DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 376 150 SP 035 571

AUTHOR Andrews, Sharon Vincz; And Others
TITLE Alternative Learning Environments Equal Role Changes for Participants.
PUB DATE Apr 94
NOTE 35p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 4-8, 1994).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; Change Agents; *Change Strategies; *Classroom Environment; Classroom Research; Curriculum Development; *Educational Change; Education Courses; Elementary Education; Elementary School Teachers; Faculty Development; Higher Education; Participative Decision Making; Reflective Teaching; *Role Conflict; Seminars; Teacher Education Programs; Teacher Educators; *Teacher Role; Teacher Student Relationship
IDENTIFIERS *Collaborative Inquiry; *Teacher Empowerment

ABSTRACT

This paper provides case studies in role change proceeding from description of a school-wide initiative to a teacher education methods class to individual students and their classroom teachers. All the case studies examine the changing roles of teachers, students, and professors within a climate of shared decision making, student/teacher collaboration, and collaborative classroom curriculum development. The paper suggests strategies which facilitate change and support teachers in new and more democratic roles in the classroom and in the school power hierarchy; addresses participants' concerns about role change in a school setting; explores conditions that provide support for role change in teaching and learning settings; and discusses the influence of teacher style. The propositions which emerged in the study and the implications for curriculum are summarized in the following statement: the qualities and conditions which democratic practice allow--development of voice, the creation of learning environments, the pursuit of inquiry, and engagement in reflexivity--are the major components of a framework for learning and therefore should be major components of curriculum in teacher education. Salient themes that emerged are noted: for role change to occur, a careful setting of the context is important, inquiry is expected and participated in by all members of the project, inquiry is collegial, those in power positions often engage in role abdication, and reflective identification of barriers to role change and strategies for overcoming the barriers are necessary. (LL)

Alternative Learning Environments Equal

Role Changes for Participants

Sharon Vincz Andrews, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Department of Elementary Education
Indiana State University
Terre Haute, Indiana 47809
812-237-2834
befac.eeandrew@indstate.edu

William E. Smith, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Department of Elementary Education
Indiana State University
Terre Haute, Indiana 47809

Patricia J. Wheeler, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Department of Elementary Education
Indiana State University
Terre Haute, Indiana 47809

A paper presented at the annual conference of the American Educational Research Association, Charleston, SC, April, 1994.

Alternative Learning Environments Equal Role Changes for Participants

This paper examines the changing roles of teachers, students, and professors as a) shared decision-making, b) student/teacher collaborations, and c) collaborative classroom curriculum development create new school climates and contexts for professional growth. Role changes and the supports and barriers accompanying them are complex. However, there are strategies and contexts which can facilitate change and support teachers in new and more democratic roles in their classrooms and in the school power hierarchy. The objectives of the paper are: 1) to identify participants' concerns about role change in a school setting, 2) to describe contexts that provide support for role change in teaching and learning settings, 3) to examine classroom curriculum development as it impacts the changing role of the teacher, and 4) to acknowledge the influence of teacher style and the intense engagement demanded by changes in role.

Theoretical Framework

In this paper we will provide case studies in role change from the "macro" to the "micro"--from a school-wide initiative (six schools in a pilot study) to a teacher education methods class to individual students

and their classroom teachers. All will explore the impact and repercussions of changing roles. The paper will proceed from two major perspectives on the topic: a shared decision-making model (Johnson, 1990) and a "teacher-as-learner" or reflective teacher model (Harste, et. al,1989; Schon, 1987). Each of the studies will be described individually, followed by a synthesis and conclusions section.

A. *The "Macro Study": Teacher Role Change Through Shared Decision-Making*

Proponents of shared decision making (SDM) have asserted that it will change teachers' roles by giving them greater voice in school decisions and holding them responsible for the success of their decisions (Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986). However, early research on SDM (Jenni & Mauriel, 1990; Lindquist & Mauriel, 1989; Malen and Ogawa, 1988) did not indicate that teachers' roles changed during SDM implementation.

In a recent case study, however, Smith (1993) found that some teachers' roles changed during SDM implementation. Believing that role change is more subtle, difficult, and complex than SDM advocates and educational researchers had acknowledged, Smith followed the progress of SDM implementation in an urban elementary school over two and one-half

years. Remaining on one site for an extended period helped the researcher to understand contextual influences on role change and to identify subtle but important changes that previous research had not revealed. To clarify the meaning of teacher role, the researcher drew upon role theory to identify specific dimensions of role change for analysis. The findings reported here come from this study of SDM and teacher role change. This portion of our paper is an examination of two dimensions of role change: changes in teachers' responsibilities and changes in teachers' relationships with colleagues and administrators.

Interviews were the primary data source for the study. The researcher conducted 100 interviews with teachers, administrators, and other school staff. Field notes and school and district documents were secondary data sources. The researcher used ethnographic methods to analyze (Spradley, 1980). Analysis began soon after initial data collection and informed subsequent data collection in a cyclical pattern of inquiry.

Performers, Audience, and Outsiders

The study was conducted at Silver Hill (a pseudonym), a large urban elementary school in the Southeast. When SDM began at Silver Hill Elementary, faculty and staff decided to implement the process through a

representative form of governance. Teachers and paraprofessionals elected colleagues from among their ranks to serve as representatives on the SDM Council. Although interview respondents agreed that the Council should consider the views of all stakeholders, the responsibility for making decisions was the Council's. Faculty and staff expressed their concerns to Council representatives. The Council ranked the concerns in terms of their perceived importance and discussed and acted on them in priority order. Council members were expected to keep their colleagues informed about SDM activities. However, most Council representatives failed in that responsibility. The Council did not produce written minutes of most meetings and did not communicate meeting agendas to faculty and staff prior to Council meetings. Thus, the majority of interview respondents said they were not able to provide their views to Council members and often did not receive information about Council decisions after the meetings. Most of these teachers said they were "in the dark" about SDM, believed it was accomplishing little, and were skeptical about its potential for restructuring their school.

In contrast, some teachers were relatively well-informed about SDM. A few Council representatives actively communicated with colleagues about SDM. One Council member noted that she used regularly

scheduled grade-level meetings to share SDM business with peers. Interviews with her grade-level colleagues confirmed that they were better informed and more hopeful about SDM than most faculty. A few teachers learned about SDM through informal channels. For example, one teacher said she kept up with the process through conversations with the faculty representative located next door to her in the building. The same teacher reported that she knew less about SDM activities when the faculty representative moved to another school. Her informal SDM contact was lost, and she was not close enough to other Council representatives to fill that void. Some faculty noted in interviews that they learned about SDM business through teachers' lounge discussions. The researcher noted after repeated visits to the school that some of the teachers who seemed best informed were those who shared the same lunch period with active Council representatives.

These differences in teachers' experiences convinced the researcher that there were three levels of teacher involvement in SDM at Silver Hill and that analysis of teacher role change had to account for these levels. Goffman's (1973) conception of performance was a useful framework for understanding teachers' differing levels of SDM involvement. Goffman believed that in any situation there are performers, audience, and

outsiders. Council members at Silver Hill were actively involved and thus were performers. Audience members were teachers who received communication about SDM and were able to follow the SDM process and contribute their views. Outsiders were teachers who were on the outside of the action. Teachers' levels of SDM involvement strongly influenced their ability to enact new roles. Performers reported substantial role change, and audience and outsiders believed their roles changed little or not at all.

Changes in Teachers' Responsibilities

Audience and outsiders reported one significant change in their responsibilities. During the first year of SDM implementation, the principal initiated a policy of involving teachers in interviewing and selecting new faculty. Teachers at all levels of SDM involvement participated in the process and overwhelmingly approved this shared activity. They believed their involvement in hiring increased faculty collegiality and the commitment of veteran teachers to the successful induction of new hires.

SDM performers believed they took on numerous other responsibilities. In addition to participation in faculty hiring, performers mentioned planning and conducting meetings, initiating proposals for

school change, writing grant proposals, and implementing staff development activities. They also were responsible for developing long-range goals for the school and annual school improvement plans. As noted earlier, a few performers worked to communicate SDM business to their peers, but most did not carry out that responsibility effectively.

Changes in Teachers' Relationships

Audience and outsiders at Silver Hill perceived that their participation in hiring increased teacher collegiality. New teachers said they began their work believing they had the collegial support of faculty who interviewed and hired them. Veteran faculty who participated in hiring said they knew the new teachers were qualified and would succeed at Silver Hill.

Audience and outsiders also believed their relationships with the principal changed through their participation in interviewing and hiring. In fact, these teachers observed that the principal became more open, accessible, and democratic after SDM began.

Performers shared these views and also reported other changes in their organizational relationships. Performers believed they developed "a real comraderie" because of their involvement in SDM. They stated that they build strong collegial bonds on the Council and learned much about

fellow representatives. As one representative noted, "You get a change to sit with some people and get to know them on a more personal level, because when we teach. . . all day, . . . we don't get to know our peers as people." Performers also said they learned they could criticize each others' ideas without endangering their collegial relationships. They noted that teachers sought them out to ask questions and share concerns. Further, performers said they had to learn to accept criticism from other teachers because of their Council roles. These observations are important because they suggest that performers were overcoming traditional teaching norms of isolation and noninterference.

Performers also believed their relationships with the principal changed substantially. Although most faculty said the principal was more willing to share his authority after SDM implementation, only performers described him as a "partner." New Council members said they were surprised on their induction to the Council to learn how willing the principal was to share his authority. Performers had more interaction with the principal and believed they could openly voice any opinion in his presence. They understood more clearly than audience and outsiders that SDM altered organizational relationships in the school and empowered them to carry out significant school change. Audience and outsiders, on

the other hand, were less sure that they could afford to be outspoken or could restructure their school.

Summary: Influences on Teacher Role Change

It is important to note that teacher involvement in hiring had the most significant impact on the roles of audience and outsiders at Silver Hill. In that process audience and outsiders were acting as performers--if only temporarily, and in a limited decision-making domain. This study suggests that teachers' involvement in decision making is a critical influence on teacher role change in SDM schools. Research on SDM that does not attend to differing levels of involvement may suggest that role change does not occur. However, the experiences of teachers at Silver Hill suggest that there are differing levels and dimensions of role change during SDM implementation. Although most teachers at Silver Hill did not believe their roles had changed significantly, SDM performers reported substantial role change. Further, some teachers perceived substantial role change in a particular domain while others--even those at the same level of involvement--did not experience that dimension of role change.

If teacher role change is a central aim of schools implementing shared decision making, careful consideration should be given to the model of governance adopted. Silver Hill implemented SDM through a

representative form of governance. Consequently, teachers had widely differing experiences of the process.

Those differences might not have been as significant if communication had been more effective. For example, performers noted that they broke traditional teaching norms of isolation and noninterference in their interactions with each other. It seems reasonable to suggest that other teachers might have had the same experience if communication structures had allowed them to participate with peers in discussions about restructuring. To involve all teachers in that conversation, however, schools must work to create and sustain channels that give teachers a means to express their views to decision makers and to follow the process of decision making. Because traditional school governance has not require such communication structures, schools implementing SDM must be explicit in their efforts to create them. Otherwise, the full potential of SDM for creating environments for teachers role change will not be realized.

B. The Classroom Study: Building an Alternative Learning Context Encourages Role Change in the Classroom.

The second part of this paper examines changes in teacher perceptions of their roles as elementary classroom teachers, as well as

changes in their theoretical orientation to reading instruction (DeFord, 1985) and to curriculum in general, which occur when teachers are "given permission" to change as a result of a graduate course in reading and language arts. The course presented a specific format for the design and implementation of a theme cycle (student-centered inquiry curriculum) in their classrooms during the semester.

Typically, teachers retain a majority of the control over their students' curriculum--content and processes. A graduate language arts methods course presented a specific format for the design of a theme cycle--student-centered inquiry curriculum--which teachers were to implement in their classrooms during the semester. The theme cycle format demanded that schools and teachers support students in the life-long learning process: a process that helps them learn how to a) make decisions about content to be studied, b) consider next steps, c) remember topics of interest, d) record noteworthy resources, and e) acknowledge personal strengths and weaknesses, as well as fostering the intrinsic desire to know more. Consequently, as teachers learned to use theme cycles, they had to re-examine the issue of classroom control and the role of "teacher." They became learners and collaborators with their students and dealt with conflicting theoretical orientations during the change

process which occurred.

If methods courses in teacher education programs are to be salvaged and imbued with new and useful life, teacher educators must be held accountable for actually living in their own classrooms the pedagogical models they advocate. Substantive methods courses must become demonstrations of pedagogy and not merely discussions of pedagogy. The curriculum structures which frame methods courses must move beyond lectures--the teaching mode which seeks to transmit knowledge--to the development of democratic social learning communities in which all participants view knowledge as contextually constructed. Methods courses must advocate active decision-making and critique rather than rote learning and compliance.

The curriculum structures we focus on in our methods courses are: the ways students are grouped, the mechanisms for class discussion, the techniques for recording and substantiating individual reflections, and the dialectical processes of developing oral and written texts. Our attempts to make our particular curriculum structures inherently democratic require students to take responsibility for their learning and require us, as instructors, to move away from center stage.

This paper describes an effort to demonstrate democratic practice

in a language arts/social studies methods course through development of curriculum structures which build a social learning community in the classroom.

A Research Cycle: Student Construction of the Knowledge Base

The theme cycle approach became a research cycle the second semester. Students then became responsible for bringing in information and for contributing what information they already had. Semantic webbing, collecting of information and structuring it, developing it into a public document allowed for more decision-making and more ownership of the particular knowledge base and the development of it. And while they were discomfitted because it was very different from anything else they had encountered [in their college education] they realized at the end of semester that they had become knowledge developers, not merely consumers.

New views of learning surfaced as the community of learners evolved. Rather than viewing learning as sets of facts or principles to be memorized, students began to see that they themselves were developing knowledge bases within their groups through a group process. Michelle reflected at the end of the first week of classes: "I have learned that several people working together can generate a lot more information than

one person working alone."

Their growing knowledge of learning theory in language education took concrete form as they read, wrote and discussed. Following the first week of webbing current information on the topics of "Middle Ages" and "Family," students reflected on the insights and learnings for the week. Several students chose to discuss their feelings about the group work in relation to the new information on their topics. Two weeks later, as we began this research project with fourth graders, their insights about knowledge construction became evident. Kylie wrote,

> The first day of work on the semantic web excited the children. It made them realize they possessed a great amount of knowledge of the Middle Ages. I explained to them that none of us knew everything about the Middle Ages and grouping our knowledge taught us more. They thought this [webbing] was a pretty neat system. Before, I think they thought all the information must come from the teacher.

Conclusions

The educational theory to which we subscribe determines the environments we plan and the curriculum structures we value. We have argued that teacher education cannot continue to promote conservative, intellectually dependent attitudes in preservice teachers, that teacher education is not the transmission and practice of a series of techniques for instruction and management. Through the presentation and analysis of

data from the social learning context of a language arts/social studies methods course, we have supported the argument that particular curriculum structures serve to support democratic practice in ways that traditional teaching cannot.

The propositions which emerged in this study and the implications for curriculum can be summarized into one brief statement: the qualities and conditions which democratic practice allow--development of voice, the creation of learning environments, the pursuit of inquiry, and engagement in reflexivity--are the major components of a framework for learning and therefore should be major components of curriculum in teacher education. We join Denise, one of our undergraduates, in a reflection piece several weeks into the course,

> In a learning environment, one needs to be free to express his opinion without fear of rejection, along with the freedom to make mistakes and learn from them. One needs support from others, and one needs to show consideration and support for others as well. People in a learning environment support someone by showing positive regard and acceptance. The fact that "we're all in it together" is helpful. My group has been wonderful! Each person has so much to share. It opens up a world of perceptions.

Written reflections, interviews, curriculum documents and scores on the Theoretical Orientation to Reading Profile (DeFord, 1985) indicate changes in thinking about their roles as teachers. Results based on

analysis of journals and interviews (Glaser & Straus, 1976) indicate several themes based on teachers' perceptions:

•Control of the curriculum and learning processes is strikingly different from traditional curriculum management. Initially, teachers are reluctant to give up the control, suspicious that when given choices students will choose badly or choose nothing. Soon, however, teachers usually find children grabbing opportunities that exceed the minimum expectations because the choices are theirs. Often teachers find this happening with students normally passive in the traditional curriculum. This opportunity seems to open up new ways for those children to participate and they take advantage of the situation.

•Teachers begin to realize the difference between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation in their students.

•Teachers perceive their own role as changing from directing a prescriptive and highly structured format to presiding over and facilitating a qualitatively different kind of learning.

C. An Alternative Format for a Methods Course in Language Arts

The development of relationships between pre- and inservice teachers in field experiences should promote early induction into and engagement with the profession. However, in a majority of cases students perceive themselves as "novices" to be trained by "expert" professional teachers. There is often little joint planning of classroom experiences and little change in roles among participants: professors (theoreticians) plan the assignments, students (learners) carry them out, and teachers

(expert practitioners) supervise the action. This part of the paper reports a research and teaching partnership between several pre- and inservice teachers which led to a "laying down" of traditional roles. This was accomplished in several ways: the preservice and inservice teachers were all students in a language arts methods seminar; all participants shared freely their fears and concerns about teaching; pre- and inservice teachers paired themselves for classroom (elementary) teaching and research projects.

Building Relationships: Building a Learning Context

> We had better relationships with our teachers than students in regular field experiences. I can talk with Trish if I don't understand. When I first went into the kindergarten I thought, "This is just play or something." Now I realize if I ever was in kindergarten, there's no other way for me because it just works so well. I think if I have been in a regular class , I would have had no relationship with my teacher where I could talk to her and find out more. That seemed really important. I learned that teachers are real people, too.

These were Stefanie's spontaneous comments offered at the end of the last seminar meeting where group members began telling what the experience meant to them. In looking at her journals and interviews over the course the semester, it seemed that her experience epitomized the importance of personal relationships in learning. In fact, from her comments on past colleges experiences and course work, it seems that the

building of close relationships also meant the possibility of learning. Very much a sensitive and social learner, she needed to feel comfortable, respected and valued in order to interact in a meaningful way. Though this is undoubtedly the case for all learners to some degree, for Stefanie this was highlighted in her journals to a much greater extent that other seminar members. This seminar environment seemed particularly suited to Stefanie's need for collaborative learning. Tracing Stefanie's responses related to relationships paints a special picture of the social nature of learning and its importance for Stefanie. Stefanie seems to have been able to maintain a low profile in most of her college courses. Having had four different majors, she could say with some authority,

> Education is definitely the safest area I've every been in--you don't have to expose yourself at all. You can go slow or just keep quiet in the background.

Stefanie had only recently become more serious about her education and more specifically, a career in teaching. Part time work, an active social life and lack of commitment to career goals combined to limit Stefanie's initial vision of the seminar possibilities. In our first brief interview before the semester began, she stated that she wanted to join the seminar group because it "fit well with her schedule." During the first few weeks of the seminar Stefanie seemed an interested observer

who was a little afraid and ready to leave as soon as the clock struck three. The combination of a group of experienced teachers and the introduction of what was a new philosophy of teaching (whole language) made Stefanie and others really guarded in expressing their opinions and questions. Her first journal entry does not really give a flavor of this beginning ambivalence except for the last small paragraph in which she acknowledges that this experience would mean work.

> The conversation between the inservice teachers and the preservice teachers was great! It was also very eye-opening when we had the "nightmare in my closet: discussion. I felt that many of my questions and fears could be overcome and someday answered. I also realized that it will take a lot of time before I will feel comfortable teaching in the classroom (it doesn't happen overnight!) When I left the seminar, I was very excited about what had taken place. I really feel part of an immense learning experience. I want to get so much information from the inservice teachers.I know this seminar will take a lot of work, but the more I give the more knowledge I will get in return.

Stefanie's growing understanding of whole language philosophy during the semester parallels her expanding relationships with the children in her classroom, with Trish and with her peers.

Collaborating with the Children

From early October on, Stefanie's growing appreciation of and joy in the children in her classroom was evident. She began to appreciate an

environment which allowed for meaningful language events and which supports the building of relationships. Initially, Stefanie was disappointed with her field experience classroom: "nothing is happening," "the kids aren't learning," "all they do is play." She had paired up with a teacher who was working hard at developing whole language curriculum with her students. One of the most outspoken and theoretically experienced of the group, Trish was somewhat intimidating to Stefanie at first. Stefanie was unfamiliar with whole language beliefs when the semester began. It was difficult for her to see what Trish and Amy were trying to accomplish. After Trish's presentation of her curriculum overhead, Stefanie hesitantly acknowledged some new insight.

> When Trish described her curriculum plan I felt a little more comfortable withthe activities that take place in the kindergarten room. I'm really not sure how language and reading are incorporated. I hope through future observations I will get a better understanding (journal entry).

Two weeks later Stefanie acknowledged a little more insight:

> I got my group today in Trish's class--Shawn, Bobby, and Adam. We talked and got to know each other. I then decided to try written conversations with my group. They all know how to write their names but had trouble writing their colors. They could not read any of the questions. I had to read them for them.I like the kindergarten class a lot better than last time. I can see progress within them each time I visit (journal entry).

The following week was a "pivotal" seminar in the words of several preservice teachers. During sharing time, Trish challenged the group with a discussion about whole language, trying to help the preservice teachers see that they needed to be able to talk about their beliefs and defend them, in particular, to be able to tell others what whole language is and isn't. Of this session, Stefanie wrote,

> Class today was an informative one. I understand much more about whole language. I had not even heard the term when I began this semester. I like the concept--especially after seeing it in action in Trish's class. From our discussion in the seminar, I began to see some of the ways her class learns when I reflected upon past observations. . . . Today in class [Trish's classroom] we discovered a boy who went from signing his name "t-t-t-t" to signing "S-t-e-v-e"! That was so exciting. Quite a few of the kids made some incredible improvements in their writing. One more thing--I'm happy to know that I can "sound out words" or tell the kids to, when they ask me how to spell a word. Before the seminar today, I was afraid to in my classroom (journal entry).

Despite the fact that none of the preservice teachers were familiar with whole language philosophy before the seminar began, they quickly formed some black/white categories for what constituted whole language practice. Perhaps because we had not talked about phonics they felt that it was not dealt with at all in practice. Even though in Stefanie's case, she had seen Trish and Amy use phonic analysis in the context of message writing, names and other functional writing, she did not seem to think of

it as phonics instruction. Perhaps because it had not been labeled "phonics" time and there were no phonics workbooks or worksheets, this "in-context" phonic analysis escaped notice. Stefanie mentioned phonics again in a later journal entry.

> Today was a really good/productive class. I was looking forward to being aroundthe kids after having such a bad week. I find myself smiling all the time when I'm around the class. One little boy, James is writing in his journal. He is so excited about school and loves to write although he is probably at the lowest level in the classroom. The environment in the room is very non-threatening and encourages writing from everyone. I'm becoming more and more comfortable with whole language. I can see it working well in this classroom. Today I heard Trish sound out a work--that makes me feel even better. I don't think phonics should be the main approach but I just don't see how you can get around sounding out and sight words! (journal entry).

Two week later, the issue seems to have dissolved as Stefanie becomes involved in the children's meaningful reading and writing which provide the functional context for the learning of letter/sound associations.

> Today was very productive for me. I had many writing experiences with the kids today--notes, mailbox letters and written conversations. James, an immature little boy in the room--asked me right away when we were going to write. We planned to sit down the next Friday and write together. I'm excited to see how he does. Omega did a super job writing--that gave me hope for the kindergartners. This is terrible to admit, but for awhile I was feeling that I didn't want to teach

any grade that is just beginning to read and write. I thought it would be boring!

Can you believe it? My mind has changed completely. It is a great feeling to see early writers and readers wanting to learn (journal entry).

Relationships with the children were very important to Stefanie's learning, but just as important were relationships with her peers in and out of the seminar. These interactions impacted heavily on her ability to feel free to think and to learn. At times personal conflicts seemed to threaten the learning context and potential. There were a number of heated discussions with peers in this class and others. Issues of caring and support loomed large for Stefanie and seemed at odds with the taking of a stand with regard to her beliefs about teaching and learning. Her struggles to articulate her beliefs without alienating others were often at the crux of developing theory. A brief look at Stefanie's categorization of other group members with regard to their beliefs and relationship to her helps us to see the necessity for supportive and low risk environments for learning and developing as teachers.

Collaborating with Peers

Stefanie valued relationships with her peers and felt she learned because of them. She said, in a post course interview:

We students talked amongst ourselves and we learned

> that way. We observed seminar relationships and things everyone said and then we'd talk about it on the way home. Gina and Tina and I talked a lot. That was the major topic of conversation last semester--the semester(interview).

Joy and Rebecca often joined Gina, Tim and Stefanie in the education students' lounge on campus during the time period when their language arts course was meeting [had they not joined the seminar, they would have all been a part of a regular class which I taught]. Often lively discussions about philosophy and teaching methods, comparisons of inservice teacher partners and other education related topics occurred during this time. This subset of the larger seminar group developed as a support group of natural collaborators drawn together by personal relationships and common interests in teaching. Though other group members mentioned in interviews and at other times that Stefanie wasn't very interested in talking about teaching, she valued the relationships and felt supported in her learning by this group.

> I felt we were all in this thing together. For a long time I felt more comfortable talking to Joy or Rebecca rather than to you or Trish if I didn't understand something (member checking session).

Collaborating with an Inservice Partner

A third collaborative relationship and perhaps the most important one to Stefanie, was her relationship with Trish, her inservice partner.

"The pairs [preservice/inservice] were almost perfect," said Stefanie in a post course interview. "The teachers really had a lot of influence on us." It took several weeks of building this collaborative relationship for Stefanie to begin feeling the "pairs were perfect." In a midcourse interview, I asked Stefanie a question that I asked all members of the group. Stefanie struggled to become committed to and comfortable in a collaborative relationship with Trish. Toward the end of the semester she said in an interview:

> I think our relationships with our teachers are better. I'm more comfortable with Trish now although I still, and I guess I should feel a big barrier, a line I can't cross. I have felt that with every field experience teacher I've every had. It's a little less with Trish. It's personal. I don't want to overstep my bounds. With Trish--she's really open and I think that we would have a lot in common and we could have really good conversations if I didn't have this boundary (interview).

"The boundary" seems to dissolve as the semester progresses. For a good part of the semester, Trish felt that she wasn't "reaching" Stefanie, that she didn't know what to do to help her enjoy the kindergarten classroom, to question the instruction, to develop as a critical thinker and theoretician. Trish and I often chatted informally before or after the seminar, discussing Stefanie and ways to help her become more involved. The research project seemed to fill this gap for Stefanie. Trish seemed to have trouble landing on a project that she and Stefanie could do together

to answer some question they had concerning the classroom language arts or reading program. They finally decided to look at their children's signatures on the various classroom sign-up sheets and other functional writing over time to determine progress in writing which occurs without direct instruction. By the end of her semester's work with Trish, the "boundary" which Stefanie seemed to feel had separated them was very much diminished. In a spring interview she said,

> This semester I don't let myself feel intimidated. [My cooperating teacher] graduated 22 years ago. The things I'm doing now or that I did last semester she's not really acquainted with so I have a slight edge. . . . Last semester I didn't feel intimidated. I don't think anyone could fee that way with Trish. Well, at first I was--maybe that's not the word. She's just really open and says what she thinks, and I really respect that in a person. I can't do that now, but I think I'm that way too (interview).

Stefanie's close collaboration with Trish and with the children on the research project was perhaps the most meaningful part of the semester's work for her. "Everyone should have to do a research project. I learned so much from it," she said in a post course interview. Not only did this work make her "open her eyes and live it" as she said of the impact of working with Trish in her classroom, but also provided a context in which she could take some joint ownership of the classroom and the curriculum. Stefanie also felt challenged and useful in this work.

Several weeks into the spring semester following the seminar, I interviewed Stefanie. We discussed the value of the seminar for her. She said,

> Sometimes I just feel so unchallenged [the semester following the seminar], it's incredible. The seminar and M311 [the general issues course] are the only two classes I've ever wanted to participate in. I went home with things to think about. Now it's like I walk out and think, "what did we talk about?" And it's not that I don't listen or that I'm not involved, but it makes no impact on me at all. . . . The seminar was so real. . . Now I go to my field experience and I straighten up the library. It's like, "I'm a lot more intelligent than you're giving me credit for" (interview).

I asked Stefanie who she thought would be interesting pairs to focus on in the reporting of this project. She immediately named two other pairs. I asked if she thought she and Trish would be interesting. She said,

> I don't know. We're both really alike. Our personalities are alike in a lot of ways. I think we'd be interesting just to look at the change in me from working with Trish. When comparing the seminar to this semester, it seems that now I have no relationship at all with my teacher. I'd just say that's the kind of person she is. . . .she's the queen bee. . . There were so many different personalities in the seminar but everyone got along and had a good relationship with their teacher. That was really important because I learned so much that in a regular classroom I never would have learned--the internship and pay strikes and teacher/principal relationships. Trish really informed me about a lot of things. . . . I just can't see how someone couldn't respect her because she is doing what she envisions. Some people can't do that. Some people are scared to take the risk. That's something to respect her for. . . She's definitely a role model to me. She's at a point where I'd

like to be. It's the way she does it, the way she believes, not just what she believes. She's so strong. In a way, she's got an attitude of "I can take you or leave you." I think Trish could really shove you aside if you don't believe what she does. I could never be that way, but it's just because she's so strong. But I think the seminar did her a lot of good [with relationships] (interview).

Because I was interested in empowerment issues for preservice teachers, I spoke with each of them about the seminar in terms of empowerment. What did empowerment mean to them? Often, I described what I felt was an empowering environment for children in classrooms: choice, respect, functional purposeful reading and writing among other attributes. If they were unfamiliar with the term empowerment as applied to educational settings, this brief description helped them to see what I was talking about and enabled them to think of the seminar in those terms. Not surprisingly, Stefanie couched her discussion of empowerment issues in terms of relationships.

I think last semester we were all empowered in the seminar because we were all so involved. We weren't treated as someone who will go and run off dittos for the teacher, like a lot of people are. The kids knew that we were important, too. It was just the way Amy and Trish treated me. They didn't treat me like a lesser person. I felt like I could get close to my kids. . . If I think back in a few years, the kids that I'll remember are James and Omega and all those kids. If I wasn't talking about them with Trish--their problems, their high points--then I was with them, doing something in the class that pertained to that. I couldn't separate myself from them. Like now [in current field experience], I can just

separate myself from it and come and go. Last semester, I spent a lot of time thinking about **what** I was going to do and how I was going to do something. It was just as important being close to the kids as being close to Trish. . . .I don't know if it's so much a balance of authority. I didn't really have authority in Trish's class. It's more in respecting each others ideas (interview).

In the study reported above, written reflections, critiques, and responses to paired case studies written by the primary researcher provided data and analysis of the changing roles and their impact on pre-service teacher socialization. Glaser and Straus's (1976)methodology of unitizing data allowed a number of salient themes related to role change to emerge:

- The group seminars promoted role change by providing common ground and equal footing between pre- and inservice teachers.

- The roles of nurturing and critiquing of each other became more accessible through a process writing approach (Graves, 1991; Harste, Short & Burke, 1988) to assigned projects. A supportive tension promoted role change.

- Roles of "expert" and "novice" were quickly abandoned due to the formation of learning teams (Andrews & Wheeler, 1993).

•building of close relationships also meant the possibility of learning.

Synthesis and Conclusions of the "Macro" to "Micro" Studies

Current calls for teacher autonomy and shared decision-making are predicated upon participants in any school setting (PTO or classroom) learning how to adapt to new role definitions and perspectives.

Willingness to become learners, teachers, researchers, even if some of those roles are not the perceived current "job description," initiates personal and professional growth. We have described in detail the contexts that became fertile ground for role change. As we look across each of the alternative contexts that provided opportunities for role change, we see some salient themes:

- A ***careful setting of the context*** is important to role change. In all of these studies, participants took responsibility for their actions, decisions, and goal setting. When there were choices, role change occurred more directly and dramatically. The primary researcher is often part of the change and often creates a new role in a particular setting.
- ***Inquiry is expected*** and participated in by all members of the settings/school. Inquiry related directly to the indentifying of concerns regarding role change by participants.
- There is a ***collegiality of inquiry*** that requires movement from pre-determined and static roles to dymanic, emergent roles.
- If role change occurs, there is often ***purposeful role abdication*** by those is power positions. Teachers become learners, researchers become the researched, and so forth. Both "teacher decision-making" models and "teacher as reflective practitioner" models offer tremendous opportunity

for role change. However, in order to be significant, the role change depends on teachers having a greater voice in school decisions and on holding them responsible for the success of their decisions. Real power changes and decision-making allow for more ownership of the particular knowledge base and the development of it. Empowerment issues are are viewed in terms of collaborative relationships--i.e., a sense of power-sharing occurs when new relationships are forged.

- ***Reflective identification of barriers to role change*** and strategies for overcoming them is necessary to the success of research partnerships in the schools.

Educational Importance

From first grade teachers to psychologists to business leaders, those who educate for the future recognize that flexibility and the ability to change perspectives and adapt to new roles and relationships is key to survival in the increasingly fast-paced and changing economic and educational environments. Site-based management, teachers' development of curriculum for their own classes. and children's choices in reading, writing, and research, point to more democratic and empowered partnerships in our schools. Professors of education can play keys roles in facilitating this movement by identifying and developing strategies for

supporting role change.

References

Andrews, S. & P. Wheeler. (1993). Learning teams in the college classroom. Teacher Educator, 26, 29-36.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986). A Nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century. New York: Author.

Deford, D. (1985). Validating the Theoretical Orientation to Reading Profile. Reading Research Quarterly, Deember, 1995.

Glaser, A. & Straus, R. (1975). Grounded theory . San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Goffman, E. (1973). The presentation of self in everyday life. Woodstock, NY: Overlook.

Graves, D. (1991). Build a literature classroom. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Harste, J., K. Short & C. Burke. (1988). Language stories and literacy lessons. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Harte, J., D. Watson & C. Burke. (1989). Whole language: Inquiring voices. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Jenni, R. W., & Mauriel, J. J. (1990). An examination of the factors affecting stakeholders' assessment of school decentralization. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association.

Linquist, K. M., & Mauriel, J. J. (1989). School based management: Doomed to failure? Education and Urban Society, 21, 403-416.

Malen, B., & Ogawa, R. T. (1988). Professional-patron influence on site-based governance councils: A confounding case study. Education Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 10, 251-270.

Schon, D. (1987). The reflective practitioner. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Smith, W. E. (1993). Teachers' perceptions of role change through shared decision making: A 2-year case study. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association.