COLLABORATIVE PEDAGOGY:
SOCIAL HERMENEUTICS IN THE CLASSROOM

JANICE LYNN OBERG ADAMS

COLLABORATIVE PEDAGOGY: SOCIAL HERMENEUTICS IN THE CLASSROOM

by

Janice Lynn Oberg Adams, B.Sc.

A thesis submitted to the School of Graduate Studies
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
Master of Education

Department of Curriculum and Instruction
Faculty of Education
Memorial University of Newfoundland

December 1993
St. John's, Newfoundland

ISBN 0-612-01834-2

Canada

Abstract

The term collaboration is in frequent use both in the business and education sectors. The idea often implied by this term is that two or more people are working together on a single product. In this thesis I explore a more comprehensive view of collaboration, one that flows from a learning praxis known as collaborative pedagogy.

This thesis is the documentation of collaborative pedagogy in a local site. In my discussion, I argue that collaborative pedagogy is based on a philosophy which views language as a socially contextual phenomenon and knowledge generation as social hermeneutics.

I provide a historical and cultural context for collaborative pedagogy by comparing a philosophy which opposes collaborative assumption to a philosophy which grounds collaborative pedagogy. I then discuss the learning environments which emanate from these differing philosophies.

Next, I describe a university course which incorporated collaborative pedagogy. I follow this description with a discussion of issues pertinent to classroom practice.

Finally, I discuss the challenges and rewards involved in the shift to collaborative pedagogy for educational practice.

Acknowledgements

I extend my appreciation to those who collaborated with me on this journey. I am indebted to Dr. Frank Wolfe for giving me courage to leave the dock, to Dr. Phyllis Artiss for providing the sailing vessel, and to Dr. Clar Doyle for his navigational expertise. A loving thank you to Ki, my first-mate, and to my patient crew, Allison and Taylor.

Table of Contents

Chapter One

A Historical Context for Collaborative Pedagogy

The purpose of this chapter is to give a historical context for collaborative pedagogy en route to exploring its use in a specific classroom setting. Many voices, each with a distinct sonority, have participated in and are participating in the development of collaborative pedagogy. As I listen to each voice, I do not hear just variations on current themes in philosophy, epistemology, or methodology. What I do hear are new themes informed by theories which stand in direct contrast to those by which society has structured its educational institutions. I hear "critiques that challenge reason, consciousness, knowledge, meaning, communication, freedom, and other values asserted by the Enlightenment and developed in modern sciences, humanities, and public life" (Phelps, 1988, p. 5). In this chapter I will challenge educational practices rooted in rationalistic thought by amplifying the voices of people in the latter part of this century who directly and indirectly have opened the way for a radical change in the way we view and educate ourselves.

First, I will contrast a rationalistic view of language with a social hermeneutical view. Second, I will compare the epistemologies informed by these two views. Finally, I will contrast educational environments which I see emanating from these two views, which are the traditional learning environment and those incorporating a collaborative pedagogy.

CHALLENGING RATIONALISTIC VIEWS OF LANGUAGE

Many people who have espoused collaborative pedagogy have done so without any reference to the term collaborative. But, it is not without significance that the people who generated the public discourse specifically

concerned with collaborative practices in North America were educators interested in language, composition, and rhetoric. In 1984, Kenneth Bruffee stated that

> there are some signs these days that collaborative learning is of increasing interest to English teachers. . . . Composition teachers seem to be exploring the concept actively. . . . Teachers of literature have also begun to talk about collaborative learning, although not always by that name (p. 635).

Bruffee noted that this interest did not originate from research but from a "pressing educational need" which began surfacing in the 1970s. Increasingly, students with abilities that should have assured them of success in college were having difficulty coping with their academic studies. And far more than course content or methods of literary criticism began to be examined. What was questioned then, and continues to be questioned now, were the philosophy, theories, and assumptions about language that informed educational practice. In his article identifying three theories of language, Bob Morgan (1987) makes just this point:

> My interest is not only to show how different theories of language entail unique interpretive strategies, but also to illustrate that they promote or disable particular understandings of sociality for both teachers and students. To change one's theory of language, in this perspective, is to alter more than a curricular approach to speech or writing. It is to redefine a social space and our possible interactions within it (p. 449).

But concern for changing the entrenched theories of language is not restricted to educators in English composition like Bruffee and Morgan. And although linguists like Volosinov and Heath are major contributors to this dialogue for change, calls also come from the writings of Thomas Kuhn in science, Lev Vygotsky in developmental psychology, and contemporary philosophers like Paul Ricoeur for an examination of the relationship between language and experience. What is emerging is that an individual's view and society's view of language are intrinsically linked with learning, politics, authority, and daily human experience.

Questions are now being leveled at rationalism, the dominant school of thought which has shaped the way language has been viewed in this century. Rationalism grounded in the Cartesian-Newtonian thought of the 17th and 18th centuries is expressed in two language trends, empiricism and structuralism. In the following discussion, I will examine the main premises and the educational practices that have ensued from rationalism's views of language, and counter this heritage with ideas that result in a different way of seeing, of educating, and of being. I see the possibility for such a change manifested in a collaborative pedagogy whose praxis flows from the activity of life.

The empiricist view holds that there is "a one-to-one correspondence between the objects in the world, the words in a language, and the concepts in our heads" (Morgan, 1987, p. 450). According to Volosinov (1973), the ideas about language stemming from rationalism were first "sharply delineated . . . in Leibniz's conception of universal grammar" (p. 57). Rationalism sees language as "a stable, immutable system of normatively identical linguistic forms" contained in a "given, closed linguistic system" ready-made for the user.

The first aspect of language this philosophy ignores is the dynamism issuing from the interrelationship of the historical, the present, and the future contexts. Volosinov claims that this view precludes "the present state of a language and the history of a language . . . entering into mutual comprehensibility." Thus,

> individual acts of speaking are, from the viewpoint of language, merely fortuitous refractions and variations or plain and simple distortions of normatively identical forms. . . . There is no connection, no sharing of motives, between the system of language and its history. They are alien to one another (p. 57).

Volosinov's voice rings out against such historical obliteration when he says that under such a system linguistic facts cannot be understood or explained as they really exist and are generated. Rather, this theory leads us away from the "living, dynamic reality of language and its social functions" (p. 82). Ricoeur also says that

> it is impossible to divorce present language use from its history since new experiences find their expression by delving into the treasury of historically established meanings. Because meanings are never firmly established in their use, it is possible for new experiences to find a new outlet by means of accepted meaning. The accepted meanings function then as a guide for new meanings (cited in Van Den Hengel, 1982, pp. 90-91).

That language not only draws on the past and defines the present but continually forges ahead as it attempts to bring understanding is exemplified by metaphor. Van Den Hengel says that Ricoeur sees metaphorical utterance operating simultaneously in two referential fields since it links a known field of established meanings with an unexplored field of meaning.

> For that reason, in order to explore the new field of reference, the semantic aim reverts to the network of familiar predicates and places them in the new field to help explore it. . . . Meaning is not a stable staple, but a "dynamic, directional, vectoral" form, which links up with the semantic aim of the sentence to forge towards its fulfillment (p. 91).

Viewing language as a fixed system of signs fails to recognize that "any utterance is essentially a social phenomenon" (Volosinov, 1973, p. 82). "A word is territory shared by both addresser and addressee, by the speaker and his interlocutor." The structure of utterance is determined by the immediate social context and the broader social milieus of past and present. Thus, verbal communication cannot be understood or explained outside of a connection with a concrete situation. As Volosinov says, "language acquires life and historically evolves precisely here, in concrete verbal communication, and not in the abstract linguistic system of language forms, nor in the individual psyche of speakers" (p. 95).

With its belief that a one-to-one correspondence exists between words, nature, and thought, empiricism "holds that language is like a window neutrally conveying the presence of the world to us;" an "innocent medium through which prelinguistic meanings pass" (Morgan, 1987, p. 450). From adhering to such a view, two conditions result. First, the agency of the speaker is reduced to choosing the "proper" expression

from the established alternatives. Second, the politics which couch both speaker and selection are denied. Morgan says, "Correspondence theory is the dream of a language intrinsically good and pure, embodying Reason itself." Unfortunately, subscribing to such a view "permits that society the misrecognition of its forms of linguistic violence" for there is "always/already a politics embedded within language as well as a politics of language" (p. 451).

Although structuralism shares roots with empiricism, this more recent approach centralizes a set of codes, conventions, and regular patterns that articulate the world in certain ways. Where empiricism curtails the "agency of the speaker," structuralism actually denies the individual the role of "guarantor of meaning." Morgan states that

> structuralism informs us that structures and relations are the most powerful forces in modernity, not individuals, and finds in language the very embodiment of such a relational force field seeing it as that objectivized form par excellence of our collective social life (p. 451).

Language as structuralists see it "always precedes and exceeds any individual subject." Thus, meaning is not "owned" by the subject, as it is in correspondence theory, but "merely rented, a by-product of discourse per se." In a structuralist world, language is seen as a generative activity in its own right. It is a form of work, which produces "you and I, that is, society." Consequently, "structuralism denies the language-existence dichotomy, demonstrating that signs are 'reality-generating' and not simply reality-reflecting" (p. 453).

Ricoeur opposes any attempt to exclude people as makers of meaning. Human effort and desire to be are "imbued with a drive toward meaning and language" both of which are a drive towards self-understanding. "It is a drive by which meaning makes us while we make it" (Van Den Hengel, 1982, p. 126).

Volosinov (1973) sums up rationalism's view of language when he states:

> the idea of the *conventionality, the arbitrariness of language*, is a typical one for rationalism as a whole, and no less typical is the *comparison of language to the system of mathematical signs*. What interests the mathematically minded rationalists is not the relationship of the sign to the

> actual reality it reflects nor to the individual who is its originator, but the *relationship of sign to sign within a closed system* already accepted and authorized. In other words, they are interested only in the *inner logic of the system of signs itself,* taken, as in algebra, completely independently of the ideological meaning that give the signs their content (pp. 57-58).

And the above claim is central to my challenge. Regardless of the discipline, the language used, be it written, internal, or external, is composed of signs whose use and meanings represent the ideologies and interpretations of a collective past and present. Words brim with content and meaning drawn from both behavior and ideology. We can understand and respond only to words that "engage us behaviorally or ideologically" (p. 70). Divorce of language from its ideological roots is, as Volosinov asserts, one of rationalism's most serious errors, an error which I feel has shaped not only education, but society's view of the human experience itself. And righting this error is nothing short of a Kuhnian paradigm shift, a revolution, as it were, in the way we view knowledge, our institutions of learning, and our own selves.

In the next section, I want to amplify the voices of people who, because of their views of language, encourage just such a shift in epistemology. Threaded through this discussion is a concern for a relevant view of authority. The voices I have listened to do not discount the importance of authority but, rather, the abuse of it, which is authoritarianism.

CHALLENGING RATIONALISTIC VIEWS OF KNOWLEDGE AND WAYS OF KNOWING

Positivism stemming from the Cartesian-Newtonian view of reality, recognizes as knowledge only that which can be objectively verified. Phelps (1988) says that "positivism originated in the 'verification theory of meaning,' the doctrine that a proposition is meaningful only if subject to empirical verification" (p. 9). Because science uses empirical methods, it has considered its body of knowledge as an accurate revealer of reality. Presently, and in the past few decades, this position is being

questioned. But, as Phelps points out, it is not science itself that is being dismissed but the authoritarian assumptions science has held about its body of knowledge and methods of knowing.

> The attack on positivism is not directed at science . . . nor a scientific thinking as actually practiced. Rather, it targets the position I will call 'scientism' or positivism, which refers to the demand of science that the explanatory method used by natural science should be the model for intelligibility in all cases where humans attempt to develop valid knowledge (p. 7).

Phelps points out that this attitude is what Jurgen Habermas calls "science's belief in itself," which is "the conviction that we can no longer understand science as one form of possible knowledge, but rather must identify knowledge with science" (p. 7).

Scientific activity, having been informed by a correspondence theory of language and reality, resulted in theories thought to mirror reality

> vertically without changing it. . . . These beliefs led among other things to idealization of the "objective attitude of the neutral scientist, who comes to his observations without preconceptions, historicity, or values. . . . Positivists thought that scientists had available to them, or would construct, a neutral observation language that would carry with it none of the connotations, prejudices, emotion, and other contaminations of ordinary or literary language. Instead, it was to be exact, formal, literal, and univocal (Phelps, 1988, p. 10).

Thomas Kuhn (1970) in his landmark book, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, is critical of these assumptions about the "purity," of scientific language and practices. Kuhn claims that there are implicit bodies of "intertwined theoretical and methodological" beliefs that guide all research. These overarching models, or paradigms, permit the interpretive processes of selection, evaluation, and criticism.

Kuhn claims that both the making explicit of a current model and the "shifting" to a new paradigm require the extra-scientific activities of dialogue, persuasion, and interpretation. But science has "disguised" these interpretive aspects of its work by an authoritarian writing and use of its textbooks.

> Textbooks thus begin by truncating the scientist's sense of his discipline's history. . . . Characteristically, textbooks of science contain just a bit of

> history . . . in scattered references to the great heroes of an earlier age. From such references both students and professionals come to feel like participants in a long-standing historical tradition. . . . The textbook tendency to make the development of science linear hides a process that lies at the heart of the most significant episodes of scientific development (pp. 137-140).

Kuhn claims that generating knowledge in science is as much of a hermeneutical enterprise as it is in any field in the humanities. Like all bodies of knowledge, scientific knowledge is entrenched in history and culture, determined by belief and prejudice and weighted with values and politics. Donald McCloskey says that "the scientific paper is, after all, a literary genre, with an actual author, and implied author, an implied reader, a history, and a form" (cited in Faigley, 1986, p. 536).

As scientific empiricism has dominated epistemology, so structuralism has reigned in the disciplines concerned with language. "In his critique of structuralism Ricoeur warns against a structuralist ideology, which he calls the 'for-the-sake-of-the-code-fallacy'" (Van Den Hengel, 1982, p. 135). According to Ricoeur, the naming of something is more important to structuralists than its connection and meaning for life. This is a position known as nominalism. Under its influence, the art of rhetoric and persuasion declined to a "theory of style and finally to a theory of tropes." Rhetoric's "bond with philosophy was broken and it became the archivist of the figures of speech." Ricoeur says, according to Ven Den Hengel, that the struggle for meaning deteriorated into a senseless word-game precisely because of the 'tyranny of the word' (p. 28).

Volosinov's (1973) ideas harmonize with those of Ricoeur's when he explains that discriminating between a word's common and occasional meanings, or its denotative and connotative aspects, or central and lateral meanings is "fundamentally unsatisfactory." Underlying such discriminations is the desire to "ascribe greater value to the central, usual aspect of meaning, presupposing that that aspect really does exist and is stable." Such an assumption is "completely fallacious" (p. 102), declares Volosinov. Van Den Hengel (1982) says that "English language philosophy rejects such a nominalism. Ryle

emphasized that words have meaning only to the extent that they are used. A word has no proper meaning" (p. 28). As Wittgenstein (1958) states, "The meaning of a word is its use in the language" (p. 20e, par. 43). "Every sign," continues Wittgenstein, "*by itself* seems dead. *What* gives it life? In use it is alive" (p. 128e, par. 432). Language is not fixed and stable. It is dynamic and each utterance, "no matter how weighty and complete in and of itself," is "only a moment in the continuous process of verbal communication" (Volosinov, 1973, p. 95). But such a view has not been a part of structuralist thought. According to Volosinov, "European linguistic thought formed and matured over concern with the cadavers of written languages; almost all its basic categories, . . . approaches, and techniques were worked out in the process of reviving these cadavers" (p. 71). He continues by saying that it was

> "philological need" that gave birth to linguistics, rocked its cradle, and left its philological flute wrapped in its swaddling clothes. That flute was supposed to be able to awaken the dead. But it lacked the range necessary for mastering living speech as actually and continuously generated (p. 72).

Viewing the word, and thus knowledge, as "stable," has led to authoritarian practices in English and language arts classrooms. Gibson (1986) says that mainstream literary criticism, rather than confronting the social and historical realities which "determine literature's production and reception," has evaded these realities by focusing on the "words on a page," the details of a narrative, and the "structure of the human mind, myth, language."

> Because of these mis-directions of focus, conventional literary criticism is elitist, sexist, unpolitical and individualist. To divorce literary and aesthetic matters from their social context is to misperceive them . . . Shakespeare cannot be understood without reference to the economic and political system of his age and ours (pp. 98-99).

Holding that knowledge is "fixed" has also led to an authoritarian use of text. Ricoeur says that structural analysis "proves itself when it permits a better understanding of the message than a first surface reading. It becomes ideological when it refuses to go beyond the text. . . ." (cited in Van Den Hengel, 1982, p. 51). Reading in

a structuralist's classroom is analogous to deciphering a cryptic code, or finding a hidden message. This message, considered to be known in its purity and entirety only by the author, who in many cases is dead, is known in as pure a form as possible by those astute in literature. Here, interpretation is reduced to breaking the code or delving into someone else's world or psyche.

For Volosinov, language has everything to do with the living moment, not a probing of a distant psyche. For Ricoeur, genuine interpretation has far less to do with code, tropes, and formal study of figures of speech than with the "ontological trait of language." He stresses that the text is a "form of life" and as such must be "moored" to the life of the reader rather than the original author. "Understanding is the first step of bringing back to life a particular text" (Van Den Hengel, 1982, p. 196). Van Den Hengel, expressing Ricoeur's ideas, continues:

> the unmooring of the text from its original situation also allows the text to drift away from its original addressees. Gadamer proposes, therefore, that the text is addressed to anyone who can read. A text loses its restriction; it is basically open. . . . The text of the Letter to the Romans is mine to read just as at one time it was the Romans. The letter assumes a new time dimension. Paul's original writing takes on a universal dimension, always ready to take on new readers and to actualize its reference in new situations. . . . In reading I am being taken where I was not before. I take up a new dwelling in the world of the text. Both my situation and the mute text are transgressed and interlinked (pp. 201-202).

Volosinov (1973) calls this the "dialectical generative process" in which "a new significance emanates from an old one, and does so with its help, but this happens so that the new significance can enter into contradiction with the old one and restructure it" (p. 106). Ricoeur, in harmony with this idea, says that

> the accomplishment of reading is its power to transform the otherness of the text into an event of discourse for me. . . . The event of discourse of the reader is a new event; that is, not a repetition of the original event, but a creation produced at the behest of the text (cited in Van Den Hengel, 1982, p. 210).

If a Ricoeurian-type hermeneutics is incorporated into English and language classrooms, the question "What does this text mean?" can no longer be used as a

bludgeon for disseminating a type of knowledge that is restrictive and monophonic. Validation must be given to many different types of knowledge and the different ways people come to knowledge. In *Women's Ways of Knowing*, Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, and Tarule (1986), describe the silence women, in particular, have felt in a world dominated by abstract reason and formulaic thought. Through interviews with a number of women, these authors identify different kinds of knowledge and ways of generating the various kinds of knowledge. The following is a list which comes from six chapter titles: "Received Knowledge: Listening to the Voices of Others;" "Subjective Knowledge: The Inner Voice;" "Subjective Knowledge: The Quest for Self;" "Procedural Knowledge: The Voice of Reason;" "Procedural Knowledge: Separate and Connected Knowing;" and, "Constructed Knowledge: Integrating the Voices." Although this list is not exhaustive, it is characterized by openness and polyphony.

But I do not think it is sufficient to just "allow" or "tolerate" other kinds of knowing. Because the silence created by rationalism's impositions has been deep and strong, we must foster and promote, as Belenky, et al. say, "the roar which lies on the other side of silence." And this is exactly what I see collaborative pedagogy doing.

If we link Ricoeur's ideas about language in the humanities to Kuhnian thought in the sciences, we hear a distinct and significant call for change in how knowledge is generated. Common to both men is a recognition of the indispensable practice of interpretation grounded and developed in the collective and in culture; a type of interpretation which illuminates and/or exposes explicit and implicit assumptions; a type of interpretation which seeks multiple alternatives for consideration. It is an interpretation which, says Ricoeur, is a "dialectic of explanation and understanding," whose conception and continuation stems more from ontological desire than cognitive prowess. It is an interpretation based on the understanding that, as Foucault says, "language is no longer linked to the knowing of things, but to men's freedom" (cited in

Morgan, 1987, p. 453). The pedagogy which I see embodying such an interpretive praxis is collaborative pedagogy.

In the next section, I will contrast learning environments informed by rationalism with those espousing a collaborative pedagogy.

LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS

Descartes' "I think, therefore I am" reveals not only the centrality of rationalistic modes of thinking, previously discussed, but also the supremacy of individualism during the Enlightenment. Two groups of philosophers that profoundly shaped western education with their own versions of individualism were the eighteenth century liberals and the nineteenth century Social-Darwinists.

The liberals viewed man as an "isolated and ultimate consciousness." As such, as Richard Brosio (1972) explains, man was seen as "inherently self-sufficient and secure. Man . . . was seemingly divorced from the society of which he was a part" (p. 12). He continues, "bourgeois theory regarded the individual mind as a separate entity complete in each person isolated from nature and from other men" (p. 25). Such an "exaggerated emphasis on the individual" rather than society was to "plague western society." It is this thinking that underlies the didactic classroom of this century.

Viewing each student as a "separate entity" has resulted in the "medical model" which pervades education. Gibson (1986) says that such a model

> is based not on the social system in which the individual child is embedded, but on the belief that the individual child possesses intrinsic, objective, identifiable and measurable characteristics (or rather, doesn't possess those objective and other characteristic) that mark . . . "normal" children (p. 143).

As Brosio states, "Consciousness may be private, but when men act they do so in a public world." As Mannheim (1936) says, although there is no such thing as a "group mind which thinks over and above the heads of individuals . . . nevertheless, it would be

false to deduce . . . that the ideas . . . which motivate an individual have their origin in him alone, and can be adequately explained" in terms of his personal experience (p. 2).

When educators perceive students as isolated academic patients, at least two situations result. First, the picture formed of the student is extremely incomplete and distorted. Second, this allows educators to claim the child learner is "deficient" rather than the system, as Gibson (1986) points out.

According to James Block (1985), the Social-Darwinists "interpreted and institutionalized" the ideas of Charles Darwin in American public education. Central to Darwinian thought is the idea that human beings like other "biological species evolve according to the laws of natural selection." Block says that the Social-Darwinists elaborated on this assumption by urging "the creation of particular social environments to help the natural selection process" (p. 12). It was the public schools in particular that "were charged with the responsibility of creating educational environments wherein our most naturally talented students could be identified and sorted from their less talented peers " (p. 12).

To carry out this mandate, educators developed a grading process in which a student's natural learning talents were "repeatedly and systematically" pitted in increasingly stiffer competitions against the talents of other students. And as Block states, "central to this process was one operating assumption: the process must reify, not challenge, the basic notion that only a few students probably had the right academic stuff" (p. 12). In the following statement, Mortimer Adler (1982) stresses how counterproductive to democratic ideals such divisions are.

> Equality of educational opportunity is not . . . provided if it means no more than taking all the children into the public schools for the same number of hours, days, and years. If once there they are divided into the sheep and the goats, into those destined solely for toil and those destined for economic and political leadership and for a quality of life to which all should have access, then the democratic purpose has been undermined by an inadequate system of public schooling (p. 5).

And in the sorting process, especially for those children under consideration for special needs treatment, Julienne Ford says, "there is something approaching a mania for testing, classifying, measuring and assessing" (cited in Gibson, 1986, p. 145). Ford calls this "instrumental rationality" in full force. "The testing industry, with its attendant claims to be unbiased, objective and scientific has powerfully gripped teachers' minds" (p. 145).

In his effective analogy about the testing procedures which allow individuals to pursue their *natural course*, Block says that

> collectively and effectively, these procedures made school learning into a sequence of progressively more competitive horse races wherein each race was designed to spread its entering student field around the track depending on their *natural* learning talents. Those who won, placed or showed in their respective learning races were then allowed to race once again against their counterparts from other learning races. And the "also rans" from each race were formally and informally allowed to drop by the wayside via a whole host of regular and remedial instructional programs (p. 12).

Because the theory stemming from these two groups has shaped education practice in this century, the landscapes of many learning environments are characterized by individuals competing against one another in the contest for rational knowledge under the assumption that this is nature taking its course. Gibson, like other critical theorists, takes exception to this assumption. He says that critical theory rejects the assumption of an individual having intrinsic qualities, arguing that they represent "social and historical processes masquerading as 'natural'" (p. 143). When a teacher's practice adheres, consciously or unconsciously, to both liberalism's view that the accountability for learning rests mainly on the natural talents of the individual learner and the Social-Darwinist's emphasis on competition, the classroom can be a very threatening environment for many students.

When we piece together the practices and ideas which have resulted in learning environments incorporating features of collaborative pedagogy, the classroom scene looks altogether different.

John Dewey's ideas about education, articulated in the first third of this century, presented a strong challenge to educational practices based on competitive individualism. Dewey's writings call for a type of educational experience rooted in democratic life. Dewey saw no way of divorcing such experience from collective interaction. His ideas and classroom practices hinged on his concept of community. If Deweyian theory had shaped classroom methodology from then until now, it is likely that there would be much documentation and knowledge about interaction of the classroom collective. But, according to Brosio (1972), there were specific forces which prohibited Dewey's ideas from being accepted. During World War II and the beginning of the cold war there was "a moratorium on serious social and educational criticism" (p.4). And in the fifties, scientific and technological prowess motivated by corporate profit consumed the energies of people, both in the workplace and the educational institutions. The concern again was with objective phenomenon, the learning of which Friere (1990) objects to strongly in his *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Freire calls such learning the "banking system of education" in which

> the scope of action allowed to the students extends only as far as receiving, filing, and storing the deposits. They do . . . have the opportunity to become collectors or cataloguers of the things they store. But in the last analysis, it is men themselves who are filed away through the lack of creativity, transformation, and knowledge in this (at best) misguided system. For apart from inquiry, apart from the praxis, men cannot be truly human. Knowledge emerges only through invention, and re-invention, through the restless, impatient, continuing, hopeful inquiry men pursue in the world, with the world, and with each other (p. 58).

In England during the sixties, some scattered and isolated voices of protest began sounding against such passive, meaningless schooling. As more educators began acknowledging that we are fundamentally social beings, the call went forth for learning environments that were characterized by the collective interacting. Abercrombie (1960), in *The Anatomy of Judgment* gives the first description of what I would consider a course based on aspects of collaborative pedagogy. Comparing her medical course to traditional teaching, Abercrombie says that in didactic classrooms the student comes to a

conclusion and finds it to be right or wrong by "comparison with the teacher's (or the currently accepted) version." But in the discussion method of teaching

> the student learns by comparing his observation with those of ten or so of his peers. He compares not only the results but how the results were arrived at, and in doing this the range of factors taken into consideration is much wider than is usual in didactic teaching (p. 19).

Abercrombie found that the students who had taken the course did "significantly better" than others in their ability to discriminate, to draw fewer false conclusions, to entertain more than one possible solution to a problem and to be less "adversely" swayed by previous experience. Overall, Abercrombie found these students to be "more objective and more flexible in their behavior" (p. 19).

Although Abercrombie's primary concern was increasing students' abilities to make better judgments, her results support a major premise of collaborative pedagogy. Because woman and men are embedded in sociality, learning is effective when the conditions in which it occurs represent the dialogic interactiveness which characterizes all of life.

During the 1960s, the University of London Goldsmith's College issued a series of five reports, each composed of edited working papers concerned with changing the educational environment for adolescents 14 through 18. Of special concern in the fourth report, entitled *The Education of the Young School Leaver,* were the young people who left school at 15 to enter the workplace. The editor, Kenneth Rudge (1966) writes:

> Education cannot be split into fields of concern any more than society itself should be divided socially, intellectually or culturally. C.M. Fleming has said that "the mental health of a community is indivisible." At all stages of education the unity and wholeness of the community needs to be emphasized, rather than differences which can easily be found. This can best be achieved through an educational program which reaches out as far as possible into accumulated experience and exposes the infinitely complex inter-relationships and inter-dependabilities of mankind (pp. 4-5).

The need for integrating learning, work, and leisure through dialogic interaction is stressed throughout the report. Near the end of this report Rudge, in order "to overcome a paucity of dialogue," offers a lucid description of collaborative pedagogy which he calls "the most useful cycle of activities to use for thrashing out of questions." To explain the purpose of the cycle he says,

> in this process more than in any other, personal involvement of the students can be guaranteed. Their own motives become open to question - in supportive not hostile condition. For many this will prove a needed therapy as well as energetic learning (p. 38).

Two features of an environment based on collaborative pedagogy stand out in the above statement. First, this is a student-centered environment. In a collaborative community, high priority is attached to students becoming personally involved. Students will not only have a say but a personal stake in and responsibility for the activities of such a classroom. Because the class is oriented around students, students' opinions, motives, and assumptions will be sought and examined. I see these kinds of knowledge issuing from the important engagement of reflection, the second feature of collaborative pedagogy alluded to in Rudge's explanation.

The importance of reflection in collaborative pedagogy cannot be stressed enough. I see reflection in what Dewey referred to as "reconstruction of experience." "To be human, according to Dewey, is to treat sensation as a prod which leads to composing a meaningful tale" (Brosio, 1972, p. 33). But what must be understood is that "sensations are not knowledge, because knowledge is the determining of what our sensations represent" (p. 32). As such,

> knowledge is never immediate. . . . Things in their immediacy are unknown and unknowable. Knowledge can never be the direct grasp of reality because raw occurrence must be placed into an antecedent-consequences continuum or order for an experience to be meaningful for he who undergoes it (p. 30).

I see this idea of reflection encompassed in Ricoeur's principle of "distanciation," as well. According to Ricoeur,

> human participation in Being seeks to come to understanding. I can only do so to the extent that the experience of participation is externalized. And this occurs at the moment when we interrupt our participation in order to signify it. . . . Our very participation in Being requires distanciation. . . . Distanciation is the condition of the possibility for the interpretation of participation (Van Den Hengel, 1982, p. 109).

When we reflect on or "distance" ourselves by considering or looking back on "sensations" and "raw occurrences," that is, experiences with people, happenings, or texts, we are interrupting out participation, externalizing it in order to bring meaning and establish connections. And again, Ricoeur states how central language is for making all experience meaningful: "Language is the basic externalization of being. . . . In the exteriorization of language and or of some other external mark, the experience of being is intensified" (p. 109). Volosinov (1973) sounds the same note when he says, "*Expression organizes experience.* Expression is what first gives experience its form and specificity of direction" (p. 85). And Dewey in the following statement indicates how important the interaction of a collective is for generating all types of knowledge: "Knowledge is a function of association and communication; it depends upon tradition, upon methods and tools which are socially developed (p. 32). Thus, in a collaborative environment, members of the collective are continually encouraged to dialogue with each other orally, on paper, or through some other external medium, about their feelings, motives, assumptions, and opinions in order to foster reflection that is captured in journal writing. Such reflection then fuels subsequent dialogic encounters which then set in motion recursive reflection and interpretation. Reflective engagements such as that just described are consistent with ideas of Schon (1982), Kim (1991), and Himley (1989).

In the fifth report from Goldsmiths' College entitled *New Roles for the Learner*, editor Edwin Mason (1969) makes a distinct call for collaborative learning when he states:

> most important of all perhaps is the opening-up of the possibility of fully collaborative learning. What we have said so far has stressed collaboration between students within the cluster, and of staff together in the focus-group, pooling expertise so that students' work is not shrunk to the

> personal limits of any given teacher. . . . At its best, collaborative learning involves teacher and students together facing investigations into phenomena which are, in some elements at least, new to them both. For this is the current reality of the human condition (pp. 30-31).

In this quote, Mason makes mention of some important features of learning environments espousing collaborative pedagogy. First is the idea of "pooling expertise". Learning in this type of classroom is everyone's responsibility. Expertise shifts as learning progresses and various avenues are explored. Although the teacher may be the organizing "expert," a facilitator, to help the group begin its collaborative endeavors, the teacher is a learning peer in the class interaction. Second, the generation of knowledge is an honest exploration. The teacher is exploring with her students the new pathways decided by the classroom community. Thus, in this environment, the questions are real. That means they are not questions asked by an authoritarian figure who is already privileged to the answers, nor are they rhetorical questions to which no answers are really desired. Rather, they are questions which surface as members of a collective reflect and dialogue on experiences, ideas, and texts of all kinds in order to generate understanding and meaning. Third, when Mason says "for this is the current reality of the human condition," he pinpoints what I feel is collaborative pedagogy's salient feature: its praxis captures the activity of daily human experience, that is, the dialogic interactions arising out of the needs and/or purposes of specific contexts. These features echo Volosinov's view of language previously discussed. These ideas embody Ricoeurean interpretation at work in a classroom community.

Near the end of this report Mason states:

> People need people who they can see are encouraging them and sustaining them. . . . If a school can see all its members as unique individuals collaborating in common purposes, its values will be made plain, and it will be effectively opposed to cheaper values emanating from those agencies which see adolescents as a mass-market and stimulate them to act as a herd (p. 59).

In this statement two more features important to collaborative pedagogy are revealed: the nurturing aspect and the implicit recognition of the heterogeneity which exists in any classroom because of the diversity and uniqueness of its individual members.

Collaborative pedagogy demands that the learning environment be characterized by nurture and encouragement. Even in classrooms not organized around collaborative practices, adoption of a feminist pedagogy by teachers like Elizabeth Flynn (1989) and John Flynn (1982) has resulted in a nurturing dimension. In a truly collaborative environment, a threatening and unfavorable climate is a contradiction in terms; competition is not the motivator for learning. Here, accountability rests not on students' "natural talents" but on their unique and personal contribution to the various collaborative endeavors and life of the class. In *A Short Course in Writing*, an influential book explaining collaborative pedagogy in a college writing course, Kenneth Bruffee (1985) speaks about another important feature of a nurturing environment, the freedom to take risks. He says, "If we learn collaboratively, when we make mistakes we make them together. We're all in the same boat. Thus we are less afraid of risking errors that are inevitable when we try to learn something new" (p. 5). Bruffee also concludes that when we work together we "tend to make fewer mistakes because we help each other see things we would not have seen on our own."

Collaborative pedagogy sees every group as heterogeneous in spite of institutional attempts to achieve homogeneity. In fact, crucial to effective collaboration in any setting is recognizing that drawing upon the differences of the individual group members will result in a more comprehensive product, project, and accomplishment. The collaborative environment is one characterized by negotiation and accommodation. When differences are viewed as a deterrent, not only will certain individuals be excluded, and thus silenced, but the group will be prevented from developing the life skills necessary for cooperation and consensus. Lunsford and Ede (1990), in their study of collaborative writing in various professions, relate ideas which came out of their

interview with Eleanor Chiogioji. She suggests that time be given to developing such skills. Writing collaboratively demands that people be able to listen in order to synthesize different view points. As well, trusting others' opinions and compromising are musts. Chiogioji notes that with society's emphasis on individuality, compromise can be difficult to achieve. "Training in listening and in group dynamics might enable individuals to collaborate more effectively" (p. 41).

The belief that children are "unique individuals" is not a return to enlightenment individualism but a guard against discriminating in favour of certain abilities, learning styles, and behaviors. Henry Giroux (1988) says that schools are

> places where dominant and subordinate voices define and constrain each other . . . in response to the sociohistorical conditions "carried" in the institutional, textual, and lived practices that define school culture and teacher/student experience. . . . Schools are not ideologically innocent; nor are they simply reproductive of dominant social relations and interests (p. 134).

Shirley Brice Heath (1983) concurs: "The school is not a neutral objective arena; it is an institution which has the goal of changing people's values, skills, and knowledge bases" (p. 368). These she concludes are part and parcel with the acquisition of language in any community. Heath's work in three communities in the Piedmont area of North Carolina shows how blatantly discriminatory teaching practices are when they favour a particular language and cultural capital. She states:

> Portions of the population bring with them to school linguistic and cultural capital accumulated through hundreds of thousands of occasions for practicing the skills and espousing the values the schools transmit. Long before reaching school [these] children . . . have made the transition from home to the larger societal institutions which share the values, skills, and knowledge bases of the school. Their eventual positions of power in the school and the workplace are foredestined in the conceptual structures which they have learned at home and which are reinforced in school and numerous other associations. Long before school, their language and culture at home has structured for them the meanings which will give shape to their experiences in classrooms and beyond. Their families have embedded them in contexts that reflected the systemic relationships between education and production. From their baby books to their guide books for participation in league soccer, these children have been motivated towards seeing their current activities as relating to their future

> achievements. Their socially determined habits and values have created for them an ideology in which all that they do makes sense to their current identity and their preparation for the achievements which will frame their future (p. 368).

Sheryl Fontaine (1988) points out that "research on language behavior strongly suggests that when we replace students' discourse with our own, we are tampering with a way of constructing knowledge and viewing the world which is culturally based" (p. 92).

Heath cautions:

> unless the boundaries between classrooms and communities can be broken, and the flow of cultural patterns between them encouraged, the schools will continue to legitimate and reproduce communities of . . . people who control and limit the potential progress of other communities and who themselves remain untouched by other values and ways of life (p. 369).

Fontaine's ideas forcibly make a similar point when she says, "if we do not recognize and accommodate [cultural bases of language], our attitude toward the established discourse students bring with them becomes adversarial; our teaching fights the culture and always loses" (p. 93).

One of the main points Heath makes in her landmark study, and one of my main themes in this exploration of collaborative pedagogy, is how pervasive language acquisition and uses of language are to every aspect of life. Giroux (1988) concurs when he states, "It is within and through language that individuals in particular historical contexts shape values into particular forms and practices." Because "language represents a central force in the struggle for voice" (p. 135) there is a direct relationship between affirmation of various linguistic capitals and valuing the uniqueness of individuals. The following three points that Heath (1983) makes about how a community socializes its children merit careful consideration:

> First, patterns of language use in any community are in accord with and mutually reinforce other cultural patterns, such as space and time orderings, problem-solving techniques, group loyalties, and preferred patterns of recreation.

> Second, factors involved in preparing children for school-oriented, mainstream success are deeper than differences in formal structures of language. . . . The language socialization process in all its complexity is more powerful than such single-factor explanations in accounting for academic success.
>
> Third, the patterns of interactions between oral and written uses of language are varied and complex, and the traditional oral-literate dichotomy does not capture the ways other cultural patterns within a community determine the uses of oral and written language (p. 344).

Collaborative pedagogy recognizes that an educator's view of language crucially shapes the learning environment.

> Schools are one of the primary public spheres where, through the influence of authority, resistance, and dialogue, language is able to shape the way various individuals and groups encode and thereby engage the world. In other words, schools are places where language projects, imposes, and constructs particular norms and forms of meaning. In this sense, language does more [than] merely straightforwardly present "information"; in actuality it is used as a basis both to "instruct" and to produce subjectivities (Giroux, 1988, p. 135).

Here, then, in summary, are some of the philosophic assumptions and features that ground a collaborative pedagogy. First, student abilities are not natural, nor intrinsic. Rather, they are products of a socialization, culture, and history which are embedded in language acquisition and use. Therefore, the accountability for learning rests on the people in power and the system they have created or tolerated and not on the individual learner. Second, uniqueness of the individual is recognized and valued. This uniqueness is best encouraged in a heterogeneous context where nurture and affirmation rather than competition energizes the learning. This demands not only the acknowledgment of the different language and cultural capitals of the various group members, but the use of diverse language and cultural capitals as the basis for generating group and personal knowledge in the collaborative endeavor. No single linguistic or cultural capital, including the teacher's, is favoured. Thus, expertise is pooled and authority is shifted as knowledge is socially generated. Third, worthwhile learning is that which enhances and makes life more meaningful. This requires a learning praxis

based on the dialogic interactions characteristic of human experience and concerned with unifying the learning, work, and leisure aspects of life. Such a praxis sees *every* group regardless of size or age as an interpretive community in a specific context concerned with ontological purpose.

Once again what Volosinov says of reality is true in the preceding discussion: language dominates in every area. It is the only and absolutely necessary vehicle for the collective and the individual to engage in life's interpretive activity or what Ricoeur refers to as the "dialectic[s] of explanation and understanding." The above assumptions and the collaborative pedagogy emanating from them are valid regardless of educational level or discipline. Because I see collaborative pedagogy encapsulating life, I feel it provides a sound basis for educational practice.

Because life is characterized by complexity, diversity, and interdependence, a pedagogy based on life praxis will have "many faces." Although each context espousing a collaborative pedagogy will have the philosophic underpinnings previously mentioned, each context will derive its own version of the collaborative effort. In the next chapter, I will describe the working out of collaborative pedagogy in one particular context.

Chapter Two

A Contemporary Context for Collaborative Pedagogy

When incorporating collaborative pedagogy, a teacher cannot fall back on overarching models for either process or learner involvement because each context requires a unique adaptation of the collaborative endeavor. Although the teacher/ facilitator aims, as part of the agenda, to increase skills, explore a genre, or illuminate assumptions, the possible paths available to work out the agenda are numerous, being sensitive and unique to both context and the people who constitute the group.

As I began researching the collaborative pedagogy incorporated in one university course, I, too, had an agenda. It can be summarized by the following questions which arose from the philosophical concerns discussed in Chapter One: *In a course purporting to adopt collaborative pedagogy, what is considered knowledge, and from what sources does that knowledge originate? What is the instructor's role? What fosters or hinders student expression? How is the collaborative endeavor uniquely sensitive to this particular group of people?* My research plans included the following: taking notes on the class happenings and interaction, having access to student writings, and recording interviews with individual students and also the instructor. What I neither could nor did plan was my place in this particular collective. Collaborative pedagogy dismisses the idea of a present "non-participant" observer or the possibility of a "fly-on-the-wall" researcher. Rather, it sees any and every presence having a unique effect on that collective. My presence would make a difference. My role in this particular group would unfold. In fact, I considered this unfolding process an important part of my research.

For purposes of structure, I will alternate sections entitled "Window" with sections called "Voices". In the "Window" sections, I will focus on a number of class

sessions using as a lens my notes taken during or immediately after classes. In the "Voices" sections, I will present what members of this collective say via journal entries and taped interviews. Each "Window" and "Voices" segment will conclude with a discussion highlighting the particular aspects of collaborative pedagogy I feel are revealed in the material presented. The numbers given to each "Window" and "Voices" portion do not correspond to the specific week in which the class occurred or the journal entry was written. Rather, they indicate the overall chronological arrangement of material. Throughout the study, I will use fictitious names for students.

Window One

The class I was to study was a third-level special topics English course being offered for the first time entitled "Gender and Writing." Since this course was an elective, people's reasons for choosing it were varied. A number were interested in its concern with gender issues; among these were students pursuing a path in Women's Studies. Two people were education majors who needed one more course to complete their degree and needed an evening slot (such as this course was in) since they were teaching full-time during the day. Others were there because they had benefited from previous experiences with this professor, Dr. Phyllis Artiss, in other classes. As well, Dr. Artiss's reputation was responsible for drawing others into this collective.

Before the first class began, Dr. Artiss requested that the students move their desks to join her in a circle. This seating arrangement continued throughout the semester whenever the group met as a whole. Dr. Artiss introduced me and asked me to explain my presence in the class and talk about the research I was doing. I responded by saying that I was in this group to explore the collaborative methodology that Dr. Artiss was incorporating. I explained that of special interest to me was how language is viewed and treated and knowledge generated. My plan was to take notes on classes and, hopefully, to have access to what was written by everyone connected with the

class. I concluded by saying, "I am not here to rate or judge what you say and write. Rather, I am attempting to document how collaborative methodology unfolds in this particular collective."

Dr. Artiss then gave out the Course Outline (see Appendix A) and from it read aloud the following agenda:

> This class provides an opportunity to consider questions of gender in writing, our own as well as that of others. It will be conducted as a series of workshops and seminars in which we engage in written and spoken dialogue to increase our awareness of power structures imbedded in language, and work towards changing these.

In her introductory comments she invited everyone present to enter, as it were, a "parlor where a dialogue was in process about language and the assumptions and power structures underlying its use." Becoming a participant in such a dialogue meant first listening to some voices that were already "in the parlor" and then exposing and possibly altering our own assumptions about language use. Dr. Artiss, concerned that no one would feel marginalized at any time during the course, said to the group, "Make me aware of any cliquish tendencies forming in the class." She stressed the importance of open dialogue and asked those uncomfortable with the idea of dialoguing with others orally and in written discourse, to come and talk with her. Dr. Artiss hoped the changes that would occur as a result of this collective meeting together would have "reverberations beyond this class."

Next, Dr. Artiss passed out index cards on which students were to put names, phone numbers, courses completed, reasons for taking the course, the grade the student would be working for, and the kinds of writing the person preferred.

Dr. Artiss then reviewed the "proposed evaluation scheme" for the types of required writing which was as follows: journals - 10%, analytical papers - 30%, a collaborative class project - 20%, and a final examination - 20%. She then discussed the

collaborative requirement. According to the outline, the "subject, format, style and all other aspects of this project" would be decided by the class, and the grade assigned to the project would be the same for all students. By her comments it was evident that Dr. Artiss hoped this project would crystallize and record much of the knowledge generated by this collective over the term. She stated her position by saying:

> Language is an important way of doing things, an important tool for changing the world. We use language with other people by listening, and engaging in a dialogue that presupposes that we are all learners. . . . If we are going to change, we need to work together. This will not happen if the classroom remains competitive and individualistic. You, individually or in smaller units, will decide both the issues to address and ponder, and the voices you will pay attention to. Then these gleanings will be shared with others, and this sharing will in turn constitute the collective dialogue. In this way, we, as a collective, will socially determine the knowledge generated in this class.

Immediately questions arose concerning the collaborative project. Apprehensions about the possibility that personality conflicts might arise in conjunction with the aspect of one group grade were expressed by some students. A number of the comments reflected very negative past experiences with group assignments where one or two people ended up doing the bulk of the work. And still others expressed misgivings that the whole class could ever reach a consensus on the particulars of such an assignment. Those who had had previous successful collaborative experiences stressed the importance and value of such endeavors. Dr. Artiss added that she hoped such a project would challenge and reflect assumptions about knowledge and questions about truth. The discussion ended with Chad expressing skepticism, but also a willingness to participate.

Dr. Artiss gave the following assignments for that week: writing a four-page minimum journal entry relating the writing role models in the student's life, reading the

assigned six essays from the two required textbooks, (*Language in Her Eye: Views on Writing and Gender by Canadian Women Writing in English*, edited by Libby Scheier, Sarah Sheard and Eleanor Wachtel; *Women's Voices: Visions and Perspectives*, edited by Pat C. Hoy II, Esther H. Schor and Robert DiYanni) and responding to two of the essays in a second four-page minimum journal entry. Dr. Artiss ended the class with these comments about the assignments:

> Read these essays and more if you can. Your written responses should not summarize the essays. Rather, think of yourself in a dialogue with these texts and authors. Don't restrict yourself. Try to enjoy what you write. Look at this as a beginning of a relationship. Be prepared to share your informal journal responses in small groups next week. In addition, feel free to write journal entries that express your reactions to and feelings about any aspect of this class.

As I reflected on this first class, three aspects stood out. First, Dr. Artiss had agendas on a number of levels. Her academic agenda included giving students opportunities both to explore what for most was a new focus, writing by women authors, and to express themselves using a variety of written forms. The proposed evaluation percentages revealed that Dr. Artiss had expectations for both participation and quality of work done.

She seemed to have another agenda for each student. As the dialogue and interaction of the collective ensued, she indicated that she hoped students would begin identifying and challenging their own assumptions about language by realizing the implications of those assumptions.

And there seemed to be a larger agenda which Dr. Artiss hoped would be realized through this collective. Her statement about the changes that occurred during the semester having reverberations "beyond this class" combined with her view that "language . . . is an important tool for changing the world" indicates an agenda with

global vision. This course was in existence for purposes much greater than fulfilling elective requirements or getting a good grade. Of far greater importance seemed to be its impact on life through personal and social transformation. Dr. Artiss's comments implied that she was in this collective to be changed herself, to foster change in the students, and by so doing, in some way to change the world.

Second, Dr. Artiss sought information which would provide some insights on the starting points for each of the students. Her use of three-by-five cards not only gave convenient access to address and phone numbers, but provided initial information about why students were in this collective. And asking students to tell what grade they wanted to receive was a way for both instructor and students to establish starting points for academic expectations. As well, by assigning a journal entry on significant writing role models, Dr. Artiss helped each student identify background information relevant to the context of this class. By doing so, she could gain insights into the starting point of each these students as writers. This also allowed students to personally situate themselves in relation to the writing focus of the course.

Third, Dr. Artiss's efforts to foster written and oral discourse would be undergirded by examining assumptions about language and the "power structures imbedded in language." This collective would be involved in seeing how language has been imposed and curtailed because of prevailing views. This collective would be encouraged to recognize, analyze, and change certain power structures by seeing and using language as a tool. These students were being asked right from the start to use and act on language rather than being acted upon and dominated by an imposition of another's language.

Voices One

Dr. Artiss chose journal writing as the only type of writing to be done that first week. The following journal entry was written in response to the suggested assignment.

I use a major portion of Allison's first journal entry because in its stream lies a number of points relevant to collaborative pedagogy.

> Before joining this class, I had been casually aware of the tensions between the female and male literary worlds. The only concrete contention I knew was that men were currently beginning [to be] told that they could not feature female protagonists in any of their stories because it required a perspective foreign and unavailable to them. Furthermore, they were in no position to critique authentically the literature for, by and/or about women for similar reasons. While I thought this rather elitist of women and felt rather a vague sense of reverse discrimination, I thought little else of it. It made sense, but was not an ideology I felt a strong attraction toward.
>
> Perhaps a large part of the reason for my shrugging off the call of the "sisterhood" was the loyalty in me toward the most significant influences in my life. The woman I am today has benefited largely from several men I have been lucky enough to know. While I am not settled into my skin wholly, the direction I am taking and the path I am on pleases me immensely. In short, I can't complain about the male influences in my life and [shudder] at the thoughts of my life without them.
>
> This is the state of mind and background that finds me in English 3817 today.
>
> Reading Alice Walker, the first thing I noticed was her affinity [towards] the "sisterhood." I found myself distanced from her for the very simple reason that it was my father who had the green thumb and zest for "gardening." I could easily identify the creative and spiritual outlets in his life and my inheritance of them.
>
> Walker got me thinking about my own mother's spirituality for the first time. Did she find an outlet or has she developed a dysfunction from lack of one? For the first time, I began to see myself as my mother's child in the struggle for release of our spiritualities. I tapped a communion I had never known existed. It is a

wellspring I will not easily come to grips with. It will take immense introspection, reflection and time to decipher.

Virginia Woolf's essay hit home when she spoke of a room of one's own. I, too, have longed for the space and freedom to develop my mind and my craft. I find that while university life opens the world up for me I am frustrated by the fast pace, the crammed semesters, the deadline pressures and the lack of freedom we have to wallow in what we are learning - "Here it is. Got it? Good! Let's move on."

But I wonder if the complaint of the lack of a room of one's own is perhaps a cop out? It is true that the disadvantaged have to struggle harder to develop their potentiality, but what of it. We must take what we have and work with it. The less we have, the less time we have to whine about it. Surely, women have more to celebrate and more to be proud of when they reach their goal precisely for their hardship. Women do not corner the market in disadvantage. The great philosopher Spinoza is a prime example of a struggling author.

Hélène Cixous' essay was lost to me. I could not even finish it. It was radical feminism and I found it violent in style. I disagree that we must speak only to women; relate only to women. That's definitely reverse discrimination. Men have their language; we women have ours. If these languages are incompatible, I feel we must invent a new one that will allow us to communicate honestly. Turning our backs is not a solution. . . .

Luce Irigaray . . . was gentler and more poetic than Cixous but she preached a similar sermon, I suspect. Perhaps it was the foreign languages and poor translations, but I simply had trouble grasping these two women. I'm not sure if the sexual currents were meant literally or metaphorically, but I definitely could not relate.

I was grateful to move on to Annette Kolodny and my native tongue. While I found her style dry it was certainly more comprehensible. I began to glean why, perhaps, I reacted so adversely to the two previous authors. As a student of the 1990's, I was not victimized by historical canons to the degree that all these women were. They had begun the fight and won their various battles along the way for me. In the true tradition of the privileged (in which they made me), I was not able to appreciate fully what they gained for me. Can one truly know the suffering of hunger when one has never starved? I have never been banned from libraries or forced only to study male authors. The passions of these women are dulled in me and I recognize now that I take for granted what they accomplished. . . .

My biggest role model has been a professor at this university. A man. Acck! He lit a fire in me that I never dreamed was smoldering. He praised and encouraged me and gave me a confidence in myself I sorely needed. I'm not sure "role model" is the right term but he was my only support and fan club for a while. To say I learned a lot from him is an understatement. I suppose I have modeled myself after him to some extent, but I'm not fully aware of exactly what techniques or attitudes I inherited from him. This is largely because I haven't yet written enough to know what my style and techniques are, or should I say will be. It is for the same reason that I cannot claim any role models in the authors outside my immediate acquaintance either. I don't see myself as a whole writer as of yet. I am still in an incubus stage. The future will determine my role models.

The above entry reveals to me a number of important starting points for establishing collaborative pedagogy. First, since a learning environment espousing collaboration must be student-centered, it is key that right from the beginning each student situates herself or himself with the context of the collective. Allison tells what she already knew about "the tensions between the female and male literary worlds" prior to taking the class. She notes her own position in relation to current thought and

allegiance to certain aspects of the women's movement. Allison's statement, "This is the state of mind and background that finds me in English 3817 today," is a literal documentation of Allison's perceived starting point in regards to issues relevant to the focus of this class. Finally, she positions herself as a writer in relation to the past and present.

Others, like Julia and Olivia, similarly position themselves in terms of their past writing experiences and expectations for this class. Julia writes:

> Writing has always been an important part of my life and even though I rarely have the time to sit down and do the kind of soul-searching, meaningful writing that I enjoy most, I still am astounded at the amount of material I churn out every week. Unfortunately, most of this material is produced under the strangle-hold of obligation and deadline - a dry, uncolourful mass of words rigidly organized to the point of utter dismay and boredom. I strongly believe that the written word was never meant to be massacred in this way, correct in grammar and form but lacking identity and virility. . . . The greatest discovery I have made in my university career is a sad one indeed: It is that the pen is mightier than the sword only if its owner has consulted a handbook. And, ever-wary of the almighty G.P.A. I play the game, winning the marks but losing so much more - losing the magic and excitement that had once flowed from my pen to my paper. If this course can bring the most minute flicker of that enjoyment then the effort will have been worth it.

Olivia writes:

> Gender and the act of what I'm doing now - never gave it much thought before so my writing is probably gender biased, my thought patterns along the lines of male structured thought. Will I think myself going mad at the end of this course? . . . How to escape?
>
> Read more female authors. Starting now I'll go and start the book for this class - "Women's Voices" . . . Female language will I come closer to its meaning?

> Writers I wish to emulate . . . to be continued ask me this question at the end of term. . . .

In the above quotations, we see these two people positioning themselves, like Allison did, either in terms of class issues or the writing focus.

As well, from the outset in a collaborative learning environment students are encouraged to continually place themselves in relation to all text and other discourse. This is what Allison does with the assigned readings. She notes the similarities and differences between her life and the lives and ideas of five different authors. She shares paths of thought prompted by some idea in an essay. She reveals her alienation from some of the writers and harmony with others.

Journal entries taken from different points throughout the term show that other learners in this collective continually respond in a personal way to the texts they read. Cherise responds to an essay read in the third week of the course:

> In "Within the Net," I like the way Roo Borson compares shoes to the roles we women feel we have to fill. I don't want to fill a role. Do I have to walk around barefoot? I like the comparison, but I don't necessarily like the insinuations. Maybe insinuations is too strong a word. I think that if I believed I was going to be categorized by my footwear, I would go barefoot. At least in the summer.
>
> This reminds me of a guy I've seen marching through the tunnels. The bottoms of his feet must be permanently black. Even in the winter, when the melting snow sometimes seeped into the tunnels onto the floor, he'd clomp on through, head held high, toes splashing.
>
> Maybe I wouldn't go barefoot. I'm too much of a conformist, now that I think about it. I guess I'd let myself be judged just like I judge everyone else. Besides, I like my cowboy boots too much to give them up!

Taylor, commenting on the essay "Just Married," says:

> This essay is a happy commentary on the state of Ms. Erlich's marriage. In today's world of "radical" feminists it is nice to see that some women still want, and work for, a happy marriage. I think many feminists feel that wanting to share your life with a man is a sign of weakness. I believe that you can be a full women of the 1990s and a wife as well.

The entries above represent for me the informal documentation of personal reactions and feelings stemming from experiences and memories prompted by initial encounters with a new text. I see in such expressions the first step in Ricoeur's "unmooring of the text from its original situation" (Van Den Hengel, 1982, p. 201) as previously discussed in my first chapter. These represent Allison, Cherise, and Taylor's first steps in allowing these texts to actualize their references in new situations (p. 202). Such entries are, for each of these learners, an effective start in transforming the "otherness of the text into an event of discourse" (Ricoeur cited by Van Den Hengel, 1982, p. 210). For the collaborative pedagogical mandate that a student-centered environment be realized, collective interpretation and generation of knowledge must begin with students relating personally to the texts they encounter.

I believe Dr. Artiss fostered this personal involvement with the texts by using the metaphor of establishing a relationship to describe the encounter with the texts she hoped students would have. They were to see themselves in a conversation with the texts and their authors and she wanted these "new relationships" to be enjoyable.

In a collaborative environment, it is not enough just to encourage members of the collective to approach and reflect on texts in a personal way as Dr. Artiss did by using her relationship analogy. There must be a way of capturing these personal encounters so they can be used for future reflection and dialogue by individuals and the collective. The journal writing that Dr. Artiss required was an excellent means of doing this in a collaborative environment. Documentation through journal writing effectively carries out Volosinov's idea, mentioned in Chapter One, that "expression organizes experience.

Expression is what first gives experience its form and specificity of direction" (1973, p. 85). It is important that individuals and the collective give the "experience" of both text and class happenings some initial "form and direction" so that dialogic interaction in the class will naturally ensue. In her guiding comments, Dr. Artiss established an approach and a tone for handling texts and she used journal writing as the means of recording the subsequent responses.

Window Two

At the beginning of the second class, Dr. Artiss requested that small discussion groups form on the basis of preference for any of the previous week's essays. To guide discussions she said, "Avoid summarizing. Again, picture yourselves in dialogue with at least two of these authors. Compare the ideas of the two different authors with your own ideas." Dr. Artiss suggested that each group pick one person who would help negotiate the agenda for that discussion.

Going around to each of the four groups formed, I found the focus of each of the discussions very different. In the largest group, three of the five students, all undergraduates pursuing different majors, had taken a course from Dr. Artiss before. Shay and Daphne began by saying that they did not like the essays by Cixous and Irigaray. They found them negative and extreme. The other three members seemed comfortable with these two authors. Then, rather than focusing directly on the essays themselves, this group began considering questions posed by Todd: "If writers such as Irigaray and Cixous are going to break with convention, how can we determine if the writing is good or bad? When a writer is experimenting and using a different voice is it possible to apply some criteria for judging the quality of the writing?"

The undergraduate students who formed a two member group were wondering if Irigaray's essay was literal or metaphoric, and if the reading difficulty existed because the

translation did not capture the word plays that were possibly important to the original piece.

Jeffrey and Nancy, the two education majors, were with Taylor and Cherise, two undergraduates in English. Jeffrey commented that there was no mention of men ever suffering or experiencing anything negative in Alice Walker's narrative essay about her childhood. This group's discussion continued to center on the content of the essays.

The discussion of a fourth group, made up of an undergraduate student and two professional women, a high school English teacher and freelance journalist, focused on Woolf, Cixous, and Walker. Here, the point of view of the authors and the influences on each author's self perceptions were discussed.

At Dr. Artiss's request, students again formed a circle when the class reconvened as a whole after the break. In making reference to the small group discussions, Dr. Artiss said that these were not to be times for "correct responses or even consensus." She recommended that such time be used to think aloud and test ideas out with one another.

Todd brought up the issue of the place of jargon in our discussions and writing. A few people shared their opinions on whether specialized words help or hinder understanding and dialogue.

Dr. Artiss, referring to the course outline, then shared what she saw as the difference between journal responses and the analytical papers on essays read. Although the analytical papers were more formal, and as such had to conform in the conventions and grammar presented in books like Gage's *Handbook of Current English,* Dr. Artiss stressed the importance of finding one's own voice in the writing of each piece. "Have the rough drafts of your first analytical papers ready so they can be discussed in small groups next week."

Next, Dr. Artiss asked the class to think about whether they would like to have a visit from Glenda Ripley, a graduate student researching Daphne Marlatt, one of the authors represented in the course textbooks. "You don't have to decide now about

having Glenda in. We will discuss this again and see whether we want to take class time to concentrate on this one author."

Dr. Artiss then explained that she would be attending the Learneds Conference the following week. In her absence, Alexis, the high school English teacher in the class, had agreed to Dr. Artiss's request for her to chair next week's session. Dr. Artiss cautioned, "Please make sure that you use I-messages in your discussion groups next week. These are messages that give information about how the speaker responds. For example, 'I find this passage unclear' rather than 'Your writing is muddled.'"

Dr. Artiss then passed out the Process Logs (see Appendix B) that were to accompany each analytical paper. Her final comments to the whole group were, "Read widely. And try to write your paper in your own voice."

After class, Daphne wanted more clarification on the analytical paper. Then Nancy asked if she could hold off doing an analytical paper for a time. She felt that she needed to read some of the other students' rough drafts to get an idea of what an analytical paper was like. She asked if she could relate an experience in narrative form similar to Alice Walker's essay instead. Dr. Artiss gave ready approval to this alternative writing experience.

In this second class, a further unfolding of the collaborative endeavor is revealed. By suggesting that essay preference be the basis for forming small groups, I feel Dr. Artiss accomplished two things. First she encouraged student-centered, not teacher-directed discussions. Some groups began immediately to discuss content and their feeling about the ideas expressed in the essays. Other groups started with questions about language and style prompted by the essays rather than the content. The variety of the foci for the discussion groups confirms for me that students discussed what was significant for them. Second, Dr. Artiss ensured that the students felt comfortable with the first small group experience. Allison showed in the portion of her first journal entry

previously quoted, that she did not connect with the writings of two authors in particular, Ciroux and Irigaray. Allison has a choice in this first discussion time, before she knows anyone, to join or not to join a group that wants to focus on these two essays. In other words, Allison has the choice to confront, or to learn about, a completely different perspective, or to choose another group and focus on the essays with which she felt in harmony. In a collaborative environment there must be accommodation for the diversity of personalities. This is not to say that students will be left with their existing ideas undisturbed. They will be asked to explore new territory and to take intellectual and personal risks. But collaborative pedagogy acknowledges that for members to participate in such activities, a comfortable and nurturing atmosphere must be established. The instructor must do all she can to ensure that members of the collective feel safe throughout the duration of the particular collaborative endeavor. Dr. Artiss showed her concern in this area in the very first class when she asked those uncomfortable with sharing to come and see her.

Dr. Artiss's after-class conferences with Daphne and Nancy continued to establish this nurturing atmosphere. Daphne readily received further clarification about the next week's assignment. And Nancy's lack of experience with one type of writing assignment was not accentuated. Dr. Artiss showed that Nancy would be expected to write in this form, but her differences were accommodated. She recognized Nancy's need to draw on the knowledge and experience of other class members before feeling free enough write in such a form. To nurture students does not imply that they do nothing until they are comfortable. Students must always be involved pursuing the reasons for the collective's existence. For this class, this meant students must be exploring the genre and writing about their explorations. Nancy had an alternative writing experiment in mind and Dr. Artiss accommodated her experiment and her desire to delay writing an analytical paper; thus the instructor showed she not only

acknowledges heterogeneity in the collective but values it through negotiation and accommodation.

Voices Two

As previously mentioned, Dr. Artiss had made arrangements with a class member to carry on with the third class. This journal entry by Glenn was written following that class.

> I think the . . . class went quite well despite your absence. However, we broke only into two groups of about eight each and some people (including, but not just, me) thought that such an arrangement did not work as well as using smaller groups. In larger groups, only a minority tend to speak.
>
> People were very hesitant about editing each other's analysis. I was worried about imposing myself, my way of writing, my way of thinking upon someone else - I am not famous for my tact. It is a quality that I still have to work on.
>
> Anyway, we adjourned an hour earlier than usual, which happened to be good for me. I went for a walk in the cool full-moon night and was enthralled with the colors of the sky, shadings uninterrupted from greening verge to darkest blue.
>
> How was your trip?

This entry reveals a number of features which show that a collaborative pedagogy is in operation.

First, the fact that the class can continue without the normal or even a substitute instructor, is significant. Such would not be the case in the didactic classroom. Here, where collective interaction is the *modus operandi*, the class can continue with occasional absences of members including the instructor. Now that does not mean that the class would have been exactly the same had Dr. Artiss been present. But neither would it have been the same had any other member been absent. Collaborative pedagogy sees each meeting as uniquely influenced by those who constitute it. But

what is significant is that the endeavor continues. It is not centered on or dependent on the contribution of one person, that is, the instructor. This is so because in a collaborative environment it is essential that expertise is pooled. Alexis's experience as a high school teacher makes her a likely candidate for being comfortable organizing groups. But I do not feel she was the only one who could have done so. A number of the students had experienced collaboration in a previous class with Dr. Artiss and experience is one feature that helps one be an "expert." In the collaborative classroom, an expert is not just a person with degrees, or with an abundance of knowledge or experience in an area; an expert can be the person who at any point in time has something to offer the group or even another individual.

Glenn is one of the students who took a course from Dr. Artiss the previous semester. It is evident that the dialogue between him and Dr. Artiss is open and easy. A relationship of trust is evident in Glenn's statements about the personal aspects of his life he is trying to work out even in this class. The interest here is not uni-directional, that is, from instructor to student; the interest seems to be mutual, based on personhood. Glenn as part of this collective is interested in Dr. Artiss as a human being, not just the person who will give him a grade. In Dr. Artiss's comments to his journal entry she answers his query about her trip by saying, "I'll tell you about it. You'd be intrigued by much that went on in both formal and informal gatherings." It is in just such an environment that Rudge's belief about the possibilities of collaboration mentioned in Chapter One is realized, that is, the student's "own motives become open to question - in supportive not hostile conditions. For many this will prove a needed therapy as well as energetic learning" (1966, p. 38). The concerns of a collaborative classroom are inherently integrated with the concerns of the lives of individuals, as well as the life of the collective.

Establishing a student-centered environment is essential to collaborative pedagogy. In Glenn's entry, we see him feeling a responsibility for the class in three

ways. First, he evaluates what happened in the class and makes a suggestion for more effective grouping practices. Second, despite his preference for smaller group settings, the fact that he "made an effort" to contribute shows that he feels a personal responsibility for what happens in this collective. Finally, Glenn relates the difficulty a number of the members had with editing each other's rough drafts of the analytical papers. By alerting the instructor to problems he detects in the class, Glenn shows he has a personal stake in and responsibility for enhancing the group's success.

Although this is only the third week of classes, a number of other members, many who had never experienced collaborative pedagogy in a class before, are expressing in their journal entries a similar responsibility for the class. After the second class Cherise states:

> The class seems to be developing very well. It was substantially smaller [than] last time, but size did nothing to hinder the constant flow of ideas. Everyone is very open in his/her viewpoints. . . .
>
> I'm glad to see that the men in our class are participating as freely as the women. It's an interesting interaction between the two sexes.

In this portion of her third entry, Allison confirms in detail her own difficulty with the problem Glenn had mentioned concerning editing other people's analytical papers.

> I must communicate a problem I had this week in class. It stems from my difficulties in concentration when reading. I have never been a fast reader and, unless I am thoroughly captivated by the text, I am easily distracted, my vivid imagination can be triggered easily. The result is that some times I find myself reading the same line or paragraph over and over again.
>
> Some people, I understand, can skim an article quickly and get some sense of it. I can't. I am slow reading, but I make up for it in my comprehension and retention. I won't continue in what I'm reading unless I have grasped fully what I

have already read. If I can't grasp it, I can't go on. It's peculiarity with me, I guess?

The point of all this is that I had significant problems reading other people's drafts this week. The atmosphere was distracting; the text's were not always simple and clear. (I mean that with the utmost respect, believe me!) I was able to edit it, grammatically; but I would not - really, could not - comment on the content. It wouldn't have been fair considering my difficulties in comprehension.

I feel particularly rotten about it because I get so much out of other people's criticisms of my paper, especially Olivia's. I don't feel I am contributing as much as every one else. I am letting them down, and I don't see any way past it.

Normally, I would shrug such an occurrence off as being over and done with and survived. However, I understand this is going to be a regular feature of the class. I dread it. I tell myself just to do my best, but I can't forget that while I struggle I am holding some innocent victim's draft up from its getting wider - and better - criticism.

While I think the criticisms are essential and extremely beneficial, I am haunted by my inadequacy to contribute.

I feel this is a valuable entry for an instructor. First, it reveals that Allison who has never experienced a collaborative environment before, does indeed feel a responsibility to this class. Second, she implicitly conveys how beneficial this particular form of interaction has been. And, thirdly, she heightens the instructor's awareness of possible inhibitors to this important collaborative engagement. The instructor may feel that a class discussion on this problem would be worthwhile or she may decide to work it out one-to-one with the student.

The members of the collective must share in this sense of responsibility for the class if collaborative pedagogy is to exist. Developing a sense of responsibility for class

activities may be new for some members, and thus, may take more time for them, but doing so is a necessary ingredient for a successful collaborative endeavor.

Students in this collective are already evaluating classes and showing that they feel a responsibility for what is happening. These are healthy signs that collaborative pedagogy is in operation.

Window Three

Dr. Artiss began the fourth class by telling about the Learneds Conference she had attended. She was pleased with the direction disciplines seemed to be taking. One inconsistency she perceived, however, concerned collaborative work. It seemed that some educators espousing collaborative practice in their published pieces were not actually incorporating it in their classrooms. Dr. Artiss said, "I want feedback when my classroom practices are not consistent with my theories."

Next, Dr. Artiss wanted to go around the circle and have everyone share three things: their favorite authors that they had explored through reading and where their interests in writing and for the collaborative project lay.

A number of students, like Todd, Shay, Olivia, Glenn, and Alexis were interested in some aspect of feminist literary criticism. Shay said that she hadn't been focusing on specific authors but reading at random and watching how the writing has changed over the years. "I'm interested in the history of theories, not only how they changed but why."

"I decided to force myself to do something new and that's why I'm interested in feminist literary criticism. I feel a necessity to learn about feminism and theory so I can participate in the conversation that's going on," Alexis stated. Alexis shared that she felt intimidated in the first discussions about feminist literary criticism because of her lack of background knowledge. "So I grapple trying to find a moment that I know. I decided at the beginning to try and work my way up. Glenn helped in the groups I've been in

with philosophy. I like narrative and it can be taken at so many levels. But I decided to force myself to do something new."

Chad said that he enjoyed the essays that contained wordplays, like "The Laugh of the Medusa" and those by Didion and Jordan. "The ones I like are those transcending self interest, the ones having a humanist approach. I like those pieces which are not speaking *at me.* I do like fiction and playing with words so that you have to think about it."

"That's an important point, Chad," interjected Dr. Artiss. "Not only serving ourselves, but always the *big* question, whose interests are served? Both fiction and poetry can be most transformative."

Cherise, Jeffrey, and Daphne, as well as Nancy and Corwyn preferred the narrative essays. Daphne said, "I really like the black women writers. I have problems with the jargon associated with literary criticism, like deconstructionism."

"I like narrative. I think it hits a wider audience. The other turns people off," commented Jeffrey.

Corwyn added, "I enjoy essays that make me feel something, like Nancy and Daphne Not what Chad likes, plays on words. I'm frustrated by stuff I don't understand. I want to feel something when I have read."

Allison interjected, "But I appreciated when Olivia and I got together just because we disagreed on how we looked at 'Medusa.' I wanted her to read my paper."

Chad offered, "I feel jargon is important. Jargon says a lot in a little space. I don't like when writers fall prey to emotional jingoism."

"I have a short attention span; I like the shorter pieces. I love narrative and the discussions have really helped my understanding of essays," added Cherise.

"Knowledge is created by all of us, that's why we need collaboration and dialogue. Find out, Cherise, how you learn best," Dr. Artiss explained.

"I listen better from others than off the page," responded Cherise.

"So maybe you want to get with others who have similar learning styles. Cherise, maybe you would like to explore criticism of stories and narrative? I'm enough of an academic to want to develop a meta-language about narrative," offered Dr. Artiss.

"I'm into soft feminism, like Atwood. . . . You can be yourself. I don't like women telling other women what to be," commented Judy.

"I agree. Radicals ruin the good that's been happening," Donna added.

Sylvia preferred writers like LeGuin. "Science fiction is a good medium for women's issues."

Allison was the last one to comment. "I want to get each of these writers in perspective historically. What influenced the context in which they wrote. Is Cixous forceful because she wrote in the 1960's? That's my current writing interest. I do like the Canadian writers."

During the break Glenn asked Dr. Artiss about the Learneds Conference. Then they discussed the work of Linda Hutcheon, a writer Glenn was interested in exploring. A number of other students had conversations with Dr. Artiss about the discussion they had just had in class or about their papers.

After the break small groups were formed on the basis of what people had shared in the whole group discussion. These discussions were to lay the groundwork for the next evaluated paper. Allison, Donna, and Shay formed a group to discuss the history of feminism. Chad and Cherise did not want to be in a group where everyone just agreed with one another. Nancy, Jeffrey, and Corwyn wanted to focus on some aspect of narrative writing. Taylor and Sylvia formed a group. And Glenn, Todd, and Alexis were in the group discussing feminist critical theory.

In the critical theory group, Todd asked some questions, and Glenn gave some definitions and perspective. Alexis was taking notes about what was being shared.

Shay, Donna, and Allison were wondering about the starting point for gaining an historical perspective on feminist critical theory and what might be some signposts of the changes that occurred.

Chad and Cherise were finding out where each other was in their perspective about women's issues.

For a while, Daphne and Judy were discussing styles of writing and how men and women write differently because they have different perspectives.

The narrative group began talking about point of view of writers. They began tossing about the idea of trying to write in another perspective for the next paper. Daphne overheard the idea they were considering and decided to join this group. Each one decided that they would write some piece attempting to capture another perspective. Jeffrey shared how differently he and his girlfriend handled grief. Corwyn encouraged him to try and feel like his girlfriend feels and identify with her grief. The discussion continued about what they thought perspective was and how they might attempt to capture another perspective in their writing. Dr. Artiss encouraged the group's decision for each of them to experiment with writing a piece in a perspective of someone with a different gender or sexual orientation.

Near the end of class the entire group met briefly to find out about each group's discussions and ideas for the next formal paper. Students were to continue reading essays from the class texts and have the rough draft of the second formal paper ready to discuss in small groups for the next class. The class ended with Dr. Artiss passing back the first analytical papers and journals.

In this class Dr. Artiss prompted student-centered discussion by providing a time when each student could express reading preferences, opinions and ideas. Giving opportunities for this kind of discussion accomplishes two things. First, the students get

to know one another better and thereby are able to establish a comfortable, risk-taking environment.

Second, students are able to form small groups on the basis of knowledge and purpose. They, again, have the choice to explore with others common interests or to confront others who seem to hold opposite viewpoints. We see Daphne exhibiting that choice well after the discussions were underway as she decided to switch groups. Such a choice fosters and provides those important starting points necessary for productive group work.

Voices Three

The following section consists of a major portion of a journal entry written by Daphne after arriving home from the class just described above.

> What a great class! I feel so invigorated! I got to talk in a group with some new faces with some great ideas. I was quite impressed with the idea of writing a narrative from a different perspective. . . . It's going to be a great exercise! Driving home, I couldn't stop thinking about it. I developed a plan of action, and I kept going through it over and over in my mind. Next thing I knew, I was in my driveway staring at the house. . . . Will I be able to make the reader feel? Will it be believable? I hope so, I really am going to try. . . . I'm fired up and ready to go! I am so grateful to Shay for recommending this course. I have gotten so much already, I can't imagine how I'll feel in August!

After individuals reflected on essays read, the members of this small group shared opinions and concerns through dialogic interaction. This in turn spawned an experimental writing idea. Although this is a required assignment, Daphne's entry gives no hint of imposition or a "have-to" attitude. Rather, we see not only an excitement for actually doing the writing but even a self-generating pre-writing strategy. Daphne realized the need to gain background knowledge which would help her make her

narrative "believable." In a subsequent journal entry, Daphne relates how she did, indeed, go outside the class for input.

> I was very fortunate to have received feedback on my second paper for this course from the people who really knew the issues first hand. . . . I read them my very basic draft for the paper, and they were very enthusiastic in their responses. They felt that overall, I had captured the essence of their lifestyle.

Daphne did not have to be led through a series of defined, teacher-provided steps in order to fulfill the requirements of this assignment. Such student-generated tasks are for me examples of connected learning where student engagements emanate from need and purpose rather than a predetermined formula. Through reflection, dialogue, and then writing, each of these students is framing and reframing her experience for her own and others' learning. This learning dynamic is a key component of collaborative pedagogy.

Window Four

During the week following the fourth class, a number of students came to Dr. Artiss for tutorials and conferences to discuss the grades and comments given on the first analytical paper. So at the beginning of the fifth class, Dr. Artiss explained in detail the criteria she uses to evaluate papers.

> Giving grades is when the rubber meets the road. I wish I didn't have to give them but I have to. I am not looking for 'a right answer' when I read your papers. I see these papers as an opportunity for you to come into a room and listen and take part in the dialogue. Your paper is not just you speaking, or you just listening but an interaction. I evaluate on the basis of how fluently and productively you seem to be entering into the dialogue with the texts and others in this class.

Dr. Artiss then explained the procedure for further refinement by saying,

> I would like you to respond to the comments I have made on your papers in red pen. I don't like abuse so please use I-messages. If you just fix convention errors, there will be no grade change. Whether you go further than that is up to yourself. If you were rushed and have now rethought some of your ideas you may want to do a rewrite. If so, it is due by next Monday. Please make sure you have a handle on these major points.

Dr. Artiss then reviewed some standard editing symbols, cautioned them that their pronouns should have clear antededents, and told them to avoid tautologies. The last two items were explained through examples written on the chalkboard. She then said,

> Some of the criteria I use to help me decide what grade is fair are: if the paper seems to do more or less what the instructions call for, is clear and concise, and is acceptable in spelling and mechanics, it will probably get a C; if it is coherent, that is, if there is a strong focus and clear transition between the different parts and the language is specific and the arguments strong, it will probably be a B; if it meets all these requirements and also really makes me think of the essay in new ways, then the grade will probably be an A.

Dr. Artiss then told the group to watch out for hasty generalizations and the use of words such as true, good, proof, natural, or normal, which suggest simplistic judgements about knowledge and value. "Make sure you identify the assumptions you are making when you use such terms. I don't mean for you to necessarily abandon your thoughts but be very careful when using such weighted terms." To conclude her comments about grading criteria she said, "I love it when you show me new things or challenge what I say."

Dr. Artiss gave a caution about journal writing. The students were to avoid using journals to simply summarize the essays. "I don't need to read summaries; I am really interested in your personal thoughts and critical responses." She encouraged others

who wanted more detailed feedback about their revisions to make an appointment for a tutorial.

Dr. Artiss made one last point before the break, "In your analytical papers, don't respond to one, then separately to the other, and make me do the comparison. Make your comparison explicit."

After the break, small groups formed. This night I went along with Dr. Artiss as she moved from group to group.

She began with a group of two, Chad and Cherise. Chad questioned one of Dr. Artiss's comments on his paper. She replied, "This is my reader response. I'm not speaking from the Mount of Olympus." After some more interchange about journal writing and feedback, Dr. Artiss moved to Allison, Donna, and Shay's group.

This group was discussing feminism. Shay was the only one who had her rough draft with her. For her second analytical paper, Allison was exploring the history of feminist literary criticism, following an interest sparked by the Kolodny essay she read during the first week of class. She had with her some outside articles and wanted to share with the group the direction she was pursuing in her paper.

When Dr. Artiss came around to Todd, Glenn, Alexis, and Olivia's group, Alexis was saying, "Would someone like to read this rough draft out loud?" Olivia did so. Then a discussion on feminism ensued, specifically on the ideological differences between social feminism and liberal or radical feminism. Dr. Artiss commented on the terminology by pointing out that a wide ranging debate is in progress about feminism, and categories are useful in the debate. Both Todd and Olivia had brought in outside articles pertaining to literary criticism.

The final group consisting of Jeffrey, Nancy, Daphne, Julia, Corwyn, and Alexis were involved reading each other's rough drafts of the experimental narratives in which they had attempted to capture a perspective different from their own.

Dr. Artiss concluded the evening by saying that she was booking a seminar room for next week's class.

The fact that there are no prescriptive patterns for collaborative pedagogy does not mean that an anything-goes environment is established. The instructor must have goals and agendas. Dr. Artiss articulated hers in the first class. And this fifth class shows that e .pectations are part and parcel of agendas. Dr. Artiss's statement to Chad shows her feelings about her position as grader in this collective. Her response is just one reader's response and she does not view herself as looking down from an all-knowing position, but in this collective she is the expert in terms of writing experience and because of her placement by the university. Although she is only one judge, she must judge.

I find the way Dr. Artiss assesses writing, as well as the way she conducts classes, grounded in collaborative principles. She gives criteria, and ranks revisions. Conventional items must be taken care of, but it is the content and ideas that are to be considered in revising for a grade change. In such a system, any graded paper is truly a collaborative affair. Its seeds have been planted through readings, watered by peer discussion, fertilized by peer critiquing of the rough drafts, and pruned by the myriad comments on the paper by the instructor. The student now has an opportunity to further cultivate the paper, if she or he so desires, by first responding to Dr. Artiss's comments and then by rewriting parts or the whole. In such a setting the myth of the writer, alone in his garret struggling to find *the* perfect word is debunked. Here, it is understood that writing is not, and never has been, an isolated activity. The voices and ideas we hear in our minds originate from a wider collective. And the perfect word is never to be found. There is no fixed way to say or write. Revision is the constant open to us. With every new voice comes an opportunity for reinterpretation. Collaborative pedagogy is founded on the possibility of endless change and, thus, revision.

One exciting element in a collaborative environment is seeing members seek material and resources of their own initiative. The minimal assignments consisted of writing analytical papers on essays read. By the fifth class, we see students doing research on their own, bringing in relevant articles they have discovered, and exploring different writing forms all generated by discussions and readings. Such initiative as these students are showing is another signpost that collaborative pedagogy is in place.

Voices Four

The fact that excitement exists does not mean that people are not being stretched in their experiences. As this next journal entry by Allison shows, not just writing, but writing in the collaborative environment can be for some a laborious and challenging enterprise.

> I'm having significant problems with Analytical Paper #2. I went to the library and found the perfect article to up-date Kolodny, but it didn't seem enough for my purposes. I was able to find two more relevant articles, but . . .
>
> I think I've bitten off more than I can chew in trying to overview the history of Feminist Literary Criticism. The problem is that is what I want to do! I am an organizer by nature. I need structure in my life. I get really insecure and overwhelmed when I find myself lost in a sea of voluminous and random data. My first and very human coping skill is to categorize. I am finding this class more and more unnerving. In the first week or two, I felt like a sinking ship, but reassured myself that things were going to come together; that I would get the knack of it; that I would eventually understand what was expected of me. This doesn't seem to be happening. While I am learning a lot I'm not sure how.
>
> To be as honest as possible, I am indecisive and lazy. In this class I am forced to make all my own decisions. What kind of paper would you like to do? Or read?

> What would you like to investigate? Or focus on? Every class is so full of questions and self-motivation!
>
> This second paper is so vague in my mind, I'm not sure what I am doing or what is expected of me. I can't ask classmates for help, because everyone is doing something different. Even the prof can only give me broad suggestions because I'm supposed to come up with this one myself. I don't seem to be able to articulate what I'm after, so this disables any advice I seek. The more insecure I get, the more inarticulate. Its a vicious cycle!
>
> I don't mind that this class is decentralized but I need a bit more structure than, it seems, the rest of the class. Is it a sign of immaturity or do I simply lack definition and/or ambition? Either way it doesn't look good for me.

Actually, an instructor of collaborative pedagogy should be delighted with this entry. The previous comment is not meant to diminish Allison's frustration, but rather to highlight the wonderful picture of a collaborative environment that Allison inadvertently paints when she says, "In this class I am forced to make all my own decisions. What kind of paper would you like to do or read? What would you like to investigate or focus on? Every class is so full of questions and self-motivation!" The momentum of any collaborative endeavor is fueled by the questions and self motivation which arise from the many kinds and levels of dialogue engaged in an environment founded on collaborative pedagogy.

Allison does work through this particular dilemma by means of a tutorial with Dr. Artiss. She says in her sixth journal entry,

> I did feel better after talking to the prof last week. You settled a topic and direction for the paper which helped a lot, even though it wasn't what I had initially wanted to focus on. I guess I have to face the fact that I'm not going to get to organize everything.

> Any way I stayed home and worked on my paper and got it in the next evening. In the meantime, Sue called me to fill me in on what I missed. I'm actually glad I didn't go. It sounded dreadful. . . .

Often because students are so personally involved in this environment, it seems as soon as one problem is conquered another one is on the scene. Allison has worked through one problem only to learn of more difficulties associated with the class. The class Allison is referring to in her entry is the sixth, my next focus for exploring collaborative pedagogy.

Window Five

The day before this class, Dr. Artiss phoned me and asked me to arrive about a half an hour late for the next class. She told me that because a number of students had mentioned me in their journal entries she felt the class needed to discuss my presence, and that the discussion might be more open if I were not present.

When I arrived the group was discussing the class itself. Cherise was saying that she thought it was important to have the whole group reconvene after every small group session so everyone could benefit from all the discussions.

Shay then brought up the subject of absenteeism. She felt that absences or not having the assigned work completed really kept the small groups from progressing. "Maybe those absent the week before could form a group so the others could get on with their work in a more consistent way."

Dr. Artiss suggested that class members get each other's phone number and call if they could not make it. Alexis said that "a little bit of guilt goes a long way." But Julia commented that she might not come if people came down on her. I commented that underlying what I was hearing in this discussion was the importance of commitment in this class. Dr. Artiss suggested that maybe if the members present took it upon

themselves to call the ones absent, more responsibility might be generated for the small groups, as well as the class as a whole.

Some students brought up the fact that they felt there was a condescending attitude exhibited in some of the small group sessions which inhibited discussion. Dr. Artiss said, "Our purpose is not to homogenize everyone. How can we best tap into each other and, most important, come to know yourselves better through dialogic interaction? How can we do it better?"

Shay offered, "I think each person should pick out a journal entry to share."

Dr. Artiss thought this was a good idea and asked that each person pick out an entry or part of an entry to share with the whole group next week.

Olivia said it can get sticky if someone criticizes you after you have shared a part of yourself.

"But what do we do?" asked Dr. Artiss. "Disband?"

"No, it is better to keep on but it is easier when you know everyone," offered Olivia.

"When I first walked in I was confused and knew I lacked in knowledge about aspects of feminism," said Alexis. "I feel we need to be sensitive to others when we have knowledge or lack knowledge."

"I think you are saying two things need to happen," said Dr. Artiss. "First, people need to be more up front and say 'I don't know,' and then those responding to their questions must be careful in the way they offer what they know or feel. Is there anything else you think would be productive?"

Sylvia pointed out that in two classes during the small group discussion times she ended up off in a corner with just one other person wishing she could be in another group. "When there are just two of you, you end up either totally agreeing or disagreeing and neither is valuable."

Dr. Artiss said that if anyone found themselves in unproductive situations, it was important to talk with her at the break so some negotiating could take place. "You must make sure your own needs are being met as we work together in groups."

During the break, Dr. Artiss told me that when the group reconvened, she would review some of the points made during their discussion about me. Then the class wanted me to explain my research once again.

Dr. Artiss called everyone together and presented the group's questions and concerns about my presence. First, they wanted to know about the content of the notes I was "furiously" taking during class sessions. There seemed to be a feeling of mystery surrounding my presence that was somewhat uncomfortable. What was made clear by the students was that in this collective, they wanted me to be a participator, not just an observer.

I explained in more detail than I had during the first class about the nature of my research into collaborative learning. (I used the term learning rather than pedagogy to avoid jargon with which they would be unfamiliar.) I assured them that my notes did not contain judgments on anything that happened or was said. Rather, they contained straight-forward information about what occurred in class sessions. I added that they were free to read my notes at any time. Feeling a need to negotiate my level of participation, I offered the following comments:

> I appreciate the fact that you want my participation and please be assured that I will participate on every occasion that I feel I have something to contribute. But I won't be able to participate in all discussions focusing on specific readings or essays. My own reading agenda associated with my research is quite heavy, and I cannot possibly keep up with all that each of you is reading. I am also willing to critique any of your papers not on the basis of content which relates to a specific text but for clarity and for their success in drawing me, a fellow learner, into your dialogues.

> I want to stress how much I appreciate having access to your written material. I can assure you that I consider your journals private and personal, and as such, I will keep confidential anything of a personal nature that you have shared. Know that I am only interested in your reflections and ideas about the class and learning-related concerns. Again, I want to make clear that my thesis is not concerned with judging the participation, behavior, or opinions of individuals. Rather, it will deal with what practices foster collaborative learning.
>
> I also publicly want to thank Dr. Artiss for being so open about her practices. I consider this class a valuable learning opportunity for all of us.

Dr. Artiss then asked the group to again discuss possible directions for the collaborative project. After this time of expressing ideas, Dr. Artiss reminded everyone to have a journal entry or a portion of an entry ready to share aloud in next week's class. For the last part of the class session Dr. Artiss requested the following:

> With the time left tonight, I would like everyone to write a journal entry in which you comment on tonight's class and the class in general, as well as express your preferences for the collaborative project. Please turn this in before you leave.

A fitting descriptor for the above class is negotiation. In the second class we saw negotiation occurring between Dr. Artiss and an individual student. But in this sixth class we see it as an important group dynamic in collaborative pedagogy.

It was exciting for me as a researcher to see the group and me jointly negotiate my role in this collective in a very direct way. My role was indeed unfolding. The students' honest concerns expressed in their journals were signals to Dr. Artiss that an open discussion was needed about my presence. That Dr. Artiss desired an honest dialogue is evident by her asking me not to be present as students aired their concerns. The following excerpts from the journal entries written at the end of this class reveal that

the discussion which took place about my presence did position me in a new way in the group.

Julia, a student who had not been in the first class meeting, and so did not hear my initial explanation, says:

> I really liked the fact that Jan had some input because before tonight I had absolutely no idea of who she was or what she was doing in the class. I was never uncomfortable with her presence but I was always curious about her purpose.

Cherise comments:

> I'm glad we had an opportunity to discuss Jan's presence here. It wasn't that I minded her (quite the opposite) I was just curious to know where all her furious scribbling was going to end up. I'd hate to open a magazine some day and see myself as a guinea pig in a discussion of new classroom techniques!!! Just kidding - I know that we'd never be abused in that manner!

Olivia writes:

> Well, Jan has spoken - quelle difference! So Dr. Artiss now it's more interesting to know what she's looking for and I'll definitely find some questions to ask her. . . .
>
> Jan, yes I suppose I should address some lines to you now that I know something maybe I'll write a journal specifically towards you as audience.

With concise humor, Glenn writes, "Never had no problem no way with Jan."

Finally, I use Todd's entry to show the comfortableness between people that I believe real negotiation spawns. The class wants my input; they have given me permission not only to read what they write but to become part of the on-going dialogue. With Todd's entry, I include my comments. These represent a turning point in my role with this collective. The comments Dr. Artiss and I wrote in the margins were usually accompanied by arrows which indicated their place of relevance. For clarity and flow I italicize my insertions. Todd writes:

> First of all, the Jan question - I'm delighted that she was neither offended by the anonymous criticisms nor unwilling to explain her situation. I think what we (I) needed was to see her put herself into the fray as a real person, not as a detached observer. But our (my) behavior seemed, well, a little animalistic, as if we (I) just wanted to inspect the new creature *Hope I smelled okay!* before letting her join the pack. *It would have taken more than one "animal" to keep me out of things but that is not to say I wouldn't have respected your "territory."* This problem is out of the way and we can move on. *Your metaphor made me smile. Hope you don't mind my playing with it! Jan.*

By encouraging the discussion that took place in this class, Dr. Artiss shows that she sees all class management concerns as important items to be negotiated by the collective. Rather than dictate, she chooses to draw from the group solutions, possibilities, and suggestions that foster a productive and caring learning environment. Although most of Dr. Artiss's comments have focused on enhancing the group dynamic, it is evident in her comment to Sylvia that a successful group endeavor does not mean an individual must sacrifice her own positive learning experience. In collaborative pedagogy, it is the reciprocal nature of the growth of the individual learner contributing to the growth of the group which, in turn, enhances and further motivates the individual that makes this praxis so viable.

I believe the salient features of collaborative pedagogy that are displayed in this sixth class, such as the reflexivity and openness fostered through journal writing, Dr. Artiss's desire for honesty, and mutual responsibility for the class dynamic, not only allow for such negotiation, but demand that it take place continually on many levels. I will explore this idea further by amplifying other ideas expressed in the journal entries written in the class just described.

Voices Five

In the class mentioned above, negotiation occurred about my place in this collective and also about class management concerns. It is evident that Dr. Artiss does not see herself, nor does she want to be viewed by the other members of the class, as the sole person responsible for making this endeavor succeed. Dr. Artiss, taking cues from previous journal entries about class management concerns, shows that, for her, inclusive decision-making is an important aspect of collaborative pedagogy. But as is shown by the following samples from the in-class journal entries, as well as Allison's comment about the class previously mentioned, there are no easy answers for deciding what things should be negotiated by the class. Shay says:

> Tonight's class is exciting, honest, very progressive and fun. It's a shame so many people were missing. I think we have an excellent handle on how to work in this class. It was shown tonight by talking about some people's inhibitions concerning Jan in our class. We discussed any problems and satisfactorily worked them out. . . . I'm happy I decided to take this course and I'm looking forward to next week's discussions.

Julia shows agreement with Shay when she writes:

> I think this class was particularly productive in matters of housekeeping. By the end of the class it seemed as if the atmosphere had changed, the air had been cleared. . . .
>
> We talked about absenteeism and found no solution. I stand firm on the fact that people should not be ostracized for a missed class because other students have no idea of what might have been going on in the lives of their classmates. I admit that it could become a terrible problem during the collaborative project but, perhaps knowing that the grade of another person, or rather other people, is at state will enforce a sense of responsibility.

Jeffrey agrees, as well, when he states:

I'm glad all the groundwork was addressed again especially regarding group work and the feedback. I have no problems with my group and I don't see anything to change. I think the absent problem discussed was worth the time because when persons are missing from the group, we are missing out on ideas just as much as them.

Loved the idea of sharing journal entries. I think it will help me get to know the class better and to understand them.

Cherise seems ambivalent about the class discussion when she says:

So many ideas have been expressed tonight. I think I need an anacin. No make it a 222 w/codeine.

People have been very open with their opinions. I think we're all going pretty much in the same direction with the odd exception. I can't help but feeling that a certain one or two people are really not happy in 3817; this class has certainly clarified that. . . .

On the matter of absenteeism I think we got carried away on this topic. We discussed it for a whole 20 minutes, and I think this time could have been put to better use. I don't think it's an incredibly great problem. I'm happy with the class!!! I do realize however that once the ball starts rolling, it's hard to stop. We seem to have problems here drawing "the line" I guess we're all blabber mouths.

I am excited about hearing other people's journals next Thursday.

Alexis makes the following observations:

Boy, its quite ironic how all this stuff that people are expressing in their journals is not coming out in the class or open air. People are very afraid of giving offense, of creating conflict. They deal with the easier subjects of the evening like attendance (I mean easier as in non-emotional). People seem very afraid of challenge or debate. . . . I guess the expression of frustration on paper is certainly the safest way of doing it. I wonder if the class is non-confrontational because it's

> women? or is it because there are a few quiet people who everyone is afraid of hurting. . . . This is all so very complicated and sensitive stuff. Anyway I think next week's journal readings may do something.

Glenn seems to agree with Cherise when he writes,

> The first part of the class was rather tedious. Absenteeism (Yawn!).

Todd makes interesting observations when he writes:

> Tonight's class was self-consciously diplomatic. Let me say first of all that I really admire how you [the instructor] made an effort to resolve whatever problems might have been out there. I'm not sure that the situation was as tense or as serious as you might have feared, but I'm glad that some of these ugly matters were dragged out into the light of day. There's no real animosity among the class; people seemed genuinely willing to be polite and compromising. Things, it seems now, will work themselves out with no real bloodshed . . .
>
> Our elaborate discussion of how to organize groups and things was somewhat pointless, I thought. After all, we only have one or two such classes left, so spending an hour talking about a moot question isn't really the best way to use our time. But these administrative details must be dealt with, I guess, and again, having gotten them out of the way, we can move on to other things. . . .
>
> All things considered, this class was . . . monotonous at times, but a necessary and beneficial step in the flow of our semester. Let's close the book on it, and turn our eyes toward next week.

From these excerpts I see, first, a real desire to get to know one another better in order that openness can exist. This again shows a concern on the part of members for the success of the group, as well as, a sense of responsibility for class happenings.

Second, I see questions arising from the spectrum of the opinions expressed that must be dealt with by any facilitator of collaborative pedagogy. What things should be

negotiated by the class? How much time should be spent on these? Does every management item need to be negotiated? Dr. Artiss's comments written in response to some of the journal entries show that she knows she does not have all the answers for creating the perfect environment. In reference to Cherise's comment about the time wasted on absenteeism, Dr. Artiss writes,

> The difficulty is that what seems like too much time on a subject for some members of the class seems just right (or even too little) for others. I'm a great believer in trusting people to speak up if they'd like to suggest moving on. Please do so next time.

This is a very real problem for every collective. Because certain things that are important to some are of little concern for others and because collaboration precludes dictatorial practices, the facilitator's job becomes quite difficult at times. The problem is further complicated by the fact that, as Allison pointed out in her second journal entry, students are not used to making decisions or being self-motivators. Their passive education has neither prepared them to do so nor to realize, as Jeffrey pointed out, how important each individual is to the success of the collaborative endeavor. In the didactic classroom, whether any one student is present or not will have little or no effect on that class's agenda. Thus, students carry with them habits accrued as a result of their previous educational experiences. The instructor incorporating collaborative pedagogy is breaking new ground for many students. Dr. Artiss makes just this point when in another marginal comment she says, "The readings and structure of classes are very risky for some people." Drawing people into the "risk zone" is a key goal of collaborative pedagogy but doing so takes sensitivity, trial *and* error, and intuitive knowledge, not formulas or unchallengeable demands.

Window Six

The ninth class is my next focus. Dr. Artiss began, "Tonight we will devote to the collaborative project. I have never done this in a class before so we will work it out together. Before we do, there are some items I must deal with." First, Dr. Artiss encouraged the students to come and see her right away about any problems they were having. "I feel bad when I read in journals two weeks later you were struggling with something that I could have helped you with." By this time in the semester, students were passing in revised drafts of the third analytical papers. Dr. Artiss asked that students make sure to date all work. She also pointed out that her comments were always made in pencil so they could be erased. Then to reiterate a very important aspect of this class, she reread the first paragraph on the course outline and then said,

> It is very important that whether you are sharing personally or more formally, that you come to some level of your own encounter with the readings and ideas. Your writing should be dialogic, a bringing of your ideas, thoughts, and feelings to the paper. The more dialogic your papers and journals have been the more I value them.
>
> Also, giving feedback on disembodied papers without a context is difficult. I need the Process Log. I need to know what you were trying to do. I need to know what you want me to do.
>
> Now the collaborative class project!

The discussion which ensued covered possible topics for and problems with doing a collaborative project. Olivia expressed the concern that coming to some consensus and working as a collaborating whole group was going to be difficult since they were used to working in small groups. A lot of ideas, including the making of a video, looking at media exploitation, exploring feminism in art, doing a mini-study to determine gender bias in readers' responses, were bandied about until break. By the end of the discussion, it was apparent that people felt it was best that they break up into

small groups on the basis of the shared ideas, and members of each group would work to develop one theme or project. These would then be shared on July 29th with the whole group, after which everyone would write a journal entry on the collaborative presentations.

After break, Dr. Artiss wanted some feedback on the final. "I would like you to decide whether you would like the final to be a take-home or an on-site exam."

To which Cherise stated, "I'm uncomfortable having a choice. You should decide. Anything with a strawberry on top."

Daphne said, "I'm reveling in this. I want the strawberries on top!"

"Any suggestions or questions?" queried Dr. Artiss.

Allison commented, "This has been so individualized. What kind of questions can you come up with?"

"But I don't see us as individuals having gone off on our own," added Dr. Artiss.

"See, I've been lost. I haven't known what we are doing and I'm going to find the exam frustrating," Allison responded.

"Maybe we need to hear from each other again. I think we will share some statements from your journals next week, as well as work on the collaborative project."

The final portion of class was spent on forming the small groups and crystallizing the focus of each of the collaborative projects.

On the class outline, it states that a Process Log is to accompany each analytical paper. In this class, with the third set of evaluated papers coming in, Dr. Artiss stressed the importance of following through on this requirement. I would like to look at Dr. Artiss's use of the Process Log, a copy of which can be found in Appendix B.

In the very first class I described in Window One, Dr. Artiss provided various means by which she and each student would be helped to build a context for the gender and writing class by articulating past and present experiences and expectations. With

the assumption underlying collaborative pedagogy that our language is a product of socialization, culture, and history, fleshing out context at every opportunity is a vital requirement. I feel Dr. Artiss's use of the Process Log is one more way of doing this. Her descriptor "disembodied papers" is telling. Unlike some instructors, who base their evaluation on whether or not a paper's content is in harmony with the instructor's own ideas, Dr. Artiss posits very different criteria.

I see this Process Log providing two important kinds of contextual knowledge. First, it allows students to reflect on the learning they have done as a result of this assignment. What inspired the topic and focus? What writing preparation was necessary? What was helpful? What has hindered? How does this work compare to previous experiences? I see encouraging such reflection as an effective way of helping students become aware of their own learning styles. Second, the answers to these questions give the instructor vital information for continually fine-tuning the collaborative endeavor underway in this particular context. This log communicates the idea that there is no preconceived body of information to which a paper will be compared. It implicitly reiterates that Dr. Artiss's criteria for evaluation come out of her own desire to learn, to be shown, to change. Depositing information and having students "spit it out" almost in the same form as it went in, has no place in this class. Honest questions asked by both instructor and students are the learning guides. Thus, the writing done in a collaborative environment is writing that attempts to capture a genuine journey or a wrestling with ideas. I see Dr. Artiss's use of this Process Log as an important element in the collaborative pedagogy in this collective.

A number of students had expressed nothing but positive comments about the learning experience they are having in 3817. Daphne referring in a journal entry to an earlier class wrote,

> In class (English 3817) I heard phrases such as "How did that make you feel?" or "Go with it." I enjoy it. . . . I can't get my academic mask to stay on. It keeps

> falling off. After three classes, it's definitely getting more comfortable. I like new experiences. It just takes me time to change mode. I can feel myself learning new ideas and views, and also applying them to my life.

But there are other students who at this juncture in the semester are experiencing frustration similar to that of which Allison hinted in her comment regarding the final. I feel there are very valuable lessons to be learned by probing the struggles students have either with the whole collaborative endeavor or with parts of it.

Voices Six

Todd went home from the class just described in Window Six and wrote a journal entry that began as follows:

> I can't do it anymore. I can't go on pretending that everything in our class is going smashingly.... Practically nothing is going well. I do not approve of where we have gone with this class. And I have some things to say about collaboration that I am sure you don't want to hear. So I think this would be a good occasion to vent some of the frustrations that have been building up in me for the past few weeks.

In Voices Five Todd expressed some boredom with the class discussions but said that he felt the housekeeping things were necessary. In a journal entry written a week before the one above, Todd had already expressed frustration with the class by saying:

> The discussions involving the entire class are neither very enjoyable nor productive for me. Usually, a couple of people dominate the time talking about things relevant only to them and not important to the rest of us. Frankly, I'm bored by talk. The round-table discussions at the beginning of the class take up what seems to be an excessive amount of time with administrative problems, which I suppose is unavoidable. Personally, I would like to see our initial talks made as short and focused as possible, so we can split up into our groups and start learning.

The strains of discontent in these two earlier entries seem to explode in the entry which begins this Voices section. Later in the entry he wrote,

> Collaboration is not an end in itself; it is not an agenda desired for its own sake - or at least I've never thought so. Instead, it is a tool to learning and when people stop learning something is dreadfully wrong. I don't care whether a classroom is democratic or not, I still believe that a professor's duty is to force people to learn. It doesn't have to be brutal or oppressive but learning does have to occur. In this class, however, a few people have decided that they're not interested in learning and thrust their will on the rest of us.
>
> Forgive me for sounding like a banking-educator or a logocentrist . . . but something is wrong with this sort of classroom. I know you're quite fond of asking whose interests are served by a variety of structures. . . . Let me ask you this: Whose interests are served by squelching intellectual curiosity in the name of democracy? Whose interests are served by letting the lazy go unpunished and dragging the motivated down to their level? Perhaps most importantly, whose interests are served by treating everyone so equitably that fairness disappears?
>
> I hope you can answer these questions . . . because I . . . can't. I now have no expectation of having any meaningful collaboration with the class as a whole. The only thing I can reasonably hope . . . is that my little group can as much as possible be left alone so that we can learn something.

Todd expresses discontent and Allison in the last class stated openly that things have been so "individualized" that she feels "lost."

The honesty which to me characterizes the above comments is significant. I have quoted just a small portion of Todd's entry which is actually six pages long. In a subsequent entry, Todd refers back to this particular offering as an "attack" on the class and the professor. The honesty is refreshing for onlookers, but I have considered how threatening such expressions would be to many instructors. Is such honesty possible

because of Dr. Artiss's expressed desire that people level with her about "her own practice," or is it part and parcel of collaborative pedagogy? As I see with many things, it is not one or the other but a merging, a oneness of instructor with the pedagogy; one cannot exist without the other. Collaborative pedagogy cannot take place if an instructor's fears, insecurities, or authoritarian bent prohibit honest dialogic encounter.

Considering how strongly Todd expresses a sense of frustration with the class, I find significant the change in tone and content of both an added note prefacing the above entry and a journal entry he wrote after the next class. His note stated,

> This journal entry requires a word of caution. Looking at it now (several days after writing it), it strikes me as too bitter, even too unfair. But I do think it's honest. It accurately reflects what I thought and felt at the time; it helped me blow off some steam. I doubt I would write anything as caustic now. Please, take my acrimony with a grain of salt, okay?

His journal entry elaborated a similar theme. He wrote,

> It's 11:30, and I've been feeling awful. Class has been over for an hour and a half, but I've just been sitting here, and feeling steadily more guilty about one I wrote last week. With any luck, you will not have read it before this entry crosses your desk. This, by the way, is something along the lines of an apology . . . or a psychological examination. I'm not sure which. . . .
>
> Let me explain. Last week, I didn't enjoy the class very much, surely for a variety of reasons. Frustrated and annoyed, I went away and wrote a bitter journal entry slamming the class, attacking our methods. . . . Now don't misunderstand me - the piece served its purpose because it helped me blow off steam. But I now am not sure that my attack . . . was at all justified.
>
> Here's the rub: tonight's class was wonderful. You orchestrated an orderly, congenial, and thoughtful round-table discussion that worked brilliantly. No one dominated; everyone spoke . . . and ideas flowed with respect and patience. It

> was, in short, as good an example of collaboration as I've ever seen. This stuff really can work . . . don't ever let me convince you otherwise. After class, I looked at your comments on my papers (and Jan's comments, too, which were great . . .). I then started thinking about all the real dialogue you and I have exchanged in the past two years, and about how much you have helped me learn.

I received these two journal entries together. When I read them, what struck me again was the important role that journal writing plays in this collective. My comments written to Todd at the end of the second entry express this idea:

> I read these entries in tandem. I don't think I have a better example of the valuable role journal writing plays than in these two submissions. What strikes me is that because the at-the-moment gut reaction was captured and crystallized, as it were, by writing it down; you had to reflect, to go back over things. It seems doing the first actually "forced" reflexiveness, Thank you . . . I must get this idea down for my thesis. I guess I have just exalted the tirade.

Journal writing like this allows the spotlight to be turned on one's own learning practice, as well as the classroom dynamic. Questions like, what type of class discussions do I find most valuable? what grouping organization benefits me most? or what has fostered or deterred my learning? not only help students monitor their own learning experience, but provide the instructor with vital information for enhancing the learning momentum.

Further into the second entry, Todd says,

> I beat up a system whose very nature allowed me to beat it up. . . . My position is similar to that of a political radical who condemns freedom of speech - the target of the attack is precisely that which makes the attack possible in the first place. . . .
>
> I've taken your teaching methods for granted. Of course, I'm not retracting everything I said last week, because I still have some problems with the way things have gone But . . . I've discovered now that working through the occasional

> problems is infinitely better than walking away from your system of learning, because when it works, it works brilliantly.

It seems that through this journal writing experience, Todd has a different perspective on the value of collaboration.

The dialectic in these two entries reminds me of Volosinov (1973) when he says, "Realized expression in its turn, exerts a powerful reverse influence on experience" (p. 90) and "A new significance emanates from an old one, and does so with its help, but this happens so that the new significance can enter unto contradiction with the old one and restructure it" (p. 106). Journal writing is an effective medium for setting in motion the dialogue with oneself and others that creates a dialectic which I believe generates knowledge.

The class that Todd refers to in his latter entry has its own, rather unique, context which I will now explore in Window Seven.

Window Seven

The possible causes for Todd's frustrations are numerous. One consideration might be that learning, like physical growth, can have times of spurts and stagnancies. Another contributing factor could be the shift in focus the collective is taking from the analytical papers to the collaborative project. Dr. Artiss said attempting a collaborative project of the kind she asked the class to do was new for her and just maybe everyone's uncertainty about exactly how to proceed has made the learning momentum slow down. But I have another possible explanation that stems from my involvement with this class as a researcher.

It was at this point in my study that I began taping interviews with the students in this collective. I was quite surprised by what a number of students had to say, for it seemed to me that some of their in-class comments did not always reflect the views and ideas they so readily shared in the interviews. What became apparent to me is that

members of this collective had not come to a common understanding of some key words, such as feminism, politics, structures of power, and socialization that had surfaced in the discussions. Thus, preconceived definitions framed how people were interpreting what others said. While taping, it became evident that people who considered themselves on "the other side" from others in the collective, were really in the same camp when definitions and assumptions were articulated. I think that in part, "lines" had been drawn that very first week when some felt alienated from ideas expressed in certain essays while others were in harmony with the essays' points of view.

I decided to share my observations with Dr. Artiss and Glenn, a student who I had learned through our conversations together had a keen interest in the workings of collaborative learning. Having informed students that I might share portions of their interviews with both Dr. Artiss and Glenn, the three of us met "to collaborate on collaboration."

I found the differences in Dr. Artiss's and Glenn's responses to the interview excerpts interesting. Dr. Artiss was not surprised by what she heard on the tapes. After all, she had been immersed in the journals and analytical papers of all the members of this collective. Dr. Artiss was aware of a larger picture of student opinions and ideas. Glenn, however, was quite surprised, as I had been. A number of times what a person said during the interview did not seem to reflect how Glenn or I had perceived their views to be based on their comments in class. As well, Glenn seemed surprised when he discovered that his use of a word, like 'politics', differed significantly from how others were using the term. It became apparent to the three of us that in a number of class discussions people had been talking past one another because there had been no coming to terms with common definitions.

Subsequently, we decided that in the next class the discussion needed to focus students in such a way that underlying assumptions and definitions would be revealed. Dr. Artiss decided that she would choose some controversial ideas expressed in various

journal entries, and present them anonymously to the whole group. The discussion which took place in that next class was the one Todd said "worked brilliantly." It was this class that seemed to make Todd change his opinion about the value of collaboration.

Voices Seven

As previously stated, part of my research agenda emanated from questions about sources and generation of knowledge. I was interested in finding out what or who were the sources of knowledge and how this knowledge was generated in this collective. I wanted to find out, as well, if members in this collective saw a difference between the learning occurring in this class and in other courses they had taken. Since the instructor's role frames the context for the how and the what of knowledge in a classroom, some of my interview questions (see Appendix C) were designed to explore the relationship of knowledge and Dr. Artiss's role in this collective. For this discussion, I draw from the interview material of four students.

When asked to describe Dr. Artiss's role, the students used words like mediator, facilitator, and guide. Corwyn said, "She is not as much a teacher as a coordinator. She is there to direct our discussions and give us topics to discuss. She gives us information but is not there to tell us what is right from wrong, but to more or less, guide us." Glenn pointed out that,

> Dr. Artiss as a mediator tries to be unbiased and non-partisan. This fits perfectly with the notions of socially constructed knowledge, the collective effort, and decentering the classroom. And she seems to do it most of the time. She's conscious of being a teacher, thus, she does guide the conversation and what we do to a certain extent. She has an agenda and usually starts out the class telling us what that agenda is.

Daphne first made this comparison to explain Dr. Artiss's role:

> It's like she's taking you on this voyage and she's saying, "To the left we have this and to the right we have this." We are there to observe and learn and it's like she's guiding us in the right direction throughout the journey but it's our job to learn as we go.

Later in the interview Daphne made this analogy:

> It's like going on a library tour and she is the guide. All that knowledge is out there and she's showing me how to go get it. If I go get it, I can really get somewhere. If I don't take advantage of that, I get nothing.

Besides the students who had taken a class from Dr. Artiss before, only Allison said that she had one other course that had been decentered, a term she defined as a type of class where the professor doesn't do all the lecturing and the students are expected to have input. "Everyone has an equal share and an equal say." Allison describes the scene in most classes as one where "you sit down, the professor stands up, lectures about the subject, and you write notes, and then go away and think about what was said." Cherise reflected on the difference between Dr. Artiss and other instructors:

> As a person she's not really different. I've had some really nice professors. It's more her teaching methods, not just her. It's like she teaches in circles and everyone else teaches in squares. This is true even with other women teachers. One I had was very nice and she did promote conversation but there was still that element of monarch. I didn't learn as much in her class as I'm learning in Dr. Artiss's class.

Students echoed each other when they said that in other classes the knowledge was given out by the instructor for them to "regurgitate" and "spit back" on tests. Allison pointed out that, in other classes, knowledge also came from textbooks but often the professor interpreted the text material. Daphne explained the adjustment she had to make as a member of the class:

> You are programmed from day one to give the professor what he wants because that is how you get a good mark. You find out what this person wants, what it is they are looking for, how they want things written, what they want you to get out of the course and that is what you focus on. So for a while, I was preoccupied with what it was she was trying to get from me so I could give it to her. I started relaxing when I realized that what was important was that we were to figure out things on our own.

Glenn expressed a similar idea when he talked about how in other classes he felt like it was a game of guessing the right answer or the interpretation in the mind of the instructor.

> Dr. Artiss tries to make each person feel comfortable within her limits and treats each individual as an individual. That gives the individual a sense of power that he or she is not going to be judged on the basis of right and wrong so that a person can say something tentatively so it can be flushed out. I don't think people are overly conscious that they are constructing knowledge but the interaction of the class deciding what we read and what we do from day to day gives a sense of power. That's a big thing for me in this course. I feel so much more active and powerful. I'm a part of the process rather than just being acted on by a lecture.

Like Glenn, students painted a very different picture of the source of knowledge in this endeavor. "In this class," said Corwyn, "we learn just as much from each other as we do from Dr. Artiss. Students are involved; we have equal input and everyone is on equal footing." Corwyn went on and shared an example of how even outside of class discussions knowledge is being generated between members of the collective.

> I wanted some other ideas outside of class and asked Glenn to meet with me. He came over to my house to help me with the collaborative project. He's not in my group but I felt he could help me with what I was dealing with. We talked for an hour about the project and then for another two hours about other things.

Allison stated that the essays were a very important source of knowledge for her. But in this class, Dr. Artiss did not interpret any of the texts. "You do the readings, the thinking, the writing, and the talking and she just guides it all."

It became apparent that it was not only the many sources of knowledge that made this class different but the type of knowledge that was generated, as well. Here is a portion of the interview with Allison that deals with the kind of knowledge she saw being generated in this course.

Q: What have you been learning in this course?

A: I've learned about female literary criticism through the readings. But I don't think I would have understood the thread that tied them altogether if the professor hadn't been there to say we should be questioning our assumptions and that this is all dialogue and we're all just supposed to talk about this and nobody is right or wrong. She solidified it all.

Q: What kind of knowledge is this?

A: It is really a structure; there is no knowledge to get in this course. I think the whole course is an exercise in self-awareness and self-questioning.

Q: What is knowledge to you?

A: It is facts and figures.

Q: So self-awareness would be in another category for you?

A: Yes, a higher category. I think the two go hand-in-hand. I mean you can't be ignorant and be self-aware. You have to be knowledgeable and self-aware.

Q: Can you be knowledgeable and not self-aware?

A: Of course you can. Lots of people that can get up there and talk about something and not have it affect their lives. I think if you are going to learn anything you need to apply it to your life.

Q: Does this course make you do that more?

A: Yes, definitely.

Q: So you would consider the learning that is taking place for you in this class at a higher level?

A: It is more personal than just information gathering, and of course that is better.

Cherise expressed a difference in the learning taking place in this context and the learning she had been used to. "The school system I went through produced square products and the school system Dr. Artiss promotes has round products. At least that is how I see it in my brain; concrete versus flowing ideas; a flowing and learning from others."

When asked how she had changed as a result of this class, Daphne said:

> Before this class I hated to write anything. Now I don't mind it as much. I can write much faster and I can get things down in a much better way. I have learned that there are different ways of writing other than what the history department or the political science department tells you.
>
> As well, this course teaches you that you have to listen, absorb, and understand other perspectives to work things out because life is a group. You are always in a group and you have to listen and learn how to make a group work.

From the above comments, three things are evident about knowledge in this class. First, in this environment, knowledge is, as Glenn pointed out, socially constructed by the members in this collective. As the comments above reflect, there is a sense of equal status for each member's ideas or contributions. Here there is not an imposed position of expertise but rather a shifting and pooling of expertise as students share and seek opinions and constructive criticism from each other, as well as the instructor. Second, it is clear to me that the generation of knowledge in this collective hinges on dialogue, both the written and the oral. The journals and assignments capture individual inner dialogues, which are themselves constituted by a polyphony of voices from such sources as written texts, others in the collective, and experience. The members of this collective have touched one another through the on-going dialogic encounters taking place both in and out of class. Third, the kind of knowledge being generated is far more than information gathering. The knowledge generated in this class seems to be, as Allison describes it above, in a "higher category," a knowledge which results in "self-awareness." This knowledge comes into being through the "flowing of ideas," by entertaining "multiple perspectives," and by exposing "assumptions and biases." I believe that this is the knowledge of individual and collective interpretation which, although characterized by a tentativeness, empowers members for individual and social transformation.

Window Eight

In this final window, I will look at how Dr. Artiss brings to a close this collaborative endeavor.

Through conversations with a number of the students, I gathered information about how their collaborative groups worked. Glenn began describing his experience in his group by comparing it with a group experience in another course:

In this other class we also had a small group project to do but the project was seen as distinct and separate from everything else. . . . The projects were set and assigned by the drawing of numbers. There was conflict in the group . . . because two of us were doing all the work and the other three weren't and there was no way to get them to do the work because there was no overriding theory or premise that we were to cooperate and negotiate and deal with each other personally at a positive level. In this course the project was just something to get done. In this class the project is a whole process characterized by negotiation.

When our group first met the other three were socializing. The talk was about movies. I tried to steer the discussion towards the project. I saw that there was a division between us: I wanted to do something in French feminist theory. Olivia wanted to look at art, Sylvia was interested in films, and Todd wanted to look at gender issues in Shakespeare. I saw that if everyone was to be included we would have to forego work on French feminism. So I suggested that we look at how women are signified in various media, like art, movies, literature, and videos and rap. This helped us evolve a common basis.

It became apparent that the other members wanted to do their part of the project independently and then come back and tie everything together by drawing ideas from feminist literary criticism to create what seemed to me a rather superficial overview. This is not what I had in mind. Although I was interested in videos and rap and had previously talked with Dr. Artiss about the possibilities of this topic, it was not really what I wanted to do for a culminating project. I had wanted to find a common basis or thesis in French literary criticism. . . . I really gave up the most in the group, since the others were working on some aspect of what they initially expressed an interest in. But that's okay. The rap issue will be a diversion for me.

In the last class, which took place in Dr. Artiss's home with food and beverage on hand, the projects were presented. The presentations consisted of a video on PMS, a

two-character play about abortion, a mini-study on reader bias, a look at media through the perspective of feminist literary criticism, and three essays (each with a different slant) on black women writers. Lively discussions followed each presentation. In addition, Dr. Artiss asked each student to write a journal entry which gave a response to each collaborative project, as well as information on the student's own experience with his or her own project. Taylor wrote:

> . . . some great dialogue at Dr. Artiss's. What a night! . . . This exercise has been very helpful. . . . Collaboration was great! I didn't think it would work, but it did. I think you have to be willing to give-in to an extent, in order to make it work. It is easy to want things your way, but in collaboration, it isn't just you any longer. If you want to keep your partners, you have to be willing to concede sometimes. You have to find time to talk to your group. You can't leave it until the night before it's due and expect it to work. It is a time-sequenced process.
>
> Dialogue is very important to collaboration. You knock back and forth ideas, as well as speak up when you agree or disagree. You have to speak - you have to help the group. Silence is the wrong voice to use - it lets your group down. In collaboration you have a certain freedom - you use your voice whenever necessary to defend your ideas. . . . I like collaboration through dialogue. I think it works.

For the final assignment, Dr. Artiss requested that everyone do an entry about how classmates helped or impeded work as well as giving feedback on the course itself. These entries were to be turned in with the binder containing all the written work done for the "Gender and Writing" class.

As previously mentioned in my description of the first class, Dr. Artiss's comments about the collaborative project showed that she hoped it would crystallize and record much of the knowledge that was generated by the collective over the term. In the comments of the two students about their experiences with the collaborative projects, I see their recognition that two kinds of knowledge have been gained: insight about the

process of working with others and an understanding of the diverse interests of members of the group.

Glenn mentioned that in another class there was not the understanding that people were to cooperate and negotiate. Dr. Artiss never lectured or gave notes which overtly declared such a premise, but I feel she established this idea by her lack of authoritarian practices and by comments such as the following given that first night:

> We use language with other people by listening, and engaging in a dialogue that presupposes that we are all learners. . . . If we are going to change, we need to work together. This will not happen if the classroom remains competitive and individualistic.

Glenn told about the negotiation and compromise necessary to come up with a topic that would incorporate others' interests. Although the video/rap topic was of interest to him, Glenn makes it plain that the project finally agreed upon was not what he really wanted to do. Reflecting on her experience with collaboration, Taylor also states the importance of the willingness to "give in to an extent, in order to make it work. It is easy to want things your way, but in collaboration, it isn't just you any longer."

In addition, Taylor makes the point about the importance of giving time for groups to talk. I see in Taylor's comment more than just a statement against procrastination. I see in collaboration the process of life. I don't mean that collaboration is a method or formula which copies the way life is. Rather, I see in collaborative pedagogy the recognition of *how* we come to know in every way which, if we combine the ideas of Ricoeur and Dewey, is to reflect on the "sensations" and "raw experiences" made up of encounters with people, texts, and other experiences, in such a way as to distance ourselves from these which then allows us to interpret our participation in order to bring meaning and establish connections. Recognizing that knowledge of all kinds comes about in this way disallows a system which labels as knowledge facts that are memorized in a night, spit out the next day on a test, and forgotten before the week is

over. Collaborative pedagogy's praxis for knowledge hinges on a process which requires time for interaction, recursive reflection, and "interpretation of participation" (Ricoeur in Van Den Hengel, 1982, p. 109). Taylor recognizes that time is a necessary condition for collaboration to occur.

Second, I think the variety exhibited in the collaborative projects is significant. In her initial comments about the collaborative projects, Dr. Artiss said, "You, individually or in smaller units, will decide both the issues to address and ponder, and the voices you will pay attention to." It seems to me that the diversity of topics and formats reveals that students have indeed decided what to address and which voices they listened to. The students in this collective have been freed, "empowered" as one student phrased it, to follow paths of their own choosing. Even in the concessions like those made by Glenn and Taylor, the giving up was a choice they made because of knowledge about how people work successfully together.

It was evident as I read the journal entries dealing with the collaborative projects, that students felt both the setting and the presentation of the projects provided a satisfying end to the course. I sensed in these entries a spirit of camaraderie and appreciation for one another's contributions.

Voices Eight

In this last voices section, I will draw from the final journal entries Dr. Artiss requested in the last class.

What became apparent as I read what students shared about each other, was how expertise was indeed pooled in this collective. Certain students were repeatedly mentioned for their particular contributions. For philosophical concerns, Todd was sought out; for an alternate perspective valued for critiquing analytical papers, Olivia was mentioned; for information about critical theory and the giving ideas about how to look at or proceed with work, Glenn was repeatedly mentioned. I was even mentioned

for my opinions on collaboration itself and, of course, Dr. Artiss was mentioned most frequently for her influence on the course and in relation to helping individuals gain self awareness about their own writing and gender issues.

Students commented on the journals entries shared in class which benefited them most or from which they received insights about other class members. Some of the students wished that there had been more time spent sharing portions from journals. They identified attitudes they felt were exhibited by other students which added or detracted from the dynamic of the class. In this entry, they also evaluated the course through compliments, criticisms, and suggestions for future courses.

I feel requiring such an entry accomplished two things. First, it gave students a final opportunity to reflect on their own learning experience in this class. Doing so again makes the students look at their own and others' behaviors and attitudes in relation to the working out of a successful collaborative endeavor. As I read their comments, I saw that the members of this collective had gained many insights about how to successfully collaborate with others. Second, this gave Dr. Artiss one last look at the collaborative dynamic which had been at work in this collective. She once again opened up her practices and herself for scrutiny.

What was especially interesting about these final journal entries was that although they brought a sense of closure to this collective endeavor, some of them ended with a comment from Dr. Artiss which invited further dialogue. It was as if the invitation to participate in the conversation taking place in the "parlour" was continually extended.

In the next chapter, I will deal with the implications for classroom practice of some of the premises of collaborative pedagogy.

Chapter Three

Reflections on Classroom Practices

Since the impetus behind this study was my desire to enhance my own and others' educational practice, the question of how I would handle or view a certain situation or emphasis if it were a class for which I was responsible was continually before me as I researched this class. This question begged me to come to some tentative conclusions about a number of aspects of the class.

First, from my description of the class, I think it is evident that the role journal writing had in this collaborative endeavor cannot be underrated. But having said this, I do feel that a word of caution about an appropriate use of journals needs to be sounded. Often when students are not used to journal writing, they confuse the desired informality with a free-for-all type of personal diary. If journal writing is to provide that necessary fuel for the dialogic interaction, it needs to be focused, relating in some way to the purpose of the collaborative endeavor, in this case, issues of writing and gender. For example, sharing details about boyfriend-girlfriend conflicts seems of limited value in this context unless viewed through the lens of concerns relevant to the class such as power struggles, gender issues, stereotypes, or gender issues generally. Relating that one's child is sick is pertinent if it gives an explanation for a late assignment or if the mother has had to work out all the details for alternate care because the spouse does not see his responsibility as caretaker. This then becomes a class related issue for this collective. In a statement Rudge makes (on p. 17 in my first chapter), he uses the term "therapy". I feel the "therapy" Rudge is talking about refers to members feeling free to offer honest opinions and ideas that make the learning in a particular context meaningful for life. In a risk-taking environment, a danger is to get sidelined from the focus of the collaborative endeavor in the misguided attempt to be everything to all people. Although the

collaborative environment should be characterized by nurture, its members, including the instructor, must never feel responsible for filling the role of those trained in counseling professions.

Second, because collaborative pedagogy is founded on the possibility of endless change, revision is, as I said previously, the "constant open to us." Such a premise brings any teacher concerned with fostering students' writing face to face with the following question: Does this premise mean that the number of versions of a piece of writing that can be submitted must be unlimited for collaborative principles to be upheld? I think not. Fostering the idea that writing is a living tool is what is important. But the limits of time for both instructor and student means that the focused collaboration on any particular piece must have boundaries. If not, the experiences associated with other parts of the instructor's agenda may never be realized especially with the time restraints imposed by semesterization. Openness and change require exploration on many fronts.

Third, an instructor incorporating collaborative pedagogy should continually help members of the collective interact in meaningful and productive ways, as exhibited in this class. Collaboration cannot take place among a group of strangers. A group of people may be completely isolated from and unknown to one another and produce a single written product if, say, one person writes, one edits, one types, etc. But the collaborative endeavor I am arguing for in this paper is based on a pedagogy which is judged by far more than an end product. For collaboration to exist, members of the group must be continually sharing ideas and interpreting them together in order that relevant knowledge is being generated for each individual and the collective as a whole. Such interaction hinges on members getting to know one another. Members of a collective must continually be given opportunities to find out how others are feeling, interpreting, and perceiving any concerns relevant to this collective. Such opportunities are vital for fostering a trusting environment that is so necessary if honest dialogue is to occur.

Fourth, the focus of any collective should be established right from the start. As previously mentioned, through the taped interviews I saw that students had been using words in different ways. It is important that, in the beginning discussions, key words or issues are brought forward so that common definitions can be fleshed out. This, I feel, will not only help focus initial discussions but will also make the dialogue more meaningful overall.

Fifth, I have pointed out that recognizing and incorporating a polyphony of voices is an important feature of collaborative pedagogy, but the importance of doing so became even more apparent to me in my role as researcher. In this collective my voice provided a different perspective than that of instructor or student. I feel my conversations with students, especially those captured on tape, provided some valuable insights into the inner workings of this collaborative endeavor. As I reflected on the session where Dr. Artiss, Glenn, and I "collaborated on collaboration" it became apparent that because the instructor is continually dialoguing with every member of the collective via journals, assignments, and conferences, what may stand out to her is the learning and change that are taking place on many fronts. The valuable changes she may see being attested to by individuals could possibly overshadow her assessment of the class dynamics at work in the group as a whole. My position and work in this collective allowed me to see what I viewed as a problem or inconsistency in the class. Sharing my conclusions resulted in some direct changes in the way subsequent classes were structured. This experience revealed to me that the importance of incorporating as many voices as possible in all aspects of the collaborative endeavor does far more than add variety or enlarge student perspectives on issues. Allowing for the voice of, for the lack of a better term, an "outsider" such as myself, brings an important evaluative perspective on the collaborative pedagogy dynamic at work in any particular context. This has implications for me as an educator. The more voices I draw on and allow to sound concerning my practice in the classroom, the more successful I will be in my

incorporation of collaborative pedagogy. This implies the importance of dialoguing with and being open to the opinions of fellow teachers, parents and administrators, outside researchers, as well as students, and taking time to reflect on what others have said.

And, finally, the following question must be considered: because collaborative pedagogy acknowledges and values heterogeneity, can the collaborative endeavor be judged successful even if all the members of the collective discover they are not in harmony with or helped by the collaborative method? In others words, do we label the attempt "a failure" if everyone's needs, real or perceived, are not met? It is in dealing with this question that I think every teacher incorporating collaborative pedagogy walks a fine line especially when considering student advice to alter or evaluate class practice. No educator can ever establish a learning environment that can meet the needs of every member while working out his or her own agenda and the curriculum guidelines. A number of times, Allison expresses difficulties she is having with this course. Todd at one point seems very disgusted with the course. Judging from some of Dr. Artiss's comments and suggestions on some students' writing, a couple of them tended only to summarize rather than placing themselves in the dialogue. At times, when it seems Dr. Artiss would like to see change and subsequent action towards a particular system or issue, a reifying of the system or a resignation to the way things are is shown. How does one balance all these divergent ingredients for assessing practice? As I see it, two things are important. One is having criteria composed of the essential features of collaborative pedagogy which serve as an umbrella reference as the class progresses, and the other is applying the criteria in such a way that the whole endeavor is judged as much as is possible. Sylvia's final entry captures for me this fine line.

> Frankly, I am a little ambivalent about the working style of this course. With the emphasis on open discussion, classes were occasionally uncomfortable and sometime just boring. Also, the smaller groups didn't work very well for me, for a

> variety of reasons, not the least of which was that personal reasons kept me out of two vital sessions.
>
> But I do see the value in this type of approach to learning. There is something exciting here, and the problem is the strength of collaborative learning is the same as its weakness: the people in the class. Where does an individual student's biases and visions stop and the class-learning begin?. . . .
>
> Even though I did spend most of the class time feeling like a fish out of water . . . and even though I obviously found some of my classmates to be less than enthralling, I can't emphasize enough my gut instinct that there is something vital and fundamentally revolutionary in this type of learning. If you had asked me halfway through this course if I'd try another like it, I'd have said "No way," but now I'd like to continue with it. Would I recommend it to another student? Not without talking out some of the problems I'd had with it, but I'd probably end up urging s/he to sign on.

I feel the opinions Sylvia expresses show that, although individual needs must be met and negotiation must continually take place individually and collectively, a teacher must try to look at as complete a picture as possible. Both the point of time in the course and the overall knowledge being generated must be considered when an educator is assessing the class and her practice. No one opinion given at any one point of time should provide the last word. The overall consensus expressed over a period of time is a good indicator of the success of the collaborative endeavor.

When I try to look back at the whole experience of this class, insofar as it is available to me, through the journal writings, taped interviews, and my conversations with and observations of this collective, I see a successful implementation of collaborative pedagogy. Repeatedly, students expressed a sense of control or to use Glenn's term "empowerment" about the writing and thinking they were doing. I see Dr. Artiss's non-authoritarian stance, willingness to negotiate, and her openness to revision

creating a risk-taking environment where people have experimented with writing and have stretched their thinking. Dialogue was central to the workings of this endeavor. This seemed to hold both in and outside class. On her taped interview, Daphne pointed out how different this class was from others she had taken. She said that when you see students in the Thompson Centre who are in your other classes, you just nod or say hello unless you know them from somewhere else. But when you see someone from this class, you stop and talk about class-related concerns. The lack of competitiveness between individuals and the various groups is significant. Expertise shifted and the shift resulted in students being affirmed and helped by one another, not vying against one another for grades. Glenn, usually a silent presence in other classes according to information he gave in his interview, expressed surprise at being recognized and sought out by many in this collective for his "expertise." Finally, I see Dr. Artiss's views about language and knowledge pervading the whole endeavor. Students repeatedly said that this class was different from others in that here the concern was not to memorize and "regurgitate" facts and information. Allison expressed that what was being learned here was a self-awareness which came through dialogue and reflection. I feel that the learning that took place in this collective did make life more meaningful for the participants. Students saw issues and their place in society in a new way. They were recognizing, as Allison pointed out, assumptions which had influenced how they spoke, acted, thought, and had been treated. I can only conclude that this group was an interpretive community concerned with ontological purpose.

In the final chapter I will discuss the challenges and rewards of establishing collaborative pedagogy.

Chapter Four

The Risks and Rewards of Collaborative Pedagogy

What factor or factors allow for the incorporation of collaborative pedagogy? A number of students seemed to feel that Dr. Artiss's personality was essential. Mentioned were personality traits such as flexibility and openness in conjunction with her nurturing and loving manner. Although I agree personality traits as those mentioned are important, I see in Dr. Artiss's work and Shirley Brice Heath's work something even more crucial to the fostering of collaborative pedagogy.

In *Ways with Words*, Heath shares in her Epilogue that, on a return visit several years after her study was published to the communities with whom she had worked, she found that most of the classroom practices reported in her study had been discarded. I asked myself: How could such a successful implementation of collaboration have been discontinued in just a few years? When her methods worked so well, how could people have allowed them to die especially considering that the success of these programs was documented with standardized achievement tests which, it would seem, provided further validation for some onlooking educators? In the Epilogue, Heath offers insight when she says,

> Anthropologists study social life as and where it is lived through the medium of a particular social group, but the ethnographic present never remains as it is described, nor does description of the current times fully capture the influences and forces of history on the present (Heath, 1983, p. 9).

One significant factor which helped change "the ethnographic present" was that Shirley Brice Heath was no longer on the scene, helping educators to work in practice a philosophy which grounded all her educational relationships and practices. As long as she was present, the philosophy pervaded. This leads me to feel that it was her presence and guiding hand rather than a shift in each teacher's own philosophy which influenced

the dramatic changes which occurred in various classrooms. How could it be otherwise? Articles such as the one by Heath and McLaughlin (1987), continue to exemplify the fact that Dr. Heath still holds to the ideologies she expressed in *Ways with Words*. The implication of the above is that our real practice as educators, that is, that which continues behind closed doors or when we are on our own, is shaped and continued by our own theories and philosophy, not by someone else's good ideas. The teachers in the Piedmont, in my mind, could not have allowed such practices to disappear had they internalized to such a degree the ideas Heath shared so as to alter their personal philosophies about the learner and education. Of course, institutional politics exerted their agenda on educational practice in the Piedmont schools, as well. Administrative pressure for conformity and standardization discouraged teachers from continuing the practice of accepting diverse cultural capitals in the classrooms of this region.

Herein lies the challenge for both those who promote and those attempting to incorporate collaborative pedagogy. It is not a step-by-step methodology. It is not a classroom practice that one can read about today and make operational in the classroom tomorrow. At its roots it is a personal philosophy which sees learning taking place when individuals and the collective are aware of the overarching pursuit of ontological significance via language experiences which are acknowledged as being embedded in people, beliefs, values, culture, and history. Thus, collaborative pedagogy sees learning occurring through, and does all it can to enhance, the interactions in the multitude of interpretive communities which form the web of our existence.

Viewing learning in this way is the shift in educational paradigms that I alluded to in my opening chapter. Many individuals, like Dr. Artiss and myself, are in the process of making the shift, but it is not an easy shift to make personally and even more difficult for the educational community as a whole. Kuhn (1970) points out, "The transfer of allegiance from paradigm to paradigm is a conversion experience that cannot be forced." A source of lifelong resistance is the "assurance that the old paradigm will ultimately

solve all its problems, that nature can be shoved into the box the paradigm provides" (p. 151-152).

I feel there is another resistant force for educators which lies at the heart of our own education. We are products of, to use Friere's metaphor, "the banking system of education." Passivity describes for most of us our stance as students. And of far deeper consequence is that our affirmation as students, and our identity in general, was dependent on a certain degree of conformity. For many of us, the report card affirmed us and, thus, entrenched further our passive "learning" behaviors.

Furthermore, from primary school through university, authoritarianism characterized many of our teaching models, exalting particular kinds of knowledge transmission, and prescribing the way information was handled. The lecture method was the *modus operandi* in most of our classes. To become and practice in ways other than we have always known is a risk of significant proportions. To do so means we launch ourselves into uncharted waters, where unanticipated events, often stormy, become possibilities each day. Although staying moored to the dock, with sails down, and everything so secure that all can be anticipated, controlled, and predicted may eliminate risk, it forcibly begs the question, "Has learning really occurred?" This is the question which stirred discontent with my classroom practices and created a crises for me which fueled the search and shift in ideas which this paper represents.

How can a major shift in learning paradigms occur for individuals and society in general? Kuhn says that the starting point is to recognize the crises. I believe we are at a crisis point in education. I think the time to revolutionize the way we view learning, knowledge, and relationships at every educational level is now. Those making noises about going back, tightening things up, standardizing to a greater degree must begin to realize that the philosophies and assumptions underlying those practices are the very things that have put us in the crisis situation which exists today. There is far too much knowledge to "bank" and cram into students' heads. Far too many students feel

alienated from content, methods, and people. Authoritarianism has created a dependence on formulas, systems, and governments, has exalted certain kinds of knowledge and excluded others, and has promoted individualistic competitiveness when what is needed for meaningful existence is initiative, openness, creativeness, and cooperation. Incorporating collaborative pedagogy is a risk; it is sailing into uncharted waters. But is the status quo really an option? For me the answer is "No". The journey from the didactic harbour into the waters of collaboration must begin even if it begins slowly.

The question which then follows is, how can a paradigm shift in the way learning is viewed occur individually and collectively?

I see the possibilities for such a shift in the praxis of collaboration itself. Although a paradigm shift is learning on a grand scale it is still learning. Therefore, the same principles of collaborative pedagogy which foster learning in the classroom will also foster a paradigm shift in the educational community. Educators along with parents and students need to dialogue, reflect, interpret, and experiment together in an atmosphere of nurture and acceptance which promotes risk-taking. We must be open to numerous voices which challenge our assumptions, illuminate our biases, enlarge our perspective, and change our practice. And most important, we must be aware that our theory of language grounds all we say and do. The metaphors we use to describe our classroom and school environments must be scrutinized for their assumptions and implications. We must be aware of biases in the descriptive terms we use in reporting and evaluating students. We must value all children's languaging, which flows from their cultural capitals. We must understand that the language of our interactions, whether in gestures, written or oral forms, has great impact on a child's self-concept and his or her school experience.

The classroom will be viewed in different ways under collaborative pedagogy. First, I think we would see classes or groupings as integral to daily living . They would

not be considered individual units where closure is the goal, but rather, time spent opening another door or discovering another lens to use for dialogue and interpretation.

Second, I think the criteria by which we judge our classes will alter considerably. The following example of possible criteria is already in use by Jerome Harste (1988) in his courses at Indiana University. He poses the following questions when reviewing a class:

1. Did we allow each person in the community to have a voice . . . The criteria we use to see if this is operationalized is whether or not at the end of a course we can point to one thing at least that each student has taught us.

2. Did we begin needed new conversations? The criteria we use here is the number of unanticipated conversations that were begun. One simple way that we monitor progress on this front is to ask what are we thinking about now that we weren't thinking about when the course began. What new sense of urgency do we have?

3. Did we provide a mechanism whereby those conversations can continue? This is tricky, yet it is the most important. In research terms we call this "pragmatic effect." What happens when we remove ourselves from the setting? This may be the criterion we all should use. It's an indication of what your theory changed, if anything. We take it as success that students who were at Indiana University at the same time still regularly communicate with each other, and that the most common complaint we receive from recent graduates is that their host institution is a "wasteland -- nobody to think with." We take it as a failure on our part that many of our students want to move rather than work at developing collaborative interdisciplinary thought collectives of faculty and teacher groups in their own area. We haven't communicated it well -- new conceptions of literacy take action as well as reflection (pp. 22-24).

As Harste points out, "These performance criteria semantically reside in a different ballpark from those we've traditionally used--convention and control."

Where are we in terms of a possible paradigm shift to collaborative pedagogy? In the following quote by Kuhn concerning the course paradigm shifts take, I will leave out the references to scientists to allow its application for education.

> If a paradigm is ever to triumph it must gain some first supporters . . . who will develop it to the point where . . . arguments can be produced and multiplied. And even those arguments when they come, are not

> individually decisive. . . . There is no single argument that can or should persuade them all. Rather than a single group conversion, what occurs is an increasing shift in the distribution of professional allegiances.
>
> At the start a new candidate for a paradigm may have few supporters. . . . nevertheless, they will improve it, explore its possibilities, and show what it would be like to belong to the community guided by it. More . . . will then be converted, and the exploration of the new paradigm will go on. Gradually the number of . . . articles, and books based upon the paradigm will multiply. Still more [people] convinced of the new view's fruitfulness, will adopt the new mode of practicing . . . until at last only a few . . . hold-outs remain (pp. 158-159).

My aim in this paper has been to strengthen the argument for a shift to collaborative pedagogy in the educational community. I hope any questions my discussion fostered or concerns it ignored will be addressed by others so that, as Kuhn says, the articles, and books will "multiply," and the time will come that many others have adapted the "new mode of practicing." Then our classrooms will have, as Harste says,

> The potential for hearing new voices, starting new conversations, and becoming a reflexive community of language learners who act knowing full well how their theory of language can make a transformative difference (p. 24).

I hope through this paper I have been another voice. I hope I have started some new conversations in the parlour.

References Cited

Abercrombie, Minnie Louie Johnson. 1969. *The Anatomy of Judgment.* Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Adler, Mortimer. 1982. *The Paideia Proposal: An Educational Manifesto.* New York: Macmillan.

Belenky, Mary F., Clinchy, Blythe, M. , Goldberger, Nancy R., Tarule, Jill M. 1986. *Women's Ways of Knowing.* New York: Basic Books, Inc., Pub.

Block, James H. 1985. "Belief Systems and Mastery Learning." *Outcomes.* 4:2, (Winter) pp. 3-14.

Brosio, Ricard A. 1972. *The Relationship of Dewey's Pedagogy to His Concept of Community.* Ann Arbor, Michigan: Malloy Lithoprinting, Inc.

Bruffee. Kenneth A. 1984. "Collaborative Learning and the 'Conversation of Mankind'." *College English*, Volume 46, Number 7, November pp. 635-652.

_____. 1985. *A Short Course in Writing.* Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

Faigley, Lester. 1986. "Competing Theories of Process: A Critique and a Proposal." *College English*, 48:6, October, pp. 527-542.

Flynn, Elizabeth. 1989. "Learning to Read from a Feminine Perspective, I." *Encountering Student Texts.* Bruce Lawson, Susan Ryan, W. Ross Winterowd. Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English.

Flynn, John. 1989. "Learning to Read: Student Papers from a Feminine Perspective, II. *Encountering Student Texts.* Bruce Lawson, Susan Ryan, W. Ross Winterowd. Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English.

Fontaine, Sheryl I. 1988. "The Unfinished Story of the Interpretive Community." *Rhetoric Review*, Vol. 7, No. 1 (Fall) pp. 86-96.

Gibson, Rex 1986. *Critical Theory and Education.* London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Giroux, Henry. 1988. *Schooling for Democracy* . London: Routledge.

Harste, Jerome C. and Short, Kathy G. 1988. What Educational Difference Does Your Theory of Language Make? Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the International Reading Association, New Orleans, April 30-May 4, 1989, pp. 1-30. ED 311 397

Heath, Shirley B. 1983. *Ways with Words*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heath, Shirley B. and McLaughlin, Milbrey W. 1987. "A Child Resource Policy: Moving Beyond Dependence On School and Family," *Phi Delta Kappan*, April, Vol. 68, No. 8, pp. 576-580.

Himley, Margaret. 1989. "A Reflective Conversation: 'Tempos of Meaning'." *Encountering Student Texts*. Bruce Lawson, Susan Ryan, W. Ross Winterowd. Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English.

Kim, Phaik Loh. 1991. "Reflective Teaching and Pre-service Teacher Education." Paper presented during Regional Seminar on Teacher Education: The Challenge of the 21st Century in Penang, pp. 18-20.

Kuhn, Thomas. 1970. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Lunsford, Andrea, and Ede, Lisa. 1990. *Singular Texts/Plural Authors: Perspectives on Collaborative Writing.* Carbondale & Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press.

Mannheim, Karl 1936. *Ideology and Utopia.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.

Mason, Edwin, ed. 1969. *Fifth Pilot Course for Experienced Teachers: New Roles for the Learner.* London: University of London Goldsmith's College Curriculum Laboratory.

Morgan, Bob. 1987. "Three Dreams of Language; Or, No Longer Immured in the Bastille of the Humanist Word." *College English*, Volume 49, Number 4, April pp. 449-458.

Phelps, Louise Wetherbee. 1988. *Composition as a Human Science.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Schön, Donald A. 1983. *The Reflective Practioner.* New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers.

Rudge, Kenneth, ed. 1966. *Fourth Pilot Course for Experienced Teachers, The Education of the Young School Leaver.* London: University of London Goldsmith's College Curriculum Laboratory.

Van Den Hengel, John W. 1982. *The Home of Meaning.* New York: University Press of America.

Volosinov, V.N. 1973. *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Wittgenstein, Ludwig. 1958. *Philosophical Investigations.* New York: The Macmillan Co.

Appendix A

Course Outline

ENGLISH 3817
Special Topics: Gender and Writing

Spring 1991
Slot 30
Classroom: S- 4083
Course ID: 240 3817 59

Phyllis Artiss
Office S-4062
Phone: 737-8063 (o)
Messages: 737-8056
Office Hours: Tue.: 11 to 12:30
Thurs.: 10 to 11:30
(and by appointment)

This class provides an opportunity to consider questions of gender in writing, our own as well as that of others. It will be conducted as a series of workshops and seminars in which we engage in written and spoken dialogue to increase our awareness of power structures imbedded in language, and work towards changing these.

Required Materials:

Hoy, Pat C., Esther H. Schor, and Robert DiYanni, eds. Women's Voices: Visions and Perspectives, eds. New York: McGraw, 1990.

Scheier, Libby, Sarah Sheard, and Eleanor Wachtel, eds. Language in her Eye: Views on Writing and Gender by Canadian Women Writing in English. Toronto: Coach House, 1990.

A college dictionary (consult with me if you'd like advice)

A handbook (preferably the Gage Handbook of Current English)

One or more hard-covered looseleaf binders, with appropriate labels and dividers

Proposed Evaluation Scheme:

Journal	10%
Analytical Papers	30%
Collaborative Class Project	20%
Attendance and Class Participation	10%
Final Examination	20%

Written Assignments:

You are expected to do a variety of writing assignments, most of which can be classified into the four types listed below. Please keep the different types in separate binders, or all in one binder with clearly labelled dividers. At any point in the term be prepared to bring all your work to class or my office.

(1) **Journal Entries:** These include responses to classes, readings, topics suggested in class, as well as topics you choose yourself. Most entries will be addressed to the class, but some may be addressed privately to me, and some to an audience beyond this class. I don't expect you to revise or edit your journal, and it will not be graded for content, mechanics or writing style. You will get the full 10% if you do the required number of entries on schedule (**a minimum of four one-page entries each week**)

(2) **Analytical Papers:** In these you will generally make specific comparisons and contrasts between two or more essays. In each analytical paper you are expected to focus on one or two issues that seem important to you, and state your own position as well as that of the authors discussed. During the first seven weeks of term you are expected to prepare **three** analytical papers; each should be accompanied by a **Process Log** describing the process you went through in preparing the paper and the kinds of feedback you would like on it.

(3) **Responses to Papers Written by Others in the Class**: When you have written detailed comments on a classmate's paper please keep a copy and, if appropriate, a copy of the other student's paper.

(4) **Collaborative Class Project.** Subject, format, style and all other aspects of this project will be decided by the class, and the grade assigned to the project will be the same for all students.

Format of Assignments: Papers to be responded to by classmates, as well as drafts and revised versions to be passed in to me, are to be **double-spaced** on one side of the paper only, with ample **margins** all around. Typed papers are of course encouraged but handwritten ones are acceptable if they are perfectly **legible**. Each paper should have a **title page** giving your name, ID number, title of paper, assignment number, date the paper is submitted, and any other relevant information. Pages should be numbered, initialed and held together with **paper clips**. The same guidelines apply to journals, except that these may be single-spaced.

Late Papers: If you miss a deadline, submit your paper as soon as possible, but **no later than three days after it is due**, with a written explanation attached. If my schedule allows I'll try to read such papers, but normally won't write comments on them. I will not accept papers that are more than three days late.

Attendance: We can't learn from you or you from us if you aren't present. If you are ill or an emergency arises that absolutely prevents your attending, you are responsible for getting handouts, assignments and other information from another member of the class, and for writing a note or journal entry to explain your absence. If you don't want to lose marks for a missed class, it's up to you to consult with me about ways of making a special contribution to compensate for your absence, e.g. by doing extra writing, editing or research for your group or the whole class.

Proposed Schedule (Mondays 7:00 to 9:45)

Week I May 13 Introduction

Week II May 21 Journal entries on personal topics *and* on at least two articles

Week III May 27 Draft of Analytical Paper #1 to discuss in groups. Revised version and journal entries to be passed in to my office by Friday, May 31

(I'll be out of town during the third week of classes)

Week IV June 3 Journal entries, including responses to at least three further articles.

Week V June 10 Draft of Analytical Paper #2 to discuss in groups. Revised version and journal entries to be passed in to me by Friday, June 14

Week VI June 17 Journal entries, including responses to at least three further readings

Week VII June 24 No class (Semester Break)

Week VIII July 1 No class (Memorial Day)
Draft of Analytical Paper #3 and journal entries to be passed in to me by Friday, July 5

Weeks IX July 8 Collaborative Class Project

Week X July 15 Collaborative Class Project (and pass in journals)

Week XI July 22 Collaborative Class Project

Week XII July 29 Collaborative Class Project due--and journals

Week XII August 5 To be decided

Appendix B

Process Log

PROCESS LOG

Name:
Date:
Assignment:

Please be as specific as possible in your responses. Use the reverse side of this sheet or extra paper when you need more space.

1. Approximately how much time did you spend on this assignment altogether? _____
2. Describe how you worked on the paper and approximately how much time you spent on different parts of the process:
   e.g. thinking of a topic; finding a focus; discussing the assignment with others (both in class and outside); doing assigned readings, research in the library or other kinds of preparation; writing rough notes, outlines, freewriting, preliminary drafts, etc.; revising, editing and polishing; anything else that occurs to you. _____
3. Which parts of the process were most productive, enjoyable, helpful, etc.?

   Which were least productive, enjoyable, helpful, etc.?
4. Have you written a similar paper (or papers)? If so, elaborate.
5. Would you like to write similar papers this term (or later)?
6. What have you learned from doing this paper? Overall, was it worthwhile for you?
6. What kinds of feedback would you like to have on this version of your paper?

Appendix C

Questionnaire

STUDENT _____ **DATE** _____

1. Why did you take this class (*Gender and Writing 3817*) in the first place?

2. What creates the dialogue/interaction in the class?

3. What factors encourage interaction?

4. What factors discourage interaction?

5. What kind of interaction do you find most valuable?

6. How would you rate the interaction of the class on a scale of 0-5 (5 indicating excellent interaction)? What are your reasons for this rating?

7. How would you describe Dr. Artiss's role in the class?

8. Is it different from the stance of other instructors you have had?

9. What things, if any, are changing, "developing", etc., for you? In other words, what have you been learning in this course?

10. What is the source of what you have been learning? Where is knowledge coming from in this course?

11. Identify any changes you perceive as taking place for others in the class?

12. What in-class happenings are worthwhile? necessary, but not beneficial? time wasters?

13. What kind of responsibility do you feel, if any, for making class sessions "work," that is, for facilitating interaction?

14. If you were in Dr. Artiss's place, would you make some changes in the class? If so, what would you do?