on the cheek; left, right, and left again. Agnes smiled, Magda wished me well, and Ursula looked on as water gathered in a corner of her eye.

I left, knowing they had two more hours of time in that room and then on to another ‘official’ meeting before they prepared for their departure home to Poland the next day. The struggle to end our time together was made more difficult by the cold, official, impersonal work of these last meetings. I knew what they were thinking, we shared in glances and under our breath comments, disdain for ‘the official’. In their lifetimes they had seen much that reeked of official words, and official proclamations, no matter how well meaning the intent of the speaker. In our time together we had grown closer and closer and although I had started out simply being an observer and participant, in the end I was proud to call these individuals my friends.

I boarded the plane for home and the many pieces of work that remained. In four months I would see the group again. This time in their country, in their homes and schools. I would be the one without language or words to ask, or words to speak. I would be the stranger on a journey trying to find answers. Answers as to how we make educational reform democratic in process and in outcome.
Social constructivism is described as "how social or cultural contexts contribute to a public understanding of objects and events" (Scheurman, 1998, p.8). The social and cultural contexts that swirled around all of us as we tried to explore the meaning and possibilities of collaboration pushed us in many directions.

Dialog and deliberation on issues served to deepen understanding and add detail to the issues that were affecting the reform of civic teacher education in Poland. Experiences with contrasting models of collaboration and opened up opportunities for deeper understanding. Cross-cultural collaboration allowed me to hold up, dissect and deconstruct the actions we Americans engaged in as we move to reform teacher education.

If people are going to engage in cross-cultural collaboration, they must participate with partners in activities designed to elicit and adapt (mis)conceptions. Educators must engage in open-ended inquiry with partners. The stance must become that of the apprentice trying to further develop the skills and knowledge necessary to successfully accomplish the task of the profession in teaching students and preparing them for life in democracy (Scheurman, 1998, p.7).

In this case of Polish teachers of citizenship education and teacher educators worked to gain new information as to how to reform the preparation of teachers of civic education. Their time in the United States involved shared tasks and deliberation. Universities and other teacher training institutions represented by the two teacher educators in this case were brought in contact with teachers emboldened by the new curriculum materials and methodologies. These teachers were part of a growing network of educators involved in democratic education reform, reform that includes
both course content and pedagogy. Bringing teachers and teacher educators together in this project was an attempt to cross a cultural divide between school and university\textsuperscript{15}.

Family memories of World War II, personal experiences with the transition to democracy in 1989, and personal experiences with teacher education created belief systems unique to each participant in the study. As the cross-cultural work played out, the power of comparison became visible in the changing understandings and depth of knowledge the group expressed\textsuperscript{16}. Clearly future cross-national projects should utilize experiences that highlight differences within the American context. By avoiding the impression that seeing one example in one part of the United States was enough, the project planners achieved their goal of increasing the understanding of school and university collaboration as a civic teacher education reform tool.

This study highlighted my need to engage in debates and exploration across national and cultural borders. I again found that cross-cultural experiences were opening my eyes to new realities, contexts, and possibilities. Greene (1994) has described the ultimate educational environment as one in which “teachers and learners find themselves conducting a kind of collaborative search, each from her or his lived situation” (p.23). As I continue to become an educator of teachers, I know that these individuals will accompany me in my thoughts and ideas.

\textsuperscript{15} Many lessons have been learned from participation, research and writing about collaboration. As the theory of professional development schools and university/school collaboration has been put into practice the ability to observe and chronicle existing programs has informed the discussion. Beasley, et.al. (1996) described the principles of PDS as “Teaching for understanding, learning community, restructuring.....” These principles are to guide and assist in the development of relationships that are equal in responsibility and authority.

\textsuperscript{16} Ross, et.al (1992) have said that personal theorizing “significantly influences the curriculum and is therefore important to understand” (p.xi). And while the relationship is not well understood (p. 3) it is important that researchers question and investigate these complex connections between educators beliefs and teaching. Stone (1992) cites Goodman in saying, “Our own personal constructs, were we to explore them, make sense of the broad time and culture in which we live...” (p.20). Personal theorizing can, then, help to show how educators are influenced and influencing history.
Next Steps

In this study I chronicled the steps in a project designed to support school and university collaboration in civic teacher education programs in Poland. In the future there is need to investigate these collaborative relationships as they develop and mature. What will the relationships look like? Will there be long lasting change to the teacher education programs and to the quality of teacher candidates that are the result? Other researchers in other studies will need to investigate these issues. Angell and Hahn (1996) have said, "ultimately, a comparative perspective illuminates our own culturally embedded experience by helping make problematic aspects of citizenship preparation that we tend to take for granted" (p.337). This case provides us one look, a look at the beginnings of collaboration and the issues related to civic teacher education reform in a context very different from our own.
CHAPTER 6

LEARNING AND KNOWLEDGE IN A GLOBAL WORLD

Introduction

The last chapter means that I am supposed to describe what new knowledge was created during the study. And yet perhaps most crucial to me in this case are the questions I am left with as the work comes to a close. I found my new understandings in the quiet reminders of the colleagues I met and worked with as a part of this project. Their struggle to create a new kind of educational system/experience in the face of generations of practice, tradition and indoctrination leaves me awed. The learning that has emerged in this case is more of the variety that confirms previous efforts, identifies its application in new environments and identifies concerns to think about. The learning provides me tools to take forward to new projects in other corners of a quickly shrinking globe.

In the first chapter I raised a series of rhetorical questions: How do Polish classroom teachers and Polish teacher educators begin building collaborative relationships? What do they hope to gain? What benefits does collaboration bring to the process of democratic educational reform? I was also curious as to how the group would view American efforts at teacher education reform.
As the study continued we focused on multiple constructions of professional development schools. Rather than centering the study on how their conceptions of school/university relationships were changing I focused on why.

Findings and Qualitative Research

Many individuals (Patton, 1990; Eisner, 1991; Guba and Lincoln 1989) have pointed out the danger of generalizing from a specific context to other contexts that are very different. Qualitative researchers argue that our task is not as clear. Linden (1993) has said "we must juxtapose an understanding of the limits on our knowing with a commitment to producing better, more complex accounts" (p. 148). Qualitative researchers openly proclaim our struggle with knowing. We openly display our learnings as contextual, situated and socially constructed. And so if I am to lay out for the reader the new knowledge or learnings gained from this study, I must first remind readers of the framework in which this study operated.

One goal of qualitative research is to identify the impact of the research on ourselves as individuals (Richardson, 1990), to identify what we gained from the research. It does not mean that we do not contribute to the general accumulation of knowledge; rather, that each individual constructs the relationship of this study, this context, to their own unique situation.

Various researchers have discussed what it is we learn from qualitative research. Huberman and Miles (1994) have explained that drawing conclusions is possible by "comparing and contrasting, identifying patterns and themes and using
metaphors" (p.429). Eisner (1991) said the goal of the narrative is to create images
that allow the reader to take learnings into a new and different context. Lather (1991)
has also described the textual staging of knowledge. She reminded me that often
researchers use language "so that it gives the appearance of clean, referential
meaning" and that to do this "is to conceal the artifice that produces the appearance of
objectivity" (p.91). I cannot claim to be objective. I care about the individuals who
participated in the study. I also care about the project of which this was a part,
Education for Democratic Citizenship in Poland. Finally, I care that Poland succeeds
at creating a sustaining democratic society. All of my learnings are based on these
assumptions.

Meaning is negotiated between writer and reader, presenter and participant,
reader and text. In laying out how we gain meaning from research Eisner (1991)
described the use of qualitative research as generalizing or transferring. As we live
experience we learn, and these new learnings are brought with us into a new context.
These learnings come in three ways: skills, images, and ideas (Eisner, 1991, p.199).
Skills include the ability to perform various tasks, to walk into a new situation and
arrange a process. Images emerge from the words, diagrams, and descriptions that
compose qualitative research. They are "constructed from our transaction with
empirical qualities"(Eisner, 1991, p.199). These images allow us to recognize
similarity and difference, commonalities and unique attributes.

"For qualitative research this means that the creation of an image—a vivid
portrait of excellent teaching, for example—can become a prototype that can be used
in the education of teachers or for the appraisal of teaching....” (Eisner, 1991, p. 199).

The ideas we gain from the research task then include the words we use to share the project, the images we create and the skills we leave the research setting with. All serve our purpose of being able to go into the next research setting, the next project and begin again to let themes emerge, images develop, questions rise to the surface. Eventually we accumulate learnings and knowledge that allows us to begin to build connections across the various contexts and lived experiences. Eisner (1991) uses the metaphor of a fine meal to describe the accumulation of learnings that result from qualitative research. Each aspect of the meal contributes something to the overall experience and memory. Each flavor and texture becomes part of the process of the meal. And at the end of the meal what we remember is the both the individual—the separate tastes, dishes and conversations—and the whole—the sense of experience shared with loved ones.

Human beings have the spectacular capacity to go beyond the information given, to fill in the gaps, to generate interpretations, to extrapolate, and to make inferences in order to construe meanings. Through this process knowledge is accumulated, perception refined and meaning deepened...


SIGNPOST—Second Teachers For Democracy Conference
June 11, 1997 Poland
I walked off the plane in Warsaw excited and nervous about visiting Poland again. It was the 4th trip to Poland. This time, to participate in a conference on teacher education and the preparation of teachers for democracy. The conference was to include the participants in my study and it was to be my chance to meet again and talk and debate and reflect on what had happened while in the United States. During the conference I planned on seeing them present on the collaborative projects they had embarked on. I planned on seeing them run workshop sessions on teaching methodologies. Talking to them about their work. In general they planned to model what we had spent most of our time talking about; forming bridges between theory and practice. I had come to Poland to learn from these peers that I was proud to call friends. Michael Fullan (1993) perhaps says it best, “There is a ceiling effect to how much we can learn if we keep to ourselves.” The group had shown me that even short periods of time could help to bring about change. It also can bring differences of opinion into stark contrast.

I had come to see the results of a journey to Columbus, Ohio. That journey occurred across national and cultural borders. A small group of teachers and teacher educators journeyed to Columbus, Ohio in the winter of 1997 to explore the field of civic education and the training of civic education teachers. They also made attempts to cross the borders between teacher educators and classroom teachers. Set in the context of democratic educational reform in Poland, I reflected on the broader issues of the interplay between teacher education reform, the imperative for democratic processes and concepts inherent in education for democracy. In my role as a graduate
research assistant I helped to greet, facilitate, instruct and lead this journey while in the United States. These educators became my friends, peers and colleagues and their struggle to create and describe the best method for the preparation of future civic education teachers reflected my struggle to define my position and place in the boundary between classroom teacher and researcher, classroom teacher and university, theory and practice.

The trip in June 1997 brought me back to Poland again. My previous trips had raised many issues. Language was the issue most brought to the surface. On my very first trip in the fall of 1995 I came to participate in a teacher workshop at the CODN, the national teacher in-service training center. During the workshop I presented with another American on the topic ‘active teaching methods’. We had been told that most of the audience would speak English. In fact most did not. Our handouts, all in English, our activity involving speaking, responding and interacting, meant a struggle. And most importantly the overwhelming feeling of ‘differentness’ as I walked between small groups, each involved in a discussion I had initiated. I was faced with the knowledge that I had no idea what was being said, asked, debated in their small groups. At the time I vowed to work more on how I welcomed the difference in language into the experience of cross-national work. On this trip back to Poland again language was an issue. I do not speak Polish. I learned however, in my two years of trips how to survive, accomplish things and do productive work. I learned to stumble and still struggle to communicate.
I came back to Poland. In my bags I carried copies of transcripts, lists of member check (Patton, 1990) issues that I wanted to raise and questions from the study that had seemed to go unanswered. I was to see the group again. This time I got to hear them on their ground, and often in their language. They would speak of collaboration, and reform, and the development of democratic educational practice; practice that sought to engage students in an active manner. We were to share our time together in a conference center in Konstancin and again the program would be shared by both Poles and Americans.

Remy and Strzemieczny (1997) have written that projects that have occurred as a part of Education for Democratic Citizenship in Poland have included this work with preservice teachers. The projects “included university preservice teachers interacting with primary school students in one of the first ever ‘field-experience’ methods course in Poland and a team that used portfolio assessment for both their primary school and university-level students”(p.51). The participants in this study were a continuation of this effort.

In this case, I remembered that as part of their work in the United States Magda, Ursula, Isa, Andrej and Agnes were to make presentations on two aspects of their time: simulations and alternative assessment. As an underlying aspect of the conference, school and university collaboration would be discussed and reported on. Many of the participants in the conference were those who had applied and received funding for partnerships between school and universities for the preparation of teachers of citizenship education. The agenda for the conference included the chance
for the participants in these partnerships to share their experiences from the last year and discuss the possibilities for the next year. For me this meant the opportunity to hear Isa discuss her project in Poznan and Andrej his project in Warsaw. Each was to be on the agenda along with the university based teacher educator with whom they had worked. I looked forward to the chance to hear how things had gone.

SIGNPOST--
June 14, 1997 Teachers for Democracy II Conference

What an amazing day. The various participants and projects reported out to the group as a whole today. Isa shared the stage with a professor from Poznan University. She described in detail the depth of work that went between her school and classrooms and the teacher preparation program at the university. The strength of voice and character in her presentation, the manner in which both individuals spoke with pride about the work seemed to me to reflect the success of their efforts. However when all the groups were done and others served as respondents they thanked the professor and not Isa. Isa, however, seemed comfortable with this and proud of their efforts.

All in all it had been a great conference a chance to see Agnes and Ursula share projects they had worked on. To hear Andrej present on the importance of active teaching methods also reflected some of the dialog, information and
experiences he had taken away from the trip. Clearly there were echoes of the debates, sessions and discussion in Columbus, East Lansing and Washington...

When I wrote this journal entry I was excited about the work I was seeing. The Polish educators who traveled to Columbus excited me with their presentations and enthusiasm. Most of the work in Poland involving Americans (mainly from Columbus) and Poles (from all over the country) takes place in conferences and workshops. Groups of people, sometimes 30, sometimes 100, housed in a small conference center, or former communist resort or a church retreat center, live in proximity for three or four days and fill their time with sessions on topics, sample lessons, and active experiences such as role plays and classroom simulations. The "Teachers for Democracy" conferences brought classroom teachers and teacher educators together to share these discussions. In most cases the teachers were the presenters of model lessons. Americans co-presented sessions and shared materials with their Polish colleagues. Sometimes they presented on active teaching methods, or forms of alternative assessment. Always a speaker or panel talked and lectured on a particular aspect of constitutionalism, or an alternative assessment or the reform process in teacher education.

The June 1997 conference continued a discussion begun a year earlier on the topic of school and university collaboration and its role in preparing teachers for democracy. Teachers prepared to teach civic education courses in the newly emerging Polish democracy were identified as the goal. Teachers comfortable with
classroom methodologies and operation that reflected the democratic society we all hoped to support and develop worked to share their knowledge.

Meeting Participants on Their Ground

As another part of the trip, I planned to meet with each of the participants and discuss the materials I had sent them earlier in the Spring. After completing drafts of each of the transcripts and identifying emerging themes, I sent each participant a packet containing copies of each part in which they had been involved. I asked them to read, comment, correct, and raise questions about what was emerging from the study. I asked Magda to meet with me at the conference, Isa as well. Andrej and I arranged to meet later in Warsaw. I would try to see Ursula and Agnes while on a trip across Northeast Poland. At each point I hoped to get a better understanding of what had emerged in the study. I was especially concerned about the transcripts. What would the group say about their English when they saw it in writing.

Transcripts of oral language are often difficult for participants who speak English as their first language, especially when they show how ungrammatical our spoken language is. For second language speakers I feared this would cause them a great deal of concern. We would see.

SIGNPOST—School #26
June 17 and 18, 1997 Northeastern Poland
After breakfast the group boarded the bus for Ursula’s school, Szkola Post. nr 26. Today we were the guests of honor at a day the school called “Day of European Union.” Ursula’s students (7th and 8th graders) had prepared displays that filled the walls of the gymnasium and surrounded the students. Included in the audience were 1, 2 and 3 graders, the students involved in the presentations and some parents. Our group was split and seated at the opposite corners of the gym. Each group of students, after an introduction by a young student serving as master of ceremonies, presented information about the country they had studied.

Wednesday, June 18, 1997

After breakfast we boarded the bus for a return to the school. This time we were to be observers at an Eighth grade graduation ceremony. The gym was packed with participants and parents. Many of the students carried flowers, the parents cameras. The ceremony was moving, especially the traditions of passing the school flag from the eighth to the seventh grade, the dancing of the Polonaise by a small group of the students, and skits and performances that reflected their memories of the school. Despite our language barrier, the ambivalence between joy at leaving for high school and sadness at saying goodbye to friends was communicated quite strongly. It was also moving to see the parents recognized for their involvement in the school. Many had helped renovate the building, volunteered in classes and involved themselves in the education of their children. As the head of the parent committee was asked to stand and be recognized a tear rolled down her face. This school was an important part of the lives of these individuals...
While on the bus traveling around Poland we stopped in a few cities in the northeast of Poland. In Bialystok, the group had the opportunity to speak to a gathering of professors, teachers and lecturers from the University of Warsaw. They had gathered to hear about teacher education in the United States. Our group, classroom teachers, recent graduates, and graduate assistants, was asked to share our experiences and views. I talked about efforts to build stronger bridges between the schools and universities. In describing school and university collaboration, I tried to simplify the language, to make it translatable and yet mean something. Our host for the day, Agnes, facilitated the discussion and raised issues she had raised while in the United States. Perhaps the most interested in what we had to say were the students studying at the university. They asked questions about portfolios, about student teaching and about the relationship between the work at the university and the work in the classroom.

SIGNPOST—Bialystok, Poland
June 19, 1997

Today we were due to leave Bialystok. Ursula and Agnes who had hosted us here both came to say good bye and wish us well. Ursula carried newspapers in her hand. The newspapers had stories of our visit to the elementary school for European Union Day. Another paper caught my eye. She held it up and pointed. ‘Your words are in here’ she said. I looked and sure enough there was my name in the midst of an article on our session at the local university. (See Figure 6.1)
Roughly translated the article discussed teachers in Bialystok working on a new type of exit exam project for preservice teachers. Project and methodology advisors (some from schools) met with teachers and others from the Ohio State University. The article describes the cross-cultural experiences of two members of the audience. For my part, it described my discussion of the need for school and university collaboration. It described my discussion by quoting “Once the university gave its students only what it considered as useful, and then schools wanted something different. That’s why there is a need for closer cooperation between school and university. For students, future teachers, to learn their profession from real specialists not only from theorists.”
Teczka dla studenta

Blisznicy naukowcy pracujacy nad "Nowa Matura" oraz doradczy metodyczni spotkali się w środę na Filu UW z grupą amerykańskich pedagogów z Marshall Center przy uniwersytecie stanowym w Ohio w USA.

Marshall Center jest od 6 lat współpracuje z Centrem Edukacji Obywatelskiej w Warszawie. Za mówicielnym czołowym prof. Hannu Kurepka z Instytutu Edukacji i Wychowania Oświaty ze Szkoły Podstawowej nr 20 w Rybniku złożyły w obecnej roli gośćką w USA. Teraz Amerykanie przybyli do Polski na konferencję poświęconą współpracy między zwolennikami edukacji obywatelskiej w Stanach Zjednoczonych a Polsce, w której uczestniczyli powiązani z pracą. - Kiedy wiedzieli, że nasz projekt obejmuje także te, co zawierań za edukację, a potem szkoła potrzebowała czegoś innego - mówi Jule Fischer. - Następnie pozwolił na ten dochód, który obok edukacji, a także edukacji zawodowej konkretnej, a potem edukacji zawodowej konkretnej, a potem edukacji zawodowej konkretnej.

Ciekawą rzeczą, którą przemawiała Sahala Trial-Praska była jej propozycja, ostatecznie dość praktyczna. Zgromadziliśmy w swoim materiale, które miały przekonać przychodzicielskie szkoły w sposób, który mogłyby przejąć je w praktyce.

Kilkanaście takich samozawodowych, înwagrzających się w polskie praktyki, otrzymało obowiązki edukacji obywatelskiej w USA. Teraz Amerykanie przybyli do Polski na konferencję poświęconą współpracy między zwolennikami edukacji obywatelskiej w Stanach Zjednoczonych a Polsce, w której uczestniczyli powiązani z pracą. - Kiedy wiedzieli, że nasz projekt obejmuje także te, co zawierań za edukację, a potem szkoła potrzebowała czegoś innego - mówi Jule Fischer. - Następnie pozwolił na ten dochód, który obok edukacji, a także edukacji zawodowej konkretnej, a potem edukacji zawodowej konkretnej, a potem edukacji zawodowej konkretnej, a potem edukacji zawodowej konkretnej, a potem edukacji zawodowej konkretnej.

Ciekawą rzeczą, którą przemawiała Sahala Trial-Praska była jej propozycja, ostatecznie dość praktyczna. Zgromadziliśmy w swoim materiale, które miały przekonać przychodzicielskie szkoły w sposób, który mogłyby przejąć je w praktyce.

Prof. Hannu Kurepka zareagował na to, że odrzucająca maturę, każdym z studentów III roku będzie otrzymanej własną teczkę. - Każdy wiedział, że za dopilnować to na co się odnieść, bo inaczej można to ułożyć na bieżącej obradzie. Teczka Stanowi w większości zawierająca fragment z wy- cieczek, ograniczonych spotkań z osobami, próbkami edukacyjnymi oraz praktykami.

Figure 6.1 Portfolios for Students
Though not exactly what I said, it was close. I argued that both the school and university had something to teach future practitioners. As the title pointed out, the aspect of the presentation the reporter found most unique was the use of portfolios. The student teaching portfolios we carried included pictures of classrooms, lessons, field trips. The pictures created quite a stir and lots of questions. The reporter characterized it this way, "It seems like advertising oneself according to American rules contains less didactics and is more pictorial." Again, not exactly what we had said. Interaction with the media seems to share some unique international attributes.

SIGNPOST— Warsaw, Poland
Monday, June 23, 1997

After traveling through large sections of Poland the group met for a final breakfast in the 'world famous' Europejski buffet. After breakfast we all said our good-byes. Some of the group departed for the airport, others prepared to go to Krakow and continue sight seeing. I departed for the offices of the Center for Citizenship Education. During our meal and over the last few days the group talked about the enormous number of experiences we had. We saw a lot of things that would remain in our memory. It was clear we were 'on' most of the visit. Presentations, formal meetings and tours of schools made this a very different trip from previous experiences.

At every stop we were greeted like old friends. Smiles, food, gifts, and warm discussions marked the exchange. For a group of American educators on their
summer vacation it says something for the quality of the visits when participants mentioned the time in schools and the feelings taken from each school visit as one of the best aspects of the trip. We gained a lot from this exchange; new ideas to take to our classrooms and lives, new contacts for students and projects, and fond memories of teachers and educators in Poland who are working to create a democratic culture both in their schools and society.

I wrote this entry after returning to Warsaw. Following the second 'Teachers for Democracy' conference a group of teachers from Columbus, Ohio spent a week traveling around Northeast Poland. In the visits to schools, universities and foundations involved in training individuals for participation in local democracy. I was impressed by the Polish teachers' dedication to the re-creation of civic education in the transition in Poland. I also knew that the events of the trip would impact again my perceptions about Poland. On each trip I had visited a new section of Poland. Each time my perceptions of the culture and place were broadened, altered, and deepened. I was reminded of what had begun my interest in cross-national collaboration.

A few days later I met with Andrej in Warsaw. We sat in an outdoor café in the center of the city. A small group of nuns walked by in full habit. Cabs came careening down the street and people rushed past on their way to and from various obligations. In my notes I made the comment how reluctant I was to mention the group at the table next to mine. Poles with the look of skinheads, shaved and sullen. A bottle of vodka that they had brought being pored into glasses on tables of the café.
Andrej and I began to talk. He talked about his experiences in the project during the last school year. He had brought his students to the university and there they had participated in lessons with the preservice students. It had been very successful and the university students seemed to have gained a great deal from the opportunity. He also talked about the struggles. Andrej was still frustrated about the manner in which teachers and their opinions were held. University people have “prestige and importance. They have titles. Teachers are not held in such good opinion.” And when asked about the most important aspect of the trip he said it was the process of having the professors asking teachers for information and help. “Schools are always changing and the knowledge of professors is not enough.” And when he reflected on the trip itself, he described as most important the opportunity to see “common life...school, and the possibility to know some teachers...conversation with students and relationships between people...”. He reminded me that often in a cross-cultural experience it is the simple things that stay in our memories.

**Learnings**

As I leave this study there are a few distinct things I will take with me. Each has its basis in my interactions with the Polish educators and in my participating in the various activities with them. They reflect where I started: the questions of circularity (Winitizky, Stoddart, and O'Keefe, 1992) or simultaneous reform (Goodlad, 1994) and how to build educational relationships. In this case I looked for strategies that would help to achieve the goal of reform in systems struggling to re-
create civic teacher education. I looked for strategies that helped these individuals create collaborative relationships.

\textit{Strategy I—Crossing Borders}

Crossing cultural borders to exchange ideas, processes, images and questions is one strategy for helping individuals build relationships. Because the need for simultaneous reform exists in both school and university, these relationships may benefit both. Crossing borders as a means of personal and social change is both possible and valuable. For me personally, the process of writing and reflecting on work across borders without the "othering" or exoticizing of the individuals I have come in contact with has been crucial. Traffic should be in both directions. (Walker, 1997, p.138) and projects such as the one chronicled in this case serve as evidence that individuals are impacted by the experience (Magda's letter, my experiences, Andrej's reflections) and that social change is affected (evidence of school/university partnerships in Polish civic education). "Despite patterns of domination we as individual human beings, acting with others, can be agents of social change" (Kreisberg, 1992, p.16).

Cross-cultural collaboration with reform models and processes, and curriculum development involves both cultures. In this case American and Polish participants shared deliberations as to how to reform citizenship education in democracies. I came to a deeper understanding of the need for active participation by students in the classroom. The participants found new information about methods
they were trying in their classrooms. Both sides gained. Both sides questioned assumptions. Both sides critiqued their own practice in light of questions, observations and discussions with those from the other place.

Crossing borders also means being open and interested in the research and practice of other countries. West, Jarchow, and Quisenberry (1996) have said “knowing and understanding teacher education research in other lands clarify and deepen our own ability to ask pivotal questions about our own practice” (p.1047). Teacher education reform efforts in the United States, I believe, benefit from looking at the reform efforts ongoing in other countries.

**Strategy II—Collaborative Work**

Collaborative work, both school/university and cross-cultural, is another strategy for building relationships and dealing with the need for simultaneous reform (Goodlad, 1994). School and University partnerships benefit from both shared tasks and deliberation. Shared tasks such as presentations, sample lessons and curriculum development allow individuals from the classroom and the teacher education program to share knowledge about practice and theory. Theory is informed by practice. Practice is informed by theory.

Deliberation-dialog about and within important societal issues allows participants to begin answering questions such as: How do partnerships begin? And how can it be used to reform civic education? What role can school/university collaboration play in helping to build a democratic society? These issues set the stage for me as I looked at
this group of Polish educators involved in building projects linking school and university. Deliberation on issues of mutual importance and common concern set the stage for collaboration (Button, 1996; Miller, 1990). Democracy is dependent on the ability to participate in deliberation (Mathews, 1996, p.279) and for these Polish educators school became one aspect of civil society. Debates about the purpose and benefits of collaboration opened participants to deeper understanding of such relationships. Both should be structured into efforts designed to build new ‘third’ institutions.

School and University collaboration needs what Walker (1997) calls a “collaboration recognizably criss-crossed by lines of power rather than some patronizing notion of equality” (p. 138). Teachers guide their own territory and operate their own biases. Both cultures, teachers and teacher educators, need access to a common discourse if they are going to speak to and with each other. What teachers do in their classroom on a daily basis must be part of the discussion. In this case discussion of simulations provided a platform for exchange of views. It also highlighted tensions. Both teachers and teacher educators need help in avoiding the “othering” of those from different institutions. “In order to have a large number of values in common, all members of the group must have an equitable opportunity to receive and to take from others. There must be a large variety of shared understandings and experiences” (Dewey, 1996, p.28). Community itself is always in the making (Greene, 1994, p.66).
School/university collaboration appears to offer one means of bringing democratic practice to educators. As we continue to develop a democratic culture in which we produce "the values and forms of interaction necessary to sustain the political process of democracy..." (Welch in Kreisberg, 1992, p. xi) we need projects and processes such as collaboration. Alternative conceptions of power demand a move away from a paradigm based on the premise of observable discrete and separate entities relating in hierarchies to one represented by interconnections, "webs of relationships and the dynamic and creative flowing of energy" (Kreisberg, 1992, p.77).

If we are to succeed in the ultimate goal of improving schools then Gitlin would have us avoid consumptive approaches. "Consumptive approaches are flawed because they ignore an important source of knowledge (what practioners know), do nothing to enable practioners to build on these insights, and view practioners as docile and compliant and therefore underestimate the power and importance of teacher resistance to reform efforts" (Gitlin, 1990, p.538). Focusing on collaborative projects, whether shared tasks or deliberation, helps bring a sense of community and common purpose.

OECD (1996) referenced the need to involve third party teacher networks as one source of energy, ideas and effort for reform that must be simultaneous. Education for Democratic Citizenship in Poland (EDCP) planned and funded a project designed to build university and school collaboration. By involving teachers who had previous work with curriculum development, by involving teachers whose recent experience...
was with teacher training in the area of citizenship education, school and university partnerships in this context (Polish civic education reform) were made stronger. The Holmes Group (1986) stated that the goals for school/university collaboration included the effort to recognize differences in teachers' knowledge, skill and commitment, in their education, certification and work. They also identified the need to connect institutions of higher education to schools because if they want to be made better, they have to make better use of teachers. And finally, they identified the goal of helping make schools better places for teachers to work. In all of these the process of building the bridges, of constructing links across cultures, is central.

Previously I have written about how the resource book *Comparative Lessons for Democracy* provides an example of how international networks might be used to develop curriculum materials (Shinew and Fischer, 1997, p.123). This study documented how international networks might contribute to ongoing teacher education reform. Ultimately, collaboration can serve as a tool for consolidating and expanding democratic practice. It can serve to create linkages across differing interests and thereby strengthen democracies (Putnam, 1993; Dewey, 1996; Parker, 1996). Projects in Central and Eastern Europe seem to have made the shift to this type of activity (Lazar, 1996), activity defined by on-going consultation and joint activities. Cross-cultural collaborative projects can therefore serve these many roles: strengthening teacher education, strengthening reform efforts, strengthening democracy.
Strategy III--Comparison

Comparisons- the use of discrepant events to build deep understanding- reinforced the need to apply constructivist notions of learning to teacher professional development, as well as classroom instruction. Providing comparative experiences deepens understanding and helps cross-cultural participants avoid generalizations. In Shinew and Fischer (1997) I helped to offer a model of international collaboration on curriculum development. In an international curriculum development project many issues arose. One issue was the similarities and differences individuals had regarding expectations of students. The perspectives we brought to the project raised questions such as, “How do our various experiences and histories affect the ways we define such fundamental principals as human rights, an open society and a free press?” (Shinew and Fischer, 1997, p. 122). Both the questions about teacher expectations and our answers to questions about life in a democracy focused our attention on the value of the comparative lens.

In this study the comparative experiences helped the international collaborators identify what was useful and valuable for them. It also highlighted the role of memory and experience. Events such as World War II and the transition to democracy served as examples of Kreisberg’s(1992) “reciprocal influences”. The inclusion of the comparative experiences highlighted Scheurman’s(1998) call for constructivism in the social studies. Constructivism is, he said, most compatible with teaching approaches that encourage “creative reflection on objects, events, and cultural experiences”(p.6). By incorporating aspects of constructivism, especially
comparison, this project serves as one piece of evidence of how to deepen understanding in cross-cultural experiential learning.

Other Issues

Other aspects of the study also have resulted in new learnings. Understanding of possible roles of schools in emerging democracies such as Poland became an important contextual factor. Similarly, issues connected to cross-cultural research highlighted the struggle and necessity for projects such as this study.

Schools in Emerging Democracies

Schools seem to remain, in the minds of teachers and other educators in emerging democracies, one of the places where democracy can be strengthened and consolidated. The participants in this study clearly believed that schools, teachers and educators had a role to play in creating and strengthening democratic practice in Poland. Kreisberg (1992) would call this the “Deweyian conception of school as (a) primary force of change” (p.17). He identified evidence that, in fact, schools can be a force of change.

One way schools can serve this ‘change’ role is called by Kreisberg (1992) the informal curriculum. It “refers to the governance of the school community and the relationships among those within it” (p.17). School can be a civic apprenticeship (Parker, 1996; and others). The relationships within and between school communities should be “models of basic civic values such as civility and respect for human dignity” (Center for Civic Education, 1995).
Civic education plays an essential role in this apprenticeship. “Civic education is understood to play an important role in the development of the political culture required for the establishment, maintenance, and improvement of democratic institutions” (Quigley and Hoar, 1997, p.11). So, schools in emerging democracies can serve to prepare, and educate the populace on democracy, its philosophy and functioning. Teacher education can help to prepare teachers to serve efforts in consolidating democracy. Certainly that has been one focus of the efforts in Poland. “Since 1995 EDCP has focused our annual exchange activities on strengthening preservice teacher education” (Remy and Strzemieczny, 1997, p.51). In doing so EDCP’s planners hope to strengthen the link between theory and practice. Teitel (1994) has said that PDS’s often start as part of regional or national networks or other programs, what are called “third parties”. EDCP’s efforts appear to serve as one piece of evidence of success.

**Efforts in Poland**

The preparation of teachers carries with it renewed importance in a field that is imbued with the belief that curriculum and pedagogy will contribute to the development of a democratic culture. In the field of citizenship education Poland is faced with a multi-faceted dilemma. Not only do teachers often face subject materials imbedded with content skewed by the recent communist past, but also teaching methodology insufficient to the task of preparing active participants in society (Remy and Strzemieczny, 1996). Teacher training programs reflect the disconnection of
classrooms and programs ill-prepared to educate the next generation of teachers in the essential content and pedagogical skills (Janowski, 1992).

Theories of pedagogy, and the ensuing methods of teaching arising from them, carry evidence of how the democratic culture is impacted by schools (Patrick, 1996). Thinking about the school’s role in preparing individuals for participation in democracies includes discussing both the processes in operation in schools and the process used to reform and govern those schools.

In Poland creation of a democratic culture is one task the educational system can assist with. By seeking to reform educational systems Poland has sought to establish long range programs to expand support for democracy and to prepare the citizens for participation in a unified, technological, multinational, democratic future. Malak-Minkiewicz (1996) names “the process of transition from what the Polish school “is” to what the Polish school “ought” to be … as a democratization process” (p.97). She clearly reflects the belief that projects such as EDCP will ultimately make democracy stronger in Poland.

Communist control of the educational system had done much damage to the preparation of actively involved citizens. “After World War II and until 1989, the values and tasks of Polish education (for example) under the communist government were simple reflections of communist ideology and the interests of the communist political elite”(Melosik, 1991). The task of the school system was basic under the communist regimes of Eastern Europe. Disseminate communist and socialist ideals, indoctrinate youth with the infallibility of Marx and develop individuals ready to
stand with the international communist vanguard. “Education was to confirm the
dominant role of the communist party” (Melosik, 1991).

Educational reform is difficult in many less complex situations. There are
many obstacles facing attempts at reform in Central and Eastern Europe. “Changes in
education are taking place in the context of severe economic constraints and highly
dynamic—in some cases unstable—political situations” (OECD, 1996). The issues
most pressing for reform are numerous. Decentralization and school autonomy,
redefining national and regional responsibilities, what to do about the national
curriculums, standards, examinations, especially matura (exit) exams all are issues.
The entire question of state oversight is under scrutiny.

Amy Gutmann (1994) defines civic competence as “putting politically
relevant knowledge to critical use, thinking beyond what exists to what could and
should exist, arguing respectfully with people who reasonably disagree about
what should exist, finding ways of resolving our disagreements” (p.115). In Poland
efforts at developing and re-creating citizenship education place the development of
civic competence at the center. In doing so reform, moves slowly, requires
deliberation, and focuses as much on the skills and attitudes as on knowledge
(Pacewicz, 1996). Teachers move at the center of these efforts.

Magda, in one of the pieces she sent me during the process of conducting the
member check in Poland said,

A teacher prepares pupils to play various roles whether they are aware of it or
not. A teacher also participates in the social life, which influences their
attitudes, values and ideas. I expect there are as many opinions on the role of a teacher in a democratic country as teachers. We must not forget that in the Polish educational system the school does not have the leading role. We inherited the prejudice against school from the former period of our history, when it was largely politically biased. The Polish school is undergoing a reform, or rather still discussing desirable aims of the reform. We are also discussing the role of a teacher in a democratic country. Changes in the Polish school must be based on the long hard work leading to construction of such a model of education that would serve development of a democratic state. A teacher cannot serve changing political needs.

The work in Poland will continue. The involvement of Americans and others appears to moving in the direction of cooperative, cross-cultural partnerships (Lazar, 1996). The situation for teachers and teacher educators will continue to evolve as the government and more importantly the society continues its debate on schools, curriculum and democracy.

Cross-Cultural Research

This study highlighted some of the struggles of doing cross-cultural research. For example, constructing the research design itself highlighted problems with the metaphors of research. As Clifford has discussed, I conducted ‘participant/observation’. I collected ‘data from the field’. I wrote from my cultural
Perspective about another culture. All "presuppose a standpoint outside-looking at, objectifying...." (Clifford and Marcus, 1996, p.11). And while I fought and struggled against this tendency, it was difficult.

Language was also an issue. It caused misunderstandings, discomfort, and struggle. Language issues did, however, highlight the essential issues the participants and I discussed. As Patton (1990) has pointed out, and I believe it to be true, I will be a better domestic researcher having gone through this experience. I will not enter a research field assuming understanding of the terminology and discourse in use.

"Language is the terrain where differently privileged discourses struggle via confrontation and/or displacement" (Lather, 1991, p.8). Issues of language and power, questions of 'from where do I speak?', how will I represent my research participants and where are their voices? All quickly come to the surface in a study such as this.

Again, Kreisberg's(1992) concept of 'reciprocal influence' helped me here. "It points to the severe limitations of describing social interactions in terms of linear cause and effect by identifying and describing the ways in which social interactions are complex and mutually influencing" (Kreisberg, 1992, p.79). Cross-cultural research is full of examples of complex mutually influencing social interactions.

Lather (1991) has said, "ways of knowing are inherently culture-bound and perspectival" (p.2). This study serves as one example of the way educational researchers might use this belief to highlight similarities, differences and common qualities across cultural borders. Dealing with the time specific nature of the study
was difficult, "Cultures do not hold still for their portraits..." (Clifford and Marcus, 1986, p.10). And yet the need to take a snap shot, to identify a process within boundaries marked by the beginning and end of an international exchange, forced me to live within the time and cultural constraints.

In a piece based largely on her experiences in Africa, Merryfield (1985) identified three key issues in cross-cultural research: cultural differences, the application of western methods in non-western contexts, and the ethical problems found in such efforts. By involving participants in the research process, by recognizing the cultural context of knowledge, I believe researchers can reflect the multiple voices of the participants and succeed in cross-cultural research.

Angene Wilson (1997) in her work on intercultural experiences identified five categories or levels of experience. She named them intercultural dabbler, intercultural student, intercultural observer, intercultural friend, and intercultural participant. I looked through her classification I was struck by the thought that nowhere did cross-cultural collaborative work fit. Perhaps a new classification of intercultural collaborator—working over extended periods of time on projects of shared interest and concern across cultural boundaries—would help to expand the usefulness of Wilson’s system. It would help name and find what Kreisberg (1992) would call “new ways of being with other people" (p. 18).

Observing cases brings new understanding to the theories at play in educational research. The North Central Regional Educational Laboratory has developed a framework for professional development that lays out 5 key aspects to
the cyclical process of improving practice. This case seems to confirm the usefulness of this framework. By observing cases where participants attempted to put theories of school and university collaboration into practice, I gained new understanding of the struggle involved and the possibility of using tasks and deliberation as means of building common language, shared experiences and shared deliberation.

Issues in Need of Further Research

There are issues that will need attention in the future. These issues reflect questions left at the end of this research study. They also reflect issues in doing cross-cultural research. First, case studies of the actual, on-going collaborative projects in Poland would give another snapshot, different in timeframe, of the evolving use of school/university collaboration in civic teacher education reform. Second, collaborative research with participants in cross-cultural experiences would seem to offer a range of research possibilities. Research by both those involved in the collaborative work and those outside it could continue to expand the notion of ‘intercultural collaborator’. Third, case studies of Polish civic teacher practices, especially methodology, will provide us a snapshot of their attempts at creating an educational system that prepares students for life in democratic society, what Remy and Strzemieczny (1997) call “trying to build a new society on top of the old rather than in place of it” (p.49). Finally, case studies of American involvement in educational reform in other emerging democracies will provide further learnings as our nation and institutions continue to engage the issues of citizenship education.
Conclusion

In September of 1997 Magda wrote me a letter. It arrived with some of the other materials I had asked her for. In the letter she described some of the impressions she had been left with as a result of the project.

"September 15, 1997

... It is difficult for me to stop thinking about schools I saw and compare them to Polish schools which are poor and sad. And changes for the better in this matter are not likely to occur soon. But we do have great schools, pupils and teachers. After the visit to your country I am convinced that when any changes or reforms are introduced, it is teachers who are the most important. That is why I like your program which releases enormous activity on their part. I have understood that the biggest threat for democracy is indifference and passivity...."

Her words and reflection helped to remind me that I had grown along with the participants from this study. What have I ultimately learned from this experience? For me, this study and my work with Polish educators parallels my transition from the classroom to the university and ultimately to a state level policy-making position. At each step of the way I have been reminded of how much there is still to learn, how many questions I still want (perhaps need) to answer. I have struggled with where to position my self and my experiences. As Andrej, stated we as a society seem to value the voices of the university over the voices of teachers and yet each has something to
offer, something to teach us. I hope I will never lose my ability to speak as a teacher and as one who has explored, debated, read, watched, and questioned what it is we as educators do, and how we do it, and why we do it. Chang-Wells and Wells (1997) have talked about the fact that the transformative view of education implies that teachers must be involved in activities that seek to transform practice (p. 148). I for one will work to ensure teachers and their many perspectives are at the table.

Shanker (1997) has said “building democracy in newly free societies and preserving it in established democracies, although different challenges, have much in common” (p.2). The experiences in this study were evidence to me that collaborative projects, cross-cultural experiences, comparative activities, shared tasks and deliberation all would benefit educators in the United States. The evidence in this case helped me strengthen my belief that we need deliberation on issues of democracy and the role schools play in improving society.

Finally, somehow, we as researchers need to pay attention to the details of our daily work and experiences, without losing site of the world around us. We must be willing to engage and learn from the world outside our national borders. I believe we must participate in deliberation with others who are trying to answer similar questions in contexts different and similar from ours. There is a continuing need for those of us in the United States to look at practice in other places. We need to interact with colleagues and ultimately, hold up our educational system up to interrogation. We must be willing to face the questions cross-cultural collaborators ask, whether they come from our own researchers or from those who enter our work from different parts
of the world, with very different assumptions. I will ultimately leave this study with memories of the faces and voices of new colleagues. They will be with me for a long time to come. Lincoln and Denzin (1994) have said,

There is an illusive center to this contradictory, tension-riddled enterprise that seems to be moving further and further away from grand narratives and single, overarching ontological, epistemological, and methodological paradigms. This center lies in the humanistic commitment of the qualitative researcher to study the world always from the perspective of the interacting individual (p.575).

Changing titles often indicate a shift in thinking and direction. When I proposed this topic the title seemed to lay out the issues I expected to concentrate on. “Establishing the Voice of the Teacher in Teacher Education: A Case Study of Poland in the Midst of Democratization” indicated for me a priori issues centered on the assumption that teachers lacked a voice in teacher education in Poland, that the transition to democracy was in fact directing or at least visibly influencing the educational reform that seems to be ongoing, and that the teacher educators who were coming would need to be convinced that teachers should play a major role in the preparation of future teachers.

As in any evolving study, especially one with a cross-cultural component, the issues at hand alter, evolve, and change. The question of voice and the assumption that it needed to be established in and of itself was problematic in this study.
Replacing the concept of “establishing” with the word “negotiating” carried with it a connotation closer to the emerging issues of partnership that became the focus of this project.

I believe teacher education in a democracy must recognize the critical role of the teacher as “curriculum gatekeeper” (Grant, 1996). The field of teacher education must also recognize teachers’ roles as “methodological innovator”, and, as such, create collaborative spaces and relationships between schools and universities in order to create a more informed and multifaceted preservice teacher preparation program specifically in the area of civics or citizenship education.

In a project attempting to build school and university partnerships, ‘voice’ and the ability to claim knowledge are heavily involved in the positionality of the individuals. My position as researcher/teacher/American also must come into discussion as I attempt to relate the group’s experiences to audiences removed from the situated nature of the participants’ lives. One assumption I will carry is that I must seek only to hold up my interactions with the group and our attempts at constructing meaning across cross-cultural borders of language, culture, and distance. Yancey (1994) however has told me that voice, even my own, “is inherently choral…sometimes mythically, always functionally…” (p. xix). And so by focusing on the development of my voice the voices of others are brought in as well. In doing so I hope I have come to a better understanding of the possibilities and limitations of cross-cultural research.
And so I will go to the next project, the next attempt to capture the interaction between individuals working to improve education. In my memory will be the learnings I take from this study. My images will grow and change and alter as they are applied in new contexts and new situations (Eisner, 1991). I look forward to the challenge.

"We all have memories of worlds opening outward through encounters we have had with other human beings, with texts, with works of art..." (Greene, 1995, p. 181).
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APPENDIX A

Letter of Invitation

School 1117
******, Poland

Dear ******,

I would like to invite you to participate in my dissertation research project, Establishing the Voice of the Teacher in Teacher Education. I have been a teacher for almost 12 years and during that time many questions have arisen as I thought about the work that educators do. For most of these years I have been an elementary school teacher involved in Social Studies and Global Education. Two years ago I decided to take some time out of the classroom and begin work on a Ph.D. in the same field at the Ohio State University. I hold a Masters degree from the program and so I hoped to have a chance to answer some of the questions that came about during my studies. One area of interest has developed in the area of teacher education and specifically the role of school/university collaboration in the preparation of teachers.

This quarter I hope to research the impact of school/university collaboration, specifically the inclusion of teacher perspectives in the preparation of teachers. Collaborative projects are being established to support the creation of new curriculum in the area of civic education in Poland. As an emerging democracy, Poland has undergone a great deal of change since 1989. While the field of education is often slow to evolve, change has entered the classroom as well.

As part of my Ph.D. program I am employed as a graduate research assistant in the Citizenship Development office of the Mershon Center. Our work these last few years has been supporting and helping you, our Polish colleagues, create courses in civic education and constitutionalism. My work with Polish teachers has already taken me to Warsaw where I have presented at workshops for teachers. I was also involved in the Teachers for Democracy conference last September. Issues around the topic of teacher training and preparation, including the role of school/university collaboration were a part of this conference.

Reflective practice has always been an important part of any work I do and so I hope this project will give me the chance to watch, document and reflect on the development of partnerships between schools and universities in support of teacher education. My role will be to assist you in the work you are here to accomplish. It will also be to assist the exchange of ideas and information with consultants, speakers and the American teachers you will come in contact with.
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The participants and site for this research have come about as the result of work I have already been involved in. By focusing on individuals like yourself; who expressed an interest in visiting the Ohio State University and exchanging views on teacher education you will have much to offer. The results will help to guide the work of collaboration as it evolves. For you, the participants I hope to provide a chance to reflect on the project you are involved in. Interviews will involve talking and thinking about the work and its consequences. I believe this will assist all involved.

Confidentiality will be maintained by changing and altering all names, places and affiliations. All documents will be altered to ensure anonymity. Any pieces I create for publication will not be traceable back to individuals involved. Hopefully, information from each participant will contribute to conclusions, influencing future directions of the work.

I plan to collect data using four methods. First, interviews will be conducted with each participant. These will take place twice and last approximately 45 minutes. I also expect to be present in Poland during the second conference on teacher education in June offering opportunities for your comments on my tentative conclusions and a final interview opportunity. I would expect to tape these interviews for future reference. After transcription, the tapes will be erased. The tapes will be transcribed with all names altered.

I also plan to ask participants to keep a log or journal of reflections you have on the work as it proceeds. Included in the log will be the opportunity to jot down concerns and impressions. Third, I expect to file, save and do analysis on all documents; memos, handouts, schedules, etc. generated by the project including documents and pieces that you create.

Finally, participant observation will play a major role in the work. By keeping records of events, meeting, and informal contacts, by recording impressions and thoughts about various events, by being there before, during, and after the work, I hope to understand and gain meaning from the activities as they unfold.

There is no right or wrong way to go about the work of creating collaborative partnerships between universities and schools. I do feel that my role will not be one of judge. Instead I hope to understand what unfolds, to clarify what it is that master educators do when they are placed in partnership with a common task and goal. I look forward to the opportunity to watch and participate as the task begins.

Sincerely,

John M. Fischer
APPENDIX  B

Interview Schedule—First Interviews

Can you tell me about your job? What is it you do? Where? For how long? How did you end up in that institution?

Tell me about the preparation of teachers in Poland (Specific to History, civics, the Knowledge About Society course..) Is it the same everywhere?

Tell me about the difference between the training of teachers in pedagogical institutions and those in universities.

How were teachers trained under the communist regime? How were they chosen for entry into programs? Who determined the university level curriculum? How was it in real life?

What part did schools play in this training? Roles, time in schools, time observing and teaching lessons? When in the program and where did it take place? How were arrangements made?

What part did teachers play in the training of preservice teachers? How about "tutors?" Are there supervisors?

How has the transition to democracy effected teacher training? (In general and then more specifically in the areas of history and civics) How is it done at your institution? How is it different from the way you were trained?

How do you think it should be? what should the role of teachers be? what should the role of university level instructors and professors be? Why? what benefit will come of altering this?

What should be the process for preparing of teachers for civics? Who should be involved?

What do you think school university collaboration means?

Why do it from the perspective of the university?

How about from the perspective of the school?

What about from the perspective of the classroom teacher?

What do you see as the limitations of such collaboration? What do you see as the benefits?

Why have you come here? What do you hope to learn?
APPENDIX C

Focus Group Interview Questions

Define the term 'collaboration' (in the context of schools and teacher training programs [university and pedagogical institutes]).

Describe what you gained from participating in the discussions with Dr. Lutz.

How did the discussion benefit from having both classroom teachers and University/Pedagogical Institution educators at the table?

Was there a difference in what information each group (teachers and teacher educators) wanted or needed?

What is the teacher involvement in curriculum decisions, How are decisions on content and methodology now made? Who makes them? How has this changed from under the previous regime?

If teachers are making the curriculum decisions does this argue for more involvement on their part in the process of teacher preparation.....could it be any other way in a democracy?

Tell me about the preparation for the presentations that you have done at this point. Have you talked with your "partner" about the presentation? Have you shared information with each other? Have you begun to plan how you would conduct the presentation?

If you have not, why not?

Do you know of any attempts at school university collaboration (in any field) in Poland? In education (any area)? Could you describe them and give your impressions.

If you were in charge, what of the current process of teacher preparation would you keep because it is working... What aspects would you get rid of and why?

What would/do your colleagues think about the university teacher preparation program/ about teachers in schools? How would they feel about collaboration with them?

Tell me about the training of teachers of Civics. What process is followed? Why are you involved? What benefit for your professional career do you see?

How has the transition to democracy affected education in general?
APPENDIX D

Teacher Focus Group Questions

Define the term 'collaboration' (in the context of schools and teacher training programs [university and pedagogical institutes]).

Describe what you gained from participating in the discussions with Dr. Lutz.

How did the discussion benefit from having both classroom teachers and University/Pedagogical Institution educators at the table?

Was there a difference in what information each group (teachers and teacher educators) wanted or needed?

Tell me about the preparation for the presentations that you have done at this point. Have you talked with your "partner" about the presentation? Have you shared information with each other? Have you begun to plan how you would conduct the presentation?

If you have not, why not?

Do you know of any attempts at school/university collaboration (in any field) in Poland? In education (any area)? Could you describe them and give your impressions.

What would/do your colleagues think about the about teachers in schools? How would they feel about collaboration with them?

How has the transition to democracy affected education in general?

Some people claim that universities spend so much time on theory that they ignore practice, some say that schools spend so much time on practice that they ignore theory? How do you feel? Are they right? Why? Is it inevitable?
APPENDIX E

Final Focus Group Discussion
(Teachers and Teacher Educators)

What do you think the role of the school and teacher is in a democratic society?

How is this reflected in your involvement in civic education? Why? What benefit for your professional career do you see? Do you see any benefits for society/Poland's democratic culture?

What do you think the future holds? For education, for civic education, for the preparation of teachers, for school/university collaboration?

What would/do your colleagues think about the university teacher preparation program/ about teachers in schools? How would they feel about collaboration with them?

Could we take a few minutes and construct a chart that shows what we think the phases of collaboration are.

What do you think the next steps should be in the process of building collaboration between schools and universities involved in civic education in Poland?

If you were in charge, what of the current process of teacher preparation would you keep because it is working... What aspects would you get rid of and why?

I would like you to respond to this quote...
"The traditional model of teacher training-- theoretical, on a highly academic level, but not very much connected with school practice. It is, as Polish teachers say, like teaching people to swim in the middle of the desert. Frequently, a newly-appointed teacher, prepared in this way starts drowning and either follows old routines of teaching or quits." (Dorczak, 1996, pg. 92)

I would like you to respond to this quote from a teacher at a conference in Poland last Summer...
'Teachers come out are appointed, come into the school and then we retrain them...'

Some people claim that universities spend so much time on theory that they ignore practice, some say that schools spend so much time on practice that they ignore theory? How do you feel? Are they right? Why? Is it inevitable?

In general (and definitely not specifically you...) do you think teachers are the problem that must be dealt with in Polish schools if the educational system is going to improve? How can the participation of teachers in the process of teacher education help in this? Can it?
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Civic education for democracy requires teachers who are committed to core concepts and skills of democracy and are able to employ the best methods for actively engaging students in learning concepts and skills.

The Ohio State University is cooperating with the Center for Citizenship Education, Warsaw to conduct an international civic education program involving Polish and American teacher educators.* In this component, three Polish teacher educators and three Polish teachers will visit the U.S. from January 11 to February 5, 1996.

The Polish educators visiting the U.S. will:

- develop a presentation for preservice and in service education on the use(s) of simulations which will include pertinent content, model lessons, readings, assessment tools and a conceptual framework for the development and use of simulations;

- engage in a sustained discourse with university-based and school-based educators about preparing civics and history teachers in the context of a professional development school (PDS) framework;

- explore, in detail, the design and implementation of simulations in history and civics courses at both the university and school level;

- explore, in detail, the design and implementation of alternative methods of assessment in history and civics courses at both the university and school level;

- observe the operations of a non-governmental civic education organization and its relations with local schools;

- participate in discussions with members of national organizations which promote civic education in the United States.

*The exchange is part of Civitas: An International Education Exchange Program, a cooperative project of a consortium of organizations in civic education in the United States and other participating nations. The program, administered by the Center of Civic Education, is supported by the United States Department of Education and is being conducted with the cooperation of the United States Information Agency.
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Week 1 (January 11th)

1/11 Saturday
11:00 pm Arrive in Columbus, Ohio
Harrison House Bed and Breakfast
313W. 5th Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43201
ph. 614-421-2202

1/12 Sunday
1:00 pm- Orientation to Mershon Center and surrounding area (Shinew)
3:00 pm
6:00 pm Welcome dinner with program staff--Dick and Dee Remy's home

1/13 Monday
10:00 am- Introduction to program (Remy and Shinew)
12:00 noon Goals, organization, product (Room 204A)

Participants' first interviews with John

4:00 pm- Discussion group with Remy, Shinew and PDS Field Professors
6:00 pm (Lori Davis, Tim Dove, Leanne Gabriel, Rudy Sever, Doreen Uhas-Sauer)
about the process of creating a collaborative methods course (Room 120)

Participants' first interviews with John

1/14 Tuesday
11:30 pm- School visit--New Albany High School
3:00 pm
4:00 pm- Attend methods course for OSU social studies preservice teachers:
6:30 pm "Unit planning" (Remy, Sever, Peet)--Northgate Center

1/15 Wednesday
10:00 am- Meet with Remy and Shinew: Discussion of PDS paper and methods
11:30 am course syllabus; share ideas on presentations for inservice and preservice
3:00 pm teachers; develop forms for final presentations (Room 204A)--READ
4:00 pm PAPER ON PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SCHOOLS AND
6:30 pm REVIEW COURSE SYLLABUS FOR DISCUSSION

Teacher focus group interview with John

6:30 pm Movie night at Lennox Multiplex Theatre and coffee (optional)
1/16 Thursday
am
Team planning session: Developing a presentation for teacher professional development
2:00 pm- Seminar on the design and use of simulations: Elements in constructing a simulation--Dr. Donald Laben, University of Mid-Texas (Room 320)
6:00 pm
7:00 pm Dinner with Donald Laben at Galaxy Cafe

1/17 Friday
9:00 am- Seminar on the design and use of simulations: Elements in constructing a simulation--Laben (Room 320)
2:00 pm
4:30 pm- Reception for OSU faculty, area teachers, community members and local government officials at the Martha King Center, 200 Ramseyer Hall
6:00 pm

1/18 Saturday
9:00 am- Seminar on the design and use of simulations: Integration of simulations into classrooms--Laben (Room 320)
2:00 pm
7:00 pm Tito Puente concert at Palace Theatre

1/19 Sunday
Teacher educator focus group interview with John
afternoon Shopping expedition (optional)

Week 2 (January 20th)
1/20 Monday (Martin Luther King Jr. Day)
9:30 am- Seminar on the design and use of alternative methods of assessment--theoretical foundations and practical applications--Dr. Rob Tierney, The Ohio State University (204A)
1:30 pm
***Confirmations about school visits on Friday, January 24th needed

1/21 Tuesday
am Team planning session: Selecting presentation topics
4:00 pm- Attend methods course seminar for social studies preservice teachers:
6:30 pm "Using Portfolios for Student Assessment" (Peet)--Westerville High School
1/22 Wednesday
9:00 am-10:30 am  Follow-up session on the design and use of alternative methods of assessment--Tierney (Room 204A)
3:00 pm-5:00 pm  Planning and debriefing session with Remy and Shinew. Discussion topics: The design and use of simulations and assessment in teacher education and classroom settings and the selection of presentation topics

1/23 Thursday
Team planning session: Organizing materials and plans for presentations

1/24 Friday
Team planning and/or school visits

*Teachers and teacher educators focus group interview with John*

1/25 Saturday
Team planning session: Outlines for final presentations

1/26 Sunday
1:00 pm  Lunch and relaxing at Dawn's

**Week Three (January 28th)**

1/27 Monday
9:00 am-1:30 pm  Final debriefing session with Shinew and Remy: Discuss organization of final presentations; goals and objectives for June Conference; advantages and challenges of school-university collaboration; program evaluation (Room 320)
6:30 pm  Farewell dinner at Guido's Italian Restaurant

1/28 Tuesday
6:00 am  Depart for Columbus Airport
7:15 am  Northwest Air Flight 464 leaves for Detroit, Michigan
8:16 am  Arrive at Detroit Metropolitan Airport (picked up by Center)
10:00 am  Arrive at St. Mary's School--A Polish Welcome to Michigan with Mr. Michael Krowlewski
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10:00 am- Tour of St. Mary's campus, museum, archives and library
11:30 am

11:30 am- Lunch at St. Mary's school
12:30 pm

1:00 pm- Center for Civic Education through Law--Oakland Schools (Room 317)
2:30 pm Overview of the Center and Michigan Itinerary

3:00 pm Arrive at Best Western Concorde Inn
7076 Highland Road
Waterford, Michigan 48348
Ph. (810) 666-8555

6:00 pm Picked up by Center--Meet in lobby
6:30 pm Dinner at the home of Linda Start, Brad Abel and Elizabeth

1/29 Wednesday
8:00 am Best Western Concorde Inn--Continental Breakfast downstairs
8:30 am Depart for Lansing, Michigan

10:00 am- Michigan Capitol Building--Welcome and Michigan Senate by Senator
11:30 am Gary Peters

11:30 am- Legislative Reception--Senate Appropriation Room in the Capitol Building
1:00 pm (attended by members of Michigan's Legislature and Center Board of Directors)

1:30 pm Michigan Department of Education (Overview of Michigan Social Studies
Education Project and Michigan Framework for Social Studies Education
with Karen R. Todorov)
4:30 pm

Arrive at Kalb Center
Michigan University
Centerville, Michigan 483338-1333
ph. (800) 555-5555
1/30 Thursday
6:00 am- Breakfast on own
7:00 am
7:00 am Depart Kalb Center—meet in lobby
7:30 am Arrive at Harrison High School
7:30 am- Classroom observation--Global Studies class
8:30 am
8:30 am- Meet with Harrison High School teachers
9:30 am
9:30 am- Classroom observation--American Studies class
10:30 am
10:30 am- Lunch--Meet with students
11:30 am
11:30 am Depart Harrison High School
12:00 noon
Michigan Historical Museum
1:30 pm
3:00 pm Best Western Concorde Inn
7076 Highland Road
Waterford, Michigan 48348
ph. (810) 666-8555
Dinner

1/31 Friday
8:00 am- Best Western Concorde Inn--Continental Breakfast
8:30 am
8:30 am Depart for Detroit
9:30 am- Teaching law in high school--University of Detroit Mercy School of Law
11:00 am with Professor Melman
11:00 am - Walk to Greek Town
11:30 am

11:30 am - Lunch at Fishbones
1:00 pm

1:00 pm - Tour of Detroit
3:00 pm

3:00 pm - A view from the summit at the Renaissance Center

Arrive at hotel

2/1 Saturday
7:15 am - Depart for Detroit Airport
Northwest Air Flight 224 for National Airport Washington, D.C.

2/2 Sunday - Washington, D.C.

Week Four (February 3rd)

2/3 Monday - Washington, D.C.

2/4 Tuesday - Washington, D.C.

Final interviews with John

2/5 Wednesday - Depart for Warszawa

2/6 Thursday - Arrive in Warszawa
APPENDIX G

ITINERARY

Teacher Education for Democracy Conference
June 13-15, 1997

Friday, June 13th

am

Depart for conference site

1:00 pm

Lunch

2:00-2:30 pm

Welcome and Introductions
Short explanation of the history of the project, purpose of the conference, and a description of the poster session with an introduction from the incentive grant recipients.
(Jacek Strzemieczny and Richard Remy)

2:30-4:00 pm

Theories and Principles of Alternative Assessment
Overview of the theoretical rationale for using alternative assessment—particularly in relation to history and civic education.
(Barbara Miller and Elzbieta Krolikowska)

4:00-4:30

Break

4:30-6:30 pm

Workshops on Assessment
Discussion and examples of the practical implications of using alternative assessment in both the United States and Poland, including (when possible) slides, video cassettes and/or photographs.

Development and Use of Portfolios in the Classroom
(Violetta Olesiuk and ---------)

Use of Portfolios in Preservice Teacher Education
(Hanna Konopka and Dawn Shinew)

Construction and Application of Rubrics
(Tim Dove and Anna Klimowicz)

Assessment for Multiple Intelligences
(Doreen Uhas-Sauer and Leanne Gabriel)

7:00 pm

Dinner
8:00 pm  Reception Hosted by Center for Citizenship Education

Saturday, June 14th
9:00-10:00 am  Principles and Implications for the Use of Simulations in Civics and History
Overview of the theoretical foundations for the construction and use of simulations.
(Richard Remy and --------)

10:15 am - 12:30 pm  Demonstration Lessons on Simulations
Model lessons which demonstrate both the use of simulation as an instructional strategy and the integration of alternative methods of assessment. Participants should choose from one of the following sessions:

- Civics Simulation  
  (Ewa Bobiuska and Katarzyna Zielinska)
- History Simulation  
  (Grazyna Ok a and Milena Wojcenttel-Jankowska)
- History Didactics Simulation  
  (Hanna Konopka and Violetta Olesiuk)

12:45 pm  Lunch

2:00-4:15 pm  Demonstration Lessons on Simulations
Model lessons which demonstrate both the use of simulation as an instructional strategy and the integration of alternative methods of assessment. Participants should choose from one of the following sessions:

- Civics Simulation  
  (Ewa Bobiuska and Katarzyna Zielinska)
- History Simulation  
  (Grazyna Ok a and Milena Wojcenttel-Jankowska)
- History Didactics Simulation  
  (Hanna Konopka and Violetta Olesiuk)

4:15-4:45 pm  Break

4:45-6:00 pm  Panel Discussion: Advantages and Challenges
Simulations Facilitators from the Demonstration Lessons will discuss and respond to questions about designing and using simulations. In addition, consideration will be given to methods for assessing student performance during simulations.
(Facilitators of Demonstration Lessons)

6:30 pm  Dinner
Sunday, June 15th
8:00-9:30 am

Advantages and Challenges to School-University Collaboration: Polish and American Models of Professional Development Schools
Representatives from school-university collaboration in Poland and The United States discuss their programs.
(Mariusz Menz and University of Poznan person, Rudy Sever and Richard Remy)

9:30-10:00 am
Break

10:00 am-12:00 pm

Exhibition Session: Sharing Information from Incentive Grant Recipients and Participants in The Ohio State University Professional Development School Network
Participants have an opportunity to meet with incentive grant recipients and representatives from The Ohio State University Professional Development School Network as they share information about their programs. This session will take the form of an 'exhibition' in which participants will have an opportunity to move from one display to another and ask specific questions about various programs.
(Polish Recipients of Incentive Grants and Ohio State University PDS Participants)

12:00-12:30 pm
Where Do We Go From Here?
Participants will learn more about future possibilities for incentive grants for school-university collaboration in Poland.
(Jacek Strzemieczny and Richard Remy)