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ABSTRACT

LEARNING HOW TO TEACH AND DESIGN CURRICULUM FOR THE HETEROGENEOUS CLASS:
AN ETHNOGRAPHIC STUDY OF A TASK-BASED COOPERATIVE LEARNING GROUP OF NATIVE ENGLISH AND ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE SPEAKERS IN A GRADUATE EDUCATION COURSE
MAY 1996
DEBORAH E. ZACARIAN
B.A., UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST
M.S., AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL COLLEGE
Ed. D., UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST
Directed by: Professors Pat Anthony and Jerri Willett

The purpose of this study was to describe how meaning was socially constructed within a task-based small cooperative learning group. The group was composed of five native English and English as a Second Language speaking teachers and teachers-in-training enrolled in a graduate course entitled "Curriculum Development for Heterogeneous Classes" in the Teacher Education and Curriculum Studies Department in the School of Education at the University of Massachusetts.

This study examined the claim that participants in cooperative learning groups must be willing to set their personal beliefs, desires, and agendas aside in order to focus their attention on the learning needs of their peers and to shift the attention of their peers to explicitly relevant information (Gee, 1990). Further, groupwork is described as an interactional experience that involves conflict, tension, and individual risk-taking behaviors (McCutcheon, 1995). This study examined the claim that these behaviors can have a positive effect on a group's process when the willingness to
analyze conflict and tension through the risk-taking process of revealing one's experience, perception, and self are present (McCutcheon, 1995).

This study researched these claims by investigating the discourse of a small cooperative learning group in this course. This study provides an ethnographic thick description of the normative patterns that emerged through the group's work. These include the communicative norms that were co-constructed prior to and after the naming and analyzing of conflict. The results of this study reveal that participants were willing to focus their attention onto the needs of their peers and were willing to focus the attention of their peers to explicitly relevant information after conflict was named. Analyzing conflict was not easily obtained in this group. Members avoided and resisted this process. However, naming conflict was seen to have a purpose in this cooperative learning group and provided a rich source of insight about the complexities of conflict, tension, and individual risk-taking behaviors in cooperative learning settings composed of native English and English as a Second Language speaking learners.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Education, then, beyond all other devices of human origin, is the great equalizer of the conditions of men, -the balance-wheel of the social machinery, Horace Mann, 1848 (Merriam-Webster, 1995).

Background

During the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, America's public schools were founded on the principles of providing a free educational system where students would acquire knowledge and where the democracy's ideals of citizenry would be promoted (Alexander & Alexander, 1985). The virtues of a universal education were promoted under the assumption that children would learn what they were told and were rooted in an uncritical acceptance of English Protestant educational doctrine which undergirded the conclusion that students were "passive" in the process of their own education and learned through "quiet attention, obedience to teachers, and recalling and repeating material" (D. K. Cohen, 1988, p. 12).

At the end of the nineteenth century, John Dewey believed that public schools could be places of vision, discovery, intellectual challenge, adventure, and excitement (1938). The principle this required was a belief in the ideals of community over authority (Dewey, 1938). Further, Dewey described this enterprise as "an organization in which all individuals have the opportunity to contribute something, and in which the activities in which all participate are the chief carrier of control" (p. 56).

Dewey's beliefs provided a vision about the ideals of our democracy and the tenets of a learning theory which would later be called cooperative learning. Educators continue to strike a balance between these founding principles: the acquisition of knowledge and the promotion of social skills within the context of
public school institutions. While these founding principles remain the same, the methods to achieve these principles are changing.

Many cooperative learning theorists suggest that cognitive and social development are fostered when students from diverse abilities, cultures, and languages are heterogeneously grouped in mainstream classrooms that use cooperative small group learning methods in which teachers give students a task and allow them to design how that task will be achieved (E. G. Cohen, 1994; Johnson, Johnson, & Johnson Holubec, 1986; Johnson & Johnson, 1985; Sharan, 1983; Slavin, 1983 & 1985; Wang, Renolds, & Walberg, 1994). Further, many educational researchers contend that communities that employ the tenets of cooperative learning promote achievement more effectively than when teachers exercise sole authority over their students in determining what is taught, what methods and materials are used for learning, and how learning will occur (E. G. Cohen, 1994; Freeman, 1992; Johnson at al., 1986; Johnson & Johnson, 1985; Maehr, Midgley, & Urdan, 1992; Sharan, 1983; Slavin, 1983).

Learning theories, however, often reflect what is claimed about the "majority" of society's students and what is assumed about its "minority" (Cummins, 1984, pp. 1-2). Further, these assumptions are often "inconsistent and contradicted" with second language research evidence despite how "well intentioned" they might be (pp. 2-3).

It is not my interest here to cast doubt on the tenets of cooperative learning theory nor to compare these with teacher-led classrooms. It is to examine the influence of cooperative learning practices in monolingual English classroom environments where native English speaking (NES) and English as a Second Language (ESL) learners have been heterogeneously grouped together.

Much of the literature points to the contributions that NES learners bring to students who are acquiring ESL in cooperative learning settings. Many educational researchers claim NES students provide authentic language models and an array of
opportunities for ESL learners to listen, practice, and acquire a new language (E. G. Cohen, 1994; Cummins, 1986; Gee, 1990; Maeh et al., 1992; Freeman, 1992; Slavin, 1985; Trueba, Guthrie, & Au, 1981). While these claims appear to be positive ones I believe that they promote the assumption that students who are NES have the most to contribute to this arena whereas ESL learners are assumed to have less participation, less legitimacy, and less status because of their dependence on NES peers in cooperative learning groups in order to make meaning of the new language, culture, and academic content.

This dissertation is about an educational practice that exemplifies the tenets of cooperative learning theory and contributes to the understanding of this method when it is used with NES and ESL learners.

**Statement of Problem**

Many educational researchers claim that American classrooms are increasingly becoming more linguistically and culturally diverse (Crawford, 1992; Cummins, 1994; Freeman & Freeman, 1988; Hamayan & Perlman, 1990; Molesky, 1988; Nieto, 1992; Ravitch, 1992). Nonetheless, "...most of the nation's teachers are white, monolingual, and female"...[and] most teacher training programs "use a monocultural approach; [and] train teachers like themselves" (Zeichner, 1992, p. 2). Further, the majority of students who are not yet proficient in English are currently being taught by monolingual English speaking teachers who have had no training in the areas of second language acquisition, bilingual education, or multicultural education (Vogel Zanger, 1989).

Educating NES and a growing number of ESL learners in mainstream classrooms, I suggest, will challenge the nation's current teaching practices. If the purpose of American public school education is to promote the ideals of democracy,
these challenges are both critical and necessary. Educational institutions can offer teachers and teachers-in-training with the opportunity to explore, examine, and experiment with new teaching practices in order to become more prepared for the workplace, the classroom (Bailey, 1993b). Little research, however, has been done in this area (Bailey, 1993a). Therefore, it is important to study by using the tenets of ethnographic inquiry how teachers and teachers-in-training who are NES and ESL learners learn about cooperative learning practices in the college classroom.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study was multi-fold. First, the process of groupwork is described as an interactional experience that involves issues of conflict, tension, and individual risk-taking behaviors (McCutcheon, 1995). Further, it is claimed that these behaviors can have a positive effect on a group's process and product when the willingness to examine and analyze differences, tensions, and conflicts through the risk-taking process of revealing one's experience, perception, and self are continuously present (McCutcheon, 1995). These claims were at the center of this inquiry. First, I explored how conflict, tension, and individual risk-taking behaviors were communicated and subsequently analyzed in a cooperative group of diverse learners comprised of NES and ESL teachers and teachers-in-training who had enrolled in a graduate education course. Second, I examined how meaning was socially constructed through the examination and analysis of these tension, conflict, and individual risk-taking behaviors. Third, the purpose of this research was to acquire a deeper awareness about the practice of examining and analyzing conflict in cooperative learning settings comprised of NES and ESL learners.

The salient issues outlined by E. G. Cohen (1994), Johnson & Johnson (1985), McCutcheon (1995), and others were used in order to gain a deeper understanding of
this learning model when it is composed of linguistically and culturally diverse learners. Cohen (1994) and the Johnscons (1985) claim that learning is enhanced when it is a (a) highly active, (b) interactive process, and, (c) interdependent endeavor and that learning cooperatively enhances the promotion of social skills. McCutcheon (1995) claims that the examination and analysis of conflict, tension, and individual risk-taking behaviors can have a positive effect on a cooperative learning group's process and product.

**Significance of the study**

The prediction that American public schools will become more culturally and linguistically diverse and the notion that students can be more active and might learn best by being participants in cooperative learning environments requires a shift in thinking and in training amongst educators. Perhaps the most optimal environment to engage and to study educators in these shifts is in college classrooms where teachers and teachers-in-training are enrolled and where it is claimed little research has been performed (Bailey, 1993b).

This investigation will add to the knowledge base used to inform the teaching community as they institute instructional practices in mainstream classrooms where NES and ESL learners have been placed in cooperative learning groups.

**Definition of Terms**

Various assumptions and interpretations might be made about the terms listed below that may confuse the meanings that are intended in this dissertation. Thus, the definitions that accompany these terms should be applied throughout this dissertation and are presented in alphabetical order.
1. Conflict

For the purpose of this dissertation, McCutcheon’s (1995) definition was used:

Conflict concerns disharmony and disagreement. It can run the gamut from dispassionate debate through heated debate to an all-out war. ... [In addition] Conflict might appear not to exist within individuals, but it does and is often described as "having mixed feelings," "on the one hand...and then the other hand" or "being of two minds." Such conflict occurs when we are simultaneously attracted to and repelled by things, when we find two things equally attractive, when we are supposed to do one thing but prefer to do something else, or when we believe we should do something else (McCutcheon, 1995, pp. 7-8).

2. Cooperative learning

Various theorists have used different terms to describe cooperative learning, such as "groupwork" (E. G. Cohen, 1994), "collaborative learning" (Harvey, 1991), "small groups" (Nunan, 1989; Willett, 1994a), "group investigation" (Sharan, 1990), and "teaming" (Slavin et al., 1985; Willett, 1994b). I prefer Sharan's (1990) definition, in which he describes cooperative learning as a community effort where no fewer than two and no more than six participants are heterogeneously grouped in order to "work together to complete a group goal, share ideas and help each other with answers to questions, share materials, and divide labor when appropriate" (Sharan, p. 2).

3. Culture

Various scholars have applied a number of differing meanings to the term culture. For the purpose of this paper, culture has been used to refer to two groups: (a) students who are acquiring ESL and are from cultures other than American and (b) American students and teachers who are NES.

Secondly, for the purpose confined to this paper, Trueba et al.'s (1981) definition of culture will be used:
Culture is essentially a form of communication with learned and shared, explicit and implicit rules for perceiving, believing, evaluating, and acting. What people talk about and be specific about, such as traditional customs and laws, constitutes their overt or explicit culture. What they take for granted, or what exists beyond conscious awareness, is their implicit culture" (Trueba et al. 1981, pp. 4-5).

4. Heterogeneous Classrooms

For the purpose of this dissertation Willett's (1995) definition of the heterogeneous classroom was used. Willett claims that all classrooms are heterogeneous. "The underlying assumptions are: all learners have strengths from which new information and skills can be taught and acquired. All learners can contribute to the learning community, and that learners learn better in challenging, interactive, multisensory, meaningful, and supportive environments" (p. 1).

5. Individual Risk-Taking Behaviors

For the purpose of this dissertation McCutcheon's (1995) definition of individual risk-taking behaviors was used: "Each person struggles with how open to be, how much of their inner self to reveal, and how far to go in suggesting a novel idea or one that seems at odds with others' ideas" (p. 151).

6. Reflection Facilitator

For the purpose of this dissertation, Willett's (1994a, 1995a) definition was used:

Each group will have one ...facilitator, who will serve the group for the semester. This person is responsible for helping the group set up and get through weekly agendas and monitor the group process; however, they should not be in control of turn-taking. They should intentionally hold back in discussions, but be willing to offer suggestions to help the discussion get moving, to stretch the group's thinking and to improve the group's functioning. ...Facilitators will frequently ask the group to spend time reflecting on the group process.... The role of facilitator is meant to assist the group on what they are doing and how they are doing it.... (Willett, 1994a).
The reflection facilitator's job is to help the group reflect on their own group processes as they engage in collaborative curriculum design. The facilitator will correspond with each member of the team through a [weekly] dialogue journal. The facilitator will also conduct group discussions about the processes and outcomes of the team collaboration (Willett, 1995a).

7. Situational co-membership

For the purpose of this dissertation, Erickson's (1996) definition will be used: The term situational co-membership refers to the "...sharing of attitudes of social identity that were distinctive as commonalties relevant in the situation at hand" (Erickson, 1996, pp. 295-296).

8. Teacher-led classrooms

Various theorists have used a wealth of terms to describe classrooms that are teacher-led where teachers exercise sole authority over their students in determining what is taught, what methods and materials are used for learning, and how learning will occur. These terms include "individualistic and competitive environments," (Schmuck, 1985); "traditional teacher centered practices" (Sylwester & Cho, 1992); and "traditional" (Sharan, 1990; Trueba et al., 1981). In this dissertation, the term teacher-led refers to classroom settings where the teacher "exercising direct supervision tells students what their task is and how to do it. [Further] She monitors closely to prevent them from making mistakes and to correct any errors right away" (E. G. Cohen, 1994, p. 2).

9. Tension

For the purpose of this dissertation, the term tension is defined as an individual's "struggle with what they have to sacrifice of themselves in order to belong to the group" (McCutcheon, 1995, p. 150).
10. Turn taking

Communication is a socially constructed activity which requires a speaker and a listener. A key element in the production of communication is turn-taking. Bailey's (1993) definition of turn taking has been used in this dissertation.

Turn taking is interactionally accomplished as the current speaker signals that he/she is ready to end a turn of talk and the next speaker prepares to take the available slot in the conversation (Bailey, 1993, p. 257).

11. Voice

For the purpose of this dissertation, Bailey's (1993b) definition of voice has been used. Bailey asserts that voice is co-constructed by a speaker and audience. It is a framework in which to describe the presence of being heard in the social process of groupwork (pp. 251-252):

...in order for an individual to have a voice in a particular group, the social system--its norms and values--must be structured so that each member has the opportunity to speak and other members are willing to hear. Further, voice requires a group organization that orients toward the knowledge and interests of its members so that they will both want to speak and have something worthy of saying (p. 252).
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

This literature review explores the tenets of cooperative learning theory. It also examines the tenets of cooperative learning theory as it relates to students who are acquiring ESL. The purpose of this literature review was to gain a deeper understanding about the milieu of cooperative learning when it is applied in American mainstream monolingual English classrooms composed of NES and ESL learners.

This chapter examines the claim that cognitive and social development is fostered when students from diverse abilities and languages are heterogeneously grouped in mainstream classrooms that use cooperative small group learning methods (E. G. Cohen, 1994; Johnson et al., 1986; Johnson & Johnson, 1985; Sharan, 1983; Slavin, 1983 & 1985; Wang et al., 1994).

In this chapter, I point to suggestions which claim that learning is enhanced when it is (a) highly active, (b) an interactive process, and (c) an interdependent endeavor and that learning cooperatively enhances the promotion of social skills (Caine & Caine, 1991; Johnson & Johnson, 1985; Sharan, 1990; Slavin, 1983). Further, I suggest that the needs of students who are acquiring ESL are not necessarily reflected in the general tenets of cooperative learning theories because they reflect what is known about majority, and assumed about minority, students and their teachers (Cummins, 1984).

In this chapter, I also examine the corollary relationships of students, teachers, and their context in order to situate the implications of cooperative learning theory in the context of mainstream American classrooms in which cooperative learning methods are used with NES and ESL learners. The claims of researchers will be used

In addition, I examine the influence of cooperative learning in monolingual English classroom environments where NES and ESL learners have been heterogeneously grouped. To do so, this chapter (a) reviews the principles claimed by cooperative learning theorists; (b) describes the experiences of ESL learners in the context of American social, legal, and educational policy practices; (c) examines the tenets of cooperative learning as they relate to the needs of students who are acquiring ESL; and (d) explores the tenets of this theory when it is applied in mainstream monolingual English classrooms composed of NES and ESL learners.

**Historical Overview**

During the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, American public schools were founded on the principles of providing a free educational system where students would acquire knowledge and where the democracy's ideals of citizenry would be promoted (Alexander & Alexander, 1985). At that time, some of the great founders of public school institutions, such as Horace Mann and Catherine Beecher, believed that education should be the right of every citizen. Beecher's vision magnified the importance of education: her *Treatise*, a best seller in its day, advocated for a formal education in a broad range of subjects (Martin, p. 115). Mann, perhaps one of the strongest advocates and most prolific writers on the subject, argued that education was the strongest device that the country had in providing its citizens
with equal opportunity. Further, he believed that a free public education would be the country's greatest equalizer where poor and wealthy would have the opportunity to be successful and claimed that education should be an "absolute right of every human being" (Alexander & Alexander, p. 28).

The virtues of a universal education were promoted under the assumption that children would learn what they were told (D. K. Cohen, 1988). These beliefs were rooted in an uncritical acceptance of English Protestant educational doctrine which undergirded the conclusion that students were "passive" in the process of their own education and would learn through "quiet attention, obedience to teachers, and recalling and repeating material" (D. K. Cohen, 1988, p. 12). These Protestant doctrines did not exist in a vacuum, doctrines of various religions dating as far back as the middle ages subscribed to these beliefs (Gardner, 1985, p. 348; Martin, 1985; Newman, 1982).

At the time of Mann and Beecher, however, there were others, such as James Fenimore Cooper and Mark Twain, who did not believe in public school institutions. Referred to as the "Romantics", these progressivists viewed education as an individualistic endeavor that was accomplished through authentic life experiences (D. K. Cohen, 1988, p. 2). They were strongly opposed to the notion of a universal education in which students would be forced to attend school. The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn, a book which describes the adventures of two runaways, was written to depict Twain's beliefs in the virtues of self-inquiry and self-exploration and the evils of formal schooling (D. K. Cohen, 1988).

At the end of the nineteenth century, John Dewey helped to bridge these two divergent schools of thought. Dewey (1938) claimed that a common set of principles could be culled from traditionalist and progressivist perspectives. Further, he believed that public schools could be places of vision, discovery, intellectual challenge, adventure, and excitement without eliminating all of their traditionalist
heritage. The principle this required, Dewey asserted, was a belief in the ideals of community over authority. Further, Dewey described this "community enterprise" as an organization in which all individuals have the opportunity to contribute something (p. 56).

While Dewey's beliefs did not have as profound an effect on public school education as some had hoped, they provided a vision about the ideals of our democracy and the tenets of a learning theory which would later be called cooperative learning. Schmuck (1985), in his writing on cooperative learning, credits Dewey's contributions: "Dewey emphasized the social aspects of learning and the role of the school in educating students in cooperative democratic living" (p. 5).

**The Principles of Cooperation**

A good deal of research interest has been stimulated by reforms in American public school educational practices. Much of the classroom-based research has shifted the focus of instruction from teacher-led environments to heterogeneously grouped cooperative learning communities (Bell, Roubinek, & Southard, 1989; E. G. Cohen, 1984; Johnson et al., 1986; Pepitone, 1985; Sharan, 1990; Schmuck, 1985; Slavin, 1983 & 1985). Some of the major theoretical contributions in this area include Dewey's (1938) writings on American public school education as well as Johnson & Johnson's (1985), Slavin's (1983), and Sharan's (1990) writings on cooperative learning.

While Dewey's educational vision included the principles of cooperation and democratic learning it was not until the 1970's that alternative theoretical methods to teacher-led environments were explored (Schmuck, 1985, p. 6). Many of these explorations were based on the belief that cooperative learning communities promoted achievement better than teacher-led settings (E. G. Cohen, 1994; Freeman,
Explorations into cooperative learning theory were based on four premises: (a) learning is enhanced when it is highly active, (b) learning is enhanced when it is an interactive process, (c) learning is enhanced when it is an interdependent endeavor, and (d) learning cooperatively enhances the promotions of social skills.

**Learning is enhanced when it is highly active**

Cooperative learning researchers believe that students should be active participants in their own education (Slavin, 1983, p. 2). They believe that students should be active partners with their teachers and peers in creating an educational system that is based on two principles: the acquisition of knowledge and the promotion of social skills. These tenets hearken back to the educational visions of John Dewey who believed that learning is a social activity (Schmuck, 1985).

Students, cooperative learning researchers suggest, should have a critical role in defining the purpose and process of their education through activities such as sharing, collaborating and negotiating with their teachers and peers because these learning activities encourage optimal cognitive and social development (E. G. Cohen, 1994; Maehr et al., 1992; Freeman, 1992; Slavin, 1985). Several researchers suggest that actively involving students in the learning process promotes and enhances a wide range of educational goals (E. G. Cohen, 1994; Johnson & Johnson, 1985; Schmuck, 1985; Slavin 1983, 1985).

This active involvement occurs by empowering students in the process of their own learning and by altering the role of teacher from the central formal authoritative figure to an active informal collaborator (Sharan, 1990). "Teachers reduce their authority ...[and]... offer guidance and assistance to develop the skills that pupils need to be members of relatively autonomous groups" (p. 79). Many cooperative learning
researchers claim that this shift in authority allows students to be more active in the process of their own learning and, as such, more successful (Bell et al., 1989; E. G. Cohen, 1994; Johnson et al., 1986; Maehr et al., 1992; Sharan, 1990; Slavin, 1985).

The acquisition of knowledge and social development is described as a process that is optimally activated through mutual collaboration (Johnson et al., 1986). Students "enjoy working in cooperative groups [because it] makes schoolwork social and exciting" (Slavin, 1985, pp. 9-11). Hence, learning is believed to be promoted when it is an active process that involves student-student and teacher-student interactions that are seen as mutual, social, exciting, and enjoyable.

Further, the quality of these conditions, mutuality, socialization, excitement, and enjoyment, have been linked with beliefs about how the human brain works best (Caine & Caine, 1991). The brain is a physiological organ that operates according to physiological rules. Learning is claimed to be a natural function of the human brain. Nonetheless, learning can be promoted or inhibited depending on the types of conditions that are present (Caine & Caine, 1991; Sylwester & Cho, 1992).

The brain's primary quest is to search for meaning by continuously attempting to make connections between what is familiar (memory) and what is novel (external stimuli) (Caine & Caine, 1991; Sylwester & Cho, 1992, p. 72). These connections, external events combined with internal memory, are essential to learning and require constant external and internal connections in order for meaning to occur (Caine & Caine, 1991). Hence, the brain is always seeking to link familiar memory with novel external stimuli. Further, making these connections is considered to be essential to learning.

A body of research has indicated that certain conditions promote the acquisition of knowledge (e.g., Caine & Caine, 1991; Sylwester & Cho, 1992). Much of this has been influenced by what has been termed "brain based learning theory" (Caine & Caine, 1991). Brain based learning theory contends that classroom
communities must be seen as safe and secure places in order for the human brain to feel that the environment is optimal for these learning connections to occur (Caine & Caine, 1991). Further, evidence suggests that the brain's activity actually slows down in response to repetitive and routinized activities and is often re-activated through activities perceived as enjoyable (Sylwester & Cho, 1992, p. 74). Moreover, it has been suggested that cooperative learning communities encourage enjoyment and stimulation more effectively than teacher-led classroom that encourage rote memorization and recall activities (p. 72-73). Thus, groupwork that is seen as pleasurable, acts as a stimulator linking the external (novel information) with the internal (memory) in order for learning to be processed and remembered (p. 74).

Learning is enhanced when it is an interactive process

Teacher-led classroom settings are those often described as having one teacher as the primary communicator. They are seen as formal and structured environments where teacher-initiated communicative acts and student rote memorization and communicative drill sequences are the norm (Sharan, 1990). It is argued that one teacher cannot provide the vast amount of attention needed by each student (Slavin, 1985). Further, active student participation has been found to be significantly low in teacher-led classrooms (p. 2). Further, it is claimed that the primary function of teacher-led environments is to maintain the teacher as the primary authority of who talks, listens, is praised, and is recognized (Sharan, 1990).

It is not my intention here to claim that teacher-led classrooms do not have a purpose in education nor to claim that cooperative learning environments should be the sole setting for learners. It is to suggest that within the construct of cooperative learning settings, students and teachers have the opportunity to work together and to collaborate toward a common goal. It is also to suggest that meaningful learning
occurs when students and teachers collaborate, negotiate, and share (E. G. Cohen, 1994; Freeman, 1992).

Collaborative learning involves students and faculty working together, generally in small groups, to create knowledge. In the process, a collaborative culture is established which transforms a number of relationships: between students and faculty; among students; among faculty; between teaching and research; and between teachers, learners, and knowledge (Landa, 1989).

Further, students are much more than passive recipients of their teacher's knowledge: "...a classroom, whether traditional or cooperative, is a complex environment of communicative events that involve meaningful exchanges between all of its members in the pursuit of learning" (Trueba et al., 1981, p. 40). However, students are far more active in the learning process when they are involved in cooperative learning settings as opposed to teacher-led environments (p. 40). Interactions between students and their peers as well as between students and their teachers has been found to enhance learning (E. G. Cohen, 1994; Freeman, 1992; Trueba et al., 1981).

**Learning is enhanced when it is an interdependent endeavor**

Working together toward a common goal is an essential aspect in cooperative learning theory (E. G. Cohen, 1994; Johnson & Johnson, 1985; Slavin, 1985). Interdependence enables individual learners to be part of a learning community that collaborates, shares, negotiates, communicates, and works closely together for the common good and a common goal. Cooperative learning communities link individuals interdependently through such common grounds as their "goals, tasks, work environments, and rewards" (Johnson & Johnson, 1985, pp. 59-65).

Further the condition of interdependence has been related with the success of the group and fosters equality amongst its members because each has an important task that is essential to the outcome of the group (E. G. Cohen, 1994; Pepitone, 1985). Thus, the common goal is achieved when each member is assigned one part of a
learning problem in which the "solution is needed by all of the members of the group" (Pepitone, 1985, p. 28). Often referred to as a "jigsaw or task specialization method" the condition of positive interdependence is a critical aspect of cooperative learning theory (pp. 28-29). Further, a number of studies suggest that this condition promotes sociality between group members (pp. 29-30).

Individual and group accountability are also addressed by educational theorists who suggest that the best outcomes are achieved when students are given two tasks: (a) an individual product-based task that is dependent on a student's collaboration with their cooperative learning group and (b) a group task that based on their collaborative efforts (E. G. Cohen, 1984).

Learning cooperatively enhances the promotion of social skills

This theoretical model is grounded in the belief that learning is a social activity (Bell et al., 1989; Dewey, 1938; Johnson & Johnson, 1985). Further, this model has been examined extensively by Johnson & Johnson (1985) perhaps the most prolific researchers in this area. They found that cooperative learning environments enhances the promotion of social skills more than teacher led models (Johnson & Johnson, 1985, p. 112). Further, it is believed that school plays a critical role in the socialization of students to adult life (Bailey 1993b; Slavin, 1983). Cooperative learning methods provide students with the opportunity to develop these adult roles in an environment that encourages equality among its participants (Slavin, 1983).

Evidence has been found that students' pro-social activities increase in cooperative learning classrooms where teachers are more facilitative and assistive and when there is more contact between teachers and students and students and students (Blaney et al., 1977; Sharan, 1990; Slavin, 1983). This increase in pro-social activities has been linked with the increased amount of interpersonal contacts found in cooperative learning settings (Slavin, 1983).
Hence, many claim that students learn best in small cooperative group settings where teachers are more facilitative and informal and where students learn with and are dependent on each other toward a common goal (E. G. Cohen, 1994; Freeman, 1992; Johnson et al., 1986; Johnson & Johnson, 1985; Maehr et al., 1992; Sharan, 1983; Slavin, 1983). Further, it is suggested that the human brain has organic mechanisms that operate for the purpose of continuously making connections between external stimuli and internal memory in order to learn (Caine & Caine, 1991; Sylwester & Cho, 1992). Moreover, it is suggested that the brain can perform these functions best in familiar group settings that are perceived as pleasurable. Thus, socially cooperative relationships between all participants in a learning community are believed to promote cognitive and socialization skills in students.

However, any learning theory's applicability to ESL learners should be constructed after carefully examining how the theory relates to what has been or is being explicitly claimed about ESL learning (Cummins, 1984). Theories often reflect what is known about the majority population and what is assumed about the minority (Cummins, 1984). The presence of diverse cultures and languages presents a highly important dimension to any learning theory. As such, it is believed that cooperative learning theory in contemporary American public school education cannot be considered without attending to the presence of linguistic and cultural diversity for they help to focus the application of this theory in a real context.

Second Language Learners: A Policy Perspective

Is cooperative learning theory capable of being put into practice effectively with NES and ESL learners? It is not my interest here to cast doubt on this learning theory. This question refers to the application of this learning theory; a question oriented to who is teaching and who is learning. After all, theorists do not develop
theories in a vacuum. They view education as a purposeful part of our society and develop theories to promote these purposes. Moreover, many theoretical scholars point to education as the training ground for adult life (Beecher, 1977; Dewey, 1938; Mann, 1847; Martin 1985; Plato, 1974; Rousseau, 1947). As such, the interest in this area is to develop a construct of cooperative learning theory as it relates to heterogeneously grouped students who represent diverse linguistic and cultural experiences.

Research in the area of cooperative learning, I suggest, should involve an examination of the corollary relationships of students, teachers, and their context in order to situate the implications of this theory in a real context. The roots of American linguistic and cultural heritage provide a locus with which to place the corollary relationships of culture, language, society, and cooperative learning theory. For this purpose, the following discussion about the nation's cultural and linguistic roots will be presented in order to situate this learning theory in an American societal context.

Diego Castellanos (1992) describes the significant diversity seen in our country's origins describing the periods between pre-Colonialism to about 1850.

Willing pioneers came from Spain, France, England and other countries of the world. ...Prior to the arrival of the Europeans, more than five hundred [native American] languages were spoken in America. ... The languages most frequently taught in school [in the late eighteenth century] were German, Dutch, Polish, and Classics. Spanish was used exclusively in the Southwest, of course, but that area was not yet part of the United States. During the eighteenth century, the German Lutheran and reformed churches built private elementary school systems which over time received public funds. ... As the number of Germans increased, public schools began to adjust their program to the needs of these children. Instruction in several districts in Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, the Carolinas, and later Wisconsin was given in German—often to the exclusion of English. It is quite obvious that this nation was born multilingual and multicultural... (Castellanos, pp. 18-19).

Nieto (1992) provides more information about our nation's cultural and linguistic roots. In a poignant description of its people, Nieto claims that liberty, one of the key aspects of the nation's democracy, was not a truth held for all of its
inhabitants. Our cultural and linguistic backgrounds are representative of widely differing historical experiences of privilege and oppression.

It is clear that American Indians, who were conquered and segregated on reservations; African Americans, who were enslaved and whose families were torn apart; Mexican Americans, whose land was annexed and who were then colonized within their own country; and Puerto Ricans, who were colonized and are still under the domination of the United States, represent unique cases of subjugated people in US. history. In addition, and probably not incidentally, they are all people of color, and the issue of race remains paramount in explaining their experiences. ... the legacy of subjugation can be seen in many arenas, including education (Nieto, p. 27).

The nation's founding fathers wanted to gain support for a revolution and saw the advantages of "translating key documents into German and Classics" in order to spread the word (Heath, 1992, 23). Their principle priority was to promote the virtues of a democracy and all languages were considered appropriate for this purpose. Further, their primary goal was to create a unified democracy and to provide compulsory schools in order to thwart the potential of a threatened democracy by an "unruly" people (D. K. Cohen, 1988, p. 1).

Many, such as Benjamin Franklin in 1753, John Adams in 1780, Congressman McCormick in 1923, and Senator Hayakawa in 1981, have advocated for a national language policy (Crawford, 1992). However, our nation has never created a clear language policy despite continuing efforts. We have failed to do so because of the "common assumption" that we are a monolingual nation (Crawford, 1992, p. 3). Further, this common assumption has perpetuated erroneous beliefs about the depth of our nation's linguistic diversity and has led to a broad range of conflicting opinions and assumptions about how to educate students who are not proficient in English (Crawford, 1992).

Many schools engaged in what is commonly referred to as the "sink or swim" method of learning English where students were placed in solely English instructed classrooms and were expected to learn English quickly or to fail (Crawford, 1992; Cummins, 1984). During the early 1960's, many claimed the nation's educational and
societal policies were discriminatory. Commonly referred to as the Civil Rights movement, it strove to create more equality among the nations' populace (Crawford, 1992). The absence of a clear language policy and the assumption that we are a monolingual English nation propelled many to take their school districts to court on the grounds that they were not able to learn because they could not understand the language of instruction. These landmark cases had a major effect in the area of educating students who acquired ESL (Crawford, 1989; Cummins, 1984; Rossell & Baker, 1988; Rossell & Ross, 1986).

During the next twenty-five years, a number of landmark United States Supreme Court cases determined how students who were not yet able to learn in English should be educated. Each has involved disputes between students and parents against their local school districts claiming that they were denied access to an equal education because of their linguistic needs. For the purpose of this paper, three will be discussed.

Perhaps the most well known in the literature on this subject is the Lau v. Nichols case. In 1974, a group of Chinese students from California brought a suit against their school district claiming the school had violated their fourteenth amendment rights to an education. They argued that their rights were violated because the school had not provided them with equal access to an education since they could not understand English, the sole language of instruction (Alexander & Alexander, 1985).

Further, the plaintiffs argued against a policy that had long been held in this country; ESL learners were expected to "sink or swim" without any specialized program to address their linguistic needs (Crawford, 1992, p. 313). The court ruled that "children who receive no help in overcoming language barriers are effectively foreclosed from any meaningful education" (Crawford, 1992, p. 5). The language of their ruling, however, did not specifically describe what remedial steps the school
should take in order to rectify the problem (Alexander & Alexander, 1985). Lau was quite vague in its ruling when it stated, "must take affirmative steps" and, as such, allowed schools a tremendous amount of latitude in remediating a long-held and unfortunate practice of "sink or swim".

Further, Lau addressed only students with no English skills when it stated: "where inability to speak and understand English" (Lau v. Nichols, 1974). It excluded a significant number if not the majority of students who had limited skills in English. "The decision does not recognize the possibility that few children living in this country will know absolutely no English, and that children can be arrayed on a continuum of ability to speak and understand English," (Rossell & Baker). Therefore, Lau prevented the majority of students who were not yet proficient in English from ever receiving an education that would facilitate the successful acquisition of English based on the assumption that those with no English skills were the only ones who needed any type of specialized program in order to meet their linguistic needs. Further, it allowed schools the latitude to create and maintain ineffective programs.

The following year, a group of students and parents, representing over 150,000 Hispanic students from New York, took their school system to court because they believed that they were improperly identified as able to learn in English. The case, Aspira v. Board of Education (1975) was the first which looked at how much English was necessary in order for students to participate in a mainstream English program (Rossell & Baker, 1988).

The defendants in this case believed that only those who had very limited English proficiency (those who scored below the tenth percentile on English proficiency testing) should be allowed entry into programs that would address their second language learning needs. While the course ruled in favor of the Plaintiffs, they also ruled that the twentieth percentile was to be the cutoff point. Thus, their ruling virtually assured that a number of students who did not possess communicative
competence in English would continue to be placed in an all English learning environment. Aspira's ruling, therefore, further perpetuated the assumption that students with limited proficiency in English could be placed successfully in mainstream English classrooms without addressing their second language learning needs.

In 1978, Cintron v. Brentwood Union Free School District, addressed a critical aspect of second language acquisition; when should students transfer from receiving instruction in the native language to an English instructed program? The court found that the district segregated and isolated bilingual students from their NES peers and ruled that the district must provide methods for transferring students into mainstream English classroom.

In these cases, and those that followed, thousands of ESL learners from across the nation have been found by the United States Supreme Court to have been treated unequally by their local school districts due to discriminatory educational practices (Crawford, 1989; Rossell & Ross, 1986; Rossell & Baker, 1988). Despite the courts ruling in favor of ESL learners there have been a disproportionate number of students who are not yet proficient in English who are placed in special and vocational education programs (Cummins, 1984). These placements have been made because students who are not yet able to learn in English have (a) been placed in English instructed classrooms, (b) have subsequently been referred for an evaluation to determine if their lack of learning is due to a learning disability, (c) have been improperly assessed using English assessments which were created for NES students, and (d) are frequently found to have special needs based on false assumptions that students with limited proficiency in English should be as successful in an all English learning environment as their NES peers (Cummins, 1984).

Language policy continues to be a hotly debated subject. Further, efforts to change the nation's public policies about ESL learners have continued to perpetuate a
"sink or swim" policy. In 1981, Senator S. I. Hayakawa sought to make English the official language of the country and in doing so intended to "prohibit federal and state laws, ordinances, regulations, orders, programs, and policies from requiring the use of other languages" (Crawford 1992, p. 1).

The absence of a national language policy" heightens fragmentation and ambiguity" around language and cultural educational issues (Jeannot, 1992, p. 15). Further, we tend to defend ourselves in contradictory terms which further perpetuates the mistreatment of ESL learners (Wong Fillmore, 1992).

We celebrate the fact that many nations have contributed to the formation of one nation. We see our multiple origins as a source of pride and strength. On the other hand, we idealize ourselves as a single, unified people and insist on conformity to a common culture, language, and purpose. Though we are a nation of immigrants, we have never felt at ease with diversity. To achieve the feel (if not the sight and sound) of homogeneity, we have often shut out those who are different, or have suppressed those who cannot or will not give up their differences (Wong Fillmore, 1992, pp. 375-376).

These divergent contexts have great meaning and implications in American public school education and, as such, have equal strength in the practices of any learning theory. A body of evidence indicates that American public school institutions serve to perpetuate the status quo of society's values and practices (Cummins, 1984; Nieto, 1992; Ogbu, 1978; Wong Fillmore, 1992). However, college classrooms according to Bailey (1993b) can be places where teachers and teachers-in-training can obtain the skills that are necessary to promote a more moral and ethical society. These changes are critical based on the needs of an increasingly diverse populace and the purpose of American public school institutions.

Increased Diversity in the United States

American public school classrooms are increasingly becoming more linguistically and culturally diverse (Crawford, 1992; Cummins, 1984; Freeman & Freeman, 1988; Hamayan & Perlman, 1990; Molesky, 1988; Nieto, 1992; Ravitch, 1992, Trueba et al., 1981; Zeichner, 1993). Further, it is predicted that the population
of students who are not yet proficient in English will continue to rise at a significant rate: "One report estimates that there are currently between 1.2 and 1.7 million such students. Even more dramatic is the expectation that by the year 2020 the number of children speaking a primary language other than English will be almost 6 million" (Nieto, 1992, p. 155). Further, the trend of new immigrants has shifted from Europeans to Asian and Latin American people of color; a significant number of whom are "refugees from countries where the United States has been involved in aggression" and many have experienced sustained and continued practices of oppression and racism in this country (p. 155).

Many language minority groups have continuously been regarded as inferior, have similarly received inferior educations, have often been disempowered, and have been alienated by school and society (Cummins, 1984; Ogbu, 1978). Further, two types of immigrant populations have been depicted; those who are valued by society and those who are seen as inferior (Cummins, 1986; Ogbu, 1978). The former often feel a sense of powerlessness believing that the latter, the dominant group has control over their lives (Cummins, 1984; 1986). These characteristics have great implications on the educational practices in public school institutions.

Schools usually reflect the practices of society where the "dominant group" controls and organizes education in an effort to maintain their power (Ogbu, 1978, p. 358). This is supported by evidence of differences found in the way teachers treated their Mexican-American and Anglo students (Trueba et al., 1981). The latter were treated more favorably in terms of "encouragement and praise" and were seen to speak more frequently than the former (p. 37). Further, evidence reveals that the "drop-out rate among Mexican-American and mainland Puerto Rican students remains between 40-50 percent compared to 14 percent for whites" (Cummins, 1986, p. 18). "Educators must change the way they perceive their students and in doing so will empower them to succeed in school" (Cummins, 1986, p. 18). Cultural
differences greatly influences how we communicate, what we say, and how we act, and how we are regarded by others. Further, teacher beliefs about student cultural traits can "politicize" students into positions of power or powerlessness depending on whether their culture is framed as an identity marker or a marker associated with value laden goods such as power, status, and worth (Erickson, 1996, p. 294).

**Contemporary educators in American public schools**

The composition of the current teacher population has significant implications in the context of mainstream classrooms where NES and ESL learners work in small heterogeneous cooperative learning groups. Most of the nation's teachers are "white, monolingual, and female" and are unlikely to change despite evidence that the population of students continues to become more diverse (Zeichner, 1992). Further, most new teachers will have had life experiences that are entirely different from the students they will teach.

While many believe teachers must be trained to meet the needs of a growing population acquiring ESL (Cummins, 1986; Fear Fenn, 1993; Hamayan & Perlman, 1990; Milk, 1992; Vogel Zanger 1989; Zeichner 1993), Zeichner has found that most teacher training institutions do not provide any training for mainstream teachers in the area of bilingual or multicultural education (1993). Further, most teacher training programs "use a monocultural approach ...[and]...train teachers to teach students like themselves" and do not teach about cultural or linguistic diversity (Zeichner, 1993). Moreover, the majority of students who are not yet proficient in English are currently being taught by monolingual English teachers who have not had any formal education in the areas of second language acquisition, bilingual education, or multicultural education (Vogel Zanger, 1989). Most teachers receive training in bilingual education, second language acquisition, and multicultural education in "the teachers lounge, over coffee, or at a copying machine and usually in a crisis" (Vogel Zanger,
Further, staff development for veteran teachers has been on a singular level where most seek information or professional training on their own (Zeichner, 1992). Moreover, staff development has often been in the realm of a one day workshop that has been found to be ineffective in creating the changes needed in teaching (Godenberg & Gallimore, 1991).

More disconcerting is evidence which reveals that many teachers-in-training view diversity as a negative (Zeichner, 1992; Goodlad, 1990). Further, in a study of teachers-in-training, a significant number believed that students from language backgrounds other than English were not as "capable" of learning as the majority (Zeichner, 1992, p. 4). Moreover, researchers examined teacher education literature for the presence of information about educating an increasingly diverse population and little information was found in this area (Grant & Secada, 1990; Ladson-Billings, 1991; Zeichner, 1992).

The pattern of ignoring culture and language has been so pervasive in teacher training programs that higher education institutions should make this topic a systemic priority (Hamayan & Perlman, 1990; Zeichner, 1992). Further, most teachers and teachers-in-training should receive instruction in the areas of "bilingual education, second language acquisition, integration, and grouping practices" (Hamayan & Perlman, 1990). Further, it is believed that training would enhance the opportunities that students acquiring ESL have in attaining a successful education (Hamayan & Perlman, 1990).

The work force is increasingly becoming more culturally diverse and this suggests that educational institutions should focus more attention on better preparing students to collaborate and get along (Fear-Fenn, 1993). Further, teacher training and development institutions should "adapt to shifting political and demographic realities" (Milk, 1992). The notion that teachers should adapt to a political climate suggests that their work has great implications for our society as a whole.
Educating NES and ESL learners in mainstream heterogeneously grouped classrooms will challenge the status quo of teacher practices. However, if the purpose of education is to promote the ideals of democracy, these changes are both critical and necessary.

**The principles of cooperative learning and ESL learning**

Several educational theorists claim that cognitive, social, and ESL development are fostered when students who are acquiring ESL are grouped with NES speakers in mainstream English classrooms. In order to examine their claims, the four tenets of cooperative learning will be re-visited.

**Learning is enhanced when it is highly active**

As mentioned, cooperative learning theorists believe that students should be active participants in their own education (Slavin, 1983). Cooperative learning environments that include NES offer ESL learners provide more opportunity to develop cognitive and English skills than typical bilingual programs that offer students less occasion to be exposed to English (E. G. Cohen, 1994). Krashen's (1988) work signifies the importance of providing "meaningful [second] language instruction that is a bit beyond the learner's current level of proficiency" in order to foster the development of a new language (in E. G. Cohen, 1994, p. 149). In addition, mainstream English classroom settings can provide ESL learners with meaningful environments to actively practice and learn a new language (E. G. Cohen, 1994).

Further, cooperative learning settings can enhance oral communicative and socialization skills by providing a safe environment in which to practice and develop ESL skills (Holt, 1992). Similarly, cooperative group experiences provide students with an array of opportunities to use their own resources to develop higher order
thinking skills in a second language (Nunan, 1989). These beliefs suggest that learning a second language involves the same brain based activities suggested earlier: internal experiences, memory, are used to make meaning of new stimuli, external events, and these connections enhance the learning of a new language (Caine & Caine, 1991; Sylwester & Cho, 1992).

**Learning is enhanced when it is an interactive process**

Meaningful learning occurs when students and teachers have many opportunities to cooperate, negotiate, and share (E. G. Cohen, 1994). It is suggested that the ideal environment for students to acquire ESL is in mainstream English classrooms that are designed for students to work together as opposed to bilingual classrooms that isolate ESL students from their NES peers (E. G. Cohen, 1994). Further, NES teachers and learners provide ESL learners with multiple opportunities to share, experience, and practice a new language (E. G. Cohen, 1994; Pica & Long, 1993).

Evidence indicates that second language learning is enhanced, regardless of proficiency level, when students have the opportunity to learn with native speakers in small informal group settings (Pica & Long, 1993; Long, Adams, McLean, & Castanos, 1976). Most importantly, student-student interactions have been found to be more beneficial than student-teacher interactions (Long et al., 1976). Hence, cognitive, social, and language acquisition skills are believed to be enhanced when ESL learners are provided with the opportunity to interact with NES learners in cooperative learning groups in mainstream English classrooms.

**Learning is enhanced when it is an interdependent endeavor**

Learning is far more successful when it is done in groups that are "small enough so that everyone can participate on a task" (E. G. Cohen, 1994, p. 1). Further,
students of mixed language groups can effectively work together on a task in cooperative settings to "describe, analyze, hypothesize and infer" meanings (E. G. Cohen, 1994, p. 161). Further, these interdependent activities have been found to promote cognitive and second language development (E. G. Cohen, 1994, p. 161). Hence, ESL students can simultaneously receive content assistance and acquire English from their NES peers and teachers. Similarly, evidence has been found that cooperative learning methods that include NES and ESL learners enhances the acquisition of academic skill development, self esteem, peer relations, and sociality for all students and simultaneously enhances the acquisition of English for ESL learners (Jacob & Mattson, 1987).

Further, the group's task has the potential to equalize the status of each group member because every participant, NES and ESL learners, are dependent on each other in order to attain a common group goal (E. G. Cohen, 1994). Full participation in cooperative learning groups is accomplished through the continual teaching of specific group behaviors in which there is "the norm that everyone should contribute" to attain the group's goal (p. 45). Further, these common goals create interdependent relationships that enhance the promotion of social skills, second language acquisition, and cognitive development (E. G. Cohen, 1994).

Learning cooperatively enhances the promotion of social skills

As stated, cooperative learning theory is grounded in the belief that learning is a social activity. Cooperative learning communities have been found to promote social skills between language and cultural groups who might otherwise have remained separate (Slavin, 1985). This is seen as one of the great advantages of this model because it provides students with the opportunity to step outside their preferred group and engage in meaningful social situations with students from diverse life experiences (Slavin, 1985). Further, evidence has been found that these methods
promote the learning of ESL and socialization skills between all students (McGroarty, 1989; Wheelock, 1992).

Further, it has been found that this model has produced more "cross ethnic cooperation and less negative and competitive behavior between members of different ethnic groups" (Sharan, 1984, p. 18). Moreover, findings of a study in which students from two mainstream high school English literature classes were paired with students from two high school ESL classes in cooperative learning groups once a month for one year revealed that (a) ESL students reported feeling better about school and more able to ask for help and (b) NES and ESL learners reported appreciating the opportunity to get to know each other (Burhoe, 1989).

Cooperative learning settings provide ESL learners with the same types of cognitive and socialization developmental learning opportunities claimed for NES; namely: learning is a highly active, interactive, and interdependent process and, as such, can be enhanced through social activities to achieve common goals (E. G. Cohen, 1994; Sharan, 1990; Slavin 1985).

Factors involved in the enhancement of learning

As mentioned, it is claimed that cooperative learning theory in contemporary education cannot be discussed without attending to the presence of linguistic and cultural diversity for it helps to focus its application in a real context. While educational theorists claim that cooperatively grouping NES and ESL learners in mainstream English classrooms can enhance cognitive, social, and language acquisition development for ESL learners, there are several who claim that this enhancement is dependent on certain important factors.
Enhancing the making of meaningful connections

Making and negotiating meaning is essential to the acquisition of a new language (E. G. Cohen, 1994; Cummins, 1986; Gee, 1990; Trueba et al., 1981). Students must be able to make meaning of their environment in order for language learning to occur. Further, participation in any learning community requires its learners to be familiar with the discourse of the community. Moreover, discourse competence must be acquired in order to be considered a legitimate member of a group and membership implies that the participant has gained competence in the culture of the social group (Gee, 1990). Teachers are the primary providers of access to learners who are new to the language and culture of the discourse (Gee, 1990).

Gee (1990) and Trueba et al. (1981) highlight the significance that discourse competence plays in the context of any learning community and highlight the impact that teachers have in assuring that this competency is achieved. In cooperative learning communities composed of NES and ESL learners, I suggest, discourse competence is achieved through the continual willingness of NES students and their teachers to provide access to learners who are new to the language and culture of the discourse. This implies that students and teachers who are NES must be particularly sensitive to the needs of particular group members, ESL learners, who might not be familiar with the language, culture, or academic content of their learning environment. Further, NES learners and their teachers must allow ESL learners the opportunity to meaningfully connect internal experiences with external stimuli, the interactions that occur and co-occur in cooperative learning groups, in order to learn.

Freeman (1993) claims that cooperative learning methods are quite dependent on the quality of student interactions. She cites a study that was used to understand the roles of students in relation to each other. In this study, a 21 year old Japanese student who was acquiring ESL was placed in two different student pairs. In the former, he was not allowed to participate fully. In the latter, he was expected to
participate. He reported that he felt frustrated in the former group and, as such, allowed his partner to rule their work. In the second group, however, he claimed that he actively participated in the learning process and believed that he was an important contributor in the learning process. Thus, interaction between students can inhibit or enhance learning. Further, teachers can successfully enhance cognitive and second language development by carefully and thoughtfully creating cooperative learning opportunities which encourage active participation of all of its members (Freeman, 1993).

Evidence of this model's success has been attributed to student willingness to give up their independence and competitiveness in favor of collaborating, sharing, and negotiating to attain a common goal (Slavin, 1983). Further, these characteristics can only be fostered when students possess the "ability to understand someone else's perspective" (p. 118). Moreover, it requires students to set their desire for independence aside in favor of the common good (McCutcheon, 1995).

The willingness and ability to set individual desires and beliefs aside in order to understand someone else's perspectives and learning needs for the purpose of achieving a common goal, I believe, are the most significant aspects of this milieu. It involves each individual's "struggle with what they have to sacrifice of themselves in order to belong to a group" (McCutcheon, 1995). However, these sacrifices can have important rewards. Learning cooperatively is as much about attaining individual and group goals as it is about the willingness to set personal agendas and beliefs aside. Thus, the willingness and ability to set one's agendas and beliefs aside in order to understand someone else's perspective and learning needs involves a host of complex tensions between the shedding of personal agendas and the attainment of personal and group goals. These tensions are highly relevant in the context of cooperative groupwork because they are so connected with our beliefs and perceptions about our
identities and the identities of others in this learning context. These claims are supported by a body of research that has been conducted in this area.

**Research findings about cooperative learning**

Since the 1970's, many studies have examined cooperative groupwork and its effect on learning (Bensimon & Neumann, 1993; E. G. Cohen, 1984; Johnson & Johnson, 1985; Sharan, 1990; Slavin, 1983; Smith, Johnson, & Johnson, 1981). Some of these studies have revealed that cooperative learning groups comprised of diverse members might not necessarily achieve the types of interactive, interdependent, or pro-social behaviors that have been linked with effective learning (Bensimon & Neumann, 1993; E. G. Cohen, 1984; Smith et al., 1981).

E. G. Cohen (1984) conducted a two year study which examined academic and racial status characteristics amongst three racially and socio-economically diverse, integrated, and untracked schools. Each school was recognized for its efforts "to include the culture and history of the minority student populations as a legitimate part of the school program" (E. G. Cohen, 1984, p. 80). Students and teachers in fifth and sixth grade classrooms were asked to rank their perceptions of students in their class in the areas of reading and influential power. It was seen that students of color, particularly Black and Hispanic, were far more likely to be ranked by their peers and teachers as low readers versus White peers who were ranked as high readers. Further, it was seen that White students who were perceived as high readers tended to dominate non-White peers who were perceived as poor readers" (E. G. Cohen, p. 93). However, it was also seen that non-White peers who were ranked as low readers and who were perceived as having influential power were seen to "booster" groupwork (E. G. Cohen, p. 86). This suggests that interpersonal influence can be a powerful contributor in the milieu of groups composed of diverse racial and academic abilities and suggests that certain minority members, those with influential power, might be
given legitimate group status. Further, it suggests that ESL learners who are perceived as having influential power might also be seen as effective group contributors. However, these findings also suggest that students of color who are perceived as having low reading and low influential status might be seen as having little influence on their groups' work. More significantly, it suggests that teachers need to rethink the structure and design of cooperative groupwork in their classrooms in order to elevate the status of those perceived as low.

Bensimon & Neumann's (1993) work on how leaders use their teams may provide useful information on how teachers might rethink the structure and design of cooperative groupwork in their classrooms. Their findings revealed how fifteen college and university presidents "made use" of their "top level leadership teams" and how team members regarded their peers (Bensimon & Neumann, 1993, p. 32). Their findings suggest that one of the most significant aspects of groupwork is who is given voice and how that voice defines the process and product of groupwork. It was seen that groups comprised of mostly men tended to give legitimacy and power to other male members and tended to treat women as "persons non grata" (Bensimon & Neumann, 1993, p. 124). Further, they found that groups are not necessarily "consciously" aware of the needs and desires of non-minority members and tend to give credence to those who represent the majority (Bensimon & Neumann, 1993, p. 120). More significant, were findings about groups where the needs and desires of majority and minority members were recognized by majority members and university presidents. When the willingness to understand and to listen to other perspectives was present, all members were found to have status power and to feel that they contributed to the success of their group. Further, in instances where majority members set their desire for independence aside in an effort to understand the perspectives and beliefs of their minority peers, "questioning, challenging, and
arguing" were found to be a common behavior and were seen to have a positive effect on groupwork (Bensimon & Neumann, 1993, pp. 43-45).

This concurs with Smith et al.'s (1981) conclusions in their study of cognitive conflict and its relation to the learning of sixth grade students. They studied cooperative learning groups in relation to the process of encouraging or discouraging controversy and found that those that encouraged the discussion of differences performed better on achievement tests and in academic understanding versus those that were encouraged to get-along. Students in the former group were encouraged to develop strong arguments on both sides of each controversy and, as a result, were found to have a broader academic understanding than their peers who were encouraged to agree. The findings from these studies have great implications for cooperative groups composed of NES and ESL members.

**Conflict and tension as normative behaviors that should be analyzed**

Cooperative groupwork has a multitude of layers and contexts: it is comprised of a collection of various individuals and their individual perceptions and assumptions of the world around them coupled with other individuals who bring a myriad of differing world views to this phenomenon (Jeannot, 1994). Each member brings their own identity and cultural belief system to the group, yet all are gathered to work cooperatively. Four features have been used to describe the dynamic characteristics of cooperative learning communities: (a) each group works with several issues at the same time; (b) "each member appraises the others and learns whose ideas are valuable, powerful, consonant with their own, or in opposition to them;" (c) each participant has their own individual experiences, interests, and desires; and (d) these differences are "likely to cause conflict [which] can lead to pressure for innovations, creativity, and change, thus deterring the complacency arising from too much stability" (McCutcheon, 1995, pp. 153-154).
Participating in groupwork is paradoxical in nature: one must shed their independence while simultaneously be willing to take a risk and reveal their individual desires and ideas in order to promote the success of the group's common goals, their task (McCutcheon, 1995). These claims support three contentions: (a) cooperative learners must be willing to shed their individual needs in order to focus their attention on the learning needs of their peers, (b) they must be willing and able to focus the attention of their peers onto what is relevant in the learning process in order for all to actively co-construct a learning community that will accomplish the group's task, and (c) conflict and tension must be seen as "normative behaviors" in cooperative learning groups (McCutcheon, 1995, p. 150).

Forming a group involves sharing norms about common interests... of developing agreement among individuals. Individuals cannot possibly act as a group until this occurs, even assuming that each individual still has his or her (subjective) practical theory of action. Because of the conflict between the group and the individuals in it, much group deliberation revolves around how to approach the task, given the various positions, particularly early in the process when people are starting to understand both the nature of the task and one another. This is why normative interests and conflict are so pertinent to group deliberation and, paradoxically, why the process of coming to agreement is so crucial. Obviously, conflict is less likely if the group has a common position from the outset... (McCutcheon, 1995, pp. 149-150).

Further, groups comprised of diverse members are more likely to have conflict because they are not functioning from a common ground (McCutcheon, 1995). This implies that conflict and tension are more likely to exist in groups composed of NES and ESL learners. This is not to claim that conflict or tension may be a negative in a group's process. Rather, conflict, tension, and individual willingness to take a risk have the potential to have a "positive role in deliberation by virtually forcing deliberators to examine alternatives meticulously" (McCutcheon, 1995, p. 150). Hence, cooperative learning groups composed of diverse members can be quite successful in achieving the group's goal when conflict, tension, and individual risk taking behaviors are analyzed and explored in the group's process.
However, it has been found that many groups will avoid conflict in the form of "scapegoating, building dependency on the [group] leader, ... ignoring the existence of the conflict, ...and the formation of coalitions [within the group]" (McCutcheon, 1995, p. 150). Further, conflict in all of its forms can inhibit communication (Saville-Troike, 1989). Erickson (1996) expands upon the concept of coalition formation in his discussion of "situational co-membership" when referring to speech communities that are composed of members who "strategically" share common "attitudes of social identity" (pp. 296-297). He claims that these attributes (e.g., NES learners) can contribute to the creation of a strong situational alliance. While Erickson suggests that situational co-memberships can enhance the relationships between people, I believe that it can also create coalitions and walls between group members. More significantly, all of these behaviors can reduce the overall success of a group by the very nature of avoiding the actual conflicts that are important to consider. Examples of McCutcheon's claims of (a) avoidance and (b) the examination and analysis of conflict, tension, and individual risk-taking behaviors are evidenced in research conducted in the college classroom where teachers and teachers-in-training composed of NES and ESL learners were cooperatively grouped.

Research findings about conflict, tension, and individual risk-taking behaviors

Maintaining harmony was one of the primary behaviors seen in a small cooperative group of teachers and teachers-in-training composed of NES and ESL learners in a graduate education course (Szewczynski, 1995). It was found that the co-construction of harmony was established during the group's formation when individual members self-disclosed that their failure in previous cooperative learning experiences was also their primary motivation to maintain the behavior of getting along. However, it was seen that the metanorm of harmony had a deleterious effect; it prohibited the achievement of a higher level of cognitive analysis and exploration of the overall group process.
Avoidance of conflict is further evidenced in Bachy (1992) and Friedlander's (1993) analysis of their roles as their group's facilitator. Bachy (1992) described her behavior as a facilitator in a cooperative learning setting as "tip-toeing around the group" in an effort to avoid conflict. Further, Friedlander (1993) described her behavior as a facilitator as having "a lot of tension...between holding back and keeping things moving [in the group] (Friedlander, 1993, p. 2)" Further, Friedlander named the cause of the tension in her rich description of the role's paradox: "this was perhaps exacerbated by the contrast between my group's 'laid back' character in relation to my own active, task oriented style. Acting is easier for me than watching" (Friedlander, 1993, p. 2). Bachy and Friedlander describe the tensions they experienced in their desire to be more active versus their belief that their role as reflective facilitator required passive, quiet, and reflective observation. Further, both Bachy and Friedlander describe the risks that they continuously perceived in terms of choosing when to talk, what to say, and how these two behaviors significantly affected their individual perceptions about their ability to be effective facilitators.

Conflict, tension, and individual risk-taking behaviors and their function in a cooperative learning group's process is further evidenced by this researcher in the first of two pilot ethnographies in preparation for this dissertation project (Zacarian, 1994). Here a cooperative learning group of teachers and teachers-in-training composed of four NES learners and one ESL learner who were enrolled in a course entitled "Principles of Second Language Acquisition" were examined using the underpinnings of ethnographic inquiry. At the group's seventh meeting, the ESL learner in the group brought a letter that he had written and gave a copy to each member. The letter informed the group that he was "not satisfied with the way our group processes things" (Zacarian, 1994, p. 14). He believed that the group was not focused enough on the theoretical basis of the course. He wrote that the group had "done nothing and [had] achieved nothing" (Zacarian, 1994, p. 14). He further wrote that the group's
discussions were "nothing but chats that lack system, organization and structure" (Zacarian, 1994, p. 14).

At the group's last meeting, group members commented that they believed he was right; they felt that the group did not have a clear understanding of the theoretical concepts. Further, one participant commented that the ESL learner had grasped the meaning of the theoretical materials before most of the other members and as a result had grown impatient with the group. She also commented that once he named this as a problem, "I learned the concepts and, boom, they came together. Until then, I wasn't able to make connections, [but] once he said all of this, I got mad and read the stuff like crazy" (Zacarian, 1994, p. 42).

In this respect, naming was a very useful and integral aspect in the process and product of this group. Further evidence which suggests that naming can be an important feature in groupwork was seen in a second ethnographic pilot study (Zacarian, 1995). The six participants in this study were composed of two Asian ESL and four NES female teachers who were enrolled in a cooperative learning group in a graduate course entitled "Curriculum Development for Heterogeneous Classes." They were given the task of developing an interdisciplinary curriculum unit on the biology of addiction for the middle school level and of presenting this unit to the whole class.

Asking questions was seen to be commonplace for the ESL learners in the group. For example, at the group's first meeting, one of the ESL learner's asked the question, "What is the biology of addiction?" The group spent the next thirty minutes trying unsuccessfully to answer this question. The NES learners in the group commented that answering this question was difficult because they took this term for granted.

Who asked and who responded to questions appeared to punctuate the presence of the two cultures in this cooperative learning group. One of the ESL
learner's claimed that she could not be a participant in the group because she was unfamiliar with the content. It forced her to ask questions in order to gain meaning.

In contrast, an NES group participant voiced concern in a dialogue journal entry about the time that the NES students were devoting to answering the questions posed by the ESL students in the group. These commonly occurring question and answer sequences were named and analyzed. The group found that the significant presence of questions and answers provided an important contribution to each individual's learning experience as well as to the group's task.

Thus, the act of asking questions was named and two distinct and essential functions were analyzed. Initially, the act of asking questions was seen as a barrier that kept ESL learners from fully participating with their NES peers. At the same time, the act of answering questions was found to be too all consuming for the NES learners in this speech community. The subsequent naming and analysis of these speech acts were found to provide new insights about their meaning and function in the group's talk. It was seen that the act of naming and analyzing issues of conflict, namely the pattern of asking and answering questions, served two important functions in this group: (a) it helped ESL learners make meaning of the culture and content of the group's process and product and (b) the repeated presence of questions were seen to help pull the group's ideas together.

The findings from these pilot studies appear to support the claims of McCutcheon's (1995), namely (a) issues of difference, tension, and conflict are inherent in cooperative groupwork and (b) these behaviors can have a positive effect on a group's process and product when the willingness to examine and analyze differences, tensions, and conflicts through the risk-taking process of revealing one's

---

1 Each group participant was required to write interactive weekly dialogue journals with their group's reflective facilitator. I was the reflective facilitator in this group.
experience, perception, and self are present during a cooperative learning group's co-construction of their process and their task.

Learning theorists point to cooperative learning as an effective method to foster cognitive, social, and second language acquisition development when (a) classroom teachers have acquired explicit knowledge and experience in the areas of cooperative learning, second language acquisition, and multicultural education (Vogel Zanger, 1989; Zeichner, 1992); (b) students are willing and able to focus their attention on the learning needs of their peers (Gee, 1990); (c) students are willing and able to help to shift the attention of their peers to relevant information that is implied in their cultural experiences and may not be explicitly or easily understood (Trueba et al., 1981; Gee, 1990); and (d) tension, conflict, and individual risk taking behaviors should be explored explicitly during the group's process (McCutcheon, 1995). The former three will be described in more detail in the subsequent sections.

Classroom teachers must acquire knowledge and experience

As claimed, most of the nation's teachers are "white, monolingual, and female" and are likely to remain the same (Zeichner, 1992). Further, most teachers have not had any training in second language acquisition, bilingual education, or multicultural education (Vogel Zanger, 1989). Moreover, most teacher training institutions do not provide training in these areas (Zeichner, 1992). Significant changes in teaching practices can be achieved when teachers and teacher training institutions take the appropriate steps to change (Cummins, 1986). I believe that teacher training institutions must engage in broad reforms in order to assure that meaningful instruction in the areas of second language acquisition, bilingual education, multicultural education, and cooperative learning occurs. Further, educators must be prepared to teach an increasing population of linguistically diverse students. If the purpose of education is to promote the ideals of democracy, these changes are both critical and necessary.
Students must be willing to focus their attention on the learning needs of their peers. Access to implicit information is believed to be crucial for ESL learners. Students must be able to differentiate between what is explicit and implicit about a culture and claim that much of what is known is learned implicitly (Trueba et al., 1981). As such, implicit information can pose a tremendous challenge for ESL and NES learners in order for each to understand the other's perspectives and belief systems. Further, it is believed that students who are acquiring ESL and are grouped cooperatively with NES learners are highly dependent on NES peers and teachers to focus their attention to relevant information and to assist in connecting this with already known information.

To be competent members of the classroom community, students must not only know what to do, but when and where to do it. In as much as the classroom is a socially organized community, participants must be able to act appropriately within its normal constraints. In order to produce behavior appropriate for a given classroom situation, students must interpret classroom rules and procedures that are often implicitly stated and which vary from situation to situation. Such competence constitutes a part of the common sense knowledge that students use...(Trueba, et al., p. 49).

It is not claimed here that these explicit meanings are easily explained in any learning context. However, it is suggested that ESL learners are highly dependent on their NES peers and teachers for this information when they are cooperatively grouped with NES students in monolingual English mainstream classrooms. Meaning involves our ability to "exclude, include, and guess" relevance within a given context or within a given social situation and our understanding of the world around us is learned by our "everyday social activities."(Gee, 1990). Every word in our language is "tied to a myriad of interconnecting cultural models" and culture has "deep implications for non-mainstream students who wish to master the standard cultural models in the society" (Gee, 1990).

Thus, ESL learners are not necessarily equal partners in cooperative learning endeavors because of their over-dependence on NES peers to make the dominant
culture explicit and accessible. This challenges the very tenets of cooperative learning theorists (e.g., E. G. Cohen, 1994; Maehr et al, 1992; Freeman, 1992; Slavin, 1985) who claim that students should have a critical role in defining the purpose and process of their education through activities such as sharing, collaborating, and negotiating with their teachers and peers. Students who are acquiring ESL may not be able to be as equally active in these activities unless they are given the opportunity to explicitly understand the implied culture and information involved in being a competent member of a cooperative learning community in an American context.

Willingness to shift the attention of peers to explicitly relevant information

Making the implicit explicit is an important task for teachers of ESL learners (Gee, 1990). One of the essential roles for teachers is to "focus student attention" on what is relevant so that ESL learners can acquire knowledge about their new culture (Gee, 1990). Similarly, "...if the culture is to become part of the consciousness of the child, then the culture of the child must first be in the consciousness of the teacher" (Trueba et al., 1981, p. 9). Teachers must gain and continually seek knowledge and understanding about their students (Williams, 1985). Similarly, American teachers should become more acquainted with the unique cultures of their students in order to help support their entree into American life (Moriyasu, 1988). Further, it is claimed that educators' awareness and support of cultural diversity enhances the success of students from various ethnic, cultural, and linguistic experiences (Gibson, 1991).

However, since one of the principle claims of cooperative learning theorists is that teachers will reduce their authority in favor of creating a setting where students work more autonomously towards a group goal (e.g., E. G. Cohen, 1994; Johnson et al., 1986; Sharan, 1990; Slavin, 1983 & 1985), this shift has enormous implications for ESL learners and NES who are joined in cooperative learning groups in mainstream English classrooms. It implies that teachers must be more reliant on
students who are NES to make the implicit explicit for the ESL learners in their classroom.

Thus, it is maintained, ESL learners are not necessarily equal partners in cooperative learning endeavors because of their dependence on their NES peers to make the dominant culture explicit and accessible and to focus their attention on what is relevant. However, ESL learners can make significant contributions as legitimate participants in these learning environments when:

• 1. Classroom teachers acquire explicit knowledge in the areas of cooperative learning, second language acquisition theory and methods, and multicultural education.

• 2. Learners are willing and able to focus their attention on the learning needs of their peers.

• 3. Learners are willing and able to help shift the attention of their peers to explicitly relevant information.

• 4. Conflict, tension, and individual risk-taking behaviors are explored and analyzed explicitly in the group's process.

Conclusions

This section examined the claims of a broad range of researchers (e.g., E. G. Cohen, 1984 & 1994; Johnson et al., 1986; Johnson & Johnson, 1985; Sharan, 1983; Slavin, 1983; Wang et al, 1994) who suggest that cognitive and social development is fostered when students from diverse abilities and languages are heterogeneously grouped in mainstream classrooms that use cooperative small group learning methods. Their claims suggest that learning and socialization are enhanced when it is (a) highly active, (b) an interactive process, and (c) an interdependent endeavor.

This section also examined Cummin's (1984) claim that learning theories are often reflective of what is claimed about the majority of society's students and what is
assumed about its "minority." This involved an examination of the corollary relationships of students, teachers, and their context in order to situate the implications of this theory in the context of mainstream English classrooms composed of NES speakers and ESL learners who are engaged in cooperative learning groups. Research from broad range of societal, educational, and legal perspectives were used to examine these contexts (e.g., Alexander & Alexander, 1985; Castellanos, 1992; Crawford, 1992; Cummins, 1994; Freeman & Freeman, 1988; Hamayan & Perlman, 1990; Jeannot, 1992; Nieto, 1992; Ravitch, 1992; Rossell & Baker, 1988; Rossell & Ross, 1986; Trueba et al., 1981; Wong Fillmore, 1992; Zeichner, 1993). It was seen that the nation's cultural, linguistic, and educational heritage is representative of widely differing historical experiences of privilege and oppression (Castellanos, 1992; Jeannot, 1992; Nieto, 1992; Wong Fillmore, 1992). It was also seen that several thousand students were found by the United States Supreme Court to have been treated unequally by their local school districts due to discriminatory educational practices (Alexander & Alexander, 1985; Cummins, 1985 & 1986; Crawford, 1992; Rossell & Ross, 1986; and, Rossell & Baker, 1988). Further, it was seen that the nation does not have a clear national language policy and that the absence of this escalates fragmentation and ambiguity around language and cultural issues (Crawford, 1992; Jeannot, 1991; and, Wong Fillmore, 1992).

Moreover, it was seen that American classrooms are increasingly becoming linguistically and culturally diverse (Crawford, 1992; Cummins, 1984; Freeman & Freeman, 1988; Hamayan & Perlman, 1990; Nieto, 1992; Ravitch, 1992, Trueba et al., 1981; Vogel Zanger, 1989; Zeichner 1993). In addition, it was seen that the population of linguistic minority students have often been disempowered and alienated by society and have been educated under the assumption that they could "sink or swim" in an all English instructed environment (Cummins, 1985 & 1986; Nieto, 1992).
Further, it was seen that the teaching population is representative of white, monolingual females who have been trained in institutions that use a monocultural approach (Zeichner, 1993). Moreover, it was seen that most teachers have not had training in the areas of bilingual education, second language acquisition, multicultural education, or cooperative learning pedagogy and that many have not been trained in the areas that they are currently teaching (Vogel Zanger, 1989; Zeichner, 1992).

Many claim that teachers must be trained in these areas in order to meet the needs of students who acquire ESL in mainstream classrooms that use cooperative small group learning methods and for schools to meet the needs of an increasingly diverse population (e.g., Cummins, 1986; Fear-Fenn, 1993; Hamayan & Perlman, 1990; Milk, 1992; Vogel Zanger, 1989; Zeichner, 1992).

In addition, it is claimed that cooperative learning environments can provide ESL learners with enhanced opportunities to attain cognitive, social, and language skills (E. G. Cohen, 1994; Freeman, 1993; Gee, 1990; Holt, 1992; Jacob & Mattson, 1987; McGroarty, 1989; Nunan, 1989; Slavin, 1985; Trueba et al., 1981; Wheelock, 1992). Further, it is suggested that students who are not yet proficient in English are highly dependent on their peers and teachers who are NES to make the dominant culture explicit and accessible (Gee, 1990 and Trueba, et al. 1981). Slavin’s (1985) claim that the willingness and "ability to understand someone else's perspective" was seen as the most essential element to the success of this milieu. McCutcheon’s (1995) claims that conflict and tension should be normative behaviors are also seen as significant features in the enhancement of groupwork. As such, it is suggested that ESL and NES learners can be legitimate partners in cooperative group settings in mainstream monolingual English classrooms in American Public Schools when:

1. Classroom teachers acquire explicit knowledge in the areas of cooperative learning, second language acquisition theory and methods, and multicultural education.
• 2. Learners are willing and able to focus their attention on the learning needs of their peers.

• 3. Learners are willing and able to help shift the attention of their peers to explicitly relevant information.

• 4. Conflict, tension, and individual risk-taking behaviors should be explored and analyzed explicitly in the group process.

By creating new understandings about cooperative learning as it relates to NES and ESL learners, students and teachers will be more engaged in environments that are explicitly built upon a thoughtful and careful theoretical construct of all of its members.

Suggestions to consider

The prediction that American public schools will become more culturally and linguistically diverse and the notion that students can be more active and might learn best from cooperative small group experiences requires a shift in thinking and in training amongst educators. Perhaps the optimal environment to engage and to study educators in these shifts are in teacher preparatory programs where novice and experienced educators have the ripe opportunity to acquire knowledge, experiment, experience, and grapple with these changes. Bailey (1993a), however, has found that "little research has been done on cooperative learning on the graduate level."

The experience of being a small group learner in a linguistically and culturally diverse small group classroom-based experience might provide educators with significant insight about this model of education. This suggests that there might be a great deal learned by researching graduate students who learn about and are participants in small and diverse groupwork methods.
Connecting second language learners as legitimate group members

Most of the literature points to the contributions that students who are NES bring to students who are acquiring ESL. As seen, many claim native English speakers provide authentic language models and multiple opportunities for ESL learners to listen, practice, and acquire a new language (E. G. Cohen, 1994; Holt, 1992; Jacob & Mattson, 1987; Long et al., 1976; Nunan, 1989; Pica & Long, 1993). While these claims appear to be positive ones, I suggest that they also further to perpetuate the assumption that NES learners have the most to contribute to this arena; whereas, ESL learners are assumed to have less participation, less legitimacy, and less status because of their dependence on NES peers to make the language, culture, and content accessible. It is suggested here, that an examination of the behaviors that enhance cognition for all learners might provide new insights about the contributions that ESL learners bring to this milieu.

Very little appears in the literature about the significant contributions that students who are acquiring ESL bring to this phenomenon. Most of the contributions claimed are in the area of promoting socialization skills. For example, Hamayan & Perlman (1990) claim that ESL learners should be seen as cultural resources in which students can have the opportunity to learn about and appreciate one another. Further, Burhoe (1989) provides evidence that both groups were more able to appreciate each other when they were paired together.

While these claims offer contributions to the field of second language acquisition, it is also believed they further to perpetuate the belief that ESL learners cannot be legitimate and active participants in cooperative learning communities that are composed of NES and ESL learners. It is believed that a shift in thinking must be made in order to more fully describe the potential that this method has in cooperative learning communities that are composed of linguistically and culturally diverse participants.
Perhaps the optimal environment to study this milieu is in the college classroom where teachers and teachers-in-training acquire knowledge, experiment, experience, and grapple with the changes that are required in order to meet the needs of an increasingly diverse student populace. Further, the college classroom offers teachers and teachers-in-training the chance to question their professional practices in "assimilating students into the mainstream of our society" (Bailey, 1993b, p. 3). Moreover, the college classroom provides a learning environment where teachers and teachers-in-training can develop new ways of thinking about their own teaching practices in ways that address an increasingly diverse student population. If the purpose of American public school education is to provide a free educational system where students will acquire knowledge and the democracy's ideals of citizenry are promoted, we in the teaching profession need to develop sagacity in order to truly support and achieve this purpose.

Gee (1990) defines the teaching of ESL as a moral act. He asserts that teachers are social models who are involved in the distribution and dissemination of such important "goods" as helping students to enculturate into a new society. Further, he claims that language teachers do much more than teach a new language, they also provide their students with the opportunity to understand or make meaning of a new culture. Moreover, he asserts that language teachers have the obligation to provide their students with an education that is based on providing a meaningful education that is based on a just society. In essence, I believe that his claims resonate the founders of American public schools.

It is the job of the teacher to allow students to grow beyond the cultural models of their home cultures and those of mainstream and school culture. Just as many women have sought to replace our cultural models of gender roles with new ways of thinking, interacting and speaking, so humans at their best are always open to re-thinking, to imagining a newer and better, more just and more beautiful worlds. That is why teaching is ultimately a moral act (Gee, 1990, p. 91).
Similarly, Bailey (1993b) suggests that teachers of ESL have an "obligation" to examine their teaching practices in an effort to analyze and possibly rethink how particular methods might foster or inhibit learning. Further, he suggests that the college classroom is an ideal site for this exploration. Both Gee and Bailey pose these suggestions in the context of ESL teaching, however, I believe that these suggestions must be expanded with a much broader brush. Therefore, I would like to expand upon Gee (1990) and Bailey's (1993b) ideas by suggesting that the college classroom can provide teachers and teachers-in-training in all disciplines, that is not exclusively language teaching, with a learning environment that is engaged in the promotion of the founding principles of American public schools.

I believe that Gee (1990) and Bailey's (1993b) claims need not be confined to ESL teachers. If most of the nation's teachers are "white monolingual and female" and are unlikely to change (Zeichner, 1992), than perhaps the broad context of the college classroom can offer all teachers and teachers-in-training with the opportunity to become better prepared for a student population that is increasingly becoming more diverse. Further, I believe that the college classroom can become an opportunistic site for students to collaborate with peers from countries, language experiences, and cultures other than their own. Thus, the college classroom can be a natural site for teachers and teachers-in-training to construct a professional identity that is based on their collaborative experiences with NES and ESL peers.

Therefore, it seems important to study how teachers and teachers-in-training who are NES and ESL learners learn about cooperative learning practices in the college classroom.
CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS

Introduction

Ethnography's central and sacred data are what one native says to another, or to the ethnographer. The objects we record, examine, consider, and write about occur in the course of social interaction. Whether observing a meeting, conducting an interview, or just sitting and chatting around the campfire, our primary data are things said as part of socially organized scenes. (Moerman, 1988).

The college classroom offers teachers and teachers-in-training with a multitude of opportunities to experiment, examine, and reflect upon reforms in teaching practices. Further, the college classroom offers the chance for teachers to make a paradigm shift in a setting that encourages group exploration and examination to achieve self-growth (Bailey, 1993b). The practice of a learning method and the simultaneous study of its theoretical underpinnings can have broad implications for our view of teaching and the impact these views might have on our societal practices (Bailey, 1993b; Jeannot, 1994).

This research put a cooperative learning group of graduate students comprised of teachers and teachers-in-training in a course, entitled "Curriculum Development for Heterogeneous Classes" at the center of its inquiry. This research was primarily based on an interest in studying how meaning was socially constructed within a cooperative community of NES and ESL learners.

McCutcheon (1995) describes the process of groupwork as an interactional experience that involves issues of conflict, tension, and individual risk-taking. McCutcheon states that these normative behaviors can have a positive effect on a group's process and product when the willingness to examine and analyze differences, tensions, and conflicts through the risk-taking process of revealing one's experience,
perception, and self is continuously present. McCutcheon’s claims were an important aspect of this research.

I have been involved in the study of cooperative learning via my experience as a graduate student in this milieu during the past three years. These experiences have been in the form of a role Willett (1994a) calls the "reflection facilitator". Willett, a professor in the University of Massachusetts’ School of Education, employs cooperative learning methods in each of her courses. The courses usually contain thirty students who represent teachers and teachers-in-training from diverse linguistic, cultural, professional, and life experiences. Students are divided heterogeneously into small cooperative learning teams which are facilitated by a student.

Willett claims that the role of reflection facilitator involves helping groups to think about their interactive process in order to achieve an understanding of the theoretical underpinnings of cooperative learning and to experience this phenomenon in action. This is accomplished through the process of reflection during the group meetings and through weekly dialogue journals written between individual participants and the group's facilitator. Willett also encourages reflection facilitators to be researchers in this venue. Thus, it was as a student/reflection facilitator/researcher that I inquired into the interactive process of cooperative learning in a group comprised of NES and ESL teachers and teachers-in-training.

This type of interactional sociolinguistic ethnographic inquiry is a "reciprocal" process because the reflection facilitator has the opportunity to share hypotheses as they emerge in order for the group to develop a local understanding of their work together (Jeannot, 1994). This type of participant research inquiry is developed through the interactive process of examination, revision, and formulation of ideas through a "collective examination of our assumptions and connections" (Jeannot, 1994, p. 55). It is a praxis which "involves change enhancing and contextualized knowledge building" (Jeannot, 1994, p. 55). Thus, research facilitators such as
myself are participatory change agents who observe group behavior in order to assist the group in naming, analyzing, and exploring the implications of these behaviors.

Reflection facilitators engage in what I call reflective noticing and spying to reflect in an effort to help the group tease out and examine (name) issues of tension, conflict, and risk-taking in order to (a) work together toward a common goal and (b) apprentice as a participant in this milieu. Fitch (1994) claims that the "ability to direct or influence others' behavior is an important aspect of interpersonal life" (p. 185). As such, I believe that reflection facilitators engage in influencing a group's behavior by directing the group's examination of reflection. Further, Fitch (1994) includes such compliance gaining directives as "requests, commands, suggestions, hints, advice, and so forth" as part of the efforts that reflective facilitators use in order to accomplish this goal. Thus, this role offers the opportunity to analyze episodes of conflict in an effort to look at how they are related to a group's process and product. I used the role of reflection facilitator as an orienting mechanism with which to understand the following set of primary questions in order to develop a keener understanding about the milieu of cooperative learning.

• 1. How are tension, conflict, and individual risk-taking behaviors evidenced in a cooperative learning group of graduate students comprised of NES and ESL learners?

• 2. How is meaning socially constructed in a cooperative learning group comprised of NES and ESL learners through the examination and analysis of these tension, conflict, and individual risk-taking behaviors?

• 3. How is the "named" analyzed conflict related to the process and product of the group?
The project used the tenets of ethnographic research (Bailey, 1993b; Carbaugh & Hastings, 1992; Dascal, 1992; Erickson, 1996; Gumperz, 1982; Gumperz & Hymes, 1972; Hymes, 1964, 1974; Schiffrin, 1994; Searle, 1970, 1979, 1990, 1992; Saville-Troike, 1989, 1996; Spradley, 1980). Ethnographic investigation is a theoretically focused description of a social phenomenon and a way to view everyday talk as the primary source with which to view social life (Carbaugh & Hastings, 1992). This methodology can be used to orient a research question in a particular manner and its underpinnings can be studied prior to or in conjunction with a research activity. Communications ethnographers suggest that understanding is derived through a careful examination and analysis of a speech community's "scene and setting, participants, forms of speech, message content, norms of interaction, purpose of an event from a community standpoint, tone in which an act was done, where the event took place, [and so forth]" (Gumperz & Hymes, 1972). Further, the heart of ethnographic research is to seek understanding about a speech community through the direct observation of and participation with its inhabitants in order to develop a deeper understanding about their meanings on a local and global level (Erickson, 1996; Spradley, 1980). Moreover, this type of research is conducted by keeping detailed records through "field notes, tape recordings, pictures, artifacts, and anything else that documents the social situation under study" (Spradley, 1980, p. 57).

Language is viewed as a "socially and culturally constructed symbol system that both reflects and creates macro-level social meaning and micro-level interpersonal meanings" (Schiffrin, 1994, p. 133). Every utterance serves the function of indexing or signaling each individual's "identity, socialization, and ideology within the general framework or context in which the utterance [is] interactively and socially
embedded" (p. 134). Further, the language used in a speech community involves a
host of implied cultural underpinnings which provide critical knowledge in the
formation of meaning. Moreover, language is one of the "symbolic resources" that is
used to "define" the concept of self and the relationships that exist among a speech
activity's participants (p. 106).

The study of everyday talk in a speech community involves "...(a) a detailed
thick description of how people act and react to each other, and the ways they use
language (including written language) to act and react [with each other], and (b) an
emic interpretation of what is happening in the event, moment by moment as the
event evolves, and as what is happening when the event changes and is contested"
(Bloome, in press, p. 8). As such, ethnographic researchers tease out interpretive
information from the data gleaned from moment to moment interactions.

Every meaningful sentence is stated in the form of a speech act and all speech
acts are connected with "meaning and intention [of the speaker], what the hearer
understands, and what the linguistic rules are" (Searle, 1979, pp. 16-21). Further, all
speech acts involve one of five categories: assertives, directives, commissives,
expressives, and declaratives (Searle, 1979, p. viii). More importantly, speech acts
occur within a particular context or schemata and perform with their own set of rules
that are separate from the language but are part of the values and beliefs of the social
system in which they are spoken (Gumperz, 1982, p. 155). For example, the
declarative, "I now pronounce you man and wife," signals a specific meaning in the
social context of an American wedding ceremony. Thus, every speech act involves a
reliance on the social culture of the situated speech activity and involves a host of
contextual cues which assist in the construction of meaning (Gumperz, 1982, p. 155).

Further, there are a finite number of things that we do with language:

We tell people how things are, we try to get them to do things, we commit
ourselves to do things, we express our feelings and attitudes and we bring
about changes through our utterances. Often, we do more than one of these at
once in the same utterance (Searle, 1990, p. 372).
Questions, like all speech acts, apply to what is understood in a speech community (Searle, 1979). The formation of a question is based on individualistic responses to interactive stimuli and an understanding of a speech community's members (Gumperz & Hymes, 1972). The act of asking a question is defined as an "illocutionary act" in which a speaker uses a sentence or utterance to "express a wish or desire from the hearer (Searle, 1979, p. 65).

The art of answering [a question] lies in the ability to restrict the scope of the question. [This restriction involves the ability to] judge conversational sequences in terms of relevance. A speech act in a conversation...is relevant not to a topic, an issue or a question, but to a purpose of (one of) the participants. ...speech act theory describes different and complementary aspects of linguistic structure, all of which are instrumental in letting speakers convey speakers' meanings and hearers understand them (Dascal, 1992, pp. 36-40).

An analysis of actual speech segments that occur prior to and after the speech act of asking a question provides a descriptive framework for understanding everyday talk (Gumperz & Hymes, 1972). An analysis of specific speech segments that included acts of asking questions in an effort to name and analyze episodes of conflict in this cooperative group of learners was relevant because it provided an orientation to this aspect of speaker meaning and hearer understanding. The analysis drew upon (Bailey's (1993b) voice framework and focused on three key elements; turn allocation, warrants for speaking, and hearing. As such, it provided a way to describe the social life of this community through exploring what was spoken.

Reflection facilitators engage in helping cooperative learning groups to name or to tease out and examine issues of tension, conflict, and risk-taking in order to work together toward a common goal. In this study, these naming acts were communicated in the form of questions in order to explore the meanings they had in this speech community. These naming acts were not be preconceived. Rather, these acts were seen as a dynamic and evolving process which involved sharing hypotheses with group members as they emerged in the form of asking questions.
Meaning involves our ability to "exclude, include, and guess" relevance within a given context or within a given social situation (Gee, 1990). This ability involves a host of implied meanings about the context that the language is situated. Implied meanings are not necessarily easily understood by every member of a speech community (Gee, 1990).

Culture has "deep implications for non-mainstream students who wish to master the standard...cultural models in the society" (Gee, 1990). Most of what is known is learned implicitly (Trueba et al., 1981). Thus, one of the essential roles for teachers, particularly those who work with ESL learners, is to "focus student attention on what is relevant so that they can acquire knowledge about their new culture" (Gee, 1990). Further, when NES and ESL learners are placed in classrooms that use the tenets of cooperative learning, learners who are not familiar with the dominant language or culture of the classroom might be dependent on their peers in order to help focus their attention to relevant information. This concurs with Slavin's (1993) claim that cooperative learning communities are the most successful when "students possess the ability to understand someone else's perspective" (p. 118).

McCutcheon (1995) claims that meaning is socially constructed through a group's willingness to examine and analyze tension, conflict, and risk-taking behaviors that naturally occur in their group's work. Further, she claims that these behaviors are more likely to occur in groups composed of diverse learners because they are not functioning from a common ground.

The study of meaning, as defined by Gee (1990), McCutcheon (1995), and Trueba et al., (1981), through an exploration of speech acts involving the analysis of named conflict provided an ethnographic opportunity to view a heterogeneous cooperative learning group of teachers and teachers-in-training who were NES and ESL learners in a college classroom setting.
Setting, Participants, and Procedures

Setting
The participants in this study were enrolled in a graduate course, Education #697T, entitled "Curriculum Development for Heterogeneous Classes" in the School of Education at the University of Massachusetts. The class was divided into two one and a half hour segments. The first segment took place in a large classroom and the second took place in a small conference room. The large classroom was comprised of about thirty desks that were loosely placed in a circle. The small conference room consisted of a large table with approximately six seats.

Participants and Participant Selection
The whole class consisted of approximately thirty students who were heterogeneously grouped into cooperative learning groups of five participants which included a reflection facilitator as well as a cooperating middle school teacher. Each group was given the task of developing an interdisciplinary curriculum unit as part of their work with the cooperating teacher.

The selection of cooperative learning groups was made solely by the professor and represented NES and ESL learners from diverse language, gender, cultural, professional, and educational experiences. These experiences were derived from information obtained during the first night of class at which time each learner was given an index card by the professor and was asked to complete the following biographical information: (a) name, (b) address, (c) phone, (d) current and past professional experiences, (e) language and cultural experiences, and (f) educational experiences. The professor created heterogeneous groups based on the information received.
The selection of each group's reflection facilitator was made solely by the professor who typically selects doctoral students and encourages them to use this experience as a student, facilitator, and researcher (Willett, 1994a).

The participants in this study were selected by the professor. Consent letters were given to the whole class during the first night of class. These letters informed the participants of the nature of the proposed research (see Appendix A).

**Procedures**

The entire class met once a week for three hours and met twelve times during the semester. Each class session was divided into two segments: (a) as a whole class during the first half of class time for one and a half hours and (b) in cooperative learning groups during the second half for one and a half hours.

Whole class meetings occurred during the first half of each class session and included a discussion of selected readings. These meetings were devoted to discussion and instruction about teaching in an American public school context and covered the following topics: "collaboration and resources; integrated/activity-based/complex instruction; meeting needs and treating status problems; reflecting on group process; issues surrounding minority culture and second language learners" (Willett, 1994a).

The objectives of each cooperative learning group, as stated by the professor, were to (a) read and discuss a number of assigned articles in the areas of heterogeneous group learning, multicultural education, and second language acquisition; (b) collectively gather information, materials, and resources about the group's curricular topic; and (c) to develop a curriculum unit for heterogeneously grouped middle school students in this content area. Additionally, cooperative learning group participants were asked to engage in weekly dialogue journal writing.
with the group's reflection facilitator in an effort to discuss readings, experiences, and perceptions about heterogeneity and cooperative groupwork.

**Data Collection**

Data was collected in a number of ways. These included directly observing the cooperative learning group weekly for one and a half hours twelve times during the semester, audio-taping and transcribing the meetings, collecting dialogue journal data at each meeting, keeping field notes, and conducting one thirty-minute interview with each participant (see Appendix B). Data collection also include conducting selected readings about the cultural and educational backgrounds of the ESL learners in the group in order to develop a better understanding about the participant's experiences. In addition, informants who represented the language and cultural backgrounds of the non-NES learners in the group were interviewed separately in order to gain a further understanding about the cultural and educational experiences of the non-NES learners in the group.

Further, data collection included reading the materials provided to the cooperative learning group by the professor as well as those generated by the group in an effort to gain an understanding about the group's common sources of information. The data provided a rich source of information and an even richer source for analysis.

**Analysis**

Three types of analyses were performed. First, a broad analysis of the speech situation was conducted and included a detailed description of the situated context of this speech community (i.e., the context of the college classroom, small group meetings, the setting, the sequencing of group meetings, and dialogue journals). The
purpose of this analysis was to provide a description of the broad context of this speech community in order to begin to develop a descriptive construct of its interactional meanings.

A second analysis focused attention on the small group weekly meetings (speech encounters) in order to gain a deeper understanding of the normative patterns that emerged over time. The purpose of this analysis was to segment patterns into specific categories and themes. Thus particular aspects were extracted and categorized in an effort to develop a thick description of this speech community and to further develop a theoretical construct of its interactional meanings.

Third, a microanalysis of selected episodes of analyzed conflict was examined. Samples of these critical incidents/moments were microanalyzed in order to gain a deeper understanding about the functions and meanings of tension, conflict, and individual risk-taking behaviors in this speech community. Attention to these events provided an in-depth opportunity to systematically analyze episodes of named conflict, tension, and individual risk-taking behaviors in an effort to analyze moment to moment interactions and the meanings that these had in this speech community.

The field notes, interview notes, transcriptions, dialogue journals, and readings were sorted and collated into several categories. These were grouped into common themes and became the primary sources for these three analyses.

The categories that were initially identified to guide this process included

- issues of conflict
- issues of tension
- issues of individuals taking a risk.

In addition, small group meetings were involved in analyzing and interpreting conflict, tension, and risk taking behaviors that occurred in the group’s process and
were subsequently named for the purpose of discussion and interpretation. The initial categories that were identified to guide this process included

- segments that name issues of conflict
- segments that name issues of tension
- segments that name issues of individual taking a risk.

While the analysis of the data was not limited to these categories, they guided the research in an effort to orient this process toward an ethnographic thick description of the phenomenon of cooperative groupwork in this setting. Thus, analyses occurred at several levels: (a) the broad speech situation [the classroom], (b) small group encounters over time, and (c) select micro-episodes of critical moments where conflict was analyzed. Each of these analyses were conducted in an effort to gain a deeper understanding about this milieu.

Trustworthiness

A host of techniques were employed in order to ensure the probability of credible, rich, and useful findings in this research project: (a) prolonged engagement, (b) persistent observation, (c) triangulation, (d) negative case analysis, (e) member checking, and (f) peer debriefing (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The purpose of employing these techniques was to ensure that the research is conducted in a thoughtful, systematic, and reflective manner (Patton, 1990).

First, two pilot studies were conducted and helped in the understanding of the broad culture of this approach. In addition, this particular study occurred over the course of a college semester in order to ensure that enough time was devoted to the purpose of "learning the culture, testing for misinformation introduced by distortions either of the self or of the respondents, and building trust" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 64).
This engagement occurred for a minimum of one hour per week for a period of twelve weeks and aided in assuring the likelihood of credible findings.

Second, persistent observation greatly assisted in the assurance of credibility (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). As such, this research project included in-depth persistent observations of the aspects that emerged as the most significant in the examination and analysis of conflict, tension, and individual risk taking behaviors in this cooperative group of teachers and teachers-in-training who were NES and ESL learners. Further, persistent observation involved the careful process of "tentative labeling of what were taken as salient factors" in an effort to provide a thick detailed description of this cooperative learning group (p. 304).

Third, the technique of triangulation was used to further strengthen the reliability and validity of the findings and interpretations and to weaken the possibility of bias from a single set of data (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 305; Patton, 1990, p. 465). This involved using diverse sources of information that included (a) observing the cooperative learning group for at least one hour each week over the course of one semester, (b) audio-taping and transcribing each cooperative group meeting, (c) observing each whole class meeting over the course of one semester, (d) reading materials provided by the professor (including the course readings and handouts) and generated by the group, (e) interviewing each participant, (audio-taping and transcribing each interview), and (f) interviewing key informants who were familiar with the language and culture of the ESL learners in the cooperative learning group. I am a NES and, as such, am not familiar with the linguistic and cultural life experiences of the ESL learners in this group. The use of key informants was helpful in analyzing and interpreting the data that is collected. "...one of the mainstays of fieldwork is the use of key informants as sources of information about what the observer has not or cannot experience as well as a source of explanation for events the observer has witnessed" (Patton, 1990, p. 263).
Fourth, negative case analysis was used in order to make interpretations and analyses that were "revised and hypothesized" as the project unfolded (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 309). This was particularly helpful in analyzing instances that did and did not appear to fit the patterns seen in the group (Patton, 1985, 463).

Fifth, member checking was employed throughout the research project in order to carefully develop a theoretical interpretation that was based on "analytic categories, interpretations, and conclusions [that were] tested with [group] members" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 314). As such, episodes and patterns of conflict, tension, and individual risk-taking were analyzed and interpreted through a process of assessing perceptions during the group meetings, individual interviews, and the written dialogue journals.

Finally, this research utilized "disinterested peer debriefers" to (a) review the data collection and research process, (b) test interpretations as they emerged, (c) ask important questions that might have otherwise remained unknown, and (d) provide guidance and support in the research project (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, pp. 308-309). Two debriefers were involved in this process for these purposes. It is important to note that both the professor and I are advocates of cooperative learning classrooms that are comprised of NES and ESL learners. As such, there was a certain amount of bias that might have occurred in this study. Thus, the use of peer debriefers further assisted in the strengthening of a credible, rich, and useful study.

Research Limitations

While I believe that there is a great deal that can be learned from this project, it should also be noted that the project had limitations in significant areas. First, subjectivity exists throughout every research process (Peshkin, 1988). Reflection facilitators, such as myself, were encouraged by the professor to be facilitators,
students, and researchers. Further, this research project was based on the point of view that cooperative learning environments can enhance the promotion cognitive and social skills when they are comprised of NES and ESL learners. These roles and points of view might have contributed to subjectivity about this milieu.

Second, there were participants in this study who represented different cultural experiences and backgrounds than this researcher. As such, it was difficult to gain a comprehensive understanding of the differing cultural cues that operated in this speech community.

Despite these limitations, however, I believe that there is a great deal that can be learned from this investigation. It can heighten our awareness about the implications of cooperatively grouping NES and ESL graduate students.
CHAPTER 4

BROAD ANALYSIS OF THE SPEECH SITUATION

A brief semester could never cover everything there is to know about teaching heterogeneous classes, nor could anyone ever know all there is to know about teaching. Rather, we must continually learn from one another, from our students, and from the scholarly literature... (Willett, 1995b).

Introduction

I have conducted research in a graduate course, Education 697T, entitled "Curriculum Development for Heterogeneous Classes" in the Cultural Diversity and Curriculum Reform Program in the Teacher Education and Curriculum Studies Department in the School of Education at the University of Massachusetts. The purpose of this study was multi-fold. First, the process of groupwork is described as an interactional experience that involves issues of conflict, tension, and individual risk-taking behaviors (McCutcheon, 1995). It is claimed that these behaviors can have a positive effect on a group's process and product when the willingness to examine and analyze differences, tensions, and conflicts through the risk-taking process of revealing one's experience, perception, and self are continuously present (McCutcheon, 1995). These claims were at the center of this inquiry and were guided by the following set of primary questions:

1. How are tension, conflict, and individual risk taking behaviors evidenced in a cooperative group of graduate students comprised of NES and ESL learners?

2. How is meaning socially constructed in a cooperative group comprised of NES and ESL learners through the examination and analysis of these tension, conflict, and individual risk taking behaviors?

3. How is the named analyzed conflict related to the process and product of the group?
Introduction to the broad analysis of the speech situation

Field Notes 9/11/95: (first night of class) The course took place in the School of Education at the University. The whole class gathered in a small windowless classroom that did not have enough seats for everyone. Shortly after 6:30 PM, more students began to wander in, at that point, there were no more seats available. Several stood quietly in the back of the classroom while others greeted familiar classmates. Professor Willett arrived, arms weighted down by a box filled with the course syllabus and books. She quickly put the box on the lone table at the top of the room which paralleled a wall of blackboards, walked over to those who were standing, and suggested that they go down to the small conference room areas and bring back some seats. She then returned to the top of the room and faced the whole class. "All right everyone, you are all here for Teaching Heterogeneous Classes, right?" asked Willett.

The utterance from Willett, as suggested in my field notes quoted above, was a question ripe with multiple meanings. Those who had signed up for this course now knew from Willett's question that they had come to the right place. The utterance "here for teaching heterogeneous classes" also seemed to signify two of Willett's goals: (a) to provide her students with a local experience, a laboratory, in which to experiment with reforms in educational practice and pedagogy and (b) to provide her students with an education about the principles, methods, and practice of heterogeneity that they would take to a more distant place, their work context. Further, "here for teaching heterogeneous classes," the first utterance spoken by the professor, was to a community of NES and ESL learners who represented varied educational, linguistic, cultural, and professional experiences. As such, yes, we were "here" in this context as a diverse lot of students who had gathered together for the communal purpose to learn to teach heterogeneous classes.

This chapter reports the findings seen in this ethnographic study of NES and ESL learners who were engaged in a speech community over the course of one semester. It describes, in detail, a description of the course, the course setting, and its participants in order to situate the local context of this ethnographic study. It includes a description of the course, the whole class, small group meetings, the setting, the
sequencing of the whole and small group meetings, and the dialogue journals. The purpose of this broad analysis is to provide a description of the broad context of this speech community in order to begin to develop a descriptive construct of its interactional meetings.

Description of the course

Education 697T, "Curriculum Development for the Heterogeneous Classes", (henceforth, the Curriculum Course), is part of a series of graduate courses offered to fulfill a requirement for certification in Massachusetts. The Curriculum Course was created, developed, and implemented by Professor Willett who taught it for the first time during the fall semester of the previous academic year. NES and ESL students enrolled in this course for a wide variety of reasons. Some took the course in order to fulfill part of their coursework requirement in the Massachusetts public school certification process. Others took the course as an elective as part of their program of study toward a master or doctoral degree (e.g., ESL and early childhood education). Further, local teachers were recruited by the professor for the purpose of filling the role of "cooperating teacher" with the understanding that their classrooms will become one of the "laboratory" sites for this course. Hence, the course was designed to be composed of a heterogeneous group of learners.

Purpose of the course

The purpose of the Curriculum Course was three-pronged. It was to provide (a) scholarly literature and a scholarly discussion about the theory and practice of teaching heterogeneous classes and meeting the needs of diverse learners in monolingual content classrooms, (b) an "apprenticeship" in the theoretical and experiential discourse of a small heterogeneous cooperative learning group of NES
and ESL learners, and (c) an opportunity to deliberate curriculum for heterogeneous classrooms within the construct of the course content and the course experience (Bailey, 1993b; Willett, 1995a). Learners in the Curriculum Course had the opportunity to experience a variety of tasks and to reflect on the process and product of these task-based experiences. As such, task and process were very important components in this course design.

As seen in Chapter 2 of this dissertation, most American public school teachers have not had training in bilingual education, second language acquisition, or multicultural education. Further, little information about educating an increasingly diverse population was found in most teacher education literature. This professor designed and implemented a course which expressly addressed these needs. She created a context in which students (a) read scholarly literature in this area, (b) experienced the context of being a participant in a heterogeneous group of NES and ESL learners, and (c) wrote curriculum (authentic professional literature) in this area. Hence, the purpose of the course was to provide multiple learning opportunities for students to discuss, examine, and to create curriculum that was explicitly designed for the heterogeneous classroom.

The course was organized around the tenets, practices, and techniques of cooperative learning. Students in the Curriculum Course were carefully placed by the professor into one of five cooperative learning groups. Each was assigned the primary semester-long task of collectively writing a curriculum unit that was based on an authentic American public school classroom setting. Students in the Curriculum Course were expected to have a critical role in the process and product of their own learning (Sharan, 1990). Some were familiar with its tenets and practice while others had never been exposed to cooperative learning theory or expected to be an active contributor in a small cooperative learning group. Further, many of the students were NES learners who were familiar with the content and context of American public
schools while several were international students who had never been in American public schools. These distinctions further highlight one of the primary purposes of this professor, that is, to create a learning context composed of diverse students for the express purpose of experiencing and studying small group learning in the context of a heterogeneous setting in an American public school. The professor's critical course design served to promote her purpose to empower teachers to evaluate, assess, redefine, and revise their work (Willett, 1995b).

Course design and organization

The professor organized the course to be a hands-on task-based collaborative experience using the principles of "interactive, integrated, collaborative, multicultural, multisensory, language promoting, supported, authentic learning in heterogeneous groups" (Willett, 1995). Each student was assigned the role of being an active interdependent participant in a cooperative learning group and each group was given a variety of task-based collaborative experiences (E. G. Cohen, 1994; Johnson & Johnson, 1985; Slavin, 1985). Further, the course was designed to provide each student with the experience of being a cooperative learner in a heterogeneous group of NES and ESL learners while simultaneously learning about the tenets and practices of this theory.

The course was framed on the four tenets of cooperative learning: (a) learning is enhanced when it is highly active, (b) learning is enhanced when it is interactive, (c) learning is enhanced when it is an interdependent endeavor, and (d) learning cooperatively enhances the promotion of social skills (E. G. Cohen, 1994; Johnson & Johnson, 1985; Slavin, 1985). These tenets were important content of the Curriculum Course and represented the reforms that the professor hoped would be carried to her students' workplaces, their classrooms.
The course syllabus provided the underlying assumptions that the professor has about all learners and their classroom environments (see Appendix C):

(a) All learners have strengths from which new information and skills can be acquired.

(b) All learners can contribute to a learning community.

(c) All classrooms are heterogeneous.

(d) All learners learn better in challenging, interactive, multisensory, meaningful and supportive environments.

The course syllabus also provided an explanation about the layers of experientially based activities that were carefully designed for the purpose of this class. This course was designed to reflect the professor's assumptions about all learners and their learning environment and the syllabus provided detailed information about the professor's assumptions about and goals for learning (see Appendix C).

The course was designed to provide students with an array of opportunities to learn as a whole class and to explore course content independently. However, a major focus of this course was in small group learning.

Cooperative learning groups in the Curriculum Course

In this class, cooperative learning groups composed of ESL and NES learners were given the primary task of creating or modifying a curriculum unit that was grounded in the principles of the course content and based on a "laboratory" classroom that had been selected for this purpose. Each small group determined the topic of their particular curricular unit based on the needs of the students, "cooperating teacher," and the learning environment in the small group's particular laboratory site.
Goals of the course

The goals of the course were multifaceted; they were to provide students with

1. An authentic experience as a participant in a heterogeneous cooperative learning group comprised of NES and ESL learners.
2. Scholarly research in the areas of heterogeneity
3. Multiple opportunities to reflect on the practice of and research about the principles of heterogeneity
4. Experience in the deliberation of curriculum.

Authentic participatory experience

Being a participant in a cooperative learning group

The professor believes that working together toward a common goal is an essential element in the learning process (E.G. Cohen, 1994; Johnson & Johnson, 1985). What was perhaps the most critical aspect of this learning environment was the belief that learning occurs through dialogue (McCutcheon, 1995). The professor believes that education is a participatory activity that is achieved through interactive and interdependent deliberations in the co-construction of knowledge. This constructivist stance provides students with the opportunity to experiment with, discuss, and reflect upon the principles and practices of groupwork while simultaneously being members of a heterogeneous group of NES and ESL learners (Bailey, 1993b). Learning about the language of heterogeneity; deliberating the curriculum for a heterogeneous class; and, simultaneously being a participant in a heterogeneous group was at the core of this professor's course design.

The cooperative group experience was designed so that every member would be an active participant and would be regarded as an important "resource" in the co-
construction of the group's task. In this course, students worked together in "Curriculum Development Teams" (henceforth, small groups) composed of five students in order to create or modify a curriculum unit that was (a) based on the tenets of "interactive, collaborative, multicultural, multisensory, language promoting, [and] support authentic learning in heterogeneous groups" and (b) situated in a real context (see Appendix C). Thus, the professor created a course in which students had the opportunity to collaboratively discuss, examine, argue, experience, read about, and reflect on the theories and practices of heterogeneity and cooperative learning by being participants in this milieu.

**Groupwork as an apprenticeship**

The professor believes that learning should be involved "in situ," that is learning should involve apprenticing new practices in the context of the actual workplace (Bailey, 1993b; Gee, 1990). It is here that students had the opportunity to apprentice in and be socialized in the Discourse\(^2\) of teaching heterogeneous classes (Gee, 1990; Bailey, 1993b). As such, the instructor provided an authentic laboratory as part of the course design, one of five middle school classrooms, in which to create or modify a curriculum unit based on the principles of the course content and in the situated context of groupwork. Small group participants were asked to visit and observe the laboratory classroom throughout the semester in order to gather, reflect upon, and examine important information about the students and the broad text of their learning environment (e.g., who the students were, the learning materials, and the physical structure of the classroom) in order to include this material in the small group's product, their curriculum unit. Hence, the professor designed (a) an active deliberatory learning process, i.e., being a participant in a small group and (b) a

---

\(^2\) Gee (1990) uses a capital "D" to mean: "a socially accepted association among ways of using language, of thinking, feeling, believing, valuing, and acting that can be used to identify oneself as a member of the socially accepted group" (p. 143).
situation in a real context, i.e., being a small group member whose task was to deliberate curriculum in an authentic laboratory site (E. G. Cohen, 1994; Slavin, 1983).

Groupwork as an apprenticeship of new roles

An important element in cooperative learning is the alteration of the teacher's role from the sole authority to an informal collaborator and the empowerment of students in the process of their own learning (E. G. Cohen, 1994; Johnson et al., 1986; Sharan, 1990). E. G. Cohen (1994) argues that students can be more active in the learning process when they are given a "role to play." These elements were reflected in the Curriculum Course. First, half of the course was conducted in small groups without the professor. The remaining half, while in the presence of the professor, was often facilitated by students. Thus, students were active participants in the process of their education.

Second, various roles were assigned in the small groups in the Curriculum Course: the cooperating teacher, reflection facilitator, and resource member:

Each team will have a cooperating teacher from a local school whose classroom will become the laboratory for a Curriculum Unit that the team will design and/or model.... Teams must work within the constraints of the particular classroom to which they have been assigned, as defined by the Cooperating teacher.... Each team will also have a reflection facilitator whose job it is to help the group reflect on their own group processes as they engage in collaborative curriculum design.... Each member will become "a resource" to the team by reading one assigned book dealing with an important principle or concept... (see Appendix C).

While the professor assigned these roles, she did not assign specific methods to play these roles. Thus, each member was given the opportunity be active and creative in the process of defining these roles for themselves. Further, students in this class apprenticed many roles throughout the semester (e.g., expert resource, student, teacher, presenter, and researcher). This furthered the underlying assumptions that the professor has about all learners, namely, they could learn new information and
skills. Therefore, students in the Curriculum Course were socialized into the practice of cooperative learning in a heterogeneous group of NES and ESL learners through their apprenticeships in these varied roles.

Participants as important and equal resources

The professor believes that groupwork is achieved when students are seen as expert resources and where everyone is seen as an equal and important contributor. She frames this belief in two distinct ways: each student is an expert resource and students learn from and teach each other.

Each student is an expert resource

The course was framed by a rather detailed syllabus in which the professor expressed her beliefs about learners (see Appendix C). Here, the professor claimed that everyone was an important contributor to the learning process and named newcomers and experienced learners as valuable resources. Further, she claimed that (a) those new to the course content, format, and setting, (b) ESL learners who might not be familiar with American culture or the course content, and (c) experienced learners in this arena were equal participants because their ideas and life experiences provided the group with valuable materials to explore, examine, and deliberate.

Students learn from and teach each other

An important feature in the design of this course is the professor's belief that students should learn from and teach each other (E. G. Cohen, 1994). Further, the professor did not attempt to disguise the fact that some students were more prepared than others in terms of their familiarity with the course content, situation, or their own experience. Rather, she encouraged students to use one another's ideas claiming that everyone had something valuable to contribute to this process. By doing so, the
professor reduced her role as the sole authority of the classroom and simultaneously encouraged her students to learn from and with each other (E. G. Cohen, 1994).

Resources are interdependently linked

Groupwork in the Curriculum Course involved the quality of interdependence between group members. The course was organized using the principles of interdependence where the small group's product was achieved, in part, by assigning each member one piece of the learning problem in which the solution was needed by all of the small group's members (Pepitone, 1985). For example, the professor required each small group to include the principles of all of the required readings as part of the rationale for their particular curriculum unit. However, each small group member was purposely assigned a required reading that other members were not. Commonly referred to as the "jigsaw" method, the professor assigned several layers of these interdependent tasks (E. G. Cohen, 1994; Johnson & Johnson, 1985).

The professor also designed several layers of authentic individual and group product-based tasks using the principles of individual and group accountability (E. G. Cohen, 1984). Tables 1 below and 2 (p. 79) provide a summary of these tasks.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Read one of the books selected from the &quot;B&quot; list and become the group's resource about the content and principles of that book.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Keep a weekly dialogue journal with the small group's reflection facilitator in order to reflect on content, theory, and the group's collaborative process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Provide a one-page written feedback paper on each small group's presentation of a draft of their curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Write a final 10-15 page reflective paper on what happened with the unit that the team developed and implemented.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

Group Tasks

1. Small groups will work collaboratively to gather information, materials, resources about the content that must be taught and about the particular teaching approaches or modes they decide to use in order to deliver the content (problem posing, simulation, literature-based learning, laboratory experiments, role playing, multimedia projects, students as ethnographers, survey research, etc.)

2. Work within the constraints of a particular classroom to which they have been assigned, as defined by the cooperating teacher, but members will do their best to incorporate the ideas that are being dealt with in readings and class discussion.

3. Collectively discuss and read about issues connected with teaching heterogeneous classes.

4. Collectively develop a curriculum unit for heterogeneously grouped middle school students in this content area.

5. Collectively present an oral draft of this unit to the whole class including information about the special needs of the students in this particular classroom. The draft includes plans of what the small group plans to do, the materials they plan to use, information about the students for whom the unit was intended, and why they are doing what they are doing.

6. Collectively present the Final Curriculum Unit visually at a Curriculum Faire (e.g., display the units, the students' work, principles used to guide the design and implementation and meta-statements about how the unit meets the needs of a diverse classroom).

7. Collectively write a final copy of the Curriculum Unit and submit it to the professor.


Thus, the course was designed using the principles of interdependence and individual and group accountability in order to involve students in the collaborative deliberation and construction of curriculum. Further, the design of the course was to provide students with a conceptual frame about heterogeneous classrooms that included scholarly readings, methodology and materials, life experiences of NES and
ESL learners in this context, reflective activities, and a laboratory experience as part of the "whole" of this college course.

**Scholarly research in heterogeneity**

Discussions about the assigned readings provided each participant with the opportunity to learn and apprentice in the language of new teaching pedagogy and practice (Bailey, 1993b; Gee, 1990). The professor designed the course to include a host of scholarly books and articles in the discourse of heterogeneity and assigned the reading, discussion, examination, and critique of these as part of the learning process. Specific classes were devoted to discussions and examinations of the literature.

Further, the professor believes that students should be actively involved in the process of their learning and provided an array of opportunities in the small group and whole class format for this involvement (E. G. Cohen, 1994). Table 3 (p. 81) provides a summary of the topics that were presented and who provided this instruction.

**Students are expected to be scholarly resources**

The professor provided a list of required readings which she referred to as the "A" and "B" lists. The "A" list contained 6 books. Each small group was assigned to read one book in common.

These books are typically narratives of teacher-researchers who talk about how they worked to meet the needs of their students (e.g., second language learners, learning disabled learners, gendered learners, reluctant learners, etc.). The purpose of this reading is to help the group become more sensitive to the needs of such learning in their laboratory classroom and to modify instruction accordingly (see Appendix C).

In addition, a "B" list of 6 books was provided by the professor with the following assignments given to each small group:

Each member will become a resource to the team [small group] by reading one assigned book dealing with an important principle or concept associated with teaching heterogeneous classes. Other members of the team will have not read the book so it is important for the resource person to help the team
incorporate the principle or concept into the team project. All students reading the same book (one member from each team) will meet together once during the full class meeting ... to discuss the book (see Appendix C).

Table 3

Presentation Schedule
Whole class met from 6:45-8:00 pm. Small groups from 8:00-9:30 pm.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Presenter/s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sept. 11</td>
<td>Overview</td>
<td>Professor Willett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sept. 18</td>
<td>Collaborative Learning</td>
<td>Professor Willett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sept. 25</td>
<td>Book Talks</td>
<td>&quot;B&quot; groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Oct. 2</td>
<td>Developing Learning Communities in Diverse Classrooms</td>
<td>Small &quot;B&quot; group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Oct. 11</td>
<td>Treating Status Problems</td>
<td>Small &quot;B&quot; group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Oct. 16</td>
<td>Making Lessons Comprehensible</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Oct. 23</td>
<td>Reflecting on group process</td>
<td>Small group 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Oct. 30</td>
<td>Team 1 (6:30-7:30p) draft presentation</td>
<td>Small group 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Small Group Meetings (7:30-8:30p) draft presentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Team II (8:30-9:30p) draft presentation</td>
<td>Small group 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Nov. 6</td>
<td>Feedback on draft presentations</td>
<td>Professor Willett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Team III and Team IV draft presentation</td>
<td>Small groups 3 &amp; 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Nov. 13</td>
<td>Feedback on draft presentations</td>
<td>Professor Willett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Team V draft presentation (6:30-7:30p)</td>
<td>Small group 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Small group Meetings (7:30-9:30p)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Nov. 20</td>
<td>Feedback on draft presentations</td>
<td>Professor Willett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Small group Meetings (7:30-9:30p)</td>
<td>Small groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Nov. 27</td>
<td>Small group Meetings (6:30-9:30p)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Dec. 4</td>
<td>Emergent Issues (6:30-9:30)</td>
<td>Small groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Dec. 11</td>
<td>Curriculum Faire</td>
<td>All Small groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The professor also believes that it is critical for teachers and teacher-in-training to become familiar with outside experts and scholarly resources. She
required that students include resources, such as "the professor, readings, other materials, films, community members, the UMASS library, and other local resource rooms, and the students themselves, as part of the scholarly material used in creating the group's product (Willett, 1995a). These scholarly goods, it was hoped, would become part of the Discourse of the group's deliberation and were further evidence of the professor's belief that learning occurs through exploration in the Discourse of a new teaching practice and in the reflective discussion of these explorations.

Reflection on the scholarly research

The professor designed the course to include continuous reflective experiences. Students were required to become local expert resources on the required literature that they were assigned. They were given the task of being the small group's expert on their particular readings and to incorporate the principles of these readings in the group's deliberations and the group's product. Students were also expected to prepare a reflective presentation of their assigned reading for a discussion in the whole class format.

Multiple opportunities to reflect on practice and principles

Reflection facilitators

The professor created a role in each small group, that of reflective facilitator. The professor created this role for a specific purpose in groupwork, that of reflecting on the group's process as they deliberate on their task. The role of reflection is seen as an important group norm in the cooperative learning process and the assignment of this role reflected the professor's belief of its import. The professor provided two arenas for reflection facilitation. These two arenas further reflected the professor's belief that learning occurs through dialogue. Reflection in the Curriculum Course
occurred primarily in the small group meetings and in learners' weekly dialogue journals. Reflection also played an important role in the whole class format and, as such, the professor designed the seventh whole class meeting to be on the topic of "reflecting on group process" (Willett, 1995a).

**Reflection in small group meetings**

"Each small group had a reflection facilitator whose job it was to help the group reflect on their own group processes as they engaged in collaborative curriculum design" (Willett, 1995a). Further, the role of reflection facilitator involved helping small groups to think about their interactive process in order to achieve an understanding of the theoretical underpinnings of cooperative learning in order to experience and examine this phenomenon in action. Thus, the role of reflection facilitator in this course was seen as a dynamic role that was carefully involved in observing the group's process in order to facilitate a reflective discussion of these observations throughout the group's semester-long deliberation.

**Reflection in dialogue journals**

Students were asked to engage in weekly dialogue journal writing with their group's reflection facilitators for the purpose of reflecting on "content, theory, and collaborative process as they work in the heterogeneous groups" (Willett, 1995a). The dialogue journal was designed to be written weekly and interactive.

**Reflection in the whole class format**

Reflection had an active role in the whole class format. The course was designed to discuss the process of groupwork during the seventh whole class meeting. At that time, the professor asked students to reflect on group process in order to tease out some of the "common" experiences that had occurred in the small groups. The
The purpose of this class design was to explore, as a whole class, the dilemmas and challenges involved in the process of deliberating curriculum collaboratively and on groupwork. The objective of the professor was to provide ample opportunities for each member to practice in the Discourse and the practice of reflection.

Reflection as group feedback

Each small group was asked to prepare a draft of their curriculum unit to the whole class at mid-semester. Every student was asked to provide no more than one page of written feedback on each draft presentation (with the exception of their small group's presentation) to each member of the presenting team during the class proceeding the presentation. This purpose of this feedback was to provide each small group with helpful information and suggestions about their curriculum unit. The process of providing feedback also provided every learner with another opportunity to communicate within the Discourse of a new teaching practice and pedagogy.

The professor's reflections as group feedback

The professor provided written feedback on each draft presentation in the form of a letter written to the whole class. Each participant was given a copy of this feedback at the class proceeding each presentation. The feedback was framed "as part of the ongoing dialogue about the content of the course and not merely responses to particular presentations or curriculum plans" (Willett, 1995b). As such, the feedback provided each student with information about the professor's beliefs about learners and their learning context.

Reflecting on reflection

Willett also encouraged reflection facilitators to be researchers in this venue in order to examine the theoretical underpinnings and practice of this role. She
encouraged reflection facilitators to become familiar with the scholarly literature on this topic and provided a specific book for this purpose. The book examined this role via authentic experiences of small team leaders on the collegiate level (Bensimon and Neumann, 1993). In addition, the professor asked me to identify articles for each small group's reflection facilitators and to add these to their repertoire of scholarly literature on the subject. Thus, the professor designed the course with a host of scholarly literature for our use. Moreover, the normative behaviors expected of facilitators were that they would read scholarly literature about this role and be "expert resources" in this area in their small groups.

Experience in the deliberation of curriculum

The primary product of the small groups was their curriculum unit. The professor based the design of this course on the authentic and purposeful collaborative experience of "gathering information, materials, resources about the content that must be taught and about the particular approaches or modes they decide to use in order to deliver the content..." (Willett, 1995a). The curriculum unit connects the learning process involved in the "whole" of this class to the group's product. The major purpose of creating or modifying curriculum in this course was to co-construct a frame for teaching. This frame concerned the heart of what teachers do; deciding what should be taught. The professor designed this course to provide each participant with an authentic experience in the decision-making process of deliberation. This course was designed to "(a) consider solutions, actions, and problems; (b) envision the potential outcomes of each; and (c) consider equally the means and ends, facts and values, and must (d) act within time constraints" (McCutcheon, 1995, p. 5). Further, the Curriculum Course was designed to think
about all learners as equal participants and learning as a social enterprise (Dewey, 1938; McCutcheon, 1995).

**Deliberation involves collaboration and conflict**

The professor posed collaboration and conflict as a group norm in the deliberation of curriculum. She expressed this belief in the syllabus: "It is the playing around with diverse, even contradictory ideas that contributes to unique and dynamic units and presentations" (Willett, 1995a). Further, she articulated her thoughts about the purpose of conflict in group deliberation during her introduction of the course during the first night of class. In preparing the whole class to be separated into small groups, she posed conflict and diversity as resources and opportunities to learn.

The Curriculum Course experience offered NES and ESL teachers and teachers-in-training with a multitude of individual and collaborative opportunities to experiment, examine, and reflect upon new teaching practices in order to become better prepared for the workplace (Bailey 1993b). Similarly, it provided a rich source of ethnographic data.

**Setting**

This course took place in the School of Education at the University of Massachusetts. The course was divided into three segments: (a) whole class meetings, (b) small group meetings, and (c) small group presentations. Each of these segments took place in different locations inside the University's School of Education building.
Whole class meetings

The first two whole class meetings were conducted solely by the professor. The subsequent three classes were directed by professor and involved a discussion from small groups of students who had read the same "B" list book. The sixth whole class meeting was led by a reflection facilitator in Spanish. The seventh, eighth, ninth and tenth whole class meetings were led by the Curriculum Development Teams (small groups) and were in the form of a small group presentation. There were no whole class meetings during classes twelve and thirteen. The fourteenth class was conducted in the form of a Curriculum Faire presentation and each of the five groups provided a short presentation of their curriculum unit.

Whole class meetings took place during the first ninety minutes of class in a small windowless classroom that rarely had enough seats for all of the students. Each whole class meeting was often interrupted by a late arrival who quickly left in search of a chair and then spent a few minutes negotiating space in the cramped classroom while fellow students politely moved closer to one another in order to make room for everyone. Whole classes took place in a small classroom with many students seated shoulder to shoulder.

Small group presentations

Small group presentations took place in one of three locations: (a) the windowless classroom, (b) a large open space composed of conference tables in the form of a large "U", and (c) the gymnasium of the University's laboratory elementary school attached to the School of Education. The gymnasium was used the last night of class for the presentation of each group's final curriculum unit and was conducted the form of a Curriculum Faire. Each small group had booth-like stations displaying their curriculum units around the periphery of the gymnasium. This included audio and video media as well as bulletin board and table displays. Each small group was
given twenty minutes to describe their final unit. In the center of the room were trays of food and beverages that the professor and students brought in celebration of this finale.

**Small group meetings**

Small group meetings took place during the second portion of the class period in small conference rooms throughout the school of education (see Table 7, p. 94, for a description of small group meetings). Many of the small groups roamed in a semester-long search for a space to call their own. Despite this difficulty, each group was able to meet on a weekly basis in a variety of available small conference rooms throughout the semester. The small group that participated in this study occupied four different spaces in the School of Education. Meetings one, two, and four took place in a small conference room at the end of a hallway of the first floor of the School of Education building. The conference room held one long table and the group sat at one end. The third meeting took place in the lobby of the School of Education. (We were unable to find any available spaces on that night.) The small group sat on a couch and two chairs adjacent to the front doors of the building and were frequently interrupted by the exit or entrance of students. The fifth and sixth meetings were held in the school lounge due to the first site being locked. The lounge consisted of a rectangular room with soda and candy machines flanking both of the short ends of the room, with a windowed wall on one side and a bulletin board on the other. The center of the room held a long conference table with a couch set perpendicular to the table. The group gathered around one end of the table for their meetings. The meetings were frequently interrupted by students and faculty who came in the room to purchase soda or snack. A third and final location was secured for the remaining small group's meetings. This location was situated in a tiny square room consisting of five chairs and one windowed wall facing out into the hallway.
The first nine of the small group’s twelve meetings were conducted between 8:00 and 9:30 at night, the tenth meeting was conducted between 7:30 and 9:30 PM, and the eleventh and twelfth were conducted between 6:30 and 9:30 PM.

**Participants**

The participants in this class represented a student population of men and women of a wide age span and diverse linguistic, cultural, educational, and professional experiences. The first section will describe the whole class participants. The subsequent two sections will describe the selection process of and the participants in this study.

**Whole class participants**

The course was taught by Professor Jerri Willett and was composed of 26 students who appeared to range in age from mid-twenties to mid-fifties. The whole class was predominantly female with 17 women and 9 men. Similarly, the class was primarily composed of NES learners, 17 in all, with 1 African American, 1 Chinese-American, 14 Caucasian-Americans, and 1 Hispanic-American. Nine of the 17 NES learners were female and 8 were male. Table 4 depicts the profile of the NES and ESL learners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whole class profile of NES and ESL learners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NES Learners</th>
<th>ESL Learners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The whole class was composed of students representing a range of differing language and cultural backgrounds. Nine of the 26 students were ESL learners whose native language was Chinese, Spanish, Tibetan, or Vietnamese. Further, 8 of the 9 ESL learners were female and 1 was male. Table 5 illustrates the languages represented by the ESL learners in the Curriculum Course.

Table 5
Languages represented by the ESL learners in the whole class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESL LEARNERS</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tibetan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further, 10 of the 26 students enrolled in the course were obtaining their master's degree in ESL, Early Childhood Education, or Reading. In addition, 7 of the students were completing a Master's program in European history. Referred to as "The Histories" these students had enrolled in this course as part of their degree requirement for Massachusetts public school certification to teach history. Six students were pursuing doctoral degrees in education. The remaining 3 had their bachelor's degree in education and were taking this course for the purpose of professional development and as non-degree students.

Selection of small group participants

The selection of the small group studied in this dissertation was made by the professor and represented NES and ESL learners from diverse language, gender, cultural, professional, and educational experiences. These experiences were derived from information obtained during the first night of class at which time each learner
completed an index card with the following information: (a) name, (b) address, (c) phone, (d) current and past professional experiences, (e) language and cultural experiences, and (f) educational experiences. The professor then created five small groups based on the information that she received. The following is a brief description of the participants in this study:

Small group members in this study

**Barbara**, an American native English speaker proficient ("though rusty") in Spanish, was in her mid twenties and a mainstream sixth grade classroom teacher in a large urban elementary school at the time of this study. This was her sixth year teaching the sixth grade and her second teaching at this elementary school. Barbara was recruited to this class by the professor and was our group's "cooperating teacher." At the time of this study, she had a bachelor's degree in elementary education and had no educational training in cooperative learning or the content of the course. This was her first experience being in a cooperative learning group on the college level and her first experience being grouped with an ESL speaker.

**John**, an American native English speaker, worked in the human services field, had limited fluency in Spanish, was in his mid thirties, and was a full-time graduate student in the Curriculum Diversity and Curriculum Reform program in the School of Education at the time of this study. John's limited teaching experience involved a teaching practicum in secondary English and ESL. John had taken several courses in the University's School of Education many of which used cooperative learning methods. This was his third course with this professor and, thus, he was familiar with her course design and organization. Further, John's undergraduate educational experience involved many cooperative learning and interactive dialogue journal experiences.

---

3 These names have been changed in an effort to ensure their anonymity.
Lucila, a native Spanish speaker from Venezuela who is fluent in English and was in her mid-forties and a Kindergarten teacher in a bilingual classroom in a nearby city at the time of this study. Lucila emigrated to the United States in 1989 and attended the University of Massachusetts to acquire ESL. Within a short period of time, she enrolled in the School of Education and earned a master's degree in early childhood education. At the time of this study, Lucila was completing post graduate work in the same field. This was Lucila's fifteenth course in the School of Education. Most, she claimed, had engaged in the use of cooperative learning methods, however, this was her first experience as the sole ESL speaker in a cooperative learning group.

Tom a native English speaking Chinese-American who was in his mid-twenties and his last year of a master's program in European history at the time of this study was fluent in Mandarin and French. Tom attended sixth grade in Taiwan. He was teaching history at the University at the time of this study and had several years of experience as a camp counselor and an ESL tutor. This was his second course in the School of Education having previously taken a course in special education. These two courses were part of the requirements necessary for him to teach public school history. Tom was to begin a full-time practicum experience in teaching secondary history during the semester following this study. Tom had experienced being a participant in a cooperative learning group in the special education course. This was his first course with this professor and his first exposure to the content and Discourse of the Curriculum Course.

Debbie. I am an American native English speaker. At the time of this study, I was in my early forties and enrolled a doctoral program in the School of Education. I had worked in the field of ESL and bilingual education for over a decade. My participation in this group was to conduct research as part of my dissertation study

4 While Tom is a NES learner, he is also strongly identified with his Chinese background. As such, I have referred to him as a Chinese Native English Speaker (henceforth, CNES) to denote this important bi-cultural distinction.
and to be the group's reflection facilitator. I had taken previous courses with this professor and was familiar with the course design. Further, this was my second time taking this course. The first time had also been in the role of reflection facilitator.

Small group task

This group was responsible for collaboratively co-constructing a curriculum unit that was to be used in its laboratory site, Barbara's sixth grade classroom. We met throughout the semester to create this curriculum. The purpose of our deliberations were to gather information, materials, and resources about the content and approaches that were to be used in order to deliver the content of a geology unit to this classroom (Willett, 1995a).

Assignment of readings

Table 6 provides a summary of the two assigned readings. Each group member read a common book and selected a book from a list of six "B" selections. No two students read the same "B" list book.

Table 6
Assignment of the Small Group's Readings (See Appendix C).

| Group Book | Fu, D. | My trouble is my English. |
| "B" list books | | |
| Barbara | Armstrong, T. | Multiple intelligences in the classroom. (Multiple intelligences) |
| Debbie | Bensimon, E. and A. Neumann. | Redesigning collegiate leadership: Teams and teamwork in higher education. (Facilitators) |
| Lucila | Au, K. | Literacy instruction in multicultural settings. (Multicultural education). |
| Tom | Wells, G. & G. L. Wells. | Constructing knowledge together: Classrooms as centers of inquiry and literacy. (Second language learners). |
Small group meetings

Table 7 represents a time line of the small group meetings in sequence and provides information of who was in attendance. The small group did not meet in entirety during meetings 2, 3, 4, and 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>In Attendance</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>9/18</td>
<td>45 min.</td>
<td>Barbara, Tom, Debbie, John, Lucila,</td>
<td>Deliberation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>9/25</td>
<td>1.5 hrs.</td>
<td>Barbara, Tom, Lucila, and John</td>
<td>Deliberation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>10/2</td>
<td>1.5 hrs.</td>
<td>Barbara, Tom, Debbie, John</td>
<td>Deliberation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>10/11</td>
<td>1.5 hrs.</td>
<td>Tom, Debbie, John</td>
<td>Deliberation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>10/16</td>
<td>1.5 hrs.</td>
<td>Barbara, Tom, Debbie, John, Lucila and professor during last 15 minutes</td>
<td>Deliberation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>10/23</td>
<td>1.5 hrs.</td>
<td>Barbara, Tom, Debbie, John, Lucila</td>
<td>Deliberation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>10/30</td>
<td>1.5 hrs.</td>
<td>Barbara, Debbie, John, Lucila</td>
<td>Deliberation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>11/6</td>
<td>1.5 hrs.</td>
<td>Barbara, Tom, Debbie, John, Lucila</td>
<td>Present draft to whole class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5 hrs.</td>
<td>Barbara, Tom Debbie, John, Lucila</td>
<td>Deliberation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>11/13</td>
<td>1.5 hrs.</td>
<td>Barbara, Tom, Debbie, John, Lucila</td>
<td>Deliberation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>11/20</td>
<td>2 hrs.</td>
<td>Barbara*, Tom, Debbie, John, Lucila</td>
<td>Deliberation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>11/27</td>
<td>3 hrs.</td>
<td>Barbara, Tom, Debbie, John, Lucila</td>
<td>Deliberation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>12/4</td>
<td>3 hrs.</td>
<td>Barbara, Tom, Debbie, John, Lucila</td>
<td>Deliberation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Barbara left the meeting early
Conclusion

The purpose of this section has been to provide a broad analysis of the speech situation which included a detailed description of the situated context of this speech community. This section has provided a lens with which to understand the small group in this Curriculum Course. As seen in this section, the design of this speech context, the Curriculum Course, supported the tenets of cooperative learning. Further, the professor designed this course in order to empower learners to actively be involved in the process and product of their own education through a semester long dialogue with peers. The goals of this course supported educational researchers' beliefs about cooperative learning and heterogeneity, i.e., learning is enhanced when it is active, interactive, and interdependent and learning cooperatively promotes social skills (E.G. Cohen, 1994; Johnson & Johnson, 1985; Sharan, 1990; Willett, 1995a).

Further, the design of this course supported the belief that teachers and teachers-in-training learn best when they are provided with (a) authentic experiences as participants in a heterogeneous cooperative learning group of NES and ESL learners, (b) scholarly research in the areas of heterogeneity, (c) multiple opportunities to reflect on the practice of and research about the principles of heterogeneity, and (d) experience in the deliberation of curriculum.

Moreover, this course offered teachers and teachers-in-training the chance to question and revise their professional practices (Bailey, 1993b). As such, the study of a small group in this speech community provided the unique opportunity to carefully view a heterogeneous learning group of NES and ESL teachers and teachers-in-training over the course of a semester. A second analysis which focused attention on the small group's weekly meetings in order to gain a deeper understanding of the normative patterns that emerged over time will now be provided.
CHAPTER 5
PHASE I: THE PLATFORM PHASE

Introduction

This chapter reports the findings seen in this ethnographic study of NES and ESL learners who were members of a speech community over the course of one semester. This chapter describes the group's first seven meetings. The two purposes of this chapter are (a) to provide a description of the normative patterns that emerged over the course of seven meetings and (b) to segment patterns into specific categories and themes. Thus, particular aspects have been extracted and categorized in an effort to present a thick description of this speech community and to further develop a construct of its interactional meetings.

This small group developed a sixth grade curriculum unit on geology. The group's task was to "gather information, materials, and resources about the content that must be taught and about the particular teaching approaches or modes they decide to use in order to deliver the content..." (Willett, 1995b). A particular aspect of the group's task was to develop their unit for the sixth grade students in the small group's laboratory site. Further, the small group needed to engage in a dialogue about "the principles of interactive, integrated, collaborative, multicultural, multisensory, language promoting, supported authentic learning in heterogeneous groups" in order to complete the task of incorporating these principles into their curriculum unit (Willett, 1995b). Each aspect of the small group's work involved a process of deliberation in order to create the curriculum unit.

McCutcheon (1995) argues that deliberation is not a linear process, rather it is a process of examining and re-examining a wide variety of alternatives in an effort to discern what is "relevant." This process in the Curriculum Course involved resolving
the primary problem of how to create a sixth grade curriculum unit. What should the
topic be? What should be included in the curriculum unit? Who were the students in
the laboratory site? What experiences did the small group members have in the
curricular area? Fundamental to the whole process of deliberation was to
collaboratively ask questions about what was needed in order to come to these
important resolutions.

Thus, the NES and ESL students in this small group needed to examine a
variety of alternatives through a semester long process of (a) reading, discussing, and
examining scholarly literature about the theory and practice of teaching
heterogeneous classes and meeting the needs of diverse learners in monolingual
content classrooms; (b) apprenticing in the theoretical and experiential discourse of a
small heterogeneous cooperative learning group of NES and ESL learners; and (c)
deliberating curriculum for heterogeneous classrooms within the construct of the
course content and course experience.

The Curriculum Course was organized around the tenets, practices, and
techniques of cooperative learning. The students in this small group, therefore, were
given a frame with which to structure their deliberative process. This structure
provided each small group member with the experience of being a cooperative learner
in a heterogeneous group of NES and ESL learners while simultaneously learning
about the tenets and practices of this theory. A major focus of the Curriculum Course
was small group learning and it is here that we now turn.

The small group had seven meetings in which to develop a draft of their
curriculum unit. This period of time allowed the group members to become
acquainted with one another and with their task. At the eighth meeting, the group
presented their draft to the whole class. They then met four more times to deliberate
their final product. The final product, the curriculum unit, was presented at a
Curriculum Faire during the last night of class. For the purpose of this discussion, these twelve meetings have been segmented into four phases.

**Phases in the small group's meetings**

Walker's (1971) "naturalistic model" has been used to describe three of the group's phases over the course of their semester long relationship. This model provides language for describing the process of developing curriculum over time. Walker (1971) defines three phases in the development of curriculum: Platform, Deliberation, and Design. He does not explicate the distinctions between solo and group deliberation whereas McCutcheon (1995) distinguishes between the two. Unlike solo deliberation, group deliberation is a social process that involves individuals who each possess unique beliefs and interests about their task (McCutcheon, 1995). When individuals engage in group deliberation there will be conflict. When this conflict is analyzed it can have a positive outcome on the group's product because it forces each member to deeply examine their task (McCutcheon, 1995). Conflict is an important element in group deliberation (McCutcheon, 1995). I have added a phase which I call Naming Conflict between the Platform and Deliberation phases in order address this important element of group deliberation. Therefore, for the purpose of this discussion these phases are presented in the following order:

1. Platform
2. Naming Conflict
3. Deliberation
4. Design.

It should be noted that while I believe that the "naturalistic model" offers a language for describing this small group's process over time, it does not allow for
these phases to co-occur or be revisited as part of the group’s process. The
"naturalistic model" is uni-directional whereas groupwork is not. Groupwork is a
social process where its participants collaboratively construct knowledge and shared
ways of thinking based on the continuous and "random" presence of individual
Platforms, Deliberations, and Design. Having stated these caveats, I do believe that
these terms provide a language for describing the patterns that emerged over the
course of this group’s twelve meetings.

Platform

The term "platform" is used to describe how participants present their
individual beliefs and value systems in the act of deliberating curriculum (Walker,
1971). Participants enter into groupwork with their individual platforms and initially
deliberate curriculum based on these individual beliefs and values. When these
platforms are stated, they become an important part of the group's deliberative
material.

Included in this Platform Phase are individual beliefs about and visions of
teaching (Walker, 1971). Each teacher develops their own ideology based on their
unique teaching and personal experiences. When teachers and teachers-in-training
are gathered together to work collaboratively, they bring their individual and often
tacit experiences, observations, reflections, and generalizations about teaching into
the text of group deliberation (McCutcheon, 1995). This presentation of individual
beliefs about and visions of teaching is a critical first component in the group
deliberative process of realizing their goal (McCutcheon, 1995; Walker, 1971). This
phase provides each participant with the opportunity to get to know one another and
to enter into the next phase of constructing their task based on the platforms that they
have discussed. This first phase, Platform, will be used to describe the group's first
seven meetings.
Naming conflict

The term Naming Conflict has been used to describe the process that occurred in this group between its Platform and Deliberation phases. McCutcheon (1995) argues that conflict, tension, and individual-risk-taking are normative behaviors that occur throughout the process of group deliberation. Further, she claims that "cognitive oversimplification, narrowing perspective, disregard of alternatives, disorganization, impatience, and forgetfulness" can all be outcomes of stress caused by these normative behaviors (McCutcheon, 1995, pp. 17-18). When conflict is named and analyzed, however, it can have a "positive role in deliberation by virtually forcing deliberators to examine alternatives meticulously" (McCutcheon, 1995, p. 150). At the group's eighth meeting, conflict was named, particularly in relation to who had voice and who did not. This meeting was a critical moment in the group's work. As such, a microanalysis will be presented of this Naming Conflict phase.

Deliberation

The third term, Deliberation, refers to the phase of collaborating and reaching agreement about several policies and materials that will be included as part of the curriculum (Walker, 1971). This phase began directly after the second phase and was signified by (a) an emphasis on analyzing and reconciling the named conflict, (b) on coming to agreement about the policies and materials that were used in their product, and (c) a growing sense of anxiety over the rapidly approaching deadline. This phase includes meetings nine and ten.

Design

The fourth term, Design, is used to describe the phase in which the group takes all of these agreed upon policies and materials and connects them to form one
overall curriculum design (Walker, 1971). This phase includes meetings eleven and twelve.

The following discussion of the small group’s meetings will be presented in the order of these four phrases. This chapter is devoted to a discussion of the group’s Platform Phase.

Phase I: Platform

Introduction

In this section, several claims will be made about the communicative patterns that were seen in the small group’s encounters during their first seven meetings. These include:

1. Two participants, the NES learners, voiced their individual platforms during this phase.
2. One participant, the ESL learner, did not voice her platform during this phase.
3. The presence of a situational co-membership was evidenced during the group’s first seven meetings among its NES participants
4. One member, a NES learner, appeared to perform the role of group moderator.

Introduction to the small group format, preparing for cooperation

The Curriculum Course met as a whole class during the first night for the full session. Using the syllabus as a guide, Professor Willett provided the whole class with an introduction to the class format during the first two hours of class. She included her belief in the tenets of cooperative learning and her rationale for the
course design. She spent a great deal of time explaining her belief that every student would contribute to the process of considering the topic of heterogeneity through the course of the semester. We were all "resources" we would learn "from each other," she repeated several times. Further, the ESL and the "Histories" students who might not be familiar with the content of this course were welcome "resources" who had a "great deal to contribute to our discussion and exploration." Moreover, the professor talked about the importance of the cultural differences in our class and gave examples of her experiences as a NES in Hong Kong.

We were all oriented to her belief and her rationale for the course design before the end of two hours. She then gave us a short break during which she reviewed the biographical information (i.e., name, address, student information, languages spoken, and teaching experience) that each student had written on index cards at her request. Upon returning from the break, she separated us into five heterogeneous groups based on our biographical summaries. Each group contained a participant who was assigned the role of reflection facilitator and a participant who was assigned the role of cooperating teacher. Prior to the close of class, she asked each group to select readings from the "B" list and to make sure that no two small group members picked the same book. We would be engaging in a "bookshare" class during the next whole class meeting and would need to read the "B" list books before the next class.

The groups huddled in five small circles in the room. Quickly, our group scanned the list of readings and made selections. Lucila chose a book about multiculturalism claiming it would be good to read a book about that topic and Barbara chose a book about multiple intelligences, "I have wanted to read about MI," she said. Tom chose from the remaining books on the list. A fourth member chose a book on brain based learning. Professor Willett told us that we would meet in our
small groups for the first time after the whole class meeting next week in order to
begin the work of developing the curriculum unit.

The second whole class meeting began with a continuation of the discussion
of the fundamental beliefs that guided this course. Professor Willett asked the whole
class to begin to think about the tensions that might form in our small groups. She
claimed that reflection facilitators should not be in charge of the group but should
help the group process the tensions that would form. Further she framed the role of
reflection facilitator as a "participant observer in a mini laboratory to work in
heterogeneous groups." She claimed that the facilitator's role was to help the group
deal with being a group. She stated that the facilitators would use dialogue journals
as a method to communicate with all of the group members and that this might be an
aspect of the course that "some may view with hate and others as very positive." She
discussed the role of "cooperating teacher" and claimed that this was also part of our
mini-laboratory experience and that it would be used to consider the "real" aspects of
the teacher's classroom and their context. She claimed that the point of the class was
for all of us to try and learn about heterogeneous groups. Thus, Professor Willett
carefully laid the foundation for cooperative learning (E.G. Cohen, 1994).

She constantly used the pronoun "we" in this second class. I marked in my
field notes that she used it over and over again. "We as teachers." "We as learners." She
appeared to purposely reduce her role as the authority in her claim that "we"
would be spending the semester exploring the role of heterogeneity in our small
groups and would bring our final product to the whole class.

Further, she talked about the diverse members of our class and stated that this
was part of the course design. Hence, the foundation for a Curriculum Course built
on the tenets and the practice of cooperative learning was laid during the first two
classes. We, as a whole class, were prepared by the professor "for cooperation" (E.G.
Cohen, 1994).
A key component of classrooms that engage in cooperative learning methods is a shift in the focus of instruction from teacher-led environments to "relatively autonomous groups" (Sharan, 1990, p. 79). As a newly formed group, we left the whole class in search of a small conference room. We were five strangers who would soon be engaged in a semester long dialogue. We walked together through the School of Education and up a flight of stairs to the very end of a hallway where we came upon a small conference room.

Platforms are evidenced

Our group began with a rocky start. Tom, Barbara, Lucila, and I were selected to be in this group. We originally had one other member who dropped out during the first thirty minutes. I left our first group meeting with the professor in search of a fifth member and twenty minutes later, re-entered with John, our newest addition. After we introduced ourselves, John asked the group what he had missed and then commented that he was "uncomfortable" being in a group that would be involved in the curriculum planning for students in the sixth grade. He and Barbara then began a discussion about their comfort level with this class and their own experiences in American public schools.

Excerpt 1

273  **John**: Before I came to class what did I miss?
274  **Barbara**: Not really a lot, I was talking about my self portraits in my class and talking about how one of my kids said to the other that the color she had used was the same as his and he said we are the same color and she said no, I'm not.
277  **John**: How old are sixth graders?

---

5 It is important to note that the facilitator's role is meant to help the group to reflect on their process. While Willett does not provide facilitors with a "script" in order to play the role she does ask facilitators to focus on process in order to allow the rest of the group to take responsibility for the construction of their task. As such, my voice was deliberately weakened (Willett and Jeannot, 1993).
Barbara: Eleven or twelve, but I have a nine year old and this is kind of strange.

John: Well, I have not been in an elementary school since I was in elementary school so at the moment I am uncomfortable dealing with little kids. I just haven't been in this situation. It is an experience that will be unusual to me.

Barbara: Well I am uncomfortable too, I went to a traditional school and my training is pretty traditional so this is new to me too.

As seen, the NES learners in this cooperative learning group presented their discomfort about the group's task. First, John framed his discomfort based on his lack of experience with students in this age group. Second, in lines 285 and 286 Barbara presented her discomfort with the task in relation to her being a product of an ideology ("traditional") that was different from this course and being a teacher who was not familiar with the course content. Thus, the group's discussion was framed by the two NES members in the form of "traditional" versus groupwork talk.

John presented information about his teaching ideology in the next communicative exchange. He told a story about an experience he had as a teacher in a high school. In the story, he described the teacher in the classroom adjacent to his who had "nothing but an easel and a pointer and a map and nothing else." To his surprise, John's students commented that the teacher was the best they had ever had. He claimed that this experience had led him to a more critical examination of "traditional" teaching practices. Notes lines 292 to 294 which indicated his thoughts about the benefits of a "traditional" education.

Excerpt 2

John: Now I am willing to change my whole outlook of everything about what and who teaches. Sort of like what we think and what we see, the clock, the easel and the pointer and he would scream at kids which bothered me, but they loved him and it made me think about what it means to be traditional. And in the CDCR program it is easy to see traditional as wrong but I am beginning to explore that and see what is right and what I benefit from this type of learning and how I benefited as a learner.

Thus, during the first communicative moments of this group's formation one of its members, an NES learner, presented his individual ideology.
Lucila and Tom had not yet entered into the conversation. I asked Tom where he went to school and his response continued the discussion by contrasting the two teaching approaches that Barbara and John had previously discussed.

Excerpt 3

300 Debbie: [to Tom] Where did you go to school?
301 Tom: I had some education in North Carolina. I have been a lot of places, some in Taiwan and I think they were both conservative, uh, I guess what we generally call traditional. And I think that certain people do well in that situation. And if the situation were reversed and the norm was how to do groupwork. And I think that it would be just the opposite. And we would be asked why don't some people do well in groupwork.

These excerpts of talk also reveal some of the speech patterns which were present throughout the first session: (a) John and Barbara, the NES learners in the group, framed the conversation for the group; (b) Tom did not speak until Barbara and John's exchanges were interrupted by my voice in an effort to include Tom and Lucila as part of the deliberations; and (c) Lucila's voice was not heard during this meeting with the exception of introducing herself.

Thus, there were two themes that emerged in the group starting from its first meeting. The text was framed by the NES speakers and a platform was revealed. For the purpose of this discussion, they will be called (a) the role of cooperating teacher and (b) presentation of platforms.

The role of cooperating teacher

The group's second meeting began after a whole class meeting devoted to a "bookshare" of the "B" list. Students who had read the same book were placed into a small group and spent the session engaged in a discussion about the book they had read. The small groups convened after the whole class session.

The participation pattern that had emerged during the small group's first meeting was further evidenced in its second meeting. I was not present at the group's
second meeting and arranged for Barbara to audio tape the group's session. The audio
taped session began with a question from John who asked if "sky" had been selected
as the group's topic. His question was answered by Barbara who responded that sky
and geology were two potential topics. Barbara then focused the group's discussion
away from selecting a topic and toward a discussion of the scholarly books that each
member had read as part of the week's task. It was during this meeting that Lucila
spoke. Notice, however, that the structural frame for talk was provided by Barbara in
lines 30 and 31 in the excerpt below.

Excerpt 4

20 John: So, you [referring to the group] are going to be working on sky?
21 Barbara: Well, I just threw this out there, because that's something that I'm
22 going to be doing and I just put it out there. Uh, in about a month or so I'll be
23 getting into a geology unit with a focus on rocks, fossils, and glaciers. And I
24 threw that out to you to see what your reaction was, and I think it
25 would be a good idea for us to talk to learn about the books and how we could tie
26 that into this unit once we decide what we are going to do. So I think that we
27 could start off with a book share. I wish we could talk about our book share. To
28 talk about the book that you read and what it is about and how it works and our
29 book share and actually I wish that I had a recorder with me because I had some
30 ideas in our group and I wish that we had brought them. So [pause] whoever
31 wants to start, um can start with their book share.
32 Lucila: All right, The book that I read was in literacy instruction in multicultural
33 settings, um, and it was very nice to read, it was easy reading and, um, good ideas,
34 it has good ideas.

What was interesting about this stretch of conversation was how Barbara
moderated the group's participation. At first, John asked the group if they had made a
decision about a topic for their curriculum unit. Barbara responded to John's question
by suggesting that the group think about doing their curriculum unit on sky or
geology. Therefore, in her role as cooperating teacher she suggested two topics that
would work in the group's laboratory site.

However, note lines 22 through 25. Here Barbara subsequently shifted the
group's attention and their focus to the books that they had individually read as part of
their requirement for the night's class and directed them to talk about their readings.
"Whoever wants to start" in line 30 signaled Lucila's entree into the group's discussion.

Lucila spent the next several minutes reporting on the book that she had selected from the assigned list. The subsequent communicative sequence presented below is further evidence of Barbara's role in the group's talk.

**Excerpt 5**

55 **Barbara:** Uh huh. Sounds good.
56 **Lucila:** Yeah, I think it was nice, it was good.
57 **Barbara:** Uh huh.
58 **Lucila:** Yeah and the last thing is that she says that the teacher that the classroom has to be a classroom of learners. Teacher learns from the kids and must be open and the center of the points of views of the kids and kids must learn from the teacher and from themselves also.
59 **Barbara:** Okay, anything else?
60 **Lucila:** No.
61 **Barbara:** Okay, I'll briefly tell you about this...

It was seen that Barbara performed several acts in this speech community. These acts were seen throughout the group's first two meetings. First, she structured the group's talk. Note the way she structured the discussion about the books that they had read in preparation for that night's class. "I think that we should start off with a book share" was clearly a structure for the group's discussion. Further, she focused the group's discussion away from selecting a topic and toward a discussion of the books as seen in Excerpt 4. Moreover, the group immediately launched into the frame of conversation that Barbara had suggested.

Further, it was seen that the group complied with Barbara's direction. Barbara moderated the discussion throughout the group's session. Thus, her participation in this group played a key role in structuring the frame for talk and in moderating the talk. The string of talk below further illustrates Barbara's performance in these two speech acts.

**Excerpt 6**

403 **Barbara:** Are you teaching right now?
404 **John:** No.
405 **Barbara:** Are you teaching right now?
406 **Tom:** Um, one.
In addition, Barbara was seen to set the agenda for the group's talk. Line 467 in the excerpt below is an example of Barbara's act of organizing the group's talk in accordance with her suggestions.

**Excerpt 7** (a few minutes later)

467 **Barbara:** Okay, let's do a check, how does the sky even sound?
468 **John:** Sky sounds good, geology does too. Cause you're doing sky and when
469 would that start and end?

These communicative patterns were seen during the group's first two meetings. It was seen that Barbara performed several acts in this speech community and that the group complied with these acts:

1. She framed the group's talk.
   
   The small group's talk was structured by Barbara who made guided suggestions about the topics of talk.

2. She moderated each group session.
   
   In addition to framing the group's talk, Barbara chaired the group's discussion.

3. She set the agenda for the group's talk.

Further, these patterns were present throughout the group's Platform Phase. Evidence of this was seen repeatedly throughout the group's meetings. Thus, a role appears to have formed from the group's earliest meetings. For the purpose of this discussion, I have used the term "moderator" to describe the acts that Barbara performed in this speech community. Let us begin this discussion with two attributes that merit consideration: the role of cooperating teacher was (a) performed by a NES learner who (b) was seen to frame the group's talk, moderate each group session, and set the group's agenda.

The professor designed both a unique and extraordinary classroom experience. Here, NES and ESL teachers and teachers-in-training had the opportunity to learn the
tenets of heterogeneity while being participants in a heterogeneous cooperative
learning group and were given the opportunity to design curriculum for a real
classroom. The layers of this classroom experience provided every teacher and
teacher-in-training with a host of opportunities to learn.

In order to accomplish her goal, the professor needed to recruit local teachers
who would be willing to open up their classrooms to be used as laboratory sites for a
small group of college students. Her goal was not to find a teacher who was an expert
on heterogeneity but to secure a natural learning situation and environment that would
become an authentic learning context for the task of creating curriculum that would
exemplify all of the ideals that the Curriculum Course promoted. Thus, the
professor's expectation was not to recruit Curriculum Course experts who would fill
the role of cooperating teacher. Rather, the expectation was to recruit teachers who
would be willing to (a) be students in this course for the purpose of their own learning
and (b) open up their classrooms as laboratory sites. Thus, the recruit was willing to
be a member of this class and simultaneously be "on stage" for peers to observe
critically for the purpose of learning about the principles of heterogeneity and creating
curriculum for the heterogeneous classroom.

The cooperating teacher's primary responsibility in her workplace is her
students. Thus, the professor needed to design the course taking into account this
important aspect of the cooperating teacher's role. In this sense, the professor asked
the recruit to make a leap of faith into a new role, that of cooperating teacher, and
trust that peers (students in the Curriculum Course) would be sensitive to the needs of
the recruit, the recruit's students, and the laboratory classroom. Thus, the cooperating
teacher in the Curriculum Course took on a new role with peers and a distinct set of
expectations; to open her classroom for the purpose of learning about heterogeneity
and to create curriculum.
The motive which prompted the invention of this role was the belief that learning should involve apprenticing new practices in the context of the actual workplace, the classroom (Bailey, 1993b; Gee, 1990; and, Willett and Jeannot, 1993). Thus, the professor carefully incorporated an authentic context as part of the course design. It was perhaps one of the most significant aspects of the Curriculum Course as it provided authenticity.

While I believe that the role of cooperating teacher offers an important and essential learning opportunity for all teachers and teacher-in-training, this study revealed some interesting dilemmas about this role. Cooperative learning is a social process where participants actively and interdependently work together to accomplish a common goal (E. G. Cohen, 1994; Sharan, 1990). Further, the practice of a learning method and the simultaneous study of its theoretical underpinnings can have broad implications for our view of teaching and the impact these views might have on our societal practices (Bailey, 1993b; Jeannot, 1994; Willett and Jeannot, 1993). Here the professor created a critical course design that sought to "transform" the workplace so that NES and ESL learners were regarded as legitimate and important members of their learning community (Jeannot and Willett, 1993). Further, in an interview with the professor about this role, she claimed that the role of cooperating teacher provided the opportunity for veteran teachers to return to the college classroom to learn new tenets and practices.

Thus, it was in the context of the Curriculum Course that teachers and teachers-in-training had the opportunity to be "empowered" (Willett and Jeannot, 1993). Further, the professor distinguishes between two views of education; traditional and empowerment:

According to the traditional view, the purpose of education is to provide learners with the skills and attitudes needed to function in society as given. ...Empowerment education, on the other hand, acknowledges that many of the difficulties faced by learners exist because society is organized to maintain existing power configurations. The aim of empowerment education is both
individual empowerment and social transformation (Willett and Jeannot, 1993, p. 478).

Hence, the role of cooperating teacher was created to be part of this task-based transformational experience. However, an important consequence of this role in this small group in this Curriculum Course was in direct contradiction with the professor's intent.

Barbara was a teacher during the day. She worked in a sixth grade classroom as the sole monolingual English mainstream classroom teacher. She was recruited by the professor to be the "cooperating teacher" in a small group in the Curriculum Course. A description of the cooperating teacher's role was provided in the course syllabus. Below is the framework that the professor provided for the role of cooperating teacher. While the intent of the professor was to create an authentic learning experience and simultaneously protect the integrity of the cooperating teacher and her students, the language that the professor used to describe this role is of import:

Each team will have a cooperating teacher from a local school whose classroom will become the laboratory for a curriculum unit that the team will design or modify.

Teams must work within the constraints of the particular classroom to which they have been assigned as defined by the cooperating teacher, but members will do their best to incorporate the ideas that are being dealt with in readings and class discussion.

One of the best ways to get to know the students is to assist the teacher...

Your cooperating teacher is willing to have you observe his or her class (how this is to be done is left up to the individual teachers and their team members).

The cooperating teacher must have the last word on this aspect of the course, however, since his or her responsibility is to the kids. (see Appendix C).

Note the language used to define the role. Group members (a) "will have a cooperating teacher," (b) "will work within the constraints of the particular classroom that they have been assigned as defined by their cooperating teacher," (c) will assist the teacher, (d) must let the cooperating teacher "have the last word," and (e) can
observe because the "cooperating teacher is willing to have you observe." This language gave power: (a) to the person who played this role and (b) about this role to the small group's participants. The professor needed to ensure that the teacher's primary responsibilities, her students, were protected. Hence, this language was used in order to ensure that these responsibilities were not compromised.

Thus, cooperating teachers had power in the Curriculum Course: the power to (a) have the last word, (b) be involved in determining what was appropriate in the group's task, and (c) provide the group with expert and insider information about the particular classroom that they had "been assigned." Further, each group member was dependent on the cooperating teacher to provide them with essential information about their task.

Here in this very course where the professor had carefully created a learning community of collaboration where all learners would be considered important contributors we have one learner who was given a different kind of status than the remaining members. The cooperating teacher was given a powerful position that was highly relevant to the group's task. I believe that the role, as it was defined, had the potential to cause the group to perceive the cooperating teacher as an expert about the curriculum, the students, the course content, and so forth. In this sense, it had the potential to put recruits who had not been trained in the principles of the Curriculum Course in the position of expert.

The cooperating teacher was expected to "define," and "have the last word" in the group's deliberation of their curriculum and in its design (see Appendix C). Thus, while the goal of the professor was to provide a task-based educational experience for the purpose of transforming teaching practices, I claim that this was highly dependent on whether the cooperating teacher truly grasped the whole purpose of the Curriculum Course. Further, I claim that there was the potential that the traditional view of education, that is "to provide learners with the skills and attitudes needed to function
in society as given," might be promoted (Willett and Jeannot, 1993). I make this claim because most of the nation's mainstream classroom teachers are NES who (a) have been trained in institutions that "use a monocultural approach...and do not teach about cultural or linguistic diversity" (Zeichner, 1993) and (b) have not had any formal training in the areas of second language acquisition, bilingual education, or multicultural education (Vogel Zanger, 1989).

Further, I believe that the acts that Barbara performed in this speech community were very much like the acts that she performed on a daily basis with her sixth grade students: (a) she structured, (b) she focused, and (c) she moderated talk. In inventing the role of cooperating teacher, I believe that she drew upon what she already knew in the hope that it would fit the "script" that she perceived was needed in order to act in the role of cooperating teacher in this group. Thus, during the Platform Phase, the role of cooperating teacher, as invented by Barbara, significantly replicated the "modus operandi" of her profession, teacher.

The absence of the familiar

The Curriculum Course was organized around the tenets, practices, and techniques of cooperative learning. It was here that NES and ESL teachers and teachers-in-training had the opportunity to practice being cooperative learners (Bailey, 1993b). The professor provided her students with a frame for their deliberative process. She also provided the group with three roles, reflective facilitator, cooperating teacher, and group resource. However, none of these roles were given prescriptive rules. Thus, it was here that teachers and teachers-in-training engaged in the process of inventing the roles for themselves (Willett and Jeannot, 1993).

Further, within this situational context of apprenticing the roles of cooperative learners, the role of professor as the sole authority of the Curriculum Course was
purposely reduced in an effort to create the frame for working together in order to create a common goal (Jeannot, 1991). Hence, there was the absence of the familiar: the absence of the role of professor in the familiar context of a teacher-led course (Willett and Jeannot, 1993). Moreover, while there was the presence of a reflective facilitator, the role was defined as a participant observer and reflector of the group's process who was not and should not be the leader of the group (Willett 1995a).

In the practice of cooperative groupwork there is no role of "person in charge." Rather, the person in charge, the professor, purposely reduces her authority in an effort to be an informal collaborator (Sharan, 1990). Accordingly, there was a perceived void in the Curriculum Course as the familiar person in charge was not present in this course (Willett and Jeannot, 1993). Thus, this course was not designed according to the expectations that many students might have had as it did not have the familiar teacher-led lecture format. Hence, in the Curriculum Course five members were given the charge of working together in the interactional process of developing curriculum. As such, each small group developed its own ways of acting within this cooperative learning structure (Jeannot, 1991; Willett and Jeannot, 1993). Further, each small group acted in the process of inventing their social community (Jeannot, 1991). Thus, in this small group it appeared that some of the functions that would have been performed by a professor in a teacher-led classroom were acted by Barbara:

1. She framed the group's talk.
2. She moderated each group session.
3. She set the agenda for the group's talk.

Further, it was seen that in this speech community, the small group complied with Barbara's direction. Thus, they accepted her leadership.
One of the interesting aspects of the group's second meeting was their discussion about the books they had read in preparation for the evening's class. While the meeting had the feel of a book report session moderated by Barbara, there were distinctions seen in the way that particular members presented their books.

Lucila's discussion was in the form of a "report." Outside of saying that "it was very nice to read, it was easy reading, and had good ideas" we were not given information about Lucila's personal beliefs or ideology in relation to the principles presented in the book. Rather, her style was that of objective reporter.

**Excerpt 8**

Lucila: The main ideas of the book is to try and raise the level of students from various backgrounds because right now mainstream students, um, no, so um, and she talk about students diverse background based on three things. One is um, language, the other is ethnicity and class. So, she thinks the group that has been inequality in literacy achievement of students of diverse backgrounds and um, teachers have to introduce education by doing certain things by making their classroom culturally responsible um, she talks a lot about constructivist theory in opposition to transmission theory and constructivist is based on teachers have to base their curriculum on their students knowledge. What they have been taught at home because she thinks literacy starts at home. So all of the knowledge that the kids bring to school, they have learned at home should be used in the curriculum. So she also talks about the teacher as um, a mediator of all the cultures in the classroom. That the teacher should get the parents involved and the community involved in school and in the classroom. She also talks about assessment and evaluation and she says that it should be culturally sensitive. Um, and and she talk about a lot of Hawaiian children and how they are culturally and what you have to do to work with them and also about African American children and but mainly what he talks about is cultural involvement, how to work with them. But mainly what she talks about it. That the teacher has to be open to other cultures and she can't use one model in the classroom. She has to um, adapt to her children in the classroom.

Barbara and John provided their particular value and belief systems in their personal commentaries about the books that they read. Excerpt 9 (p. 117) illustrates Barbara's talk about her book, her expectations of teachers, and her personal experiences as a learner. Note the differences between Barbara's personal and
Lucila's objective style during this Platform Phase. In lines 126 through 131, for example, Barbara provided each group member with her beliefs about the book.

Excerpt 9

120 **Barbara** But, on one hand he breaks it down and give you some practical
121 things that you can do, it's just that he's very idealistic and constantly
122 weaving things into every aspect of his teaching just to make people aware of
123 the MI theory. Um, I brought this book up at a staff meeting and a lot of
124 people never heard of the notion of multiple Intelligences and so on the one
125 hand people are expected to teach this way, I mean this is the wave of the
126 future. But how can this be expected when most people aren't aware of it? I
127 think that it is good. I think that [pause] you know you talk about the whole
128 notion of traditional versus non-traditional classrooms where most of these
129 Intelligences that they talked about were totally squelched and the one that
130 was there was linguistic, you know reading and writing. But, like bodily
131 kinesthetic and musical, we never had that.

John then focused the conversation on his beliefs about assessment and evaluation in education. Again, in contrast to Lucila, the ESL speaker in our group, we were privy to John's ideology in this area. Note how John talked about his belief that testing was a method of permanently labeling students into specific categories.

Excerpt 10

139 **John:** It's [referring to testing] all that pigeon holing like the astrological
140 signs that say oh, you are like this and then you end up being like that to fit the
141 image. It's like which comes first which comes first the chicken or the egg
142 kind of questions. Oh, I'm this kind of learner so I'll tune out on logic.

John and Barbara then began a rather lengthy two-way exchange about their beliefs about and their personal experiences in education.

Excerpt 11

150 **John:** It was was of the things that we were talking about in our group as
151 well, um, a lot of what we were readings leads us in that direction, it's
152 interesting, the political, in political education, what I call it, we are seeing a
153 movement toward those types of tests...
154 **Barbara:** Just today there was this big article where I teach that said back go
155 back to basics and you know here is this one on the left and there that one on
156 the right and just this research says all this great stuff and now we go back.

It was not until the latter half of the second meeting that Tom spoke. John had just finished a discussion about Caine and Caine's book on brain-based learning. As before, he used many personal examples in reporting his book. At this point, Tom
Tom: Okay, I did constructing knowledge together by Gordon Wells. Basically, it's, it's um, letting students choose their own path of learning and constructing knowledge within a broad scope. It's basically that idea and usually either by random selection or ah, usually choosing their own partner or their own project, usually they are interested in the same thing and you know they will be working together. Or if you are the only one interested in it that is okay you can be in a group of one. And if the student comes across something that he doesn't understand, then they go to their teacher. Um, basic problems with this would be the time constraints and how would you put it into a high school when the teaching get more advanced and more specific.

Interestingly, both John and Barbara responded to Tom's summary with further evidence of their individual platforms and their distinct relationship in this context. We again hear a string of exchanges about their experiences as students and as teachers. We also hear back channeling comments, (e.g., "wow" and "yeah") which further evidenced their mutual ability to participate in a conversation because of their shared sense of each other and their social context (Erickson, 1996). The communicative sequences below occurred directly after Tom finished his summary and exemplify this point.

Barbara: Wow, I wish it wasn't like that.
John: It's bizarre, I mean high schools are like behaviorist factory model situations. I mean the whole idea of a middle school is to get away from that situation...

Barbara: Yeah, I don't understand that.
John: Um, if it's okay for eighth graders, how come it's not okay for 9th graders. I mean if the idea is for high schoolers to work in the factories, I mean it's a very real idea that's talked about how to make the education work in America that is not working now. Like in Millville, there are not more factories, but if you look at the high school, it is the factory model. If you're

6 The name has been changed in an effort to ensure anonymity.
good, you get an A if you're bad you get kicked out or punished and it's pretty basic and it doesn't work very well although some students do well.

Barbara: Like last night I looked for something that was in this book, you know musical, spatial, kinesthetic, and you know, well maybe one of those was there on a narrow scope, yet the kids were on the edge of their seats.

John: Yeah, I think that they went for the interpersonal, you know wanting them to be there being supportive, making them feel good about themselves.

Thus, it is seen that the style that the participants used to present the content of their readings was quite distinct. John and Barbara, the NES learners, used a personal style in reporting their books. Interestingly, this style also informed the group of their platforms. This supports Walker's (1971) claims that teachers bring their own ideology based on their unique teaching and personal experiences to the Platform Phase. However, at this point, we were only privy to Barbara and John's platforms. As such, this important first component in the group's deliberation process, that of presenting platforms, was not evidenced by all of the group's members.

Negotiating meaning in the small group format

Bailey (1993b) provides important information about the importance of individual participation in the co-construction of a group's task. How individuals participate and who is regarded as powerful and powerless are often reflected in the type and amount of participation in which each individual engages (Bailey, 1993b). He claims that an examination of turn-taking can reveal some important cultural distinctions between members. He claims that one of two "techniques" are used in taking a turn in a conversation: "a current speaker may select the next speaker and a speaker may self-select a turn" (Bailey, 1993b, p. 256). Further, he claims that the most common method used to gain entry into a conversation is by self selection.

An examination of the group's second meeting from this lens provided important information about each member. Table 8 (p. 120) describes the types of turns that were taken during the small group's second meeting according to the
following adaptation of Bailey's (1993b) framework: (a) speaker self-selected a turn, (b) speaker was asked to speak, and (c) speaker asked a question in order to seek understanding. The purpose of this Table is to illustrate how the participants allocated turns in order to describe the distinctions seen among group members.

Table 8
Turn allocation in the small group's second meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Self-Selected</th>
<th>Was asked to speak</th>
<th>Spoke in form of asking a question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucila</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*asked to speak by Barbara

During the group's second meeting Barbara and John spoke the most frequently and Lucila and Tom, respectively, spoke significantly less. In addition, Lucila and Tom were asked to speak by Barbara during the bookshare event. Thus, John and Barbara, the NES learners spoke the most frequently and that Tom and Lucila, the CNES and ESL learners in the group, spoke the least frequently. The number of times that each participant asked a question was significant. Here Lucila was seen to perform the speech act of asking a question in order to seek information far more frequently than her peers. These communicative acts of asking questions performed the function of seeking information about Barbara's class and the group's task. In both instances her questions were answered by Barbara.

The examples below illustrate the type of questions that Lucila presented in the small group format as well as the responses that she received. Lucila sought information about Barbara's classroom in order to make meaning of the small group's task in relation to the situated context of the group's laboratory. These communicative acts of asking questions about the group's task and laboratory were
seen to be performed by Lucila throughout the group’s Platform Phase. Note Barbara’s definitive answers to these questions. The first question, seen in line 126 of Excerpt 14 below, was posed to the group. Barbara self-selected to speak in responding to this question. In this small group, one member, the ESL speaker asked questions about the group’s task and the group’s laboratory. These questions were answered by Barbara.

Lucila performed the act of asking a question in order to seek information. This act also revealed the types of roles that she and Barbara enacted in this speech community (Bailey, 1993b). In this encounter, Lucila was soliciting the group for information but not anyone in particular. The participant who self-selected a response to Lucila’s question would be viewed as a "valuable resource" (Bailey, 1993b). In this case the slot was filled by Barbara. Thus, Lucila was "member who needed resource" and Barbara was in the more power laden position of "valued resource."

**Excerpt 14**

126  **Lucila:** Do we all have to read everyone else’s books?
127  **Barbara:** No, we just have to read our book for the book share.

By the end of the group’s second meeting, several patterns had begun to emerge:

(a) Barbara assumed a role, moderator, and performed several acts while playing this role:

1. She structured the group’s talk.
2. She moderated each group session.
3. She set the agenda for the group’s talk.
4. She was in the position of valuable resource.

(b) The group complied with Barbara’s direction.

(c) Barbara and John voiced their opinions and ideologies during this Platform Phase.
(d) The members in this small group were privy to Barbara and John's beliefs about their readings, teaching ideologies, and personal experiences and could use these as part of their deliberative text.

(e) Lucila and Tom did not express their individual platforms and they were thus missing from the group's deliberations.

(f) Tom and Lucila spoke far less frequently in the group's talk in contrast to Barbara and John who were frequently engaged in two-way exchanges.

(g) Unlike the other group members, Lucila asked questions about the group's task and Barbara's classroom in order to make meaning of the task in relation to the group's laboratory.

Presence of a situational co-membership

The fourth week's whole class meeting was devoted to a discussion about Tom's book, *Constructing Knowledge Together*. Lucila was absent from class as she had to attend an "Open House" at the school where she taught. After the whole class meeting, the small group convened for the third time. We were unable to use the small conference room and settled in the lobby of the School of Education. Thus far, the group had not decided on a topic for their curriculum unit. John began the group meeting stating that he thought the group had decided to do a unit on geology. He said, "I guess what we are doing is starting to think about how we are going to contribute to or how we are going to do this upcoming unit on geology, something that we are going to do together, right?" Barbara, as in the previous meetings provided the frame for the group's discussion.

Excerpt 15

163  **Barbara:** I mean right now we could have an open brainstorming session, but
164  next week we should bring something to the group something tangible to the
165  group and then start possibly working on, um, once we have our themes in
place working on specific objectives for our students. I am just throwing this out here.

Her suggestion that the group brainstorm was met with a response from Tom, who up until this point in all of the group's meetings had hardly spoken. Here Barbara solicited the collaborative participation of any member of the group. Interestingly, Tom responded to Barbara's request to brainstorm and in doing so gained the floor. Note Barbara's evaluative response to Tom in line 170.

Excerpt 16

Tom: Okay, how about under forming land mass, tectonic plates, earthquakes when two masses meet together, seismic waves.

Barbara: Yeah, totally that's great.

Here, she signaled that his suggestion had been heard. Over the course of the next several minutes several additional suggestions were made. However, the length of responses that Barbara provided Tom were significantly shorter than those she provided John. Note line 171 in the excerpt below where John suggested that the group might think about earthquakes. His suggestion took up much more "air time" than Tom's. Thus, Barbara's responses to John encompassed much more air time than her responses to Tom.

Excerpt 17

John: Maybe, um we could look at building, thinking about earthquakes which I do every time I am on this campus [laughs] but the UMass library is not earthquake proof. I mean bricks fall out all the time and this is why they have a big fence around it and why you can't sit near the library and maybe that is something that we could look at, I mean we do have earthquakes here; in fact, there was one last year which no one really felt.

Barbara: Yeah, I remember last year and that kind of lends itself to the person, you know in your group who talked about the book that you read, how I forget now, the students were doing something and the building was near....

John: Yeah, that's how one unit on earthquakes could lead to a unit on...

7 "Air time refers to the total number of lines of transcript spoken by each participant" (Bailey, 1993b, p. 285).
These lengthy sequences all involved Barbara and John. Tom's voice was not heard until several minutes later and it was the last time that he spoke during the group's entire meeting. Notice the length of Barbara's response to his question in line 220.

Excerpt 18

214: **John:** So we are talking about thematic units that could conceivably last forever so what we want to narrow this down to is to get more of a lesson within one of these units where we could do a dig.

215 **Barbara:** Right, and how we could integrate it with other things, like with art, music, with other things, math, um.

217 **Tom:** I wonder if they could do a plaster cast of a fossil?

218 **Barbara:** Yeah, we did that last year.

219 **Tom:** Oh you did that, how did it turn out?

220 **Barbara:** Great.

221 **Tom:** Oh.

Tom was familiar with the topic of geology. For example, in lines 168-169 of Excerpt 16 (p. 123), he stated, "how about under forming land mass, tectonic plates, earthquakes when two masses meet together, seismic waves." This clearly evidenced his knowledge about the group's topic. However, notice how he did not push his point. Rather, his communicative actions appeared to reflect his Chinese cultural beliefs to treat each member with a great deal of respect. In an interview with a Chinese informant, it was seen that maintaining the face of others is highly important in Chinese societal practices. Chen (1990/1991) in her study of face confirms these claims. Thus, while Tom had expertise in geology, he would not seek to call attention to those who did not for fear that this action would be seen as disrespectful, immodest, and would disrupt the harmony of the group (Chen, 1990/1991).

Cultural differences and "cultural displays of personhood" are important aspects to consider in the context of cooperative learning groups composed of NES and ESL members because they may represent contradictory beliefs (Carbaugh, 1994). For example, Bailey (1993b) studied a cooperative learning group of NES and ESL teachers and teachers-in-training in a graduate education course entitled Methods of Teaching ESL and found that "the group norm for participation in Japan is for
much less talk than in the United States" (p. 159). Further, he found that these behaviors can be misconstrued by non-cultural representatives: "...failure to speak in the culture of the United States marks a person as being "dumb"... (p. 156).

Thus, while the language of geology and the principles of the Curriculum Course were evident in the group's discourse, it was equally evident, if not striking, that Tom spoke minimally during the entire group meeting. Further, this communicative behavior may have reflected his cultural beliefs to remain quiet.

The group's third meeting was heavily marked with long exchanges between Barbara and John who brainstormed several ideas for the group's curriculum unit. This pattern now appeared to occur frequently in the group's talk. Erickson (1996) claims that interactions are often symbolic or political constructions of social identity in a culture and as such signify members from non-members. Further, the ability of speakers and listeners to "read" each other's meaning and intent are often expressed in the "rhythmic organization of conversation in action" (Erickson, 1996, p. 290-291). These ebbs and flows marked Barbara and John's mutual ability to participate in a conversation because of their shared sense of each other and their social context. In the string of talk presented seen in Excerpt 18 (p. 124), both Barbara and John frequently displayed their ability to "read" each other's meanings and, as such, their conversation appeared to follow a rhythmic flow (Erickson, 1996).

Like Gee (1990), Erickson poses that familiarity with the culture that talk is situated in is critical in how members listen to and speak with one another. Thus, familiarity with the culture can distinguish relationships among the members of this small group. In this case, John and Barbara appeared to have formed a relationship, a "situational co-membership," that was situated in this speech context and representative of their commonalties (Erickson, 1996). Their two-way exchange continued for several minutes and was punctuated with the now familiar "yeah, right,
and okay" back channeling which further marked their relationship in this situational context (Erickson, 1996).

Thus, the patterns of talk were maintained throughout this fourth meeting:

(a) Barbara structured the group's talk (in this scene, brainstorming) and moderated the group's session.

(b) The flow of talk was marked with frequent exchanges between John and Barbara concerning their beliefs about and experiences in American public schools.

(c) Tom's voice was hardly present in the small group format.

Platforms in the dialogue journals

Dialogue journals were a form of joint communication between the reflective facilitator and a group member. The purpose was to provide a forum for a discussion between each group member and the reflection facilitator. It was a partnership that was enacted through a written medium. What was written in the dialogue journals reflected the content, theory, and collaborative process involved in the Discourse of the Curriculum Course. Journal writers discussed a wide range of topics including personal platforms, experiences, and reflections on the course content and the experience of being in a cooperative learning group. Bailey (1993b) suggests that dialogue journals are an important "site of reflection on issues raised within the course for many students." This claim was supported by the professor who in the opening classes stated that dialogue journals had been of considerable value to some participants.

After our small group session, Tom and I walked to our cars together. It was at that time that he explained that he was surprised to be "put in the spotlight" during the whole class discussion about the book he had read. He stated that the professor
had asked him a question about "scaffolding" and he wasn't sure what the term meant. I mentioned that I would have felt the same in a European history class where the terms would be new to me. He commented that the whole class format was new and, as such, made him feel uncomfortable. He stated that it was hard for him to state an opinion or take a stand within the group format. He said that giving an opinion wasn't his "style".

His journal entry opened with the statement, "I was surprised that our group would be put in the spotlight this week. Maybe there would have been a discussion, but to be put up there! I would have skimmed the book again if I had known." What followed was a long descriptive discussion about Tom's teaching ideology, personal experiences, and a reflection on the course content and group design. Note his expertise in the area of geology and his beliefs about education throughout his dialogue journal talk.

About the geology unit: I was hoping that I still had my old geology textbook back when I was a geology major but I sold it. Oh well.

My main push in a geology unit would be tectonics and earthquakes. Nevertheless, I really don't think Barbara's class will focus on that. I believe it will be more on fossils because that is what supposedly interests them more.

Although it is more in the realm of pedagogy...but maybe I can ask why are fossils preserved? Then I would get into the nature of the earth's crust.

Let's return to the book, Constructing Knowledge Together. A lot of this class seems to be taken from that book. A problem with the class and the one illustrated in the book is this: What the ?! is going on? I suppose many of the education students are used to this as all of the Ed courses I have taken here are group oriented, like the SPED one I took last semester and Ed. law (taking now) are the same. I find that us "Histories" guys have to flounder for the first couple of weeks. In any event I am still unsure of the role that I have in the group and class as a whole.

That being said, I must say the book Constructing presents an ideal class situation. I only worry about those who would rather learn on their own. What if one person wishes to explore an area which the rest of the group doesn't.

The answer can't be as simple as let him go off on his own and form his own group. Since everyone wants to learn different things, eventually the teacher will end up with thirty students doing thirty different things.
He had clearly thought about the content of the group's work and had "expert" experience in the realm of geology. Further, he was engaged in the process of problemation, that is, seeking answers to the primary question of how to create a sixth grade geology curriculum unit, as evidenced in his journal (McCutcheon, 1996). Most significantly, we begin to see the marking of Tom, his platform, in the situated context of the dialogue journal.

Further, he posed himself as an outsider, a "Histories guy", who was in the unfamiliar situational context of an education course in the School of Education. Hence his question, "what the ?! is going on" and his statement that he was surprised to be in the "spotlight" reflected his lack of experience in relation to the design and content of this course. I would like to discuss one particular statement that he made in this entry: "In any event I am still unsure of the role that I have in the group and class as a whole."

Reflection facilitators were assigned the role of observing and reflecting on process. Cooperating teachers were assigned the role of providing the laboratory for the curriculum unit. NES and ESL teachers and teachers-in-training visited the cooperating teacher's classroom where they learned about students and their context. Both of these roles, while not prescriptive, had been loosely defined and were seen as critical to the group's process and product. In addition, each member, including reflection facilitators and cooperating teachers, were a "resource" in the small group because they had read "one assigned book dealing with an important principle or concept" (see Appendix C). Tom's role was "resource" in this group.

While the professor carefully designed the course to include each member as an active and important contributor, I believe that his role, resource, was not clear to him. Beyond reporting his book and including the principle concepts of the book into the discussion of the group's curriculum, Tom was not clear about what his role was in the group. This lack of clarity may have contributed to the formation of his
question, "what the ?! is going on?" While each member might have also been grappling with the uniqueness of this course design, his particular role, resource, lends credence to his question. The role of "resource" might not have been significant enough for Tom to feel that he was a legitimate and therefore important member of the group. He had a role that everyone had, to be a resource. He was not assigned a special role like the cooperating teacher and reflection facilitator. Perhaps the absence of a special role distinct from the others in the group led him to flounder for a role and to speak minimally in the small group format.

At this juncture, Tom's voice was only heard in the context of this dialogue journal partnership. While the dialogue journal may lend a voice for reflection, it was his voice and Lucila's that were needed in the Platform Phase of the group's deliberation in order for the group to truly be an active and interdependent community working together to achieve a goal.

As a result, I wrote Tom a response and asked many questions about what might happen if group members did not contribute:

I was glad we had the chance to talk after class and would welcome learning more about what your thoughts are about the process of groupwork and the course and dialogue journal writing processes. You voice a question, what the ?! is going on. You stated that you are not sure what your role is. I have wondered the same about mine. In this way, I guess groupwork is dynamic and that it means that we flounder at first? I am not sure. What happens when there are members who want to work together and others who would prefer to work alone? You mentioned that it is hard to take a stand. How can groups work together when there might be members who are not comfortable with the format? What are your thoughts?

Thus, our dialogue journal partnership became Tom's primary mode of communicating during the group's Platform Phase. Unfortunately, his voice continued to be absent in the group format throughout this phase.

Barbara's voice in the dialogue journals was very much like her voice in the small group format. She made many suggestions about how the group should be structured. Example included: "perhaps we need to delegate..." "I hope the group will begin to work on its task..." and, "maybe we should..." In addition, the entries
were filled with her enthusiasm about the readings and her interest in applying what she learned in her work.

Similarly, Lucila's voice was very much like her voice in the small group format. There was a "report" quality in her writing that was similar to the style she used in the small group to discuss her book. Her second journal entry was the first glimpse given about her educational ideology:

We must create a unit that maximizes the achievements of each student in the classroom making sure that the inequalities in the larger society are not reproduced in the classroom and specifically in this sixth grade classroom we will be working on.

Thus, the dialogue journals provided information about the group members during the Platform Phase: (a) Barbara continued to suggest a frame and direction which was consistent with her role in the small group format, (b) Tom's ideological beliefs about teaching were present in the dialogue journal yet remained absent in the small group format, and (c) Lucila used the dialogue journals to report her beliefs about the group's purpose. It is John to whom we now turn.

Platforms as borders

Walker (1971) argues that curriculum is developed by people who come with both a "political platform" akin to their beliefs about the way things are and a "vision" of what ought to be (p. 51-53). Further, he argues that these two platforms are what we "stand on" in the course of creating curriculum (p. 51-53). As stated, John indicated an interest in an ideology different from this course. His platform about traditional classrooms was evidenced during the first class meeting. It was during the small group's fourth meeting that he stood strongly on this platform.

Barbara and Lucila were absent from the group's fourth meeting. The whole class was devoted to a discussion of Cohen's book, *Designing Groupwork*. After the whole class discussion, Tom, John, and I walked together to the small conference
room only to discover that it was locked. Our meeting was held in the lounge in the School of Education and was frequently interrupted by those in pursuit of a snack or soda from the machines. The small group format had the feel of an interview. John opened the small group discussion stating that the School of Education had a "certain philosophy of what teaching is..." He would "strongly prefer" another format. The excerpt presented below is part of a long segment where he presented his political and visionary platforms.

**Excerpt 19**

64 John: In this class there are like two books to read and if this was a  
65 traditional class, I mean we would be expected to read a book a week and  
66 write about let's say write a paper about the book. And I am convinced that I  
67 would learn more if I had to do that. It would be harder, it would be grueling  
68 [laughs] but my hunch is that I would get more. I would get more. I would  
69 get more information. I would be working harder at assimilating at soaking  
70 up all of this information rather than really giving, well what we are getting is  
71 sort of a cursory sort of explanation. I mean there is not enough time. We get  
72 a sort of piece of paper on the board that can't. Well if I read the book myself,  
73 like say a history seminar and everyone read the book. I mean it's a grueling  
74 exercise. But I think that you really come out of the experience with in-depth  
75 knowledge.

In lines 68-69, John claimed that he "would get more information" if the course had been designed using a "traditional" teacher-led lecture format. John's beliefs were also evidenced by two male NES learners in an ethnographic study of a cooperative learning group composed of NES and ESL teachers and teachers-in-training in a graduate ESL teacher education course (Bailey, 1993b). Both claimed that they might have learned more "hard information" in a teacher-led lecture format and, as such, were frustrated with what they believed that they had missed.

These findings raise important issues for educators to consider in the use of this learning method. First, there may be students who enter a cooperative learning setting with a preference for a teacher-led lecture format. This preference may be difficult for students to set aside and may lead to resistance in the form of "outspoken critique and organized protest, all the way to subversion of the process" (Willett and Jeannot, 1993). Second, and at the very least, students who prefer a teacher-led
lecture format must manage the tensions between their preference for a "traditional" teacher-led lecture format and their desire to comply with others for the sake of the common and their individual good. Third, the findings from this and Bailey's (1993b) study suggest that students may perceive that learning with and from others involves the giving up of such important goods as "getting more information" for the sake of being a member of a cooperative learning group.

John's platform continued in the dialogue journal where he voiced resistance to and resentment about the dialogue journal process. Here he claimed that dialogue journals seem "rather hokey and decidedly non-academic." Perhaps this resistance further reflected his wish to be in a competitive teacher-led format:

I have often been required to keep these journals in my time here in the School of Ed. I have always resisted. What bothers me the most is that it is so often a requirement. It actually seems rather ridiculous to me to be exchanging journals at this point in my education. It seems rather hokey to me and decidedly non-academic. It seems to me that if I need to synthesize my thoughts in writing, that, aside from any assigned papers, I can make that decision on my own, and don't necessarily need to share that process with someone else. ...In almost every class here, the students have had to work predominantly on group projects. While I enjoy seminar formats, I'm not crazy about working in small groups. Actually, maybe I'm simply getting tired of it.

Erickson (1996), in referring to cultural differences, describes two characteristics that can exist, culture as a boundary or culture as a border. A cultural boundary is identified as a "cultural difference, ...the difference is recognized as an identifying marker that is not politicized; it has no relationship to difference in the distribution of power or advantage between two groups" (p. 294). Cultural boundary refers to difference in a non-judgmental manner. Cultural border, however, refers to "differences that are politicized" and where those who possess the culture trait are relegated to a position of disadvantage in power relative to those who do not possess the trait" (Erickson, 1996, p. 294). John referred to the School of Education as having a culture where groupwork was the norm. As such, he wrapped a border around the practice of groupwork. It was his ideology, his platform, that he would strongly
prefer to be in a culture of independent deliberation where a teacher-led-lecture format was the norm. This ideology was evidenced in the first small group meeting and became a common thread throughout his talk.

In contrast, Tom stated, "I am in the willing-to-give-it-a-chance category" when I asked what his views were about groupwork during this small group meeting.

Thus, the group's fourth meeting provided those in attendance with more information about John's platform. Tom, however, continued to present his ideological and personal beliefs exclusively in the dialogue journals. His platform voice was not heard in the small group format.

In Tom's journal entry the following week, he again wrote about being put in the "spotlight." "I know that Jerri was trying to get me to speak up about the theories which I read about in the Chang Wells book," he wrote. Further, he stated:

It's sometimes intimidating to give an opinion to people who have more experience in this field than I have. I haven't even started to teach in the high schools yet! To reply to your question, I do not think I made myself clear. It is not hard for me to take a stand. It is hard for me to jump in -- interject, so to speak. Like I always feel as though I'm interrupting. Cultural upbringing. Respect those older and more experienced. As I said before, I am the only who has no high school/elementary teaching experience.

Gee (1990) claims that making meaning involves our ability to understand relevance within a given cultural scene. Further, he poses that membership in a culture involves the acquisition of "ways of acting, interacting, being, thinking, valuing, believing, gesturing, dressing, using various 'props'...as well as ways of using language" in order to be able to be an active participant in the social context of the culture (p. 174). Tom posed himself as distinct from the culture of his NES peers in this group. He claimed that it was his cultural upbringing that posed a dilemma in the context of what was expected in this Curriculum Course.

A Chinese informant, interviewed for the purpose of this study, claimed that Tom's cultural upbringing was in contradiction with the tenets of the Curriculum Course. The informant claimed that "silence" is commonly used in deference to those...
with experience. Further, she distinguished between two types of talk. She claimed that NES often interrupt one another in conversation. She claimed that she had never experienced this phenomenon in her Chinese culture. She claimed that harmony was regarded as important as silence. "You don't want to embarrass yourself, and if you interrupt, you bring conflict to a group. It is embarrassing, you are making others unhappy." These claims were supported by two other key informants. Thus the very behaviors that Tom had expressed were seen to be reflective of his CNES identity.

In order to participate in the small group, he would need to act in contradiction with his "cultural upbringing." In this case, he had deferred to everyone in the group, despite the norms that our professor laid down during the first two classes as well as in the course syllabus. At this juncture, Tom's platform was that those without experience should not have a voice. This was his norm for acting during the Platform Phase. Thus, he had erected a cultural border around himself.

Teacher as informal collaborator

The focus of the sixth whole class meeting had been on making lessons comprehensible. It had been led in Spanish by one of the other group's reflective facilitators. The whole class discussed qualities about the lesson that made it possible for non-Spanish speakers to understand the content.

The group's fifth meeting was attended by all of the group's members. John opened the meeting. He claimed that he had thought about and been having trouble with writing the dialogue journals. He questioned what their purpose was, how they were read, and whether they were for the purpose of commenting about other group members. He further evidenced his platform in this area:

Excerpt 20

137 John: ...I mean if Debbie is reading it as a group facilitator and how does the reader read and why does the reader read, and are we supposed to be
commenting on the group and will the facilitator use this to guide the group and if this is the case it is a little scary because I don’t know that I want to comment on the group to someone in the group and that’s personal because there seems to be boundaries and I don’t know.

Barbara: Okay, did you find that when you worked with group did you find that some of your students needed it?

John: Yeah, but I was crossing lines and some of the students really needed but I felt really personal and not like I should get involved. I mean like a student who is pregnant and they write about it and it’s great that they can cry.

Barbara: Well, it depends on what you are going to write back to her [laughs].

Barbara then launched into a story about her sixth grade teacher and how much the teacher’s method of dialoging in journals had meant to Barbara. Her story then focused back to the small group:

**Excerpt 21**

Barbara: I think that they are critical, but I don’t yet understand what we are doing. Are we writing about us, our context, how we feel, should share too much, probably not, do we build a bridge, what do we do? And it is all of these feelings that you know are part of this.

Teachers, in cooperative learning contexts are not excluded from the scene of learning. Rather, they empower students in the process of their own learning and are active informal collaborators. It was at this point in the small group’s meeting that our professor walked in and asked about our work. The turn-taking sequences, for the length of time that the professor was there, were punctuated with Barbara and John’s voices. The presence of the professor did not alter the participation framework that had been established since the first meeting: (a) Barbara structured the group’s talk, focused the group’s discussion on a particular topic, and moderated the group’s session; (b) the flow of talk was marked with frequent exchanges between John and Barbara about their beliefs about and experiences in American public schools; and (c) Tom and Lucila spoke minimally in the small group format.

**Excerpt 22**

John: I don’t know what we are supposed to write in the journals. What should we be writing about?

Professor Willett: Certainly in terms of the structure of the class, in terms of defining it, it is open to ways as are, um, from my point of view it is to see that different people look at it differently...
Barbara: I have been thinking of the students in my class and the risks they take in writing me.

Professor Willett: Yes and it is different when you are in this yourself...

John: I guess the other issue that we need to look at is what are we going to do with the class.

Barbara: Something that I was thinking about today was to see if we get a time going here when we can meet at the school to, "a", have you come into my classroom, I would like to come and see my classroom. I would really like you to do that and we have a great resource and a very resourceful librarian and science person and I am hoping that we can get a time going and get cranking along and I would like to well, I can't meet on Wednesday. Well, tell me what days you could meet. Well, Lucila?

The communicative patterns are maintained

The focus of the seventh whole class meeting had been on reflecting on group process. The whole class discussion was led by the fifth small group and centered on a reflection of the tensions that can occur in groupwork. Included in the whole class meeting was a discussion about the distinctions between task versus process. Group Five led a discussion about their experience in trying to focus on their group's task while at the same time trying to make time to discuss process.

John, Lucila, Barbara, and Tom had met during the week in Barbara's classroom and they came to the sixth small group meeting with several ideas about their project.

Barbara began the sixth small group's meeting, "Okay let's go from the abstract to the concrete, momentum." She used the word "okay" throughout the meeting to signal her role as moderator over the proceedings, i.e., she did not use it to indicate agreement. She used the word more as teacher-talk where the teacher controls the flow of talk or activities.
Each member contributed an idea that they had about the draft of their geology curriculum. Each of the ideas were followed with John and Barbara's back channel remarks. The excerpt below exemplifies the common verbal signals that were frequently exchanged between these two members. These signals did not occur in the conversations between any other members.

**Excerpt 25**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Message</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>It is starting to come together and you have some concrete things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Yeah. You know the fact that we know that we are doing two lesson plans and we are doing one for [unclear].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Yeah, it's starting to come together.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Collaborative planning in the co-construction of task**

Lucila wanted to connect her reading of Au's book on multiculturalism into the curriculum unit. She told the group that she read a book about the great walls of the world and wanted to incorporate these into the unit. As stated previously, Lucila often asked questions about the group's task and Barbara's classroom. At this meeting, she stated that she had found a book that she wanted to use in the unit but was not quite sure how to accomplish this task. She sought a collaborative dialogue in making these important connections. Note lines 86 and 100 in Excerpt 26 (p. 138), here Lucila asked the group to engage in a discussion relating the book that she had read with their task.

**Excerpt 26**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Message</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Lucila</td>
<td>I'm planning to make for the next lesson plan I would like to do something multicultural because that is the book that I read about, you know introduce something multicultural. Well, I have some ideas but I don't know how can I use that. One is to use the book called Talking Walls. It's about different walls that mean different things to different people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Debbie</td>
<td>How would it be multicultural?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Lucila</td>
<td>Like the pyramids of Mexico and Egypt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>It would be good to have readings that would be appropriate for</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
92 the classroom.
93 **Lucila:** Or another thing would be history, the different cultures like the
94 stone age and the use of rocks through through, well up to now
95 **John:** Right like we talked about a time line and you could-
96 **Lucila:** Yeah.
97 **John:** Well maybe there is some way to talk about the walls and
98 integrate the time line that were made on the time line and the pyramids
99 and something like that.
100 **Lucila:** Do you think that it is something that is beyond sixth
101 graders? The book looks so good.
102 **Barbara:** I think that it would be great.

What made this discussion unique was that all of the other members had
presented their ideas in the form of declarations of the activities they had planned on
including as part of the group's geology unit. Here we see evidence that Lucila
sought the group's collaboration in accomplishing this task. Willett (1995b)
distinguishes between cooperative and collaborative planning.

In cooperative planning individuals each develop some aspect of the unit and
then put them together in some way. If there is enough time, then the group
can figure out how to coordinate the pieces so that the seams are smooth.
Nevertheless, in this fashion there are bound to be pieces that do not fit as well
as they might. In collaborative planning, individuals work together
throughout the planning so that joint decisions are made all along. The result
is a seamless product... (Willett, 1995b, pp. 2-3).

In this small group, Lucila was the sole member who asked the group to
engage in a collaborative dialogue in order to connect the course's principles with its
task. She was the sole member who engaged the group in collaborative planning. As
seen in the excerpt above, she sought the group's collaboration by naming the
difficulty that she had in make these important connections. Thus, the presence of her
questions in the small group format had three distinct characteristics: she sought
information about (a) the group's task, (b) the group's laboratory, and (c) the
principles of multiculturalism in connection with the group's task. The presence of
her request for a collaborative dialogue was quite distinct from the communication of
the other group members who had not, thus far, engaged in collaborative planning.

I would like to expand upon Willett's beliefs about cooperative and
collaborative planning in this analysis of Lucila's participation in this small group.
Willett poses that collaborative planning is an important "strategy" in group deliberation because it provides each member with the opportunity to consider the over-arching goals of the curriculum, the objectives, the learners and their needs, and the activities that will be used (Willett, 1995b, p. 4). Each of these important collaborations become part of the group's co-construction of their task. In the case of this small group, Lucila engaged the group in this important activity. Her questions provided the group with the opportunity to discuss the principles of multiculturalism, their curricular goals and objectives, as well as the learners' needs in the situated context of their sixth grade geology unit. Thus, as suggested by Willett (1995b), Lucila's questions served an important function in the group's deliberation of their common goal.

Tom planned a "layer of the earth" unit with clay. John planned a "dig." Each spoke about the individual activities that they had developed. They did not engage the group in a collaborative discussion, rather they declared their plans. Distinct from Lucila, they did not seek their peers' assistance in forming activities that would relate to the books that they had read. While on one level they accomplished a specific task (they developed activities that were related to their readings), they did not engage the group in a collaborative discussion about their work. Thus, the group missed important collaborative opportunities.

John's journal entry provided information about his preference to finish the task rather than "sit and blab" about the theoretical issues. His journal entry further promoted his platform against groupwork. The term, "sit and blab," further laid claim that his beliefs about collaboration were in contradiction with the tenets of groupwork and, more significantly, Lucila's actions.

Our last class meeting seemed to go well. It seems like some of the members of the group are really task oriented. At this point, I suppose I am too. As we approach the mid-point of the semester, it's time to think about working this project through. As much as I'd like to sit and blab about the theoretical issues, I'm hoping to finish the lion's share of this project as early in the semester as possible.
Similarly, Barbara wrote in her journal entry that it was her desire to move from the "abstract to the concrete" as quickly as possible. Interestingly, the words that she used in the journal entry were the same words that she used to structure the small group's meeting: "Let's go from the abstract to the concrete," she had directed. Here she used the term "abstract to concrete" to signal her desire to complete the group's task. On both occasions, the words "abstract to concrete" appeared to signal her desire to be in a task producing mode as opposed to collaborative a dialogue about "ideas."

...I enjoy working with the group I'm in. Yes there are a lot of ideas and with that a lot of dialogue, but overall, once we moved from the abstract to the concrete (with our unit) things seem pretty much in place. I am eager to see the group share what they've been collaborating on in our next class. As a learner, I've always needed and appreciated seeing a concrete model.

The desire to forge ahead as quickly as possible may have prohibited members from engaging in the important task of collaborative planning. More importantly, the differences in planning styles distinguished members into two categories: resource interdependent and resource independent.

Lucila solicited a collaborative dialogue in to order to connect the principles of multiculturalism with the group's task. The presence of these requests for dialogue was quite distinct from the other group members who did not engage in collaborative planning. Lucila requested the group to engage in a collaborative dialogue about multiculturalism, thus she was "resource interdependent." Her peers chose to complete these tasks independently and as such were "resource independent."

While Willett (1995b) suggests that collaborative planning is an important feature in groupwork, I suggest that participants may value cooperative planning differently collaborative planning. In the case of this group, John voiced the message that a collaborative discussion about the theoretical concepts was equivalent to the act of wasting valuable time.
His statement has important implications in groupwork because it points to the possibility that students may frame their beliefs around their perceptions and misconceptions of particular acts. Further, these acts might "politicize" individual participants into positions of power or powerlessness depending on how these acts are framed (Erickson, 1996, p. 294.). Thus, those who engage in the act of collaborative planning might be regarded as an asset or a problem depending on how their peers frame attitudes about the culture of collaborative planning in groupwork. Those who believe in collaborative planning are more likely to grant such power laden "goods" as valuable to those who engage in this act, while those who do not believe in collaborative learning are less likely to grant these important goods.

The dilemma of task versus process

Field Notes: 9/23/95  Tom connects the scholarly readings and his experiences in the dialogue journal. "I special ordered the Fu book and Wow! The first chapter where she describes her English classes sounds very familiar!" I have urged him to present his ideas to the small group. I hope to ask about this at the group's next meeting in terms of who has voice in our group. I talked about this with Professor Willett who suggested that I bring a copy of an episode from the group's transcript so that we can use this as part of the process talk.

The eighth whole class meeting included two draft presentations. The first group presented their draft of a fifth grade astronomy unit. This was followed by a second presentation of a curriculum unit for second language learners in the area of health education.

Barbara, John, Lucila, and I walked to our meeting area. Barbara and John commented that they were pleased to see two drafts. It gave them both an idea of how to proceed with the group's draft presentation. Barbara stated that she had noticed that the cooperating teacher led the presentations and thought that might be a good idea our group. We walked into our meeting with the familiar "yeah" from John in response to Barbara's suggestion.
At the group's seventh meeting Tom was absent. I opened the meeting and requested that the group engage in a discussion about process as opposed to task.

Excerpt 27

Debbie: Well, I have come up with some questions for us to talk about in terms of reflective questions about our group and that is what I hope that we can start our conversation with.

John: Well, we have forty minutes to plan our presentation and it sounds like a predicament to me.

Debbie: Hmm.

John: This doesn't seem like nearly enough time to do get ready to do what we have to do especially cause Tom is not here.

Barbara: It seems like a predicament to me and I have a conference this weekend. And I hate to throw a monkey wrench into the whole works, but we might not be able to take my class on the field trip on Thursday.

John: You're kidding.

Barbara: I talked with my principal and he says there is the place, the place...

Out of deference to the group's sense of urgency with regard to task, I asked if they would take some time to reflect at the group's next meeting. Task and process are typically the two driving forces in this small group format (Bailey, 1993b). Here their primary task was to create a product, whereas mine was to initiate and guide a reflective process. I liken our task and process work to an assembly line where their job was to keep the conveyer belt moving. At this juncture, they had to present a draft of their unit to the whole class at the next meeting. They were not eager to stop the conveyer belt and I did not want to push them to be reflective under the pressure of the imminent presentation. Thus, I decided to wait until the eighth meeting. Interestingly, it was at this juncture that a critical moment occurred in the group's process.

The primary focus of the group was to prepare a draft of their curriculum for a presentation at the next whole class meeting. Lucila suggested that the group have an extra meeting outside of the small group format. During the next series of exchanges a discussion ensued about coming up with a date and time for the meeting. Barbara and John looked at each other exclusively during this decision making event. Note John's response to Lucila in lines 107 through 111.
Excerpt 28

100 Lucila: We should still get together.
101 Barbara: Yeah.
102 John: Yeah we should.
103 Barbara: Yeah, right.
104 Lucila: I am a member of [names an institution] and even though, uh,
105 though I have a reception on Wednesday, I don't mind I won't go at 3:30, um,
106 the, it will go until well 3:30 to 5:00.
107 John: The way I see it is that we are all busy, we all have tight schedules
108 like Tom with his afternoons and we have some working people who don't
109 have the morning or the days so, so it seems like there is always going to be
110 something missing and it seems like we are just going to have to go with it
111 and it's uh, it's just the way it is going to have to be.
112 Lucila: So he will be better after 5:00? [referring to Tom].
113 Debbie: You would be better after 5:00?
114 Lucila: Yeah, this reception, [name], it starts at 3:30 and goes until 5:00. Oh, it's
115 okay, I guess I cannot go.
116 John: Yeah.
117 Lucila: I guess I just not go?
118 John: Yeah.
119 Lucila: The first time I could really come is at 5:30.
120 Barbara: The best time for me would be in the late afternoon. Well school
121 ends for me on Wednesday at 1:00 that is when the kids get out and I don't
122 know 5:30, well I could do it, but I would hope that we could meet a little
123 earlier.
124 Lucila: Oh.
125 John: Well, I am free on Wednesday so.

[a few moments later]

149 Barbara: Well, we can come up with consensus now, like 4:00.
150 John: 4:00.
151 Lucila: Oh boy, that would mean that I couldn't go to the reception.
152 Debbie: Are you being honored?

As evidenced in the exchange above, Lucila made a suggestion, that the group
meet outside of class. The NES participants, John and Barbara agreed to her
suggestion. Lucila then voiced a time that she would prefer that the group not meet.
In line 104 and 105, she stated, "I am a member of [names an institution] and even
though, though I have a reception on Wednesday, I don't mind I won't go at 3:30, um
the, it will go from 3:30 to 5:00." This was followed by a rather lengthy statement
from John which stated that there would always be someone missing. He did not
engage Lucila in the process of negotiating an alternative time. Nor did Barbara.
Hence, it was during this seventh meeting, that we see evidence that the members who were engaged in a situational co-membership appeared to have distanced Lucila.

**Conclusion of the Platform Phase**

The small group deliberation which I have described and analyzed in this section provides a lens with which to view the communicative patterns that were evidenced during this Platform Phase. The Curriculum Course was organized around the tenets, practices, and techniques of cooperative learning. This structure provided each member with the experience of being cooperative learners in a heterogeneous group of NES and ESL learners while simultaneously learning about the tenets and practices of this theory. A major focus of their work was on the creation of curriculum in the small group format. Walker (1971) defines three phases in the development of curriculum. In the first phase, the Platform Phase, teachers and teachers-in-training bring their individual and often tacit experiences, observations, reflections, and generalizations about teaching into the context of group deliberation (Walker, 1971). Further, these are an important aspect in the process of collectively constructing their task (McCutcheon, 1995; Walker 1971).

The following patterns were seen during this Platform Phase:

1. Two participants, the NES learners, voiced their individual platforms during this phase. We learned the ideological and personal beliefs of the NES learners during the opening segments of the group's encounters. For example, John did not believe in the dominant ideology of the Curriculum Course and preferred to learn in a teacher-led setting.

2. Lucila, the ESL learner, did not voice a platform during this phase. Instead, she appeared to request a collaborative dialogue in order seek (a) information about the group's task, (b) information about Barbara's
classroom, and (c) assistance in connecting the principles of the book she read with the group's task.

3. Tom, a CNES participant, voiced his platform in the context of the dialogue journals exclusively. Further, it was his cultural belief that because he had no teaching experience he had no right to voice an opinion. In order to participate, therefore, he would need to act in direct contradiction to his cultural beliefs. Thus, in this small group only two of its members, the NES learners presented what Walker (1971) claims is important information in the process of designing and creating curriculum, their platforms.

4. The role of professor as the sole authority of the Curriculum Course was purposely reduced in an effort to create the frame for working together to reach a common goal. Further, there was no role of authority assigned in any small group as part of the course design. Thus, the group's five members had been given the charge of working together to perform a task. Each small group needed to develop their own ways of acting within this structure. In this small group, it appeared that three of the functions that would have been performed by a teacher in a teacher-led course were assumed by Barbara, a NES learner and the cooperating teacher of this group. The role of moderator has been used to describe the role she assumed to (a) create a structure for talk, (b) moderate talk, and (c) set the agenda for the group's talk.

5. The group's meetings were heavily marked with long exchanges between the NES learners in the group. Erickson (1996) claims that interactions are often symbolic or political constructions of social identity which signify members from non-members. Further the ability of speakers to "read" each other are often expressed in the rhythmic ebbs and flows of
their conversation (Erickson, 1996). Familiarity with the culture and context can create a situational co-membership. In this case Barbara and John, the NES learners in this group, formed a situational co-membership in this small group that appeared to have distanced Lucila.
CHAPTER 6
PHASE II: NAMING CONFLICT

Introduction

This chapter will present a microanalysis of the group's eighth meeting. It will also present the findings and discussion from the interviews that were conducted with each participant during the week following the eighth meeting.

Introduction to the Naming Conflict Phase

Four features have been used to describe the dynamic characteristics of cooperative learning communities (a) each group works with several issues at the same time; (b) "each member appraises the others and learns whose ideas are valuable, powerful, consonant with their own, or in opposition to them"; (c) each participant has their own experiences interests and desires; and (d) these differences are "likely to cause conflict [which] can lead to pressure for innovations, creativity, and change thus deterring the complacency arising from too much stability" (McCutcheon, 1995, pp. 153-154).

McCutcheon (1995) argues that conflict, tension, and individual-risk-taking are normative behaviors that occur throughout the process of group deliberation. Further, she claims that "cognitive oversimplification, narrowing perspective, disregard of alternatives, disorganization, impatience, and forgetfulness" can all be outcomes of stress caused by these normative behaviors (McCutcheon, 1995, pp. 17-18). Nonetheless, when conflict is named and analyzed it can have a "positive role in deliberation by virtually forcing deliberators to examine alternatives meticulously" (McCutcheon, 1995, p. 150).
Reflection facilitators are central in the construction of the group's reflection on their process. Reflection facilitators look at how a group's talk influences their task, their relationships with one another, and their relationship with the content. They engage in the process of observation, or "spying to reflect," in order to lead the group in a type of dialogic analysis and examination of the group's talk. In this case I was interested in a specific type of observation and examination, that of conflict. Reflection facilitators can have an important role in the group's process by specifically (a) observing for the presence of conflict and (b) directing the group to engage in an examination and analysis of the conflict that has been observed. Reflection facilitators thus perform the communicative act of compliance gaining that focuses on a communicative end, a group analysis of conflict (Fitch, 1994).

Compliance gaining attempts to compel the actions of others. It is a type of directive speech act that is seen in a range of forms such as a "request" or "command" and its sole purpose is to direct the group in a communicative process (Fitch, 1994, p. 185). An assumption cannot be made here, however, that the act of asking a group to examine its conflict will result in the group's compliance. There is always the possibility that participants may resist these compliance gaining directives (Fitch, 1994).

The willingness to set individual desires aside for the common good

McCutcheon claims that the examination of conflict involves the willingness of individuals to (a) shed their individual desires and (b) take a risk and reveal their beliefs to others. Reflection facilitators are peers in this process. They are not the authority nor the teacher-in-charge. They are students who have been assigned a role. Yet, they are distinct outsiders whose job it is to look inside the group in order to
make meaning of their process and to "act as a limited leader" in the process of reflection (Jeannot, 1994). This is not an easy role to assume.

McCutcheon claims that group members must shed their independent desires in order to promote the success of the group's common goals. Reflective facilitators must be willing to shed their desire to avoid conflict in order assist in the important group examination process of conflict. A delicate balance that must be maintained in the assumption of this role. It is the pull and tug between wanting to help in the reflective process without being too authoritative (if not domineering) in forcing a group to look at process through this naming conflict lens and silencing or polarizing them in the process (Willett and Jeannot, 1993; Jeannot, 1994). Moreover, I believe reflection from this critical stance involves incorporating insight into the process of cooperative groupwork in the name of this role: reflection facilitator as conflict namer. Gee (1990) claims that in order to acquire the Discourse of a community, one must serve an apprenticeship in the community. Thus, it was with seven weeks of listening and observing that I stepped up to the plate wearing the "uniform" of reflection facilitator as conflict namer.

The dilemma of groupwork involves the willingness to shed our individual desires and ideas in order to promote the success of the group (McCutcheon, 1995). The dilemma in the context of the Curriculum Course was also time. While the group forged ahead to create a final product before by the end of the semester, they needed to take time to engage in reflection. Hence, groupwork in this course was a constant battle against the clock and between the reflection and production elements.

In the context of this small group, the willingness to shed one's individuality for the sake of the group applied to all its members. Tom needed to shed his cultural beliefs for this situational moment in order to become an active participant in the group's process. Similarly, Lucila needed to present her platform in the group's deliberative process and be heard by all of the participants. Both Lucila and Tom
needed to become more active in the process of group work in the context of the small group meetings. While each had engaged in a number of independent activities (e.g., the readings and the dialogue journals) they needed to be heard in the text of the group meetings. At the same time, Barbara and John, the NES members of the group, needed to be willing to focus their attention on bringing Tom and Lucila into the deliberative process and to open up the circle of their co-membership to include their ESL and CNES peers. Finally, I, as reflection facilitator, needed to shed my individual desire to avoid conflict (Willett and Jeannot, 1993). Hence, the paradoxical nature of groupwork is evidenced here: participants must shed their independence while simultaneously be willing to take a risk and reveal their individual desires and ideas in order to promote the success of the group's common goal (McCutcheon, 1995).

In this sense, I, as reflection facilitator, would ask each individual participant to engage in the process of change. This would involve asking the group to examine their communicative patterns in the hope that this intervention would result in change. Bailey (1993b) and Jeannot (1994) describe facilitators as change agents. Reflection facilitators involve the group in an examination of their communicative process in order to make meaning of these patterns and understand some of the key elements that promote and hinder the group's work. Further, these examinations are referred to as "interventions" toward the achievement of change (Bailey, 1993; Jeannot, 1994). I as reflective facilitator would be performing an intervention: seeking the group's compliance in my wish to analyze and examine conflict in order to engage the group in the implementation of change. It is here that we now turn.
Voice in the collaborative process of groupwork

In this speech community, two participants, the NES learners, voiced their individual platforms during the group's first seven meetings, whereas, the CNES and ESL learners did not. The group's meetings were heavily marked with long exchanges between the NES learners in the group who were engaged in a situational co-membership that distanced the ESL speaker. One member, the CNES learner, rarely spoke in the group's meeting. In addition, (a) she framed the group's talk, (b) she moderated each group session, and (c) she set the agenda for the group's talk. The small group complied with the cooperating teacher's direction and accepted her leadership. Each of these communicative patterns had an important relationship with the questions of who was given and who wanted voice in this speech community.

Voice is co-constructed by the speaker and audience and is a framework that can be used to describe being heard in the social process of groupwork (Bailey, 1993b). In this case, two members had voice and two did not. Bailey (1993b) provides an important framework for understanding voice in the context of groupwork. I have drawn upon three elements of his work in order to frame a microanalysis of this group's eighth meeting: (a) turn allocation, (b) warrants for speaking, and (c) hearing.

Turn allocation

Turn-taking plays an important role in groupwork, particularly in groups comprised of diverse members. Gumperz (1982) claims that turn-taking involves a host of "indirect inferences which build on background assumptions about context, interactive goals, and interpersonal relations to derive frames in terms of which they can interpret what is going on" (p. 2). Turn-taking involves a host of implied understandings about situational context and social identity. Thus, how we talk, what
we say, and who listens to our talk is a reflection of our familiarity with the culture that the talk is located in as well as the power that we are given in this local community.

Bailey (1993b) claims that the study of turn-taking in groups composed of diverse members is important because it can reveal some important cultural distinctions which can enhance understanding of its local meanings. He describes two "techniques" that are used in the allocation of turn-taking: "a current speaker may select a next speaker and a person may self-select a turn" (p. 266). Turn allocation involves familiarity with the communicative practices of the culture that it is situated in and thus can put members from cultures other than the situated one at a distinct disadvantage.

Bailey (1993b) also points to two important distinctions that are seen in the allocation of a turn to gain the floor. Members can self-select and members can solicit others. He points to the first as the most common method that speakers use to gain the floor. He points to the second as an important technique that members can use to solicit those who might not otherwise contribute.

**Warrants for speaking**

Bailey (1993) uses this term to describe the power that each person is afforded or affords themselves in the context of groupwork. The study of warrants is important because they provide a lens "into the local criteria for having something worthy of saying, being persuasive, or justifying a speech action" (p. 262). Each group has its own specific "warrant for voice" that is rooted in the local context's communicative rules for acting. These warrants are an important aspect in the examination of voice because they provide important information about "how the social context shapes the voice of individuals" that we seek to understand (p. 262).
In this particular speech community, it appeared that two members had warrants for speaking, Barbara and John, the NES speakers. In the eighth meeting the group would be asked to analyze the meanings of these warrants. The study of warrants provides insight in terms of why particular members possessed, were not able to possess, or chose not to possess this power.

Hearing

Bailey (1993) also describes a third lens with which to analyze speech, the "social signaling of hearing" (p. 268). He poses that voice is co-constructed in groups. He claims that certain members are "heard" in the process of co-construction while others are not listened to. He emphasizes the importance of listening in the co-construction of voice. It is not so much who speaks but who listens to what has been spoken. Further, Bailey (1993) claims that the process of analyzing hearing in communicative discourse can provide a means with which to understand the "local norms for judging speech to be comprehensible and valued in a particular setting" (p. 268).

Turn allocation, warrants for speaking, and hearing involve the possession of three characteristics: (a) the ability, (b) the willingness, and (c) the power to participate in a socially constructed scene. These three elements are critical in the co-construction of cooperative learning groups. Each is related to the speaker's familiarity with the social context and content of the speech situation as well as the value that the hearer affords the speaker. As such, the microanalysis of these key elements provided the opportunity to understand their meanings.

The ability to negotiate the allocation of a turn and to be heard involves our ability to "exclude, include, and guess" relevance within a given context or social situation (Gee, 1990). It also involves our understanding of the everyday social activities that are part of the participation framework of this type of learning. Those
who have not experienced groupwork or who are not familiar with the content or context of the group's work might be at a distinct disadvantage. Peers who are familiar with the culture of this social situation can be important resources in helping newcomers to become legitimate members. Thus, the ability to take a turn and to have a voice can be highly dependent on previous experience or on the willingness of peers to help newcomers gain entry.

Willingness is linked with the desire to shed individual beliefs aside for the sake of the common good. One must set aside their desire for independence while simultaneously be willing to take a risk and reveal their individual desires and ideas in order to promote the success of the group's goals and task (McCutcheon, 1995).

The power to participate is linked with the value that each member is awarded in terms of value, legitimacy, and worthiness (Bailey, 1993b; Erickson, 1996).

Framework for microanalysis

The purpose of this microanalysis was to provide an important facet in the understanding of this small group. The following questions were used to guide this microanalysis and were drawn from Bailey's (1993) work in the area of voice.

- What types of turn allocations were used in gaining the floor?
- What types of warrants were used in members' speech?
- What were the functions of the hearings in the group?

The group's eighth meeting was unusual. I asked that the group conduct its meeting through my lens of process. Thus, I entered into the eighth meeting with a wish that the group would grant, the wish to examine several key questions (see Appendix D for a full listing of the questions that were asked). These questions included (a) what role do differences among our group members make in terms of how we reflect on and how we learn about heterogeneity, (b) what and who
influences what we talk about, and (c) how do these influences promote or hinder our group's process?

A microanalysis of this unusual meeting provided important insights about the factors that affected the participation of each group member. The norms for talk have been described in Chapter 4. Primarily, the group norms for talk revealed distinctions seen between the NES learners and the CNES and ESL learners in the group. Two members appeared to have voice in the group's process and product and two did not.

**Analysis of Data**

This section contains a description of how the eighth meeting was analyzed. Hymes (1972) provides a schematic vocabulary for conducting an ethnographic analysis. His SPEAKING mnemonic has been used to describe how talk was explicated in this sociocultural system. The analysis of talk in this speech community also drew upon Bailey's (1993) voice framework and focused on three key elements: turn allocation, warrants for speaking, and hearing. Turn allocation was analyzed singularly while warrants for speaking and hearing were analyzed under the broad category of "social signaling of hearing" (Bailey, 1993).

In order to develop a deeper understanding about local turn allocation, I coded each turn of talk by person based on two characteristics: (a) was the speaker selected or (b) did the speaker self-select to speak. These data provide rich information not only about who spoke but about how people gained the floor during this meeting. This provided additional information about the patterns of turn allocation.

Bailey (1993) claims that hearing in discourse can be "tracked" in order to follow its "intertextual link between a current speaker and another text." In this study intertextuality refers to each member's link with fellow members. Bailey (1993b) suggests that these categories provide a lens with which to understand the element of hearing and warrants for speaking in groupwork. These categories have been used to
describe the oral discourse of this group during this eighth meeting. Selected episodes where conflict was named have been isolated and are described using the categories of Bailey's typography of hearing (1993b):

1. **Personal reference.** A person refers to another's prior turn of talk by using a reference to the speaker's name (e.g., Andrea's idea) or by the use of a personal pronoun (e.g., your suggestion). This type of discursive move materially links the current speakers turn of talk with a prior turn of talk and constitutes a form of hearing.
2. **Ideational reference.** An idea introduced into the discussion by one person can be discussed by a subsequent speaker. A speaker signals that an idea had been heard either by using the identical lexical items (e.g., a word or phrase) or a paraphrase of the original speaker's words.
3. **Discourse cohesion.** In this category, I am grouping the diverse set of linguistic devices used in conversation to signal that one person has maintained a common topic across turn of talk.
4. **Evaluation.** Evaluation links a previous turn of talk with an explicit judgment by a current speaker as to its acceptability. Evaluation can be positive or negative.
5. **Response to speech act.** One of the key components of any analysis of hearing is the relationship between the discourse function of the speaker's comment and the response (or not) of other members. If a person makes a request, evidence of hearing must include an analysis of how the hearer responds to that request. Hence, speech act analysis is an important part of this framework.
6. **Meaning negotiation.** Meaning negotiation constitutes a type of hearing as a group member take remedial steps to negotiate a common understanding of a person's turn of talk. Crucially, any discourse move that attempts to clarify or elaborate another's speech would constitute a type of hearing.
7. **Collaborative completion.** The completion of a sentence or phrase begun by one speaker and completed by a current speaker is a type of collaborative completion. The completion is often positively evaluated or echoed by the original speaker.
8. **Back channel.** In many conversations members provide verbal signals that they are attending to each other's speech. These are often in the form of "uh huh," "yeah" or "right." (Bailey, 1993b, pp. 272-273).

**Introduction to the small group's eighth meeting**

At the group's eighth meeting conflict was named. This meeting was a critical moment in the group's work. I met with the professor in order to plan for the meeting. We developed seven questions for discussion (see Appendix D). These were copied for each member. The transcript segment from the seventh meeting where Lucila,
Barbara, and John engaged in the conversation about an extra meeting time before their draft presentation (see Appendix F) was copied for each group member. The small group's meeting occurred after their draft presentation to the whole class and was subsequently followed by a second small group's draft presentation.

The whole class meeting was devoted to a ten-minute feedback discussion led by our professor about the draft presentation from the previous week and our group's presentation of their draft. The whole class meeting was followed by our small group meeting.

I arrived early to help the group prepare for their presentation. Three were engaged in getting ready, Lucila, Barbara, and John. Barbara had brought boxes of books, a scale for weighing rocks, and boxes of colored clay. These were placed on a cart for display. She had also involved her sixth grade students in a variety of poster-board activities on geology and had brought a number of samples of her student's work in this area. One poster listed questions that her sixth grade students had written about the subject of geology (e.g., what is geology, what are rocks, and how are rocks formed). Barbara also brought a poster of a graffiti experience that the students had done. This poster included hand written responses to how her sixth grade students would like their school and community improved. Barbara also brought a large pad of paper and colored markers. When I arrived, John was taping the student's posters on the walls of our windowless classroom. He and Barbara were engaged in conversation about the comments that Barbara's students had written on the posters. As they talked, Barbara taped blank sheets on the wall in preparation for a whole class activity. The small group's plan was to have the whole class engage in the same activities as Barbara's sixth grade students and then to discuss their draft after the activity segment.

---

8 The group met over the week-end to plan. I had not been invited.
Lucila had brought a number of books that she had borrowed from the library which related to the Au book on multiculturalism. She was engaged in standing them on a table at the front of the classroom. I helped Lucila. Tom was involved in another class on the other side of campus. None of the group members knew what time he would arrive. The small group's presentation began without Tom. Lucila stood on one side of the front of the room while Barbara and John stood on the other. I sat with the whole class.

Prior to the group's presentation, our professor provided feedback about the draft that had been presented during the previous class. She provided a short discussion about her response and a longer explanation about her use of written feedback. She then handed each student a six-page document which provided her response to the previous week's draft. She explained that the written feedback was for every student in the Curriculum Course and a method of communicating her beliefs about group learning. The whole class discussion and written feedback reinforced and re-emphasized her beliefs about learning. She again claimed that students could learn with and from one another. She claimed this during the oral discussion and in the written feedback. She also discussed the importance of interdependence in the whole class format and in the written feedback. She claimed that the quality of interdependence had the potential of two outcomes: a better curriculum unit and tension between group members. She claimed that while many students might expect the facilitator to "take care" of these tensions, each member should ask, "how can the facilitator help me to bring up these issues in the group?" (Willett, 1995b). Further, she claimed that the examinations of tensions could result in a better group product (Willett, 1995b). Thus, the professor's beliefs about learners and the importance of examining conflict was evidenced during the whole class format as well as in her written feedback. This ten-minute discussion was followed by our group's draft presentation to the whole class.
Small group's draft presentation

Barbara walked to the front of the classroom and introduced the presentation. She explained that the group was creating an "integrated unit" on geology. Next, she separated the whole class into five groups and, with John's help, passed out the colored markers. She then asked each group to complete three tasks: (a) write something they knew about geology on one of the blank sheets of paper taped to the wall, (b) write a "graffiti message" on a second sheet, and (c) write what they would like to know about the subject of geology on a third sheet. John helped Barbara explain the three task activities.

It was at this point that Tom arrived and stood next to Lucila. Barbara walked over and told him what the whole class was involved in. At the end of fifteen minutes, Barbara gathered the whole class together. She described and pointed to the posters that her students had created as a result of being given the same three tasks. She then called on John to present his portion of the draft presentation.

John provided the class with a brief description of a sixth grade writing activity that would include some of the content gleaned from the poster activities that the whole class had just been engaged in. While talking, he passed around a carton filled with rocks and asked each student to select a rock for their own. He explained that language arts instruction would involve the "writing about geology and writing about these rocks." He then engaged the whole class in an activity. "Name a metaphor with a rock included," he asked. The whole class volunteered metaphors (e.g. "like a rolling stone" and "like a rock") and John wrote them on a blank piece of paper that he had attached to the wall. He added that the geology unit would be integrated into art and music and asked the whole class if they could think of songs that included something about geology. Again the whole class volunteered song
titles. He said that he had read the brain based learning book and that these activities were based on the principles from the book. He finished his portion and walked over to Barbara who then went back to the front of the class and introduced Lucila.

Lucila explained that she wanted to connect multicultural education with this topic so that "students of different backgrounds" would learn how to link geology with culture. She explained that she had found a book, Talking Walls and wanted to use this as a link among the subjects of geology, literature, and culture. She suggested that students could be placed into cooperative learning groups where each would read common books and would become the class "experts" on a particular wall. She completed her portion and returned to stand near Tom. Barbara then returned to face the whole class and introduced Tom.

Tom presented the idea of asking students to describe rocks while blindfolded. He suggested that this might help students to think about the properties of rocks. He also included a brief description of how the students in this sixth grade unit would be engaged in a model clay-making activity of plate tectonics and their life cycle in order to help students understand these concepts through "doing."

Barbara then asked if there were any questions. Various questions were asked, e.g., how would these activities be connected to the principles; how long would the unit last; and, how would these be taught, in pairs, in groups, independently? Barbara and John answered the questions. Our professor then thanked the group for their draft and asked that each whole class member remember to write the group a one page "feedback response" about our small group's presentation. These would be given to our group during the next class.

Note the group's participation framework during the whole class presentation. First, Barbara moderated the event. Second, she and John engaged in frequent communicative sequences that reflected the relationship of their situational co-membership. Third, Tom and Lucila stood quietly against the wall while Barbara and
John frequently engaged the whole class in commentaries about their draft. Hence, the group's participation framework was maintained during their draft presentation to the whole class.

At the end of their presentation, Barbara had to make two trips to her car with the help of Tom and John in order to re-load all of the materials she had brought. Similarly, I helped Lucila bring all of the books to her car. At that point, we searched for a room in order to meet. The group was clearly glad that their presentation was over and was exhausted from the work that they had done in the planning of it. "I am exhausted," Barbara said as she entered the meeting. We had found a new space for our small group meeting. It was in a tiny room across from our whole class that had five chairs and no table.

Use of Hymes SPEAKING mnemonic to describe this speech event

Chapter 4 provides a detailed description of the small group's Scene, Setting and Participants. The Ends (goals and outcomes) were to discuss the group's process. The Acts (message, content, and form) were primarily focused on a discussion of the group's process by way of naming and analyzing the conflict that had been evidenced during the group's first seven meetings. The emotional Key was characterized as serious. The group had not previously engaged in a discussion involved in naming and analyzing the conflict that had occurred in the group's interactions. It was a serious and, at times, an emotional discussion. The Instrumentality was a face to face meeting. The Norms of and for interaction and interpretation have been described fully in Chapter 4. The group consisted of peers who were actively engaged in the process of cooperative learning in order to complete a common goal. Each member should be an equal resource in terms of the group's work. Each learner was to be considered an important contributor in the co-construction of the group's process and
task. Finally, the Genre that was created was an educational dialogue in a college classroom with five participants of NES and ESL teachers and teachers-in-training who had been assigned a common task of creating a curriculum unit for an authentic mainstream classroom.

Turn Allocation

During the group's eighth meeting, I asked the group to begin to peer through my lens of conflict. I led the group's discussion. My goal was to engage each member in participating in this discussion in order for each member to be an active participant in the collaborative process of analyzing conflict. Table 9 represents an analysis of the local turn-taking in this speech encounter.

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Self-Selected</th>
<th>Was asked to Speak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Debbie</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucila</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* asked to speak by Debbie

The amount of turn allocation seen in the second meeting between Barbara, John, Tom, and Lucila was not greatly different from the talk allocation evidenced at this meeting. While this appeared to be a pattern of the group in terms of its "turn taking economy", it does not assess the quality of participation seen by each member (Bailey, 1993b). The most significant difference at this meeting was the presence of my voice. Further, Bailey (1993b) claims that what is stated during each member's
turn might have more "weight" than the number of times each individual takes a turn of talk. It is important to analyze for hearings and warrants for speaking in this small group during this conflict naming meeting.

Naming the conflict

Because I didn't have to be a part of the group presentation or product, the curriculum unit, I was able to look at the group's work from a different lens. I could focus on what was occurring in the process of talk. This created a very different role than anyone else's in the group and became part of the discourse of the eighth meeting. As the reflective facilitator of process, I began the meeting for the first time. Prior to that point, Barbara had led the group discussion.

It was during this meeting that the group was asked to look through my lens of process. From this critical stance I asked the group to comply with my wish to examine conflict. In the role of reflection facilitator as conflict namer, I sought to influence the group's behavior by asking them to look through the lens of reflection and analyze the presence of conflict. Fitch (1994) claims that compliance gaining is an important speech act "of interpersonal life." She includes a range of directives that can be included in the category of compliance gaining, such as "requests, commands, suggestions, hints, advice, and so forth" (p. 185). At the opening of the eighth meeting I posed the first request toward the naming and analyzing of conflict.

The request to examine conflict

During the opening of the meeting, I posed the question, "How do you think that the group reflects on its process? In terms of how our group works together?" This was a general question that was posed to the whole group in solicitation of their
response. In terms of turn allocation, the question was posed to solicit a speaker to self-select a turn (Bailey, 1993b).

John responded to the question stating that the group's reflections were defined by their task. His response was met with agreement from Barbara. Thus, the initial question posed to the small group revealed the group's common pattern for talk. John and Barbara self-selected a turn and so it was their voices that we initially heard.

I then asked the group if there were other thoughts about how the group reflected on its task (Excerpt 29, p. 165). I was much more specific in naming the patterns that I had observed. I posed the question to the group rather than to a specific member. John and Barbara, as seen in the past, were the first to fill the open slots for turns of talk. While it was important to note their answer, the turn-taking patterns that had been present throughout are also of import: namely, Barbara and John dominated the group's turn allocation and appeared to be the voices for the group when a general solicitation was presented.

Thus, the opening of the meeting revealed significant information about the social participation framework that was co-constructed in this group. When five strangers create a community, they develop shared ways of communicating with one another. These shared ways become their communicative rules for speaking. Thus, the first response in this speech encounter provided information about the group's warrants for speaking. John spoke first followed by a back channel utterance from Barbara. They enacted a particular pattern that was rooted in the group's form for participation. In both instances, the two participants used the most common form of turn taking; they self-selected (Bailey, 1993b). They possessed the ability, the willingness, and the power to gain the floor.

The response to my second question provided further evidence that the warrants for speaking in this group were possessed by Barbara and John. Note lines
37 and 42 below, where Barbara and John claimed that a general norm of groupwork was that certain members would and certain members would not have voice.⁹

**Excerpt 29**

32 **Debbie:** It appears is that in our group, our group process or task is voiced and acknowledged by either one of you and when I look for other presence of that, it doesn't exist. Tom and Lucila don't seem to be making, um, group statements of group of either reflective or what the group's task is or what the group's process is and that is something that I've, I have just noticed, um, and I um, I am just asking what this might mean?

37 **Barbara:** Sure, right, this is what happens in groups.

38 **Debbie:** It's whose voices are there, uh, [(2)] I am not sure that this is what happens in all groups all the time, but it is happening in this group, like every group is different and in our group this is what seem to be happening and I am wondering what this means in this group, what does it mean?

42 **John:** Right, there's certain roles, I mean, um [^]

I believe that Barbara's statement "this is what happens" identified her beliefs about groupwork. As such, she defined a particular type of warrants for speech: there will be those who will possess warrants for speaking and those who will not in every cooperative learning group. John's response, while interrupted by Lucila, gave credence to Barbara's definition of cooperative group norms. He named a functional aspect of groupwork, "roles," and claimed that this function creates the hierarchy of power. I believe that John signaled his agreement with Barbara based on his perception that all groups have roles and these roles create warrants for speaking for some but not all members of a cooperative learning group. In this very short string of talk, two members described the meanings they perceived about the culture of groupwork. Their powerful message was that groupwork, in general, contains members who have voice and those who do not.

They were describing a norm that was in direct contrast with the tenets of cooperative learning. Further, the Curriculum Course was structured in order to give voice to each participant based on the belief that all learners should be considered an

---

⁹ Excerpts in the named conflict section have been asterisked to indicate that they have been coded using an adaptation of Bailey's (1993b) transcript notation framework (See Appendix E).
important and valuable participant. I believe that it reflected the assumptions that the
two members had about the nature of groupwork and might have reflected their
resistance to and avoidance of the process of reflection. They did not expressly
address my request to talk about this specific group. Rather they provided an answer
about groupwork in general: "this is what happens" and "there's certain roles" were
generalized statements that avoided the question. Further, I believe Barbara and John
formed a coalition to avoid the process of reflection. Their responses to my
compliance gaining acts were reflective of the common behaviors that have been seen
in the avoidance of conflict (McCutcheon, 1995).

It was here that Lucila interrupted John. She suggested that each member
might have the opportunity to contribute if their turn-taking was controlled with the
use of a "rock." Thus, she chose that moment to self-select a turn in order to express
a solution, as opposed to a response, to my original question. Her suggestion was met
with astonishment from Barbara and John. It was then rejected by Tom on two
grounds: He didn't have an equal amount to contribute and he believed that my
observations were based on an audio-taped recording that had not seen the visual cues
he had communicated.

**Excerpt 30**

Lucila: =Like the rock, I mean everybody, that's that's a good idea. I mean
you talk and when you've finished everybody gets a turn to talk, understand,
so like she talks, she puts the rock there, you talk so, I want to talk so I take
the rock. I talk, it won't be my turn until he or she talks unless he or she says I
don't want to talk and then when you want to talk, you wait your turn, it is a
the form of controlling who talk and not one person, I mean can monopolize
the topic.

John: Do you think that [+:] is something that should be done in
our group?

Barbara: Right, do we feel [:], do we feel like we, urn want to use this [ha]?

Tom: Well, I was thinking of this also, and it seems to me that this is not
necessary, that everyone has the same amount of speaking time and some
people will talk more than others, given like the opportunity and some people
will not talk as much as others, it's just the way that they communicate in
words, but yeah, I see, I can see this in our group, but I am a quiet person, I
don't speak a lot, but some times I'll use visual signals or body signals which I
don't think is recorded by the tape recorder, um [ha] you know, I don't
know.
I would like to note two responses seen in the string of talk above. John and Barbara responded to Lucila's solution in astonishment. They both self-selected a turn in order to voice their opinion of Lucila's suggestion. Their response, I believe, unearthed some important aspects about the warrants for speaking and the function of hearings in this small group. The group complied with Barbara's direction. The flow of talk was often marked with frequent exchanges between Barbara and John that reflected their ability to "read" each other and their familiarity with the content and the culture that the group was situated in. This familiarity was identified as a situational co-membership (Erickson, 1996).

At this meeting, a different communicative pattern had been enacted. On this occasion, I structured the group's talk, moderated the session, and set the group's agenda. In addition, I asked the group to comply with my wish to examine conflict. Thus, I was requesting that the group undergo a major communicative pattern change and in the process a shift in warrants for speaking. Up until this meeting, the group had complied with Barbara's direction. Her warrants for speaking had gone uncontested. Further, she and John had engaged in frequent two-way exchanges which signified their powerful identity in this group (Erickson, 1996). Both of their voices were often seen in tandem and had gone uncontested. In the string of talk above, Lucila voiced a solution: control the turn-taking allocation. It was the first time that the type of turn allocation that had been used to gain the floor was contested. Thus, I believe that Barbara and John's contributions in this speech segment were evaluative statements that indicated their displeasure with and rejection of the solution that was offered.

Tom's comment in this speech event highlighted a very different type of declaration. During the group's Platform Phase, Tom claimed that it was hard for him to be involved in the group's talk because of his lack of experience (a) in the School of Education, (b) in teaching, and (c) in the course content. Further, Tom claimed
that it was difficult for him to participate in the group because of his cultural beliefs that he should defer to those with experience. As a result, he was seen to participate significantly less than the other members of the group. At this meeting, a different communicative pattern had been enacted. On this occasion, I structured the group's talk, moderated the session, and set the group's agenda in an effort to pay attention to the participation patterns that had been evidenced. Up until this meeting, Tom's lack of participation had gone uncontested. He was not challenged to participate. At this meeting, however, naming this communicative pattern of participation put it in jeopardy: Lucila issued a solution that had the possibility of putting Tom in the position of being forced to take a turn. I believe that his evaluative statement indicated his displeasure with and rejection of the solution that Lucila suggested because, like Barbara and John, he wanted to maintain the communicative pattern that had been rooted during the group's Platform Phase. In addition, I believe that he conveyed an important message to me during this exchange. He stated that the tape recorder had not recorded the body signals that he had communicated. Thus, he was contesting my statement about the participation that I had observed. As such, he too resisted my request to analyze this conflict.

Barbara self-selected the next turn of talk. She commented that she felt that she was "constantly validated" by all of the members of the group. She signaled her agreement with Tom's statement stating that this validation was in the form of "you know, the nodding of the head." This message laid further claim to the three participants' resistance to examine the speech patterns that had been evidenced through the Platform Phase.

Excerpt 31

62 **Barbara:** I would like to say about working with you is constant validation, you know, nodding of the head.

Fitch (1994) claims that "compliance gaining" act reflects the desire of the speaker to influence the hearer to comply with the speaker's wish. Embedded in my
work as reflection facilitator as conflict namer, was the desire for the group to comply with my wish, i.e., analyze who had voice in the group, what did it symbolized, and how we might proceed based on this analysis. Reflection facilitation from this stance was focused on the belief that when conflict was named and analyzed it could have a "positive role in deliberation by virtually forcing deliberators to examine alternatives meticulously" (McCutcheon, 1995, p. 150). In paying close attention to the sequential aspects of this meeting thus far, however, it appeared that my first attempt to gain compliance from the group had not been successful.

A second attempt at gaining compliance as reflective facilitator as conflict namer

At this juncture in the group's eighth meeting, I launched a second strategic attempt to ask the group to analyze the communicative patterns that had developed. Prior to asking this question, John made the claim that all of the group's members were not paying attention to me because my role was different. He stated that my role was "almost on the edge of the group" which led each group member to "tune" me out. Barbara claimed that everyone felt this way. I chose that moment to ask a second question. Again, as seen in line 161 of Excerpt 32 below, it was a general question that was posed to the group. While my compliance gaining request was far more direct, the turn allocation was again self-selected by both Barbara and John. Note lines 162 to 167, here they expressed their desire to focus on the group's task as opposed to the group's process. Further, they acted as spokespeople for the group.

Excerpt 32

161 Debbie: Okay, this is what everyone feels?
162 Barbara: The group, we were saying that right now, we were saying last week, well you said, okay let's go upstairs and reflect and I think we all just wanted to get this task down on paper and even the week before=
163 John: =Right, I mean even at the school though we had this conversation and again that was conversation that we were all there and you weren't so it contributes to the dynamic.
168 [(1)]
Barbara and John self-selected turns to express their resistance to the process of reflection. Barbara's statement contained two important messages. First, in lines 162 and 163, she acknowledged that I had requested the group to engage in the process of reflection on two occasions. Second, in lines 163 and 164, acting as spokesperson for the group, she claimed that they preferred to engage in their task as opposed to the process of reflection. John self-selected the next turn and signaled his agreement with Barbara that the group's task was more important than the process of reflection.

It was at this juncture that I tried a third tactic; I asked Tom and Lucila to voice their opinion. Here the turn allocation shifted from those who had warrants for speaking to those who had not.

Excerpt 33

168 **Debbie:** Okay, [(1)] I think that what I would welcome is hearing every perspective. At this point, I am hearing your perspectives [/
169 **Barbara:** [/] Oh yeah?
170 **Debbie:** But yours (to Tom and Lucila) are not in there, so I am wondering how the other members feel? I don't know, as the group's reflective facilitator, is that I don't know. Is whether this is everyone's feelings about this role or?
174 [(1)]

In this exchange, I purposely altered the turn allocation pattern in an effort to bring Tom and Lucila into the group's talk. In this sense, I modeled a specific type of participation framework, actively soliciting others to speak. Thus far, Barbara and John had been the spokespeople for the group. The "intervention" seen in line 168 represented my wish that groupwork should represent the active participation of each member. The question that I posed left a slot open for two specific members, Tom and Lucila. Lucila chose the open slot to take a turn.

**Conflict is named**

Lucila labeled the communicative behavior that she had noticed. It was the first time that the group's communicative pattern was described and analyzed. It was
here that we learned Lucila's belief that she had to follow Barbara and John because her suggestions were not given credence. Notice lines 182, 185, and 194 of Excerpt 34 below. Here Lucila directly pointed to the belief that her voice was not valued or legitimized by the group's members. She marked this with a type of evaluative talk that indicated that she had not been heard. In addition, from lines 186 to 193 we are given important information about Lucila's beliefs about the group's work.

Lucila described the communicative acts that she had performed in order to have warrants for speaking in the group. Notice how she described the chain of communicative events that had occurred. First, she committed the communicative act of making several suggestions (lines 184-185). Second, her acts were not acknowledged (lines 188-189). Third, she was willing to set aside her preference for these suggestions (line 191). Finally, because she was never acknowledged, she stopped making suggestions to the group (line 194).

**Excerpt 34**

182 **Lucila**: What I think is like the two of you always like lead the main idea and I follow or not is my decision, but um, the things that sometimes I have said, like the parent involvement and like, and I once, I said we haven't talked about the objectives and nobody talked about it, it was like what is she saying? And one thing that I have thought about is we have never talked about our rationale and as I plan a unit I always have my rationale and my objectives and um, and when I said let's talk bout the objectives like I need to do this first and nobody says anything and that is why I didn't talk about rationale either, we went right to activities so I thought okay, they want to do activities so let's go to activities, change your mind, I mean there could be a different way of focusing, and it's not the way that I would if I was by myself but here we have more than one people so [ha] um, I said let's talk about the objectives and it was like nothing so I didn't say anything, so I stopped insisting.

195 [(2)]

Lucila named and discussed the conflict that she had experienced and that had been evidenced in the group's talk. She had not been granted warrants for speaking and had never been heard by the group's members. The term "like nothing" described the role that she was given in this community. She was present at the group's
meetings, attempted to have a voice in the group's process and product, and was not heard.

Prior to receiving a response to what Lucila stated, Tom launched into a commentary about his communicative behavior in the group's process. Here he revealed that he deferred to John and Barbara because he believed that he did not have anything of value to contribute.

Excerpt 35

202  **Tom:** Okay first of all, it's very different for me to step back and take a look and think about this. The reason why I think that I defer to these two is that I really think well first of all it's Barbara's class. Everyone in this room has more experience teaching than I do so I, I sort of feel a little hesitant to say something especially teaching this age group this age group. I love teaching, and I, I some time pick up stuff which I think that just by listening I pick up lots of information and I think, um, there's a saying um, what that saying, like, oh, better to keep your mouth shut and let people think you're stupid than open your mouth to prove it. You know so, I think, I, I do learn more by listening especially when it's in a subject that I am not experienced in and that that's just the way I feel.

The dilemma of setting one's individual desire to remain silent aside

Earlier in this section, I claim that turn allocation, warrants for speaking, and being heard involve the possession of three characteristics: (a) the ability, (b) the willingness, and (c) the power to participate in a socially constructed scene. Talk is powerfully influenced by our sense of identity, our sense of personhood in relation to those that we interact with (Carbaugh, 1994; Erickson, 1996). The concept of having voice, in the collaborative process of groupwork is related to the participation of its students. In order for students to have voice, learning environments must be designed to invite all to participate and to be active and interdependent partners in the group's goal.

In the case of the Curriculum Course, the professor had carefully designed a framework in which each participant was to be considered an important resource and
a valuable contributor. She had stated this explicitly in the syllabus and the whole class format. Further, she had continuously exhibited these beliefs through her actions.

Despite the professor’s deliberate efforts to create a course design in which all participants would be considered valuable resources, Tom did not believe that he had the right to have a voice in this group. He provided a powerful message about his cultural beliefs of who should possess voice in this community. "Keep your mouth shut" was a powerful message about his identity in the context of this group. He positioned himself as a person who was not deserving of the honor of warrants for speaking because he had no experience. Warrants for speaking, in Tom's belief system, should not be given to those who had no experience because they have nothing worthy of saying. His emotional key can best be described as serious and with feeling. At that moment he had revealed the important cultural border that he had wrapped around himself.

Thus, the two members who had no warrants for speaking in the group named two important conflicts in the group's communicative process. First, Lucila declared her warrants for speaking. Second, Tom declared his warrants for not speaking. This was an important juncture in the group's meeting.

In the exchange that immediately followed, seen in Excerpt 36 (p. 174), Barbara again commented that she felt validated by each member. She did not comment about what the two had voiced. Their comments continued to have no influence in the group's process because there was no indication that their voices had been heard (Bailey, 1993b).

Interestingly, I believe that the structure of this portion of the speech event contributed to the lack of the social signaling of hearing. Bailey claims that certain members are "heard" in the process of groupwork while others are not listened to (1993b). He emphasizes the importance of listening in the co-construction of voice.
During this speech encounter Lucila spoke. She told the group she had not been given warrants for speaking. During the next turn of talk Tom spoke. He told each member how he felt about his participation in the group's work. Thus, the two members created a structure for this type of talk. They reported their beliefs about their participation to the group. Lucila reported that she had no voice, Tom reported that he learned by listening. Hence, Barbara continued this type of talk. In the segment below she reported that she felt validated. This structure for talk gave further credence to Lucila's claim that she had not been heard because the structure for talk in this short segment was to report not to hear.

**Excerpt 36**

214 Barbara: Can I say something, I feel that in working with you there has been constant validation, um, with I think every idea that we've watched that John and Lucila, about the whole multicultural thing and your, [to Tom] um, what you've touched upon today in the presentation it's been worked into the unit and I think that we've all especially when we have been meeting at Mainstream Elementary School\(^\text{10}\) that we have all been saying like yeah, that an excellent idea, yeah that would really work, yeah.

Barbara claimed that she had been heard. Thus, she had voice and power in the group. She also issued a declarative statement that each member had been heard. She claimed that their back channel comments at the group's laboratory site had continuously signaled that each member had attended to the other. Here Barbara described the work that Lucila and Tom had just completed. I believe that her statements, "the whole multicultural thing" and "what you've just touched upon" were attempts to acknowledge her two peers. However, these attempts were not real indicators of the statements that they had made about their identities in the group.

Barbara had not yet paid close enough attention to the needs of her peers and assumed that they were feeling as validated as she was. Earlier in this paper, I have suggested that being a member of a cooperative learning group includes the willingness and ability to set one's agendas, beliefs, and desires aside in order to pay

---

\(^{10}\) The name has been changed in order to ensure anonymity
attention to the needs of peers. At this point in this speech community, these behaviors had not been evidenced.

A further attempt at gaining compliance as reflective facilitator as conflict namer

In the next communicative exchange, in Excerpt 37 below, I named what Lucila and Tom had claimed about their identities in the group. I then asked the questions, "what is groupwork if we have two identified leaders and two specific followers. Is that really a group?" Again, we see Barbara and John as the spokespersons for my general questions (note lines 231 and 239). The turn allocation appeared to have been maintained. Barbara and John continued to be the primary respondents to general questions and once this turn allocation was completed Lucila then self-selected a turn.

During this segment, however, I attempted to implement a change in the group's structure for talk. Up until this point, the structure for talk had been a "report" format. During this segment of the speech encounter, I attempted to engage the group in complying with my wish to examine our communicative process by evidencing that I had heard what Lucila and Tom stated. My voice in the segments below indicated a personal reference to Tom and Lucila which materially linked my talk with their prior turns of talk (Bailey, 1993b). As such, I engaged the group in a type of communicative structure that indicated that certain members were heard in the group's communicative process.

It was here that we learned that Lucila wanted the group to maintain the role of moderator in order to (a) create a structure for talk, (b) moderate talk, and (c) assist the group in forging ahead. Note lines 240-244 of the excerpt below.

Excerpt 37

224  Debbie: I can't comment on the meetings at Mainstream School, but I can
225  comment on the meetings here.
226  Barbara: Yeah, I'm talking about our work.
227  Debbie: And you are saying that you feel validated.
Barbara: Yeah, I'm talking about our work.

Debbie: But I heard Lucila saying, what I heard her say earlier was that when she has thrown out ideas she feels like you two are the group's leaders [/]

Barbara: Well yeah.

Debbie: And so when she has thrown out ideas, the ball hasn't been picked up and then what you're saying [Tom] is that because we have had experience as educators, that puts you in a a position of well in a less, a weaker position in status or whatever and you don't feel that you have expertise and why say some things that might sound stupid and what I am wondering is what is groupwork if we have two identified leaders and two specific followers? Is that really a group? Is that how we should work? Is that how we want it to work here? [=]

John: [=] I think that depends.

Lucila: I think that leaders are necessary, to me they must move forth, um, like opinions agree with what he or she thinks and I think in that sense they have never taken decisions by themselves, I don't say they have looked for my opinion, no, they have and I agree, but it's like as they go ahead always, it's just like I have to say I have to agree or not.

Analysis of the value of voice in the small group

Lucila believed that she was not valued by the group's leaders, John and Barbara, yet, she believed that their leadership was necessary because it helped to keep the group moving forward. Thus, she gave Barbara and John the license to lead the group.

She did not, however, give them the license to dismiss her voice or to marginalize her voice. Looking at the transcript that I had given the group of their seventh meeting, she pointed to the line where I asked, "Are you being honored?" (see Appendix F, line 152). She said that I should not have had to "intervene" on her behalf. She told John and Barbara that they should have listened to her voice. Notice Lucila's declaration to John and Barbara that her voice was important for them to consider in the process of groupwork.

Excerpt 38

Lucila: And I don't think that she had to intervene to say that's important because if I had something, if it's for me important, it doesn't matter whether it's for you or not.
Excerpt 39

Lucila: Nobody cared, from in my mind, I never thought about it. It was like, we have to get together. And that's why I said, wow, 5:30 or even that's why I said, I don't go, if it's so important, I don't go, uh, I was putting first all of us, and, but then, suddenly, I says, well look, I am going to do this, and well, um, that is why I try to think hard and say Thursday or another day because if you are not consider me I am going to do what I have to do first.

John: Right.

Lucila: That was my meeting [/]

John: Ultimately, we did.

Lucila: But she [:] had to intervene [+].

Lucila's statement expressed her belief about leadership in the broad context of groupwork and her analysis of the leadership in this small group. She claimed that leaders are necessary. Yet, she also defined a type of leadership that is important and meaningful: leadership that grants value and legitimacy to all "constituents."

Cooperative learning groups are democratic speech communities in which all members have the opportunity to contribute and their contributions are regarded as valuable. Schools usually reflect the practice of society where the dominant group controls and organizes education (Ogbu, 1978). Lucila was advocating for a different type of school practice in this small group in the Curriculum Course. She was consenting to be a "constituent" of a particular type of leadership, one in which the leaders regarded her as a valuable participant. I believe that her statement "if it's for me important, it doesn't matter whether for you it's not" laid claim to her belief about the essence of cooperative groupwork. To push this point further, I would like to expand Willett's claim (1995a): "All learners can contribute to a learning community" and as such should be treated as valuable participants.

Lucila's statement in this meeting provided a very interesting layer to the type of power that she would consent to as a "constituent": that is to say, she told her leaders that she would allow them to lead if they adhered to the tenets of a democratic organization.
In the Curriculum Course roles were not prescribed. Rather, learners were expected to construct learning communities where each member was interdependently and equitably involved in the learning process. The roles of leaders and followers could be enacted, though the participants would need to continuously ask themselves if the enactment of these roles was equitably tied to the learning process in order to ensure that the tenets of the Curriculum Course were being accomplished.

In contradiction to the tenets of the Curriculum Course

I asked the group about the norm that the professor had so carefully defined where each member was to be an important contributor. Tom responded to this question. He stated that if this had been a course in history he would have been more able to contribute. "Maybe if we were doing a class on European history, I would be speaking more, and maybe Barbara and John would be speaking less," he said. "Oh yeah," Barbara's back channel signaled her agreement with Tom. They both likened the ability to participate with the amount of expertise and familiarity that each member had with the content and context. Hence, they did not evidence belief in the professor's claims about all learners in the Curriculum Course. For them the claim, "All learners can contribute to a learning community," (Willett 1995a) should have an important addendum - only when each learner is familiar with the content and context.

Thus, at this point in the meeting, several perspectives were presented:
(a) Two leaders had been identified and named; (b) Lucila voiced the belief that her opinion was not valued by the group's leaders; (c) Lucila claimed that leadership was necessary in groupwork; (c) Lucila claimed that her voice should be valued by the group's leaders; (d) Tom claimed that his opinion was not valuable because he had less training and experience than the other group members; and, (e) Tom and Barbara claimed that participation was dependent on expertise.
John claimed that the biggest factor in groupwork in the Curriculum Course was its task. He agreed with Tom that the task was dependent on how much knowledge the students had about the task. He claimed that process in the Curriculum Course was secondary to the group's task. "See the group is really defined by the task." Here again was further evidence of an ideological claim that was in direct contradiction with the ideology that had so carefully and explicitly been named by the professor.

It was at this point that I named a conflict directly. To some degree, I believe that I was speaking for the professor. I was using my role as reflection facilitator as conflict namer to point the group toward the foundation that had been laid by the professor. I was reflection facilitator as spokesperson for the professor. In Chapter 5, I claimed that groupwork in the Curriculum Course was based on the distinct absence of authority and on the tenets of cooperative learning that included the primary task of creating curriculum and an examination of the group's process. Using that framework, I named the conflict.

Excerpt 40

415 John: And that's why I don't think that we have had time, so I don't feel like
416 I have been able to be as sensitive to the needs of every member of the group
417 as I think that you would like us to be, see the group is really defined by the
418 task and there comes the point [/].
419 Debbie: I have to interject=
420 John: =Okay=
421 Debbie: =I see that [John's position about task] as a problem. I don't see this
422 class at all, [(1)] I think if it was the task there would not be the role of
423 reflection facilitator and there would not be dialogue journals.

In this paper, Walker's (1971) "naturalistic model" provides language for describing the group's process of developing curriculum over time: (a) participants initially deliberate curriculum based on their individual beliefs about teaching (their platforms) and (b) participants get to know one another and begin to enter into the next phase of constructing the curriculum based on the platforms that they have presented.
As seen in this group, five strangers did not simply engage in presenting their platforms. In this situational context, we saw two members who did not engage in this process during the group's first seven meetings. More interestingly, in the role of reflective facilitator, I too did not engage in presenting my platform. I engaged in the process of observing in order to reflect on the group's process. During the group's eighth meeting I presented a significant platform in conjunction with the tenets of the Curriculum Course and in direct contradiction with the group's belief about groupwork.

John responded to my claim. He stated that the group's task prevented him from being "sensitive to the needs of the every member of the group." He maintained that the group's task was more important than the group's reflection on their process. Note lines 425 to 428 of Excerpt 41 below.

**Excerpt 41**

425 John: Right, but I see that [process] as secondary to task because of what I am being asked, I am being asked to get up in front of a bunch of people, I've got to do that, I have got to be prepared and have x amount of time in our group to get ready for this and everyone had to do their best to run with it.

As a reflective facilitator, I had no power in forcing my beliefs onto the group. Rather, it was my hope that my voice would be heard. The purpose of my role as conflict namer was to "intervene" in an effort to provide warrants for speaking to each participant in this small group. While specific group members had warrants for speaking, I argued for a revision. In this sense, I was imposing my views on the group. In the uniform of reflection facilitator as conflict namer and using a transcript of the group's talk, I sought to engage the group in an analysis of their past in order to re-frame their future. At the end of the group meeting I gave each member a copy of the third chapter of *Designing Groupwork* (Cohen, 1994, pp. 24-36). The chapter was about the dilemma of groupwork in terms of status, expectations, dominance, and inequality. I expressed my desire that they read this chapter.
Debbie: I wasn't sure what people would have to say so I copied this chapter called the "Dilemma of Groupwork," I didn't know what was going to happen but I knew that I had thoughts that pose a dilemma to me. She talks about some of the issues that we talked about tonight and I hope that it will be good to read it and to talk about it.

During the group's eighth meeting I used what Willett and Jeannot (1993) have coined the "language of critique" in order to help the group reflect on how it had co-constructed a community where one member was not given a voice and where another did not want a voice.

Resistance can often be an outcome of compliance gaining (Fitch, 1994; McCutcheon, 1995). In this small group there were various layers of resistance seen in the group's eighth meeting. John and Barbara answered all of the questions that I posed as general questions to the group. Their answers fell into two categories: ideological answers that were in direct contrast to the tenets of the Curriculum Course and responses that indicated that the group's task was more pressing (and therefore more needed) than the group's process. Tom expressed resistance in two specific ways: (a) he expressed resistance to the process of reflection claiming that I had not "seen" his communicative contributions and (b) he claimed that he was unable to contribute to the group because of his lack of familiarity with the group's content and context. Lucila, the ESL speaker, was the only member who did not express resistance to the process of reflection.

Participant Interviews

During the week between the eighth and ninth small group meeting, I interviewed all of the participants individually. The interviews were guided by questions that I had developed and had given to each participant at the conclusion of the eighth meeting.
Interview with Tom

Tom was interviewed the day after class. The interview took place at my workplace in a small office area. He had prepared for the interview. He had taken the time to jot down several responses to the interview questions and came to the meeting with these in hand. When asked about the strengths of cooperative learning, he referred to the participants and named two characteristics: those who had previously taken a course with the professor and those who had teaching experience.

Excerpt 43

281 Tom: Well the strengths of this group are those who have actually had Jerri's classes before [laughs] to I guess to give us some sense of normalcy, yes this is what happens, this is what we are supposed to be doing to make sure and of course the experience of the three more experienced members have helped me a lot.

He claimed that he was "quiet" in the group because he was having difficulty making meaning of (a) the course content and (b) the course content in relation with the course task. He claimed that the group's eighth meeting gave him the opportunity to analyze and examine two issues: Lucila's warrants for speaking and group task versus group product.

Warrants for speaking

He described his perception of Lucila. Notice, in lines 316-317 below, how he connected the communicative behaviors that had been named at the eighth meeting with the scholarly readings, his experience, and, most significantly, teaching practices:

Excerpt 44

314 Tom: Uh, I think basically, that our last class when Lucila was expressing her dissatisfaction with how we weren't paying attention to her, uh, that really moved me, sort of transferred the group's process onto a younger group especially the book that we are reading in our group about how people can be ignored and you know, when I was a kid in Taiwan, we didn't do groupwork and yet, a lot of people came to my aid so I really I didn't think experience
being ignored and I don't know why, I don't know if it's just younger people
at that age and natural inquisitiveness or if it was cultural, I really don't know
what the factors that led to why they opened up to me, and I guess I just
assumed that would happen over here. I guess that is not the case. Yeah, we
have to make it go better [laughs] I don't know with younger people they seem
to make the effort.

He came to the conclusion he distanced Lucila because of her accent and he
did not distance the NES participants who, he said, were "easy to listen to." "Her
accent is hard for me listen to and understand. I mean it is easier listen to Barbara and
John," he stated. Most significantly, he had taken the time to reflect on what the act
of distancing might mean in the work place. In line 316, "sort of transferred the
group's process" indicated that he had made important connections between being an
apprentice in a cooperative learning group, his previous experiences learning a second
language, and being a teacher in the workplace. He claimed that the previous meeting
had helped him to understand the effects of his not listening to Lucila: (a) he had
given her no voice in the group, (b) he had given other members more status because
they were "easy to listen to", and (c) he realized that he could transfer the act of not
hearing to the workplace of teaching. Thus, Tom made many important connections
through the process of naming and analyzing conflict. In this case the conflict was
his willingness to set aside his desire to "hear" only those who were "easy to listen
to." "Make the effort," in line 325, I believe, was his plan of action for what he
wanted to do for his peer, Lucila. He had made the connection that being a member
of cooperative learning group meant that he needed to shed his individual desire to
"hear" those who were "easy to listen to" in order to focus his attention on hearing his
peer who spoke with an accent.

Task versus process

Up until the eighth meeting, Tom believed that the goal of the course was the
group's product. After the group's eighth meeting when conflict was named and
analyzed, he had the opportunity to re-think the purpose of the course.
Excerpt 45

472 Tom: It was good because it definitely helped me to see what we should be working on, and I thought oh, I get it, that is what we are suppose to do.

Making and negotiating meaning is essential to the acquisition of a new Discourse. Gee (1990) and Trueba et al. (1981) highlight the significance that Discourse competence plays in the context of any learning community and highlight the impact that teachers have in ensuring that this competency is achieved. In cooperative learning communities, I suggested earlier, Discourse competence is achieved through the continual willingness of NES students and their teachers to provide access to learners who are new to the language and the culture of the course. Here we see that Tom was making meaning of the new Discourse. I believe that his statement, "I get it" reflected this important element, Tom was being socialized into the language of teaching heterogeneous classrooms. Further, he named the eighth meeting, the one in which the conflict was named, as the vehicle that helped him to make these important connections.

Cultural border as a way of being

Tom acknowledged that it was the act of naming and analyzing the conflicts of the group had that helped him to make these important connections. This did not mean that he was ready to begin being an active member of the group as he continued to have difficulty making the important connection between his experience and the group product.

Excerpt 46

506 Debbie: How about the contributions that she can make and you?
507 Tom: Well [laughs] that is what I am not sure, I don't know how to tie my European history experience into this group.

This was further evidenced in his journal entry. He maintained that he should not have a voice in the group because the more experienced members had the
"advantage" of having knowledge and experience. We do not see evidence that he was willing to shed his platform: those without experience should not have a voice.

Interview with Barbara

Barbara was interviewed three days after the group's eighth meeting. The interview took place in the teacher's lounge at her school. I asked her what her thoughts were about being in a cooperative group and she claimed that the small group design offered her more opportunity to learn than an independent design would have.

Excerpt 47

Barbara: I think that I learn more with dialogue and the exchange of ideas, um, I think that when there is something that I am not particularly strong in and I am always happy when there is at least one member who is strong and can help me and when there is an area that I am comfortable in, then I share it with them.

She also claimed that being in a small group provided more opportunity to generate ideas in the deliberation of curriculum and she claimed that this added to her excitement about the work that the small group had been engaged in.

Excerpt 48

Barbara: More ideas are generated, more ideas, you know if I was by myself I wouldn't of thought it, you know the activities we came up with there was so much and some of us brought in the readings, you know I don't think that I would have thought so much, so many ideas and I am really psyched about having this in our science unit at school...

Barbara claimed that she had no experience in the area of heterogeneity or in being in a group of diverse learners. Hence, the Curriculum Course offered her the important experience of being a participant in this milieu. In addition, she claimed that this was her first experience being grouped with an ESL speaker. I asked her what had been distinct about this experience. It was for the first time that Barbara claimed that she would need to shed some of her individual desires in order to pay more attention to Lucila.
Excerpt 49

Debbie: What has been distinct about it, I mean this experience?

Barbara: Well, I think that I need to be more in tune, it has made me
look at the whole role of active listening in a different way because there
are times where I am not sure of what she is telling me or what she is
trying to explain so just trying to have the patience and take the time to
try and understand what she is trying to articulate.

She claimed that being in a group with an ESL speaker was more challenging
yet provided the opportunity for her to learn from a variety of perspectives.

Excerpt 50

Barbara: Yeah, I think the experience is more challenging, um,
because of the language and cultural differences, it made it more difficult
on the one hand and on the other hand it gives us a broader picture
because you are getting other ideas.

She also claimed she had more in common with Lucila than the other
members in the group. She stated that she noticed this when Lucila visited her
classroom and they both acknowledged their common teaching philosophies. I asked
about Lucila's claim that she was not a member of the group and Tom's that he had
nothing to offer the group because of his lack of experience. Her response indicated
that she had not known that the members had felt this way.

Excerpt 51

Barbara: ...I thought that I wish it had been brought up a lot sooner
and that to me it came out of nowhere. I remember one incident and that
was when she brought up the thing that she had to do. But other than
that, I didn't know that that was the way she was had felt. I mean, we
were all of a big high that this was all over with and that was the
difficult part and we could just get things down on paper and then
afterwards, hearing that I felt like, whoa, someone is feeling like this.

She then revealed that it was the role, the role of cooperating teacher, that
prevented her from focusing on the needs of her peers. She claimed that she was very
focused on the group's task over its process.

Excerpt 52

Barbara: I think that if I wasn't the teacher, I wouldn't have been as,
well I would have been like, all right, what, whatever, forward focused.
The cooperating teacher's reflection on her role

Barbara claimed that this was the first time she had been a member of a cooperative learning group in a college course and the first time she had been a cooperating teacher in a small group. She claimed that she "had no idea" and was "kind of unsure" what her role was in the small group. She claimed that she was quite uncomfortable in the beginning until she met with other cooperating teachers during the second class and "realized" that she needed to take a more active role in the production of the group's task.11

Excerpt 53

65  **Barbara:** So, initially, I started off, you know, uncomfortable with it, and then I met with the other cooperating teachers and once I met with them I felt as though I needed to take a more active role and when I talked to the other teachers, they were like saying, well, I am making sure that this fits into my classroom and this does and I thought, oh, I really need to start doing that, and then I went through a transformation, where I felt like I was throwing things out and became a lot more task oriented and thought, okay, this means more than I thought it meant.

She also named her role in the group as the "teacher" of the group. She claimed that she came to perceive herself as the small group's teacher when she met with the cooperating teachers and perceived that this was the role that she had been assigned. Note lines 81 and 82 where she names her role.

Excerpt 54

76  **Debbie:** The other cooperating teachers made you feel?
77  **Barbara:** Yeah, I initially started feeling like I was just a member and when I talked to the other teachers in sharing, I realized that I as being too, looking at myself as just, I don't know, it changed my feelings and it changed the way I was perceived in the group, or the way I perceived myself. Still a group member but now teacher of the group, okay, this unit has to fit in my classroom, and I started to take a much more active role in the group.

---

11 It should be noted that the cooperating teachers in the Curriculum Course were NES learners. One was taught adult ESL, the remaining four were middle school classroom teachers from local public schools.
The cooperating teacher's reflection of her role after the Naming Conflict Phase

Barbara had taken some time to reflect on the group's eighth meeting and claimed that she had made a decision to be less involved in the group's discussion. She believed that after this meeting she needed to be more reflective and to listen more to the group's talk.

Excerpt 55

270 **Barbara:** Yeah, I made a decision after last week, I would like
271 [laughed] to sit back for a while and take more of a passive role and hear
272 more dialogue and see more reflection from a different standpoint.

I believe that the group's eighth meeting and the interview gave Barbara more opportunity to "invent" the role of cooperating teacher based on the advent of (a) naming the conflicts that had occurred in the group and (b) the realization through reflection that she might be able to perform the role less actively. Barbara claimed that one of the tensions that she had experienced was wanting to do a good job in the role. She claimed that in the beginning of the course, the definition of a good performance was replicating what she believed was the performance of the cooperating teachers in the Curriculum Course. She defined this as being highly action oriented and using a good deal of control and decisiveness. The eighth meeting and the interview gave Barbara the opportunity to examine a variety of alternatives in the enactment of this role. Thus, it is seen here that when conflict was named and analyzed it can have a "positive role in deliberation by virtually forcing deliberators to examine alternatives meticulously" (McCutcheon, 1995, p. 150). In this case, Barbara had begun the process of examining the alternatives of her role and, as such, the opportunities that might exist if she were to let others have a voice.

Interview with Lucila

This was Lucila's fifteenth course in the School of Education. She claimed that most had engaged in the use of cooperative learning groups, some to create a
final project while others in a "whole semester doing cooperative projects." I asked Lucila what made this cooperative learning experience distinct. She stated, "this is the first group where I am the only one who is from another country."

Lucila claimed that learning in a heterogeneous group had many benefits. Note lines 69 and 73. Here, Lucila claimed the importance of a variety of perspectives.

Excerpt 56

67  Lucila: I think that if the group is heterogeneous, that you learn more because you learn from different points of view but of course all groups are heterogeneous but if you see more differences in more people you can learn more from others.
68  Debbie: You find that more helpful?
69  Lucila: Yes and I learn to change my perspectives especially if mine isn't right because some people may see things that I don't see and when I miss things I think that that is right and it helps me.

I asked if there were particular behaviors which did not help her to learn and she claimed that when she was in a group with people who did not have "high expectations about" her she found it difficult to do well.

Excerpt 57

108  Lucila: In any group, if I know people expect a lot from me, I can do a lot but if you see that they don't expect too much from you, you don't feel well. ...It's the opposite kind of if you feel you are validated, your opinions count, you want to do more and contribute more.

She claimed that she wanted to belong to this small group. She believed that she would be granted warrants for speaking if the group was willing to "recognize" the conflict that had been named. In lines 256 through 258, Lucila claimed that the group need to acknowledge the conflict.

Excerpt 58

249  Lucila: I want to belong to the group even though I notice the problem. 250  I would like harmony and I that's why afterwards I spoke the other day 251  I am not sure if we gained or I gained. I am not sure because everybody 252  was kind of defending themselves. You know it was like, oh you 253  know, we are task oriented, and we don't have too much time to think 254  about what is going on and I understand that but once I said what was 255  happening, they still didn't acknowledge that was happening. It was 256  like everybody was looking for an excuse, um, but not that they were
trying to solve a problem there, they were not in the sense that if you don't recognize there is a problem, you cannot solve the problem.

This belief is further evidenced in her dialogue journal entry. Lucila claimed that the naming conflict meeting "opened a different perspective in our usual talk." She claimed that she hoped that the group would "try and make an equitable place for its members." She connected this wish to teaching practices. Her journal entry expressed the unique purpose of the Curriculum Course, that of making connections between our apprenticeship and our teaching practices:

How are we going to make our classrooms an equitable place where everybody can feel secure and express his/her own ideas? If we don't see the tensions in our small group, will we see them in our classroom?

Instruction versus education

Lucila identified an important aspect of groupwork. She claimed that the group "didn't acknowledge" the conflict that had been named. Further, she stated that the group must acknowledge that there was a problem in order for the group to solve the problem. McCutcheon (1995) claims that groups will often avoid conflict and as a result miss the opportunity to perform an important group function: "understand one another's positions more clearly than if there were no conflict" (p. 5). I believe that what the group needed to do was grant Lucila what she had requested, a voice in the process of their deliberation. Thus, the group's norms for speaking needed to be restructured so that her peers were willing to "hear" what she had to contribute.

I would like to argue two points here. Lucila was pointing to two critical aspects about the purpose and design of the Curriculum Course. First, this course offered teachers and teachers-in-training the opportunity to (a) apprentice a new practice, (b) study the ideologies of that practice, and (c) engage in a dialogue about these apprenticeships and ideologies. She claimed that the group needed to acknowledge what she had stated in order to "solve the problem" of giving a voice to
Tom and herself. While I agree with Lucila's point wholeheartedly, I am not certain
that the type of acknowledgment that she desired in this situation would occur
simultaneously because I believe that education is distinct from instruction.

Instruction occurs in the classroom. Each of the members of this small group
had received instruction about the ideologies and practices of heterogeneity and
groupwork. They had received this "instruction" in the whole class and small group
format, in independent readings, and in developing the group's task throughout the
entire semester. But being educated about a new practice may not occur at the same
moment as being instructed. Here lies the critical point of Willett (1995b): "one brief
semester could never cover everything there is to know about teaching heterogeneous
classes; rather we must continually learn from one another, from our students, and
from the scholarly literature..." She does not expect the group's final product to be
any more than a draft (Willett, 1995b). As such, Willett (1995b) is pointing to the
critical distinctions between instruction and education.

Therefore, while Lucila believed that the group needed "to acknowledge that
there was a problem in order to solve it," I believe that the purpose of the course was
to experience and examine these problems in order to be educated. As such, being
educated may not necessarily occur simultaneously with being instructed. It occurs
over time and through a cyclical process of exploration and reflection. Hence,
students in the Curriculum Course have the opportunity to experiment with new ideas
and practices with the hope that they will carry some of what they have learned to
their workplace in order to create a more just society.

**Interview with John**

John and I met before the tenth whole class meeting in a conference room in
the School of Education.
Group hierarchy is important

When John was asked to comment on his experiences in working in cooperative learning groups, he spoke about his experience working in a restaurant's kitchen. He stated that a restaurant is composed of a "very task oriented team" who worked well because of its hierarchical organization. He was advocating for a type of group that has clear tasks in order to complete a common goal.

Excerpt 59

John: There is a real hierarchy, a chef, a cook, your prep cook, your kitchen people, and your dining room people and in that sort of group teamwork is the number one thing people really need to be able to come together and work together as a team and it seems to me that that hierarchy helps in this case.

Further evidence of a situational co-membership

He stated that he believed that he had a great deal in common with Barbara. He commented on many of their commonalities during the meeting. In the exchange below notice how many times he refers to the acts they have in common:

Excerpt 60

John: Yeah, there is definitely something there, it seems to be the given the, or maybe it's because Barbara and I do set the tone I think we do that, um, we have been task oriented that when she had something to say it doesn't seem to fit. Like the agenda. Maybe that's because she doesn't share the agenda and then if we're dominating the group which is quite possible and she wants to say something about, you know, if we are talking about putting together an outline of the unit, she might want to discuss, you know what one of her readings from the book she is obviously very interested in, you know multicultural classrooms, and it just whatever the input is it doesn't really fit the schemata of what has been said.

In the above string of talk, John claimed that he and Barbara performed the acts of (a) setting the tone, (b) creating the task, (c) creating the agenda, (d) dominating the group, and (e) putting together an outline of the unit. Thus, he described the situational co-membership that had been co-constructed in this group (Erickson, 1996). He contrasted the communicative actions he performed with Carolyn with his perceptions of Lucila's actions; she didn't share the agenda and
wanted to "discuss ...what doesn't really fit into the schemata of what has been said."

These distinctions are important in the context of groupwork.

**Desire to maintain the modus operandi**

John evidenced the desire to maintain the communicative patterns that were present during the group's Platform Phase. In the string of talk below he indicated his frustration in "waiting for" Lucila and Tom to speak. He claimed that he (a) engaged in the act of waiting in order to provide the opportunity for his fellow group members to take a turn, (b) had "pretty much given up" on that strategy, and (c) decided that he would fill the slot with his talk.

**Excerpt 61**

137  **John**: You know no one says a thing it's like how long do you wait
138 before, it's like all right I have something to say and um for the first few and
139 like I tried that in our group, I don't know, not as much anymore, I have pretty
140 much given up I suppose because I feel more comfortable, but you know
141 waiting for Lucila to say something, waiting for Tom to say something, I
142 mean if nothing is going to be said, I will say something because I have
143 plenty to say but I try to edit myself as far as giving people a chance because I
144 am aware of the fact that I can stop people from getting in.

Further, he claimed that graduate students should know how to contribute actively in groups. In the segment below, in line 207, John claimed that graduate students should "jump in and say something" when they wished to take a turn.

**Excerpt 62**

205  **John**: ...Look, [laughs] this is kind of harsh. It's a graduate class, this is
206 graduate school, if you have got something to say or contribute, you've got to
207 jump in and say something and contribute it. That's the group, it's what I feel
208 like saying...

This view was also evidenced in an ethnographic study of a cooperative learning group of ESL and NES graduate students enrolled in a graduate education course in ESL methods (Bailey, 1993b). It was seen that a NES learner believed that an "individual has a great deal of the responsibility for getting themselves heard during a [cooperative] group meeting" (p. 147). Bailey claims that this belief is
reflective of "American discourse patterns" and might not allow for alternative discourse patterns representative of other cultures (p. 147).

Thus, in this study, we have seen evidence that when conflict is named and analyzed it did not necessarily mean that every member embraced the variety of alternatives that were presented. John did not set his cultural beliefs aside in an effort to examine the possibility that the group might need to change its communicative patterns in order to allow all of its members to have voice. Rather, he preferred to maintain the status quo. Similarly, Dan did not shed his cultural beliefs in order to examine the possibility that he might have important contributions to make to the group. He too expressed his preference to maintain the status quo.

Pajares (1992) claims that it can be particularly challenging for college institutions to engage teachers and teachers-in-training in change because its "students have commitments to prior beliefs" that are deeply rooted.

Preservice teachers are insiders. They need not redefine their situation. The classroom of colleges of education, and the people and practices in them, differ little from classrooms and people they have known for years. Thus, the reality of their everyday lives may continue largely unaffected by higher education, as may their beliefs. For insiders, changing conceptions is taxing and potentially threatening (Pajares, 1992, p. 323).

In the Curriculum Course, the professor purposely created an educational setting that was not reflective of the deeply rooted cultural beliefs of John or Tom. Thus, each was challenged to set aside his cultural beliefs for the brief moment of this course in order to stretch their thinking about learning and teaching.

Conclusion

At the group's eighth meeting, four of its members, John, Barbara, Lucila, and Tom, for a variety of reasons, did not express belief in the tenets prescribed by the professor or by their reflection facilitator.
1. During the eighth meeting John claimed that he believed that the group's task was far more significant than reflection on its process. He linked his view of task with the elements of time and the pressures of presenting his ideas in the whole group format. During our interview, John maintained that group hierarchy and roles were an important component of groupwork. He also advocated for the group to maintain its communicative pattern.

2. At the eighth meeting, Barbara agreed with John that the task was more important than the process in this group. Like John, she linked the element of time with the pressure of developing a curriculum unit during the short course of one semester. During our interview, Barbara claimed that the eighth meeting helped her to understand that she would need to shed her individual desires to forge ahead with the group's task in order to pay more attention to Lucila. She also claimed that the meeting helped her to reflect on the role of cooperating teacher and that she would spend more time listening to the members in the group.

3. During the eighth meeting, Tom claimed that his voice was of less value because of his lack of experience and familiarity with the content and context of the course. During the interview, he maintained this belief. Further, he stated that he was quiet in the group because he had difficulty making meaning of the group's task and connecting his experience in the group's talk. He claimed that the group's eighth meeting gave him the opportunity to analyze two issues: (a) Lucila's warrants for speaking and (b) group task versus group product. He claimed that he gave Barbara status because of her important role as the group's cooperating teacher. He claimed that it was Lucila's accent was "hard for him to listen to" versus the NES members who were "easy to listen to" and that this distinction had resulted in his action of distancing Lucila. He acknowledged the act of naming and analyzing conflict as having an important function in the group's process and in helping him to learn about the tenets of the Curriculum Course.
4. Lucila believed that her voice was not heard by the group's leaders, John and Barbara, yet believed that their leadership was necessary in groupwork and that her voice should be heard. During the interview, Lucila claimed that the group needed to acknowledge the conflict that was named in order for them to recognize its meaning in the group. She believed that each member needed to make this important connection in order to carry this to their workplace. While Lucila believed that the group needed to acknowledge that there was a problem, I believe that the purpose of the course was to experience and examine these problems in order to be educated, although being educated may not occur simultaneously with being instructed. Education occurs over time and through the cyclical process of exploration and reflection.

In summary, I believe that the group's difficulties were not a result of the length of time that the group was given to complete its task. Their difficulties related to the amount of time that the group had devoted to the creation of a cooperative learning community who was willing to (a) focus their attention on the needs of their peers in order to assure that each member had a voice in the deliberation of curriculum and (b) truly apprentice in the milieu of a cooperative framework. Hence, the willingness to set one's individual beliefs and desires was more apparent during the group's eighth meeting.

These two points, the willingness to focus attention on the needs of the group and to apprentice in the milieu of cooperative learning, need to be expanded upon. First, at the eighth meeting we became more aware of the specific platforms of Lucila and Tom. For differing reasons, their voices were not heard in the group. Lucila claimed that her voice was not valued by the group. As the ESL learner in the group, her peers needed to be willing to focus their attention on giving her a voice in the collaborative process. Bailey (1993) claims that certain interactional events must occur in order for a speaker, in this case Lucila, to have a voice in groupwork.
[It] requires a host of adjustments and aligning actions among participants. Voice is the communal product of the coordination of multiple domains of interaction: gaining a turn of talk, orienting to one's audience so that one has something worthy of saying, and finally, the willingness of other to acknowledge your talk (Bailey, 1993, p. 275).

Secondly, Tom claimed that he should not have a voice in the group's process. He used a variety of rationales for his platform, such as, he had less teaching experience, had less teacher training, and was not familiar with the needs of sixth grade students. Each one of his rationales provided ample reason for the group to agree with Tom's platform. The group needed to consider the framework of this course. Here the professor laid certain ground rules. Each member was considered an important participant because of their lack or abundance of experience.

Thus, the group needed to be willing to focus their attention on encouraging Tom to participate. The group also needed to be less reliant on John and Barbara as the group's sole voices. Each member needed to be willing to give voice to their peers in completing their task and in reflecting on their process. Reflection on process would only be accomplished if participants were willing to set aside their individual desire to remain focused on the group's task in order to better understand the learning needs of each member and the group's communicative process. It is not that these individual desires needed to be shed completely. In fact, each might be used to contribute to the whole of the group's work. It is how individual learners work together and understand one another in heterogeneous groups that is so important. The group needed to be more engaged in the tenets of this Curriculum Course which emphasized the significance of task and reflection on group process. It is here that we now turn.
CHAPTER 7
PHASE III: DELIBERATION

Introduction to the Deliberation Phase

Deliberation refers to the phase of collaborating and reaching agreement about several policies and materials that will be included as part of the curriculum (Walker, 1971). This phase began directly after the second phase and was signified by an emphasis on analyzing and reconciling the named conflict and on coming to agreement about the policies.

Introduction

This section will be devoted to a discussion of three elements: (a) the feedback about the group's draft presentation that was provided by the professor and the students, (b) the small group's ninth and tenth meetings, and (c) the dialogue journals.

In this section several claims will be made about the communicative patterns that were seen in the small group's encounters during the next two meetings. These will include the following two claims. First, the feedback from the professor and students in the Curriculum Course about the group's draft presentation served important functions in the group's work. It legitimized Lucila's contributions and it encouraged the group to collaborate in order to develop an overarching rationale and objective for the array of activities that had been presented. Second, the participants began the process of examining a variety of alternatives.
Opportunity for feedback

The tenth whole class meeting included two segments. First, the professor wrote feedback to our group in the form of a six page document. "Dear Class," the document opened. Professor Willett handed each student a copy of her feedback about our group's draft presentation and briefly highlighted its contents. In the written feedback were many references to the professor's beliefs about her educational philosophy and its relation to the Curriculum Course design "...my educational philosophy suggests learners need to experience some of the authentic concerns and issues and the same kinds of thinking and problem solving that would occur in the target situation for which they are being prepared..." (Willett, 1995c). She continued her discussion about tensions in groupwork. In bold letters she wrote, [the] "different cultural styles of interaction of group members are creating some difficulties" (Willett, 1995c, p. 1). She claimed that these were important for the group to "talk explicitly about" in order to understand the importance of these tensions in the workplace. She also claimed that "groups are reluctant to reflect deeply on the process of collectively completing the task" and encouraged each group to engage in the process of reflection (Willett, 1995c, p. 2).

The document also provided feedback about the group's draft presentation. The professor stated that the presentation was richly stimulating. She suggested that those who had read the brain based learning book photocopy a specific chapter for their group members about the importance of the "hands-on activities" and "multi-sensory displays that were included" (Willett, 1995c, p. 4). Further, the feedback also encouraged our group to think about the organizing concepts that needed to be included as part of these activities. Moreover, she suggested that the group think about its overall goals. Each class participant read the feedback letter while our professor highlighted specific areas during the whole class meeting.
Feedback as a legitimizing mechanism

The feedback that the group received from the professor paralleled the conflict that Lucila had named during the previous small group meeting; the group had not talked about the rationale or objectives for the curriculum unit. Rather, Lucila claimed, the group "went right to activities" and did not acknowledge her suggestions that they think about their over-arching rationale and objectives. Thus, at the opening of the whole class meeting, our professor gave legitimacy to Lucila's voice.

A second interesting occurrence took place during the whole class meeting. As opposed to creating a draft presentation about curriculum, the fifth group had received permission from the professor to conduct a presentation about reflection on group process. They provided the whole class with a presentation about the critical differences between group members and how these differences contribute to the element of groupwork. Using the work of Bensimon and Neumann (1994), the small group led a one hour class discussion about how to make teams work through the active process of reflecting on group process.

The presentation was highly related to the communicative patterns that had emerged and had been named during our group's eighth meeting. During the whole class presentation, each participant engaged in two activities. During the first activity we gathered in our small groups, completed an independent writing activity, and discussed the activity among our small group members. Table 10 (p. 201) provides the questions that were completed as part of this activity. Each question asked participants to comment on their perceptions of the communicative behaviors in their group's process. We were given a few minutes to complete this writing activity and were then asked to meet in our small groups in order to discuss what we had written.
Barbara laughed at first and said, "wow" at the questions that were asked of us. We all wrote our responses to the questions and gathered together to talk. At first, we each stared at each other and the floor waiting for someone to start the conversation. I spoke first asking if someone would like to comment on their responses. No one in the group volunteered. After a few uncomfortable moments, I told the group how I had responded to each of the questions. I stated that I wasn't sure about control, but that I had claimed that Barbara seemed to be the voice in our group. John agreed and said, "she's the teacher."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reflection activity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you think that your group works well? If yes, why? If not, why not?

1. Is there a person who controls everything? Are you the person who talks the most? Do you give space to other people? How can you tell?
2. Is every idea opinion valued? Is everyone listening to others? How can you tell?
3. Does everyone have the equal chance to talk? How can you tell?
4. Does everyone feel free/comfortable to express oneself?
5. When there is a disagreement, what do you do?
6. If there is a person who is not motivated to work in group, what do you do?
7. Are there tensions in your group? How can you tell? How do you deal with them? Then one in the group reports on the findings of your discussion of: what are the criteria that make a group work well?

From Small Group Five's draft presentation, Fall 1995, "Teaching Heterogeneous Classes." Education 697T. Fall 1995. Amherst, University of Massachusetts.

The tenor of our small meeting in the whole class context was tense. I believe that being asked to discuss these issues in the whole class format did not give our group the chance to process our conflict-talk naturally. We were forced, under the light of another small group's investigation, to talk about the conflict that had so recently been named. Our script for that type of talk existed in our small group meetings in the situated context of our own private space.

We deliberated a response to the question "what are the criteria that make a group work well?" John commented that a "proper physical environment" should be
at the top of our list because we had such a difficult time finding any space. We then talked about the challenge we had experienced in securing space for our small group meetings. I believe that our response to this question filled the vacuum with easy talk as opposed to taking risks in the unfamiliar setting of the whole class meeting.

Each group was asked to summarize their group's responses to this question and to have one "reporter" inform the whole class of their summary. Tom volunteered to be the reporter. The presenters wrote the responses on a blackboard and marked those in common with a check. The most common responses to the question, "what are the criteria that make a group work well" were listening to others, being open minded, and being willing to fairly distribute the work.

Each class participant was then asked to complete a questionnaire. Table 11, below, illustrates the questionnaire that we were given. These were then collected by the presenters who reviewed our responses and sorted us into groups based on the responses that we had given. Tom and I were placed in the same groups. Lucila, Barbara, and John were divided among the remaining groups.

Table 11

Small group 5 questionnaire

WHOSE JOB IS IT?
When I am in a group, I do the following (A = always, S = sometimes)

_____ pose questions (which can lead to the solution of a problem)
_____ offer creative new ideas
_____ take charge of the group
_____ provide information and knowledge to solve the problem
_____ summarize facts or ideas given by the group
_____ listen to others carefully and give support
_____ help others understand and communicate to each other
_____ eager to accomplish the task
_____ thinking about timing
_____ keep the group together diplomatically
_____ would rather observe and let others do the work

From Small Group Five's draft presentation, Fall 1995, "Teaching Heterogeneous Classes." Education 697T. Fall 1995. Amherst, University of Massachusetts.
Neumann (1994). These included a definer, analyst, interpreter, critic, and synthesizer. What the group emphasized during this meeting was not the definitions of these terms, rather that effective teams were those whose members carefully listened to their peers and were willing to hear various points of view.

Thus, the tenth whole class meeting was in the form of a small group presentation about the importance of working together toward a common goal. The whole class meeting ended and various classmates handed their one-page feedback about the group's draft presentation to each of us as we headed to our small group room. While on route, Tom and Barbara asked me, while laughing, if I had helped the presenters write the night's presentation.

Thus the group's ninth meeting came directly after four specific events: (a) the naming conflict meeting, (b) the individual interviews, (c) feedback from the professor about our draft, and (d) a draft presentation which emphasized the importance of listening and paying attention to various points of view.

**Deliberation about feedback**

The small group gathered in the tiny space across from the whole class space and immediately began reading the feedback they received from their peers and professor. Barbara opened the small group discussion by asking Lucila if she might borrow the group book. Lucila responded to her request stating that she would be happy to give it to her when finished reading it. Barbara then asked Tom if he might be able to lend her the book and similarly he claimed that he had not finished reading it. She then asked John. Barbara continued to direct the group's talk, yet, the order in which she selected the turn allocation was interesting. She first asked a question of Lucila, followed by Tom, and finally John. While I am not certain that this was her intent, it did serve to engage each group member in a conversation. This was
followed by a stretch of silence during which each member read the feedback that
they had received.

Lucila was the first to enter into a group discussion. She asked about the
feedback that she had received. Once again, we see evidence of Lucila's desire to
collaborate with the group in order to make meaning. In lines 31 and 32 below, she
sought the group's advice in helping her to understand the feedback that she had read.

Excerpt 63

31 Lucila: ...It seems like I wasn't clear. I wasn't clear? Well it seems that way
32 because I told it twice here but it is not totally clear in the grouping. So?
33 Barbara: No, I think that you were clear, I think we just had so much of
34 everything that we didn't feel like, like we didn't have very many specific
35 lessons plans all of had those, but I think we had so much like I didn't go into
36 my very specific lesson plan. I wasn't specific. I felt that you were specific
37 and [to Tom] you too, um, I just think, you know as I read these that they don't
38 know that we had specific things mapped out especially with what Jerri says.
39 Tom: I noticed a lot of people loved the Walls.
40 Barbara: Oh yeah, definitely.
41 Tom: There is someone who thought that the plate tectonics would be too
42 hard.

In this scene, Lucila asked the group to comment on the feedback that she had
received. Barbara and Tom provided her with supportive feedback. They clearly
understood her question and signaled their hearings of her question in their responses.

Deliberation involved how the members talk back and forth and engaged in a
rich discussion about their curriculum unit in order to reach agreement about the
policies and materials that would be used (Walker, 1971). During the ninth meeting,
the group used the feedback that they received as a springboard to discuss their unit.
Each member participated in this "feedback" talk. The turn allocation seen in this
meeting reveals the number of times that each person took a turn and spoke. As seen
in the last chapter, two specific members were identified to have warrants for
speaking. As such, the group's turn taking allocation of its ninth meeting was
measured to determine if the naming conflict meeting had an effect on this aspect of
the group's communicative pattern. Table 12 (p. 205) illustrates the turn allocation
that was seen during the ninth meeting. Notice the distinctions seen for those participants who self-selected a turn.

Table 12

Turn Allocation in the small group's ninth meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Self-Selected</th>
<th>Was asked to Speak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucila</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 below refers to the turns that were taken during the group's second, eighth, and ninth meetings. The turns that were taken during the group's ninth meeting were not significantly different from the other two meetings with one exception, my voice. My voice was far more present in the group's eighth meeting. This reflected my role during this important process meeting as reflective facilitator as conflict namer. In the following meeting, I deliberately reduced my voice in an effort to focus on process in order to allow the rest of the group to take responsibility for the construction of their task. As such, my voice was deliberately weakened. Lucila's turn allocation was almost the same as John and Barbara's during the ninth meeting. Tom's frequency of participation continued to remain significantly lower than the other group members.

Table 13

Percentage of Turn Allocation during the 2nd, 8th, and 9th meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>2nd meeting</th>
<th>8th meeting</th>
<th>9th meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucila</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie</td>
<td>not present</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The percentage of turn allocation was also consistent with the platform evidenced by Tom, namely that it was his role to be a listener in the group. This was further evidenced in his dialogue journal entry. Tom commented about the reading, "The Dilemma of Groupwork" (E. G. Cohen, 1994, pp. 24-36) that I had given the group during their last meeting in his dialogue journal entry. He claimed that the reading reinforced his belief that "the person who speaks the most will eventually get the most status." He claimed that he tried to give everyone his attention when they spoke. He stated that while he recognized each participant as an equal, he regarded Barbara as having the most status in the group:

Nonetheless, I gave Barbara more status since we are working in her classroom. In effect I still think that she has more actual status because she has final say in what should go on in her classroom or not. As for group status, working in the project, yes, I must have transferred that status to her group status. Which might be wrong.

Tom made an important connection between the status that he had given Barbara as the cooperating teacher and how he "must have transferred that status to her group status." This confirms the points that were made in Chapter 5 about the role of cooperating teacher. Tom also discussed the relationship between expertise and warrants for speaking. Here we again see evidence of his cultural border. He claimed that those with less experience and expertise were "usually at a disadvantage."

I might be an expert in European history or in overseas experiences, but I must gain information from her. I don't want you to think that our conversations have been in vain—but in a sense, when one person has information about a particular subject and another person doesn't, the less informed is usually at a disadvantage. So while we may all be experts in a particular field, we are not polymaths, and John, Lucila, and Barbara have the advantage over me in teaching experience. I have the advantage in European history and overseas experiences. Lucila would have the advantage in Spanish.

I believe that Tom's claims are very relevant in the context of groupwork. The perception of status is linked with the amount of information or "expertise" that each member brings to the talk (E. G. Cohen, 1994). Tom believed that he was at a distinct
disadvantage in the group because of his lack of experience. He also claimed that his lack of experience meant that he should not have a voice in the group's process. This belief reflected his cultural identity (i.e., those with no experience are not expected to be heard). Having no voice did not mean that Tom was not "educated" about the principles and practices of heterogeneity. Tom's socialization and education about the tenets of heterogeneity were clearly evidenced in his journal entry. He connected the experience of being a participant in a cooperative learning group with what he believed was the purpose of the course:

But I think the point that we are trying to learn here (and please help me if I don't get it) is that regardless of status of speaker, or the amount being spoken, the speaker's contribution should be considered equal to anyone else's contribution. And if we start to recognize the processes that we as adults go through in groupwork, we will be able to better understand the processes that our students may one day go through.

His journal entry revealed that he had truly been socialized into the talk of heterogeneity and groupwork despite the limited number of turns of talk that he had engaged in during the group's communicative process. Hence, while the turn allocation does reveal the number of times that each person took a turn and spoke it does not reveal the quality of learning that Tom exhibited in his journal entry. The journal was an important medium in the learning process. It provided Tom with an opportunity to discuss (a) the scholarly readings about, (b) the experience of being a participant in, and (c) his reflections on the principles and practice of heterogeneity.

**Structure for talk**

The number of turns taken during the group's ninth meeting did not reflect the collaborative talk that was significantly exhibited at this meeting. It is important to analyze for hearings and warrants for speaking in this small group in order to understand its meanings.
John was given a geological article about the Connecticut River from one of the whole class participants. He brought it to the small group meeting and suggested that the article might be used as one of the activities in the group's unit. Tom self-selected the next turn and made several connections about how the article might be used in the group unit:

Excerpt 64

131 **Tom:** Yeah, plate tectonics and earthquakes, I think that they would be interested in this also and maybe we can do geothermal energy and that ties into why there are these shifts, I don't know maybe it will change their view of the earth.

Each group member engaged in the lively back and forth process of using the feedback that they had received to discuss, question, and analyze their unit. John asked how the group would like to organize all of these independent activities into one cooperative whole. He framed the group's talk and began to lead the group's discussion about the elements to include in the geology unit.

Excerpt 65

155 **John:** So, I was wondering if we wanted to start thinking about what, that is to give shape to the unit, I don't know how we want to do that, what we have is a collection of activities and they are good but what do we do with the collection. Like Lucila has been working on this on the activity with the wall and you seem to be interested and have knowledge on some of the geologic activities and I have been working on some writing activities and now how do we bring these activities together in the form of a unit that would please Jerri as well?

Lucila self-selected a turn and provided the group with several statements about the rationale that she had developed for the multicultural component she had presented. She agreed with John and declared that the group must spend their time putting the activities into one unit with a clear rationale and objectives, "now we have to put them together, like why we want these activities?" She advocated for a rationale. John, in lines 183 to 185 of Excerpt 66 (p. 209), signaled an evaluative response that indicated that he had heard Lucila.
Lucila: I thought, this is my idea, so you might have other ones. But when I was doing this, like I put that as rational is to awaken in students their involvement and their appreciation for the role of minerals and rocks and we use their natural interest in rocks as a starting point for their motivation, um and I added that we want students to have an opportunity to think and hypothesize like archeologists and geologists or historians like you know, see themselves, as I don't know the word?

John: Archeologists? That sounds really nice to me, how do you think that fits in with, well what are your [to Barbara] ideas with what you want with your class. What do you have to do with your class?

Here we see an intertextual link between John and Lucila. He heard what she stated and linked her talk with the group's laboratory. He then asked Barbara how Lucila's rationale "fit" with her class. These intertextual links reflect that Lucila was heard in this speech event and was granted warrants for speaking (Bailey, 1993b). Further, her work in the unit's rationale had become part of the group's text.

Barbara responded to John's question claiming that Lucila's rationale and the group's activities would "blow the socks off" her school. Everyone in the group smiled and laughed. In many regards, the meeting had the feel of an active, collegial, and lively discussion about a topic that everyone was familiar with.

The group began to argue back and forth about "Lucila's rationale." It became the primary topic for several minutes. Her ideas had been heard, valued, and were now part of the group's plan. I believe that the group continued to have a rich discussion that was based on (a) the activities that they had independently created, (b) the feedback that they had been given, (c) the scholarly readings, and most significantly (d) an interest in giving everyone warrants for speaking.

John was not sure how to organize the unit. He asked if the content should "begin with rocks and end with walls or begin with walls and end with rocks."

---

12 McCutcheon (1995) claims that when groups work together they will acquire language that uniquely describes their work. The term "walls" and "Talking Walls" was the group's language that depicted their thematic component. Secondly, the terms "rocks to walls" and "walls to rocks" was the language used to describe how to create curriculum that would connect the significance of the scientific properties of
Lucila commented, "Well that's like going from part to the whole." The group began a discussion about how to organize their unit. Each member was asked for an opinion about whether they would prefer whole to part or part to whole. Lucila asked Barbara what she thought her students would prefer. Barbara stated that she did not want to make a decision at that point. Throughout the group's meeting few decisions were made.

**Deliberating curriculum in the small group format**

The Curriculum Course created small communities of learners who engaged in the co-construction of a product. Students engaged in an authentic participatory experience by being participants in a cooperative learning group. During the group's second meeting, we saw evidence that Lucila sought information about Barbara's classroom in order to make meaning of the small group's task in relation to the situated context of the group's laboratory. The communicative act of asking questions was performed by Lucila at that meeting.

During the group's ninth meeting, every member engaged in asking questions about the group's curricular unit in relation to (a) Barbara's class, (b) the feedback they had received, (c) the unit's rationale and objectives, and (d) clarifying questions in order to understand a peer. The distinct presence of questions was unusual in terms of the communicative patterns that had previously been exhibited. Up until that point, the act of asking questions had primarily been performed by Lucila. Table 14 (p. 211) illustrates the number of questions that were asked during this meeting. Nearly 23% of the group's meeting involved the act of asking questions.
Table 14

Asking questions in the small group's ninth meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Barbara's Class</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Big concepts</th>
<th>Clarifying</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Debbie</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucila</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bailey (1993b) suggests that voice is co-constructed in groups. He claims that certain members are heard in the process of co-construction while others are not listened to. He emphasizes the importance of listening in the co-construction of voice. In the group's ninth meeting, the presence of questions appeared to perform the function of making meaning of (a) Barbara's classroom, (b) the feedback, (c) the objectives and rationale, and (d) another person's talk in relation to the group's task. The group thus engaged in the process of collaborating in order to make meaning.

Up until this point, we have seen evidence that the group was not engaged in the collaborative process of working together. During this meeting, the group's communicative text was heavily marked with collaborative talk in the process of coming to agreement about the policies and materials that might be used in the group's unit. The presence of questions helped the group to collaborate in an effort to make meaning of the activities in relation to the unit's rationale, objectives, and its learners.

During this meeting John claimed that he was able to see the connections that the group was making between the activities they had created and the rationale that Lucila outlined. Note his claims in Excerpt 67 (p. 212).
Excerpt 67

John: I think that the rationale is good and we might want to be more specific about the connection between hypothesizing being archeologists, geologists, and historians and then relating this to culture; maybe we'll write more about that to make it more focused about what is the connection between culture and geology and archeology and that is, I mean that is what I am seeing as the big picture, connection between your first paragraph and your second of the rationale. You know what I am saying, am I making sense?

The role of cooperating teacher

John structured the frame for talk at the group's ninth meeting. Barbara performed the function of answering questions about the geology unit in relation to her class. In addition, she supported John with frequent back channel, "yeah", "yes", and "you got it" remarks. During the ninth meeting, John created a structure for the group's talk, set the group's agenda, and moderated the talk. He performed the role of moderator during this meeting and he received support in performing these acts from Barbara.

Each member participated and had warrants for speaking during this meeting. Thus, the type of democratic leadership that Lucila had advocated in the Naming Conflict Phase was evidenced.

The eleventh whole class meeting was devoted to a discussion of the group's task. The professor provided the fourth group with feedback and reinforced the importance of our working interdependently to accomplish our task. We were then given two hours to work as a small group. Barbara said she wasn't feeling well and left shortly after the meeting began.
Viewing the alternatives meticulously

Barbara began the group's tenth meeting. She brought two formats for the curriculum unit's design. She labeled these "A" and "B" and asked the group to review them and to select one that we thought would be the most appropriate. She resumed the role of moderator, structured the meetings' agenda, and simultaneously asked the group to begin working on its curriculum design.

The group quietly read the charts while Barbara explained how each one might be used. John self-selected a turn and stated, "I like A." Lucila and Tom signaled their agreement with John (see Appendix G and H for the "A" format). Thus, the group consented to Barbara's leadership in creating the format for the curriculum unit's design.

In the string of talk that followed, Barbara claimed that she believed Lucila's "ideas of walls would make a good culminating activity." She pointed to the bottom of the flow chart. Lucila self-selected the next turn of talk and stated, "what do you mean by that?" Barbara responded that she believed that the Talking Walls would make a "great final project, like a celebratory activity."

While Barbara had set the agenda and the structure for the group's talk by bringing two formats for a design selection, Lucila wanted to engage the group in a collaborative discussion of the rationale and objectives for using the wall unit. The meeting had three primary topics of talk: (a) the unit design using the "A" format, (b) the unit's overarching rationale and objectives, and (c) the rationale and goals for each of the activities that had been created.

Barbara claimed that she had read the professor's suggestions and now believed that the Wall component of the unit would make a "good culminating activity." She also claimed that she was not feeling well and would only be able to stay for part of the group's meeting. While she advocated for the "part to whole" plan
that the group had talked about during the previous meeting, there were members who had differing ideas about the placement of Lucila's wall component.

John wasn't quite sure where to place the Wall activities. He claimed that these might be placed as an ongoing social studies or language arts unit. He began to advocate for designing a curriculum that would follow the webbing chart because it would complement Barbara's daily structure. Lucila claimed that the group needed to focus on developing what it was that they wanted the children to learn prior to deciding where to place the Wall component. Here we see evidence of tension and conflict in the group's talk. Barbara and John wanted the group to design the curriculum unit while Lucila wanted to continue collaborative discussion about the unit's overall objectives and rationale.

John advocated for a menu driven curriculum whereas Lucila preferred to develop a detailed rationale and objectives during the small group meeting. The two connected their talk with their individual beliefs about what was needed in the group's work and engaged in a lengthy back and forth debate. Barbara excused herself from the meeting and asked me to call her the next day with information about the decisions that the group had made concerning the curriculum's design.

Upon her exit, John asked the group to begin to think about a "structure" for their curriculum work. His speech acts reveal that he enacted Barbara's role: he structured the group's talk, set the group's agenda, and set the group's structure. In the dialogue journal, John wrote that he worked "hard to listen and to accommodate others in the group." He claimed that he wanted the group to define the unit's structure. He stated that perhaps that was his role in the group during its tenth meeting. His claimed that he had taken this role because "the group needs some
definition of task and direction.” I believe that this paralleled John’s belief about the group’s task. In being the “definer” it helped John to push the group ahead and complete what he perceived was the most important purpose of the course, its task. His performance in this role during this meeting appeared to serve two functions: (a) it helped the group to begin thinking about its curriculum design and (b) it helped the group to define the purpose of its activities, rationale, and objectives.

Making connections in the deliberation of curriculum

The string of talk below exemplifies the contrast between John and Lucila.

He was ready to compile the activities into one overall design while Lucila preferred to deliberate the group’s rationale and objectives.

Excerpt 68

123 **John:** Another way to look at these is that we are trying to teach the big ideas and one of the big ideas is the scientific method and then you could use, rather than thinking of minerals, rocks, classification, think of the process of what is happening and any of those things could be part of that.
127 **Lucila:** I think that we have to focus how are we going to ever get to the kids. We want them to learn this and this and this; we don’t have the objectives or how we are going to assess them.
130 **John:** Right, well I am trying to think of a different kind of focus.
131 **Lucila:** I think that it is easier to put the activities if we have a couple of objectives and if these objectives are about science and social studies. I mean I look at about seven books about rocks and I mean it is huge, you can go to volcanoes, earthquakes, and I mean this is so, we I mean we really have to focus on something, our rationale for doing this.

By tracking this central conflict we can begin to understand the function that their collaborative process served in the group. The small group format provided each member with the opportunity to take a turn. Lucila suggested that the multicultural component that she had developed would need to connect with the cultures that were represented in Barbara’s class. She wanted to use the Wall in every aspect of the student’s day in an effort to accomplish the over-arching rationale and objectives of the unit. Further, she wanted to develop a rationale and objectives for
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each of the activities that would be included in the unit. John wanted to create a unit that would "fit" seamlessly into Barbara's existing daily schedule. He was ready to design the unit. In the string of talk below, we see evidence of these tensions between the desire to design and the desire to deliberate.

**Excerpt 69**

527  **John:** So how do we do this? Do we want to use the Talking Walls as the hook, is that what you are suggesting?
528  **Lucila:** Yeah, that's my suggestion.
529  **John:** That's a good suggestion but how do you structure that into her class? Do you take the day, let's see if we can take our ideas and fit them into her class because teacher has said this is what my kids do this is what they're comfortable doing and this seems to be how they seem to learn best. They work in pairs, I mean she has spelled this out clearly, so given those parameters, and I think that it is nice to have parameters to work with because it makes our job easier but maybe not, but how do we if we say that reading is a good hook and talking walls you have a lot of books, um, so then the question is when we do a unit. How do you plug that in?

Throughout the discourse was the common question of how to connect and where to place Lucila's Talking Walls. Toward the end of the tenth meeting, the group had not reached consensus. They had developed a host of rationale and objectives for many of the activities that they had created but could not agree on whether to begin or end with the Talking Walls activities. Lucila wanted to think about the Talking Walls as a way to connect with the learners. She stated that the group should teach in context of what "makes sense to the kids:" Toward the end of the meeting, John claimed that the difficulty that he was having was in integrating the unit across all of the content areas. He claimed that this was the hardest part of the their work. His term "tricky" in line 634 of Excerpt 70 (p. 217) described the difficulty that he had in connecting Lucila's Talking Walls with the whole unit.

**Excerpt 70**

625  **Lucila:** So let's say the Walls, they learn the rocks about the Wall, and things that make sense about that Wall because it has something to do with their background and for that that big think you start going down to the small picture.
629  **John:** That sounds excellent to me. I still want to know, I still don't see how it fits into the. Okay, let's go with that, I mean you have the activities so let's start with brainstorming, um, doing their round table like what do you know
about the Great Wall of China, what do you know about the Vietnam memorial? I mean, there is, I mean we almost have a unit within a unit and that is what I think is a little tricky, it's that we are basically, I mean that is why it is not done very often.

While it was his preference to move ahead and "plug" the activities into a curriculum design, Lucila asked the group to think about the overall objectives and rationale. In doing so, she helped the group to examine their activities in an effort to begin to think about how these related to the overarching goals of the course, i.e., developing heterogeneous classes that were based on the tenets of cooperative learning, multicultural education, brain based learning, second language learning, constructing learning communities, and multiple intelligences, etc. Throughout the discourse were the presence of Lucila's questions. The act of asking questions were seen to be in the form of requesting assistance in helping her to relate the wall component with the unit's rationale and objectives.

Excerpt 71

Lucila: So what would you like them to learn scientifically?
John: So then we decide and then so if we want them to learn classification and identification, let's do that, sounds good to me, let's do that.
Tom: I just want to throw something out. Maybe when we are talking about say math, maybe that is math for its own sake but like having them estimate how many rocks were used in the wall and how heavy the wall is, I don't know, but I don't know, maybe that is what Jerri is driving at.
John: I think it is, yeah how does it connect.
Tom: What does it tell you about the wall. How it connects.

The string of talk above exemplifies the presence of Lucila's questions and the function that they performed. Lucila had asked the group to define what they wanted the students to learn. In line 670, she requested information about the group's curricular goals and objectives in science. John selected the next turn of talk and responded to Lucila's question. He responded that students should learn "classification and identification." His next statement, I believe reflected his wish to "do" and not to talk about what to do. "Let's do that, sounds good to me, let's do that," I believe reflected his wish that the group forge ahead and create the unit. I believe that it reflected his wish to finish the task as quickly as possible without
taking the time to process, reflect, and analyze what each of these rationale and objectives meant.

In the next turn of talk, however, Tom made some important connections about the integration of the unit across all of the curricular areas by using the theme of Lucila's Talking Walls. Each of these turns of talk were intertextually related to Lucila's question and Tom provided language for the group to consider in their quest to develop a unit. In lines 674-675, he pointed to the importance of thinking about math as a singular unit or math as an opportunity to connect the group's theme of Talking Walls. In line 676, Tom also identified an important connection between their work and the goal of the Curriculum Course. The statement, "maybe that is what Jerri is driving at," I believe, was Tom's signal to the group about the purpose of their work. Thus, Lucila's original question requesting the group to define what they wanted the students to learn served an important function in the group. The act of asking questions to solicit information about the goals and objectives of the curriculum unit assisted the group to (a) begin thinking about its curriculum design; (b) define the purpose of its activities, rationale, and objectives; and (c) create a curriculum for a heterogeneous classroom using the principles that the group had acquired in the Curriculum Course.

Reflection during the Deliberation Phase

Toward the end of the meeting the group discussed their common reading, My trouble is my English. Tom related his experiences learning Chinese as a Second Language in Taiwan. He told the group that he had spent the sixth grade in Taiwan and had been given a great deal of support from his peers in learning Chinese. He contrasted this with the experiences presented in the book and asked the group why they thought ESL students did not have the same experience with their NES peers in
the United States as he had in Taiwan. John selected the next turn of talk and asked if it might be "linguistic styles" that posed these distinctions. Lucila stated that she had worked with a Chinese child and realized that it was hard for her "to understand what she was saying." In the following exchange, Tom shared with Lucila how he listened carefully and devoted a lot of attention to her speech because of her accent. In the excerpt below, note how the two discussed this issue and how John in line 1231 declared that he was not asking about accents.

Excerpt 72

1223 Lucila: Like I was working with a Chinese child and it was hard for me to understand her but in working with that Chinese girl I stick there and try to understand her and I thought, you know, it was more nice to her to follow her thinking even though it was taking me longer to do that.
1226 Tom: It is actually an effort to listen to someone with an accent and to decipher what they are saying and because if it is an effort for us as adults.
1229 Lucila: Yeah.
1230 Tom: Than it will be quite an effort for kids to be
1231 John: Well I am not talking about accents.
1232 Debbie Is that what you were saying Tom?
1234 Tom: Well yes, I personally have to listen very carefully to you and I have to devote a lot of attention to that to decipher what you say and I am just transferring that experience to let's say there's someone in another class a group of students with difficulty in English, are other students going to make the same effort as I am to understand that person?

Tom clearly had made a connection between the effort that he was making in "hearing" Lucila and the efforts he would make with second language speaking students in a classroom setting. The word "transferring that experience" laid claim to this important connection. Here too we see his willingness to share with Lucila the time that he had devoted to "decipher" her accented language. I believe that Lucila's response, seen in the excerpt below, helped Tom to view language accents as a culturally identifiable distinction as opposed to a cultural border worthy of denying warrants for speaking (Erickson, 1996).

Excerpt 73

1247 Lucila: I think that if you are used to people from foreign countries you get used to this very easily, if you are not used to it, it is harder. It depends on how much talk you have with them and some people it is hard.
At the end of the evening I asked John how many courses he had previously taken with our professor and what this experience meant to him. He told the group that this was his third course with the professor and he connected his past experience with his growing sense of anxiety to write the small group's geology unit. In the excerpt below, we see further evidence of his strong wish to complete the task. John claimed that the group was not ready for the process of writing the task. During the following exchange Lucila countered John's concern with her beliefs about group work.

Excerpt 74

1264  **John:** Yes, I am stuck, I know exactly, I have in my mind what we have to do and I know how hard it is and how long it takes and I am saying we are not even close. Who is going to be sitting up all night writing up this unit plan?
1265  **Lucila:** There, I will throw that out to the group.
1266  **John:** Yes, I am stuck, I know exactly, I have in my mind what we have to do and I know how hard it is and how long it takes and I am saying we are not even close. Who is going to be sitting up all night writing up this unit plan?
1267  **Lucila:** Yeah, but excuse me we can do it.
1268  **John:** That's right but we haven't talked about it, I mean we have two weeks.
1269  **Lucila:** Yeah, but what I am saying is that we can write everything down and you don't have to feel that pressure on yourself because.
1270  **John:** No I mean I-
1271  **Lucila:** We are a group, there is not one of us, so you get a quarter and we put it together.
1272  **Debbie:** You have an understanding about this unit from your past experience with Jerri and could it be something about your past experience that is what is making you think this versus our experience.
1273  **John:** Yes, I am stuck, I know exactly, I have in my mind what we have to do and I know how hard it is and how long it takes and I am saying we are not even close. Who is going to be sitting up all night writing up this unit plan?
1274  **John:** No I mean I-
1275  **Lucila:** Well we are a group.
1276  **John:** Okay.

Lucila commented that John was not alone in his quest to complete their task. At each turn of talk she claimed that the participants were a "group." She advocated strongly for the group to work together. Interestingly, she also chose the moment to describe each member's responsibility. The term, "a quarter," in line 1273, described her belief that our group should be representative of an equitable relationship. This provided further evidence of her beliefs about democratic cooperative learning communities that require their members to equally contribute their fair share.
The tenth meeting concluded with the participants agreeing that they would each go home and think about the unit's actual design and would then discuss their ideas with Barbara at the next meeting in order to create the unit's design.

**Conclusion**

The Deliberation Phase began directly after the Naming Conflict Phase and was signified by an emphasis on analyzing and reconciling the named conflict and coming to agreement about the policies and materials that would be included (Walker, 1971).

The Deliberation Phase involved the opportunity for the group to analyze the feedback that they had been given from the professor and their classmates. The feedback was seen to serve two important functions in the group's work: (a) it legitimized Lucila's contributions and (b) it encouraged the group to collaborate in order to develop an overarching rationale and objectives of the array of activities that had been developed.

The percentage of turn allocation was calculated for the group's second, eighth, and ninth meetings and was consistent with the platform evidenced by Tom, namely, that it was his role to be a listener in the group. The dialogue journal was seen to be an important medium which reflected his socialization and education about the tenets of heterogeneity. In addition, we see Tom's willingness to share with Lucila the close attention that he paid in order to "decipher" her accent. I believe that Lucila's response helped Tom to view language accents as a cultural distinction as opposed to a cultural border worthy of denying warrants for speaking (Erickson, 1996).

The turn allocation did not reflect the collaborative talk that was exhibited in the ninth meeting. Lucila was given warrants for speaking and that her rationale and
multicultural unit were an important part of the intertextuality of the group's Discourse. The presence of questions during the group's Deliberation Phase helped the group to collaborate in an effort to make meaning of the activities in relation to the unit's rationale, objectives, and its learners. Further, questions were seen to help the group identify, clarify, and unify their goals and objectives for the curriculum unit based on the principles that they had learned in the Curriculum Course.

The participation framework remained somewhat consistent. John and Barbara moderated the group's talk. The type of moderation that they exercised, however, was consistent with the type of leadership that Lucila had agreed to follow.

The group's tenth meeting involved the request from Barbara for the group to begin its curriculum design. While John and Barbara preferred to move ahead and "plug" the activities into a curriculum design, Lucila asked the group to think about the overall objectives and rationale. In doing so, she helped the group to examine their activities in an effort to begin to think about how these related to the overarching goals of the course, developing heterogeneous classes.

At the end of the group's tenth meeting we see evidence of John's growing sense of anxiety to complete the group's task. Lucila took this opportunity to assure John that the group would work together to complete their task. Hence, she continued to advocate for the principles of a democratic institution where everyone contributes their fair share.
CHAPTER 8

PHASE IV: DESIGN

The trouble with the concept of design is that the curriculum’s design is difficult to specify explicitly and precisely. A method is needed for representing the potentially effective features of a set of curriculum materials schematically so that design elements can be identified and treated analytically (Walker, 1971, p. 53).

Introduction

This chapter will discuss the group’s work in creation of its curriculum design during the its eleventh and twelfth meetings. It will also present findings and discussion of some of the participants’ final papers.

Introduction to the Design Phase

Curriculum in its final form is a unified whole that is organized to be used. It is a concrete outcome of a process. The process of developing curriculum involves asking important questions in order to formulate decisions that can be explained, analyzed, and used. What is included and how it is organized are but some of the essential elements that must be explicated in the product's design. Curriculum, however, is not based on a set of absolute truths; rather it is a systematic whole that represents "condensations of practical experience, conventional wisdom, speculative hypotheses, or simply hunches" (Walker, 1971, p. 63).

Group deliberation in the design of curriculum, therefore, is based on the social co-construction of wisdom, hypotheses, and hunches. It is a process of unraveling a host of ideas and beliefs in order to come to agreement, reach consensus, and create a product. The social co-construction of a design involves four paradoxical
elements. Participants must be (a) willing to set their personal agendas and beliefs aside for the sake of the common good, (b) willing to recognize that individual desires can be met in the context of groupwork, (c) accepted by group members as worthy, and (d) willing to compromise "but not about absolutely everything" (McCutcheon, 1995, p. 151). These paradoxical elements, I believe, are particularly important in the Design Phase because they are so heavily related to the issue of who has warrants for speaking. The power and authority that each person possesses and the influences that they exert have a powerful effect on the group's product (McCutcheon, 1995).

A second important characteristic of group design that cannot go unheeded is the simultaneous acquisition of group and individual knowledge. When individuals work together they accumulate "group" and "individual" knowledge over time (McCutcheon, 1995). These two types of knowledge can be in contrast with one another. For example, a group may reach consensus to include particular elements in their design that an individual does not believe should be included. Thus, while the design may represent consensus it does not mean that the individual's beliefs have been abandoned. Hence, what is shed, valued, and compromised are important dimensions and tensions of groupwork.

**Willingness to set individual desires aside**

Unlike the other phases of curriculum development, the Design Phase involves the coming to agreement about what will be included in the product. This coming to agreement phase continues to involve the willingness to shed individual desires in order to create a common design. It is not that members must forego their beliefs about the process, it is that members must be willing to forego their individual opinions in the product. While each phase may involve the willingness to shed individual desires for the sake of the common good, I believe this phase involves the
willingness to shed individual desires for the sake of coming to a final agreement about an end.

**Being accepted by group members as worthy**

Participants gain warrants for speaking during the Platform, Naming Conflict, and Deliberation Phases and continue to exercise these warrants in the design of the curriculum. Thus, the power that each person acquires and the influences that they exert during the Platform, Naming Conflict, and Deliberation phases have a powerful effect on the group's product. Those who are considered worthy have a "voice" in the Design Phase whereas those who are not may be distanced from it.

**Being willing to compromise but not about absolutely everything**

The process of designing curriculum involves making important determinations about what should and should not be included in the group's final product. It requires each member to "struggle" with three key elements: "...(1) individuals' struggling with the dynamics of influence, such as how to have a voice in the group, (2) how to speak with authority but not arrogance, and (3) being willing to compromise but not about absolutely everything" (McCutcheon, 1995, p. 151).

At the small group's last meeting, we see evidence that Barbara and John wanted to move ahead to create the final product. Their desire was not unreasonable as the group had three more meetings before their final product was due. They wanted to begin to systematically create the geology unit. Lucila, however, wanted the group to examine its overall objectives and rationale.
The process of reaching consensus involves taking all of the agreed upon policies and materials and connecting them to form one overall design. As seen in the last meeting, this group did not come to agreement about its policies. Rather, they wanted to make these decisions with Barbara, the group's cooperating teacher. Barbara left the meeting early and asked the group to make a decision about the design of the curriculum. After she left, however, the group decided to wait until their next meeting when Barbara would be in attendance in order to decide on a final design.

The dialogue journals revealed some important information about the participants beliefs about the process that the group had engaged in order to achieve consensus.

**The role of cooperating teacher in the unit design**

Barbara's journal entry revealed her perceptions about the group's work since the Naming Conflict Phase. She discussed two issues. First, she had noticed that Tom and Lucila were talking more in the group. She claimed that their presence in the group's talk helped her to feel less stressed.

Although I was exhausted tonight, I really felt good about our group. It seems as though Lucila and Tom have really begun to make their "voices" heard. I appreciate when others "step up to the plate" so to speak; I feel less stressed as a result.

She then focused on the difficulties that she had in enacting the role of cooperating teacher. She claimed that she felt tension in this role because of what she perceived were its responsibilities. In the journal entry, she wrote that she believed her role in the group remained "teacher" and she pointed to the group's work as more than a course experience.
On the other hand, I still feel my role in the group is "Teacher." I want to make certain that if this unit is going to be used by my colleagues, I'd better make sure that it is user friendly and chock full of interesting as well as curriculum based ideas and activities.

Here we see layers of tension that had not been evidenced in the small group's meetings or in the dialogue journals. Barbara saw the possibility that the group's product might be used by her colleagues in her workplace. She had mentioned this to the group during their ninth meeting when she stated that it would "blow the socks off" her school. In the journal, though, we see the tensions that she felt about the group's work in relation to the responsibilities that she perceived were hers.

She wrote that she felt that she was the group's teacher. She also wrote that she "felt good" about Tom and Lucila's contributions because it made her feel "less stressed." I believe that these claims referred to some of the responsibilities and tensions that she felt as a group member about her desire for her peers to be participants. I believe that her comment about feeling less stressed was in relation to the responsibility that she felt about the group's task. "Less stressed", I believe, referred to the relief that she had in knowing that others would work to complete the task.

In addition, Barbara expressed a vision that the small group's product could be used by her colleagues. While this was not the intention of the professor, it was Barbara's perception of the role. The statement, "if the unit is going to be used by her colleagues" reflected a very different layer of tension that she had created in the enactment of this role: the product needed to meet the needs of her colleagues in her workplace. Hence, the curriculum unit would be judged by two juries, the professor as well as her colleagues. Thus, the role that Barbara had enacted in this small group had taken on layers of meanings and tensions: (a) group teacher and (b) product maker for the Curriculum Course and the colleagues at her workplace.
Barbara wanted to "make sure" that the unit was "user friendly and chock full of interesting" ideas. The words "I'd better be sure" reflected the pressure that she felt in accomplishing the group's task. While the small group members may have shared the same goals as Barbara's, her reasons were quite unique.

She pointed to an interesting tension about the role that she had enacted in this small group. All of the participants observed Barbara at her work site. As such, they were given the opportunity to become familiar with her students and her classroom. One of the purposes for their observations was to work interdependently with Barbara in order to develop a curriculum unit that would be authentic and "tailor made" for Barbara's class. She had the opportunity to be involved in the creation of a unit that was highly meaningful and purposeful to her. At the same time, she envisioned the possibility that the group's product might be used by colleagues in her school.

There are two points that I would like to make about the opportunity that she envisioned to generalize this unit. First, the professor had created a course whose primary purpose was for students to learn. Learning how to teach heterogeneous classrooms was the goal of the Curriculum Course and creating a curriculum unit was but one of the means that the professor had devised in order for her students to achieve this goal. She did not create a course with the intention of creating a product that would be used by teachers who were not participants in the course. The professor had created a course whose purpose was to empower teachers and teachers-in-training. The aim of empowerment education is both individual empowerment and social transformation (Willett and Jeannot, 1993, p. 478).

Barbara envisioned the possibility that this unit could be used by colleagues at her workplace. She saw the prospect of the group's product empowering and transforming the education being provided on a local level (her classroom) and on a more global level (her colleagues' classrooms). When she pointed to the possibility that the tenets of creating heterogeneous classes could be extended beyond her
classroom and into her colleagues' classrooms, the goals of the Curriculum Course had far reaching, though unintended, possibilities.

**Consensus versus accommodation**

Lucila wrote in her dialogue journal that it was hard for the group to reach consensus about the curriculum unit and that most of the decisions were "in opposition to at least one of our group members." Tom wrote that the group reached consensus under the leadership of Barbara and John. He wrote, "Barbara or John put forth a proposal and Lucila and I vote on it." Thus, the claims that Lucila had made during the group's Naming Conflict phase (the group was led by Barbara and John) continued to be evidenced in their eleventh week.

**The dilemma of gaining voice**

An important aspect to consider in group work is the element of social construction. Tom claimed that he should not have warrants for speaking during the group's Platform Phase because of his lack of experience in the School of Education, in teaching, and in the course content. At this point in the semester, however, Tom had acquired more experience in the School of Education via being a participant in the Curriculum Course and he had acquired knowledge in the course content. Despite the knowledge and experience that he had acquired by the group's eleventh meeting, he claimed that Barbara and John led the group while he and Lucila followed. The paradox inherent in group work suggests the conflicting social identities that Tom needed to manage in order to become an active and valued participant. This conflict represented the struggle he had in sacrificing or setting aside his cultural beliefs to
remain silent in an effort to reap the rewards of being a member of a cooperative learning group.

Tom's dilemma provides us with important insights about the problems and tensions involved in maintaining our cultural beliefs while at the same time engaging in the interactive process of groupwork. While Tom believed that he had compelling reasons to remain a quiet participant, the group would move ahead with or without him. Thus, those who choose to remain silent might not be given the chance to have a voice in the process simply because the rules for communicating may be well established by the time they exercise this choice. Resistance to the process of groupwork may further exacerbate the problem. A group can become a group only when its members are expressly willing to participate.

The important aspect that must be considered in groupwork is its paradoxical nature (McCutcheon, 1995). In Tom's case, his Chinese cultural beliefs suggested that he should remain silent in deference to those with experience and at the same time the cultural beliefs of the Curriculum Course suggested that he speak in order to comply with the requirements of being a member of a cooperative learning group. Thus, Tom needed to negotiate among conflicting beliefs, desires, and agendas in order to attain individual and group goals and to maintain his identity. Similarly, each participant in a cooperative learning group must negotiate amongst a myriad of conflicting desires and agendas. Further, each member must be willing to stretch their thinking about these agendas and desires in order to expand their scope to include a diverse population.

In addition, the investment that students have in engaging in this process is an important aspect that cannot be ignored (Norton Peirce, 1995). Each student enters into this learning situation with their own reasons and purposes for being there. Thus, the process and product of groupwork may have differing meanings for each member. There may be those who are there strictly for the purpose of doing what is needed in
order to get a good grade and others who are in attendance for the purpose of completing the requirements needed for teacher certification. Thus, each member may have a different stake in this process. Further, the degree to which each member is invested in this process may have important consequences in terms of the level that each member is willing to negotiate amongst conflicting beliefs, desires, and agendas in order to attain individual and group goals and to maintain their identity.

Accommodation for the sake of sensitivity

John wrote that the group had no mechanism to reach consensus and that the group "basically talked in circles" in an effort to "accommodate each other's ideas, needs, and sensibilities." He expressed his angst with the group's process. He did not believe that the Talking Walls had a connection with the geology unit and that he had to "stretch the connections beyond practical reason."

Thus, there were three members who voiced their concern about how the group reached consensus. Although their concerns were not evidenced in the small group's meetings, they were presented in the "privacy" of the dialogue journals and away from the group. As a result, we are given evidence in the dialogue journals that the group's product might not be based on a careful and deep examination of a wide array of alternatives and opportunities because its members had not expressed their concerns about the group's process of achieving consensus in the small group's talk. Here lies another important dilemma of groupwork.

I would like to focus on one of the group members in order to expand on this point. Meaningful learning occurs when students and teachers have many opportunities to cooperate, negotiate, and share (E. G. Cohen, 1994). In the Curriculum Course, each student was placed in a cooperative learning group that met weekly for at least ninety minutes. Thus, time was allotted for each student to
cooperate, negotiate, and share in the co-construction of the group’s task. Bailey (1993b) asserts that college classrooms that are designed for its students to work together provide an ideal experience to apprentice the practice of this milieu. The Curriculum Course was designed to provide this ideal opportunity. Despite the presence of these "ideal" elements, John’s journal expressed a great deal of angst about the group’s process. He did not believe the theme of the Talking Walls should be the "driving force" of the group’s work and believed that the group had devoted far too much time trying to make it "fit in." The entry below exemplifies his concern.

Just because walls are made of rocks does not make such a unit appropriate to be the driving force of a geology unit. And that is what is taking shape. The T.W. [his mnemonic for Talking Walls] an excellent unit in itself has become the driving idea behind a unit on geology. I think that while the emphasis can be included in a good geology unit, it would be more appropriately included as a smaller piece or vehicle for further exploration at the end of the unit.

John had not voiced his concerns about the Talking Walls element in the group’s talk. Rather, he voiced his concern in the dialogue journal away from the group’s ear. Thus, his beliefs were not part of the group’s deliberation. I encouraged John to share his beliefs about the Talking Walls component with the group. He claimed that he did not voice his concerns to the group because he wanted to "appease" and "accommodate" everyone. Further, he claimed that it was this group’s norm to be polite and accommodating and that these behaviors had led to "getting nowhere, feeling uncomfortable, and getting headaches, etc."

Why? Because no one wants to be perceived as insensitive. No one wants to hurt someone else’s feelings. No one feels comfortable saying, "I really think that’s not a good idea."

John’s "critique" of the group exemplifies some of the ideas that have been expressed by others with regards to their criticisms about this milieu (Willett and Jeannot, 1993). This notion has been analyzed as a stage in the process of becoming critical and can offer important insights about the types of "struggles" that are present in the engagement of this learning method (Willett and Jeannot, 1993).
In this dissertation I have invoked the claims of McCutcheon (1995) in order to examine the paradox that occurs by being a member of a cooperative learning group. Each participant must be willing to shed their individual desires while simultaneously taking a risk and revealing individual beliefs that might be in direct conflict with group peers. John revealed that he was willing to shed his individual desires for the sake of accommodation but was not willing to reveal his personal opinion at the risk of appearing insensitive. As a result, we do not hear his concerns about the Talking Walls elements in the group’s talk. We hear them clearly in the dialogue journals. Unfortunately, these important concerns were not part of the group's talk and the group missed an important opportunity to examine these concerns deeply.

The paradox of groupwork should not be ignored. Each member must be willing to shed their individual beliefs for the sake of the common goal and at the same time be willing to share with others their beliefs, experiences, wisdom, and speculative hypotheses about the concepts that are being promoted and the relationships that these have with the group's purpose (Walker, 1971). John claimed that the Talking Walls component should have had a much smaller part in the curriculum unit, but that he preferred to accommodate Lucila rather than voice his concern. As a result, he continued to believe that the Talking Walls component was inappropriate despite its inclusion in the group’s curriculum unit.

In this group, five individuals worked together to create a common goal. In the process, we accumulated group and individual knowledge over time (McCutcheon, 1995). For John, these two types of knowledge were in direct contrast with one another. The group's "acquired knowledge" reflected the theme of Talking Walls across all of the curricular areas, whereas John's "individual knowledge" did not lay claim to using the Talking Walls as a significant element in the teaching of
geology. Thus, the group’s design represented his accommodation, rather than his agreement, about a very critical component of the group’s work.

He strongly believed that revealing his beliefs would have a deleterious effect. It would appear that he was insensitive and hurtful. Various educational researchers who have studied this milieu have experienced similar concerns about revealing one’s beliefs (Bachy, 1992; Bailey, 1993b; Friedlander, 1993; and, Szewczynski, 1995). While McCutcheon (1995) points to the importance of sharing our beliefs with others, we cannot minimize the difficulties that exist in accomplishing this important function.

Meetings Eleven and Twelve

The turn allocation of the group’s eleventh meeting, seen in Table 15 below, reveals that Tom participated more frequently than he had during the previous meetings. The turn taking economy reveals that his participation was significantly less than the other members of the group and continued to indicate his role as listener.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Self-Selected</th>
<th>Was asked to Speak</th>
<th>Percentage of Turn Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucila</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The eleventh meeting began with Barbara asking the group what she had missed. Tom responded to Barbara’s question and described what had occurred at the
last meeting. He stated that the group did not want to make any concrete decisions in her absence.

He then described a curriculum design that he had developed independently during the week. Taking into consideration Barbara's schedule, he created an idea that would "display" a whole to part and part to whole scheme. As he spoke, Barbara, John, and Lucila signaled their agreement with "wow" and "yeah." He claimed that each of the subject areas could be taught by using the topic of geology and the great walls of the world like the ones depicted in the book Lucila had read.

**Excerpt 75**

34  Tom: Well, I came up with, uh, this is what we can do for a display for a lesson display. I don't know how you divide up your class but I have social studies, science, math, language arts, art, music. What I have done is play around with the concurrent sessions that you could have. For example, when you're doing walls in your language and social studies class, your language class could be writing an essay on do you think walls keep people in or out?

35  Barbara: Wow.

36  Lucila and Debbie: Yeah.

37  Tom: And you could draw in their people's past experiences, I think, student's past experiences with wall or what they think about walls or if they are introverted or extroverted how that would affect their perception about what a wall is even if they have never lived next to a wall.

38  Barbara: uh huh [signaled agreement].

39  [other voices signal agreement]

40  Tom: The science, just the different experiments, I just scribbled them in but, we can figure them out later. Math, we had the walls problems for walls with different, I don't know reading them vertically everything should connect somehow and reading across in a row. It might make a good chart to present if not to divide into lessons. I don't know, I was trying to make this neater but, but, you can read that, I don't know this is one suggestion.

Lucila spoke after Tom. She read several articles about teaching geology and brought one to our meeting. She read a segment from the article aloud. It was about the importance of paying close attention to the needs of "minority students." When she finished reading Tom commented that the article's suggestions could apply to all students. Each of the group members agreed. John then reported his thoughts about the unit's design. He stated that he "envisioned" the unit as a collection of activities, each with its own rationale and objectives under the umbrella of a "large rationale and objectives."
The opening segment of the eleventh meeting revealed the speech patterns which were present: (a) Barbara moderated the talk, (b) she signaled hearing with back channel remarks, (c) each member reported their individual desires to Barbara, and (d) members did not yet engage in seeking more information about the suggestions that each member made about the curriculum design. The meeting, thus far, was in the form of a report format.

In the string of talk that followed, Tom was more descriptive about the design that he had created. He stated that the plan could be designed to mark lessons that involved individual, paired, and group work. He stated that he had given the group's discussions some thought and realized that it might be advantageous to create a design that could be flexible in order to be taught from the rocks to the walls or the walls to the rocks:

**Excerpt 76**

309 **Tom:** I was thinking that if you want to develop the lesson plan, you could
310 have in each section a number of lessons which are group and which are
311 individual, and we could make up three sample unit plans, I'll make up three
312 tables and it will show how the teacher can pick and choose different exercises
313 which will connect with each other and which will have a varying degree of
314 individual and groupwork and we can also between those plans have one
315 going from walls to individual rocks themselves and another one going from
316 rocks to walls, top down and down to top, so if we put in three sample unit
317 plans showing that there is a choice and that there is flexibility and we do
318 account for individual work and group work in it, and if our lesson plan do
319 account for past experiences of kids maybe we can cover ourselves like that.

John responded positively to Tom's ideas with an evaluative statement which signaled that he had heard what Tom stated. "I think that is a good idea," he claimed. He also stated that he liked a "flexible unit plan." At this juncture, Tom suggested a design for the curriculum unit and John signaled his agreement. Even so, the group did not engage in a dialogue about Tom's suggestion. The next segment of talk involved a question from Lucila about what the group thought of the activity she had made for the unit.
Negotiating meaning in the curriculum design

Lucila stated that she needed to be more precise in defining the rationale and objectives and assessment pieces of the Talking Walls component. Lucila sought the group's advice as to how to write her lesson plan on the Talking Walls throughout the course of the group's eleventh meeting. The act of asking for help was in sharp contrast with the other members who did not engage their peers in this specific type of assistance. For example, Tom asked how each activity should be concluded and Barbara responded that he should include an assessment component. John asked about the format of the curriculum design, and Barbara responded that it should include a rationale, objectives, activities, and assessment component. Hence, Tom and John asked general questions about the structure of the unit. Lucila, on the other hand, sought the group's collaboration in connecting the Talking Walls component to the curriculum's objectives and rationale. Below is an example of this type of request:

Excerpt 77

Lucila: You, when I wrote the students will make history come alive, I was thinking it's like most of the walls mentioned here have separated people and I would like them to learn that a wall that it's like trying not to make things happen again. Do you understand what I mean? It's like the wall, many walls have separated people like the China Wall or like. It's like don't let's have another another Vietnam Wall again. It's difficult to connect. How the students will make history come alive, it like happened, connect what happened and try to help it not happen again. It's difficult to connect.

Debbie: Difficult to connect?

Lucila: How the students will make history come alive? It like happened um, connect what happened and try to help it not happen again.

Throughout the meeting were many speech acts in which Lucila engaged the group in this type of collaborative dialogue. At one point, John evidenced some of his concern about the connection of the Talking Walls component with their topic of geology. Lines 575-578 of Excerpt 78 (p. 238) presents a string of conversation where he expressed some of these concerns. Lucila self-selected the next turn of talk and agreed with John's concern. John stated his concern again, "yeah, a catch 22."
At that point, I self-selected a turn and asked the group to examine its purpose for including the Talking Walls component. John responded to my request in lines 584-585. He did not provide any further information about the concerns that he had. Rather, he made a declarative statement about the purpose of including the Talking Walls. As reflection facilitator, I could request that the group examine its conflict; I could not, however, force them to. It was a delicate balance between wanting to help in the reflective process without being domineering or polarizing the participants in the process. John remained resistant to discussing his concerns more fully. In line 593, he chose to turn the topic away from his concerns toward completing the unit design.

Tom self-selected the next turn and expressed his belief that Talking Walls could be included without straying from the group's geology curriculum. John did not push the point further, instead he forged ahead with the group's task. Barbara joined John in their quest to complete the group's task with a back channel remark signaling her agreement to go forward.

**Excerpt 78**

575  **John:** I think that we have to be careful not to go too far away from geology.  
576  It could all be a very short jump to archeology and I think that with the  
577  Talking Walls, it's going to be, you are going to have to, you could go too far  
578  which is nice, but.  
579  **Lucila:** Yeah, there is a danger.  
580  **John:** Yeah a catch-22.  
581  **Debbie:** Well, what is the purpose of this Talking Walls, what is our purpose  
582  in including it? What do we need to think about what might be the pros and  
583  cons?  
584  **John:** Well to play with the link of how it is related to geology, what made,  
585  uh, it is made out of and how it connects.  
586  **Tom:** I think that the teacher can connect as much as he or she wants to but a  
587  teacher can't say that well this is a wall and leave it at that, I think that the  
588  conditions under which it was built perhaps should be explored like when it  
589  was built and why that is standard, but I don't think that I don't think that  
590  explaining those facts are going into archaeology and history.  
591  **Debbie:** Does that mean that we have a rationale, a reason to connect these?  
592  **Lucila:** It gives a description.  
593  **John:** Do you want to choose, um, someone can draw up the unit page.  
594  **Barbara:** Yeah, that what, yeah.
In the string that followed John provided a structure for the group to complete their task. He suggested that each member write a rationale and objectives for the specific activities that they had developed for the group's draft presentation. He suggested that they could then engage in an activity of "stapling them together." This again was a push for a cooperative mode as opposed to a collaborative one. In the next string of talk, Barbara signaled her agreement with John and provided further structure for the group's design. Notice, in line 624 below, how she signaled her agreement with John by stating that they were "on the same wavelength."

Excerpt 79

624 Barbara: Yeah, if, I mean we are on the same wavelength right now, I was just thinking the same thing.

Barbara structured the next segment of the group's design. At the end of the same string of talk, she suggested a task for each member to complete in their process of designing the geology unit. Note John and Lucila's back channel responses that signaled their agreement with Barbara's structure.

Excerpt 80

629 Barbara: Perhaps it would be helpful for you [John] to take the language arts for you [Lucila] to take the social studies, you [Tom] to take the science, me to take math, we each take a lesson plan following this specific format, that we all then, um, I can do the dear parents letter and you [Tom] can do perhaps the menu and you can do it, a chart, so right now.

630 John: Right.

631 Lucila: Yeah.

632 John: Yeah, I think you have, you want to work on, I think that you have already done, if you wanted to write the unit rationale and the unit objectives [to Lucila].

633 Lucila: A general one, a general one.

Thus, a plan was placed for the unit's curriculum design. John continued to make suggestions to Lucila for the rationale and objectives of the Talking Walls activities.
Excerpt 81

John: Like you could go to Amherst College and you could take them to the museum and it could be a whole day's lesson with the rationale, objectives, and procedures. do they bring their notebooks to take notes, are they looking for information on rocks, or walls, or like you said, the films.

Toward the close of the eleventh meeting, Barbara stated that the group should "think about" its overall rationale and objectives. Lucila self-selected the next turn and stated what she had suggested during the Deliberation Phase. Without hesitation, she stated: "We want students to have an opportunity to think like geologists and archeologists." She followed this statement with a question soliciting the group's input on the rationale she had just stated, "I don't know, what do you think?" she asked. Tom self-selected the next turn and said that he had been thinking of that statement in relation to the feedback that the group had been given after their draft presentation. He suggested an expansion of Lucila's statement. Lucila signaled her agreement with Tom's suggestion. Toward the end of the meeting, our professor arrived to ask how things were going with our group. Barbara asked our professor what kinds of plans the group needed to be thinking about for the Curriculum Faire. Our professor suggested that we think about providing the whole class with a "metaview" of our unit.

Excerpt 82

Professor Willett: I think it would be good to have that meta-view. You know this is what we are doing and these are ways in which we are thinking and looking at in terms of a heterogeneous class...

Our professor asked if we understood the meaning of metaview and the group signaled their understanding. Barbara asked the group if we had any questions for our professor, "Do we have any questions about the actual format? Do we want to run it by her?" she asked. John self-selected the next turn of talk and asked if their final unit should include a rationale and objectives. Our professor signaled her agreement and John stated, "Okay, I guess we are sort of ready."
The communicative patterns are maintained

During the group's eleventh meeting, the communicative patterns that had been evidenced from the group's Platform Phase were maintained. Barbara structured the group's talk, she moderated the talk, provided a schematic for the group's curriculum design, and set the agenda for the group's talk. It is important to note that Lucila claimed that leaders were necessary during the Naming Conflict Phase and that she gave Barbara the license to lead. Lucila's statement about leaders was uncontested at that time. From that time, the group continued to evidence their desire for Barbara to perform this function. During the tenth meeting, Barbara left early and suggested that the group complete their design. In deference to Barbara's role as cooperating teacher, the group waited for her to be present in order to complete this task. While I believe that there were no prescriptive rules for enacting the role of cooperating teacher, I maintain that each member perceived that Barbara was the leader of their task activity. As such, she performed a number of functions in order for the group to complete this end.

Getting ready to go to the Faire

The group's final meeting was devoted to designing plans for the Curriculum Faire. Lucila opened the group's meeting stating that she had thought about how to begin the unit and had thought that it should open with a reading of the Talking Walls book. Barbara asked how she would plan this reading and Lucila suggested a brainstorming session. Tom selected the next turn and stated that he had revised the chart depicting the unit's flexibility and asked if each of the group members would have three or four sample lesson plans that could be attached to the chart that he had devised. He had expanded his design. He said that he wanted to provide teachers
with several ideas for each of the content areas in order to provide each teacher with flexibility. Teachers could select content area lessons and their depth depending on their interests. He explained his rationale for expanding this flexible plan.

**Excerpt 83**

31 **Tom:** Okay, I could go through them all or on the other hand I could make up my own table with an earthquake first and build up to the walls, um, and if the person wanted to emphasize science you would have a big block of science and some sample lessons so that they could pick and choose and then we could even have a big section with art so you could use big and little blocks to emphasize the amount of time, like a day or two or extended over a couple of days or weeks, and I think that we have many lesson plans, I mean many short lessons. And I was thinking that maybe we could, I mean if you because your ideas are covered in this, I mean you could have a different plan in which you start with the reverse with the basics and build up to the walls. That way it would save some time because you don't have to choose.

In the string of talk that followed, the group's communicative patterns that had been evidenced throughout their work were evidenced. Lucila asked a clarifying question, Barbara responded to Lucila's question, and John provided a declarative statement about Tom's suggestions. These communicative patterns were seen throughout the group's work. Note below the pattern of question, answer, evaluative statement.

**Excerpt 84**

42 **Lucila:** So they choose?
43 **Barbara:** The teacher has the freedom and that as a guide.
44 **John:** What is nice about that is you get to visualize different ways to structure your unit.

At the group's second meeting, Lucila performed the act of asking questions in order to seek information. This act also revealed the type of role that she and Barbara had enacted and maintained in this community (Bailey, 199b). While other members also answered Lucila's questions, Barbara was the primary respondent throughout the group's work. During the Platform Phase, Barbara fulfilled the role of valuable resource to Lucila's questions. The presence of these questions and answers continued through the Naming Conflict, Deliberation, and Design Phases. These were quite distinct from the other members who generally, with the exception of the
Deliberation Phase, presented their ideas in the form of declarations and rarely sought clarifying information.

I believe that these questions were requests for collaborative dialogue and assisted the group in their efforts to make meaning of the activities they had created in relation to the unit's rationale and objectives, the principles of heterogeneity that had been acquired during the Curriculum Course, and the unit's potential use in the classroom.

At the same time, however, I also believe that the requests for collaborative dialogue were often seen as a problem because they delayed the process of moving forward as quickly as some of the members would have liked. This is an important aspect of groupwork, I believe, and cannot be minimized. In my view, if task is a rocket, then the presence of questions are the boosters that make it soar. However, from the point of view of those who are most interested in moving the task ahead as quickly as possible, if task is a rocket, then the presence of questions prevents it from taking flight.

Putting it all together

The excerpt below exemplifies the dynamics that were seen at the group's final meeting and were representative of their rules for talking. Using Tom’s plan, the group engaged in the process of creating a poster which depicted their metaview of the unit. Lucila asked if the group wanted her rationale for social studies. Notice John’s responses to Lucila and Barbara were clearly focused on creating a specific structure to ensure that the task would be completed during the remainder of their meeting.

Excerpt 85

109 Lucila: Social studies, you want social studies?
110 John: Put one objective.
Lucila: Okay, I will relate this unit to the different cultures that are represented in the classroom to the book, Talking Walls, in order to improve the self esteem of the students and to awaken their curiosity. Is that too long?

John: No.

Barbara: I am going to take that and put it on the poster

John: Use Roman numeral "I", Talking Walls, Roman numeral 1, then under it put "a" the objectives

Lucila: Students will answer these questions, under what conditions were walls built and why were they built?

With Tom's plan, the group created a poster that depicted their semester long project of creating a geology unit that used the theme of Talking Walls. John had claimed that the group needed some "definition of task and direction" in his dialogue journal entry during the Deliberation Phase. I believe that the group's task was clearly understood by John because he had previously experienced this type of course design. His experience in terms of putting the final pieces together were evidenced during the group's last meeting. Further, his communicative actions expressed his desire to stay focused on the task in order to complete it.

In the excerpt above, we see threads of the knowledge that the group had acquired through their working together. In unpacking the excerpt above, we see these intertextual links. First, we see Lucila's willingness to talk about the objectives that she created for the Talking Walls segment. In the previous meeting, she had asked several questions about what to include in the activities. On this day, she was prepared with an objective and rationale in hand.

John asked that she state one objective. I believe his request represented his desire to move along quickly. Notice Lucila's objective stated in line 111 of Excerpt 84 above. The subject of geology was woven with a cultural component throughout the curriculum unit. Upon completing her statement, Lucila solicited the group's evaluation of her work. "Is it too long?" she asked. "No," John responded. His response, I believe further reflected his desire to move ahead and complete the task. Barbara signaled her agreement with John by stating that she would write Lucila's statement on the poster. John and Barbara, respectively, paraphrased the objectives
Lucila had stated. As seen in the past, the two continued to work together in a situational co-membership that reflected their familiarity with the culture and with their task.

Lucila took the next turn of talk and assisted in the paraphrasing activity. John, in his role as group definer, suggested a method to write the objectives that had been spoken. Lucila then provided more information about the social studies objectives. Again a link was made between the subject of geology and the theme of Talking Walls. While Tom's voice was not present during this segment, he had clearly engaged in active listening and had contributed to the learning process.

The Curriculum Faire

Barbara had engaged her sixth grade students in a brainstorming poster making activity. She brought these to the Faire. One asked Tom's question, "Do you think walls keep people in or out?" A second poster listed the metaview of the group's geology unit. Lucila brought in a documentary of the Great Wall of China as well as the book, Talking Walls. I arrived at the Curriculum Faire where Lucila, Barbara, and John were setting up their display table in preparation for the Faire.

Our group had selected the first display table in the gymnasium. The Talking Walls book stood tall on the table. Each of the group members had written their content activities. We stapled six sets together, one for each member and one to be turned into our professor. We were the first group to present our work to whole class.

Tom spoke first. He presented the group's idea to create a "flexible" unit. He explained the overarching rationale and objectives of the unit. Barbara and John added information about the group's plans to use the Talking Walls as part of the theme of teaching geology. Toward the end of their short presentation, Lucila showed the video and explained that the group wanted to include the cultural
backgrounds of the students in Barbara's class in the geology unit. At the end of the small group's short presentation, a round of applause was given by the whole class participants. We had completed our task.

Final papers

Each student was required to write a final paper "in which they reflect on what happened with the unit that the team developed and implemented and how the ideas encountered in the course will affect their teaching" (Appendix C).

From instruction to education

Barbara had not turned in a final paper at the time of this writing. Lucila wrote a paper which highlighted various concepts and ideas that could be used with Kindergarten students. Her paper described the elements of a heterogeneous Kindergarten classroom. While the paper was not a reflective piece about our experience, it did provide information related to the learning that had occurred in the Curriculum Course. Also included in Lucila's paper were her beliefs about creating a curriculum that was centered on the needs and desires of the students. As I read the paper, two ideas came to mind: (a) her familiar question in our group, what is it we want the children to learn? and (b) her belief about the democratic process.

Children are allowed to explore and arrive at their own conclusions concerning the reading, writing, and language process because they are free to take risks...in a learning environment that affirms their existence both as individuals and as members of a cultural and racial group, and freedom to show them how to deal critically and creatively with reality in order to participate in the transformation of their world.
Tom's paper was a reflective piece that expressly explored the experiences that had occurred during the semester. His paper began with a short discussion of the communicative patterns that had been seen during the small group's Platform Phase:

Because I was new to these classes and seemed to have a disadvantage in age and experience compared to the other members, I decided to keep quiet. Lucila because of her limited English ability could not dominate the conversation for a long period of time.

He also expressed the discomfort that he felt when he was asked to talk about the book that he had read in the whole class format. "I felt that my knowledge was very inadequate."

He claimed that the communicative patterns that he had observed during the group's work were the following:

Debbie stepped back from the "initializing" of the group and had faded into the background. John or Barbara would speak at length upon an idea, and then put it to the group for a vote. Thus, Lucila and I were relegated to role of ratifiers of policy.

He claimed that this pattern continued until a "pivotal" meeting. Tom's reflections of the Naming Conflict Phase provide us with a great deal of insight about the influence of this compliance gaining action:

It was very hard for Debbie to convince John and Barbara that she was not blaming them, but just indicating what was happening in our group. This led to a brief discussion on the thought process. Unfortunately, while our group would always be aware of the group dynamics from now on, the group would never interact in the same way again, nor did we ever engage in the reflective process for more than fifteen minutes.

He stated that the E. G. Cohen (1994) article had given him great insights about his communicative behavior in the group. Notice how Tom connected the cost of his remaining silent. In the final paper, we see his recognition and his willingness to shed his desire to remain silent for the sake of the common good.

After reading this article, I realized that I was giving other members of the group more status than myself, simply because I was a "Histories guy" and not an "educated person" like the other members of the group. After recognizing this behavior and reading about it in Cohen, I decided to try and speak up more, even if it meant showing my ignorance about certain matters. I did not see what at first, that I had to offer the group, but as the unit progressed, I saw
certain areas where I could insert my own special knowledge to contribute to the group's work.

At the conclusion of Tom's paper he stated the paradox of naming conflict. He stated that he was never sure if his or Lucila's ideas were valued because of their integrity or because of the conflict that had been named. The issue that John raised in his dialogue journal about accommodation was further evidenced here. Tom claimed that he "wondered whether Lucila and my ideas were valued because of their worth or because John and Barbara wished to placate Debbie and just turn the unit over to us in order to show that they were not dominant." While we see evidence that Tom acquired a great deal of insight and knowledge from being a member of a cooperative learning group, the paradox that he presents about his experience is an important aspect to consider when engaging in the naming and analysis of conflict.

The platform is maintained

John's paper presented a very different dynamic. His angst about groupwork was further evidenced here. His paper opened with a statement which laid claim to his platform about groupwork:

From the beginning, this class posed a number of interesting challenges to me many of which were a direct result of the personal beliefs and experience that I brought with me to the classroom.

Further, he claimed that (a) students should be given the option of working alone if that is their desire, (b) group participants should be given prescriptive roles to play, and (c) it is "impossible" to process about and do a task simultaneously.

Thus, in John's final paper we see ample evidence that his beliefs from the very beginning of the course were in direct contrast to the beliefs promoted in the Curriculum Course.

From the get go, I wanted to create the unit right away and have it done. I saw processing within the group as actually getting in the way, preventing us from doing what we were "suppose" to be doing. I felt the pressure of a deadline.
Earlier in the paper, I invoked the claims of Pajares (1992) who suggests that it can be particularly challenging for college institutions to engage teachers and teachers-in-training in change because its "students have commitments to prior beliefs" that are deeply rooted. In the Curriculum Course, the professor created an educational setting that was not reflective of the deeply rooted cultural beliefs of John. As such, he was challenged to set aside his cultural beliefs for the brief moment of this course in the hopes that he would stretch his thinking about learning and teaching and possibly even adopt the professor's beliefs about empowerment education (Willett and Jeannot, 1993). Though John was given the opportunity to expand his thinking, he did not adopt this method as his. Rather, he maintained that the unit was built on accommodation and he was not pleased with the outcome. Thus, for the brief moment of this course, we are given ample evidence that John's beliefs were deeply rooted and, as such, were quite resistant to change.

**Conclusion**

I believe that Tom, Lucila, and John each provide important insights about the process of groupwork to us. Each presents a very different dynamic to this process that should be given important consideration. Lucila had been distanced by the group. Tom had chosen not to have a voice in the group's process. John had entered into the course with beliefs in contrast to the tenets that were being promoted. McCutcheon claims that conflict is a normative behavior in groupwork (1995). She claims that in order for a participant to be an active member of a group they must be willing to shed their individual desires for the sake of the common goal and be willing to share their individual beliefs (1995). Further, she claims that groups made up of diverse members are more likely to have conflict (1995).
I maintain that cooperative learning is a highly effective educational method when participants are willing to (a) focus their attention on the learning needs of their peers, (b) help shift the attention of their peers to explicitly relevant information, and (c) name and analyze conflict.

In this small group, all of the members were willing to focus their attention onto the needs of their peers and to shift the attention of their peers to explicitly relevant information. We see this in Barbara's willingness to provide assistance to Lucila. We see this in Tom's willingness to shed his desires to be silent and to pay attention only to members who are "easy to listen to" for the sake of the common good. We see it in Lucila's willingness to shed her desire to create a curriculum unit that was built in a certain order. We also see John's willingness to shed his individual desire in order to accommodate his peers.

Naming and analyzing conflict were not as easily obtained in this group. For various reasons members avoided and resisted the analysis of conflict. It is important to note that the primary conflicts that were evidenced were reflective of the central tenets of cooperative learning; namely, task versus process and harmony versus conflict.

During the Naming Conflict Phase, we saw evidence that when conflict was named it was not necessarily analyzed. Group members resisted the process of analysis as well as avoided the process. Thus, some of the significant conflict that was named went unanalyzed in this group. While the dialogue journals remained an important medium for a discussion of conflict, we do not see much evidence of its analysis in the group's talk. As a result, I believe that the group missed an important function that might have assisted in their process and product. Having stated that, I do believe that the Naming Conflict phase did serve a purpose in the group. We see evidence of this in terms of Tom's reflective paper and his participation in the group. We also see that Lucila was given warrants for speaking. The analysis of conflict, I
believe must involve the willingness to shed our individual desires to remain quiet in an effort to share with others, with the most sensitivity possible, our beliefs about the learning process. When those circumstances are met, I believe that this learning method can be a highly effective model of training NES and ESL teachers and teachers-in-training to be more prepared for a heterogeneous workplace.
CHAPTER 9
CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Summary of the study

Many cooperative learning theorists suggest that cognitive and social development are fostered when students from diverse abilities, cultures, and languages are heterogeneously grouped in mainstream classrooms that use cooperative small group learning methods in which teachers give students a task and allow them to design how that task will be achieved (E. G. Cohen, 1994; Johnson, Johnson, & Johnson Holubec, 1986; Johnson & Johnson, 1985; Sharan, 1983; Slavin, 1983 & 1985; Wang, Renolds, & Walberg, 1994). Learning theories, however, often reflect what is claimed about the "majority" of society's students and what is assumed about its "minority" (Cummins, 1984, pp. 1-2). Further, these assumptions are often "inconsistent and contradicted" with second language research evidence despite how "well intentioned" they might be (pp. 2-3).

Many educational researchers claim that American classrooms are increasingly becoming more linguistically and culturally diverse (Crawford, 1992; Cummins, 1994; Freeman & Freeman, 1988; Harnayan & Perlman, 1990; Molesky, 1988; Nieto, 1992; Ravitch, 1992). Nonetheless, "...most of the nation's teachers are white, monolingual, and female"...[and] most teacher training programs "use a monocultural approach; [and] train teachers like themselves" (Zeichner, 1992, p. 2). Further, the majority of students who are not yet proficient in English are currently being taught by monolingual English speaking teachers who have had no training in the areas of second language acquisition, bilingual education, or multicultural education (Vogel Zanger, 1989).
Educational institutions can offer teachers and teachers-in-training with the opportunity to explore, examine, and experiment with new teaching practices in order to become more prepared for the workplace, the classroom (Bailey, 1993b). Little research, however, has been done in this area (Bailey, 1993a). Therefore, it was important to study by using the tenets of ethnographic inquiry how teachers and teachers-in-training who are NES and ESL learners learned about cooperative learning practices in the college classroom.

The intent of this study was multi-fold. First, the process of groupwork is described as an interactional experience that involves issues of conflict, tension, and individual risk-taking behaviors (McCutcheon, 1995). Further, it is claimed that these behaviors can have a positive effect on a group's process and product when the willingness to examine and analyze differences, tensions, and conflicts through the risk-taking process of revealing one's experience, perception, and self are continuously present (McCutcheon, 1995).

These claims were at the center of this inquiry. First, I explored how conflict, tension, and individual risk-taking behaviors were communicated and subsequently analyzed in a cooperative group of diverse learners comprised of NES and ESL teachers and teachers-in-training who had enrolled in a graduate education course. Second, I examined how meaning was socially constructed through the examination and analysis of these tension, conflict, and individual risk-taking behaviors. Third, the purpose of this research was to acquire a deeper awareness about the practice of examining and analyzing conflict in cooperative learning settings comprised of NES and ESL learners.

The salient issues outlined by E. G. Cohen (1994), Johnson & Johnson (1985), McCutcheon (1995), and others were used in order to gain a deeper understanding of this learning model when it is composed of linguistically and culturally diverse learners. E. G. Cohen (1994) and the Johnsons (1985) claim that learning is enhanced
when it is a (a) highly active, (b) interactive process, and, (c) interdependent endeavor and that learning cooperatively enhances the promotion of social skills. McCutcheon (1995) claims that the examination and analysis of conflict, tension, and individual risk taking behaviors can have a positive effect on a cooperative learning group's process and product.

Willett (1993) suggests that the role of reflection facilitator can involve helping groups to think about their interactive process in order to achieve an understanding of the theoretical underpinnings of cooperative learning and to experience this phenomenon in action. I used the role of reflection facilitator as an orienting mechanism with which to understand the following set of primary questions in order to develop a keener understanding about the milieu of cooperative learning: (a) how are tension, conflict, and individual risk taking behaviors evidenced in a group of graduate students comprised of NES and ESL learners; (b) how is meaning socially constructed in a cooperative learning group comprised of NES and ESL learners through the examination and analyses of these tension, conflict, and individual risk-taking behaviors; and (c) how is the named analyzed conflict related to the process and product of the group?

This research put a cooperative group of graduate students comprised of NES and ESL teachers and teacher-in-training in a course, entitled "Curriculum Development for Heterogeneous Classes" at the center of its inquiry.

The project used the tenets of ethnographic research (Bailey, 1993b; Bloome, in press; Carbaugh & Hastings, 1992; Dascal, 1992; Erickson, 1996; Gumperz, 1982; Gumperz & Hymes, 172; Hymes, 1964; Schiffnin, 1994; Searle, 1970, 1979, 1990, 1992; Saville-Troike, 1989, 1996; and Spradley, 1980). Three types of analyses were performed. First, a broad analysis of the speech community was conducted and included a detailed description of the situated context of this speech community. A second analysis focused attention on small group weekly meetings in order to gain a
deeper understanding of the normative patterns that emerged over time. Third, a microanalysis of selected episodes of analyzed conflict was examined. Samples of these critical incidents were microanalyzed in order to gain a deeper understanding about the functions and meanings of tension, conflict, and individual risk taking behaviors in this speech community.

While there is a great deal that can be learned from this project, it should also be noted that the project had limitations. First, subjectivity exists throughout every research process (Peshkin, 1988). Reflection facilitators, such as myself, were encouraged by the professor to be facilitators, students, and researchers. This research project was based on the point of view that cooperative learning environments can enhance the promotion cognitive and social skills when they are comprised of NES and ESL learners. These roles and points of view might have contributed to subjectivity about this milieu.

Second, there were participants in this study who represented a different cultural experience and background than this researcher. Thus, it was difficult to gain a comprehensive understanding of the different cultural cues that operated in this speech community.

Despite these limitations, however, I believe that there is much that can be learned from this investigation. It can heighten our awareness about the implications of cooperatively grouping NES and ESL graduate students.

How were tension, conflict, and individual risk-taking behaviors evidenced in a group of graduate students comprised of NES and ESL learners?

Native English speaking participants had warrants for speaking during the first seven meetings. In addition, the participant who enacted the role of cooperating
teacher, a native English speaker, was seen to (a) create a structure for talk, (b) moderate talk, and (c) set the agenda for the group's talk.

An ESL learner was not given warrants for speaking during this first phase. This learner sought the group's collaboration in accomplishing their task which was distinct from the other members who presented their ideas in the form of declarations of the work they had completed independently. Finally, it was seen that a native English speaker of bi-cultural background chose to remain silent in deference to those with experience during the group's first seven meetings.

Gaining warrants for speaking

Cultural variabilities are important aspects in cooperative learning groups composed of NES and ESL members because they may represent contradictory beliefs (Carbaugh, 1994). In this study, one participant's cultural norm for acting was to remain silent in deference to group members who had experience. In order to participate in this small group, he needed to act in contradiction with his cultural beliefs. Thus, it was seen that his voice was rarely present in the group's talk during the first seven meetings and that this communicative practice reflected his cultural beliefs.

An important aspect to consider in group work is the element of social construction. This learner claimed that he should not have warrants for speaking during the group's Platform Phase because of his lack of experience. Despite the knowledge and experience that he had acquired by the group's eleventh meeting, he claimed that certain members continued to lead the group while he followed. The paradox inherent in group work suggests that learners need to set their individual beliefs and desires aside in order to become active and valued participants. The
absence of setting beliefs aside can have an important outcome that must be considered.

Groups are socially constructed and, as such, their rules for communicating are rooted in their talk. The dilemma seen in this study provides us with important insights about the problems of keeping silent. This learner did not see that his insights about the purpose of the course were something special. Thus, they were not part of the group's talk and, as such, were not included in the co-construction of their task. Hence, the group forged ahead without his important insights. The dilemma for those who choose to remain silent is that they might not be given the chance to have a voice in the process of groupwork simply because the rules for communicating may be well established by the time they are ready to contribute. Resistance to the process of groupwork may further exacerbate the problem.

Thus, each participant in a cooperative learning group must negotiate amongst a myriad of conflicting beliefs and desires (McCutcheon, 1995). Further, each member must be willing to stretch their thinking about their personal beliefs and desires and to expand their scope of understanding about the cultural variabilities that exist in cooperative learning groups composed of NES and ESL learners. As such, each member might have more opportunity to regard one another as important, valued, and special.

Further, the investment that students have in engaging in this process is an important aspect that cannot be ignored (Norton Peirce, 1995). Each student enters into this learning situation with their own reasons and purposes for being there. Thus, the process and product of groupwork may have differing meanings for each member. Further, the degree to which each member is invested in this process may have important consequences in terms of the level that each member is willing to negotiate amongst conflicting beliefs, desires, and agendas in order to attain individual and group goals and to maintain their identity.
Implications about the role of cooperating teacher

While I believe that the role of cooperating teacher offers an important and essential learning opportunity for all teachers and teacher-in-training, this study has revealed some interesting dilemmas about this role. An important consequence of this role in this small group in this Curriculum Course was in direct contradiction with the professor's intent. The role of cooperating teacher was performed by an NES learner who framed the group's talk, moderate each group session, and set the group's agenda. This small group accepted her leadership because they perceived her as an expert.

While I believe that the role offers the unique opportunity for NES and ESL teachers and teachers-in-training to learn 'in situ', it also speaks to the heart of cooperative learning. Cooperative learning is a social process where participants actively and interdependently work together to accomplish a common goal. The practice of a learning method and the simultaneous study of its theoretical underpinnings can have broad implications for our view of teaching and the impact these views might have on our societal practices (Bailey, 1993b; Jeannot, 1994; Willett and Jeannot, 1993). Here the professor created a critical course design that sought to "transform" the workplace so that NES and ESL learners would be regarded as legitimate and important members of their learning community (Jeannot and Willett, 1993).

While the intent of the professor was to create an authentic learning experience and simultaneously protect the integrity of the cooperating teacher and her students, the language that the professor used to describe this role in the course syllabus was of import. It was found that this language gave the perception of power to the person who played this role and about this role to the small group's participants.
Hence, this outcome must be considered with respect to teachers and teacher-in-training who participate as learners in the college classroom in order to learn new practices.

I believe there is the potential for participants to perceive the person who enacts the role of cooperating teacher as an expert on the curriculum, students, the course content, and so forth. There is the potential that the person who enacts this role may have similar perceptions. In this sense, it has the potential to put recruits who have not been trained in the principles of the Curriculum Course in the position of expert.

While the goal of the professor is to provide a task-based educational experience for the purpose of transforming teaching practices, I claim that this is highly dependent on whether the cooperating teacher truly grasps the whole purpose of the Curriculum Course. At issue is the central tension between authenticity and possibility. There is the potential that the traditional view of education, that is "to provide learners with the skills and attitudes needed to function in society as given," might be promoted (Willett and Jeannot, 1993). I make this claim because most of the nation's mainstream classroom teachers are NES who have been trained in institutions that "use a monocultural approach...and do not teach about cultural or linguistic diversity" (Zeichner, 1993) and have not had formal training in the areas of second language acquisition, bilingual education, or multicultural education (Vogel Zanger, 1989). There is also the possibility that empowerment education will be fostered (Willett and Jeannot, 1993). Thus, the tension between authenticity and possibility are of great import in this milieu.

Therefore, I recommend that the role of cooperating teacher be defined as a "limited leader" of the laboratory and that the role be entitled, "laboratory facilitator." Recruits might need additional support in the enactment of this role in order to better assure that the goals of the Curriculum Course will be fostered. However, this is not
to claim that these recommendations fully address the dilemma that might exist in instances where those enacting this role are seen to promote the status quo.

**Collaborative planning in the co-construction of task**

The ESL learner in this group frequently sought the group's collaboration in accomplishing their task. This was distinct from the other members who more frequently presented their ideas in the form of declarations of the tasks they had completed independently. Willett (1995b) distinguishes between cooperative and collaborative planning. In the former, each participant completes a task independently and then jointly attaches them to their peers' work while in the latter participants work together in order to complete a task (Willett, 1995b, pp. 2-3).

Evidence of both of these strategies were seen in this cooperative learning group. The cooperative learning strategy was seen to help move the task forward and to accomplish the task within the time constraints. The collaborative strategy was seen to help in the exploration of some of the aspects of the course's learning goals.

Willett (1995b) poses that collaborative planning is an important "strategy" in group deliberation because it provides each member with the opportunity to "consider the overarching goals of the curriculum, the objectives, the learners and their needs, and the [learning] activities" (p. 4). The desire to forge ahead as quickly as possible appeared to have prohibited members from engaging more extensively in collaborative planning. More importantly, the differences in planning styles distinguished members into two categories: resource interdependent and resource independent.

I suggest that the distinctions seen between those who engage in cooperative versus collaborative planning might be an indicator of participant "value" because it points to the possibility that students may frame their beliefs around their perceptions
and misconceptions of particular interdependent versus independent acts. Further, these acts might "politicize" participants into positions of power or powerlessness depending on how these acts are framed (Erickson, 1996, p. 294.). Thus, those who engage in the act of collaborative planning might be regarded as an asset or a problem depending on how their peers frame attitudes about the culture of collaborative planning in groupwork. Those who believe in collaborative planning are more likely to grant such power laden "goods" as valuable to those who engage in this act, while those who do not believe in collaborative planning are less likely to grant these important values.

How was meaning socially constructed in a cooperative learning group comprised of NES and ESL learners through the examination and analyses of these tension, conflict, and individual risk taking behaviors?

Conflict was named and analyzed during the group's eighth meeting. Reflective questions and a segment from the group's transcripts were provided to each participant at this meeting (See Appendices D and E). Analyzing the conflict that was named was not easily obtained in this group. The participants resisted the process of analyzing the named conflict in the small group setting. The dialogue journals and participant interviews were seen as important mediums for the discussion and analyses of conflicts.

All of the participants, however, indicated that the Naming Conflict Phase helped them to understand the tenets of heterogeneity as well as the process of groupwork. For example, the cooperating teacher claimed that naming the conflict helped her to better understand the role of cooperating teacher and the needs of her small group peers. A second participant acknowledged the act of naming and analyzing conflict as having an important function in the group's process in terms of
paying attention to the needs of others and in helping him to learn about the tenets of the Curriculum Course. One learner claimed that the group needed to acknowledge the conflicts that were named in order to recognize their meaning in the group. She believed that each member needed to make these important connection in order to carry these to their workplace.

**Instruction versus education**

This participant identified an important aspect of groupwork. She claimed that the group needed to acknowledge the conflicts that had been named. Further, she stated that the group must acknowledge that there were problems in order for the group to solve the problems.

The participant pointed to two critical aspects about the purpose and design of the Curriculum Course. First, this course offered teachers and teachers-in-training the opportunity to apprentice a new practice, study the ideologies of that practice, and engage in a dialogue about these apprenticeships and ideologies. Second, she claimed that the group needed to acknowledge what she had stated in order to "solve the problem" of granting her a voice. While I agree with the participant's point wholeheartedly, I am not certain that the type of acknowledgment that she desired in this situation would occur simultaneously because I believe that education is distinct from instruction.

Instruction occurs in the classroom. Being educated about a new practice may not occur at the same moment as being instructed. Here lies a critical point made by Willett (1995b): "one brief semester could never cover everything there is to know about teaching heterogeneous classes; rather we must continually learn from one another, from our students, and from the scholarly literature..."
I believe that the purpose of the course was to experience and examine these problems in order to be educated. Being educated may not necessarily occur simultaneously with being instructed. Education occurs over time and through a cyclical process of exploration and reflection. Hence, students in the Curriculum Course had the opportunity to experiment with new ideas and practices with the hope that they would carry some of what they learned to their workplace in order to create a more just society (Willett & Jeannot, 1993; Bailey, 1993b).

How was the named analyzed conflict related to the process and product of the group?

Each participant was given warrants for speaking in this small group after the named conflict meeting. The participant who had been silent was slightly more participatory in the group's meetings, as seen in a quantitative analysis of turn allocation. Feedback one week after the named conflict meeting from outside resources (the professor and whole class participants) in response to this small group's draft presentation also had a significant impact on the group's communicative pattern. The feedback served two important functions in the group's work: (a) it legitimized the ESL learner's contributions and (b) it fostered a collaborative dialogue about the tenets of heterogeneity in relation to the group's task.

Implications to consider about the function of feedback in cooperative learning groups

In this course, there were multiple opportunities for participants to be engaged in reflecting on the practice and principles of groupwork. Interestingly, however, the group was engaged in one large activity which provided feedback from members "outside" of the group, their professor and classmates from the Curriculum Course.
This feedback engaged the group in collaboratively analyzing their work and provided each member with significant information about the process of groupwork and their task.

This suggests that feedback from outside resources might have an important function in groupwork and merits further investigation. While the role of reflection facilitator provides a unique opportunity for a small group to reflect on its practice, it might be important to analyze the effects of feedback from outside sources (such as the professor and other small groups) as a mechanism to further engage learners in the process of reflecting on their work.

In addition, the participant interviews were an important opportunity for participants to engage in reflection and might have important implications in the analysis of conflict. We should explore the possibility of providing participant interviews as a possible added element that encourages reflection.

Accommodation versus deep analysis

In this paper I have invoked the claims of McCutcheon (1995) in order to examine the paradox that occurs by being a member of a cooperative learning group. Each participant must be willing to set their individual desires and beliefs aside while simultaneously take a risk and reveal individual beliefs that might be in direct conflict with group peers. One member revealed that he was willing to set his individual desires aside for the sake of accommodation but was not willing to reveal his personal opinion at the risk of appearing insensitive. These important concerns were not part of the group's talk and the group missed an important opportunity to examine these concerns deeply.

The paradox of groupwork should not be ignored. Each member must be willing to set their individual agendas and beliefs aside for the sake of the common
goal and at the same time be willing to share with others their beliefs, experiences, 
wisdom, and speculative hypotheses about the concepts that are being promoted and 
the relationships that these have with the group's purpose. While McCutcheon (1995) 
points to the importance of sharing our beliefs with others, we cannot minimize the 
difficulties and tensions that exist in accomplishing this important function. As such, 
I believe that an analysis of conflict can play an essential role in groupwork when 
participants are willing to set their to individual desires to remain quiet aside in an 
effort to share with others, with the most sensitivity, their beliefs about the learning 
process. When these circumstances are present, I believe that this learning model is a 
highly effective method of training NES and ESL teachers and teachers-in-training to 
be more prepared for a heterogeneous workplace.

**Conclusion**

The purpose of the Curriculum Course was to provide teachers and teachers-
in-training with an opportunity to explore the needs of diverse learners in 
monolingual content classrooms. It provided a rich opportunity for teachers and 
teachers-in-training to create new ways of thinking. The prediction that American 
public schools will become more culturally and linguistically diverse and the notion 
that students can be more active and might learn best by being participants in 
cooperative learning communities emphasizes the importance that courses, such as 
the Curriculum Course, can offer our field and in so doing will further to promote the 
ideals of learning.
APPENDIX A
PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

September 11, 1995

Doctoral students in the Educ. 697T, Developing Curriculum for the Heterogeneous Classroom, and I will be studying the nature of interaction in teacher preparation classes designed around the principles of cooperative learning and the influence of this interaction on learners' perspectives. This letter is a formal request for your permission to quote anything that you write or say as part of this course. We anticipate presenting and publishing this research at conferences, in scholarly journals, and in the doctoral student's dissertation. It is also possible that excerpts may be quoted in published articles by other researchers.

All activities, assignments, readings, field work, and presentations have been designed and will be used to help participants meet the goals outlined in the course syllabus for the class. Instructional principles will guide the interactions and decisions throughout the term, not the concerns of this research. In particular, audio-tapes of small group sessions, dialogue journals, and observations of our work will provide a large part of the data base for this research. Further, any transcript data pertaining to you can be made available upon request at any time.

Students are under no obligations to participate in this research project by giving permission to use their exact words or ideas in the research that is published. Grades for the course will not be affected by whether you give permission. We will strive to protect the anonymity of participants by using pseudonyms instead of real names. Given the number of students in this study, there is a small risk of being identified, however, we will make every effort to minimize this risk. Further, participants may withdraw their permission at any time during the study.

Thank you for considering this request.

Sincerely yours,

________________________________________  ________________________________________
Jerri Willett, Principle Investigator  Deborah Zacarian, doctoral student

Yes, I give my permission for my exact words and ideas to be quoted in the research described in this letter.

________________________________________
Signature:

Date:

Permanent Address:

Telephone Number:
APPENDIX B

PARTICIPANT INTERVIEW GUIDE

1. Could you comment on your experiences in working in cooperative learning groups prior to taking this course? Please cite examples.

2. Could you comment on your experiences in working in a heterogeneous learning group prior to taking this course? Please cite examples.

3. Were there ways that made your experience of being in a heterogeneous learning group different from your experience of being in a homogeneous group? Please cite examples.

4. How did you feel about the role that the teacher had during this experience? Did it differ from the experiences you have had in other types of classes? Please give some examples.

5. What did you find helpful or not helpful in terms of your learning? Could you please give examples.

6. Could you give an example of how you think that the experience of being in a heterogeneous cooperative learning group might have been more beneficial?

7. Do you believe that there were particular behaviors which helped you learn? Please give examples.
8. Do you believe that there were particular behaviors which did not help you learn. Please give examples.

9. Could you describe any of the behaviors of your or other group members which you believe contributed to the strength of your group? Please give examples.

10. Could you describe any of the behaviors of you or other group members which you believe contributed to the weakness of your group? Please give examples.

11. Did you change or rethink any of your ideas based on something that another member said? Would you please give examples.

12. What do you believe are the most important aspects of groupwork?

13. Were there any particular group discussions or controversies that you found to be the most helpful in your learning. Would you please give examples.

14. Could you briefly describe your overall evaluation of being a participant in a cooperative learning group?
APPENDIX C

COURSE SYLLABUS

Dr. Jerri Willett
Fall 1995

Education 607T

TEACHING HETEROGENEOUS CLASSES

This course is concerned with the theory and practice of teaching heterogeneous classes and meeting the needs of diverse learners in monolingual content classrooms. The underlying assumptions are:

All learners have strengths from which new information and skills can be acquired
All learners can contribute to a learning community
All classrooms are heterogeneous
All learners learn better in challenging, interactive, multisensory, meaningful and supportive environments.

The course aims to meet a variety of needs in one integrated course and to model the principles presented in the course.

Approach

The class will be divided into Curriculum Development Teams. Each team will have a cooperating teacher from a local school whose classroom will become the laboratory for a Curriculum unit that the team will design or modify. Teams will work collaboratively to gather information, materials, resources about the content that must be taught and about the particular teaching approaches or modes they decide to use in order to deliver the content (problem posing, simulation, literature based learning, laboratory experiments role playing, multimedia projects, students as ethnographer, survey research, etc.) Teams must work within the constraints of the particular classroom to which they have been assigned, as defined by the cooperating teacher, but members will do their best to incorporate the ideas that are being dealt with in readings and class discussion. During the process of developing the unit,
students will be discussing and reading about issues connected with teaching heterogeneous classes.

The principles of interactive, integrated, collaborative, multicultural, multisensory, language promoting, supported, authentic learning in heterogeneous groups will be presented and discussed as teams prepare their units and presentations. Teams will be expected to incorporate these principles into their units and presentations.

Each team will also have a reflection facilitator whose job it is to help the group reflect on their own group processes as they engage in collaborative curriculum design. The facilitator will correspond with each member of the team through a dialogue journal. The purpose of the journal is to help members reflect and to give support and assistance during the process of collaboration. The facilitator will also conduct group discussions about the processes and outcomes of the team collaboration.

Each member will become a "resource" to the team by reading one assigned book dealing with an important principle or concept associated with teaching heterogeneous classes. Other members of the team will not have read the book so it is important for the resource person to help the team incorporate the principle or concept into the team project. All students reading the same book (one member from each team) will meet together once during the full class meeting (see booktalk) to discuss the book.

Team members will also read one book in common. These books are typically narratives of teacher-researchers who talk about how they worked to meet the needs of their students (e.g., second language learners, learning disabled learners, genders learners, reluctant learners, etc.) The purpose of this reading is to help the group become more sensitive to the needs of such learners in their laboratory classroom and to modify instruction accordingly.
Around the middle of the semester, drafts of the units and information about special needs of the students in this particular classroom will be presented orally to the whole class in order to get peer feedback before the unit is taught. Team members will present what they plan to do, the materials they plan to use, information about the students for whom the unit is intended, and why they are doing what they are doing.

Other students in our class will provide written feedback to the team. Based on this feedback the team will revise their units and then the unit will be taught by the cooperating teacher. Those members of the team who are available to help the teacher document what happens during the implementation stage of the unit and those unable to present during the implementation will prepare the data (e.g. transcribe tapes, photocopy written work or field notes, etc.). The team will reflect on the data collected as a Team. Each member will write an individual reflection paper on the process and product of their team's efforts, using whatever data, analyses and readings are relevant.

At the end of the semester, each Curriculum Team will present their Units visually at a Faire (e.g., display the units, the students' work, principles used to guide the design and implementation and meta-statements about how the unit meets the needs of a diverse classroom). Colleagues, friends, and supervisors will be invited to the Faire to view the work.

Content

Several layers of content will be covered in the course through experiential and reflective learning, including:

a) language and content integration
b) innovative teaching approaches
c) mini-knowledge base about teaching second language learners with and without special needs at the middle school age
d) principles of "whole language" learning and teaching
e) collaborative teaching and learning
f) multicultural curriculum development
Resources for this content include the professor, readings, other materials, films, community members, the UMASS library, and other local resource rooms, and the students themselves. Content teachers will be important resources for content teachers, who must learn how to work with second language learners. Bilingual students and/or teachers will be important resources for monocultural/lingual teachers (and vice versa), who need to work with learners from other cultures. Students with varied majors and backgrounds will be important resources for helping us to learn about content from varied academic perspectives. The success of the class depends on all of us contributing our knowledge and skills.

Schedule: The whole class will meet from 6:45 to 8:00 and in their teams from 8-9:30.

1. Sept. 11 Overview
2. Sept. 18 Collaborative Learning
4. Oct. 2 Developing learning communities in diverse classrooms
5. Oct. 11 Treating status problems
6. Oct. 16 Making lessons comprehensible
7. Oct. 23 Reflecting on group process
8. Oct. 30 Team 1 Draft Presentations (6:30-7:30)
   Team Meetings (7:30-8:30)
   Team II Draft Presentations (8:30-9:30)

13 The original course schedule, as it is written in this Appendix, was modified in order to meet the smaller size of the class (i.e. there were five small groups as opposed to six. As such, the Nov. 13th class was divided into two segments: (a) Draft presentation of Group V from 6:30-7:30 and (b) Small group meetings from 7:30-9:30.
9. Nov. 6 Team III and Team IV Draft Presentation (same schedule as above)
10. Nov. 13 Team V and Team VI Draft Presentations (same schedule as above)
11. Nov. 20 Observing Student Learning
12. Nov. 27 Emergent Issues
13. Dec. 4 Emergent Issues
14. Dec. 11 Curriculum Faire and Multicultural Potluck
15. Dec. 18 Final papers due

Required Readings
1) Two assigned books (one in common with your team; one different from the others in your team).
2) Various resource articles and materials that will be handed out.
3) Team selected reading needed to complete your projects.

Assignments
1) Students will keep dialogue journals with their reflection facilitators (emphasis Professor Willett's) in which they will reflect on the content, theory, and collaborative process as they work in their heterogeneous groups. Weekly entries should be written on loose-leaf paper to facilitate the dialogue process. There is not set format to follow, as you will negotiate among yourselves what works. The journals will not be graded but they will be seen by the professor (when the course is over) and be used by the reflection facilitators to complete their projects. Others will not see your journals without your permission.

2) Students will participate in the planning and modifying, implementing, researching, and presenting of their team's unit (emphasis Professor Willett's).
The best presentations are always the ones for which team members were well prepared conceptually and have worked collaboratively. This conceptualization comes from reading and discussing the concepts with one another early on in the semester. The best ideas come from brainstorming and building on one another’s idea. Sometimes teams will automatically assume that the more experienced students or teachers in the team have the best ideas and those with less experience either fail to contribute ideas or others fail to hear their ideas. This is a mistake. A true collaboration works with all kinds of ideas, even those that may at first seem off the wall or unworkable. It is the playing around with diverse, even contradictory ideas that contributes to unique and dynamic units and presentations.

In addition, to ideas and knowledge from team members, you should gather materials from as many sources as possible -- including the UMASS library (ERIC is an important resource that I expect everyone in the class to know about by the end of the semester). There are books and catalogues in the CDCR resource room and the cooperating teachers should be able to explore the resources available to them.

Timely preparation for this aspect of the class is absolute. If you cannot meet this requirement, then you should take the course at a later time when you are able to participate fully. As the class will be getting much of the content of the course from student presentations, they are depending on a quality presentation for their own learning.

3) Provide **written feedback on each team presentation (no more than one page each)**. (emphasis Willett). This feedback should be a genuine personal response to the presentation in a collegial manner and should be given directly to the team.
Make enough copies of your comments for each member of the presenting team and keep one copy to turn in at the end of the semester.

4) Students will write a final paper (10-15 pages) in which they reflect on what happened with the unit that the team developed and implemented and how the ideas encountered in the course will affect their teaching. The papers should incorporate their personal experiences and reflection as well as reflections on the concepts and theories introduced in class and in assigned readings.

5) Students will observe and/or interact with diverse middle school learners in order to become more sensitive to their developmental, personal, cultural, and academic needs. Reflection on these experiences should appear in the dialogue journals. Your Cooperative teacher is willing to have you observe his or her class (how this is to be done is left up to the individual teachers and their team members). Observing learners and getting the necessary information from them requires tact, sensitivity and time. One of the best ways to get to know the students is to assist the teacher with some kind of activity and perhaps to give feedback to learners on some of their writing assignments. If you are unable to participate directly, then you will need to use the data collected by members who are able to observe. Instead of observing, you should take on the responsibility of getting the data in a convenient format for the whole team (e.g. transcribing a tape or photocopying relevant student work.) It might also be possible for those who cannot observe to correspond with selected students in the class through a dialogue journal. What you have learned about individual learners in the class should be reflected in the unit design. The cooperating teacher must have the last word on this aspect of the course, however, since his or her first responsibility is to the kids.
6) Students will **complete all assigned readings** and any reading that the team deems necessary for completing a quality unit and presentation. If you do not keep up with the reading, you will find yourself the brunt of resentment and the cause of considerable anxiety. Since any class is jointly constructed by all participants, the success of the class depends on all of its members contributing their best thoughts, reflections, and ideas. Nevertheless, to deserve these contributions, we as a group must be sensitive to the needs and challenges faced by the individuals in the class. For example, some of the class members will be second language speakers and may read more slowly than native speakers. On the other hand, those who have not interacted much with people from other cultures, may have difficulty relating the reading to experiences and therefore may take longer to internalize some of the concepts.

**Evaluation Procedures**

The course will be offered for a letter grade with an option for pass/fail. Students will be evaluated on their effort, participation and growth in the learning activities listed above, rather than on a fixed standard of individual achievement. This participation should demonstrate a developing awareness of the concepts, skills, and theories presented in the readings, presentations and discussions and a promise of continues growth after the course finishes. Full attendance is expected. If you miss a class, you should let your team know that you will be missing and find out what you need to do to keep up with the team. You should also borrow the tape recording of the team meeting and listen so that members do not have to fill you in on decisions and discussions. Finally, you should request an alternative readings assignment and submit a reaction paper to this reading. This option is more time-consuming than attending class, so use it only if you have no other choices. Attending your team's presentation is mandatory for course credit.
Since students will be working in teams, grades will reflect the growth and collaborative learning, as well as individual learning. Since a teacher's primary role is to support individuals' learning, the support you give to others is considered more important than anything else you do in the course. As you will discover, if this type of learning is new to you, collaborative learning is not easy. I expect that growth will be gradual and far from perfect. What I am looking for is a genuine effort to examine your own learning in this area, to explore new ways of becoming a better collaborative learner, to understand the nature of collaborative learning so that you might better create the conditions for collaborative learning in your own classrooms.

Since this is a heterogeneous class, it is not expected that all students will be performing at the same level at the end of the semester. Some students are new to everything (teaching, collaborative learning, the content of second language learning, the U.S., my classes, etc.) while others have had considerable experience in all these areas. Newcomers may find this way of learning a little different and confusing at first, but by the end things usually fall into place. Don't panic-- it is the responsibility of everyone in the class to give your assistance. For those of you who are more experienced with this kind of teaching and learning (or the content), it is important for you to challenge yourself to think more deeply than you have in the past about the issues the course raises. I have been teaching these classes for seven years and I learn something new every semester. The content of this course is embedded in all of the activities and happening in the course rather than isolated for you -- if your learning seems to slow down, just shift your gaze a bit.

At the end of the course each individual should submit to me a final reflective paper and their reaction to the five presentations to me (which will be returned with comments) and submit to their reflection facilitator their completed dialogue journal (who will turn them into me after they have finished their analyses).
If you do not receive the grade you wish, you may take an incomplete in the course and resubmit the paper later after receiving feedback. Any student who received a grade low than a B- will automatically receive an incomplete with feedback on how to revise the paper. Late papers are acceptable as long as you give me a target date for finishing the paper. You will receive an incomplete in the course until you are able to complete the work.

READINGS

GROUP READINGS (A list)

RESOURCE READINGS (B list)


APPENDIX D

REFLECTIVE QUESTIONS FOR
SMALL GROUP'S EIGHTH MEETING

1. How does this group reflect on process?

2. Do these reflections take into account the learning needs of all members?

3. What role do differences among our group members make in terms of how we reflect on and how we learn about heterogeneity?

4. What is important to consider about our individual, cultural, linguistic, and educational experiences?

5. Are we addressing these differences?

6. Upon, reflection, what and who influences what we talk about?

7. How do these influences promote or hinder our group's process?
APPENDIX E

TRANSCRIPT NOTATION

The following transcription notation used in this paper has been adapted from Bailey (1993b).

[+] - Rising intonation
[.] - Falling intonation
 [=] - Connects two turns of talk with virtually no pause between them

[(3)] - Pause in seconds
[0] - Unintelligible
(.) - One beat pause
[/] - Overlap speech
[ha] - Laughter by speaker
[:] - Lengthened vowel sound
[^] - Interrupts a turn of talk with no pause between
APPENDIX F

TRANSCRIPT SEGMENT FROM THE GROUP'S SEVENTH MEETING

Excerpt 28

100  **Lucila:** We should still get together.
101  **Barbara:** Yeah.
102  **John:** Yeah we should.
103  **Barbara:** Yeah, right.
104  **Lucila:** I am a member of [names an institution] and even though, uh, though I have a reception on Wednesday, I don't mind I won’t go at 3:30, um, the, it will go until well 3:30 to 5:00.
105  **John:** The way I see it is that we are all busy, we all have tight schedules like Tom with his afternoons and we have some working people who don't have the morning or the days so, so it seems like there is always going to be something missing and it seems like we are just going to have to go with it and it's uh, it's just the way it is going to have to be.
106  **Lucila:** So he will be better after 5:00? [referring to Tom].
107  **Debbie:** You would be better after 5:00?
108  **Lucila:** Yeah, this reception, [name], it starts at 3:30 and goes until 500. Oh, it's okay, I guess I cannot go.
109  **John:** Yeah.
110  **Lucila:** I guess I just not go?
111  **John:** Yeah.
112  **Lucila:** The first time I could really come is at 5:30.
113  **Barbara:** The best time for me would be in the late afternoon. Well school ends for me on Wednesday at 1:00 that is when the kids get out and I don't know 5:30, well I could do it, but I would hope that we could meet a little earlier.
114  **John:** Well, I am free on Wednesday so. Now for Thursday, I am not going to be able to miss my class so I will have to leave at 11:15.
115  **Barbara:** That's fine, that's fine
116  **Lucila:** And we cannot meet on Thursday?
117  **John:** Thursday during the day?
118  **Debbie:** Could we all meet before class on Monday? Does anyone have class before this one?
119  **John:** The Histories do, he has class right up until 6:30.
120  **Lucila:** How about Thursday?
121  **Barbara:** Actually, I could meet until 4:30, actually no, I can't I have to leave right after school.
122  **Debbie:** So Wednesday, it's the best time for to whole group?
123  **Barbara:** Yes
124  **John:** Yes
125  **Barbara:** Well, we can come up with consensus now, like 4:00.
126  **John:** 4:00.
127  **Lucila:** Oh boy, that would mean that I couldn't go to the reception.
128  **Debbie:** Are you being honored?
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