INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

U·M·I

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

Order Number 9314585

Introduction of cooperative learning in one rural elementary school by the school psychologist

Jones, Thomas Ernest, Ed.D.

The University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 1992

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

INTRODUCTION OF COOPERATIVE LEARNING IN ONE RURAL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL BY THE SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGIST

by

Thomas Ernest Jones

A Dissertation Submitted to
the Faculty of the Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

Greensboro
1992

Approved by:

David H. Reesby
Dissertation Adviser

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of the Graduate School at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Dissertation Adviser _____

Committee Members _____
_____
_____

Nov. 2, 1992
Date of Acceptance by Committee

Nov. 2, 1992
Date of Final Oral Examination

JONES, THOMAS ERNEST, Ed.D. Introduction of Cooperative Learning in One Rural Elementary School by the School Psychologist. (1992) Directed by Dr. David H. Reilly. 150 pp.

The purpose of this research was to increase understanding of the change processes involved when a school psychologist introduces the instructional program of cooperative learning to a rural elementary school.

Three cooperative learning exercises were collaboratively planned and conducted followed by interviews with the teachers involved as well as with the guidance counselor and principal. The change processes were viewed from three perspectives: that of the participants including the school psychologist, faculty, and children, that of the setting, and that of the innovation itself. Through autobiography and psychodynamic and sociolinguistic analysis of his interactions with the faculty, the school psychologist delineated personal and professional role characteristics which would enhance or impede the change process. It was emphasized that interactions were highly influenced by the linguistic format of the interview.

At the conclusion of this study cooperative learning was not implemented at the school. Primary barriers to the change process were too short a time frame, insufficient enlistment of system-wide support, and inadequate

development of incentives for teachers to change their instructional practices. Lack of organizational structures for participatory decision-making, concern over potential loss of control over students, perceived diminished ability to prepare for annual testing, lack of resources, and the burden of increased planning time would all have to be addressed in any future change efforts in this regard. Three theoretical concepts were viewed as particularly pertinent and giving direction to further research efforts. The first is loose-tight leadership which would bridge the needs for both formal organizational support and grassroots ownership of the change endeavor. The second involves looking at the results in terms of the precontemplation and contemplation stages of the change process, and the third speaks to attempting to attain the ideal speech situation through examining sociolinguistic characteristics of conversation.

School psychologists interested in altering their roles were advised to engage in a self-study involving soliciting opinions of existing stakeholders, studying types of activities that could be performed, exploring alternative ways of funding their positions, and analyzing how he or she comes across in conversations with others.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank Dr. David Reilly, Dissertation adviser, and Dr. Dale Brubaker, Dr. Joseph Bryson, and Dr. Svi Shapiro, the other members of the dissertation committee, for their support and lending of ideas as to what would make a worthwhile study in the area of change. I especially appreciate the faculty of Island Elementary School who took risks in volunteering for this project. We are closer together for it.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
APPROVAL PAGE		ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS		iii
CHAPTER		
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Problem	2
	Conceptual Base	3
	Purpose	6
	Research Questions	7
	Significance of Study	7
	Outline of Paper	9
II.	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	10
	Overview	10
	Philosophical Leanings	11
	Late 1950s - Early 1960s	11
	Mid 1960s	12
	Late 1960s - 1970s	12
	1980s	13
	Late 1980s - Early 1990s	14
	Summary	18
	Context Factors	19
	Summary	22
	Cooperative Learning	22
	Summary	26
	Change	26
	Overview	26
	Multidisciplinary Contribution	27
	Change in the School Setting	29
	To Change or Not to Change	31
	Change Factors and Cooperative Learning	34
	Summary	38
III.	METHODOLOGY	40
	Paradigm Infrastructure	40
	Context	42
	Innovation	42
	Change Strategies	43
	Validity, Reliability, and Objectivity	46

Page

IV. RESULTS 48

Introduction 48
Autobiographical Sketch 49
Setting 53
Significant Events 57
Interviews 62
Methodology 62
Elaine Martin 67
Jim Hunter 71
Sally Morris 77
Jack Craig 87
Elizabeth Young 106
Summary 116

V. DISCUSSION 119

Introduction 119
Summary of Results 120
Participants 120
Setting 123
Innovation of Cooperative Learning . 125
"Negative" Results 127
Theoretical Implication 130
Loose-Tight Leadership 131
Stage Theory 132
Ideal Speech Situation 133
Practical Implications 134
Suggestions for Future Research 135

BIBLIOGRAPHY 138

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Through this study I intend to describe and critically reflect upon my experiences as a school psychologist in attempting to introduce an innovation in one rural elementary school in Southern Appalachia. Cooperative learning was the vehicle for exploring the change process. The culture of Island Elementary School with its 25 staff and 300 students was the context. This and all other names in the study are fictitious in order to protect the privacy of the participants. The primary instrument of the study was myself in a participant/observer role performing a variety of functions related to but different in key respects from my traditional duties as school psychologist for the school. Although primarily utilizing the methods of interpretive inquiry, I drew upon quantitative data to enlarge my perspective. The significance of the study will not lie in testing hypotheses regarding the introduction of cooperative learning in a school system, but it may clarify which questions we should be asking about this specific kind of change process.

Problem

Although the factors related to school improvement have been well defined, there continues to be a lack of specific knowledge as to how and why improvement occurs. Effective schools have been identified, but there is limited understanding as to the processes involved in how a school moves from one type of functioning to another. It has been suggested (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) that one obstacle to understanding has been use of a conventional change model which assumes that change is a linear process in which an external change agent must lead an organization through a sequence of set phases.

It has also been conjectured (Foster, 1986; Sarason, 1990) that inadequate attention to the interests and values of persons involved has been an impediment to understanding why persons respond favorably or unfavorably to change efforts. There is a need for increased focusing upon these values and interests and power relationships in general if we want to understand fully the change process. There has been limited research on the impact of a school psychologist attempting to institute at one school an instructional program that alters teacher-student, student-student relationships and which has profound implications in terms of the way power is re-distributed in the classroom.

Conceptual Base

Researchers have been systematically studying the change process in United States schools for over 50 years. Mort's (1941) American School in Transition has been credited as providing the first of such studies. Through his work in the International Movement Towards Educational Change (IMTEC) Dalin (1978) examined educational change not only in America but in Western Europe and lesser developed countries. Miller and Lieberman (1988) trace the history of the research on school change or improvement utilizing the dichotomy provided by House (1979) of "technical perspective" and "cultural perspective." The former is described as dominating the research scene through the 1940s, '50s, and '60s and as being characterized by empirical inquiry and associated quantitative measures.

Much of the research dealing with effective schools has come out of the technical perspective (Rutter, et al, 1979; Purkey & Smith, 1982; Good & Brophy, 1984). Fullan (1985) provides a list of eight organization variables gleaned from the research on effective schools: (1) instructionally focused leadership at the school level; (2) district support; (3) emphasis on curriculum and instruction; (4) clear goals and high expectations for students; (5) a system for monitoring performance and achievement; (6) ongoing

staff development; (7) parental involvement and support; and, (8) an orderly and secure climate.

The cultural perspective described by House (1979) has roots in the 1940s and '50s but did not gain serious attention by the educational community until the 1970s. Its research approach is characterized by looking at the process of change through qualitative means and being particularly sensitive to the cultural context of the proposed change. Sarason (1982, 1990) has been a vocal proponent of the need to study the cultural setting before developing a research plan and contends that the plan is destined for failure otherwise. The researcher may enter a new situation with sound theory and knowledge of where the innovation has been successful elsewhere but will encounter resistance or "intractability" by the school if aspects of the new context are ignored such as structure of the school, implicit and explicit rules, and traditional power relationships.

It was anticipated that the changes inherent in implementing a cooperative learning program would be substantial and would require considerable involvement on the part of the school-based staff. In summarizing the research that has been done, both Sharan (1990) and Slavin (1990b) communicate their enthusiasm for the cooperative learning approach but also depict the enormity of the task

of implementation, especially in classrooms and schools that have been traditionally teacher-centered.

Johnson and Johnson (1985) indicate that research on student-student interaction dates from the late 1880s; however, they credit Deutsch's work in the 1940s as providing a major theoretical underpinning for the ways that students can interact with each other as they learn. Deutsch (1962), extending Lewin's theory of motivation, conceptualized that there are three basic types of interactions depending upon the type of goal structure in the situation. In a competitive situation the goals of separate individuals are linked so that there is a negative correlation among their goal attainments. In an individualistic situation there is no correlation among the goal attainments of the individuals. The goals of separate individuals are linked together in a cooperative situation so that there is a positive correlation among their goal attainments. Deutsch's conceptualizing focuses on the intra- and inner-dynamics of the students.

Although Johnson and Johnson (1985) caution that there is also a need for students to learn how to compete appropriately and to work individualistically, they have compiled a multitude of research findings that point to the myriad benefits of cooperative learning. Specifically, the

research suggests that cooperative learning, (a) promotes basic achievement, retention of information and development of specific strategies for learning; (b) increases motivation to learn; (c) results in more positive attitudes toward the instructional experiences and the instructors; (d) leads to higher levels of self-esteem; (e) heightens perceptions that other students care about how much one learns; and, (f) results in greater acceptance of differences and interpersonal attraction among students from different ethnic backgrounds and among handicapped and nonhandicapped students. A major cadre of support for cooperative learning comes from those opponents of tracking or ability grouping who view cooperative learning as a way for teachers to be able to work with heterogeneous classrooms (Oakes, 1985).

Sarason (1990) views the activities of the students as intricately related to power relationships in the classroom with the teacher a key player in how power is distributed. Others such as Freire (1992) and Bowles and Gintis (1976) view the teacher's holding onto power as part of a cultural and political phenomenon in which social inequities are reproduced within our social institutions.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to increase understanding of the change and conservation processes involved when a

school psychologist introduced the instructional program of cooperative learning to a rural elementary school.

Research Questions

It was envisioned that research questions would evolve as the study unfolded. Too much speculation in advance may have constrained the inquiring process; however, certain questions were developed early in the study:

(1) Does this school's adherence to more traditional teacher-centered classrooms reflect a lack of exposure to the concepts of cooperative learning?

(2) Have there been adequate opportunities to learn how to implement cooperative learning?

(3) Are there social pressures on the part of the community to maintain a more traditional classroom?

(4) Do teachers believe that students are generally capable of working in a cooperative, productive way with other students and taking some responsibility for their learning?

Significance of Study

Through this study an effort was made to generate meaningful questions that might emerge when a school system's school psychologist introduced the innovation of cooperative learning to one rural elementary school setting. It was anticipated that these questions would fall within three interrelated domains: (a) The implications of the school psychologist attempting to step outside his usual

testing role; (b) the characteristics of the setting which might enhance or impede the change process; and (c) aspects of cooperative learning which might invite or discourage adoption of the innovation.

Questions regarding shifting of roles were not confined to a formal discussion of the professional role options for a school psychologist. In addition, a self search process occurred. Value was placed upon the utilization of autobiography and sociolinguistic analysis of his interactions with faculty. The methodological weaknesses of studying these interactions through formal interview format were discussed.

This study emphasized that an in-depth knowledge of the setting in which an innovation was proposed was vital in understanding the change or conservation process. The physical structure of the school, the typical instructional practices, the organizational structure for participatory decision-making, and other communication regularities were all identified as factors that would influence whether the innovation of cooperative learning would succeed. The ideal speech situation was explored as a way to transcend contextual barriers to change.

The study identified specific aspects of cooperative learning that would have to be addressed if its introduction were to be successful. Concern over loss of

control over the students, diminished ability to prepare for annual testing, lack of resources, and the burden of increased planning time were all registered. The salience of these concerns highlighted the importance of viewing the results of this study as representing an early stage of the change process.

Outline of Paper

The next chapter, Chapter II, provides a review of the literature which is structured in terms of my philosophical leanings over the years, context factors in a study such as this, the key aspects of cooperative learning, and the characteristics of change. Chapter III presents methodology which is qualitative in nature. Chapter IV discusses the results which include an autobiographical sketch, an in-depth description of Island Elementary School, a chronicle of the significant events in the study, and interviews with five faculty. The final chapter, Chapter V, presents a discussion of the results, both positive and negative, and theoretical implications. The study concludes with suggestions for future research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Overview

Unlike a study in which the hypotheses to be tested are clearly delineated beforehand, a review of the literature in preparation for a qualitative study must be wide sweeping and less focused. It is not known what questions and theories will be generated, and much of the literature search will occur after the study has begun. The process is analogous to the peripatetic wanderings of Ernest Hemingway as he gathered literary material by roaming through Europe, Africa, and the Caribbean versus a Cook's tour in which the itinerary is carefully laid out in advance with little room for alteration -- "If it's Tuesday, it must be Belgium." At the same time, those approving the proposal must achieve confidence that the writer has familiarity with the key issues that might be involved. Therefore, in my reading I have attempted to cover four main areas: (1) the philosophical leanings that will inform this study including a tracing of my conceptual interests from the late 1950s to the present and my current affinity with interpretive or naturalistic inquiry; (2) context factors that need to be considered when introducing cooperative learning to Island

School; (3) the varied forms that cooperative learning can assume, how it relates to identified factors of school success, and issues surrounding its usage; and, (4) change processes and strategies.

Philosophical Leanings

Late 1950s - Early 1960s

Early in my employment as a psychometrist in a state hospital I was imbued with psychoanalytic theory, but remember how pleased I was with the neo-Freudian concept of "conflict-free ego sphere" developed by Heinz Hartman (1939) which suggested that people were guided by more than primitive impulses and capable of pursuing humanitarian goals and transcending baser human characteristics. White's (1960) theory of competence pointed to the motivating force of curiosity and problem seeking versus being controlled solely by the sexual and aggressive impulses of the id.

In my interactions with the state hospital patients, I sought to understand our commonalities and to bridge communication differences between us. My Wayne State University master's essay in 1960 focused on the language productions of schizophrenic patients, distinguishing between their speech and non-verbal behaviors and those of a "normal" population and attempting to ferret out meaning from what was spoken or acted out.

Mid 1960s

Interest in the self reports of patients intensified with reading Carl Rogers (1959) and studying how his language interactions with clients promoted greater acceptance of all facets of self. It was hypothesized that this acceptance was contingent upon the degree that the therapist had successfully communicated such therapeutic ingredients as accurate empathy, nonpossessive warmth, and genuineness. I was impressed by Truax and Carkhuff (1967) measuring these dimensions through analysis of taped sessions. My readings along with experiences of the "here and now" in numerous encounter groups were preparing me for a humanistic, phenomenological orientation to my professional practice.

Late 1960s - 1970s

I became an avid proponent of the community mental health movement in the late 1960s and through the '70s. The deinstitutionalization of the state hospitals and provision of an array of services on the community level all made a great deal of sense to me. As director of the children's program for a community mental health center I promoted consultation and education in the schools. Undoubtedly, I fell too frequently into an expert/advisee relationship with faculty but, nevertheless, much of the advice drew upon the humanistic concepts of Thomas Gordon (1970, 1974). His

"active listening" and "I messages" resonate with the ideal therapeutic ingredients discussed by Rogers.

1980s

As a school psychologist through the 1980s to the present, I have struggled with attempting to carry out the mandate of P.L. 94-142 while at the same time becoming increasingly aware that the profession of school psychology is much like "wandering through the wilderness" (Reilly, 1984) with difficulty finding a home either with mainstream psychology or with education. Milofsky (1989) stated that "as a systematic intervention to help children, school psychology is basically bankrupt" (p. 174). He goes on to suggest that the process of evaluating children involves "rubber-stamping referrals... cloaking them in objective, scientific legitimacy... a maze of red tape that at best is a waste of time... at worst... further entrenches practices harmful to children" (p. 175).

Reilly (1984) stated that there must be significant alterations in the way in which school psychologists are trained and go about their business with more focus on the development of appropriate school environments for children, less emphasis on being the mental health expert, and more emphasis on becoming "experts in understanding how learning is affected by different settings interacting with different people of different ages" (p. 69). Growing discomfort with

my traditional role as a school psychologist played a large part in selecting educational administration for my graduate studies rather than doctoral level school psychology.

Late 1980s - Early 1990s

Although I retain conceptual baggage associated with behaviorism and traditional quantitative research, I find myself today more taken with the subjectivist than with the objectivist view of the essence of being, the nature of knowledge, and methodology as outlined by Burrell and Morgan (1979). The subjectivist view, which includes the interpretive research approach, conceptualizes being as constituted by individuals and not made up of hard, tangible structures that exist outside the person. Knowledge is relative and can only be understood from the point of view of the individuals directly involved in activities. This contrasts with knowledge derived from hypothetico-deductive reasoning which actively searches for regularities and causal relationships between events.

An extension of the interpretive mode of inquiry is the proposition that the meaning that persons give to their experiences does not evolve out of a vacuum or de novo but rather reflects material interests, resulting in differences in power and domination by some over others. Called "radical humanism" by Burrell and Morgan (1979), it is now more frequently referred to as "critical theory."

Foster (1986) traces the historical foundations of critical theory and describes its main characteristics. Its ideas were developed the first half of this century by the neo-Marxists of the Frankfurt School in Germany. Critical theory questions the framework of the way our lives are organized by us and for us. It is committed to values such as democracy and freedom and to examining how certain social structures impede the attainment of such values.

Jurgen Habermas (1971, 1975) is the major spokesperson for critical theory. His works are still not completely translated from German to English, and what is in English must be interpreted for a reader such as myself not acclimated to European philosophy. Young (1990) presents Habermas' ideas especially in the context of educational thought. It is not always clear, however, when Habermas' ideas leave off and Young's begin. Both contend that existing society is only an imperfect representation of what it could be and that educational processes are at the center of possibilities for human progress. The crisis in education and difficulty in moving to a more ideal state is attributed to economic and political forces. The byproducts of modernity such as consumerism, technology, and information processing have led to institutional complexes and associated managerial systems which stifle individual values and creativity. The new right calls for more

economic, technological development. The old left calls for further development of rational legal organization through more bureaucracy. Habermas and others believe that an alternative is to promote a critical meta-awareness which addresses itself to a continual confrontation of the existing state of affairs with its own contradictions.

A particularly relevant written example of this confronting process is Shapiro's (1984) discussion of the Individualized Education Plan (IEP). The IEP has become sacrosanct within special education with its focus on customizing an educational program for a handicapped child, and yet as Shapiro points out, its behavioral emphasis on measurable goals results in rigidly prescribed procedures and a learning experience that is controlled and limited in potential freedom for the child -- "Its typical expectations (being able to answer so many questions, by a particular date, at a prescribed level of accuracy) ensures a notion of individual learning that stresses conformity with the already-anticipated results of those in authority" (p. 374). Shapiro suggests that the IEP and its emphasis on individualization is an example of what Antonio Gramsci refers to as "hegemony" with the dominant culture exercising its power by both advocating a praiseworthy goal (i.e., individualized education) and subordinating people at the

same time (i.e., individualized instruction is employed for the low ability student).

Although written confrontation is part of the critical theorist's armamentarium, it is through the "ideal speech situation" that liberating change is envisioned. Habermas believed that children are sufficiently rational to engage in pedagogically sound dialogue. He developed a notion of communicative competence involving validity, appropriateness, and authenticity of utterances not unlike Roger's ideal interactions with his clients or Gordon's interactions between parents and children, between teachers and children, and between teachers and administrators. The ideal speech situation emphasizes that what we are saying or hearing should be intelligible, true as far as we know it, and normatively appropriate considering the relationships among the people and between them and the situation they are in. The latter requirement takes into account that certain speech interactions are entirely rational and appropriate but not always symmetrical in terms of power positions between the participants (e.g., physician to patient).

The dilemma for the teacher is how to achieve a balance between fostering autonomy in the child and arranging the educational conditions considered necessary for the development of that autonomy. Young (p. 96, 1990) lists a number of traditional teaching methods which, if posed in

the converse, may assist the teacher in arriving at that balance -- e.g., shun the "banking" concept of learning described by Freire (1992) in which knowledge in the child is built up like a bank account, have both teacher and student transmitters and receivers of knowledge, select knowledge for the curriculum that is related to the "life-world" of the learner, and no matter how professionally developed and polished, the instructional package must allow space for critique.

Summary

In attempting to discern any common thread in my philosophical leanings over a span of thirty-some years, it is a faith that human beings have the capacity to transcend their baser instincts, whether defined in Freudian, humanistic, sociological, or political terms. I view the major vehicle for this transcendence to be the language interactions among persons. Although still not ready to dismiss totally cause and effect thinking in my understanding of why persons change or stay as they are, I resort less to linear explanations and more easily see that events arise from a multi-variate range of experiences that mutually shape one another. This speaks to the need to be highly sensitive to context factors when studying a change process, the subject of the next section of this review.

Context Factors

In this section context is viewed in terms of the contribution of the qualitative approach to understanding social phenomena, the concept of culture and regularities both generally and specifically within the school setting, and finally the perspective provided by the social interactionist's and sociolinguist's focus on language interchange.

Traditionally, qualitative research has been recognized for its focus upon context factors in attempting to understand social phenomena. In tracing the history of qualitative research Bogdan and Biklen (1982) described the researcher's emphasis on collecting data in the field and understanding behavior from the framework of both the subject and the participant observer. Data is produced in the form of words or pictures rather than numbers, and nothing is trivial or taken for granted. Glaser and Strauss (1967) acknowledged the contribution of rich description of the setting but indicated that much of the research was "too impressionistic" and intent on "getting the story straight." They contended that too often data were used to verify someone else's theory rather than to generate new theory, and, consequently, there frequently would be a poor fit between the data and conclusions. Through their concepts of "grounded theory" and "comparative analysis" Glaser and

Strauss (1967) proposed a qualitative research approach for generating theory that closely adheres to the context of the study and safeguards against logico-deductive theorizing removed from the particular situation. Their approach has guided the writings of contemporary qualitative researchers such as Bogdan and Biklen (1982), Lincoln and Guba (1985), and Patton (1980).

Understanding of context is enhanced by the concept of culture, defined by Lee (1959) as "a symbolic system which transforms the physical reality, what is THERE, into experienced reality" (p. 1) and by Foster (1986) as "a form of communication that results in the establishment of shared ways of addressing the world" (p. 135). Culture for Sarason appears to lie in both his concept of creation of settings (1972), which refers to two or more people coming together in new relationships for a sustained period of time in order to achieve stated objectives, and in his focus upon shared regularities that occur in those settings (1982, 1990).

There has been much written about the regularities in a school setting. Brubaker (1982, 1991) distinguished between curriculum as a course of study and curriculum that focuses upon the intricate interactions that occur between adults and children within all parts of the school setting. Learning settings are cooperatively created. In his review of the literature, Scroggs (1989) suggested that

regularities within the school arise out of a dynamic interplay between organizational structure or programmatic regularities and individual responses or behavioral regularities issuing from that structure. He described such responses as ranging on a continuum "from compliance and acquiescence to pragmatism and even to counter-culture resistance" (p. 63). He concluded that those teachers who continue to be committed to meeting expectations are those that gain power and satisfaction through autonomy in their classroom and who have succoring and nurturing leaders who assist them in deriving meaning from their lives.

Social interactionists view context as the way that meaning is created between persons. This is done through non-verbal and verbal communication. Mead (1934) stated: "Language in its significant sense is that vocal gesture which tends to arouse in the individual the attitude which it arouses in others, and it is this perfecting of the self by the gesture which mediates the social activities that gives rise to the process of taking the role of the other" (pp. 160-161). Lutifiyya (1987) in interpreting Mead (1934) views language use as providing constructionary powers, allowing humans to envision futures and thereby break out of redundant meaning or response patterns.

Summary

Almost by definition the qualitative approach to research is especially sensitive to context factors in striving to make sense out of social phenomena. Attending to natural settings, seeking to understand the frame of reference of both the subject and researcher, and grounding theory to unfolding data all demand concentration upon context factors. The concepts of culture, created settings, programmatic and behavioral regularities, and curriculum as what each person experiences as learning settings are cooperatively created all provide guidance in the quest for understanding. Regardless of the setting, the way that meaning is created between persons is through the language of social interaction. In this study much of the social interaction that will occur will revolve around cooperative learning, the subject of the next section of this review.

Cooperative Learning

In this section cooperative learning is viewed from the standpoint of its effects (a) upon achievement, both basic skills and higher-order conceptual learning; (b) upon relationships among persons of diverse social and ethnic backgrounds and different levels of academic and intellectual functioning; (c) upon attitudes toward self and school; and, (d) upon the power relationships that exist between teachers and students. The latter becomes an issue

both in terms of who is going to decide which topics to pursue and then how much freedom there will be to think critically about the selected content. All of the above considerations are reflected in the language interactions of teachers and students.

The research literature on cooperative learning is voluminous. Slavin (1990) summarizes four full-scale reviews (Slavin, 1989; Johnson, et al, 1981; Newmann and Thompson, 1987; Davidson, 1985). There is wide agreement that cooperative methods can and usually do have a positive effect on student achievement. All four reviewers mention group goals or positive interdependence and individual accountability as essential elements of cooperative learning.

A question being debated is whether cooperative learning is as appropriate for higher-order conceptual learning as it is for basic skills. Stevens, Madden, Slavin, and Farnish (1987) successfully taught higher order skills involved in creative writing. Smith, Johnson, and Johnson (1981), using Johnsons' constructive controversy methods, demonstrated that students are able to achieve higher-order understanding in their social studies.

In areas other than achievement there is even broader consensus that cooperative learning has certain beneficial results. Intergroup relations are improved

between students of different racial or ethnic backgrounds (Slavin, 1990b). Academically handicapped students are more easily accepted when mainstreamed (Johnson, et al, 1983). Other outcomes are observed such as gains in self esteem, liking of school and of the subject being studied, time-on-task, and attendance.

The degree to which teachers direct what the students will do in their cooperative learning activities varies. The Group Investigation approach developed by Sharan and Sharan (1990) emphasizes the importance of students having a say in what topic they are going to pursue, thereby allowing an opportunity for their different interests, backgrounds, values, and abilities to emerge.

Sapon-Shevin and Schniedewind (1990) believe that cooperative learning should not be viewed as simply a new instructional way for teachers to teach what they typically teach. Instead, an opportunity exists to become more critical about what is taught, to weigh carefully the value and relative merit of every aspect of the curriculum. In talking about past wars, students should also be exploring the role of competition in causing wars and cooperative methods of conflict resolution. "Who's Famous?" should consider why our list often excludes people of color and women. The values taught within cooperative learning should extend beyond the small group activities to other facets of

the school day. Teachers and students can be empowered to help schools become models of democracy. Schniedewind and Davidson (1987) list specific activities that enable students to make connections between the classroom and broader societal issues.

Several researchers have focused on the language interactions of teachers and students as a way of studying the effects of cooperative learning. Hertz-Lazarowitz and Shachar (1990) found that when teachers used the whole-class method, they delivered long lectures, gave students orders, asked questions that required short answers, used collective disciplinary measures, and praised the entire class as a unit in general terms. By contrast, when teachers used Group Investigation, their speech was more intimate; there was more support for initiation and communication among students; individual students were provided feedback about their academic work and praised for specific activities. In looking at student talk in cooperative groups, Scanlan (1988) found that the students' discourse was significantly different from the typical classroom patterns. Sixty-one percent of talk was related to the academic content itself; thirty percent was used to regulate their group processes; seven percent was for social/personal purposes; and only two percent was uncodable.

Summary

The literature suggests that cooperative learning has a beneficial effect on the achievement of students, both in terms of higher-order conceptual learning and basic skills. There is even broader consensus that relationships between diverse groups of students are improved. Attitudes toward teachers and others as well as toward school in general appear to become more positive. Some researchers have focused upon the potential of cooperative learning for assisting students to become more self-determining in what they choose to study and how they critically examine what is taught. A useful approach to studying the effects of cooperative learning has been to focus upon the language interactions of teachers and students. Such studies suggest that academic, personal, and social values are all served well by cooperative learning. And yet the high marks accorded to cooperative learning by the research have not resulted in a rush to implementation by individual school systems. The next section deals with the issues which must be considered in attempting to understand both the forces for change and for maintaining the status quo.

Change

Overview

In this section, I will touch upon the multidisciplinary contributions to the change literature in

general and discuss seminal concepts in the area of change that have been applied to the school setting. A perspective will be presented to the "resister" and "innovator" which emphasizes that the position of each is complementary to the other and that no one position is intrinsically more valuable. The term resilience is posed as a way to reconcile the need for both change and persistence. The concept of mutual adaptation and development offers another way to reconcile opposing forces in a change endeavor. Finally, specific research will be reviewed dealing with the change factors involved in introducing cooperative learning to a school system.

Multidisciplinary Contribution

Human knowledge involves a borrowing and building process in which no one discipline can claim exclusive authorship of an epistemological domain. This is certainly the case with the subject of change. Rogers and Shoemaker (1971) credit the sociologist, Gabriel Tarde, as among the first to suggest that the adoption of a new idea follows a normal, S-shaped distribution over time. They also credit a group of rural sociologists for developing a stage theory in the early 1950s in their attempt to understand the adoption of agricultural innovations (i.e., awareness, interest, mental trial, trial, adoption). Building on this latter stage theory Rogers and Shoemaker (1971) developed their own

model consisting of (a) a knowledge of awareness stage; (b) a persuasion stage during which favorable or unfavorable attitudes are formed regarding the innovation; (c) a period of decision making activities geared toward accepting or rejecting the innovation; and finally, (d) a confirmation stage in which the focus is on the seeking of reinforcement for whichever innovation decision was made. Despite their orientation toward stage theory, Rogers and Shoemaker (1971) warned that stages do not have to occur in immutable sequence and can even be skipped (e.g., awareness stage in the case of subliminal perception).

Mathematicians such as Galois (Bell, 1937) and Whitehead and Russell (1910-13) played a role in the change literature when Watzlawick, Weakland, and Fisch (1974) built their theory of first order and second order change upon their mathematical principles (e.g., theory of groups in which 5 + 0 still equals 5 or theory of logical types in which whatever term involves all of a collection must not be one of the collection.)

Psychotherapists made up of anthropologists, psychologists, psychiatrists, and other mental health professionals operating from the Mental Research Institute in Palo Alto during the 1960s and '70s brought a sensitivity to the role of interactional communication in change (Watzlawick & Weakland, 1977). The organizational

psychologist, Karl Weick (1984) contributed understanding of the incremental, "small win" nature of change.

Change in the School Setting

Fortunately, there is no scarcity of theoreticians and researchers who steadfastly apply the concepts of change from a broad array of disciplines to the school setting. In his compact Understanding Change in Education: An Introduction, Huberman (1973) manages to pull together key concepts involved in understanding change in the school including assimilation (taking in new ideas or practices), accommodation (adapting former structures to these new ideas or practices), and elements that aid or hinder new development (complexity of the innovation, cost, communicability, divisibility into parts, nature of relationship between the source of change and the persons being helped to change). He notes that changes are more durable and effective if the user has embraced them because they satisfy his or her own needs. Learning the innovation per se is secondary to the user knowing what changes will have to be made in attitude. Changes in "things" (e.g., classroom hardware) are easier to cope with and can occur within shorter periods of time than changes in practice, attitude, or values. In either case, Huberman (1973) views educational change as difficult:

> To change education amounts in fact to changing the way parents bring up their children. It alters the relationships between adults and young people and disturbs the controls the former have over the character of the coming generation. It is hardly surprising, therefore, that educational ideas, habits and patterns normally change very slowly. History shows, in fact, that education is a domain where there has almost never been a radical rupture between the new and the old. (p. 1)

Dalin (1978) has suggested that one reason educational change moves slowly is that researchers seldom explore the underlying assumptions and ideologies implicit in the approach. He has indicated that one useful way to examine a proposed educational change is to ask (a) who will benefit? (b) who will decide? and (c) who will have to change? By asking the first question, interests of participants are made more explicit and hidden agendas are minimized. The second question clarifies ownership of the innovation and thereby relates to the prospect for successful implementation. The third question reduces the tendency to think of the innovation in the abstract and specifies who actually is expected to change knowledge, skills, attitudes, and/or behaviors. Theoretically, the parties in a change process could all be isolated from one another or, instead,

share points of identification, roles, responsibilities, and norms. Dalin (1978) emphasizes that in educational change the clarification and understanding of one another's goals and subsequent securing of agreement on goals is a time consuming process. Although he acknowledges that to some degree change is determined by forces outside the control of educators, he stresses that change can be facilitated if those within the system thoroughly understand the complexities and dynamics of the change process itself.

Fullan (1985) has articulated four process variables that he believes are necessary in order to achieve the characteristics of an effective school discussed in Chapter I: (1) Leadership feel for the improvement process; (2) a guiding value system; (3) intense interaction and communication; and, (4) collaborative planning and implementation. The latter requires an intricate balance between top-down and bottom-up planning -- "...central initiation and direction are coupled with decentralized (school-based) analysis and decision-making" (p. 403).

To Change or Not to Change...

In the literature, change has clearly received more "press" than its complement, persistence or conservation. In the political arena the emphasis is on change in education rather than leaving things as they are. Eicholz and Rogers (1964) described the "resisters" and the

"innovators," and over the years the latter have been championed while the former have tended to be viewed in negative terms. Harvey (1967) described the proponent of the status quo as having a concrete cognitive style, engaging in good-bad thinking, depending on authority, being intolerant of uncertainty, and having a poor capacity to act "as if."

Huberman (1973) has suggested that persons resist because the innovation has not been adequately disseminated, is not logically compelling, is not materially or psychologically compelling, or has not been successful in past trials. Some may elect not to accept an innovation because it was poorly planned and executed (Gross, Giaquinta, & Bernstein, 1971) or because it was felt to reflect faddism or the quick fix (Corbett, Firestone, & Rossman, 1987). Corbett, Firestone, and Rossman (1987) suggest that some innovations threaten "the sacred" in school norms and that what may appear as unreasonable stubbornness and limited vision on the part of the resister is an effort to preserve "a deeply held professional raison d'etre for school staff members" (p. 38). This resembles the "loose-tight" leadership strategy described by Peters and Waterman (1982) in which certain values within an organization are closely protected while others allow for individual interpretation.

Dalin (1978) has preferred to describe the above characteristics of the conservation/change process as barriers to change rather than resistance. He viewed the latter terms as being based on the faulty assumption that the innovation was automatically "better" for the system. He indicated that too often failure to adopt is viewed as unwanted obstinacy rather than a natural reflection of political forces and values within a social system.

A way to reconcile the change or not to change dilemma may lie in Smith's (1988) discussion of "resilience" which he defines as "persistence of a system and its ability to absorb change and disturbance while still maintaining the same relationships with other entities in its ecosystem" (p. 128). He describes the conflict brought about by change efforts as disturbing in a relationship but legitimate inasmuch as turbulence is part of growth and creativity.

Dalin's (1978) discussion of mutual adaptation and development is another way to think of reconciling opposing forces in a change endeavor. He conceptualized a kind of dialogue that must exist between central administration and the local school unit. The development needs of each party are articulated and through a combination of consensus and conflict an innovation is implemented that bears the stamp of each and may look quite different from the original innovation. Dalin indicated that a top-down mandate for

change that does not include this dialectic process does "...not seem to produce the continuous process of renewal within the institution which seems to be a necessary condition if innovations are to have any meaning." (p. 97).

Change Factors and Cooperative Learning

As might be expected there has been considerably more research on the effects of introducing cooperative learning to students than to teachers. The limited research that has been done with the latter group has taken several forms including prescriptive recommendations by a school psychologist on how to implement cooperative learning in a school (Margolis, 1990), a theoretical formulation relating ideological benefits to implementation of cooperative learning (Beeley, 1989), and a combined qualitative/quantitative study focusing on changing the instructional model of whole-class, presentation-recitation to cooperative, small-group teaching (Sharan & Hertz-Lazarowitz, 1982).

Margolis (1990) suggests that school psychologists can assist teachers in implementing cooperative learning in the following ways: (1) work with teachers who want to try it; (2) emphasize that as long as certain basic principles of cooperative learning are adhered to (e.g., individual and group accountability) teachers may modify procedures to fit their teaching style, classroom needs, and personal goals;

(3) arrange for extensive initial training emphasizing a particular cooperative learning strategy which teachers find appealing and congruent with their goals; (4) follow-up initial training with in-class demonstrations and regular instructional consultation; (5) with administrative endorsement form a cooperative learning teacher support group; (6) decide with teachers what information is needed to assess the effectiveness of cooperative learning; (7) recognize desired accomplishments and efforts; (8) identify problems individual teachers are having with cooperative learning and be willing to discuss problems privately; (9) arrange with administrators to eliminate organizational barriers to progress (e.g., provide release time); (10) consider collaborative classroom research, perhaps with university faculty; and, (11) listen carefully and be there when needed.

Rich (1990) suggests that much of the failure to implement cooperative learning is due to an ideological incongruence between teachers' beliefs about education and their perception of cooperative learning. He points out that while the four commonly accepted goals of education are academic, social, vocational, and personal (Goodlad, 1984), the academic goal is supreme. The dual emphasis of cooperative learning on the academic and the social arouses suspicion in some along with passive and

active resistance. He posed a by-polar matrix with the type of goal orientation (Personal-social or Academic) along the vertical axis and preferred way for knowledge to be acquired (social or transmitted) along the horizontal axis. It was hypothesized that the teachers who maintained a personal-social goal orientation and a social genesis view of intellectual development would be most receptive to the cooperative learning approach. Staff development would be relatively easy for this group. However, for those teachers whose goals were incongruent with the purposes of cooperative learning, staff development efforts would be directed toward raising the level of congruence.

Beeley (1989) appears to support the congruence theory. It was hypothesized and demonstrated that teachers who model a high degree of collegiality with their peers (as rated by their principals) would use more cooperative learning in their classrooms (as determined by scores on the Cooperative Learning Scale).

Sharan and Hertz-Lazarowitz (1982) attempted to implement cooperative learning in three elementary schools serving a lower class neighborhood in Tel-Aviv. Fifty teachers participated in a total of 18 workshops held over the course of a year. Twenty-five teachers from a nearby school served as a no-contact control group. Four sets of

data were gathered: (1) classroom observations to assess the type of instruction going on, (2) an attitude scale, (3) a personality inventory, and (4) a tape-recorded interview with each teacher. The complete transcript of all the interviews was subjected to a content analysis directed by the principles of grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Thirty-two categories evolved and were ultimately collapsed into four major dimensions. Classroom observations showed that by the end of the second year there was a balance in classroom teaching between the traditional whole-class approach and the newly acquired small-group methods. In terms of attitude change the experimental group showed a more progressive and less controlling attitude towards pupils and class instruction than the control group. The general school climate was viewed as higher by the experimental group. Personality and interview data were analyzed according to who implemented the small group instruction past a certain criterion (the Innovators) and those who did not (the Resisters). The innovators were less conservative, more experimenting, less complacent and self-assured, more imaginative, more sensitive, more open to being affected by feelings and emotions, more outgoing and socially oriented, and more positive about the experience. Both the innovators and resisters appeared to view themselves as compulsive and moralistic. The authors

concluded that stereotyped "closed" personalities will not necessarily reject innovation if the proper staff development conditions and institutional support are provided.

Summary

This review of the literature has been in the nature of a preparation for a journey into the change process involved when the school psychologist introduced cooperative learning to one rural elementary school. My philosophical leanings have been shaped by numerous employment experiences in different mental health and educational settings and exposure to an array of disciplines and theories. A common thread in these experiences has been an attraction to those ideas which emphasize the potential of human beings to transcend their baser instincts and to reach levels of functioning that seem to defy ordinary cause and effect logic. The major vehicle for this transcendence would seem to be meaningful relationships among persons, and an ideal way to study these relationships is through focusing upon language interactions. The understanding of such interactions needs to evolve out of a sensitivity to the context in which the interaction occurs. The context for this study consisted of the culture of Island Elementary School and the ways that teachers, students, administrators, and myself communicated with one another as cooperative learning was introduced.

Cooperative learning is a rich medium for studying the change process as despite its demonstrated academic, personal, and social value for students, it has not been rapidly implemented by individual school systems. Called forth in understanding the change process were ideas that have been contributed by multidisciplinary sources and included such important concepts as stage theory, first and second order change, assimilation, accommodation, critical process variables such as "leadership feel" and a guiding value system, resisters and innovators, barriers to change, resilience, and mutual adaptation and development. The literature on change factors in introducing cooperative learning is somewhat limited but tends to point to the need for congruence between teachers' beliefs about education and their perception of cooperative learning.

My review of the literature temporarily concluded at this point but resumed as soon as the study got underway. The next chapter, Chapter III, deals with the proposed methodology.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The design for this study incorporated the tenets of interpretive inquiry in describing the change processes involved in introducing cooperative learning to a rural elementary school. Although a plan was developed and set into motion, it should be noted that in keeping with the interpretive inquiry paradigm the focus changed as new information was introduced. The design contains at least five broad components: (1) paradigm infrastructure; (2) context for the proposed change; (3) cooperative learning innovation; (4) the change strategies; and, (5) the means of establishing validity, reliability, and objectivity regarding the findings.

Paradigm Infrastructure

Regardless of the focus of the study, certain axioms of the interpretive or naturalistic inquiry as described by Lincoln and Guba (1985) were immutable. From the beginning, for instance, the investigator emphasized that this study might raise more questions than it would answer and that the aim was to arrive at deeper understanding of the change process rather than to predict or control the future. The concept of one "true" reality for the school setting was

eschewed in favor of a conception of multiply constructed realities. The inquirer and "object" of inquiry would interact to influence one another; the knower and known would be inseparable. An idiographic body of knowledge linked to the time and context of the study might provide tentative working hypotheses about the particular type of change process observed. There would not be, however, broad based, or nomothetically derived, generalizations that would hold anywhere and at anytime. Instead of causal linkages between the school psychologist and the faculty, participants would be viewed as in a state of mutual adaptation. No pretense has been made that this study is value free. Instead, the author stated his biases, as much as they could be consciously described, in order that the readers might draw their own inferences as to the findings. In contrast to the objectivity touted by traditional change studies, this investigator openly assumed dual roles, one in which his orientation to cooperative learning was clearly positive and the other in which he scrutinized his biases. This approach followed Touraine's (1988) method of action sociology in which sociological intervention occurs by the sociologist observing the effect of his or her own practical intervention upon a given social reality.

Context

In view of the emphasis that interpretive inquiry places upon contextual factors in arriving at meaningful interpretations, this study described the following: (a) The state and county in which Island Elementary School is located, its geography, history, and demographic characteristics; (b) the nature of the school system including history, physical structures, financial status, personnel, traditional curriculum orientation and governance; and, (c) Island Elementary School. This latter section dealt with those factors already touched upon for the total school system but this time in more depth. The culture of the school was articulated. The description of the physical layout of the school was supplemented with a photograph. The school's principal, faculty, students, and parents were described more fully. They served as the population and boundary for this study. Inasmuch as the primary instrument of this study was myself, an autobiographical sketch was presented describing key events in my life, my shaping as a school psychologist, and especially my interests, values, and biases as they relate to the study.

Innovation

Much of what transpired in this change effort was intricately linked to the meanings ascribed to cooperative

learning by the administrators, faculty, students, parents, and this investigator. The conceptual rationale and basic elements of student to student learning have been presented above. There are a variety of cooperative learning activities characterized by such factors as the size of the group, the mix according to achievement and/or sociability, the degree of competitiveness, and the type of individual and/or group rewards.

Change Strategies

Few researchers would deny the importance of having a plan for a change endeavor. Lincoln and Guba (1985) warn against the danger of formalized plans taking on a procrustean quality but still emphasize the importance of an outline showing those things which the investigator must attend to before a study gets underway -- "The heavy emphasis that we have placed on the emergent nature of design should not be interpreted as a license to engage in undisciplined and haphazard 'poking around'" (p. 251). Many activities proposed for this study were placed conceptually at a certain location in the proposed chronology of events. In reality, certain activities had consequences not anticipated, calling for repeating of earlier steps or revising of subsequent ones. In other words, the plan on paper appeared linear even though actual reality assumed a different, less predictable shape.

Following was the tentative plan for the study:

(1) Immediately upon approval of the dissertation prospectus, I began a journal in which events and associated introspections regarding the investigation process were recorded. Space was left on the paper for opportunities to later step outside myself and to add any insights that rereading evoked.

(2) Inasmuch as confidentiality issues would undoubtedly surface early in this study, a consent form was developed which described the purpose of the study, the investigative approaches, ways that persons would be asked to participate, and measures that would be taken to maintain confidentiality and anonymity.

(3) Conversations were held with key stakeholders in the implementation of cooperative learning at Island Elementary School. These conversations covered the needs that such an innovation might address, the ways that the innovation would be attempted, and how results would be assessed. These contacts respected the traditional chain of command within the school system with first obtaining support of my immediate supervisor and then of the principal. These persons in turn were able to suggest ways to broaden the constituency of support (e.g., superintendent, other central office personnel, parents, teachers).

(4) After securing consent from key persons, a formal proposal was submitted to the principal outlining the substance of earlier conversations, providing a tentative timetable, and soliciting formal approval for the investigation.

(5) With formal approval granted, steps were taken to disseminate on a large scale information about the project to faculty, students, and parents (e.g., regular faculty meeting, PTA) and formal consent was obtained from participants.

(6) I then gave three demonstrations of cooperative learning in three regular classrooms. Content was that which was normally planned by the teacher for that class. There were several advantages to this approach: (a) Observing the school psychologist struggling to conduct a class should break down the traditional consultant-consultee relationship between the school psychologist and the teacher, especially if the teacher was asked to assist in planning the lesson and to critique what she saw. (b) By becoming the teacher temporarily, I stood in the shoes of the teacher and obtained his or her perspective of the innovation. (c) By observing the demonstration the teacher was able to experience stages of the adoption process (Rogers & Shoemaker, 1971) such as awareness, interest, and mental trial without having to make a commitment to try it.

(d) Materials were accumulated through the demonstrations (e.g., transparencies, video tapes, posters) which could later be used for staff development.

(7) After the demonstration, three teachers, the guidance counselor, and the principal were interviewed regarding the experience. The interviews were transcribed, coded, and analyzed for common themes or metaphors.

Validity, Reliability, and Objectivity

In order to not have qualitative research or interpretive inquiry dismissed as "too subjective" or "too soft", Lincoln and Guba (1985) stress the need to have "trustworthiness" -- "How can an inquirer persuade his or her audiences (including self) that the findings of an inquiry are worth paying attention to, worth taking account of?" (p. 290). Four concepts are developed that cover the key dimensions of trustworthiness, namely, (1) credibility, (2) transferability, (3) dependability, and (4) confirmability. The counterparts of these concepts in logical positivism are respectively (1) internal validity, (2) external validity, (3) reliability, and (4) objectivity.

In this study, credibility was established by prolonged engagement over a period of one year with the demonstrations followed by the interviews with teachers and other stakeholders. The demonstrations and interviews occurred between August, 1991, and June, 1992. Credibility was

achieved through triangulation (Denzin, 1978) such as comparing teachers' interviews regarding the same cooperative learning demonstration or by comparing existing test scores (e.g., classroom grades, CAT scores).

Transferability was achieved through "thick description" (Geertz, 1973) of findings in a case report. As already stressed, the purpose was not to make broad generalizations about introducing cooperative learning into a school system, but rather to detail the many specifics that gave this context its unique form. This was not to preempt the possibility of certain insights emerging that could be applied in similar settings.

The dependability of this inquiry or degree the findings would be consistently repeated in the same or similar context with the same or similar respondents was largely established by the "inquiry audit" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) of my records (e.g., journals, tapes, transcriptions, memos, letters).

The confirmability of the inquiry or degree to which the findings stemmed from the characteristics of the respondents and the context and not from biases of the inquirer were established by the deliberate attempts of the inquirer to be clear about his biases in his autobiography. The next chapter, Chapter IV, presents the results of this study.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Introduction

Results of this study will be presented by first providing an autobiographical sketch of myself. Through this sketch I will make a special effort to describe the early background of the person whose philosophical leanings have already been shared and to give a sense of how earlier influences affected my current research interests and style. Island Elementary School will be described with attention to the characteristics of the county in which it is located and the history of the school. With this contextual background of the autobiographical sketch and the school's setting the reader will then be given a sequence of significant events that occurred during the course of the study. The events that assumed the most importance in terms of data to be analyzed were interviews that occurred with five employees of Island Elementary School. These interviews will be described in detail not only from the standpoint of what they reveal about the introduction of cooperative learning by the school psychologist but in terms of the methodology of the interview itself.

Autobiographical Sketch

I was born in Detroit, Michigan, October 8, 1934, the youngest of four boys. As a "depression baby" and another mouth to feed I have always carried the notion that I was born unplanned. My parents, Ernie and Fran Jones, were born in the first decade of this century. Fran did not finish high school. Ernie had two years of college. They married at the ages of 17 and 21, respectively. Although the financial background of my mother was more humble than that of my father, the message was early conveyed that her side of the family was more genteel. She played the role of dutiful (but begrudging) wife and homemaker throughout her adult life and was never gainfully employed. My father was a hardworking man who had a Horatio Alger career path, ultimately holding top administrative positions for the City of Detroit. Although I have often shown the same drive and constancy of purpose, I have tended to do so in a self-effacing manner.

I was described by my mother as a "good" baby--"Always lying quietly in your crib, smiling, never crying." I became a listening, watching, thinking, and talking child rather than an active, rough and tough boy. Through the age of five I was thin, almost frail, and subject to colds and ear infections. My constitutional make-up was ideal for the overprotection my mother concentrated upon me. I remember

being terrified in kindergarten, missing my mother, and being afraid of the school yard "bully." I gradually found my niche in the academic side of school, developed high verbal skills, read and wrote well. I performed poorly in PE and math.

In 1947 I was appointed as a pageboy to the United States Senate, an appointment that received national media attention due to it being the first Republican appointment after many years of Democratic patronage. I lived in Washington, D.C. off and on through my high school years. Personality characteristics of sociability, compliance to my superiors, and wanting to please all held me in good stead as I was given instructions to run errands for the senators.

Upon graduation from Capitol Page School I attended Wayne State University in Detroit and ultimately majored in psychology. I lived at home at the time in the midst of considerable marital conflict on the part of my parents. I received my BA in January, 1957, and then joined the Air National Guard. After basic training I entered the MA program in clinical/educational psychology at Wayne State University. During graduate school I worked as a caseworker for Detroit's Department of Social Services.

Just prior to receiving my MA degree I took a position as a psychometrist at Pontiac State Hospital and moved into the staff house. During my twenties I specialized in the

child population of the hospital, and my functions broadened to include assessment and psychotherapy. I entered psychoanalysis, publicly talking about the need for "professional growth" but privately hoping to work through internal conflicts. At age 30 I began a Ph.D. program at Michigan State University but dropped out after one and a half years after failing the qualifying exams. I returned to Pontiac State Hospital where I shifted from the in-patient population to doing out-patient and consultation work with children, their parents, and teachers.

At age 31 I married Kathie Harty and discovered the joys of married life. We had three children in close succession. They are now in their twenties, out of the home, and either starting or finishing college. Kathie is an occupational therapist and works in a private psychiatric hospital.

In 1973 I became the Director of Children and Youth Services for Blue Ridge Community Mental Health Center in Asheville, North Carolina. I worked diligently for six years building the staff to twelve persons, planning and overseeing the construction of an addition to the mental health center, and establishing a number of quality programs serving children and youth. Although I had legitimate authority, my leadership style was non-authoritarian and depended heavily on a collegial relationship between myself

and my staff. I gained commitment from the employees by attempting to set an example of hard work and doing clinical and consultation work beside them rather than becoming bogged down with administrative duties. In 1979 a new assistant director was hired for the Center, and he became my supervisor. Shortly after assuming the job he told me something to the effect, "I haven't heard good things about you, but let's work together for a couple of months and see how you work out." His comment ran counter to what I had believed had been an exemplary job performance. The following day I resigned, to his surprise. I have often wondered if my self-esteem would have been less damaged if I had waged a fight.

From my mid-forties to the present time I worked as a school psychologist for a neighboring school system, first on a contractual basis and then full-time. I never moved to the system's county from my urban home, and although I feel a sense of acceptance by the native born population, there are occasionally feelings of alienation and being left out of the many extended kinships that exist. My Yankee heritage, age, and mystique surrounding my profession are other factors that probably put distance in my working relationships.

In May, 1989, I received an MS in Human Resource Development from Western Carolina University and shortly

after began the Ed.D. program in Educational Administration from the University of North Carolina at Greensboro. In my current graduate program there has been considerable opportunity to reflect upon my leadership style. Paper and pencil tests including the Blake-Mouton Managerial Grid (1964) have suggested high relationship skills but with focus on the task tending to be compromised by my need to maintain harmony. In actuality, I am often task-oriented to a fault, raising the possibility that the paper and pencil tests are depicting the way that I want to present myself publicly rather than reality. The emphasis on tact has probably been more of an asset than a hindrance in the traditional role of school psychologist that I have played out.

I have to this point described a person who in his educational and career pursuits has had both achievements and disappointments. A leadership style was depicted which emphasized collegiality and tact and perhaps excessive need to maintain harmony and to avoid confrontation. I now ask the reader to picture this type of person functioning in the following setting.

Setting

Island Elementary School is located in a rural county of Southern Appalachia. The county is highly mountainous with many back hollows which are close to one another as the

crow flies but often a considerable distance by road. By last census the population was under 20,000. Many existing families have descended from Scotch-Irish who migrated south through the Appalachians during the 18th and 19th centuries and settled in areas once roamed by the Indians. The settlers have been described as having superior resourcefulness. The ability to read and think was most important, and in spite of frontier conditions, the citizens sought to provide education for their children. There was and continues to be a high sense of family loyalty with no one daring to violate the privacy of the home--but the latch string is always out for the friend who comes to visit and share the hospitality of home and table. The residents were and still are unquestioningly conservative in religion and keenly interested in politics. The county did not experience the Southern plantation history characterized by more eastern counties, and the current minority population is less than 1%.

The county is depressed economically with many residents supplementing farming income by commuting to a nearby urban area and working in factories. There are middle and upper middle classes comprised in part by the teachers of the public school system. An informed source states that there are some "six figure" persons in the county although the trappings of wealth are rare. Persons

are very private about what they earn and own, and they shun ostentation.

The history of education in the county includes a period in which church schools were prominent. These were gradually replaced by public schools in every small community. These in turn were torn down, boarded up, or put to other uses as consolidation occurred. Formally the organization and governance of the school system has always followed a clear hierarchy of authority from the board to the superintendent to the principals. There are precise rules and obligations with considerable task specificity. Knowledge has largely been disseminated in a top-down manner although in the last couple of years there has been increased pressure to develop site-based management teams. Frequent changes in superintendents over the last three years has had an unsettling effect on staff morale.

The curriculum of the school system has the same course content as most other school systems in the state--that is, reading, language, math, social studies, science, PE, and an assortment of vocational classes. More recently art, music, foreign language, drama, and speech have been introduced. There are compensatory education classes, programs for exceptional children both handicapped and gifted, and educational services in the areas of drugs, alcohol, and sexuality.

Subjects are taught in a variety of ways although in the strictly academic classes the traditional teacher-centered approach predominates with the teacher doing much of the talking and with limited opportunities for student to student interaction. There is considerable pressure on teachers covering material in preparation for end of the year testing. The focus is often upon inculcating knowledge into the child rather than ascertaining that deep level understanding and integration with other material have occurred.

Island Elementary School is reportedly the only public school on a fresh water island in the continental United States. As I approach the island by going through a small town and crossing a bridge, I am struck by the idyllic beauty of the whole setting. The old courthouse, the slice of mountain that rises almost vertically behind it, the goings and comings of its citizens all convey a sense of an earlier time, of a period less rushed and less pummeled by technological and social change. The river passing by the island is ever changing depending on how much precipitation has occurred upstream over the past few days--sometimes swirling, lapping the banks and resembling well-creamed coffee and at other times ambling by with exposed islets of sand and rock and presenting an almost olive color. When the school was built in the twenties, there was opposition

from those who believed that the island and school would be flooded periodically. Those in favor of construction contended that the large retaining wall would prevent such an occurrence. As time intervened the critics proved to be correct with flooding occurring on numerous occasions (Figure 1). The successive flooding influenced planning and funding, and gradually newer schools have been built on higher ground. In the 1970s the school went from K through 12th grade to K through 8th grade. In the early 1990s it went to 4th through 5th, and there is every expectation that in the next five years the school will be totally phased out and the buildings razed. With declining enrollment the school has held less and less status in sports competition within the district and region. Currently, central office operations have taken over empty classrooms. Even though I travel to other schools my home base is the island, allowing for more contact with the school faculty than otherwise might be the case.

Significant Events

The results of this study will be more understandable if the reader is provided with a sequential review of the significant events that occurred during the research:

Spring, 1991 Idea for dissertation conceived while taking Dissertation Seminar and Interpretive Inquiry at UNC-G. Pilot programs in cooperative learning with a class of

Figure 1. Island Elementary School under flood.

USDA - Soil Conservation Service

7th graders at Island Elementary School. The lesson dealt with making contractions, admittedly not an exciting topic but one which the teacher had planned to introduce the date of the pilot. Interviews with three of the students afterwards revealed considerable enthusiasm and memory for the social component of the experience but limited recollection of the objective on contractions.

August, 1991 Approval by principal and superintendent of proposal. Presentation of proposal to the faculty and request for volunteer teachers. Elaine Martin, Jim Hunter, and Sally Morris (all pseudonyms) agreed to take part in the study.

September, 1991 Developed and presented a cooperative learning lesson with Elaine Martin, 6th grade teacher. Lesson focussed on learning the six steps of the scientific method by studying the water quality of the river from samples drawn from two different locations. An Imhoff Cone was used to study the sediment level from each sample. Groups of three and four students went through the scientific method, aided by a visual imagery mnemonic for the six steps. Presentation was followed by a recorded interview with the teacher.

October, 1991 Developed and presented a cooperative learning lesson with Jim Hunter, 8th grade teacher.

Again, lesson focussed on learning the six steps of the scientific method by studying the water quality of the river from samples drawn from different locations. Each table of students was given a kit allowing the measurement of oxygen in each sample. Presentation was followed by a recorded interview with the teacher.

November, 1991 Prospectus presented to Dissertation Committee and approved.

December, 1991 Developed and presented a cooperative learning lesson with Sally Morris, 4th grade teacher. Topic was North Carolina history. Small groups of children were asked to "stand in the shoes" of different segments of the population--that is, farmers, plantation owners, slaves, merchants--and to develop viewpoints revolving around post Revolution issues such as the pros and cons of westward migration. Members of each group had specific roles to fulfill--e.g., recorder, presenter to class as a whole. Presentation was followed by a recorded interview with the teacher.

January, 1992 Transcription of interviews and beginning analysis.

February, 1992 Attended winter conference of the North Carolina School Psychology Association at Browns Summit, North Carolina. Title was "Finding the answers to the school restructuring puzzle: Where does school

psychology fit?" There was considerable focus upon the questions being addressed in my dissertation--that is, how does the school psychologist assume a role different than that of the traditional tester.

March, 1992 Continuing analysis of transcripts. Increasing fascination with the intricacies of conversational activity from a sociolinguistic perspective (Gumperz & Hymes, 1972; Gumperz, 1982; Tannen, 1984, 1986, 1989).

April 22 and 23, 1992 Comprehensive exams for doctoral program. Questions focussed on issues involved in implementation of innovation in education--that is, type of leadership required, structural barriers to change, the need to have approval and support at high levels while at the same time maintaining ownership at a grassroots level.

May 11, 1992 Defended and passed Comprehensive exams.

June, 1992 A second interview with Sally Morris. Interviewed the principal, Jack Craig (pseudonym), and the guidance counselor, Elizabeth young (pseudonym). Transcribed interviews.

July, 1992 Analyzed transcripts from the standpoint of coding categories as discussed by Bogdan and Biklen (1982) as well as from a sociolinguistic perspective (Tannen, 1990). My reading of Briggs (1986) and his sociolinguistic appraisal of the role of the interview

in social science research gave pause to placing too much faith on the veridicality of data secured by interviews.

In the next section the discussion of the specific interviews will be preceded by general observations of the methodology of the interview which will serve as a recommendation to attend to the process aspects of the interview and as a caveat to overinterpreting the content.

Interviews

Methodology

Akinnaso and Ajirotuto (1982) remind us that interview conversation differs from ordinary conversation in several respects:

> In its simplest form, it is prototypically manifested as an interrogative encounter between someone who has the right or privilege to know and another in a less powerful position who is obliged to respond, rather defensively, to justify his/her action, to explain his/her problems, to give up him/herself for evaluation (p. 119).

Briggs (1986) indicates that the social situation created by the interview shapes the form and content of what is said. He refers to the context that is formed as continually renegotiated in the course of the interaction. Bias cannot

be controlled, only made more explicit. He contends that the interview presupposes a set of role relations, rules for turn-taking, canons for introducing new topics, canons for judging the relevance of statements, and constraints on linguistic form.

Noting that interviews have characteristics different than ordinary conversation should not obscure the fact that contrasting conversational styles show up in interviews and frequently determine the direction of the discourse. Tannen (1990) has drawn upon sociolinguistic research to produce a highly readable account of differences in conversational style, especially as they divide along gender lines. She describes men as engaging the world as a contest, as a struggle to preserve independence and avoid failure. They talk more in public ("report talk"), and through exhibiting knowledge and holding center stage they strive to maintain their status in a hierarchical social order. Women on the other hand enter the world as a network of connections. They talk more in private ("rapport talk") and use talk to hold relationships together. Male conversations are typified as focusing upon status and independence; those of women focus upon seeking and giving confirmation and support. These differing conversational styles play out in the form of metamessages which identify the activity going

on, the position that the speaker is assuming, and the position that the listener is being assigned.

Tannen (1990) is aware that by developing prototypes of masculine and feminine conversational styles, she risks the dangers of generalizing, of predicting some behaviors and not capturing others. She argues, however, that denying real differences compounds confusion--"If we can sort out differences based on conversational style, we will be in a better position to confront real conflicts of interest and to find a shared language in which to negotiate them" (p. 18). Tannen (1990) does not make numerous references to situations in which men and women do not fit their gender prototypes (such as my preference as a child for reading over "rough and tough" play). She suggests that men who do not use the forceful strategies associated with masculinity may have the listening skills of the archetypal clinician but still be at a disadvantage in the practical, everyday world.

In this study five interviews were recorded and transcribed. The format contained both standardized and nonstandardized elements. There were certain questions asked of most of the interviewees such as inquiries regarding background, reactions to the cooperative learning demonstrations, and opinions on the five research questions developed prior to the study. These standardized questions

were asked in a nonscheduled manner with the wording and order posed in a way which seemed most suitable for the interviewee. Other questions evolved from the flow of the interview. My intention was to have the general tenor of most of the questions open-ended with the range of possible answers not specified. Analysis of the interviews revealed only partial success in this regard. I was struck, for instance, by my periodic "fishing" for compliments on the demonstrations.

Despite the standardized elements and the fact that the same person was the interviewer each time, there were clear differences in the five interviews. Some of the differences were in terms of the topics generated. Other differences were related to the sociolinguistic characteristics. The length of each interview, the extent that each person spoke, who set the topic, and the type of metamessage being conveyed frequently varied.

As a convention in my transcribing two dots represent a pause. Three dots indicate that I have jumped to another part of the interview; this risks conversation being interpreted out of context but saves the reader from having to go over much redundant material. Parentheses ( ) are used to show my interjection or to show that what was said could not be understood on the tape. Words placed within

parentheses along with a question mark represent my educated guess.

There were a few characteristics that were common across the interviews. For example, I asked the initial question and closed the interview. There was also a tendency to repeat or expand upon the question and to leave a phrase dangling. Following are a couple of examples of that characteristic:

> Tom: I remember that there were some things that I did that you were...that you were free to say you felt...could have been done differently, or you, you had some..a..you had some..

> Tom: Okay..a..you know they say that schools have different kinds of climates..you know..that there's ways that things get done or..a..can you characterize Island Elementary School in any particular kind of way? Either by..

Although upon reading the transcript I was initially bothered by this apparent beating around the bush way of asking questions, I can see how the ambiguous format might allow the listener to be freer or more self-revealing in his or her response; therefore, my questioning style could be interpreted as being in the service of promoting discourse rather than obfuscating it.

Another characteristic that emerged in almost all the interviews was a reference to my positive feelings over assuming a different role with the children:

> Tom: I need to tell you, the experience was really positive for me because I..my traditional role is that when I get in my office with a youngster, we get testing...the testing's kinda game-like, and for the most part we have rapport. We have a good thing going. (But) now when they're in a group of their peers, especially when they go onto the high school, pass them by in the hall, I better not say "Hi" cause then it's kinda like a stigma. So I have to..it's almost like a relationship I have to keep a little quiet about. You know, I can't broadcast that this person was close to me, you know. But by doing what I did with you..a..kids are coming up to me like in the cafeteria saying, "Hello, Mr. Jones" in the hall, and I get..I'm getting more feeling of acceptance than I've gotten in a long time in my traditional role.

Other characteristics occurred in two or three interviews but not in all. These will be noted in the description of each interview.

<u>Elaine Martin</u> Elaine was born and raised in an adjacent county. She is a divorced woman in her thirties and a mother of one child. She graduated from college in her

early twenties but after her student teaching experience decided not to teach--"I was in an open school and it was a bit difficult with no walls..airplanes flying over the dividers...I thought if this is the way kids are, I don't want to be around them." But after a period of substituting she entered the county school system full-time four years ago. I have known her since she began and have consulted with her on several occasions about children who were being served by the Exceptional Children's Program. She is teaching the 6th grade with mostly a self-contained classroom although all her children are pulled for art, music, and PE, and some are pulled for resource and Chapter I.

The interview took place in an office in an elementary school near Elaine's home. The location was for her convenience as it was the end of the school day, and after the interview she would be just a couple of minutes from home. The interview took less than an hour. An inspection of number of words generated and by whom suggested that I spoke approximately 35% of the time, and Elaine spoke 65%. I spoke more in proportion to the interviewee than during any of the other interviews. Although this might indicate an egalitarian, give and take quality to our relationship, the deferential nature of some of her responses points to asymmetry in our interaction. The following excerpt suggests a change process occurring although I was

uncomfortable with the expert/student tone of the interchange:

Tom: Now, I noticed..the day..I guess maybe it was the following day..I came back and you were going through the scientific method again with some other project.

Elaine: (Smiling) Got to get it while it's hot.

Tom: Yeah..and is that..

Elaine: Yes.

Tom: ..is that catching? Are they getting the scientific method?

Elaine: Mhm. Thank you. They are. A..forgot what it was. Oh, we put clay and sand and the humus in jar of water. And then we shook it up and tried to see..first we tried to decide which one would seem to settle the most to the bottom. They all were supposed to guess and then we looked at it again. Then came to their conclusions. So we're going to be doing that a lot, thanks to you.

Tom: Well..

Elaine: I just couldn't figure out how do you get 'em to remember the steps because they always come back, "What was that?" "What was that?" I'd have to look it up. But I'll remember it now, thanks to you.

In another interchange I come across as a diagnostician, and when Elaine responds as patient, I endeavor to soften the clinical tone:

Tom: Okay. A..now I'm getting a little bit of feeling for what you're like as a teacher..this little experiment that we did..and..a..

Elaine: And my needing walls.

Tom: Well, I would..no, I've been impressed with your teaching and like I've mentioned to you, it sounds like you've been doing some cooperative learning stuff.

Despite her clear inclination to please me, Elaine expressed during the interview a number of reasons why she would be hesitant to adopt cooperative learning as an instructional approach. As apparent from the following excerpts these reasons revolve around concerns over added preparation time, the availability of resources, increased problems with discipline, and whether the activities have relevance to children doing well on the California Achievement test (CAT):

Elaine: Of course, I'm so rattled trying to teach so many different subjects, I don't have that much time to prepare...if there had been some way that we could have had enough..we just don't have the facilities that we need...and...I found that the attention-getters tend to act up more with these kinds of activities...and in those groups that was the problem that day..with those that needed the attention, whether it was acting out;

> whether it was being the center of attention with something...the pressure is to teach test, and this other stuff doesn't matter..and working in these groups is not part of the test, and so I tend to put a lot more fun stuff off until May..April and May.

When asked, specifically, her view on the interest in cooperative learning in the school and system-wide, Elaine said:

> ..the ones I've talked to, majority don't want to be bothered. They want to keep it the way they have it. They're organized that way. They have their routine down. They have their rules, and it's only a hassle to get kids together.

Jim Hunter Jim was born and raised in the county. He is in his late twenties, married, and the father of one child. He has a number of relatives within the school system and is frank to say that teaching in his county is one of the better paying jobs. He began teaching shortly after finishing college and is now working on his master's degree. He teaches science to 7th and 8th graders and has gained recognition for bringing the science lab back to life. I have done relatively little formal consulting with him, and contacts have been mostly casual around the school.

The interview took place in his classroom in the middle of the day and took approximately an hour. I spoke 20% of the time to his 80%. However, I did not feel that I was having difficulty getting a word in edgewise. Perhaps because of his trusting nature he spoke candidly about his and other's career development, his concerns as a teacher, his opinions about cooperative learning, and his reaction to our cooperative learning exercise on water quality. I found myself frequently using "active listening," the term Gordon (1970) coined to describe the reflecting back of feelings heard. Occasionally, I intuited feelings that were barely on the surface. The following excerpt provides a sense of the easy flow of conversation between us:

> Jim: So I think there's a lot to be learned. And I get discouraged, you know, when I think that people don't want to learn new things because I think there's a lot out there.
>
> Tom: It's always..it's always kinda a risk, you know.
>
> Jim: That's true.
>
> Tom: ..like setting something aside.
>
> Jim: Well, we get in our own..it's like I said before..get in our own way or own mode of operation, way we want to do things. That's why there's so much resistance to..a..the effective teacher training. And

because the teachers who've been teaching for 20 or more years..and I'm not so sure I blame them..they felt that they'd made it for 20 years without somebody telling them how to teach.

Tom: Yeah.

Jim: They know how to teach, and they didn't need it. And to an extent I..I agree with that. But at the same time I guess we're never too old to learn, to learn a different way, not necessarily a better way or a new way, but just a different way.

Tom: But I can see where a teacher who's been in the field a long time would..sometimes there's a sense of being patronized, you know, like..like someone out there has the answer, and here I've been for..

Jim: That's true.

Tom: But that's the benefit I guess of being in school. You know..

Jim: That's true.

Tom: ..kinda forces you to try out new ideas.

To a degree the "easy flow" of this conversation may reflect two males engaging in an analytical discussion of change.

As the following excerpt suggests Jim appears to feel positively about cooperative learning but also recognizes its limitations:

Jim: I think it's (cooperative learning) an excellent way of doing..especially science. I'm not so sure that it would work..well, I'm sure it won't work for every type of situation. But it..I think science lends itself toward cooperative learning because you, you need to work in groups. You need to work with hands-on situations. And I think it's good especially with the new tests that the students will be given in the next year or two. I think it's extremely important that students begin to think about why something works, not just that it works, or trying to find something that does work but thinking past that and trying to think about why it worked, why something else didn't work, or why the results came out like they did.

In the next segment Jim is talking about our experiment and the importance of the students assuming different roles within the small groups. This led into a discussion of the significant impediment of ability grouping to the implementation of cooperative learning:

Jim: Some of them had reading problems and I tried to separate the groups in such a way that there would be one reader that (read well) and I used processing supervisors who's in charge of making sure that everybody knew what to do and where to go.

Tom: Yeah. I thought that went well, by the way.

Jim: I think it did, too.

Tom: I felt that the kids kinda got into that and protected their roles, you know..

Jim: They..I thought so too..they didn't want anybody else. The equipment engineer wanted to make sure that nobody else got any equipment except from them. And I think that's very important. I'm not..the one problem that I see with cooperative learning..and it's not really a problem with cooperative learning..it's just a problem with, with the way that we have separated some of the students..is that..I think that you almost have to have a heterogeneous group or at least..you don't want to have a situation where you have a lower group that has been grouped and almost all of them are lower students or students who have problems with reading and have problems understanding different concepts because..really..you almost get to the point where you're disgusted because you keep trying and you keep trying to get a point across and it seems like by the time the lab is over, the point somewhere has been lost. And you did the lab..but mentally you didn't accomplish anything. And that, I think that's discouraging for the teacher. And it almost turns you off to cooperative learning when it's really not

the fault of the cooperative learning itself. It's the way that the students were grouped.

Tom: So the composition of the class that we had was not a heterogeneous group?

Jim: It was, but very..only very slightly. You could take out..you could take out four students out of that group, and it would be a homogeneous group.

Tom: So it's kinda like lip service to heterogeneous..

Jim: Absolutely.

Tom: ..grouping.

Jim: Absolutely. There's four or five students who were placed in that group, just basically so we could say that the group was heterogeneous. And that's as honest as I can be about it.

He went on to suggest that a major pressure for grouping is by the parents of high achieving students:

Jim: I think that's a decision that goes back to the fact that we still have parents who..if their student is not a person who does real well in school, then they're a parent who wants heterogeneous groups. They want their students mixed in with other students who do really, really well. However, if you're a parent of a student who does exceptionally well, you want the groups to be homogeneous. You want your student to be

> in a group that's known as being the smart group. And I think we're at some point we have to stop catering to the parents and say, "Homogeneous grouping is not the best way to go."

An additional impediment to implementation of cooperative learning is a teacher's adherence to the principle that students copying from one another is a form of cheating rather than sharing. Jim's rationale for having students write down questions assigned appears to follow the former notion:

> Jim: The first thing is, if they have to write the question, they probably will understand the answer better. And the second thing is, that the old..you know..down through time you have kids who like to copy other people's paper. And if they have to go to the trouble of writing the sentence, then they'll probably just go ahead and answer it too...instead of copying somebody else's.

<u>Sally Morris</u> Sally was born and raised outside the county. She is in her mid-fifties, has been married for over 30 years and is the mother of five children. Her husband was in the military, and the family has travelled extensively. Although she has had many rich experiences interacting with children, her formal teaching did not begin until five years

ago. She now teaches 4th grade with mostly a self-contained classroom although as noted for Elaine Martin there are a number of pullouts.

Our interviews took place in my office in the school, a choice made by Sally as there would be fewer interruptions than in her classroom. Regrettably the first interview could not be transcribed; therefore, the following analysis is based upon the second interview which includes recollections of the first. I spoke approximately 25% of the time, and Sally spoke 75%. Initially, the interview was not comfortable for me and, I suspect, neither for her. A major reason for the disharmony seemed to revolve around different perspectives on the cooperative learning exercise. I was rather cavalier about covering aspects of westward migration in North Carolina prior to my didactic presentation to the class and subsequent small groups. If the children had not read the assignment, that was okay as my introduction was to pique curiosity and raise awareness of the issues. Questions were thrown out that students could not answer. Sally was disturbed by their non-responsiveness and seemed to view it as a negative reflection upon my teaching, and more importantly, upon hers:

Tom: It was my approach. I know what it was..it was..a..a..you had indicated that the children hadn't been taught..

Sally: Oh, yes.

Tom: ..what I was asking.

Sally: Exactly..the reading. They had not done the reading..nor had it been done to them.

Tom: Yeah.

Sally: The area, the materials that were covered, and I felt that their responses were not as they normally would be.

Tom: Uh-huh.

Sally: Because they're very open and eager to participate in discussion.

Tom: And if they didn't know the answer, I..I guess..I got the feeling that you felt kinda bad about it. If they weren't able to kinda come up with..

Sally: I felt for them, that they were frustrated because..a..anyone would have been..you know..that was not familiar with the materials, and I felt that it set the stage for..then you did some reviewing which went way back, and I felt that they in turn did not respond to the things that they did know..which was..a..I..I did not know why they did not because there were

certain things that you asked that I know that they did know.

Tom: Uh-huh.

Sally: And..a..I think that they had a taste that maybe you were going to ask them something they wouldn't know; therefore, they would just be mum.

This interchange set the tone for other tense interactions. In obtaining background information I became aware that Sally had served in two other schools within the system and that it might be of interest to compare her experiences in all three. She complied but as will be seen did not feel comfortable with the process. Following are pertinent comments in this regard:

Sally: Well, I've never thought of comparing the three schools. I think that probably..my..the school at Running Springs was the most different. It..it had a quality that is rare, that we've preserved in this county. A lot of their old time values are still there. I felt (the children) were not nearly as touched by what we call the negative side of modern society. There is a real close family tie which..a..goes back with the grandparents being part of their lives. I had..a..fewer broken families, less children from divorced family and one parent families. They're still

> rural, and many of them farm, and they still hold more to the old ways...I had a positive experience at Hill School..I did, I..I enjoyed it. A..I..as to compare to Island, it's hard to. Both of the schools are old, and..a..I..I really would prefer not to compare schools...be better if I did not.

I was left feeling that I had tried to engage her in a gossiping session in which she would be forced to say that one school was better than the other.

When asked about her teaching development over the last four years, Sally appeared to alternate between being self-disclosing and assuring me of her adequacy:

> Sally: Oh, I think I'm a better teacher than I was the first year.
>
> Tom: What..
>
> Sally: A..I think I was a good teacher the first year, but you see I come from an experienced background of dealing with children. It's not like..cause I'm 55 years old..so I think that makes the difference there. So I did go into the classroom with really no difficulty in being able to teach. A..and I enjoy it tremendously, but..I think I'm a better teacher now than I was four years ago.

Tom: What, what do you think you do that might be better? That's different or..

Sally: You want to compare how I have grown as a teacher?

Tom: Yeah. Uh-huh.

Sally: Well, I think I pace myself a little better. I..I don't feel..I have realized that..I cannot save the world. My first year I really thought I could..and it, it bothered me greatly..not to be able to. And I took it home with me. And I've learned now that there's certain things that I as one person..all I can do is just contribute..to maybe helping. Sometimes you win and sometimes you don't. I believe that there's the biggest change, and I think it's the pace..

Tom: Okay..

Sally: ..of..

Tom: ..it sounds as if..

Sally: ..how I measure myself.

Tom: Uh-huh.

Sally: Uh-huh. How I measure myself against myself.

Tom: Your expectations maybe in the beginning might have been..a..too idealistic?

Sally: I was extremely idealistic. I still am, very idealistic. I always have been. I always will be, and when I am not, I don't think I should be teaching. You

need to learn that all your ideals are not going to come true.

Tom: And that realization came about by..things that happened with the kids, would you say?

Sally: Lots of children, parents, and..a..the personnel..and development of resources. Everything does not always fall into place and work the way it should, but most things do. I would say I've achieved 75% of my goals, and I call that good.

Tom: It sounds good to me.

When talking specifically about cooperative learning, Sally indicated that it "is not a new concept; it's just a new name," and she provided a number of examples of how she incorporates cooperative learning techniques in her teaching. She frequently places the children in small groups but prefers groups of two over four, certainly an acceptable grouping practice.

Sally: And I have found at these lower levels..now I don't know what it's like at the junior high level, high school level..but I think at the lower levels two children together is much better than four..because so often when you put four children together, they have not developed the independence in which they can become a part of it. Most always you will have one

> outstanding child that the other three depend on, and I think that we don't develop independence by having them grouped in fours as much as we do in twos.

I supported groups of two over four just from the viewpoint of the facilities:

> Tom: It's certainly easier just in terms of the furniture arrangement.
>
> Sally: Well, my furniture arrangement, it's just, it's horrendous. I mean I have these ol' timey desks with..
>
> Tom: Yes..
>
> Sally: ..with arms on it.
>
> Tom: ..I know. When I did my thing with you..like..
>
> Sally: It was terrible!
>
> Tom: ..you had nicely put them in little groups, but it took..it was hard to do.
>
> Sally: They need eye contract, and you know, they need privacy.

A similar discussion occurred during the first interview, and I was struck by Sally's stating that the children in the groups needed to have eye contact with her, raising the question of how much she would be able to relinquish control of the classroom.

In at least one cooperative learning exercise Sally indicated that she excluded some children:

Sally: Now these (the ones included) were the children who functioned in our level (i.e., fourth grade) you understand..who can read. We have some children that I did not include in that because it would not have worked because this required reading, finding answers, agreeing on their answers, and working out the materials. And then once they found all their answers to the materials within the reading and they agreed on their answers, then they were given a self check answer sheet to really see exactly what they had done.

I wondered what the excluded children were doing and whether there may have been a way to include them in the dyadic interchanges even if they could not read.

In another example Sally talked about her pairing methods.

Sally: I tried to pair them according to, to ability. I did not necessarily put a very high student with a low student, not at all. I felt that it worked better if I had them more equally..do you know what I mean?

Tom: Uh-huh.

Sally: Because then each child would develop independence because, for instance, and it wasn't boy, boy and boy..and girls and girls. According to their personalities. Ask Jack Brown, you remember him.

Tom: Uh-huh.

Sally: Very gregarious personality. Very, you know, loud boy who jumps at all things. Very smart, but he never could settle down. I paired him with a little girl who was very quiet and her level was a little above his academically because she was settled down and quiet. But she was not as sure of herself. She didn't have that self-confidence that Jack has. I mean, he can rule the world, you see. And I put those two together, and they worked beautifully. And they worked their answers out, and they enjoyed it so much. And, and he told me how much fun it was, that he wished all learning was like this.

When asked how the parents react to her cooperative learning approach, Sally replied that her parents are her allies:

Sally: They see me in various stages of development, and they're free to come and go. And we invite them for special things. And they have been in when we're moving, all moving around. They're not all seated there in, in straight rows doing this, quiet as they can be. But we are productive and we are doing things. Then they have seen us when we're very quiet. You could hear a pin drop. We're working independently

with our work. They know that I have control. But they also know that those children have a lot of freedom, and these children like it.

When Sally was asked how she felt about the school psychologist coming in and talking with her about a particular instructional technique, she emphasized that she enjoys people visiting her classroom--"No, I don't feel threatened by people coming in. That was your question? No, I don't."

Jack Craig Jack, the principal, is in his mid-forties, married, and the father of one child. He was born and raised in the county and is fond of telling people that he has been assigned to Island Elementary School for 29 years. He was a student from the first through the twelfth grade; he taught there most of his teaching years, and he has been principal for 14 years. I have known him since the mid-1970s and feel confident of our friendship although we have different conversational styles and disagree in certain areas. He is talkative and sometimes loud. He does not mince words nor carefully choose the time or place when he has something to say. He is frequently in a complaining mood, and it is not uncommon for him to try to enlist me as an ally for one issue or another. There is seldom a dull moment in his presence. His first cousin (and my

supervisor) is program administrator for the Exceptional Children's Program and has her office down from his. Periodically, the cousins feud, and I become an unofficial mediator. Jack extended every courtesy for this study and arranged approval from the superintendent and cooperation from his faculty.

Our interview took place in his office on a teacher's workday. This invariably is where he likes to have meetings occur even though there are many interruptions. Although I attempted to bring the interview to a close after one hour, he indicated that certain topics had not been discussed, and we went for another half hour. The length of the interview and the key role that the principal has in implementation of an innovation led me to devote more discussion to this interview than to any of the others. An inspection of number of words generated and by whom suggested that I spoke 15% of the time, and Jack spoke 85%. I might introduce a topic, but he would run with it and elaborate upon it. He also did not hesitate to introduce his own topics--e.g., "Let's talk about corporal punishment." The interview was, consequently, rich in subjects, some bearing more directly on the research than others. True to Tannen's (1990) description of the prototypically male style Jack displayed his vast knowledge in the educational field and used terms that are currently in vogue (e.g., "curriculum alignment,"

"outcomes-based education," "image enhancement"). The interview may have reached the criterion of "a good interview" as defined by Bertaux (1981)--"..one in which the interviewee takes over the control of the interview situation and talks freely" (p. 39). I, however, felt somewhat dominated in the situation. While typing the transcript I was amused to note that I would use chance interruptions in the discourse (e.g., phone answering, tape running out on the recorder) to regain control of the topic. I also noticed that in my 15% I was quite directive.

Early in the interview Jack discussed his philosophy on running the school:

> Jack: Well, I would like to think that we're a student-centered school and..a..I think that..a..my philosophy is that the kids come first. The parents come sec..a..the teachers come second, and the parents come third. And..a..I think that the principal must be ..a..out and associating with the students and the faculty and not be behind closed doors. I do not think..I do not believe in the Great Man theory that, that the principal can be, you know, all-knowing, all and all that. A..I believe teachers need lots of flexibility (without someone always?) watching over them. But going back to student-centered, I think that the administrative area has got to be open to

students..a..first. Kids have got to feel like the principal and the administrative area is a place that they can go to for whatever problem. Otherwise, they're, they're shut off. They have enough problems finding someone to communicate as it is. A..I think students..a..need to see the principal. They, they need to have a warm relationship with their teachers. And I think we've got to look for the good that kids do and not the bad.

In talking about the origins of his philosophy, Jack indicated that it has been handed down from one principal to another, always men. In speaking of his predecessor he said:

Jack: His..his..well my philosophy would be very close aligned to his, and..a..I, I often tell people that outside of my father, he probably influenced me more than any other man..a..because..a..I think he had, he had a feel for kids and for what needed to be happening in the schools and not..a.. He believed in the worth of the individual and that I hope would be the philosophy that I have, that every kid is special, there's worth, and that everyone should be treated with dignity and respect no matter what they've done. Cause

they are, they're kids! If they acted like adults, wouldn't need teachers.

A component of the school's philosophy has been its long-standing support of corporal punishment. Over the years the teachers and principal have come to tolerate my opposition to it even though I have had the distinct impression that my views have been discounted as the ivory tower ramblings of the school psychologist. Jack's current outlook on the practice seems to reflect his efforts to accommodate the increasing pressure to eliminate corporal punishment:

Jack: I happen to believe that corporal punishment only works if you have a personal relationship with the person that you're using it on. If some stranger whips, whips a child, it doesn't do any good. And I think that's why in a larger school setting it won't work, and it's totally improper. But we have students..a..we've had students in the past that, that again, that gave them the reinforcement that, that gave them the claim to fame--"I've had five whippings or ten whippings." That's beginning to decline. I think corporal punishment is on its way out. I think we've got to find alternative ways to discipline children

without using corporal punishment. But I don't know what it is. I, I haven't found one yet. We used probably less corporal punishment in this year than ever before. We've had things like our tardiness increased; our laying out of class increased; our use of tobacco products increased..a..and overall..a attitude of, of work participation in school decreased. Now whether or not it had to do with our using corporal punishment or what it had to do with..a..you know, maybe we failed to emphasize these things but at one time we didn't..tardiness was never a problem in this school until this year.

The following "psychological interpretation" of his above statement carried the implication that he was not captain of his ship, and I believe it had a patronizing quality. And yet it elicited what may have been the primary reason for his declining use of corporal punishment:

Tom: Sounds like you've had some pressure to decrease corporal punishment.

Jack: There is, there is pressure to decrease corporal punishment and..a..the fact that I'm being lawed for a Civil Rights violation has a lot to do with whether I use it or not but..there's got..we've got to find an alternative.

Jack rejects suspension from school as an alternative but sees merit in a type of in-school suspension:

> Jack: I wish we had some kinda..like a time out. Every school how large or small needs an area, a time out room with supervision that a child had to go to and there was nothing in that room except four bare walls and a chair and somebody..some kind of supervision..just like it would be if instead of suspending a child, we said, "Well, we, we care enough about you we want you to sit today and think about what it is that's, that you're doing that's interrupting your learning and the learning of others." Think how slow a day it'd be if you had to go sit in a room that had four bare walls and just a chair you'd sit in, how long the day would be. I'd want to modify my behavior to get out of that situation.

Jack emphasizes that we have to quit blaming the parents and that teachers have to quit wanting the non-problem children. At the same time he indicates that the numbers of problem children are increasing. He seems to associate this with declining socio-economic status of the children:

> Jack: We're getting more and more kids in schools that we've had less and less success with. We're getting

fewer middle income kids. There are few families from affluent families. You know, the, the standard of living whether we want to admit it or not is going down.

This line of conversation may have had interest with reference to differential power relationships between teachers and students and its meaning in terms of introduction of cooperative learning. However, when it came time to change the tape, I elected to ask Jack's opinion about the amount of exposure his faculty has had to cooperative learning. In his response he was critical of the lack of staff development in the system:

Jack: Our staff, and, and I'd say our staff is typical of all of the schools in _____ County. There, the amount of exposure to cooperative learning is very in..they haven't had a lot. It's insignificant the amount that they have had as far as the project you undertook. and I think that's bad. A..(adjacent) County has, has been trained, especially their middle school teachers in cooperative learning for the last four years. So there have been activities around. For whatever reason we either haven't been informed, haven't been, haven't chose to keep informed, but I

think that we're behind in the area of cooperative learning as far as using it as a teacher technique.

In lamenting the use of alternative teaching methods, Jack characterized the traditional approach by using direct quotes, a metacommunicative device that two of the other interviewees used for the exact same point:

Jack: We are still trying to teach a different population the same way that we were taught. A..we're trying to teach, "Everybody, get their textbooks out, turn to page 30. We're going to read this chapter in social studies and discuss it. We're going to take a test."

As Jack talked about the lack of alternative practices in his school, I was struck by the externalized locus of control quality of his thinking, and I began to ask questions designed to put the ownership of the problem in his lap (obviously my agenda and not his). It was an awkward interchange with the discomfort shown sociolinguistically by overlaps, interruptions, and false starts:

Tom: When you say "we" now, were you talking about (our) County..

Jack: I'm talking about our school and..

Tom: ..schools?

Jack: Our school and (our) County, too.

Tom: Island Elementary. Okay. So, so you're saying at Island Elementary the more traditional instruction is..

Jack: It's..still..

Tom: ..predominant?

Jack: ..still that's the way we're teaching it, and there's no, no allowances made for different learning styles.

Tom: Okay. A..

Jack: But, let..cooperative learning, you know, it would open up an avenue. A..we have..I think we've made some, some strides with some cooperative activities like our history day and stuff, our, our folk life festival..a..you know. I think we've got, we've got some hit and miss. A..but we don't have..I don't think there's a plan, system-wide or school-wide, to involve different learning styles in our teaching methods.

Tom: Okay. And, and who would know better than you, right! (laughs)

Jack: Well, I don't know..

Tom: Well..

Jack: In this school. I can speak for this school.

In studying this interchange, I was left concluding that my public emphasis on harmonizing relationships may be belied by a more manipulative and incisive going after what I want.

When Jack was asked whether he believed the county would support a shift from a traditional approach to cooperative learning, he talked about an innovative teacher in the past, and he suggested that the telling criterion would be the outcome:

> Jack: ..and she and I use to fuss about it some because I felt like they (her activities) were more fun and games. But here again I've got to change my philosophy, too. But..I've often made the statement..and, and the reason I know she was doing a good job..on the (State) Science Assessment she would always come out doing better than most other schools in our county.
>
> Tom: Is that right.
>
> Jack: And I often made the statement that she could accidentally teach more school than I could ever teach on purpose. And I think that, that's, it's a real good statement. Because even though those activities looks like fun and games, there was lots of learning going on.
>
> Tom: Uh-huh.
>
> Jack: And it was..when it was measured by standardized

tests, it came through..that there was a lot of learning going on.

When asked to discuss implementation of cooperative learning, Jack indicated that planning is the key:

Jack: What we've got to do is we've got to ease into some cooperative kinds of activities at each grade level. If, if..I think, I think you could do it in your reading assignments, your social studies area, and your science area. If you're going to do hands-on activities..a..you, you, you can get involved in some cooperative learning. But we need a planned approach to that. We need somebody to work out the details and then provide the materials to the teachers. Teachers do not have the time nor the financial resources to, to get all the materials they would need for those activities. Does that make sense?

Tom: Oh, yeah.

Jack went on to emphasize that the impetus for change has to be system-wide rather than at the local school site, a return to the locus of control issue:

Jack: I think that's got to come from..that's got to be system-wide. Otherwise, we get right back where we're at, hit or miss kinds of things.

Later in our conversation I asked Jack, "Even though it's system-wide, how do you mobilize people's interest in, in doing things differently?" His response stressed the importance of leadership but also cautioned against making further demands upon teachers:

> Jack: Well, you've got to do..the leadership has got..a..what is the old saying? "You either lead, follow, or get the hell out of the way." The leadership must be able to show teachers that what they're asking to do can be done and will be successful and that the reason that we're being less successful is because we're not doing those things that can be done and will be successful. I think, I think that we're making demands upon teachers that make them less than successful. I think that..a..not only central office people and me as a principal, state department, and central office people are making demands upon teachers that they themselves could not do were they a teacher in that class...I think Exceptional Children's Program is making demands on regular teachers that people in your program could not do even though they say, "You must do this. You must do that." I don't think they would do..I think we've got to quit making demands upon teachers.

Jack sees merit in modeling different instructional techniques for the classroom teacher but criticized the one-shot approach and perhaps obliquely was pointing out a fault of my study:

> Jack: If I, if I think something could be done, I, I should be willing to go in that classroom and do it. Model so the teacher could model from me...It's easy for me to go over there and teach that one period. I don't have to come back and teach it tomorrow...I think, I think every principal, every supervisor, superintendents, every year ought to have to teach a certain amount of time lest we forget what it's like in the classroom.

As I endeavored to bring the interview to a close, Jack indicated that we had not discussed ability grouping. Inasmuch as this is such a critical issue in the implementation of cooperative learning, I encouraged him to state his philosophy about grouping:

> Jack: I believe, I believe in grouping kids. I believe in heterogeneous grouping but not before the 7th grade. There should be no grouping until students reach the 7th grade. But I believe that the reason that grouping fails is that we tend to give the poorest students to

the least experienced teachers or the poorest teachers. If we're going to group students, we must identify those teachers who are good, and make sure that those students, those poor students, or your low class students, academically lower class students, get the benefit of the good teachers. And good teachers have got to realize that, that the true mark of a teacher is the person who can teach the students who don't want to learn and are far behind academically or come from the wrong side of the tracks. Anyone can teach affluent, middle-class kids who are self-motivated and who have parents that want them to excel. A..that's, that's not the mark of a good teacher. (Any?) person can teach them. The mark of a good teacher to me is that teacher who can take a group of slower students, academically, and build a positive self-image in those students, bring up their self-esteem, and yet actual learning take place. And that kind of learning has to be measured differently than some kind of standard achievement test. I..I believe that everyone should develop their potential to the fullest, and I don't think we can allow our better students, academically better students, to sit in the classroom while the teacher tries to bring everybody up to their level. I think we tend to bring them down.

Jack's views ran counter to my sense of fairness as to how students should be treated and also were in contrast to the contention by some (Finley, 1984) that teachers of lower track students find themselves disgruntled and relegated to lower status positions in the school hierarchy. My interest was emotionally charged, and our conversation became more fervent:

Tom: So let me, so let me just kinda talk this through, then. Through the 5th grade you've got your placement being very heterogeneous..almost like drawing them..

Jack: Through the 6th, all the way up through the 6th.

Tom: All through the 6th. So it's almost like drawing out of a hat.

Jack: Right.

Tom: Twenty-four go here; twenty-four..

Jack: That's right.

Tom: All right. But at the conclusion of the 6th then you're, you're feeling you need to..

Jack: ..need to begin to, to, to specialize and send some kids into some special areas. And I think at, at that point of time we need to, to begin to remediate which I..I actually think that remediation is almost too late by then, but we need to channel those kids into a area of interest for them. And I'm not saying

necessarily..but I think we're trying to make college graduates out of all of our students. You know, we're trying to prepare them all to go to college. College is not for every child.

Tom: How, how does that get decided? Pretty much on your, your, your..a..

Jack: We..

Tom: ..group testing at the end?

Jack: ..use the testing, teacher recommendation. Because you have some students who test well but won't..a..won't do the work required to..a..won't live up to the expectations of, of that standard. But, but the, but..a..grouping..bad light that grouping has as I see it..that it's characteristically being used to give the students who need the most help to the teachers who are illest equipped to provide that help.

Jack went on to support his position by presenting two scenarios, one in which a low level student is in a heterogeneous class; the other in which that student is in with other low level students:

Jack: If you put 'em in a heterogeneous class, they're still going to be the bottom. They're not going to be the ones that the teacher calls on first. They're not

going to be the ones that's selected to do X, Y, or Z activity. They're not going to get to be, to feel like they're the teacher's pet. But in that (homogeneous) class somebody is going to be the one that's called on. They're going to get positive self, some positive imaging in the class setting, you know, by the other class as well.

At this point all semblance of being a non-directive interviewer vanished!

Tom: I find myself not agreeing with you.

Jack: I, I know you..do.

Tom: A..but..a..but..that's all right. I feel comfortable..

Jack: To disagree.

Tom: ..with you to disagree.

Jack, indeed, did not appear concerned about the disagreement and proceeded to argue his point:

Jack: But, but Tom, let's, let's look at reality here. If grouping is bad, why does Harvard have some kind of standard for your getting in? Why don't they have an open enrollment and the first 1500 students to apply are, get in? But, but they scrutinize that because everyone is not meant to be a student at Harvard...and

I almost..my feeling about grouping has been that I could take the 7th grade students at Island Elementary, and I could take 'em to the cafeteria, and I could say, "Okay, now, I want you all to sit anywhere you want to"..

Tom: Uh-huh.

Jack: ..and I can come up within four or five kids out of a hundred, I can come up with three distinct groups.

Tom: Yeah. But, but you see I'm contending that that's something they have learned early in life, what their status is, you know, that, that the fact that they go off to the group that you predict they're going to go off to doesn't necessarily mean that that's, that's the right thing, that..a lot of these kids learn their status early in life, you know, and part of, part of, part of that learning has to do with early grouping that goes on..a..

Jack: Well, that's a..and that gets back to within the classroom even though you had a heterogeneous group. But Tom, we have, we have to understand that, that some kids when they come out of the womb, the day they're born..some are born more equal than others, and I, I wish that were not true.

This interview had a disquieting effect upon me. On one hand I heard a principal give his endorsement to the

implementation of cooperative learning within his school; on the other hand I heard him discount one of the major reasons for its implementation--that is, the promotion of a learning environment that can accommodate heterogeneity in the classroom.

Elizabeth Young Elizabeth was born and raised in the midwest. She is in her late fifties or early sixties, divorced, and the mother of five adult children. She has her Ph.D. in psychology and numerous other credentials in the areas of counseling and guidance. She came to the school system four and a half years ago from a university setting, and I played an indirect role in her being hired. She is a guidance counselor for Island Elementary School and in many respects has become Jack Craig's right hand. We have a friendly, trusting relationship and share the same private office complex in a nearby urban setting.

The interview was conducted in my office on an off school day and took approximately an hour. An inspection of number of words generated and by whom suggested that I spoke approximately 30% of the time, and Elizabeth spoke 70%. The interview was often easy flowing with both of us agreeing on many issues. Elizabeth was particularly supportive and showed this support with many positive back channel cues or listening signals (e.g., "Uh-huh," "Yeah, yeah"). However,

when studying the transcript, I noticed that from time to time I played the role of gadfly and seemed to be trying to evoke dissatisfaction in a person who is basically happy with her job and loyal to her principal. Tannen's (1990) distinction between the contest talk of men and connection talk of women seemed to be apropos.

When asked about the climate of Island Elementary School, Elizabeth responded as follows:

> Elizabeth: I think my feeling is that..a..it tends to be rather traditional. And..a..I have in conversations with the principal, he seemed to give, want to give the teachers more freedom to do things than they were willing to take, that..a..it was all right with him if they tried a lot of different things. But the teachers for some reason felt pressured to do things in a traditional manner..a..such as teaching to the test, teaching to the CATs or covering the book, covering the whole book and not having time to stop and..a..make a lot of diverging kinds of activities..a..enrichment.

She proceeded to give an example of how one year she and Jack developed a pre-vocational curriculum with many hands-on activities, but the Board said, "No" because it meant having another period during the day, a resource teacher, and considerable material.

Following is another example of Jack's hands-on orientation and his propensity for developing a customized vocational program for some students. Also note my ready inclination to view conflict as top-down rather than bottom-up:

Tom: (Jack) likes trying..a..to have learning occur in hands-on sorts of ways.

Elizabeth: Right. Sorta real life kinds of activities. Well, that was evidence, too, in getting some of the boys to do a lot of..a..practical things. And last year the two that were having difficulties in school and just were skipping school. They were missing school. And he got them..he was criticized for it..but he got them doing things and he said, for instance, they could run the loud speakers and do some of the mechanical things around school far better than he could. He just turned it over to them; they did it.

Tom: You say he got criticized. I've often thought it was an awkward situation for a principal to also be in the building where the central office is.

Elizabeth: Yeah.

Tom: Have you felt that? It's kinda like everything he does is kinda subject to scrutiny about, you know..

Elizabeth: A..though I didn't, I never heard Central Office being criticism, critical, but some of the

teachers would say, "You belong..they belong in class; they shouldn't be out here doing these kinds of things." Sorta missing the point and then I know they (sigh), it is their responsibility to have kids in classes. But at least these kids came to school, and they worked, and they were not discipline problems, and..and they were cooperative, and they had some pride in what they could do. And you know, to have responsibility. You could tell by the way they carried themselves that they were special.

In the following interchange Elizabeth and I continue to explore the reasons for the traditional ways of teaching at Island:

Tom: Do you think that the way that they teach is something that they've learned from their peers in that setting, or do you think they came to that setting with that kind of, the more traditional orientation? Do, do you feel like the, the peer..there's a lot of peer influence on what they do?

Elizabeth: Yeah, yeah, quite a bit, especially for those who want to do..a..do it, quote, (motions quotation marks with hands) "right." Maybe there's several different things playing in. A..according to what I have read and..a..been taught in..a..been, you

know, in workshops, a lot of teachers are what I would call left brain..they like to do things in a linear manner. It's one thing at a time. Explain it thoroughly. And the..a..lecture method, and then go onto the next; whereas..a..a more, quote, "right-brained" person might have give a more of a holistic picture of how all these little things fit together. So I think maybe part of it is the teacher's own personal style and..a..therefore, teaching style. Another thing that enters in might be their own experience as we usually tend to teach as we've been taught.

Tom: It's a good point.

Elizabeth: And as that's what they remember and see, that's the way they do it.

Elizabeth links adherence to the traditional teaching approach to the power and pressure of the annual testing program:

Elizabeth: It's much more risky, more scary to sorta throw the books away and, and jump in on your own. It's a lot more work, but it's also more scary because you don't know what's going to happen. A..you don't know what the results will be. You don't know if the children will learn what they're supposed to learn in

order to..a..get a certain grade on the CAT.

Tom: Uh-huh.

Elizabeth: And they are pressured in one way or another to have their children achieve because every year at the end of the year when..a..toward the end when they look a the CAT scores..a..if they've gone down or something, they almost take it as a personal..a..loss or a personal..a..point that they weren't, didn't teach as good that year. And for some reason their kids didn't achieve what they should have, didn't, quote, "learn" what they were suppose to. So..a..there's a lot of, there is a lot of pressure on them and unspoken pressure or pressure that their kids have to achieve if they're going to be rehired for the next year. And whereas I've never seen that written anywhere, it's sorta in the air (laughs), in the climate. And with all the pressure now on CAT scores in the media, they're..a..I can see where the pressure would come and people tend to think then the best way to, for children to learn is to tell them. "I'll tell 'em."

In talking further about the reasons that teachers feel constrained to follow traditional instructional methods, Elizabeth points out that there is concern that individual

accountability is jeopardized if teacher go to small group activities:

> Elizabeth: ..and that's where I think the scary part comes in because my, well, first of all my feeling is that, that then the teachers might not, or they might feel they don't know what each child has done, and so..and they have to have a grade for each one of those children and something they can back up.

Elizabeth points out that if change is to occur, staff development must be over time with opportunities to practice what has been learned:

> Elizabeth: ..probably in a course or two, it's probably not enough to..a..change their style, and then when they go out and start teaching they typically get into a traditional styles classroom, and they go back to original, you know, structured learning style again...they don't have enough practice in the doing it. It's like introducing a whole new thing without enough practice to feel comfortable with it and to be able to carry through on it and also encouragement throughout the year from somebody in authority how to do it.

When asked about the community's reaction to implementation of cooperative learning, Elizabeth indicated that the key might be in the type of advance preparation:

> Elizabeth: I would even recommend that, that before a teacher started something like that to inform the parents of her classroom of..a..what she was going to do, either written or meetings..a..something and so if they did come in they'd, they'd know what was going on...I don't see many parents coming in at, at all. My feeling would be that if, if their child..a..a parent, you know, parent's children started coming home with stories about school being fun, they might be a bit surprised at first. A..some might look into it. But probably the final thing would be if the child's grades went up or down or stayed the same, that might get a reaction from them. A..some of the parents who visit might come in and say, you know, "What's happening here?" (Children?) come home with all these kinds of stories about what they're doing. Or they've got to bring such and so to school and, therefore not having homework anymore. They're having something different. That might get a rise from, from some parents.

In talking about reactions of parents, the subject of grouping arose:

Elizabeth: (In planning for the Middle School) all the parents wanted their children in 7th and 8th to be in the highest group. And..a..because they were grouped, had been grouped by ability, and when it was tried to mix 'em up a little bit, there was a lot of resistance to that.

I then indicated to Elizabeth that Jack Craig appeared to be for grouping, and she seemed perplexed by that possibility:

Tom: A..I, I felt that Jack has really been for grouping even though he's had some pressure not to have it. Has, has that not been your experience?
Elizabeth: Hm! Well, may..maybe I've come across more strongly as not liking grouping, and he was..but we have talked about it quite a bit..a..and in that time, the, those, those discussions, the statistics indicated, that we discussed, indicated that..a..in cross ability grouping it didn't pull down the higher students, but it did challenge the lower ones.
Tom: Uh-huh.
Elizabeth: So I had gotten the feeling that he liked cross class grouping. I may be getting him mixed up some with Mr. _____ from last year because we were

going to, we were going to try to <u>really</u> mix 'em up this last year but..

Tom: Yeah.

Elizabeth: ..then I asked Mr. Craig about it, and he said, "Well, that being it's the last year before the middle school.." (He) just decided not to. There was a little bit of it done and that got some reactions, so..

Tom: Little bit of?

Elizabeth: Mixing, mixing.

Tom: Mixing.

Elizabeth: Yeah.

Tom: But not a whole lot this year.

Elizabeth: No.

I then changed the topic and asked Elizabeth what she thought the teachers' reactions were to me as a school psychologist being involved in this study. Her response doused my hopes of having my example spur a great deal of interest and enthusiasm. Note my defensiveness:

Elizabeth: I heard a little bit, but I didn't hear very much. A..I guess..pretty much what I heard was that you were going to do some..a..studies in some of the classrooms. I, I had the impression it was positive, and, and they were sorta interested in what

was happening. A..it probably was more..well, this is my perception..more in the feeling that it was something you were trying to model for them to follow through on. It was your project..

Tom: Uh-huh.

Elizabeth: ..and something you were going to try to do. A..my perception was that they thought that was going to be interesting. But I didn't pick up anything that indicated they might try to keep going with this style.

Tom: Yeah. Of course, I made it voluntary.

Elizabeth: Uh-huh.

Tom: And as you might expect because of that the three teachers that did volun..volunteer to do it were ones who I think are more, were more receptive to doing it.

Elizabeth: Yeah. Yeah. Yeah.

Summary

In an effort to fully understand the process involved in a school psychologist introducing an innovation in one rural elementary school, I described the persons participating, the setting for the change efforts, the significant events in chronological order, and the issues that evolved regarding cooperative learning. The description of persons involved began with a presentation of

myself form an autobiographical perspective as well as from an analysis of my input in the interviews. The analysis had both sociolinguistic and psychodynamic characteristics. The descriptions of the other participants were also from a biographical, sociolinguistic, and psychodynamic viewpoint.

The setting was described historically, first on a county level with an account of the early settlers and their basic values. The history of education in the county was reviewed along with a description of the current curriculum and my appraisal of the predominant instructional approach. I then focused on Island Elementary School with its unique location and the gradual reduction in grades and enrollment due to recurrent flooding of the island. The culture of the school was hinted at from the historical account but emerged more clearly from the interview descriptions of how faculty and children go about their business.

Significant events during the course of the study included the presentation of cooperative learning exercises in three separate classrooms and subsequent interviews with the teachers, guidance counselor, and principal. Approximately six months into my data gathering, I began to view my findings more and more from a sociolinguistic perspective, and it seemed appropriate to summarize my reading and conceptual insights in this section. The uniqueness of the interview as methodology and gender

distinctions in conversational style became topics of particular interest.

A variety of issues emerged regarding cooperative learning. Some questions were addressed that had been developed early in the study such as degree of exposure to the concepts, whether there had been adequate opportunities to learn how to implement, the extent of social pressure to maintain the status quo, and teacher's attitudes toward a more student-centered classroom. Other issues came out of the interviews. Considerable interest was expressed, for instance, in the relationship between cooperative learning and its effect on annual test scores. The impact of ability grouping on the efficacy of cooperative learning was also discussed. In the following chapter the above results will be examined in greater depth.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

Introduction

This chapter will be devoted to summarizing the results in depth, examining the reasons for negative results, exploring the theoretical and practical implications of the results, and making suggestions for future research. The summary will view the change processes from three perspectives, that of the participants, that of the setting, and that of the innovation itself. Although treated separately for sake of exposition, it should be emphasized that the perspectives are simply different views of the same process.

In the absence of clear-cut hypotheses for this study, it may be inaccurate to speak of "negative" results. More appropriately this section might be conceived as an opportunity to speculate about the discrepancy between early aspirations and current reality. The point will be made that <u>successful</u> results, as beauty, are mostly in the eyes of the beholder.

The theoretical implications will consist primarily of viewing the discrepancy from the standpoint of various theoretical constructs presented in earlier chapters.

Results will be discussed in terms of loose-tight leadership, stage theory, and the ideal speech situation.

I have elected to define the practical implications of the study as essentially the different options open to me in the area of cooperative learning within my school system. School psychologists in similar situations may find these options relevant to their functioning. Probably the most generalizable findings will evolve from the emphasis I have placed on the school psychologist attempting to change roles and how the meaning of that change is reflected in conversational interactions with his or her colleagues.

Suggestions for future research will revolve around ways to study the roles of the school psychologist. These will be approached from a macro to micro perspective, first looking broadly at how school psychologists divide their time and how their positions are funded. The understanding of their various roles will be extended by examining the conversational characteristics associated with each role.

Summary of Results

Participants

As a participant in this study I deliberately set about to depart from my usual activities as a school psychologist to promote an instructional approach that I felt had value. Committed to participatory teacher education, I endeavored to develop instructional activities that were planned

collaboratively and in which I tried to present the message, "I am one of you." Other than verbal sanctioning of the study by key persons within the hierarchy, I did not seek substantive, system-wide support for the study (e.g., being freed up from testing responsibilities, vying for a portion of staff development days). It was not expedient to do so, and a part of me did not want to subject "my study" to the bureaucratic approval (or rejection) process. I carried a fantasy of grassroots enthusiasm for the innovation and spreading adoption by the teachers.

During the course of the study there were components of both self-liberation and self-discovery. Relating to the children and faculty in ways different from my prescribed functions was interesting and exciting and carried a sense of doing something meaningful. At the same time there was discomfort. At an age when it might be expected that childhood conflicts would have been resolved, the juxtaposition of autobiography and analysis of my interview behavior confronted me with contradictions in the ways that I interact with others--on the one hand reacting against some of the prototypical characteristics of my gender; on the other hand showing "take charge" behaviors that might have made Ernie Jones proud. I concluded that my effectiveness as a facilitator of change or advocate for

conservation will depend upon the degree that I am able to reconcile these opposing personas. During the course of the study I became more aware of my need for "inside-out" psychology as discussed by Hunt (1987) in which I accept and trust my own experiences.

The other adults in this study shared some common characteristics. They all volunteered to participate; they expressed an interest in cooperative learning, and they agreed on some of the obstacles to implementation. Each related to me cordially, and I feel friendly toward each one. And yet by studying the nature of our conversational interactions, I was able to identify potential stumbling blocks to our working together. Elaine's deference toward me might stand in the way of her stating how she was really feeling in the relationship. I, in turn, might too easily accept that deference and play the expert in our planning. The easy relationship with Jim gives promise of productive collaboration but could also become problematical if our agreement on key issues causes divisiveness between him and his principal. Sally's emphasis on presenting her competencies as a teacher (and they are many) raises the question of whether I have adequately communicated my unconditional acceptance of her whether she is on top of a situation or expressing self-doubts. Jack's monopolizing of conversation is frustrating but not an insurmountable

problem, especially if I were to become more skilled at interrupting and disagreeing! He responds well to the language of banter. With Elizabeth I need to be able to draw upon her insights on child development and child-centered pedagogy while at the same time be mindful of the loyalty she feels toward her principal.

The other participants in this study were approximately 75 children--that is, three separate classes within Island Elementary School. Their reactions to the cooperative learning presentations were not elicited in a systematic way. Sally suggested that the didactic portion of my presentation was frustrating to her children as they either did not know the answers to my questions or were afraid to answer when they did. Elaine and Jim reported success in children remembering the content of the sessions, which could be attributed more to the use of a mnemonic than the small groups per se. My informal contacts with a number of the children after the sessions have been positive with personalized greetings and asking when I was going to return to their classrooms.

Setting

Despite its location in an idyllic setting, the history of Island Elementary School has been like a fading star with declining enrollment, fewer grades, and aging buildings. There is a sense that its time is limited. The principal is

liked by his faculty and students although his manner is occasionally gruff. Until recently corporal punishment was used regularly, even though dispensed in a benevolent "this hurts me more than it does you" manner. There is collegiality within the school, and Jack informally draws upon the opinions of his faculty before making decisions. There is, however, a lack of effective organizational structures for participatory decision-making. The periodic faculty meeting, for instance, usually consists of information dispensing rather than problem-solving. Jack has many good ideas about running his school but often feels that his hands are tied by lack of system-wide planning and support. Instruction is mostly traditional and teacher-centered. Tracking has been one of the regularities of the school. Occasionally, Jack reacts to an obvious inappropriateness of the formal curriculum or existing teaching strategies by developing a customized school day for a student, generally of a vocational nature. If asked about formal approval for such a practice, Jack would likely cite his lack of success in gaining approval in the past and make his oft heard statement, "It's better to beg forgiveness than ask for permission." The negative side of this flexible arrangement is that it takes the burden off the teachers to make their curriculum and instruction appropriate; it relegates the student prematurely to the

"working class," and preempts him (always male) from learning academic material.

Innovation of Cooperative Learning

Interview material revealed that teachers had had varying formal exposure to the concepts of cooperative learning. Sally tended to adopt the view that any activities in which children worked together was "cooperative learning." Some of her activities were on the mark in terms of grouping across personality and/or academic levels; some activities lacked the ingredients articulated by Johnson and Johnson (1985) and Slavin (1990a) such as individual and group accountability. Elaine frankly talked about her ignorance of cooperative learning principles, and yet utilization of hands-on activities in her instruction showed receptivity to learning more. Jim was knowledgeable about cooperative learning concepts, especially in terms of different role assignments within the small groups.

None of the teachers had been given intensive staff development in the area of cooperative learning nor adequate opportunities to learn how to implement the principles. Other staff development needs competed for their attention and time. Decisions regarding staff development tend to be centralized and top-down.

The interviewees did not appear to believe that parental resistance was a major factor in instruction

staying traditional. In fact, parents were described as probably being pleased if their children would come home with more positive comments about their school day. Consensus seemed to be that if properly prepared, parents would readily accept the "fun and games" looks of cooperative learning.

Teachers' attitudes toward cooperative learning may be a more constraining force. All three teachers made reference to the issue of maintaining discipline and control of their children, especially in the eyes of their peers. Cooperative learning by its very nature risks more noise, if not through voices than by moving chairs. Elaine spoke of certain children taking advantage of the situation to act up. Sally seemed to feel that her control was diminished by not having eye contact with all the children.

All the interviews referred to pressure to raise CAT scores, and it was implied that cooperative learning activities were more of a diversion than a vehicle for meeting that goal. Elaine suggested, for instance, that she prefers to postpone "the more fun stuff" until after the testing.

Although upon first consideration ability grouping might not be viewed as an impediment to the success of cooperative learning, it presents that possibility. Jim articulated that position well. In the small groups, for instance, it is often important that at least one student

have grade level reading ability. Oakes (1985) has suggested that children on the low track are more prone to low self-esteem and compensatory acting out behavior, a situation making the teacher reluctant to try a more student-centered instructional strategy.

Other negative attitudes toward implementing cooperative learning relate to increased planning time and lack of resources. These concerns would arise, of course, with any proposed innovation. They are concerns that speak to the need to have wide-based, concrete support for the change efforts.

"Negative" Results

If the success of this study were based on the extent to which cooperative learning has been implemented at Island Elementary School, it would have to be considered a failure. However, it would be a mistake to fault the innovation of cooperative learning itself or to place the blame upon the setting or faculty. More likely, the answers lie in my failure to give adequate attention to time-honored principles regarding the change process. For instance, the emphasis that Huberman (1973) and Dalin (1978) place upon the slowness of educational change, especially when values and attitudes are involved, would suggest that a one year time frame was too short. In addition, when the change endeavor is viewed from the perspective of who will benefit,

who will decide, and who will have to change (Dalin, 1978), the scales were tipped heavily in my favor for all three questions. I benefited from having a dissertation project and an opportunity to step temporarily outside my traditional role and relate differently than usual to students and faculty. I decided what the innovation would be and the parameters of its introduction, but teachers were asked to do the most changing. I was naive about two ingredients of change--ingredients which on the surface seem oppositional but are actually essential components of the same phenomenon. The one component is the need to have an organizational directive with legitimate authority which pushes administrators and teachers to perform in a certain way. This was the crux of several of my comprehensive exam questions which spoke to the need to have approval and support at high levels. In this study, I had the approval but not substantive support. The naivete was my fantasy that grassroots enthusiasm alone would gradually secure wide-based organizational support. The other necessary component is the need for participants of the change endeavor to feel ownership of what is happening, to feel that the change activities are addressing their interests and values. My naivete in this regard was not lack of recognition of this need but a too ready assumption that I could move into the role of the teacher and become part and

parcel of the grassroots support. During the course of the study it became apparent that by conducting one class, I was not breaking down the traditional consultant-consultee relationship between the school psychologist and the teacher. My teaching activity could have been viewed in one or more negative ways such as one-upmanship, insensitivity to the ongoing daily demands placed upon teachers, or simply ineptness as implied by Sally. Years of relating in the mode of giving advice, having answers, and making crucial decisions may not have facilitated my entering into egalitarian, collaborative relationships with teachers.

An additional criticism of this study could be that there was insufficient recognition of the quality practices in which the faculty were already engaged--that many things being done should stay the same or be conserved. Brubaker (1984) has described the frustration that teachers feel when constantly being told they must change by outside consultants:

> Teachers in the (workshop) audience take on guilt in part because the school system has created an aura of authority for the outside expert who in turn assumes that those being spoken to are not personally doing the right thing in order to be professionally acceptable (p. 19).

It would appear then that the reasons cooperative learning was not fully implemented at Island Elementary School were not due to resistance or resisters but rather to a variety of barriers to change as discussed by Dalin (1978). I would like to close this section by suggesting that if this study were viewed as more formative than summative, it could also be considered more successful. The insights derived could be applied to further change and conservation efforts.

Theoretical Implications

The previous discussion of reasons for the discrepancy between early aspirations and current reality suggests the following theoretical implications for this study: (a) that simultaneous loose-tight leadership as postulated by Peters and Waterman (1982) may be the most useful construct to bridge the needs for both formal organizational support and grassroots ownership of a change endeavor; (b) that stage theory of change (Rogers & Shoemaker, 1971) leads to appropriate focusing during the change process and militates against premature rejection of a change effort when initial outcomes are "negative;" and, (c) that the concept of the ideal speech situation (Habermas, 1971, 1975) may be enriched by the insights of sociolinguistic theories.

Loose-Tight Leadership

As applied to this study, loose-tight leadership would first involve the Department of Public Instruction, regional office, and top level administrators of the school system endorsing the principles of cooperative learning, backing their endorsement with concrete support and establishing expectations as to when certain outcomes would be forthcoming. Part of the expectations would be that leaders, not simply managers, would move the school system in the desired direction through the eight leadership attributes articulated by Bryson (1989)--that is, vision, knowledge, courage, wisdom, ability to deploy human and material resources, energy, charisma, and absolute integrity. The above is essentially the "tight" component of the construct. The "loose" component refers to the grassroots element, that for change to be successful the participants at all levels have to feel that their interests, values, and individuality are represented in the change process. This calls for a balancing between demanding what is absolutely essential for the change to occur and allowing flexibility for the participants to put their unique stamp on the project. The concept of equifinality as discussed by Zemke (1987) is relevant here--that is, there are a number of good ways to design a process or set of tasks to make a desired set of outputs happen.

This balancing, give and take process is essentially what Dalin (1978) has referred to as mutual adaptation and development.

Stage Theory

Although viewing change as a series of stages risks linear thinking, it allows an organization and focusing of efforts and as indicated above tends to prevent premature rejection of a change endeavor. The study under consideration involved the first two stages developed by Rogers and Shoemaker (1971)--a knowledge or awareness stage in which faculty and students learned something about cooperative learning and a persuasion stage in which the participants formed favorable or unfavorable attitudes. Prochaska, DiClemente, and Norcross (1992) characterize these two stages as "precontemplation" and "contemplation." Precontemplation for a satisfied, traditional teacher whose instruction was primarily whole class would be no intention to change instructional behavior in the foreseeable future. Any movement in that direction would be the result of outside pressure. A traditional teacher in the contemplation stage is aware that his or her instruction would improve if small groups were utilized but has not yet made a commitment to take action. Staff development during these early stages would more appropriately focus upon consciousness raising and self-evaluation than upon pushing

persons to go through the motions of cooperative learning. Jack made considerable sense when he spoke of "easing" persons into cooperative learning.

Ideal Speech Situation

As I engaged in conversations with Elaine, Sally, Jim, Jack, and Elizabeth, I believe that we approximated Habermas' (1971, 1975) conceptualization of the ideal speech situation. What we said was generally intelligible or comprehensible. The content seemed to be true as far as we knew it, and what was said was appropriate in light of prevailing norms and values even though discussants took different positions on issues. I would contend, however, that we still did not reach an "ideal" state in our speech interactions as there were metamessages that framed our conversations in ways that we may not have intended. Interview techniques themselves as pointed out by Briggs (1986) are tied to relationships of power and control rather than egalitarianism. Tannen (1990) described other sociolinguistic characteristics, especially gender differences, that may have impeded communication. The ideal speech situation is indeed "ideal" and, thereby, elusive in its realization. This is in keeping with Sherrard's (1991) definition of language as "an arena where identity is continuously renegotiated, as the goals and contexts of interaction shift" (p. 171).

Practical Implications

This study was essentially a unilateral move by a school psychologist to assume a different role within his school system by introducing a particular instructional approach. I became an internal consultant using interpersonal and problem solving skills in an effort to have teachers utilize cooperative learning strategies within the classroom. My efforts banked on my personal characteristics and informal sphere of influence. These factors were not sufficient to effect change at higher stages of the change process. In any further efforts to implement cooperative learning at Island Elementary School, I would join forces with Jack and assist him in developing strategies for obtaining system-wide support. If that support were forthcoming and I were asked to assume a role in its implementation, I would need to know how I would be relieved from a portion of my testing responsibilities, how much time I could devote to the consultation, and what type of budget would be available for staff development and other resources.

Given the above support I would engage in conversations with the faculty involved, try to listen to their needs and concerns and be explicit about the new role that I am assuming which contains aspects of the initiator, expert, and facilitator (Gebelein, 1989). As initiator I primarily

would be speaking the language of telling and directing. As expert I would cautiously dispense specialized knowledge without pontificating. As facilitator I would be assisting faculty to solve their own problems by listening carefully and nudging them toward self-determination. I would address criticisms of cooperative learning that unfolded in this study such as demonstrating how other systems have bolstered their annual test scores by its usage and showing how students actually develop more self control when they are given more responsibility.

In order to provide "loose" as well as "tight" leadership, teachers would be encouraged to be self-directing in their application of cooperative learning. As described by Shaeffer (1990) they should be prepared to play an active role in the training process, to develop their training needs from their own reflection and introspection, and to view training as participatory in nature with actual, concrete experiences of working with children in classrooms. From my experience I would have teachers model for each other rather than attempt to assume that role.

Suggestions for Future Research

If school psychologists are dissatisfied with their current roles, it appears that there would be benefit to their engaging in a self-study involving the evaluation of

psychological services within their school system. Such evaluation might include the following questions: (a) What are the opinions of stakeholders and other audiences regarding existing services; (b) what are the varying types of activities in which school psychologists could engage; (c) what are the constraints surrounding changing the status quo; and, (d) what are the opportunities for changing the status quo. Activities that might emerge from this study could be assisting children to be better behaved in school, assisting teachers to function as team members, teaching students to develop effective classrooms, teaching students directly social skills, and fostering school-community relations. Some activities will already be in place such as assessing students for the Exceptional Children's Program. Part of the school psychologist's self appraisal could include an analysis of sociolinguistic principles. Such an analysis would underscore those activities for which the school psychologist is best suited.

Ultimately, the way that the school psychologist's position is funded drives the type of activities that are done. Currently, the vast majority of school psychologist positions are funded by special education funds. Alternative funding means could be investigated which might provide more flexibility to the school psychologist's activities. Specifically, I would like to see more ways

that school psychologists could justifiably be involved in consultation activities with regular education teachers on regular education issues as were explored in this study.

Finally, this study of a school psychologist introducing an innovation within one rural elementary school presented a type of research which was highly personal and sensitive to the values, interests, and the intricate interactions among the participants. The person advocating the change reflected considerably upon his motivations and personal qualities that might facilitate or impede the change process. He was aware that he was engaging in a moral enterprise, a necessary requirement for any such research.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Akinnaso, F. N., & Ajirotutu, C. S. (1982). Performance and ethnic style in job interviews. In J. J. Gumperz (Ed.), Language and social identity (pp. 119-144). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Beeley, C. E. (1989). A study of the relationship between K-12 teachers' ability to model collegiality and their use of cooperative learning in their classrooms (Doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo). Dissertation Abstracts International, 50, 1638-A. (University of Microfilms No. DA8919348).

Bell, E. T. (1937). Men of mathematics. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Bertaux, D. (Ed.) (1981). Biography and society: The life history approach in the social sciences. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. S. (1964). The managerial grid. Houston: Gulf Publishing.

Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (1982). Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (1976). Schooling in capitalist America. New York: Basic Books.

Briggs, C. L. (1986). Learning how to ask: A sociolinguistic appraisal of the role of the interview in social science research. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Brubaker, D. (1982). Curriculum planning: The dynamics of theory and practice. Glenview, IL: Scott-Foresman.

Brubaker, D. (1984). Teacher frustration--who's to blame? North Carolina Education, 15(1), 19,38.

Brubaker, D. (1991). Research methodologies and curriculum definitions. The AASA Professor, 14(1), 1-4.

Bryson, J. E. (1989, September). Leadership and living the quality message. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Congress on Educational Leadership, Rand Afrikaans University, Johannesburg, So. Africa.

Burrell, G., & Morgan, G. (1979). Sociological paradigms and organizational analysis. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Corbett, H.D., Firestone, W. A., & Rossman, G. B. (1987). Resistance to planned change and the sacred in school cultures. Educational Administration Quarterly, 23(4), 36-59.

Dalin, P. (1978). Limits to educational change. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Dalin, P. (1990). Educational renewal and staff development. In V. D. Rust & P. Dalin (Eds.) Teachers and teaching in the developing world (pp. 235-256). New York: Garland Publishing.

Davidson, N. (1985). Small-group learning and teaching mathematics: A selective review of the research. In R. E. Slavin, S. Sharan, S. Kagan, R. Hertz-Lazarowitz, C. Webb, & R. Schmuck (Eds.), Learning to cooperate, cooperating to learn (pp. 211-230). New York: Plenum.

Denzin, K. (1978). The research act (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Deutsch, M. (1962). Cooperation and trust: Some theoretical notes. In M. R. Jones (Ed.), Nebraska symposium on motivation (pp. 275-319). Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Eicholz, G., Rogers, E. (1964). Resistance to the adoption of audio-visual aids by elementary school teachers. In M. Miles (Ed.), Innovation in education (pp. 299-316). New York: Teachers College Press.

Finley, M. K. (1984). Teachers and tracking in a comprehensive high school. Sociology of Education, 57, (October): 233-243.

Foster, W. (1986). Paradigms and promises: New approaches to educational administration. Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Books.

Freire, P. (1992). Pedagogy of the oppressed (M. B. Ramos, Trans.). New York: Continuum.

Fullan, M. (1985). Change processes and strategies at the local level. The Elementary School Journal, 85(3), 391-421.

Gebelein, S. H. (1989). Profile of an internal consultant: Roles and skills for building client confidence. Training & Development Journal, 43(3). 52-58.

Geertz, C. (1973). The interpretation of cultures. New York: Basic Books.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory; Strategies for qualitative research. Chicago: Aldine Publishing.

Good, T. L., & Brophy, J. E. (1984). Looking in classrooms (3rd ed.). Cambridge, MA: Harper & Row.

Goodlad, J. I. (1984). A place called school: Prospects for the future. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Gordon, T. (1970). P.E.T.: Parent effectiveness training. New York: Peter H. Wyden.

Gordon, T. (1974). T.E.T.: Teacher effectiveness training. New York: Peter H. Wyden.

Gross, N., Giaquinta, J. B., & Bernstein, M. (1971). Implementing organizational change. New York: Basic Books.

Gumperz, J. J., & Hymes, D. (Eds.). (1972). Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Gumperz, J. J. (Ed.). (1982). Language and social identity. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Habermas, J. (1971). Knowledge and human interests, (J. J. Shapiro, Trans.). Boston: Beacon Press.

Habermas, J. (1975). Legitimation crisis. (T. McCarthy, Trans.). Boston: Beacon Press.

Hartmann, H. (1939). Ego psychology and the problem of adaptation. New York: International Universities Press, 1958.

Harvey, O. (1967). Conceptual systems and attitude change. In C. Sherif & M. Sherif (Eds.), Attitude, ego-involvement and change (pp. 201-226). New York: J. Wiley.

Hertz-Lazarowitz, R., & Shachar, H. (1990). Teachers' verbal behavior in cooperative and whole-class instruction. In S. Sharan (Ed.), Cooperative learning: Theory and research (pp. 77-94). New York: Praeger.

House, E. (1979). Technology versus craft: A ten-year perspective on innovation. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 11, 1-15.

Huberman, A. M. (1973). Understanding change in education: An introduction. Paris: UNESCO.

Hunt, D. E. (1987). Beginning with ourselves: In practice, theory, and human affairs. Cambridge, MA: Brookline Books.

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R.T., Nelson, D., & Skon, L. (1981). Effects of cooperative, competitive, and individualistic goal structures on achievement: A meta-analysis. Psychological Bulletin, 89, 47-62.

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., Maruyama, G. (1983). Interdependence and interpersonal attraction among heterogeneous and homogeneous individuals: A theoretical formulation and a meta-analysis of the research. Review of Educational Research, 53, 5-54.

Johnson, R. T., & Johnson, D. W. (1985). Student-student interaction: Ignored but powerful. Journal of Teacher Education, 36(4), 22-26.

Lee, D. (1959). Freedom and culture. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Lutfiyya, M. N. (1987). The social construction of context through play. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Margolis, H. (1990). Helping to implement co-operative learning. School Psychology International. 11(4), 309-318.

Mead, G. H. (1934). Mind, self & society. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Miller, L., & Lieberman, A. (1988). School improvement in the United States: Nuance and Numbers. International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 1(1), 3-19.

Milofsky, C. (1989). Testers and testing: The sociology of school psychology. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Mort, P. (1941). The American school in transition. New York: Teachers College Press.

Newmann, F. M., & Thompson, J. (1987). Effects of cooperative learning on achievement in secondary schools: A summary of research. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin, National Center of Effective Secondary Schools.

Oakes, J. (1985). Keeping track: How schools structure inequality. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Patton, M. Q. (1980). Qualitative evaluation methods. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Peters, T., & Waterman, R. (1982). In search of excellence. New York: Harper & Row.

Prochaska, J. O., DiClemente, C. C., & Norcross, J. C. (1992). In search of how people change: Applications to addictive behaviors. American Psychologist, 47(9), 1102-1114.

Purkey, S. C., & Smith, M. (1982). Too soon to cheer? Synthesis of research on effective schools. Educational Leadership, 40, 64-69.

Reilly, D. H. (1984). School psychology: The continuing search. Psychology in the Schools, 21, 66-70.

Rich, Y. (1990). Ideological impediments to instructional innovation: The case of cooperative learning. Teaching & Teacher Education, 6(1), 81-91.

Rogers, C. (1959). A theory of therapy, personality and interpersonal relationships. In S. Koch (Ed.), Psychology, A study of science (Vol. 3, pp. 184-256). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Rogers, E. M., & Shoemaker, F. F. (1971). Communication of innovations: A cross-cultural approach (2nd ed.). New York: The Free Press.

Rutter, M., Maughan, B., Mortimer, P., Ousten, J., & Smith, A. (1979). Fifteen thousand hours: Secondary schools and their effects on children. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Sapon-Shevin, M., & Schniedewind, N. (1990). Selling cooperative learning without selling it short. Educational Leadership, 47(4), 63-65.

Sarason, S. B. (1972). The creation of settings and the future societies. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sarason, S. B. (1982). The culture of the school and the problem of change (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Sarason, S. B. (1990). The predictable failure of educational reform: Can we change course before it's too late? San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Scanlan, P. A. (1988). Student talk in cooperative learning groups (Doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa) Dissertation Abstracts International, 50(4), 868-A. (University Microfilms International No. 8913229).

Schniedewind, N., & Davidson, E. (1987). Cooperative learning, cooperative lives: A sourcebook of learning activities for building a peaceful world. Dubuque, IA: William C. Brown.

Scroggs, R. W. (1989). Shared decision-making equals empowerment: Portraits of teacher-leaders in a high school setting (Doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina at Greensboro). Dissertation Abstracts International, 50, 90A, 2742-2743.

Shaeffer, S. (1990). Participatory approaches to in-service teacher training. In V. D. Rust & P. Dalin (Eds.), Teachers and teaching in the developing world (pp. 95-114). New York: Garland Publishing.

Shapiro, H. S. (1984). Ideology, hegemony, and the individualizing of instruction: The incorporation of 'progressive' education. J. Curriculum Studies, 16(4), 367-378.

Sharan, S., & Hertz-Lazarowitz, R. (1982). Effects of an instructional change program on teachers' behavior, attitudes and perceptions. J. of Applied Behavioral Science, 18(2), 185-201.

Sharan, S. (Ed.). (1990). Cooperative learning: Theory and research. New York: Praeger.

Sharan, Y., & Sharan, S. (1990). Group investigation expands cooperative learning. Educational Leadership, 47(4), 167-21.

Sherrard, C. (1991). Developing discourse analysis. Journal of General Psychology, 118(2). 171-179.

Slavin, R. E. (1989). Cooperative learning and student achievement. In R. E. Slavin (Ed.) School and classroom organization (pp. 129-156). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Slavin, R. E. (1990a). Research on cooperative learning: Consensus and controversy. Educational Leadership, 47(2), 52-54.

Slavin, R. E. (1990b). Cooperative learning, Theory, research, and practice. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Smith, K. A., Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1981). Can conflict be constructive? Controversy versus concurrence seeking in learning groups. Journal of Educational Psychology, 73, 651-663.

Smith, K. K. (1988). Epistemological problems in researching human relationships. In D. N. Berg & K. K. Smith (Eds.), The self in social inquiry: Researching methods (pp. 123-141). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Stevens, R. J., Madden, N. A., Slavin, R. E., & Farnish, A. M. (1987). Cooperative integrated reading and composition: Two field experiments. Reading Research Quarterly, 22, 433-454.

Tannen, D. (1984). Conversational style: Analyzing talk among friends. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Tannen, D. (1986). That's not what I meant! How conversational style makes or breaks your relations with others. New York: William Morrow.

Tannen, D. (1989). Talking voices: Repetition, dialogue, and imagery in conversational discourse. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Tannen, D. (1990). You just don't understand: Women and men in conversation. New York: Ballantine Books.

Touraine, A. (1988). Return of the actor: Social theory in post industrial society, (M. Godzich, Trans.). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press. (Original work published 1984).

Truax, C. B., & Carkhuff, R. R. (1967). Toward effective counseling and psychotherapy: Training and practice. Chicago: Aldine.

Watzlawick, P., Weakland, J., & Fisch, R. (1974). Change: Principles of problem formation and problem resolution. New York: W. W. Norton.

Watzlawick, P., & Weakland, J. H. (Eds.). (1977). The interactional view. New York: W. W. Norton.

Weick, K. (1984). Small wins: Redefining the scale of social problems. American Psychologist, 39(1), 40-49.

White, R. W. (1960). Competence and the psychosexual stages of development. In M. R. Jones (Ed.), Nebraska Symposium on Motivation (pp. 97-141). Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Whitehead, A. N., & Russell, B. (1910-13). Principia mathematica (Vol. 1, p. 37). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Young, R. E. (1990). A critical theory of education: Habermas and our children's future. New York: Teacher's College Press.

Zemke, R. (1987). Sociotechnical systems: Bringing people and technology together. Training, 24(2), 47-57.