ABSTRACT
        This paper examines the teacher research process from
two points of view: that of a university-based researcher and that of
a school-based classroom researcher. Speaking from the experience of
engaging in research from both perspectives, the paper presents six
reflections on teacher research that describe the special nature of
inquiry as conducted by classroom teachers. The paper concludes that
"insider" status as a full-time, school-based teacher researcher
provides a unique perspective for engaging in inquiry on the teaching
and learning of literacy in children. The paper also acknowledges
that other points of view--including the "outside" perspective of a
university-based researcher--provide valid and complementary
positions for acquiring understanding into the complex nature of
literacy acquisition. Contains 30 references and a sample lesson
plan. (Author/RS)

The Inside and Outside of Teacher Research: Reflections on Having One Foot in Both Worlds

James F. Baumann
University of Georgia

NRRC

National
Reading Research
Center

2

NRRC

National Reading Research Center

The Inside and Outside of Teacher Research:
Reflections on Having One Foot in Both Worlds

James F. Baumann
University of Georgia

PERSPECTIVES IN READING RESEARCH NO. 11
Winter 1997

NRRC National
Reading Research
Center

About the National Reading Research Center

The National Reading Research Center (NRRC) is funded by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement of the U.S. Department of Education to conduct research on reading and reading instruction. The NRRC is operated by a consortium of the University of Georgia and the University of Maryland College Park in collaboration with researchers at several institutions nationwide.

The NRRC's mission is to discover and document those conditions in homes, schools, and communities that encourage children to become skilled, enthusiastic, lifelong readers. NRRC researchers are committed to advancing the development of instructional programs sensitive to the cognitive, sociocultural, and motivational factors that affect children's success in reading. NRRC researchers from a variety of disciplines conduct studies with teachers and students from widely diverse cultural and socioeconomic backgrounds in pre-kindergarten through grade 12 classrooms. Research projects deal with the influence of family and family-school interactions on the development of literacy; the interaction of sociocultural factors and motivation to read; the impact of literature-based reading programs on reading achievement; the effects of reading strategies instruction on comprehension and critical thinking in literature, science, and history; the influence of innovative group participation structures on motivation and learning; the potential of computer technology to enhance literacy; and the development of methods and standards for alternative literacy assessments.

The NRRC is further committed to the participation of teachers as full partners in its research. A better understanding of how teachers view the development of literacy, how they use knowledge from research, and how they approach change in the classroom is crucial to improving instruction. To further this understanding, the NRRC conducts school-based research in which teachers explore their own philosophical and pedagogical orientations and trace their professional growth.

Dissemination is an important feature of NRRC activities. Information on NRRC research appears in several formats. *Research Reports* communicate the results of original research or synthesize the findings of several lines of inquiry. They are written primarily for researchers studying various areas of reading and reading instruction. The *Perspective Series* presents a wide range of publications, from calls for research and commentary on research and practice to first-person accounts of experiences in schools. *Instructional Resources* include curriculum materials, instructional guides, and materials for professional growth, designed primarily for teachers.

For more information about the NRRC's research projects and other activities, or to have your name added to the mailing list, please contact:

Donna E. Alvermann, Co-Director
National Reading Research Center
318 Aderhold Hall
University of Georgia
Athens, GA 30602-7125
(706) 542-3674

John T. Guthrie, Co-Director
National Reading Research Center
3216 J. M. Patterson Building
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742
(301) 405-8035

NRRC Editorial Review Board

Susan Lytle
University of Pennsylvania

Bert Mangino
Las Vegas, Nevada

Susan Mazzoni
Baltimore, Maryland

Ann Dacey McCann
University of Maryland College Park

Sarah McCarthey
University of Texas at Austin

Veda McClain
University of Georgia

Lisa McFalls
University of Georgia

Randy McGinnis
University of Maryland

Mike McKenna
Georgia Southern University

Barbara Michalove
*Fourth Street Elementary School
Athens, Georgia*

Elizabeth B. Moje
University of Utah

Lesley Morrow
Rutgers University

Bruce Murray
Auburn University

Susan Neuman
Temple University

John O'Flahavan
University of Maryland College Park

Marilyn Ohlhausen-McKinney
University of Nevada

Penny Oldfather
University of Georgia

Barbara M. Palmer
Mount Saint Mary's College

Stephen Phelps
Buffalo State College

Mike Pickle
Georgia Southern University

Amber T. Prince
Berry College

Gaoyin Qian
Lehman College–CUNY

Tom Reeves
University of Georgia

Lenore Ringler
New York University

Mary Roe
University of Delaware

Nadeen T. Ruiz
*California State University-
Sacramento*

Olivia Saracho
University of Maryland College Park

Paula Schwanenflugel
University of Georgia

Robert Serpell
*University of Maryland Baltimore
County*

Betty Shockley-Bisplinghoff
*Barnett Shoals Elementary School
Athens, Georgia*

Wayne H. Slater
University of Maryland College Park

Margaret Smith
Las Vegas, Nevada

Susan Sonnenschein
*University of Maryland Baltimore
County*

Bernard Spodek
University of Illinois

Bettie St. Pierre
University of Georgia

Steve Stahl
University of Georgia

Roger Stewart
Boise State University

Anne P. Sweet
*Office of Educational Research
and Improvement*

Louise Tomlinson
University of Georgia

Bruce VanSledright
University of Maryland College Park

Barbara Walker
Eastern Montana University–Billings

Louise Waynant
*Prince George's County Schools
Upper Marlboro, Maryland*

Dera Weaver
*Athens Academy
Athens, Georgia*

Jane West
Agnes Scott College

Renee Weisburg
Elkins Park, Pennsylvania

Allan Wigfield
University of Maryland College Park

Shelley Wong
University of Maryland College Park

Josephine Peyton Young
University of Georgia

Hallie Yopp
California State University

About the Author

James F. Baumann is a Professor of Reading Education and Associate Director of the National Reading Research Center at the University of Georgia. His research interests involve comprehension strategy instruction, the establishment of teacher research communities, and integrating skill instruction with literature. During the 1994–95 academic year, he participated in a job exchange, returning to teach second grade full-time in an Athens, Georgia, public elementary school.

The Inside and Outside of Teacher Research: Reflections on Having One Foot in Both Worlds

James F. Baumann

University of Georgia

Abstract. *This essay examines the teacher research process from two points of view: that of a university-based researcher and that of a school-based class-room researcher. Speaking from the experience of engaging in research from both perspectives, the author presents six reflections on teacher research that describe the special nature of inquiry as conducted by classroom teachers. The author concludes that "insider" status as a full-time, school-based teacher researcher provides a unique perspective for engaging in inquiry on the teaching and learning of literacy in children. He also acknowledges and argues, however, that other points of view—including the "outsider" perspective of a university-based researcher—provide valid and complementary positions for acquiring understanding into the complex nature of literacy acquisition.*

Prologue

In this paper, I examine the process of teacher research from two perspectives, that of a classroom-based teacher researcher and that of a university-based researcher. Relevant to this analysis is the hierarchical structure of research, specifically, who is researching whom. Harding (1987), within the context of feminist inquiry, discussed the power structure in some research arrangements. In many cases, researchers may "study down"; that is, university researchers studying teachers, teachers studying students, and so forth. In other cases, researchers may "study up"; for example, university students examining their professors, children or adolescents examining their teachers, or perhaps professors studying themselves (see Alvermann essay in Baumann, Dillon, Shockley, Alvermann, & Reinking, 1996). Allen, Buchanan, Edelsky, and Norton (1992) have noted that literacy researchers more often study down rather than study up.

Another way in which the research hierarchy has been described is the "insider/outsider" dichotomy. Cochran-Smith and Lytle (1993, p. xi) note that most conventional literacy research has been "outside-in," in which university researchers (i.e., the outsiders) examine practice and offer suggestions for teachers and students (i.e., those on the in-

1

side). Quite infrequently, Cochran-Smith and Lytle (1990) argue, has research from the inside been valued, even though there is a long history of classroom-based action or teacher research (Olson, 1990).

In this essay, I explore the dual worlds of insider and outsider researchers. I do so on the basis of a recent personal experience of being a teacher researcher. During the 1994–1995 school year, I taught second grade full time at Fowler Drive Elementary School in Athens, Georgia, a school that serves children from primarily low-income, minority families. I did so on a university/school-district job exchange that had me assume a position vacated by an elementary teacher, Betty Shockley, who, in turn, assumed my undergraduate teaching duties at the University of Georgia.

As a classroom teacher, I studied my own teaching (*studying up*) through a reflective, self-examination of the impact returning to teach had on me as an elementary teacher, a researcher, and a university teacher (Baumann, 1995). I also studied students' learning (*studying down*) by examining the development and impact of my yearlong program to integrate reading and writing strategies within a literature-based reading program (Baumann & Ivey, 1996). I conducted my research within the context of the National Reading Research Center's School Research Consortium (SRC), a teacher-directed community of classroom researchers of which I was a member. In this paper, I examine my teacher research experience (*an insider*) in relation to my prior work as a university-based researcher (*an outsider*), reflecting on the unique, complex, and enriching nature of classroom-based inquiry.

Perspective and Questions

This paper draws from a self-study of the "everyday lived experience" (Dilthey, 1985) of being a second-grade teacher researcher (see "Case One" in Baumann, Shockley, & Allen, in press). A phenomenological perspective (van Manen, 1990) guided this inquiry, within which I asked the question, What is it like to be a teacher researcher after having been a university researcher? This broad probe led to several specific questions: What are the salient characteristics of being a teacher researcher? Does teacher research promote or impede teaching effectiveness? How is being a teacher researcher like or different from being a university researcher? What research methods are useful in classroom inquiry? Does the teacher researcher perspective provide a researcher enhanced insights and understandings about teaching and learning? Are there tensions associated with simultaneously fulfilling the roles of researcher and teacher?

Data for this investigation have come from a variety of sources: a personal research/teaching journal, informal classroom assessments, the children's work and other classroom artifacts, videotaped lessons, and interviews with children, parents/care givers, administrators, and other teacher researchers. Continued reading of the teacher research literature, ongoing discussions with other university faculty who have returned to classrooms to teach and engage in research (e.g., Dudley-Marling, 1995; Hudson-Ross & McWhorter, 1995), and the written texts I am creating about my experience (van Manen, 1990) also serve to deepen and clarify my learnings.

Reflections

Having been a full-time elementary teacher who has engaged in classroom inquiry, what am I learning about the inside world of teacher research in relation to my outsider research experiences? Following are six selective reflections gleaned from my experience.

Teacher Research Involves Reflection and Action

Most definitions of teacher research (e.g., Lytle & Cochran-Smith, 1994; Wells, 1994) include the idea of teachers reflecting on their practice and then acting upon those reflections. Indeed, what I did all year was to systematically document, think about, analyze—*reflect on*—what I was doing. I did so by creating and rereading my journal; writing detailed daily lesson plans; conducting interviews and conversing with administrators, parents, fellow teachers, and university colleagues; and examining students' work, classroom photos, and video images. I then *acted on* my reflections through my next day's lesson plans; by preparing longer ranged plans; by adjusting instruction and curriculum to match students' needs; and through daily, in-class, on-the-spot decision making.

An example of reflection and action involves the struggle I was having at the beginning of the school year to find meaningful ways to integrate instruction into my literature-based reading framework. This was a regular theme in my journal, in which I commented as follows on September 6, 1994:

> . . . I think that my reading strategies period needs the most work. It will be helpful when I get the trade and other books I've ordered, but I need to find a way to get INSTRUCTION into my plans more. Maybe when the routines get nailed down, I can do a better job. Also, I wonder about the wisdom of working with 3 groups. Maybe the Blue and Yellow groups need to be merged. I need to have more/better time to TEACH these kids about literacy. Gotta work on this. Problem is that the Yellow/Blue group would be so large. This needs thought and action. . . .

Following several days of pondering my frustrations and experimenting with different structures, I came up with an alternate plan, which I implemented the next week, as indicated by this September 12 journal excerpt:

> . . . Academically our morning today was about as good as any I have had. I restructured the reading strategy time over the weekend. I eliminated the Blue group and redistributed those kids into the Red and Yellow groups. . . . The Red group read *Have You Seen My Duckling?*, and then we did some pocket-chart activities. We did some initial consonant review work on the board, reviewing consonants /t/ and /s/, and then we read the little practice books. . . . Tomorrow's lessons will be on a couple of phonograms. My point is that I am trying to do some decoding instruction with these kids as well as give them really holistic reading opportunities. And I have got the 5th Grade tutors working tomorrow. . . . So what I am really striving for here in terms of reading and language arts is to get a balanced program in which the kids can read and write whole stories and books and yet

provide them with strategy instruction,
skill instruction, that they desperately
need. . . .

This example documents what I learned and relearned throughout the school year: The process of engaging in classroom-inquiry creates an analytic mindset that promotes a responsive, action-oriented pedagogy. Reflecting and acting were regular, natural parts of teaching and researching.

Engaging in Research Enhances a Teacher's Instructional Effectiveness

This is a corollary to the preceding point. There is no doubt in my mind that I was a better teacher *because* of my systematic reflection-in-action. I engaged in many activities that were primarily motivated by my researcher role, but each guided and informed my teaching. For example, I conducted informal reading inventories (IRI) in August, January, and May so that I could document my students' reading growth across the school year. However, having base-line IRI data in August, a function of my research initiative, enabled me to have a deeper understanding of each student's unique ability so that I could match them to reading materials, place them in instructional groups, and individualize instruction for each of them better than had I not conducted IRIs. Likewise, the second round of IRIs in January provided me an opportunity to re-evaluate placement, grouping, and specific strategy instructional decisions for each of my students.

Another example of how research enhanced instruction involved the painstaking, after-school process of creating detailed lesson plans (see Table 1 for a typical daily lesson plan). Had I not been engaging in classroom research for which it was essential that I be able to document and reconstruct all classroom events across the school year, I probably would not have written such explicit plans. However, writing detailed lessons required a level of thought and care that, I am certain, enhanced the quality of my instruction and the depth of my students' learning. Furthermore, my after-school lesson planning routine forced me to reflect on the day's successes and failures as I planned for tomorrow.

A third example of research activities enhancing instruction involves my daily journal. The initial purpose for my journal was to complement my lesson plans so that I would have a detailed record of my research experience. I soon realized, however, that dictating entries on the drive home from school fostered an analysis of daily events that led me to significant modifications in my curriculum and instruction (see preceding journal excerpts for an illustration). Of all the research activities in which I engaged, my research/teaching journal proved to be the most helpful structure for both improving my teaching and addressing my research questions.

In looking back, there were no clear separations between researching and teaching activities in most cases. Likewise, theory and practice blurred. This interrelatedness, or praxis (e.g., Kincheloe, 1991; Lather, 1986), was fundamental to my work. All my planning was theory in practice, and all my researching was analyzing my practical theory.

It is Different Doing Research While Teaching Children Full Time Than When Doing Research from a University Position and Schedule

I take pride in the line of classroom-based studies I have conducted over the years (e.g.,

---

Table 1
Sample Lesson Plan

Time	Activity	Plans
7:30–8:00	Before School	Math p. 410 Read quietly
8:00–8:10	Organization	Pledge, Announcements, etc.
8:15–8:45	P.E.	Ms. Lane in the gym; restroom on return
8:50–9:50	Reading	**Yellow Group** 1. Begin reading *The Josefina Story Quilt*, a theme related book for Book 1 in *Come One, Come All*. Have the kids review the theme (Growing Up—physically, emotionally, etc.) 2. Read *Dakota Dugout* to set the mood for the book the kids will read. Explain that the story they will read also deals with pioneers, but in a somewhat different fashion. 3. Have the kids brainstorm what they know about pioneers, wagon trains, and a trip west in the 1800s. Read the "Author's Note" at the end of the book to get the kids warmed up. 4. Introduce the character names and a few other words: Josefina (chicken), faith, Ma, Pa, California. 5. Begin reading the first chapter "Josefina" as a group. 6. Review predicting, and then have each student write 2 predictions in their steno notebooks. 7. If still time, have the kids buddy up and reread the chapter. JB: Do a genre lesson on historical fiction on a subsequent day. Also read related titles to the kids: *The Patchwork Quilt, The Keeping Quilt,* and *The Rag Coat*.
		Red Group 1. Opening "Private" read: Reread (a) all storing in *Morning Bells*, and (b) Wiggle Works books I've selected in packs for the kids. 2. Preview next story: Have kids look through "Shoes from Grandpa" and have them predict what it will be about. Write predictions on board for verification as we read it.

		3. New vocabulary: Write, discuss, and read words from story (see highlighted words on pp. 342–343). Do a semantic map of "School Clothes" to list vocabulary. 4. Story reading: (a) read it aloud to the kids as they look at the pictures; (b) read it again, having them track print as you read it; (c) do shared reading of the story for a third pass. 5. Ending "Private" read: Reread "Shoes from Grandpa" and stories from *Out Came the Sun*.
9:50–10:20	Story, Snack, & Recess	Have kids clean desks as you read the chapter book to them.
10:20–10:35	Class Meeting	Assign new jobs for the week, time for sharing, & read new picture books to the kids.
10:35–11:15	Math	Review addition with renaming on board (various configurations). Present format for today's work, which is pp. 221–222. Give them "Triple Treat" assignments if done early.
11:15–11:45	Writing	Have kids select writing topics of their choice. Hold a brief review "topic brainstorming" session to get them thinking about selecting old and new topics for their compositions. Have them spend time drafting new compositions or working on old ones.
11:45–12:15	LUNCH	
12:15–12:30	Read Aloud	Restroom followed by read aloud time.
12:30–1:00	5th Grade Reading-Writing Buddies	Buddy up as per usual—half of my kids to Ms. Erickson's classroom, and half of her kids to mine.
1:00–1:15	Recess	
1:15–1:45	Weekly Reader	12-16-94 issue to read, share, & discuss.
1:45–2:15	Science	Begin new unit on solar system. Have kids select one of the nonfiction trade books you've assembled to read to them to kick off the unit. If time, have them begin decorating their solar system folder.
2:25	Dismissal	Walk the kids to the busses.

Baumann, Seifert-Kessell, & Jones, 1992) within which I have worked directly with children. The intensity, pace, and real-world aspects of teacher research, however, are unlike even the most applied educational studies I had done in the past. I learned that an outside researcher who comes into classrooms to work with students, gathers data, and then

returns to the university, as I had done previously, lives a research life very different from that of the full-time teacher researcher.

While teaching second grade, I had planned on replicating many of the data gathering techniques used in a collaborative study I conducted with 2 fifth-grade teachers the year before (Baumann, Hooten, & White, 1996). I soon learned, however, that this was impossible. Being solely responsible for the students and the classroom made it difficult during the school day to engage in certain data gathering tasks. The year before, I had the luxury of time to set up video equipment, work with children for an hour, and then depart to my university office to analyze that day's lesson and plan for tomorrow's. When teaching second grade, however, I had kids all day long, oftentimes with no breaks from teaching and supervision, resulting in a research environment very different from the rather leisurely pace of classroom research I had experienced in the past.

Saying this, however, does not mean that teachers cannot or do not engage in real, meaningful research. They do and I did; but teacher research often involves approaches and processes different from those employed by outside researchers. Betty Shockley, my trading-places partner and an experienced teacher researcher (Shockley, Michalove, & Allen, 1995), commented on how she and her teacher-colleague, Barbara Michalove, found their research niche by observing and working with JoBeth Allen, a university-based research collaborator:

> In the beginning, Barbara and I as classroom teachers could not imagine how we were going to do research at the same time we were meeting our responsibilities as teachers. To be honest, JoBeth's freedom to record dialogues and observations without the added encumbrances of constant monitoring and teaching made us a bit jealous. When we saw her detailed observational notes, it challenged us to make manageable and meaningful adaptations in order to participate effectively as active researchers. Slowly we developed our own workable systems for learning with and from our students. Writing in our teaching journals, keeping anecdotal notes that landed on our desks until we had time to claim them after school, and collecting samples of children's literacy became part of our natural classroom life. (from Shockley essay in Baumann, Dillon et al., 1996, p. 226)

Teacher researchers adapt or construct workable means to document and record classroom events. This pragmatism, a necessary teacher researcher trait, in my opinion, has methodological implications, as I discuss next.

Teacher Researchers must be Methodologically Flexible and Creative

I began my year in the classroom with some grand methodological plans. I was going to conduct my self-study within a hybrid phenomenological (van Manen, 1990) and educative research (Gitlin et al., 1992) framework. I was going to employ the formative experiment structure (Newman, 1990) for my literature-based/strategies study. As soon as I got into the classroom and began to wrestle with the realities of researching while teaching, however, I found that these methods needed to be modified (see "Case One" in Baumann et al., in press). The educative research approach

proved not to be as suitable as I had intended, and the formative experiment structure became replaced with a qualitative case study approach (Merriam, 1988). Teacher researchers are thoughtful in the methods they choose, but methods are no more than tools of the trade that may and must be modified to achieve the goals underlying an inquiry.

Teacher researchers adapt and create methods to suit their needs, classrooms, and personal researching styles. We have seen this process repeated many times within the SRC teacher research community, as the following example illustrates:

> The SRC researchers failed to find research journals as easy to keep and useful as reported by other teacher researchers in the published studies they were reading. Instead they found ingenious ways to make daily records of their research experiences, be they addenda to daily plans, a hybrid plan-book/research-journal, or literally notes on transparency scraps. If it worked methodologically, its use persisted; if it didn't, it atrophied or was thrown away. (Baumann et al., in press)

In sum, my experience confirmed that method-ological creation and evolution are inevitable characteristics of teacher research.

The Insider Perspective Provides a Teacher Researcher a Unique and Powerful Viewpoint for Classroom Inquiry

As a teacher researcher, you know things about your students, their families, the curriculum, the school culture, and the community that an outsider cannot possibly know. This insider, or emic, perspective (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1993, p. 43) provides a teacher researcher insightful advantages when it comes to data selection and interpretation. Atwell (1993, p. ix) comments that a teacher researcher's insider position provides context-rich findings. I certainly found that to be the case. For example, on October 7, I commented in my journal on a conference I had with Quaris's grandfather.[1] Although Quaris was struggling academically, particularly in language arts, I learned first-hand about the wonderful academic support he was getting from his extended family:

> I met this afternoon with Quaris's grandfather, whom I saw last night at the hot dog supper and flea market at school, and I was able to schedule a conference with him. . . . And he came in today.
> . . . Grandfather is a very very responsible committed parent. I am really impressed with him and really like him. He is raising the kids right now while his daughter is pursuing her education. He keeps 2 of the children at night, and then 1 more during the day, I believe, all from the same family, Quaris's brothers and sisters. And grandfather is really working with Quaris and was positive in commenting on some changes in Quaris, which is nice to hear, compared to his progress from last year, which was slow at best. I shared with grandfather all the academic details: how language arts is a problem for Quaris, but how he has successes in math, and how he clearly

---

[1] The children's names in this paper are pseudonyms. I also have altered nonessential facts in several classroom and home descriptions to protect the privacy of the students and their families.

---

studies his spelling. Quaris is getting terrific support at home. And his grandfather indicated that he reads with him as often as he can. And so it is a good situation, and we will capitalize on it.

The emic perspective may have limitations, however. Erickson (1986) noted that "in some ways the teacher's very closeness to practice, and the complexity of the classroom as a stimulus-rich environment, are liabilities for reflection" (p. 157), suggesting that an outside researcher/collaborator might provide a useful balance to a teacher's personal view. Furthermore, a teacher's knowledge involves tremendous ethical responsibilities when research is reported and written. Deciding what to reveal, what not to say, and how to protect confidentiality, all while still telling a thorough and truthful story, is complex and weighty (JoBeth Allen, personal communication, August 23, 1995).

But being on the inside provides a teacher researcher compelling knowledge. Anthony's courage and candor in sharing with me the violence he and his siblings experienced at home helped me act with greater sensitivity and understanding when he showed anger at school or had difficulty focusing on his school work. Knowing that LaTrisha was staying with her aunt while her mother was out-of-state participating in a trade-school training program helped me understand why LaTrisha was uncharacteristically having problems concentrating, getting along with classmates, and completing her schoolwork. Sitting with her on the playground at recess one sunny spring afternoon as she told me through her tears how she missed her mother and how sorry she was that she wasn't being as "good" as she had

been previously gave me not only a lump in my throat but insight that an outside researcher who came and went from my classroom could not possibly have had.

There are Healthy Tensions Between the Roles of Teacher and Researcher

Betty Shockley described how teacher research was organic for her, how it became a natural and essential part of her work day (see Shockley essay in Baumann, Dillon et al., 1996). Teacher research enhanced my teaching effectiveness; my year was more fulfilling personally and professionally than it would have been had I not conducted research; and when I go back and teach children again, I will be a teacher researcher once more. But teaching while researching did present dilemmas now and again; it did not always fit so neatly into my day, schedule, and life.

While conducting research in a middle-school science classroom where he was simultaneously teaching, Wong (1995) reported that he experienced conflicts of purpose and conduct. For example, as students were struggling with difficult scientific concepts, as a researcher, Wong felt compelled to stand back, observe, and let classroom events unfold for their observation and documentation. However, as a teacher, he felt obliged to intervene by guiding and assisting students with their learning. Although I did not experience these types of conflicts—I never felt torn in the middle of a lesson between doing something "researchy" at the expense of instructional integrity—I did experience tensions of time and task (Baumann, 1996).

My philosophical stance toward teacher research demanded the primacy of teaching and students. In other words, my research activities could never interfere with or detract from my responsibility to help students learn and grow. As teaching and researching played out for me, there were times when I had to enact this principle with respect to certain data gathering and analysis plans. For example, early in the school year, I had to defer plans for classroom video taping, student interviews, and conferences with SRC colleagues because I was all consumed with trying to be the best teacher possible.

Out-of-school time also involved some research compromises. I skipped occasional SRC functions that would have been beneficial to me as a teacher researcher because I needed the time after school for thinking, evaluating the day's lessons, and responding to students' work. Likewise, in the evenings, I sometimes had to forego writing more journal reflections, phoning Betty to discuss events at Fowler, or reading relevant professional journal articles, instead engaging in concrete planning for the next day's lessons. And I never was able to employ a constant comparative method for data analysis (Glaser & Strauss, 1979) in any significant way; I could barely keep up with data collection while teaching, let alone engage in ambitious, daily data review and analysis sessions.

Wilson (1995) challenged Wong's (1995) conflict perspective by arguing that, for her, teaching while researching was natural and noncompetitive. She envisioned teaching and researching as one relation, not two distinct roles. Although being a teacher researcher was

not conflict-free for me, as it apparently was for Wilson, I found benefit in the tensions I experienced. For instance, through my struggles to find workable, useful research methods and efficient ways to gather and examine data, I had to re-evaluate my research purposes, questions, and methods. I believe that this continuous, on-line process of wrestling with research issues resulted in not only a better inquiry but also more thoughtful, responsive teaching on my part.

Epilogue

As is true for all research endeavors, my experience and analysis have limits. For example, a professional colleague (personal communication, April 9, 1996) commented on a written description of my return-to-teaching experience as follows:

> The author is simply not credible as an "insider." He is an "outsider" who worked *within* but was and is not *of* insider culture. He might have a foot but certainly not a foothold in both worlds/cultures. . . . We, in the academy, need to stop playing insider "dress-up."

What about my claim to have insider status? Do I have sufficient knowledge and credibility to speak as a classroom teacher researcher? No doubt, my experience was limited by duration (one year) and position (my employer remained the university). I neither had to worry about living on an elementary teacher's income nor achieving public school tenure. I admit that my return to the university in June insulated me from some realities associated with career teaching. I also concur that

my cache of teaching experiences and knowledge of contemporary elementary school culture are significantly less than my second-grade teacher colleagues at Fowler Drive Elementary. Similarly, other teacher researchers (e.g., Betty Shockley, with whom I exchanged jobs) are more experienced and skillful than I at the process of simultaneously teaching and researching in one's classroom. As a result, I made beginning-teacher mistakes, and my first attempt at teacher research often reflected naiveté.

On the other hand, I was assigned a classroom and group of students just like the other second-grade teachers, had the same instructional and supervisory responsibilities as my colleagues, and worked hard for 180 instructional days, just like all the staff members at Fowler Drive. I received no preferential treatment as far as I can tell. I did the job and engaged in teacher research. It was all very real.

So, does my prior work as a university professor and researcher preclude me from commenting on the process of researching while teaching? Are my experiences and insights invalid? If so, then does it become a matter of time before one achieves cultural status? If so, how long is enough? Five years? Ten? Or can "insider" status ever be achieved if one has experience in academe? Did I abandon my classroom teacher cultural heritage when I left the elementary classroom in the 1970s to go to graduate school? Is Betty Shockley likewise precluded from making valid comments about the world of academe in relation to public school teaching because she has worked at a university for only a short time? Will her analysis of teacher research be invalid when she returns to the public school classroom and again teaches and researches every day?

All researchers must guard against overgeneralizing findings and making sweeping conclusions. Therefore, I present the preceding reflections not as universal tenets but rather as specific, personal themes that are a function of my unique experience. Whether they have meaning beyond my own experience is a judgment that can be made only by others. Cochran-Smith and Lytle (1993) comment that, even though they are experienced practitioners and researchers who have "worked both inside and outside the culture of a large research university," their inside and outside experiences have "sometimes made us marginal in both worlds" (p. xi). I am beginning to appreciate their dilemma. More importantly, I worry that exclusionary views of those who can or may "know" about teaching and learning will limit, rather than broaden, our understanding and appreciation of kids, classrooms, teaching, and learning.

In sum, there is much to the inside and outside of teacher research, and there is nothing simple about the teacher researcher relationship. Its complexity is a function of the classroom inquirer's unique role, which is "not that of the participant observer who comes from the outside world to visit, but that of an unusually observant participant who deliberates inside the scene of action" (Erickson, 1986, p. 157). Indeed, my emic view provided me knowledge and insight no one outside my classroom and role could have possessed.

The insider perspective of a teacher researcher also has limitations. A teacher re-

searcher must generate responsive research methods (Baumann et al., in press), and the teacher researcher process, although exhilarating and great fun, is simultaneously exhausting and emotionally draining. The very strengths of teacher research—its immediacy, continuity, authenticity, and personal nature—may also limit it. Although "objectivity" in educational research is mythological, regardless of the paradigm from which one works, the special subjectivity of teacher research can be balanced with other subjectivities. Those added perspectives might include researchers whose realm of inquiry resides both inside and outside the daily lives of classrooms and kids. In other words, teacher research can be corroborated, compared, balanced, challenged, or extended by numerous others—other individual teacher researchers, communities of teacher researchers, collaboratives of school- and university-based researchers, and even those only from the academy. Although I believe that teacher research must remain the keystone in constructions of classroom understandings, through the assemblage of experiences and knowledge generated through multiple research formulas, we are likely to come to deep and theoretically practical educational insights and implications. As Erickson (1993, p. ix) noted, "neither the outsider nor the insider is granted immaculate perception."

References

Allen, J., Buchanan, J., Edelsky, C., & Norton, G. (1992). Teachers as "they" at NRC: An invitation to enter the dialogue on the ethics of collaborative and non-collaborative classroom research. In C. K. Kinzer & D. J. Leu (Eds.), *Literacy research, theory, and practice: Views from many perspectives* (pp. 357–365). Chicago: National Reading Conference.

Atwell, N. (1993). Forward. In L. Patterson, C. C. Santa, K. G. Short, & K. Smith (Eds.), *Teachers are researchers: Reflection and action* (pp. vii–xii). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Baumann J. F. (1995). Sabbatical in second-grade: Reflecting on the lived experience. In C. K. Kinzer, K. Hinchman, & D. J. Leu (Eds.), *Perspectives on literacy research and practice* (Forty-fourth yearbook of the National Reading Conference, pp. 390–399). Chicago: National Reading Conference.

Baumann, J. F. (1996). Conflict or compatibility in classroom inquiry? One teacher's struggle to balance teaching and research. *Educational Researcher, 25*(7), 29–36.

Baumann, J. F., Dillon, D. R., Shockley, B., Alvermann, D. E., & Reinking, D. (1996). Perspectives for literacy research. In L. Baker, P. Afflerbach, and D. Reinking (Eds.), *Developing engaged readers in school and home communities* (pp. 217–245). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Baumann, J. F., Hooten, H., & White, P. (1996). Teaching skills and strategies with literature. In J. Baltas & S. Shafer (Eds.), *Balanced reading: Grades 3–6* (pp. 60–72). New York: Scholastic Professional Books.

Baumann, J. F., & Ivey, G. (1996). *Teaching reading and writing strategies within a literature-based framework: A yearlong qualitative case study.* Manuscript submitted for publication.

Baumann, J. F., Seifert-Kessell, N., & Jones, L. A. (1992). Effect of think-aloud instruction on elementary students' comprehension monitoring abilities. *Journal of Reading Behavior, 24*, 143–172.

Baumann, J. F., Shockley, B., & Allen, J. (in press). Methodology in teacher research: Three cases. In J. Flood, S. B. Heath, & D. Lapp (Eds.), *A handbook for literacy educators: Research on teaching the communicative and visual arts*. New York: Macmillan.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. L. (1990). Research on teaching and teacher research: The issues that divide. *Educational Researcher, 19*(2), 2-11.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. L. (Eds.). (1993). *Inside/outside: Teacher research and knowledge*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Dilthey, W. (1985). *Poetry and experience*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Dudley-Marling, C. (1995). Uncertainty and the whole language teacher. *Language Arts, 72*, 252-257.

Erickson, F. (1986). Qualitative methods in research on teaching. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed., pp. 119-161). New York: Macmillan.

Erickson, F. (1993). Foreword. In M. Cochran-Smith & S. L. Lytle (Eds.), *Inside/outside: Teacher research and knowledge* (pp. vii-ix). New York: Teachers College Press.

Gitlin, A., Bringhurst, K., Burns, M., Cooley, V., Myers, B., Price, K., Russell, R., & Tiess, P. (1992). *Teachers' voices for school change: An introduction to educative research*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Glaser, B. C., & Strauss, A. L. (1979). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Hawthorne, NY: Aldine.

Harding, S. (1987). Introduction: Is there a feminist method? In S. Harding (Ed.), *Feminism & methodology* (pp. 1-14). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Hudson-Ross, S., & McWhorter, P. (1995) Going back/looking in: A teacher educator and high school teacher explore beginning teaching together. *English Journal, 84*(2), 46-54.

Kincheloe, J. L. (1991). *Teachers as researchers: Qualitative inquiry as a path to empowerment*. London: Falmer.

Lather, P. (1986). Research as praxis. *Harvard Educational Review, 56*, 257-277.

Lytle, S. L., & Cochran-Smith, M. (1994). Teacher research in English. In A. C. Purves (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of English studies and language arts* (pp. 1153-1155). New York: Scholastic.

Merriam, S. B. (1988). *Case study research in education: A qualitative approach*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Newman, D. (1990). Opportunities for research on the organizational impact of school computers. *Educational Researcher, 19*(3), 8-13.

Olson, M. W. (1990). The teacher as researcher: A historical perspective. In M. W. Olson (Ed.), *Opening the door to classroom research* (pp. 1-20). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Shockley, B., Michalove, B., & Allen, J. (1995). *Engaging families: Connecting home and school literacy communities*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

van Manen, M. (1990). *Researching lived experience: Human science for an action sensitive pedagogy*. London, Ontario: State University of New York.

Wells, G. (Ed.). (1994). *Changing schools from within: Creating communities of inquiry*. Toronto: Oise Press.

Wilson, S. M. (1995). Not tension but intention: A response to Wong's analysis of the researcher/teacher. *Educational Researcher, 24*(8), 19-22.

Wong, E. D. (1995). Challenges confronting the researcher/teacher: Conflicts of purpose and conduct. *Educational Researcher, 24*(3), 22-28.

NRRC National
Reading Research
Center

318 Aderhold, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia 30602-7125
3216 J. M. Patterson Building, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742