

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 333 336

CS 010 593

AUTHOR King, James R.
 TITLE Structural and Social Metaphors in Reading Recovery Training.
 PUB DATE Dec 90
 NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Reading Conference (40th, Miami, FL, November 27-December 1, 1990).
 PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS Educational Research; Grade 1; Higher Education; Primary Education; Program Descriptions; Reading Programs; *Teacher Education; *Teacher Educators; Theory Practice Relationship
 IDENTIFIERS *Reading Recovery Projects; Richardson Independent School District TX; Scaffolding; Zone of Proximal Development

ABSTRACT

A study described the theoretical, procedural, and social knowledge bases that comprise Reading Recovery as they unfolded during a year-long teacher leader training program. Subjects included seven teachers (including the researcher) enrolled in 18 hours of graduate coursework required for the year-long teacher leader training program. Data were collected for the entire duration of the training program. Fieldnotes, interview transcripts, and artifacts from the context (texts, handouts, etc) were collected, dated, and bound. A method of modified analytic induction was used to synthesize data into emergent categories. During data analysis, multiple data sources were used in an effort to triangulate any phenomenon. Results indicated that the major metaphors that permeated the training were: (1) working in a zone of proximal development; and (2) scaffolding instruction within that zone. Results also demonstrated the pervasive authority of the text in the training for teacher leader training and in the training for Reading Recovery teachers. (RS)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

ED333336

Structural and Social Metaphors in Reading Recovery Training

James R. King

University of South Florida

This paper will be presented as part of Symposium 78 at the National Reading Conference, Miami, FL, December 1990.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

James King

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

CS010593

Introduction

From August of 1989 until May of 1990, I participated as a member of a Teacher Leader Training Group in Reading Recovery. From the beginning of the training, I was involved with two separate, yet complimentary agendas. These were: to learn the theoretical, procedural, and social knowledge bases that comprise Reading Recovery; and to record these knowledge bases as they unfolded during the training year. During the training, and certainly during subsequent analysis of the collected data, I have realized how our acquired knowledge, as trainees, influenced the roles we played in the social context of training (Research Note 1). One purpose of this paper is to describe aspects of the social structure of the training group in which I participated. I also realized that much of our shared knowledge and my understanding of the training was framed in metaphors. So, the following description is framed by the different metaphors for the social relations in the training. To do this, I have chosen to write in what Van Maanen (1989) calls a reflexive narrative mode.

Background

Reading Recovery is an early intervention reading program, designed to bring at-risk first graders into average band performance within a twenty week, one-on-one program. The program is based on the work and the research of Marie Clay, and was first used in New Zealand, where it is still a functioning program. In the United States, that program is interpreted and administered by reading faculty at the Ohio State University. In Reading Recovery (RR), specially trained teachers each work with four at-risk first graders, a typical effort for RR teachers. This comprises half of the teachers' workload. The remaining parts of the teachers' workloads have been construed differently in different implementation models. But whatever implementation model is selected, a major effort in the program is the year long training provided for the new RR

teachers. Descriptions of the components of RR lessons, management of programs, politics of implementation, and other descriptive writings are available in the literature (Clay, 1987; Lyons, 1989; Pinnell, 1987). The purpose of this account is to provide some idea of what the year long training is like.

Starting out as a Teacher Leader

Seven of us showed up in late August at RISE Academy in the Richardson, Texas Independent School District (RISD). Three of us had relocated to new apartments in new cities. Three others drove across the Dallas-Ft. Worth metroplex in a daily commute. And the final participant was from the RISD. So, for the most part, we were new to the training site, and we were simultaneously adjusting to several new contexts. For this training, becoming a teacher leader meant giving up something old (a job, a house, a city, at least temporarily) to gain something new. For me, I'd left the role of higher education teaching to return to full time student status. We had all enrolled for the eighteen hours of graduate coursework, which were required for training at the Teacher Leader level.

Levels of training: A structural hierarchy

One of the first hurdles the seven of us encountered was learning the roles, the titles, and the pecking order of the different positions in RR. We were training to be Teacher Leaders. This meant that upon completion, all seven of us would be certified to implement Reading Recovery at a site. For the six trainees besides myself, this meant going back to their school districts, who had financed this year of training, and starting up Reading Recovery by training a group of RR teachers. Our trainer for Teacher Leader status in RISD, was Billie. Two years ago she spent the year in Columbus, Ohio, being trained in RR and studying with the faculty at OSU. That year of training certified her as a Teacher Leader, which she became during in her first year of implementation back

at RISD. Billie's partner in the first year was Diane, a Teacher Leader also trained by the OSU faculty. After the first year of implementation at RISD, Billie returned to OSU for additional training during the following summer to pick up certification as a Teacher Leader Trainer. It was in this capacity, during the following fall, 1989, that the seven of us, in training as Teacher Leaders, encountered Billie.

RR Teachers are usually, though not always, former primary grade teachers, preferably with first grade teaching experience. In RISD, the applicants for the limited RR training slots for teachers were interviewed by a team which included the two trainers, the coordinator for at-risk programs, and at least one RR teacher. If selected, the applicants enrolled in six hours of graduate course work, agreed to attend a summer workshop, and, of course, committed half of their teaching work to RR. Unlike the training for a RR Teacher, availability of slots for Teacher Leader training, the training level for my group of seven, did not reach the level of a limited commodity. Rather, eligibility for training depended on the sponsoring school districts' willingness to support a teacher leader during the year of training. This, of course, is part of the districts' willingness and ability to commit district resources to the RR program. The seven Teacher Leaders in training all had at least Master's degrees in education, as the Teacher Leader training is at the doctoral level. In at least one case, a second choice for the Teacher Leader training was sent because the first choice candidate had not yet completed her MA. Eligibility for Teacher Leader Trainer status (Billie's role) is less clear. But two different sources of information provide some notion of the additional effort and control required. First, Billie returned for a summer at OSU after one year of implementation at RISD. This was after spending the year prior to that in training as a teacher leader at OSU. The additional summer qualified

her to become a Teacher Leader Trainer. Second, when I was nearly at the end of my training year as a Teacher Leader, a university offered me a faculty position, where I would be a Teacher Leader (one who trains RR Teachers) and simultaneously, a Teacher Leader Trainer (one who trains Teacher Leaders).

Since RR, as it has been implemented in Ohio, is a program distributed through the National Diffusion Network, there is a mechanism for "quality control." That means that a program cannot claim to be Reading Recovery without an approval from the OSU coordinators. While this decision making is now moving to a national committee, at the time it was in the hands of the OSU faculty in RR. In order to implement RR at this proposed university site, the OSU faculty in Reading Recovery stipulated that I spend the summers of 1990 and 1991 in Columbus, Ohio; that I plan to make three extended visits to Columbus during the 1990-91 academic year; and that I plan for several site visits from the OSU faculty to the proposed implementation site. The content and purpose of these visits was not specified by the coordinators, but Carol Lyons did say that the intent was to "fill in for the gaps in my training at the Teacher Leader level." Their major concern was that I hadn't experienced the politics of implementation.

Based on the preceding anecdotes, it is reasonable to conclude that the RR approach to training is a top down hierarchy, with knowledge, procedures and permissions coming from the power levels above. Training as it is practiced in RR, is an internship program, designed to model and shape teaching and administrative procedures. Simultaneously, the training imparts a theoretical perspective to its participants and socializes them into acceptable belief systems through behavioral modelling, sanctioned interaction structures, and allowable discourse frames. While the preceding sounds like an induction to a restricted environment, such a hasty and surface level analysis does not do

justice to the extensive degree of hierarchy that does exist. Conversely, such cursory analysis does not describe the privilege that is inherent in the society surrounding the RR program. Nor does it examine the the underlying empowerment for teachers that is nurtured within this society.

Becoming Reading Recovery

In our work with children and in our work together as learners, there is a pair of powerful metaphors that we used as guideposts. The first of these is Vygotsky's (1962) Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). While RR is in theory and practice decidedly child-centered, it is also goal oriented toward more complex literacy, toward independent deployment of literacy in classrooms, and most pragmatically, levels of measured literacy that warrant "discontinuing" from the reading recovery program. The tension between these two perspectives is the angst that contextualized teacher decision making in our daily work with children. We worked daily based upon what we had discovered about the child the day before, and based on a less concrete goal of independence that would translate into successful work in classroom literacy. These two ends of a continuum form a ZPD for the child's literacy growth. Similarly, teachers' work between centering on the child and moving that child toward independence created the ZPD for teachers growth as decision makers. These two perspectives were the theoretical linch pins of our work with children and training work with teachers. The first two notions, child centering and independence, are consistent frames for analysis when teachers in training navigate within Zones of Proximal Development with their clients "behind the glass."

A second underlying metaphor for the program was that of scaffolding. While a single teacher worked with a child, the rest of us watched and analyzed the teaching moves. We attempted to infer the underlying thinking by the teacher that would have warranted such moves. As we observed and critiqued teaching,

our attention was directed to ways the teacher might have scaffolded (Wood, Bruner & Ross, 1976) the work of the child. It was a shared belief that the children should not experience failure and the frustration that accompanies it. Children's experiences with failure were seen as failure by teachers to make the most productive decision in a given situation. In training for the teachers, the same beliefs held true. And the orchestration of attention between teaching behaviors as they affected the child, and analysis of those behaviors as they related to the teacher under scrutiny, and by extension, the teachers outside the glass, was the work of the Teacher Leader, who directed the discussion.

Examples of the intricacy of this reciprocal scaffolding occurred each time the discussion behind the glass was conducted by a guest Teacher Leader. Teacher Leaders' stylistic differences in communication caused some anxiety on the part of the participants outside the glass. For me, this anxiety gave way to voiced contention on at least one occasion. The issue of disagreement was whether or not a child who was reading aloud behind the glass was doing so in a fluent manner. I thought so. The guest Teacher Leader thought not. After some struggle with this issue, the leader suggested that we wait and discuss it with the teacher. A resolution for what constituted fluent reading was not formed, but the mechanism for conflict resolution for discussion behind the glass was invoked, and that was the end of the disagreement. And, true to the metaphors of scaffolding, and within my own ZPD, in a later class Billie, made the disagreement the focus of the teaching which followed the lesson. In this way the differences became the curriculum which was derived from the observed lesson. The point of this anecdote is that the underlying problem was my response to an aggressive, more confrontational style of discussion, a style I perceived as nonsupportive, and without appropriate scaffolding. Of course, with additional exposure, I realized that there are also different training

styles for Teacher Leader Trainers.

Such critical analysis and reflexive re-analysis (Ruby, 1982) is, in turn framed by two additional metaphors: teacher as knower, and productivity. In teacher as knower, all participants agreed that the teacher behind the glass had the most valued perspective, and the broader knowledge base for decision making. Our outside-the-glass critique, as a result of teacher as knower, spoke of "options," and "choices." So that moves by the teacher behind the glass were neither "right" nor "wrong." At a given decision point, the Leader of the discussion that occurred outside the glass might have prompted observers with "Talk about what you see [the teacher] doing." After some discussion directed at identifying evidence of strategy use, a follow up comment from the Teacher Leader would likely have been "What other options did [the teacher] have?" And finally, the discussion Leader might have asked "Which would be the most productive choice? Why?" So, the range of possible choices was identified and evaluated by the discussion group. Since the teacher behind the glass was the knower, these were merely possibilities, until they were checked with the teacher.

In the context of a current lesson, the step of the lesson that was occurring, the lesson focus or foci set by the teacher, and the appropriateness of the choices made by the teacher in lesson decision making (e.g. timing, materials, sequence) were considered in evaluating the teaching moves. However, I do not mean to suggest that these factors or procedures were used overtly as any evaluation rubric. Rather, the different factors used for critique were in the realm of the Teacher Leader. These issues of materials, of timing, of sequence were available to the participants as shared knowledge, but it was the discussion leader who chose what part of the evaluation rubric we were to use as a focus. When a choice for focus was selected by the Teacher Leader, then

discussion centered on the productivity of the teacher's decision. "Was that a productive choice?" was a question I often heard, and later used myself to promote discussion as a Teacher Leader.

Productivity appears to be a balance of factors considered simultaneously and holistically. When asked to consider the productivity of a teaching move, we look at the focus for the lesson, and whether the task that manifests the decision making would be a consistent representation of the goal for that child in that lesson. Also considered is the amount of time the task requires, and to what extent completing the task puts the child in an empowered position. Billie often asked us to observe and decide "Who's doing the work?" With this question, she simultaneously directed our attention to the productivity of the teaching and the level of the independence of the child's task completion.

So, major metaphors that permeated our training and our teaching were working in a Zone of Proximal Development and Scaffolding instruction within that zone. Our ZPD's were hueristics used to make decisions for children from child centered perspectives, yet moving towards independence and eventual discontinuance to a normal literacy life in classrooms. Scaffolding permeated our training, but was most salient in our discussions outside the behind the glass lessons. Because the teacher behind the glass "knew" and we could only guess, our efforts at understanding and at becoming a credible teacher were simultaneously supported. The issues of "good" and "bad" teaching were made less threatening with the use of productivity.

Textual Authority

In addition to the authority embedded in the structural hierarchy of leadership roles, there was the pervasive authority of text in the training for Reading Recovery. In Teacher Leader Training and in the training for Reading Recovery Teachers, three texts by Clay were systematically used. Instructional

procedures are taught from and checked against The Early Detection of Reading Difficulties (Clay, 1987) or "E.D." Accuracy of our work with students and appropriateness of our choices was often gaged by how closely they matched the written procedures in E.D. Clay's (1979) Reading: The Patterning of Complex Behavior, known as "Patterning," was also used in both Teacher Leader and in Teacher training. Patterning was most often used as background reading, assigned in advance with the purpose of providing a basis for class discussion about the content, or to contextualize the procedures found in E.D. Observing Young Readers (Clay, 1982) was used in the Teacher Leader training as the research base for Clay's theory and procedures found in the other two texts. In addition, two large binders of duplicated readings were used in the Teacher Leader class to either support or contrast with Clay's positions.

One common way E.D. was used in both levels of training was to support argument. We were asked to "Find it in E.D.", with accompanying praise for the one who found the information in E.D. first. Several of my training partners attached colored plastic tabs to critical or useful sections in E.D. We all underlined, highlighted, and annotated this text. Further, Billie modelled text notation when she showed us her much inscribed text. We were also provided with insert text to clarify ambiguous materials and provide additional examples. We were instructed to cut out the override text and tape it over the matching part of the original text. While these text moves are not atypical from a reading/study perspective (Andre & Anderson, 1978-79), they appeared significant as ritual that intensified the importance of the text as a source of direction, and guidance. This seems even more important when I consider that these same words and study behaviors are being re-enacted at the other teacher training sites around the U.S. and Canada. When Billie read the an earlier draft of this manuscript, she responded in a corrective way to my mention of the

words "outdated" and "confusing" as descriptors for E.D. She wrote "Clay doesn't consider, nor do I, ED to be outdated - notes may be inserted for clarification as needed by teachers." For me Billie's comments reflect her concern with being represented accurately. They also point up the pervasiveness of the very issue of text as authority. Her call to "Clay" and the permission she gives teachers with "may be inserted" illustrate her trust in E.D.

These texts were also used to invoke the presence of Billie's training mentors. When she opened her E.D. and shared an annotation, a clarification or an addition, Billie also shared the source. Frequently, this meant an anecdote either about the time she wrote this bit down, or about the origin of the text, and most certainly about the characters whom the textual bit evoked. In this way, E.D. also served as a social connection between the the different lives of Reading Recovery Training. Barbara Watson from New Zealand was a frequent spirit who entered our class through the medium of Billie's E.D. Likewise, Gay Pinnell, Diane DeFord, and Carol Lyons from Ohio State University taught us through Billie's annotations. Billie's site leader, whom she shadowed into the public schools, often made her presence known to us through Billie's stories based on text markings. And, of course, the words of Dr. Clay were frequently used to contextualize her own writing.

Mentoring in layers

Mentioning the presence of "outsiders" to our training group in ways that caused us to view them as sources of guidance was a technique Billie used often. Throughout our training, a generalized notion of "Dr. Clay" was created and reinforced through readings, discussion, and through storytelling. In this narrative milieu, Dr. Clay emerged as the researcher, the university person, the one interested in pushing the parameters of the Reading Recovery approach.

Barbara Watson was characterized as the program person most closely connected

with implementation of RR in the schools of New Zealand. This interpretation was corroborated when a graduate student from my university reading program returned from a year's training in New Zealand with the same impressions from a first hand perspective. It was further supported when Dr. Clay visited the RISD program in January of 1990.

More immediately for Billie, and therefore for our training group, was the invocation of the training staff at OSU. Long before Gay Pinnell or Diane DeFord made site visits to RISD, we had heard of them, and we were provided insight through Billie's reference to them in class. Later, the seven of us in training met these people at the Ohio Reading Recovery Conference. My peers remarked how these corporal entities were either similar or dissimilar to the characters we'd assembled based on Billie's introductions through anecdotes. From my perspective, both Billie and Diane had created social slots for each of them and our interaction in Columbus felt like a social cloze exercise. And around me, in both the Teacher Leader training, and in the training for Teachers, Billie and Diane were cited as a "knowers" and as sources of direction. This is especially important in a broader view where my training partners are now training new reading recovery teachers in their respective school districts. In their classes, Billie's presence will be felt long before she pays a site visit to each of these six sites. And Billie's words, and Billie's versions of her mentors' words are now being inscribed into the texts of these would be Reading Recovery Teachers. When she read this section of a rough draft of this manuscript, Billie commented: "This is scary. I hope that rather than 'knowers' we can be viewed as searchers. Perhaps we need to really be cautious about this."

Quality Assurance and Reality Consensus

Observing procedures as they were executed by teachers and simultaneously

critiqued by other teachers was one way we learned what productive teaching moves looked like. The "behind the glass" lessons taught by the members of the training groups gave us opportunities for on-line analysis of teachers' decision making. Personally, I viewed the teaching in dichotomous ways - that is - "good/bad." This may have come from years of training and observing preservice and inservice teachers. More often than not, I felt comfortable that my evaluative stance was not out of line with what constituted effective practice within reading recovery criteria. However, the fact that I may have generated evaluations of teaching-behavior-as-product that were similar to those of the other trainees and those of the trainers, misses an underlying difference in the ways I thought going into the training and what I eventually internalized as an effect of the training. What I learned is outlined in the description that follows.

As mentioned, discussion of a fellow trainee's teaching was a regular aspect of our class meetings, both for the Teacher training and for the Teacher Leader training. In virtually every class meeting, we observed two distinct half hour lessons. While a teacher taught behind the glass, the Teacher Leader asked for comments from the observers. In the initial stages of training, when we were grappling with procedures, we labelled what was happening. For example, we identified texts that the child and teacher worked over. We learned how magnetic letters and sentence strips were integrated into the lesson flow. We also discussed the parts of the lessons and the management of these lesson parts within a framework of limited time. As we grew more knowledgeable, we evaluated the use of the letters, texts, markers and other lesson artifacts. The operating metaphor that was used most consistently by the Teacher Leader was "productivity." Frequently, we were asked "Was that the most productive use of time?" With a thirty minute restriction on lesson length, time was made a

limited commodity (Fabian, 1983) and productive use of a scarce commodity (Gross & Averill, 1983) was the underlying rubric for discussion. Solutions for higher productivity were cast as options available to the teacher at a given decision point. These options were presumably, though not directly stated, limitless, and were most often generated by the observing critics. At a final level, which occurred in the second semester of training, we compared what we collectively interpreted from behind the glass with what the teacher had previously written as focus for the lesson. While the productivity and efficiency metaphors were still used, their power was somewhat counterbalanced by the performing teacher's intended focus for the lesson. This meant that some comments were overruled because they failed to consider the teacher's plans for the lesson. However, based on the collective wisdom formed from the observation of the child's levels of competence, the teacher's goals themselves were subject to the same scrutiny of productivity and efficiency.

At the Teacher Leader level of training, this same process was used, but the very act of critiquing to generate options became itself the object of a second level of critique. Because the role of the Teacher Leaders was to engender and support risk taking on the part of the observing teachers, our focus during a lesson was split between the ensuing lesson behind the glass, and the social context of lesson processing which occurred outside the glass. At this level of analysis, our questions for the other Teacher Leaders sounded like "Was the discussion of [some aspect of the lesson] the most productive use of time in order to move the teachers' beliefs?"

Counterbalancing the socially constructed critique was a belief that none of us knew the child better than the Reading Recovery Teacher who was teaching behind the glass. This belief was reinforced by the many hours all us had spent with our own clients, as well as an ethos of professional respect for each

other's work. To accommodate this mutual respect, observers were asked to give feedback to the teachers following observed lessons. It was during this interaction that teachers were simultaneously held accountable for teaching decisions and also invited to contextualize their notable decisions that may have generated discussion among the observers. At this point the teachers contributed new, possibly hidden, and privileged information about their clients. In Billie's words: "We don't know it all. We are not the authority. Rather we negotiate. If two authorities disagree, then they need to work it out, together."

This interaction structure and its discourse rules were initially modelled for us by the Teacher Leader Trainer during our first few weeks, and were subsequently shaped by the Leader's insistence for respect for the teacher and reliance upon data based feedback. "What did you see?" was a frequent call for reliance on data. The frames for our feedback sounded like: "I noticed you _____. Tell me about that." "What were you thinking when you _____?" Later, when the Teacher Leader group became more sophisticated, we were involved in the planning that occurred immediately after the two lessons and immediately before the discussion of those two lessons. At that point, I learned that the notable features of the lesson, as it was observed by the Teacher Leaders, were used to teach the needed concepts or procedures. As a result of lessons observed during the previous week's site visits, from the curriculum of the training, or from the readings, there were topics, such as the use of cut-up sentences, necessitated as teaching agendas for the evening's class. When possible these imported topics would be merged or contextualized with the data from the observed lesson. In this way, the discussion of lessons was also appropriated for instruction of the Teacher Leader's agenda.

Outside-In Perspectives

It would be a mistake to label my training as a type, an approach or a philosophy. First of all, I don't know what the label would be. But secondly, it is for me not a good idea to pigeonhole the experience. With that caution, I'd like to look at the RR training from the perspective of feminist pedagogy. It may seem presumptuous for the only male in this training to write about women's reality as an organizing framework. Yet, there are aspects of this lesson observation and discussion experience that are similar to the issues raised by Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger and Tarule (1986) concerning women's ways of knowing and women's construction of reality (Harding & Hintikka, 1983). One clear parallel is in the notion of collective decision making. At first, this characteristic may seem in opposition to mentioned structural and mentoring hierarchies, as well as textually based authority. But in my training, the paradox was more hueristic than pragmatic. This was due to the way Billie negotiated the information and authority sources within the social context of the class. Her approach was one based on the notion that there was a right way to execute procedures (authority based knowledge), but shaped by the awareness that the teachers in training would benefit most from discovering and verifying the effectiveness of productive decision making in given social contexts (social constructionism). While one could argue that Billie's version of teachers' self discovery is more likely "guess what's in my head" (Vacca & Vacca, 1986), it becomes a moot point relative to the insiders' view of the training.

According to Gilligan (1982) "the essence of moral decisions is the exercise of choice and willingness to accept responsibility for that choice" (p. 67). In retrospect, a consistent agenda in the RR training was to provide a framework for making informed decisions about children, about literacy, and about instruction that empowers children to their own control of literacy. From my perspective, it is significant that participants (other than myself) were

female. That single fact appears to have had a major effect on the training context. Gilligan (1982) also suggests that "women [can] feel excluded from direct participation in society, [that] they see themselves as subject to a consensus or judgement made and enforced by the men on whose protection and support they depend" (p. 67). This perception can lead to "...a sense of vulnerability that impedes these women from taking a stand...[a] 'susceptability' to adverse judgements by others, which stems from [their] lack of power" (p. 66).

Much of Billie's work with us, the group of seven Teacher Leaders in training, was intended to establish our ability of make judgements about the quality of what we observed. The evaluation rubric for our judgements was based on content knowledge of RR theory and procedures. This information was provided in readings, anecdotes, and teased from observations. However, in the process of learning to make these judgements, we also learned a moral framework for decision making. Similarly, the training for RR Teachers dealt with procedural and theoretical knowledge bases for RR teaching. And both Diane and Billie shaped a decision making process in their teachers.

I do not mean to suggest that the fact that the participants were female was in any way a detriment to or a limiting factor for the training experience. Rather, I see it as a contributing factor. Gilligan (1982) characterizes women's disenfranchisement from decision making as "drifting along and riding it out..." creating the effect of "experience of women caught in opposition between selfishness and responsibility. Describing a life lived in response, guided by the perception of others' needs, they can see no way of exercising control without risking an assertion that seems selfish and hence morally dangerous" (p. 143). For me, this paradox seemed to create a willingness for and tolerance for ambiguity, and a readiness to "question the idea that there is a single way to

[teach] and that differences are always a matter of better or worse [productivity]" (p. 143).

In the discussions about the teaching that occurred behind the glass and during the debriefings which followed them, this model of decision making of "choice with consequences" was consistently used. Productivity, vis-a-vis the children's work, and feedback based on observers' data, were the framing metaphors used by Billie and Diane (and eventually by us all) to shape our moral development into RR's received ways of thinking and talking about what we believed. Gilligan (1982) also uses a contrast between hierarchial and webbed social relationships to contextualize women's moral development.

Webbed social structuring relies on interconnectedness and a wish to be at the center of that connection (accompanied by fear of being at the edge). Despite perceived differences in power distribution, things will be fair, and everyone will be responded to and included. No one will be left out or hurt. It is as if awareness of power hegemony was a fact of life and once acknowledged, was set adrift. Our process learning and construction of RR knowledge was a webbed social experience. In contrast, hierarchial models of social relations suggest inequality, separateness, fear of others and closeness. In some ways observance of the RR pantheon, and our respect for scripted knowledge, both from text and from authorities, suggest an additional, hierarchial social structure operating in the training. While these two frameworks may seem incompatible, I think they were orchestrated to complement each other in training. Perhaps an alternative perspective would shed light on this paradox.

Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger and Tarule (1986) present a taxonomy of women's ways of knowing. One way to know is received knowledge. For men, knowing from others, or recieved knowledge, is often based on identification

with authority. But women, who usually do not encounter other women as authorities, tend to view themselves outside the dichotomous relationship of "Authority-right-we" (p. 44). Of course, women do listen and learn in social contexts, but according to Belenky, et al (1986), it is with a connected perspective, rather than one that is dichotomous and separate. Consequently, women who value and use received knowledge tend to use it for self-advancement "only if it is clear that self-advancement is also a means of helping others....that they can strengthen themselves through the empowerment of others is essential wisdom" (p. 47).

Certainly, the presentation of the non-negotiable content of RR (lesson structure, record keeping, data procedures, etc.) were clear cut examples of received knowing. And consistent with Belenky et al. (1986), advances in knowing that distinguished a knower were shared with the group. Penny, a member of the the Teacher Leader training group, frequently shared information management techniques with the rest of us. We also shared notes taken from the different placement sites, and suggestions from individual practica. These were routinely brought to class and shared. At the time, I saw these as unoffensive, yet self centered attempts at individual enhancement. I don't think that that analysis is adequate or even correct anymore. Quite similarly, self advancement was also possible in terms of effective teaching with children. The underlying trope of "advancing children" was a factor in that productive teaching helps the first grade clients and provides model for other teachers.

For Belenky et al. (1986), the framework of hierarchial and webbed knowing are recast as "separate" and "connected " knowing. While both kinds of knowing are based on procedural knowledge, separate knowing is textual, based on belief in authority, and subject to rigorous procedural inspection. It is characterized by a self separation and a mastery over the object (or person).

On the other hand, connected knowing is experienced based and relative. It is characterized by intimacy and equality between self and the object (or person). It is the connected knowing that closely matches the process training that permeated the learning of the content, or separate knowledge.

During each class, teachers told stories about their work with their children. On several occasions, Billie expressed some concern over the conflict she experienced regarding this. She was aware that the teachers needed to tell stories about their teaching in connected discourse frames. But she also felt a need to press the separate knowledge of text, procedures, and things she "knew" as a Trainer. Support for her choice is found in the notion of "sharing small truths" (Belenky, et al., 1986, p. 116). According to this idea, the forms connected knowing takes in discourse frequently approximate narratives, one type of which is gossip. "Gossip concerns the personal, the particular, and frequently the petty; but it does not follow that it is a trivial activity...The explicit information gossipers share concerns the behavior of other people; but implicitly, gossipers tell each other about themselves by showing how they interpret the information they share" (p. 116). Whether in gossip or in other narratives, we communicated "In connected knowing groups [where] people utter[ed] half-baked half-truths and ask[ed] others to nurture them. Since no one would entrust one's fragile infant to a stranger, members of the group must learn to know and trust each other. In such an atmosphere members do engage in criticism, but the criticism is connected" (p. 116). In our training groups this was certainly true. We told countless stories, and supported each others' telling of stories. When we did criticize, the discourse framing resembled Lakoff's (1975) hedges and tag questions. Often, comments were preceded with a self disclaimer attached to the front end of the statement. And, like Belenky's suggestion our "authority rest[ed] not on power or status or certification but

on commonality of experience." (p. 118)

1. Research Note: The data for this description were collected over a complete cycle of the event (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984), August to June, 1989-1990. Fieldnotes (Bogdan & Biklen, 1983), interview transcripts (Miles & Huberman, 1984), and artifacts from the context (texts, handouts, etc.) were collected, dated, and bound. A method of modified analytic induction (Bogdan & Biklen, 1983) was used to synthesize data into emergent categories. In this way, data collected one day influenced my perspective, and therefore what I looked for and collected the next day. Lincoln and Guba (1985) call this approach to research the naturalistic inquiry of symbolic interactionism. The "validity" of this paper is a function of at least three factors. During analysis, and even more so during the write up, I used multiple data sources in an effort to triangulate any phenomenon. A draft of the report was submitted to the participants (Diane and Billie) for its congruence with their views (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984). Its validity, or value, is also a function of whether or not it was written in a "believable style" (Van Maanen, 1988). I guess the final issue won't be apparent until we talk after you've read.

References

- Andre, M.L.D.A. & Anderson, T.H. (1978-79). The development and evaluation of a self-study technique. Reading Research Quarterly, 14, 605-623.
- Belenky, M.F., Clinchy, B.M., Goldberger, N.R., & Tarule, J.M. (1986). Women's ways of knowing: The development of self, voice, and mind. NY: Basic Books.
- Bogdan, R. & Biklen, S.K. (1982). Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods. Allyn and Bacon.
- Clay, M. (1987). Implementing Reading Recovery: Systematic adaptations to an educational innovation. New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, 22, 35-58.
- Clay, M. (1985). The early detection of reading difficulties, 3rd Ed. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Clay, M. (1979). Reading: The patterning of complex behavior. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Clay, M. (1982). Observing young readers. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Fabian, J. (1982). Time and the other. NY: Columbia University Press.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Goetz, J. & LeCompte, M. (1984). Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research. NY: Academic Press.
- Gross, M. & Averill, M.B. (1983). Evolution and patriarchal myths of scarcity and competition. In S. Harding & M.B. Hintikka (Eds.), Discovering reality (pp. 71-95). Boston: Reidel Publishing Co.
- Harding, S. & Hinnitka, M.B. (1983). Discovering reality: Feminist perspectives on epistemology, metaphysics, methodology, and philosophy of science. Boston: Reidel Publishing Co.

- Lakoff, R. (1975). Language and women's place. NY: Harper & Row.
- Lincoln, Y. & Guba, E. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Lyons, C. (1989). Reading REcovery: A preventative for mislabeling young "at-risk" learners. Urban Education, 24, 125-139.
- Miles, M.B. & Huberman, A.M. (1984). Qualitative data analysis. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Pinnell, G. S. (1987). Helping teachers see how readers read: Staff development through observation. Theory Into Practice, 27, 51-58.
- Ruby, J. (1982). A crack in the mirror: Reflexive views in anthropology. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Vacca, R. & Vacca, J. (1986). Reading in the content areas, 3rd Ed. Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman.
- Van Maanen, J. (1988). Tales of the field: On writing ethnography. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Vygotsky, L.S. (1962). Thought and language. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wood, D., Bruner, J.S., & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem solving. Journal of Child Psychology, 17, 89-100.