INTRAPERSONAL AND INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS IN THE CLASSROOM: NEEDS FOR AGENCY AND COMMUNION

By

BARBARA LEHMAN CARLOZZI

Bachelor of Arts
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan
1971

Master of Education
University of Houston
Houston, Texas
1978

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
December, 1993

INTRAPERSONAL AND INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS

IN THE CLASSROOM: NEEDS FOR

AGENCY AND COMMUNION

Thesis Approved:

Joseph Pearl

Thesis Advisor

Barbara Wilkerson

Paul Grand

Larry M. Perkins

Thomas C. Collins

Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I have read some funny acknowledgments, and would love to write one, but there are too many people who deserve my serious thanks. First of all, I would like to thank my parents who gave me a loving environment from which to begin my life, and then provided sufficient motivation to encourage me in endeavors such as this one.

To the teachers and students and administrators who opened themselves up to my scrutiny and shared their lives with me, I am deeply indebted. You permitted me to slip in and out of your lives and left me with a profound appreciation for our interconnectedness.

I am grateful to my advisor and dissertation chair, Dr. Joseph Pearl, for his support throughout my doctoral program. This support has included flexibility in course design so that I could pursue the interests associated with this dissertation, but, more importantly, Dr. Pearls' support has been by way of personal example. As a teacher and as a spiritual guide, he has been a quiet and reliable example for me to model.

A number of faculty members here at Oklahoma State University also deserve mention - not just the ones who provided Tylenol and moral support throughout the "summer

of my dissertation," but also those who encouraged me in a more direct way. Dr. Paul Warden introduced me to Robert Kegan's work, which left me feeling that I had at long last found a kindred soul within the field of human development. Professor Larry Perkins taught more than just the mechanics of qualitative research; he also fostered tremendous appreciation and enjoyment in the work of the qualitative researcher. Dr. Barbara Wilkinson helped with writing style and format and added much appreciated personal comments to my first dissertation draft.

To my friend and walking partner, Johanna, who has listened through all the trials and tribulations of this dissertation, I am grateful.

Finally, I want to thank my family for carrying on in my absence. Brian and Sara, you have been grownup enough to allow me the luxury of completing this work and gracious enough to let me know that I was missed. Al, your dissertation gave me the foresight to know that this task was both possible and difficult. More importantly, however, was your willingness to assume the role as sole parent while I sequestered myself in your office. Lastly, you accepted this arrangement with love and demanded only that I finish and give back your office. Here, with love, is the finished product, and your key.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter | Page

Chapter | Page

Chapter

Page

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Twelve years ago when I left a teaching career in the public school system, I began ruminating over my "successes" and "failures," successes and failures meaning, respectively, those students whom I had served well, encouraging their academic development and those who, for one reason or another, I felt I had not helped develop sufficiently. At about the same time I read a book by William Schutz (1958) called FIRO: A Three-Dimensional Theory of Interpersonal Behavior, in which he described three personality dimensions exhibited in varying ways by all people. As a result, I began thinking about my teaching experience in terms of these three personality dimensions.

The dimensions defined by Schutz were need for inclusion, control, and affection, which were postulated to differ among individuals from high, to ideal, to low need, with each of us remaining relatively stable over time on each factor. Inclusion was defined as the desire for interaction with others, for the purpose of knowing and being known by others; it involved prominence and the

recognition by others of one's individual identity. Control referred to the need for authority over others, and affection denoted emotional closeness between two people.

What impressed me about Schutz's theory in terms of my teaching experience was the degree to which students with whom I felt successful appeared to have needs for inclusion, control, and affection which complemented my own, while those with whom I felt I had failed had incompatible needs. In organizing my classroom, it seemed that I had arranged for my own needs to be met, but had not considered that the needs of my students might be different than my own. For instance, I valued emotional closeness and encouraged such things as paired learning and frank discussions among students, but not activities where students could meet needs for inclusion, for example, by participating in class plays or large group games. I began wondering how the satisfaction of interpersonal needs affected learning in the classroom and how other classrooms compared to my own.

A review of the literature related to Schutz' theory of interpersonal needs revealed nothing relevant to children or their academic performance in school. However, other research did suggest the importance of interpersonal needs and perceptions for students' academic performance. Schmuck and Van Egmond (1965), investigating interpersonal perceptions and academic performance, found that

satisfaction with the teacher and perceived status in the peer group significantly predicted academic achievement when familial social class and perceived parental attitudes toward school were held constant. Schmuck, Luszki, & Epperson, (1963) reported the results of a pilot study where teacher/pupil incongruence on general beliefs about standard classroom behavior accompanied low academic achievement. Additionally, research with college students indicated that students with high affiliation scores received better grades in classrooms where teachers were perceived as warm and friendly than in classrooms where teachers were not so perceived (McKeachie, 1961). (The same did not hold true for high affiliation students in less friendly classrooms or for low affiliation students in warm and friendly classrooms.)

The research reported above suggests a relationship between emotional and cognitive processes. Current research on attachment also emphasizes the interrelatedness of emotional and cognitive development. Cowan (1982) states, "The attachment literature suggests that there is a special and direct connection between relationships with people, emotional development, and cognitive growth" (p. 65). Parental responsiveness or sensitivity has been associated with higher levels of cognitive and social-emotional development in children (Ainsworth, 1982; Beckwith, & Cohen, 1989; Bornstein &

Tamis-LeMonda, 1989). Thus, despite the paucity of research on learning and personal relationships, the existing literature seemed sufficiently provocative to warrant further investigation of the area.

I then turned to related theorists. While doing so, I encountered the writing of Robert Kegan (1982), whose philosophy of constructive-developmentalism closely approximated my own philosophical beliefs. In his book, The Evolving Self, Kegan drew on the theory of D. Bakan, a theorist to whom I had previously resonated when he was cited in one of the few studies of individual differences in children's friendships. (See McAdams, 1984.) Bakan (1966) identified two central forces in the development of the individual, communion and agency. Communion is the need to be included, to be part of something larger than ourselves. Unlike agency, which is a doing state, communion is a being state. It involves openness, intimacy, and sharing, and is evident when we spend time with another simply for the pleasure of doing so. McAdams (1988) describes communion as an act of surrendering the self. It is related to the desire for intimacy, for closeness, and to compassion. When we are motivated by communion, we are interpersonally oriented, as opposed to instrumentally oriented; we are spontaneous, gentle, and yielding. An emphasis on communion during a problem-solving situation means that equality and support are fundamental to the process, and "voice" and loyalty

strategies are fostered. The process is cooperative and affectionate, but spontaneous and open.

Agency refers to the need to be a unique individual, autonomous and independent. It is the desire for separateness, protection, and control over one's environment. McAdams (1988) associates agency with assertion, protection, and expansion of the self. It is evident when one assumes responsibility, makes plans, and gives advice. We show our motivation to agency when we speak out, manipulate, and dominate others. Those who seek positions of leadership or prestige, who enjoy aggression or achievement, are motivated by agency. With regard to problem-solving, the agentic orientaion is evident when we become task-oriented, rather than people-oriented. It leads us to become authoritative, to take charge, assume responsibility, and to persuade others. McAdams (1988) regards helping behavior as agentic also, because it assumes an unequal relationship between the helper and the helpee.

Kegan's (1982) use of the term, constructive developmentalism, comes from the belief that human development is a process of constructing meaning, i.e., making sense of the world and one's place in it. This life-long process of defining reality takes place as the individual attempts to resolve the tension between the forces of agency and communion, forces which he identifies as central to the development of the individual. [Kegan

(1982) acutally uses the terms "independence" and "inclusion" instead of "agency" and "communion;" I have chosen to use the latter terms, but when discussing Kegan's theory, I will use his terms. No distinction is made between the terms "independence" and "agency" or between the terms "inclusion" and "communion."]

Recognizing the similarities between Schutz' terms inclusion, affection, and control and Bakan's terms agency and communion, I shifted my focus from the former to the latter conceptualization because the terms agency and communion were more consistent with my own philosophical orientation. As I explored Kegan's theoretical framework, I eventually arrived at certain questions that seemed to be at the heart of the problem which concerned me. Those questions will serve as research questions for this study.

Research Questions

1. How do students' differ in their needs for agency and communion?
2. How do students' needs for agency and communion interact with the corresponding needs of fellow students and their teacher?
3. How do the needs for agency and communion and the interaction of such needs among students and between student and teacher, contribute to/detract from the learning process, as designed by the classroom teacher?

Overview

This study, developed from my personal teaching experience, was designed to explore differing intrapsychic and interpersonal needs in the classroom. Building on the work of Robert Kegan, it set out to investigate the ways in which agency and communion were expressed in the elementary school classroom.

Because this was a new area of study, an exploratory design was selected to examine how students' differed in their expression of agency and communion, how students and teacher dealt with differing needs in the classroom, and how the agency/communion interactions affected the learning process.

Chapter II of this paper provides a rationale for the chosen methodology and a description of my philosophical orientation. It also contains an explanation of the dialectical perspective and a brief review of the literature, including a summary of Kegan's theory and a discussion of two studies of classroom interaction.

Chapter III describes the research design and the roles of the participants. It delineates the means of data collection, which were observations and in-depth interviews, the Friendship Motivation Scale, and the California Child Q-Set and a modification of this Q-Set.

Chapter III also describes the research sites and discusses the limitations of this study.

Chapters IV and V focus on the observations at the two schools, providing details about the teachers, student participants, principals, and general atmosphere of the two buildings.

Chapter VI presents the major issues which surfaced in these schools and discusses these issues in terms of agency and communion. The concluding chapter, Chapter VII, is a summary of the findings. It identifies the conclusions derived from these findings, suggests some possible implications, and makes recommendations for educators and future researchers.

CHAPTER II

PHILOSOPHY AND REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

It is customary to begin this section of a dissertation with a thorough review of the relevant literature. Given that most dissertations are written from a positivist perspective, where hypotheses are generated from the existing theoretical base, this is a reasonable procedure. However, increasingly researchers are beginning to question this philosophy and are choosing, instead, a qualitative research design, where the theory is grounded in the research (Reichardt & Cook, 1979,). For the present research a qualitative design was selected both because it is consistent with my philosophical beliefs and because it is also appropriate for an area of research that has insufficient theorizing from which to hypothesize. Although a brief review of the related literature is appropriate for a qualitative study, it is after the research has begun that theory is developed and/or related by the researcher to support his/her observations. For grounded theory, where one's research drives the theory, it would be antithetical to

begin with an extensive literature review. What follows, then, is a description of my philosophical position and a brief review of the literature; the bulk of the theorizing will be interwoven into the research analysis.

Philosophical Orientation

Any research project, and especially a qualitative study, is influenced by the philosophical position of the researcher, so it seems important to begin this section with a description of my philosophical beliefs. Lincoln & Guba (1985) describe four fundamental perceptions of reality which differentiate one philosophical belief system from another. The first of these is called objective reality (also naive realism or hypothetical realism) and is the basis for the positivist approach of orthodox science. Basic to this position is the belief that a tangible reality exists independent of our observations and that this reality is capable of being fully known by multiple persons. Naive realists offer as support of their belief in a tangible reality, the fact that independent observers, working separately, arrive at similar conclusions.

The second perception of reality is perceived reality and differs from the position of the naive realists only with regard to our ability to completely comprehend reality. Those subscribing to this belief system believe, like the naive realists, that a real world exists beyond

our experience of it, but unlike the viewpoint of the naive realists, it can never be fully known. Each of us has a unique perspective, which shapes our reality and will never be the total picture.

The third perception of reality, constructed reality, best characterizes my own position at this time. For the constructivist, perceived reality is constructed by our minds. Whether or not our constructions really exist can never be known. Because each of us has our own constructed reality, there are an indefinite number of ways to describe existence. The process of seeking truth becomes one of reaching general consensus between varying individual constructions.

The fourth perception, created reality, assumes there is no tangible reality, that what we recognize as reality is what we as participants create. This position, which is often so inconceivable to Western minds, represents, among others, the perspective of some adhering to Eastern philosophies who believe that none of what we experience as reality endures beyond our conceptualizations. (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Bochner, Cissna & Garko (1991), writing about metaphors for studying interpersonal interaction, distinguish a number of useful viewpoints or paradigms, but suggest that usefulness, not correspondence to reality, should be the criteria by which we adopt one of

these viewpoints. Dependent upon our particular focus, one viewpoint will yield a vocabularly more suitable than will another. Of the seven perspectives outlined by Bochner, Cissna & Garko (1991), the radical constructivist is most useful for my purposes.

The radical constructivist, like the aforementioned constructivist, believes that reality is constructed in the minds of the participants. Each individual has a mental map that incorporates past experiences and assists the individual in dealing with new situations. Because primary relationships tend to repeat interaction patterns, the mental map of each individual is especially influenced by these relationships. Additionally, since the researcher has her own mental map, every researcher is a participant in her own research. It then becomes critical for the researcher to document her beliefs, values, emotions, etc.

Review of the Literature

In seeking to review the current research on interpersonal relations in the classroom, it very quickly becomes apparent that a void exists in relationship research within the field of education. There is an absence of relationship-level research, as opposed to research which is individually centered. Existing research centers on the individual level, by studying the individuals who comprise the relationship. For instance, there is research which looks at teacher characteristics

such as power, immediacy, solidarity, and teacher communication style, typically examining the effect of these characteristics on student learning. As Baxter (1988) states when writing about relationship research in general, "[It is assumed] that relationship dynamics can be explained adequately by understanding the individuals who comprise the relationship" (p. 258).

This assumption has been increasingly rejected by current theorists (Baxter, 1988). Just as family systems therapists conceptualize the family as more than the collection of its individual members, so, too, must educators conceptualize a class (or school) as more than a body of students, teachers, and administrators. Every dyad, group, classroom, and school has its own unique characteristics that result from the interaction of its respective members and which cannot be reduced to a compilation of characteristics drawn from its individual members.

Lock (1986) goes even further than the above position by rejecting the assumption of pre-given individuality and asserting that what we come to think of as individuality is a construction of our own making, and a construction integrally bound to our relations with others. For example, the human infant develops language through interaction with caretakers and from the acquisition of language arises the capacity for thought. Lock (1986)

writes, "It is not the case that interaction facilitates [the development of individual abilities], as though they would develop anyway: rather, interaction must somehow constitute them - they would not develop without it" (p. 91).

Lock's point, a constructivist viewpoint, is that the idea of the individual loses its usefulness when we consider that each of us constructs our own meaning system based upon our interaction with the environment and each other. The significance of the above for future research is concisely articulated by Baxter (1988): "The individualistic perspective heads one down the theoretic path of cognitive psychology, whereas a relationship perspective such as dialectical theory focuses attention outwards on the relational situation" (p. 258). It is this relational situation that has been neglected by the field of education.

Powell & Nicholson (1986) in their review of teacher affect in the classroom, which is simultaneously a review of interpersonal relations in the classroom, acknowledged that a huge deficit exists with regard to our understanding of classroom interaction. Blumstein & Kollock (1988) and Hinde (1976) make a similar observation about the study of interpersonal relations in general. Powell & Nicholson's recommendations for future research, which included a call for more naturalistic, descriptive accounts of teacher-student behavior, are remarkably

similar to what a constructivist/radical constructivist researcher would do. Essentially, the call is for more holistic and integrated theoretical frameworks, for more process-oriented research, and for a less static view of human relationships (Powell & Nicholson, 1986; Duck, 1988; Duck, 1991). Implicit in the recommendations of Powell and Nicholson (1986) is the notion that research should consider interactions rather than variables or individuals or even collections of individuals. The broad theoretical framework from which this study has evolved is consistent with the recommendations of Powell and Nicholson (1986). In the next section I will describe that framework.

Constructive Developmentalism

As previously mentioned, constructive developmentalism is the philosophy underlying Kegan's (1982) theory of human development and is a transformation of Piagetian theory and those theorists who see humans as meaning-makers, specifically, the neopsychoanalytic ego psychologists, the neopsychoanalytic object relations theorists, and the existential phenomenologists. Kegan equates the process of meaning-making with what has previously been described as constructing our own reality.

A central aspect of Kegan's theory is that it reflects a dialectical perspective, rather than a dichotomous one. According to Baxter (1988), there are two

features of dialectics that are common to all dialectical theories: process and contradiction. By process is meant that all things are in a constant state of flux. Theoreticians with a dialectical perspective do not:

> think in terms of 'ready-made' things, whose properties and potentialities (they seek) to fix and determine once and for all....(D)ialectics refuses to think of things each by itself, as having a fixed nature and fixed properties...but it recognises that things come into being, exist and cease to be in a process of unending change and development... (Cornforth, 1953, p. 68).

With respect to Kegan's theory, the dialectical perspective means that human development is a constant, ongoing process and the researcher's goal is to capture the nature of this process in thick description. The quality of contradiction inherent in dialectics is the belief that all things exist in opposition to their polar opposite and cannot be understood in separation from one another. The tension between two opposing forces is the nature and very essence of the universe. The constructive-developmentalist focuses on the tension between the two opposing forces of agency and communion.

A primary component of constructive-developmentalism is an emphasis on the self as an active agent, in contrast to a position such as the Freudian where the individual is forever reacting to the drives of the id and superego, and

the ego functions much as a referee between these two super powers. For the constructive-developmentalist, the ego is the foundation of the personality.

This process of meaning-construction is the individual's attempt to make sense of the world and his/her place in it; it is the process of defining reality, our own being included. Kegan, in fact, defines person as a process as much as a thing. Like Piaget's theory, this process of meaning-construction takes place via our interactions with the environment; development is more than an unfolding of biological maturation. From infancy throughout the life-span, the individual is involved in this process of constructing meaning - indeed, the individual self is this process of meaning-construction. Kegan (1982) says,

> the most fundamental thing we do with what happens to us is organize it. We literally make sense. Human being is the composing of meaning, including, of course, the occasional inability to compose meaning, which we often experience as the loss of our own composure (p.11).

Our need for others is what David Bakan (1966) calls one aspect of the duality of human experience. He calls this the need for communion, the need to be included, to be part of something larger than ourselves. For the infant who, before birth, was part of something larger than

herself, there is the need to be cared for, protected from undue stress, and loved. The need for communion in the mature adult can be evidenced as the desire for intimacy or generativity or spirituality.

While the need for communion is one aspect of Bakan's duality of experience, the need for agency is the other. Agency refers to the human need to be a unique individual, autonomous, and independent. It is agency that propels the toddler toward forbidden objects despite parental disapproval. Similarly, agency motivates the young adult to leave home and begin a rewarding career.

Kegan (1982) proposes six stages of development roughly corresponding to the four stages of Piaget's cognitive development, with Piaget's stage of formal operations being divided into two stages and with the addition of a post-formal stage. Throughout our lives, in response to the tension between independence and inclusion, we tend to become overinvolved in one or the other of these two extremes. Kegan, using object relations terminology, refers to this as embeddedness, meaning that while caught in one of these extremes, we are unable to recognize and see beyond our frame of reference. The movement to a new stage of development is a reaction to the inadequacies of the previous stage and resolution is a stronger emphasis on whichever orientation (independence or inclusion) was de-emphasized in the previous stage. Again, using object relations terminology, Kegan refers to

this movement as one of differentiation from the embeddedness of the old center to reintegration of a new center.

At different times in our lives the emphasis will return to either the inclusive or independent frame of reference, but each time the new center will involve a greater degree of complexity. It is assumed that the individual is developing toward an ideal period where independence and inclusion are seen not as opposing forces, but as each facilitating the other, as two sides of the same coin.

Stage 0. The first stage is called the Incorporative Stage, where the child is subject to her[1] own reflexes, senses, etc. Timewise, this stage is commensurate with Piaget's Sensorimotor Stage and Loevinger's Pre-social Stage. Instead of being a person who has reflexes, senses, etc., the child in the Incorporative Stage is her movement, reflexes, senses, etc. There is no self from which to differentiate non-self and, thus, no self to distinguish from reflexes and senses. At the conclusion of this stage, when the child recognizes that she exists

---

1. To avoid gender bias, personal pronouns will be alternately masculine and feminine. The use of either the masculine or feminine orientation is unrelated to the content of the discussion.

as a separate being, the senses are recognized as something that belong to her, but they do not define her. Kegan believes that each new developmental milestone involves a loss, as well as a gain. In order for the child in the Incorporative Stage to move on to the next stage, she must give up that part of herself which we recognize as the senses and reflexes. Now they are no longer part and parcel of herself; they are brought back in relation to her as something she experiences, or, as Kegan says, they are "found" and reintegrated as "other." With respect to the tension between agency and communion, because the child at stage 0 has not developed a sense of self, Kegan does not yet position her on one side or the other of this contradiction.

Stage 1. Once the child realizes that he exists as a separate being, he enters the second stage, called the Impulsive Stage; a stage comparable to Piaget's Preoperational Stage, Loevinger's Impulsive Stage, and Erikson'stage of Initiative vs. Guilt. In terms of the agency/communion contradition, the stage 1 child is overinvolved in inclusion, assuming as he does that his perceptions, etc. are the same as everyone else's. Although he differentiates between himself and other(s), the stage 1 child is still blind to his own frame of reference, which in this stage is his perceptions and impulses. Saying that one is embedded in his own

perceptions and impulses is equivalent to Piaget's description of the preoperational child, where one's own perceptions are assumed identical to everyone else's. For the child in stage 1, the moon does, indeed, follow him around and his mother cannot be someone else's sister.

Kegan, however, adds to Piaget's description of this child by theorizing that it is not just the cognitive limitations which constrain the child in Stage 1; there is an affective element at work here, too. Since the perceptions and impulses are not differentiated from one's self, to acknowledge their separateness from one's very being, constitutes a loss, a giving up of what one is. Therefore, in order to achieve control of his impulses and affirm the differing perceptions of others, the child in stage 1 must reject a part of himself. Kegan adds that the perceptions and impulses are then reintegrated as object.

Stage 2. The Imperial Stage (Piaget's Concrete Operational Stage, Loevinger's Opportunistic Stage, and Erikson's Industry vs. Inferiority Stage), achieved by rejection and reintegration of one's perceptions and impulses, is characterized by a high need for control (or independence). Now that the impulses and perceptions are something that one has, the world can be manipulated for one's own benefit - if one takes control. Kegan (1982) describes the stage 2 child as "seal(ing) up," meaning

that "there comes as well the emergence of a self-concept, a more or less consistent notion of a me, what I am (as opposed to the earlier sense of self, that I am, and the later sense of self, who I am)" (p. 89).

The difficulty for the stage 2 child is that, sealed up as she is, and involved as she is in controlling her self and surroundings, she is unable to place needs, wants, interests, etc. outside of her self. I remember my son experiencing less family interest in baseball than he himself experienced, saying to us in painful seriousness, "If you don't like baseball, you don't like me." He was caught in a stage 2 frame of reference, where he was defined by his baseball interests and could not consider that either he or others existed independently of their interests or needs.

One consequence of the embeddedness described above, being stuck in one's needs, rather than able to see beyond them; is the absence of a shared reality. If I cannot step outside my needs, I cannot do the same for others, and therefore cannot coordinate my behavior with others. Kegan (1982) writes, "The intrapsychic consequence of moving the structure of needs from subject to object is that the person is able to coordinate points of view within herself, leading to the experience of subjectivity, the sense of inner states, and the ability to talk about feelings experienced now as feelings rather than social

negotiations" (p. 95). In order for the stage 2 child to move on developmentally she must come to the realization that acting only out of her needs does not take her where she wants to go. More mature individuals expect her to consider her needs and theirs as negotiable, rather than given. Furthermore, life cannot be easily manipulated according to one's needs so the stage 2 child's efforts at control are inevitably frustrated. With the recognition of needs as object, the tension between independence and inclusion, which in stage 2 has been so heavily involved in independence, shifts over to the inclusion side for stage 3.

Stage 3. This stage, called the Interpersonal Stage, roughly corresponds to early formal operations within a Piagetian framework and to Loevinger's Conformist Stage. Kegan (1982) says he believes Erikson missed this stage, which comes after Erikson's Industry vs. Inferiority Stage, and before the Identity vs. Role Confusion Stage. Unlike stage 1, there is now a differentiation between self and other, but the nature of that self is defined by those others with whom one is affiliated. If we think in terms of the adolescent or young adult, it is this embeddedness in inclusion which makes the adolescent so dependent upon the peer group. It is also what compels these individuals to retreat so forcefully from the nuclear family. Because there is, as yet, no true

individual identity and one's group determines identity, the person in the Interpersonal Stage must be very careful about which group he is aligned with. A person with a more developed personal identity, would not feel that the family affilation precluded a unique personal identity. On the other hand, a secure personal identity would not necessitate a strong association with a particular group.

At some point the person in the Interpersonal Stage begins to experience the difficulty of a group-dependent identity. Groups break up, conflict, and change, leaving a fractured sense of self. In addition, a group is a collection of individuals who differ among themselves, so the person with a group-dependent identity is subject to conflicting wants and values. As a result, there develops a desire for an individual identity that is defensible from one non-contradictory set of values. This is the move to the Institutional Stage.

Stage 4. Coinciding with Piaget's Full Formal Operational stage, Loevinger's Conscientious Stage, and Erikson's Identity vs. Identity Diffusion Stage, is Kegan's Institutional Stage which is characterized by overinvolvement in independence. During this stage the individual has an identity, but one that is like that of an institution where there is a set of rules or principles to define it and loyalty is demanded to maintain the identity. The individual is so overinvolved in setting up

a clearly definable identity, that contradiction is avoided in favor of a clear, consistent self. Kegan (1982) says that this stage is inevitably ideological and "probably requires the recognition of a group...to come into being" (p. 102). This group might be based on class, gender, race, religious affiliation, etc. In any case, the emphasis is on commitment, autonomy, and self-reliance. If development is to continue, the individual must begin to question this narrow focus in life and recognize a need to connect with others. Thus, begins the move to the final stage of constructive-developmentalism, the Interindividual Stage.

Stage 5. The final stage of the constructive-developmental theory is the Interindividual Stage, a key feature of which is openness to contradiction, the adoption of a dialectical, rather than dichotomous perspective. With reference to other developmental theories, there are similarities between this stage and Erikson's stages of Intimacy v. Isolation and Generativity vs. Stagnation, but the dialectical nature of agency and communion is absent in Erikson's theory. Piaget did not include this final stage in his theory and Loevinger's final stage, the Autonomous Stage, is fundamentally different from Kegan's.

The individual at this stage recognizes that reality is change, motion, process - not objects. There is a

necessary tension between independence and inclusion but this tension is desirable, not something to be transcended. Relationships between systems are recognized; the self is seen in relation to the rest of society, both present, past, and future. Intimacy is truly possible only at this stage of development when intimacy and autonomy are not seen as mutually exclusive, but instead are viewed as mutually enhancing.

Discussion. Kegan's dialectical perspective of development and his elaboration of the tension between agency and communion are significant contributions to the study of human development. What is missing from his theory is an acceptable explanation for variations in development. Gender differences, for instance, are explained by suggesting that women spend longer in the Interpersonal Stage, while men spend longer in the Institutional Stage. Since there is some evidence to suggest that women are more capable of intimacy than men (McClelland, 1985; Rubin, 1983), which could place them in the Interindividual Stage before men, this explanation of gender differences is insufficient.

More generally, though, constructive-developmentalism has not adequately addressed individual differences in development. The dialectical perspective has not been applied to the concept of stages, in general. The theory allows for either stage advancement or delay, with no

other provision for problematic development. Additionally, there is no accounting for the severity of abnormal development. Kegan (1982), himself, notes that he groups together people who appear quite sick and people who seem to be considerably less so, although he believes this is defensible because of the shared similarities between these people.

Nevertheless, I believe that ultimately this theory must also be able to account for differences between people in any particular stage. Perhaps there are differences in degree of embeddedness so that the individual who might be called sick is more deeply embedded than the one considered to be less so. Or, if we conceptualize the individual like a landscape, as Jacqueline Klein and M. Balint do, each of us is an integrated arrangement of varying features with layers that may contain faults (Klein, 1987). Klein, paraphrases Balint:

> In this landscape are features caused by long-ago events; mountains and oceans, scarps, crags, and valleys left behind after major upheavals; millennia of weather and the slow grind of glaciers have had their effects. Now plants cover the earth; not immediately apparent in the landscape are faults in the geological structure - faults not in the sense of errors

> or sins, but weaknesses in the terrain, where the ground may crumble and crack in times of strain (p. 321).

Klein's and Balint's metaphor allows for variety in a way that Kegan's theory does not. It accounts for stage advancement (new geological periods), but does not reduce all development to uniform stages, i.e. varying features persist over time. Furthermore, Klein's and Balint's metaphor incorporates a means to depict the severity of insult one has endured, i.e. faults. Any theory that claims to be dialectical must be able to account for both the forces enhancing development and those which constrain it. It must explain how an individual changes over time, but also how he remains the same. The present research assumes that Kegan's theory must be augmented by research which looks more closely at individual differences in development.

Studies of Classroom Interaction

Despite the absence within the field of education of a body of research on interpersonal relations, there are, nonetheless, two four-month long ethnographic studies relevant to the present research. One (Batcher, 1981), done in a grade five/six elementary classroom in Toronto focused on emotions in the classroom. Batcher concluded that emotions function as the language of interpersonal events. They communicate the relation of an event to

oneself, and are, therefore, the essence of meaning-making, differing from intellect by communicating that which is closer to our selves. As an example, Mario, a student in Bell's class was the recipient of his teacher's anger. Unable to understand what had been so wrong about his behavior and recognizing that other students did not receive similar treatment from Bell, Mario concluded that Bell did not like him. Bell's anger communicated dislike to Mario.

Batcher's conclusion that emotions function as the language of interpersonal events, that they convey the relation of an event to ourselves, is interesting when compared to De Rivera's (1977) stuctural theory of emotions. De Rivera is not cited by Batcher, but his theory shows marked similarity to Batcher's findings. He conceptualizes emotions as "transformations of our relation to the world - to the persons, objects, events, and actions that are important to us. These transformations are the movements of emotion and each type of emotion (anger, fear, love) reflects a different kind of transformation... a way of organizing the relation between the person and the other so that the response itself gives meaning to the stimulus situation..." (p. 35-36). In the case of anger, De Rivera (1977) submits that the message communicated to oneself in the experience of anger is, "remove the other," "I do not want you to belong

to me" (p. 44). Applying this to Mario's case, it is easy to see how Mario's experience of Bell's anger communicated that he was not liked.

Although Batcher differentiates the emotional system from the cognitive by suggesting that emotions communicate that which is closer to the self, Kegan conceptualizes these systems differently. Quoting from Piaget, he writes "'There are not two developments, one cognitive and the other affective, two separate psychic functions, nor are there two kinds of objects; all objects are simultaneously cognitive and affective' (1964, p. 39). This is because all objects are themselves the elaboration of an activity which is simultaneously cognitive and affective" (Kegan, 1982, p. 83). The activity to which Kegan refers is the process of meaning-making, which for Kegan is what being is.

Elsewhere (Kegan, Noam, Rogers, 1982), writing about the relationship between emotion and cognition, Kegan, Noam, & Rogers state that it is not "What is the relationship between affect and cognition?" but "What is the relationship that 'has' cognition and affect?" (p. 105). These authors are referring to the process of meaning-making and they provide a useful metaphor in illustration of their point. The metaphor is that of a hollow glass tube, the openings of which are of some concern to someone. Kegan et al., 1982, write:

> We begin to talk about the tube's 'right opening' and "left opening,' or make some such distinction. This is perfectly sensible; the tube does have two different openings. But this is just the point: The tube has two openings; the openings do not have a tube. Still, we can imagine that if we pay so much attention to the openings rather than the tube itself, we could come to the sense that what a hollow, open cylinder really is is two holes connected by a glass tube. This strikes us as a strange definition of a cylinder because, as we are likely to say, 'All that there really is is the cylinder.' It is not so much that the two openings have a relationship as that there is something which has them....Cognition and affect, similarly, might not have a relationship so much as they are created out of a bigger context that has them (p. 105-106).

Batcher (1981), looking at emotions in the classroom and their function as a language to the self, can be reconceptualized in Kegan's terms. That is, what do the emotions witnessed in the classroom communicate about the individual selves (which are this process of meaning making)? Since <u>individual selves</u> does not make much sense in light of Kegan's theory or the philosophy upon which this research is based, the above question might better

be: What do the emotions witnessed in the classroom communicate about the process of meaning-making within that class?

The second study relevant to this research, Friendship Development Among Children in School, Rizzo (1989) concerned the development and maintenance of first grader's friendships. Believing there was a real need for theories about how children develop and maintain friendships, Rizzo directed his exploratory research at theory development, rather than theory validation. His findings are summarized in two central assertions. One is that children's school friendships predominantly revolve around school activities, meaning that class work has a great deal of influence over friendships in the classroom. It, therefore, behooves us to pay close attention to the ways in which class activities influence the relationships in the class. The second major finding, stemming from the fact that people tend to congregate around similarities, is that school work can be useful in encouraging children to recognize their commonality and at the same time increase interest in school activities. Noting the apparent similarity between agency and activities and relationships and communion, it will be useful to see how each of these contribute to the ways in which class members make sense of their world.

Conclusion and Summary

Research, such as this, that is exploratory and hypothesis-generating, rather than hypothesis-validating, takes as data that which is submitted by the research participants to the researcher. It is the researcher's job to sort through this data, identify themes, and provide tentative explanations to previously disparate issues. This chapter, therefore, summarized only that research and theory which was related to the over-arching focus of the study, with the understanding that pertinent research would be discussed in later chapters after the participants had spoken. Kegan's (1982) theory of constructive developmentalism was summarized, as were two studies of classroom interaction. Since the primary tool in ethnographic research is the researcher, a description of my philosophical orientation was included.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

Introduction

The previous chapter provided the rationale for a qualitative research design and explained the need for descriptive information related to classroom interaction. This chapter will describe my role and that of the research participants, clarify the means of data collection and data analysis, and describe the research sites. It will conclude with a discussion of the limitations of this study.

In anticipation of this research, a pilot study was done with the same focus as this research, and using similar methodology. The data collected was so rich that it was decided to continue the research at another school and compare the findings from both schools. Although the methods used in the two schools were much alike, there were several differences that will be outlined below.

Only schools with self-contained classrooms were considered for this research because I wanted a fairly stable classroom environment in which to observe. Fifth grade was chosen because, with the self-contained

classroom, I wanted a more advanced developmental age where potential individual differences were more likely to occur. Because my research questions necessitated an in-depth look at the teacher and her students, it was decided to limit my focus to a small number of students in the classroom. On the other hand, I wanted more than one or two students because I was interested in individual differences. The number of student participants was set at six because it seemed to be about the maximum number of students that I might conceivably follow in enough depth that individual differences could be observed.

The primary means of data collection in both schools was through classroom observation and interviews. I entered the schools anticipating that I would behave as a participant observer, and offered to perform duties in the classroom similar to what one would expect from a parent volunteer, e.g. assisting students who were having difficulty, aiding in the preparation of teacher-made materials, etc. In actuality, my role was more that of an observer as participant than as participant observer, meaning that for the most part I observed, and only occasionally entered into the classroom life as a participant.

In the pilot the teacher was told that I was studying emotions in the classroom and would be watching classroom interaction. She was told that I was looking for individual differences in children's emotional needs and,

in particular, was looking at the interplay between emotions and learning. (See Appendix A for a copy of the consent form signed by the classroom teacher.)

The teacher who participated in the main study, however, was given a choice regarding her role. This was done to give the teacher some control over the research situation and, thereby, minimize any potential feelings of dehumanization on her part. Her choices were to participate in the same manner as the pilot teacher and have access to the same information about the research, or participate more like a collaborator. The latter role meant that she was given my research proposal to read, containing all the specific research interests, but she would be expected to keep a log of her research-related feelings and experiences and be available each week to discuss this information with me. The teacher participant for this research chose the latter role.

Two research measures were also utilized to provide additional information about the teachers' and students' needs and values. Both the Friendship Motivation Scale and the California Child Q-set (and a modification of this Q-set) were administered by education graduate students. The Friendship Motivation Scale is a storytelling exercise which was requested of the 12 student participants to assess their preference for having friends, as opposed to other experiential goals. The Q-sets, a set of

personality descriptors, were given to the two teachers who were told to sort them according to their opinion of an ideal student. The Q-sets were used as a check on the validity of my own observations. Results of both the Q-set and the Friendship Motivation Scale were withheld from me until I had concluded my observations and preliminary interviews and analyses. This was done to avoid contaminating my perceptions during the initial data gathering phase. If the results of the Q-set differed from the behaviors I saw, these differences were to be discussed with the teacher. (As will be noted later, this possibility was never realized.) With regard to the Friendship Motivation Scale, results which differed from my observations were to be analyzed as friendship preferences of which students might be unaware or as behaviors indicative of temperamental factors unrelated to desire for friendship.

Interviewing was structured around tentative questions developed for the interviewee and was related to the specific research question/questions being addressed. The absence of a formal structured interview was in keeping with the grounded nature of this research which precludes the researcher predetermining the participants' agendas. Questions focused on the issues which developed in each school and on the feelings of the participants regarding those issues. Particular attention was paid to

the meaning of emotions and the ways in which class activities effected agency and communion-related behavior.

Research Sites

Site 1

James Walker Elementary[1], the site of the pilot study, was located in a community of approximately 60,000 people and had approximately 800 students in grades kindergarten through fifth grade. The community functioned as a suburb to a major Midwestern city and, although it was an upper-middle class community (median income $40,000), James Walker served the lower to middle-class population in this community. The principal, Mr. Anton, told me that most of the parents of children in the school worked for someone else for wages or a salary and about 10% of the parents were professional people. James Walker was a Chapter I school with two full-time Chapter I teachers. Approximately 20% of the families received public assistance. Less than 3% of the students were from minority cultures.

Site 2

Whitestone Elementary, the site of the main study was located in a small town about 20 miles from a major

---

1. The names of all people and places in this study are pseudonyms.

Midwestern city. The actual town of Whitestone was only about 2500 - 3000 people, but the school served students in the surrounding rural area. There were approximately 600 students who attended Whitestone, grades kindergarten through fifth grade. The students at Whitestone Elementary were from the lower-middle to the middle-class socioeconomic group; 99.5% or more were Caucasian.

Data Collection Procedures

Entry, Role Negotiation, and Student Selection

James Walker Elementary. A fellow graduate student suggested the site for this research because he said the principal was particularly conscientious, concerned about the welfare of the students and staff in his school, and was willing to cooperate if the research showed some potential for constructive benefit to the school.

Following my conversation with this graduate student, I phoned the principal, Mr. Anton, briefly explained my research and the benefits provided the school, and found that, indeed, he was very cooperative and friendly. (Proposed benefits were the provision of compensatory services by assisting in the classroom, making teacher-made materials, etc. and providing information on the relationship between cognition and affect in the classroom.)

Mr. Anton offered to discuss this study with the appropriate administrator and with his staff if I would send him a copy of my proposal, which I did. Within a couple of weeks, he called to say that he had a fifth grade teacher, Ms. Smith, who was willing to work with me on this research.

Ms. Smith and I arranged to meet to discuss the research and select the six students who, with the teacher, would be the primary research focus. Our meeting time was during the lunch hour and we had only a short time to talk before students started filtering in after having eaten their lunch. After some initial getting-acquainted talk, I explained the process whereby I would randomly select the six students. Ms. Smith supplied me with the names of the students whose last names began with the randomly selected letters of the alphabet. By coincidence, three of them were boys and three were girls. In the next two weeks all six students and their parents agreed to their participation
in the research.

Ms. Smith gave me a copy of the class's scheduled outside activities, such as music and physical education, so that I could plan my observations around times when the students would be in the classroom. I left with the understanding that I would look over the class schedule she had given me and call her to arrange a mutually

agreeable time to begin my observations. This was easily done during the next week as there was really only one or two times that were compatible with both our schedules. Tuesday mornings, from school opening until 1:00 p.m. were the agreed-upon times and beginning in February of 1991, I went each week for ten weeks. In May of that year I returned for several brief visits to interview students.

On this first visit with Ms. Smith there was no substantial discussion about my role in the classroom, or questions or concerns of Ms. Smith's. Partly this was due to the distraction of the entering students, but it was also a function of Ms. Smith's personality and my reluctance to continue our conversation at a time when Ms. Smith seemed very busy.

Whitestone Elementary. Entry into Whitestone Elementary was also facilitated by a fellow student who, in the computer lab, overheard me becrying my need for another research site. After explaining the nature of my research, she contacted the prospective fifth-grade teacher and asked her if she might be interested in participating in the research. When the teacher agreed, I called and personally explained the research and when she expressed willingness to participate, I called to discuss the project with the building principal, Mr. Roman.

Mr. Roman never spoke to me personally about the research, as he was always out of the office when I

called. Instead, all communication went through his secretary, Ms. Hawkins. Ms. Hawkins, however, relayed the information to me that it was fine to do the research as long as the teacher, Ms. Everland, was willing.

On the day that I met with Ms. Everland to discuss the research, I met briefly with Mr. Roman, who asked a few questions before expressing some concern that Ms. Everland might have felt pressured by my contact person to participate. I assured him that I would clarify this before proceeding with the research and he then showed me the way to Ms. Everland's classroom.

Ms. Everland and I talked for quite a while before getting down to the specifics of the research, and she assured me that she had not felt pressured to participate in the research and was doing so willingly. Eventually we began the process of randomly selecting the student participants. The same selection procedure was used at Whitestone as had been used at James Walker except that at Whitestone I gave the teacher the option of selecting one student about whom she particularly wanted input. When it came time for me to give Ms. Everland the randomly selected letters to select students by their last name, we came up with five girls and one boy. (One female student was chosen per teacher request.) I asked if any of the letters fit more than one child and when told, yes, switched one of the girls for a boy whose last name began

with the same letter. That left me with four female and two male student participants at Whitestone.

In discussing the students' class schedule and trying to figure out a good time for my observation periods, it became obvious that the fifth-grade classes at Whitestone were not exactly self-contained. At 1:40 p.m. each day the students dispersed to go to either band or music or physical education. From 2:45 p.m. until dismissal at 3:18 p.m., the fifth grade teachers traded students for science class. My observations started with my staying the whole day and either going to physical education or talking with Ms. Everland during the 1:40 - 2:25 p.m. time period. After four weeks, there seemed little reason for me to continue this full day schedule and I began staying at the school only until 1:40. This continued for four more weeks, after which I returned twice around the lunch hour to finish some of my interviewing. All together, I spent about 41 hours observing at Whitestone; this was equivalent to the time spent at James Walker.

The decision about which research role to accept was not an easy choice for Ms. Everland. She was uncertain and asked which role I would prefer. After a good deal of indecision, she finally decided to act as research collaborator, with the understanding that she would keep a log of her research-related feelings. As it turned out, she did not do very well in this regard and, despite,

several requests, only provided me with a few scanty notes about herself and the students. She was, however, very good about allotting time to talk to me about the research and I was able to get a good deal of information from interviews.

Observations

James Walker. Initially, at James Walker I took a few brief notes while I was observing in the classroom and then augmented these notes later when I was at my word processor. However, about a third of the way through my observations I began to have questions that could not be answered by trusting my memory. For instance, I wanted to know which of the students was initiating interaction with others and how often. I also began to form opinions, but did not have detailed examples of how I came to these opinions.

My notes at this time, then, became more detailed as I took more extensive notes while in the classroom. Since I had been asked by Ms. Smith to do a task for her which required the use of a dictionary or thesaurus, I almost always had these books out and took advantage of this front to take detailed notes about the classroom interaction. Though I was, by appearance, sifting through a dictionary or thesaurus, more often than not I was taking notes on my observations. No one ever challenged me on this behavior or asked me specifically what I had

just written in my little notebook, though I suspected that Ms. Smith and at least some of the students were aware that sometimes I was recording their interactions.

Whitestone. At Whitestone, it seemed relatively inocuous to openly take notes as I observed. Most of the action in Ms. Everland's classroom took place in a large group and was, therefore, more public behavior than what I observed in Ms. Smith's classroom. From the beginning, this is what I did at Whitestone. As will be noted later when I describe a typical day at Whitestone, one student did comment about this behavior, but did not argue with my response that, yes, notetaking was going to be my main activity in the classroom.

At both schools there were times, of course, when notetaking was suspended until, at the latest, the conclusion of the day's observations. This happened when an emotionally-charged event took place or when the environment was more intimate and notetaking seemed inappropriate.

One final comment is necessary to clarify the notation system used to report this research. Double quotation marks (") will be used to indicate a direct quote of one of the participants. Single quotation marks (') indicate that the material was paraphrased. Following direct quotes there will be a notation (FN...) which indicates which page of my notes contained the quote.

Interviews

At both schools the student interviews were done almost exclusively on the playground. Students seemed to be more at ease there and would talk freely while we walked. The playgrounds were both big enough and the noise level sufficient to allow relative privacy during these conversations. At James Walker, the issues were clear enough that semi-structured interviewing focused on the problems evident in the classroom. Before conducting an interview, I jotted down the questions for which I needed answers and usually made a few brief notes to myself during the interview. Afterwards I recorded the content of the interview and my accompanying observations. The issues at Whitestone did not surface as quickly, so my initial interviews with students were informal, and centered around agency and communion-related questions concerning a play that had been done in Ms. Everland's classroom. Later semi-structured interviews focused on the issues which developed at Whitestone. (See Appendix B for examples of interview questions.)

At the conclusion of my study at James Walker each student also had an audiotaped interview that was later transcribed. This was not done at Whitestone because the student interviews weren't as critical a part of my

research at this school, and it was not difficult to adequately transcribe them later.

Teacher interviews were done over lunch or when the students were out of the classroom - at music, etc. Ms. Everland made ample time for us to talk before, or more often, after school hours but Ms. Smith was unavailable during after-school hours. Consequently, I was continually wanting more time to interview her. This turned out to be one of the limitations of this study and will be discussed in the section on limitations.

Research Measures

The Friendship Motivation Scale. The Friendship Motivation Scale, developed by McAdams & Losoff (1984) measures "a recurrent preference (consistent desire or readiness) for having friends over and against other experiential goals" (p. 13-14). Friendship motivation was assessed because it is hypothesized to detect preferences which may in actual behavior, be confounded by either lack of awareness or temperamental variables, such as extraversion and sociability. It should be noted that "recurrent preference" implies that friendship motivation is a relatively stable personality characteristic, which may change over the course of one's life, but would remain consistent across differing situational conditions. Because situational conditions would be expected to influence actual

behavior, friendship motivation was examined to assess the hypothesized stable propensity for valuing friendships.

Reliability data on the Friendship Motivation Scale is unavailable and it has been argued elsewhere (Bellak, 1975) that projective personality measures do not lend themselves to standard evaluations of reliability and validity. However, in terms of construct and concurrent validity, McAdams and Losoff (1984) reported that in a study of 52 fourth and sixth graders, the results of the measure significantly correlated with a) teacher trait ratings such as friendly, affectionate, sincere, and cooperative; b) extent of one's knowledge about his or her best friend; c) friendship depth or understanding of the meaning of one's own friendships; and d) friendship stability or stability over time of best-friend choice. McAdams and Losoff reported a correlation of .87 ($p < .001$) between two trained coders scoring friendship motivation on each subject.

Approximately mid-way through the research the Friendship Motivation Scale was individually administered, following the instructions outlined by McAdams and Losoff (1984). Four picture cards were presented and the students were asked to tell a story about them. The stories were recorded, transcribed, and scored for friendship motivation, dependent upon statements about 1) positive affect, 2) friendship or love, 3) dialogue between characters, and 4) helping. Scoring of the

Friendship Motivation Scale was completed by two trained raters who assigned ratings to the transcriptions. Interrater reliability on a trial administration of the scale was 93.8%. On the measures done at James Walker, the interrater reliability was 97.5% and at Whitestone it was 100%.

California Child Q-set. The California Child Q-set is a set of 100 cards containing descriptions of personality characteristics. Developed by Jeanne and Jack Block (1978), the CCQ may be used in a variety of ways to get an overall view of an individual's personality. For the pilot research the classroom teacher sorted a set of the cards to describe the ideal student. Afterwards it became obvious that many of the cards in the original CCQ were obviously not descriptive of an ideal student, nor were they easily identified as typifying either agency or communion. Therefore, a teacher could sort the stack without clearly communicating her values for agency and communion.

For the main study, a modified stack was then composed, containing only 26 cards, nine of which typified autonomy-related behavior, nine typified inclusion-related behavior, and eight were positive characteristics that could not be classified as either of the above. This modified Q-set was created by me and was based on the writing of McAdams, 1988. Using McAdams'

conceptualization of autonomy and inclusion (which he terms "agency" and "community,"), I generated a list of phrases descriptive of these two terms. From the list of phrases, I chose nine of the original Q-set cards which seemed most characteristic of autonomy, and nine which were most characteristic of inclusion. The remaining eight cards were also from the original Q-set but could not be clearly classified as either autonomy or inclusion.

The modified California Child Q-set was administered to the classroom teacher, asking her to sort the cards to describe the ideal student. Because the majority of the obviously negative personality descriptors were removed from the Q-set stack, only the five positive and/or neutral categories were used for sorting the cards, i.e. the four negative categories were removed. Thus, the categories utilized in this research were relatively neutral or unimportant, somewhat characteristic or salient, fairly characteristic or salient, quite characteristic or salient, and extremely characteristic or salient.

Information on the reliability and validity of the CCQ would be inappropriate for this research, given the modifications made on its administration and use. For the present research, validity of the modified CCQ was to be assessed by discussion of the results with the teacher and by observing similarities between the results and teacher

behavior and verbalizations. As noted in the Limitations portion of this chapter, the results were not discussed with the teacher, and the validity of this instrument was thereby compromised.

Data Analysis

Introduction

With regard to the analysis of data for qualitative research, it seems appropriate here to discuss some issues which develop because of differences between qualitative and quantitative research. One such issue concerns the topic of reliability and validity in qualitative research. Lincoln & Guba (1985) assert that in qualitative research, reliability and validity are really matters of credibility. The assertions and conclusions of the researcher ought to be credible, confirmable from the data. These authors list three methods by which researchers can maximize their credibility: 1) prolonged engagement, meaning staying in the field long enough to obtain trust, learn the culture, and check for misinformation; 2) persistent observation or getting enough detail to provide in-depth understanding; and 3) triangulation or using multiple forms of data collection, multiple sources of information, multiple investigators, etc.

In reference to the credibility of qualitative research, Rosenwald (1985) makes the following comment,

> In general, an interpretive account is judged successful to the degree that it is internally consistent, that it is comprehensive of the many elements of what is to be interpreted as well as of the relations among these elements, that it resolves obscurities, that it proves useful in encompassing new elements coming into view, and that it stands in some rational relation (confirmation, supplementation, elaboration, simplification, supersession) to previously held interpretations (p. 696).

Similarly, Kreisberg (1992) asks the following questions about his research:

> Do my analyses resonate with the study participants' understanding of their experiences? Have I been able to convey their experiences with power and insight? Does my analysis have relevance and resonance in the lives of people who read this book? Can the concepts and experiences explored and shared help people to better understand their experiences...? (p. 235).

Concerning the issue of credibility and the suggested means of maximizing credibility, this research involved over 80 hours of observation and interviews, resulted in approximately 200 single-spaced pages of detailed fieldnotes, and used interviews, observations, and two research measures to collect the data. Every effort was made to maximize credibility by persistence, prolonged engagement, and triangulation of data collection and sources.

In addition to questions of reliability and validity, quantitative researchers examine the generalizability of their research, and in doing so are careful to select a sample representative of a larger population. In contrast, qualitative researchers eschew generalizability in favor of gaining depth in a particular setting. The only generalizability, therefore, that can be expected from qualitative research is the potential for hypothesis generation.

Analysis of Observations and Interviews

Data analysis followed the procedures outlined in Agar (1986), Lofland & Lofland (1984), and (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) where behaviors or events are categorized and examined for unifying themes. These themes are then unified in some way to make meaningful sense of the data, by constructing theory or relating the themes to theory.

All my field notes were maintained in two different ways, in chronological order and in composites related to individual people. With regard to the latter arrangement, any reference to an individual was highlighted and placed in the stack of notes for that individual. In this way, I had a whole set of data for each individual that could be analyzed relative to other individuals or for that individual alone.

The data collected on each individual was examined by describing in general terms what was happening in each event or segment of interaction. This descriptive information eventually fell into various categories, and general themes emerged which were related to the issues that had developed. In a similar way, the chronological data was coded and sorted until I began to understand how the emerging themes fit together in a coherent whole. When I examined the field notes, for instance, on Ms. Everland, I made descriptive notes in the margins beside each incident or comment. After many, many pages of these descriptions, it became apparent that certain categories were emerging. One of these categories involved her reactions to student comments or requests. Examining these reactions revealed a number of different things, but one thing that emerged was her consistent reponse to negative comments. Eventually, the theme that arose from this analysis was combined with other themes that provided

a larger understanding of Ms. Everland, namely that consideration of the group superceded individual concerns.

Analysis of Research Measures

Friendship Motivation Scale. McAdams indicated through personal communication that training and scoring of the Friendship Motivation Scale could be accomplished by following the directions in his journal article, "Friendship motivation in fourth and sixth graders: A thematic analysis," (1984). The graduate student who had administered the scale and a counseling psychologist read the suggested article and scored the scale of a trial subject. Interrater reliabilities were reported previously and were well within acceptable standards. Analysis was a simple process of examining the scores for projected friendship motivation. A higher score indicated greater preference for friendship than did a lower score.

California Child Q-set and CCQ Modification. The CCQ, when used for descriptive purposes, rather than for comparisons, is evaluated simply by an examination of the data. The instructions suggest that it is particularly useful to look for constellations of items and to pay close attention to those items which were placed in the extreme positions.

For the pilot study, where there were nine categories in which to sort the cards, the four categories at the two

extremes were targeted for examination. However, it was very quickly apparent that this was not particularly useful for the negatively salient end of the sort because it contained so many obviously negative characteristics which no one would use to describe an ideal student, e.g. "attempts to transfer blame to others," "is inappropriate in emotive behavior," and "cries easily" (Block & Block, 1980). Therefore, I looked at the items in the two categories at the other end of the extreme (extremely salient and quite salient) and also looked at which items were placed in the piles which contained items that others might conceivably consider descriptive of an ideal child. These turned out to be the piles which were third and fourth from the negatively salient end of the continuum. Admittedly, this analysis was less than desirable and was responsible for the alteration of the Q-set for the present study.

As mentioned previously, in the present study the Q-set was reduced to only 26 cards, all of which could conceivably be characteristic of someone's ideal student. These 26 cards were placed in only five categories, although Ms. Everland put none of them in the category labeled "neutral or unimportant," which meant that in actuality only four categories were used. In this study the items placed in the extreme positions were examined, particularly with respect to the constellation of items

placed in these extremes. By looking at the picture that emerged from the whole set of descriptors in each of these categories, it was possible to make some projections about what Ms. Everland valued in her students. This analysis was then compared to the data collected from interviews and observations to see if it was consistent or if discrepant, where the discrepancies occurred.

Limitations

This study, like any research project, has limitations which hinder the credibility of the research or which detract from the ability of the study to give meaning to the experience of others. In qualitative research, as in quantitative research, the study is made better or worse by the tools of the researcher. The unique feature of descriptive qualitative research is that the researcher is the tool. Therefore, this research was limited by my abilities, my observation abilities and my ability to judge fruitful directions for observation, my ability to accurately report what I saw in the classrooms and to hear what my respondents told me. The research was limited by my analytic abilities, my ability to accurately describe and categorize the data, to see themes, and unify those themes into a meaningful whole. The research was also limited by my ability to establish trust with my respondents and to respect their own developmental balances, as Kegan (1982) would say.

It is in regard to the latter ability that one of the most significant limitations of this study developed. To be specific, my relationship with Ms. Smith was not optimal. I suspect she was particularly sensitive to the detailed examination that my research entailed and when she and a student, John, began conflicting in my presence it may have been very painful for her. In addition, I may have been less tactful than I could have been with regard to her questions about the research. About the same time that she and John began conflicting, Ms. Smith began asking for more specific information about the research. I told her that I would be happy to provide that at the conclusion of the research, but was concerned about biasing the research if we got too specific during the research. (She asked for specific journal articles related to the research I was doing, and I did give her some from a related, but more general area - on cooperative learning.)

Although Ms. Smith seemed to understand my rationale for not going into the specifics of the research while it was in progress, it seemd to me that our relationship suffered after this incident and that is the reason I gave Ms. Everland the option of behaving more as a collaborator.

Ms. Smith was cordial to me and before I left we did have one conversation that was both enjoyable and

informative, but after the conclusion of my observations, she stopped returning my phone calls and I was not able to talk with her about my findings. I had hoped to discuss my observations with her and get some feedback from her, but this did not occur.

Unfortunately, the same situation developed with Ms. Everland, in that I did not discuss my findings with her. She left the area after my research and I lost track of her. During the course of the study, she was always very friendly and we communicated easily, but it is certainly a limitation of the research that the results were not discussed with the two teachers.

Another limitation was the difficulties associated with the California Child Q-set. The modification provided more information than did the original, but the teacher was still not forced to make fine enough distinctions about her values with regard to students. The situation would have been remedied had I been able to discuss it with the teachers, but as was stated this was not possible.

A final limitation with this research was the quality of the teacher's log done by Ms. Everland. She gave me six hand-written pages of information that did address the topic of agency and communion in her classroom, but I had hoped to get far more than I got. It seemed to me that this was also a case of my not sufficiently understanding the developmental position of my research respondent. I

don't think that Ms. Everland wanted the control in this research, which I gave her after my experience with Ms. Smith. In my opinion, Ms. Everland seemed to want to please me, so it is to be understood that agreeing to do something as time-consuming as a weekly log, would not work out very well if the motivation for agreeing to this was desire for acceptance.

The instructions for this log were initially very open-ended - comments and questions related to the research proposal and the terms agency and communion. When Ms. Everland had difficulty with this, I gave her more direction, suggesting that she write about students who bothered her or who particularly pleased her, how she saw her students in terms of agency and communion, etc. She did write about this a little, but not in much detail, so it reduces the confidence in my findings.

Summary

Chapter III described the research site for this study and the site for the pilot study, which was used as a comparison to this research. Fellow students facilitated entry to the two schools, where a teacher and six students were selected from each school to be the primary focus of this research. The primary means of data collection were observation and interviews, although two research measures were also used to detect friendship

preferences in the student participants and to assess teacher beliefs about the ideal student.

Included in the chapter was a description of the means of data analysis, which consisted of coding the fieldnotes, noting the categories which emerged from the codes, and finding themes that developed out of the categories. A discussion about reliability and validity in qualitative research concluded the portion of the chapter that dealt with analysis and brief descriptions were given for the analysis of the two research measures.

The final section of the chapter reported the limitations of the study, which were the limitations of my abilities to observe, describe, and interpret, and, in particular, my ability to establish a sense of trust with one of the teachers and to maintain contact once the data collection phase of the research ended. Two final limitations discussed some disappointments with the Q-set and the teacher participant's weekly log.

CHAPTER IV

JAMES WALKER ELEMENTARY

Entry and First Impressions

After Mr. Anton, the principal at James Walker, told me that Ms. Smith was willing to participate in my research I phoned her to arrange a meeting. A couple of phone calls were unsuccessful because she was with students or a parent, but finally a time was set up for me to come to the school to discuss the research with her and select the students who would be the primary research focus.

When I arrived at the school for the first time, it was lunch time. I checked in at the office and learned that Mr. Anton was in a meeting that would last until after my scheduled departure. I do not remember what instructions the school secretary gave me, but for some reason I was unescorted and in the hallway outside the cafeteria when I met Ms. Smith for the first time. Her class was just arriving for lunch and she and I looked at one another and inquired if we were the anticipated research associate. My initial impression of Ms. Smith was favorable; she seemed straightforward and unpretentious,

though noticeably reserved - meaning that she was not an animated speaker, did not engage in small talk, and appeared just generally to be intentional and controlled in her demeanor. Additionally, I had not anticipated that she would be as interested in the research as she obviously was.

Back in her classroom, we had only a short time to talk before the students started filtering in after having eaten their lunch. She explained to me that this was her first year at James Walker Elementary, having been out of the public school system for eight years. In the meantime, she had been teaching preschool, where she was when Mr. Anton called her to ask her to consider teaching at James Walker. Her previous public school experience was in an inner city public school, so she said she decided to see 'how the other half lived.'

She explained the organizational system used in her classroom, where students assumed much of the responsibility for getting their schoolwork done and also for attending to the day-to-day functioning of the class. Using an economic model to organize the class, students were paid for work done, fined for misbehavior, and employed in various capacities within the classroom. There was, for instance, a real estate agent who was responsible for seating arrangements within the classroom; a custodian, responsible for keeping the room neat; an attendance clerk who took roll each day; even a personnel

clerk, who was responsible for keeping track of these and nearly twenty other positions held by students. At the beginning of each day, students copied from the board all the assignments to be done that day and, with minimal prompting from the teacher, they worked through the assignments alone or in small groups.

The students who began to trickle into the classroom during the lunch recess were generally those who had not gotten their assignments done, though there may have been some who were there for disciplinary purposes. Some had questions or needed assistance, so there was relatively little time for Ms. Smith and me to talk about other research-related issues. I explained the process whereby I would select the students who were to be the primary research focus and Ms. Smith supplied me with the names of the students whose last names began with the randomly selected letters. I then asked Ms. Smith a few questions about the students selected: Did she know of any one of them who was going to be moving before the year was over? Did she think I had a mix of personality styles; for instance did I have a "loner" in the group and someone who was more extraverted or did I have a sample that tended to be very similar? She did not know of anyone who was moving and thought I had a good variety of personality styles.

Ms. Smith provided a copy of the class's scheduled outside activities, such as music and physical education, so that I could plan my observations around times when the students would be in the classroom. We talked very briefly about the research and Ms. Smith said that she thought social development was very important to students. She commented that students who did not learn about social behavior during their time in school, would not have an opportunity to do so afterwards.

At this point, I began feeling torn between a desire to complete our discussion about the research, while at the same time recognizing that Ms. Smith had other pressing matters. There was no substantial discussion about my role in the classroom, or questions or concerns of Ms. Smith's. As stated in Chapter III, the schedule of my observations was arranged after my departure and consisted of 10 four-hour blocks of time, totaling approximately 40 hours of observation.

Classroom Life at James Walker

It was during my second visit to James Walker Elementary School (my first four-hour observation), that my role in the classroom was clarified. I also met the principal, Mr. Anton, began the process of obtaining consent/assent from parents and students to participate in the research, and was able to see the students and teacher in interaction with one another. I will describe this

visit in particularly fine detail, not only because of the significance of the interactions which took place, but also because the visit was representative of future visits.

When I arrived at James Walker at 8:55 a.m. all the students and teachers were gathered (standing) in the cafeteria, as they do on every morning, for the opening ceremony. Led by the school's music teacher, students and teachers sang several songs, using an overhead projector to display the words. One of the songs, the title of which I could not later recall, had been requested by the fifth grade students and reminded me of the song "Over the Rainbow." Another song sung this day was "We the People." There was then an announcement of those students having a birthday that day and the birthday students were invited to come up on the stage while everyone sang the Happy Birthday song. Following the birthday singing, was an announcement of a school money-making event coordinated with a local grocery store and then a weather and news report was read, and apparently also written by fifth grade students. Particularly interesting was the fact that the weather report included the weather in Saudi Arabia (since Operation Desert Storm was current news). Students were then wished a good day and were dismissed to their classrooms.

The music teacher was a very energetic, enthusiastic teacher with a beautiful voice so the tone of this opening

ceremony was very upbeat and positive. Students also were very enthusiastic in their participation, though the fifth graders who stood at the back of the room, were generally less so - some merely mouthing the words and others either not singing or singing only an occasional chorus. Dismissal from the opening ceremony was an automatic, relatively fast process, whereby each class knew from which direction and doorway they departed, and there was no one directing them or instructing them to wait until other classes had departed. This is not to say, that everyone moved at a fast pace, with no talking on the way to the classroom. In contrast, the walk to Ms. Smith's classroom was rather leisurely, with chit-chatting taking place on the way there.

On this particular day in February, there was a lot of talking and mingling once we arrived in the classroom. The noise wasn't deafening, but I was surprised that Ms. Smith tolerated this amount of noise. The person responsible for taking attendance was recognized and told to proceed with the job, and several other individuals were also reminded of their responsibilities.

For a while I stood reading the posters and newspaper articles tacked to the back wall of the room. Soon, however, Ms. Smith asked one of the boys, Chris, to collect the students' pizza money and I was asked to assist. (Teachers, I was told, were not allowed to participate in the collection of money for classroom

activities.) The money collecting activity, however, was a short one because only three people brought money - Chris, a male friend of his, and a female student. All three brought $2, fifty cents more than the requested amount, which was for three pieces of pizza. Supposedly, the extra fifty cents was to get more pizza. Since the party was to have been on this very day, the party was postponed until the coming week.

As Chris collected the money, recorded who contributed, and added up the total, I observed. He was completely capable of handling this job alone, which he did. No one spoke to me throughout the activity and the questions I asked of Chris were answered with as few words as possible. In short, it appeared that I was either an uncomfortable presence or an unwelcome participant in this activity.

The questions I asked of Chris related to the reason the class was having a pizza party. I was told that it was for "being good," (FN2/19-1). As it was explained to me, there was a jar in the classroom which, when they were behaving, was filled with a certain amount of beans. When the jar was full, the reward was a pizza party. I asked how often the jar had been filled this year and was told that this was the first time.

After the pizza money was collected, students were told to do "response" and to start copying the day's

schedule off the board. ("Response" apparently involved copying a sentence or two that was written incorrectly on the board, and correcting the errors.) There was still much talking and walking around the room, but everyone eventually got down to the task at hand without being reminded. Much of the talking seemed to be about the substitute the class had had on the previous Friday. (This was Tuesday; Monday had been a holiday.) Students complained that they couldn't understand her when she read their current read-aloud selection. The general consensus (on the part of the students) seemed to be that the substitute was weird. It appeared to me that the students were glad to have Ms. Smith back and the joking about the substitute was their way of welcoming her back.

After working on response and the schedule, students were told to write a letter to a soldier in "Saudi." Using forms provided by some business (an airline company, perhaps), students were to work on the letter either individually or in pairs. Those who chose to work in pairs were still expected to each compose a letter, but they could discuss with one another what they were writing. I noticed that several chose to work in groups of three and were not prevented from doing so. All the students appeared to be working on the letter, but some were very involved, while others seemed to be simply completing an assignment.

As students worked on their assignments, Ms. Smith called students individually to discuss their completed work. A paper previously assigned on Linda Brown (Brown vs. the Board of Education of Topeka) was seemingly overdue for some students because Ms. Smith reminded students about it and said, "And I surely hope you have it" (FN2/19-1). I noticed that one girl did not have the completed paper. The matter was discussed quietly and the girl promised to bring it tomorrow. Someone asked Ms. Smith how to spell "Saddem Hussein" and several students were asked to give their opinions. One of the male student's opinions was finally accepted, though I think it was incorrect.

After about an hour and a half, students were called to "group." There were some dismayed "Ohh's," apparently because the letters were still unfinished, so students were allowed to bring their letters to group. Ms. Smith read from the current read-aloud selection and the students were expected to listen carefully. I could see why the substitute had had difficulty with the book because it was written with a distinct dialect that made both reading and listening difficult.

At some point during the morning, Ms. Smith had explained an activity that I could do for her, looking up personality descriptors in the dictionary. Originally, she said, she had intended for the students to do this

activity, but found it too difficult for them. (They were to go through the alphabet, using the dictionary, and pick out words that describe people's personality.) While the story was being read, I sat, half listening and half doing the dictionary work as described above. I found it impossible to catch the gist of the story with my attention divided. A number of students apparently experienced similar difficulties because when asked to relate the story's events, they responded incorrectly. One boy's incorrect response prompted snickering from his classmates and he was corrected by Ms. Smith; the snickering, however, was not mentioned.

After the story, students were told to line up for lunch and we went to the cafeteria. While Ms. Smith was on an errand, I saw a man who looked like he could be the principal, inquired, and learned that he was, indeed, the principal; so I introduced myself. He was friendly, said he'd been in meetings all morning - which was what I'd been told when I inquired about him on my arrival to James Walker. I asked him how he'd prefer I handle the first contact with the parents of the six children I had selected to focus on. He suggested I write a short cover letter to accompany the consent forms that had been included in my original research proposal and either mail them or send them home with the students. He advised that sometimes the latter was less alarming for parents and volunteered school letterhead and the use of a typewriter

if I wanted to work on it that day. Also, he offered to co-sign the letter I sent home and to field any questions the parents might have, though he did not expect to find any unwilling parents. I thanked him for his help and his willingness to participate in the research and it seems to me he responded with something about their interest in seeing what I found out. I said I didn't want to hold him up, that I knew he had meetings all morning, but he said that it was ok; he was going to be in the cafeteria for a while. We then said good-by, he to return to his activities in the cafeteria, and I to the teachers' lounge where Ms. Smith was getting a salad to take back to the cafeteria and eat with her students.

This time I had brought a lunch so we sat with the boys and chatted back and forth. (On this and all other occasions, the girls sat at one table and the boys at another; the two tables were almost end-to-end so that the girls and boys who sat at adjacent ends could exchange remarks, which they did only occasionally. There were more girls in the class than boys, so the girls' table was usually full and the boys' table had a few vacant seats on the end furthest from the girls.) The boys didn't much like their pork patties, discussed what kind of meat was really in them, and then a couple of them proceeded to play with the food by putting the string beans in the mashed potatoes, etc. I made a remark to Ms. Smith about

the "joys" of eating in the cafeteria with the kids and she agreed. Mr. Anton then put up his arm to the cafeteria group, making a sign like a peace sign. They all quieted and he made an announcement before we all left the cafeteria.

Back in the classroom, things were pretty busy since it was a cold and windy day and all the students had been given permission to come into the room instead of going out for recess. Ms. Smith, too, seemed busy, preparing for future lessons. (I noticed that the days' schedule on the blackboard was noticeably shorter than it had been on my previous visit, and since she had been absent on Friday, I wondered if she could have used some additional preparation time this morning.)

We talked briefly, at first about how I would spend my time in the classroom. She wanted to know if I would be taking notes the whole time I was there and I told her that I would be taking some notes, but mostly was working on the list of personality descriptors; besides, it would be uncomfortable for everyone if I just sat and observed all the time. I added that I was willing to do an activity for her while in the classroom, but didn't want to make more work for her by requiring her to provide something for me to do each time. I showed her the list of words I had prepared, commented that my own son, also a fifth grader, was pretty verbal and wondered if they were too difficult. She thought they would be fine and remarked

that that was the idea anyway - to learn new words. Additionally, she asked that I work on them again next time. She wanted a set of cards - two sets, so the kids could match up synonyms.

At this point, I said good-by, left the classroom, and went to the office to check out. I left a message for Ms. Smith about the parental consent forms and introductory letters. They would be delivered to the school during the upcoming week.

As I drove home, I was aware of the things I had neglected to do before my arrival at James Walker, e.g. scheduling a time to formally introduce myself to the principal, and preparing letters of introduction and consent for parents of prospective student participants In general, I was concerned with the presentation of myself and did not take stock of my fleeting reflections on Ms. Smith and her classroom.

Looking back, I recognize that this second visit to the school, the first of my scheduled observation periods, was representative of many of my future visits. Unlike the principal, the school secretary was more business-like than friendly. She was always courteous, but never had time for any conversation other than what I requested of her. I came to think of her as more task oriented than people oriented. Though I did not consider it at the time, Ms. Smith later struck me similarly. It is noteworthy,

for example, that the only introduction to have taken place so far was my own introduction to the principal. I was not introduced to the students or to other teachers or staff members. Throughout my stay at James Walker the only person I was ever introduced to was the music teacher. Whether in the company of cafeteria personnel, or teachers in the teachers' lounge or on the playground, no introductions were ever extended.

In fairness to Ms. Smith, on the day I arrived for my first observation, she was returning from a day or two's absence and, understandably, appeared to need some time to get organized. Except over lunch, which was spent in the company of students, we had no time to sit and talk. However, on future visits when there were no similar extenuating circumstances, Ms. Smith had little, if any, time to sit and talk. Throughout our time together, she had few questions about the research, despite the fact that she had only been given a brief description of it. Over the course of the next nine weeks there were many times when I felt the need to sit down together and discuss the way things were progressing or to ask questions about something that had happened in the classroom. Ms. Smith, however, had little time for that. She was either busy preparing for future lessons, or helping students, or meeting with another teacher. Eventually, I recognized that I would have to specifically

ask for time to talk to Ms. Smith and schedule it ahead of time.

The Students

Introduction

Before my next visit to James Walker, I mailed to the school consent forms and letters of introduction for parents of each of the six children selected for participation in the research. Mr. Anton cosigned these letters and sent them home with each student. When I arrived at the school the following week, I learned that all of the parents had given permission for their children to participate. (Actually, one parent had not formally returned the consent form, but had given a positive response to the teacher, provided that I respond to some questions she had about the research. By the time I returned to the classroom the following week, her questions had been answered and she had returned the signed consent form.) The student participants also had signed the consent form, except for one whose father had signed in his place; he verbally assented to participation. Despite my earlier concerns about not arriving at the research site with all paperwork in hand, I now found myself ready to begin meeting the selected students.

From my first encounter with Ms. Smith's class in the hallway outside the cafeteria, there had been four boys who stood out from the rest of the group. Of the four, two had been selected as part of the six who would be my primary research focus. In the weeks to come there would be frequent references in my notes to this group and the difficulty of ignoring them to concentrate on "less visible" groups. The four boys were Chris, who was the one I watched count the pizza money, John, Luke, and Nathan. John and Nathan were among the six selected as primary research participants. Identification of the female student participants was, however, a difficult matter. Because consent forms had yet to be signed, I did not, during my first four-hour observation period make any attempt to pick out the six students who had been selected for intensive focus. At the conclusion of my first observation period, no girl was mentioned by name in my notes.

John

John attracted my attention immediately. On my first visit to James Walker he was one of the boys actively involved in a game of twenty questions which the students played while waiting in the lunch line. Later, during my first scheduled observation period, John had the responsibility for taking the day's attendance. He had

forgotten if it was his responsibility or not, but about the time Ms. Smith had it doublechecked, he had already discovered the fact himself. He apparently did the job without assistance and later when I asked him who was absent, he immediately gave me the names of three students.

It did not take me long to discover that John was a key figure in this classroom, both with his peers and the teacher. In my notes, he was almost always interacting with peers, e.g. discussing sports while supposedly doing a class assignment, interjecting a comment into a discussion of a small group of girls (and being told to "Butt out!"), teasing and chuckling with a female classmate, etc. His expressive face at one time reflected passionate interest, at another amusement or out-and-out merriment, and at another livid anger.

Nathan

Nathan, a good friend of John's, was also involved in that game of twenty questions I observed on my first visit. Along with Chris and a boy from another fifth grade class, he was one of the biggest boys in the school. Like John, he was social, active, and full of expression. Unlike John, however, he was not prone to anger and on the few times he was observed to be angry, the anger dissipated quickly and appeared to leave no lingering residue.

On my second scheduled observation, I noticed Nathan looking my way several times, and after making eye contact,

he would look away. Once he leaned back in his chair which then tilted a bookcase near me. He then smiled sheepishly and said, "Whoops," (FN2/26-2). After lunch, when it was his turn to read in front of the class, he asked Ms. Smith if he had to sit in the chair in front (the one designated for the readers); he was told, "Yes." Ms. Smith coached him on a number of the words and he sighed deeply several times throughout the activity, including when it was all over. On the playground, however, in basketball or 4-square, he was all bravado and clearly in command of the game.

Daniel

Small and slender, quiet and inconspicuous, Daniel was the third male student participant. In the classroom, Daniel was seated with his back to me, facing the front wall of the room. Because he often stayed at his assigned seat, was not very active or animated, I had to make a conscious effort to note his behavior. On one particular day, for instance, when I was doing spot checks on each of the six student participants, all my notes on Daniel indicated that he was sitting quietly, alone, working. Once he showed his work to his friend who sat beside him, but that was the extent of the noted observations.

Because he was so quiet and unobtrusive, I mistakenly assumed that Daniel was not a very verbal child. When on my second scheduled observation it was Daniel's turn to read in

front of the class, I was surprised to discover that he read well and clearly, too. He fidgeted the whole time, either swinging his legs or shifting his position and he did not look up, but his reading continued uninterrupted.

Rebeccah

In looking back, I recall noticing one girl on the first visit I made to James Walker, when I went to meet Ms. Smith for the first time. During the game of twenty questions played while the students were standing in the lunch line, most of the girls talked quietly amongst themselves and did not participate in the game. One girl, however, did take an active part and she, I later learned, was Rebeccah.

My first field note in reference to Rebeccah was during the second observation period. I noted that she was part of a small group of girls who were not very visible in the classroom. Yet, I had already distinguished her from the rest of the girls on two occasions. One of the occasions was the one mentioned above during the game of twenty questions; the other was during the opening ceremony at James Walker where Ms. Smith's class had performed a small skit. Rebeccah had had a prominent part in this skit and had said her lines loud enough to be heard at the back of the room.

In attempting to characterize Rebeccah, I found a somewhat noteworthy girl who was part of two inconspicuous

groups: 1) the total group of females in the classroom and 2) a small peer group within that larger group of girls. This seeming paradox between prominence and unremarkability may have resulted from more than just happenstance or my own ineptitude in characterizing Rebeccah.

Throughout my notes on her there was considerable variability. On one day Rebeccah was working quietly with a friend most of the morning. On another, she flitted from one thing to another, first asking Ms. Smith a question about lunch, then nibbling from what appeared to be a bag of goodies, then chatting with a friend. On some days Rebeccah could not be seen on the playground; on one day she was the center of attention and on another clearly visible as she played a game of tag with friends. With Ms. Smith, Rebeccah could be apologetic (as when she misunderstood her role as group moderator and called on people who hadn't raised their hands), but she could also be very assertive (as she was one day during her individual conference time with Ms. Smith). Over time, the characterization that I developed for Rebeccah was that she was flexible, mature, and many-talented, all qualities that contribute to variability in behavior.

Teresa

Whereas I initially found it difficult to characterize Rebeccah, with Teresa, another student participant, the

initial characterization came quickly. Teresa was a member of the most visible group of girls in the classroom, a group that ranged in size from four to seven. Three members, one of whom was Teresa, were almost always an integral part of the group and all the other girls in the room, except two, (Rebeccah and a friend) rotated in and out of this group.

Teresa was first mentioned in my notes as the one being teased by John. Her response, which appeared to be said in anger, was "I'm not stupid!" (FN2/26-1). What provoked this remark, I do not know. John, chuckling, replied that he was only kidding. My impression was that he really was only kidding, but had hit upon a sore spot for Teresa. Both students immediately returned to their work without another comment.

On my next visit to the school two more incidents erupted which resembled the previous one, in that they involved anger and discreetness, "discreetness" both in the precipitating incident and the outcome. In the first, Teresa was involved in a quiet discussion with another female student and the girl said, "I will if you're mad at me." (FN3/5-1) In the second, another female student accused Teresa of being a liar. Both times, Teresa's response was a low, verbal remark that was unintelligible to me and both times the response effectively ended the discussion. It was said without apparent emotion and with the head lowered. In the first incident, the fellow classmate returned to her seat seemingly satisfied that the conflict was settled. In

the second, however, the classmate was obviously still angry and later refused to move so that Teresa could see the board. Because of these initial observations, I came to think of Teresa as quick to anger, but unwilling to work at resolution. My later observations found her far more sophisticated than this.

Shannon

Shannon, the sixth of the student participants, was, I suspect, also far more complex than cursory observation would indicate. She maintained such a low profile that on my third visit to James Walker, I still did not know which student Shannon was. Her teacher and a fellow student described her as very bright, a good student. Frequently, when I observed her in the classroom she was working, either alone or with one other student.

On the day of this third visit, Ms. Smith's students went to the library for a lesson on call numbers. The students were seated at round tables which held four to five students each. Shannon sat at a table to the back of the room, which was far from my vantage point. Three other girls, including Teresa, were at her table. During the librarian's opening remarks several students, including John and Nathan, volunteered answers to her questions, but Shannon remained quiet. A small group activity was then assigned to each table and I noted how the groups handled

the assignment. John, for instance, got disgusted with the process at his table and took a leadership role assigning everyone a task. It was difficult for me to see what went on at Shannon's table, but I noticed that the written material faced Shannon and Teresa and both girls took an active role in completing the assignment.

After the lesson was finished the students walked back to their classroom and Shannon was with the group of girls that I earlier described as very visible. Today they were all admiring one of the girl's jacket, a pink jean jacket with rhinestones and ribbons on it. I overheard Shannon say that she had written on a library table, that she didn't know why she had done it. There was no response from the other girls.

Later, on the playground, Shannon was part of a large group of girls who were wandering around en masse. In time, they asked a boy if he wanted to walk around with them, which he did. Shannon kept looking over at me and when they all walked off to the side of the playground furthest from the school, she looked back several times as if to see if I was watching.

I suspected that Shannon was ambivalent about being noticed. During my interview with her, she recounted an incident in class where she told Ms. Smith that 'you drive us crazy about as much as we drive you crazy (FN5/7-2). She said she hadn't meant to say it out loud. She was often "in the background," meaning at the back of the room or off in

the distance, but then indicating a contrary interest - as when she walked away with the group of students, but kept looking back over her shoulder at me.

The Teacher

I found Ms. Smith to be no less intriguing than Shannan. Throughout my time with her she remained unpretentious, dedicated to her teaching, and reserved - so reserved that it wasn't until our third meeting (the second observation period) that I discovered I had been addressing her incorrectly. She was "Miss Smith, not "Mrs.," as I had been calling her. She never corrected me, but over lunch recounted that she was from the East, had previously lived in Houston, and was single.

This was one of the rare times when Ms. Smith disclosed personal information about herself and she confided that she was worried about her parents, who were still living on the east coast. They were having a hard time adjusting to retirement and her mother was having considerable health problems. She said she would advise young people today to not move away from family. On a later visit she said she was afraid her parents would die before she got to see them again and sometimes wondered if she shouldn't just up and go.

In reviewing the comments Ms. Smith made to me, most were about the students - their academic performance, or

discipline issues, or special problems. Almost as numerous were comments about the research and my role, including some remarks that were simply social courtesies, e.g. where I could sit, etc. A few times she talked about teaching issues, such as classroom organization and grading, especially in relation to the policies at James Walker. And a few times she addressed personal issues like the concerns about her parents or her dress on picture-taking day.

Other than the statement about her parents, there was no disclosure about her emotions or feelings. Similarly, with her students she did not discuss emotions or feelings - either theirs or hers. I could certainly infer that she was frustrated with a number of concerns, but this was never explicitly stated in terms of her own feelings. Instead, she talked about a recurring issue of fairness between the boys and girls in her class, where even the order in which she called the students up for conferencing became a bone of contention between the boys and girls. Accusing her of always calling the girls first, John once reportedly chided, "She's traditional." (FN3/26-4) On another occasion we were discussing a conflict that had occurred between Ms. Smith and John and she said, 'There's no talking to him. Just like today - he just kept going...' (FN4/9-4). Her own frustration with their interaction was not openly discussed. During the time I spent in her classroom, I had the sense that Ms. Smith was not happy. She rarely smiled and almost never laughed. Only twice did she ever behave in what might

be called a playful or humorous way. Once, when I arrived at James Walker she smiled and said, "They're all yours." (FN3/12-1) (She had a cold and obviously did not feel well.) Another time when I had asked to talk with her, she suggested, with a smile, that we talk while walking (FN4/30-5). (This referred to my way of conducting the student interviews, which was while walking with a student on the playground.)

In sum, then, I concluded that this was a difficult year for Ms. Smith. In addition to the concern over her parents and the issue of fairness between boys and girls, John presented a special challenge to Ms. Smith, as did returning to elementary school teaching after an eight year absence. At times I felt that my presence in the classroom must have placed an additional burden on her. Considering the stress she already appeared to be under, I found it remarkable that a woman, such as she, who did not easily deal with personal issues, could open herself up to my scrutiny.

Summary

This chapter described my initial visits to the pilot school, James Walker. The teacher, Ms. Smith, was described as a straight-forward, unpretentious individual who took her job seriously and was struggling with personal and professional issues. Her classroom was organized according

to an economic model where students assumed responsibility for the day-to-day functioning of their class. Each of the six students was presented and John, in particular, was singled out as a key figure in the classroom. Brief mention was made of the school's opening ceremony, the principal, and my initial thoughts about the school.

CHAPTER V

WHITESTONE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Entry and First Impressions

When I first visited Whitestone Elementary, it was closing time (3:25 p.m.). I was surprised to note that all of this small community's school buildings were within a quarter mile of each other and all were very new. The parking lot and interior of the building were busy with students leaving and parents and buses arriving to take children home. A parent showed me where the office was, as it was not clearly visible when I entered the building. Once inside, I met Ms. Hawkins, who did not know where Mr. Roman was. I asked if he was wearing a suit and when she answered affirmatively, told her that I thought I had seen him out in front of the building. Ms. Hawkins, satisfied that that was indeed Mr. Roman, told me to take a seat, as he would be only a few minutes. (My appointment was actually with Ms. Everland, although I had asked earlier if I might meet with Mr. Roman on the same day as I visited Ms. Everland. Since Mr. Roman was uncertain about his availability on this day, he had relayed word through Ms. Hawkins that, 'If he didn't catch

seat, I was uncertain if I was going to meet with Mr. Roman or if, as a matter of respect, I was expected to introduce myself to the building principal before proceeding on to Ms. Everland's classroom.) Since I saw Ms.Everland come into the office and knew she still had students with her, I decided to sit tight and wait for Mr.Roman.

The office was busy with students who did not know where they were supposed to go after school. At least one had missed the bus and one was there to see Grandma, Ms. Hawkins. Ms. Hawkins handled everything. Without looking up the phone number, and addressing the woman by her first name, she called the mother of the boy who didn't know where he was to go, sent the young boy off to his babysitter's, and then tore out of the office trying to catch the other child's missed bus. Failing that, she called a teacher who lived near the boy, only to find out that the teacher wasn't going home until 4:30. Meanwhile, Ms. Hawkins spoke to her grandson and his two small friends and sent them on their way. Lastly, she talked to a woman who wanted to see the principal about enrolling her "emotionally disturbed" kindergartner. At about the time that Ms. Hawkins referred this woman to the Director of Special Services, Mr. Roman walked in and apologized to me for keeping me waiting.

In his office, he told me it was fine for me to do the research; he just wanted to be sure that Ms. Everland

was really willing and hadn't felt pressured by my contact person. I agreed with him that it would be a mistake for her to participate if she had any reservations and told him that I had expressed a similar concern over the phone with Ms. Everland. However, I would doublecheck with her.

He asked about the nature of the research, which I explained as research on the social interaction in the classroom. He wanted to be sure that pseudonyms would be used, which I confirmed; and then he volunteered that it would probably be adequate for them to just send a letter home with the students explaining that I would be observing in the classroom... . To this I responded that I was required by the Institutional Review Board at my university to obtain written consent from the parents of the six students who, along with the teacher, would be the focus of my research. He said, 'Fine' or something to that effect.

When I mentioned that I had done a similar study in another school, he asked me about the amount of structure in that classroom. After I explained, he told me that the reason he had asked was that Ms. Everland had just had a student teacher who required less structure than did Ms. Everland and she had been struggling with this issue and was in a period of transition. Before this year he said that Ms. Everland had been a very traditional teacher. I was not sure why he told me this, but my

description of the previously researched classroom seemed to satisfy him.

At some point Mr. Roman said that he didn't want to be 'caught in the middle' or uninformed in case some parents called with questions and I said that I would send him a copy of my research proposal. (I had not brought this with me because I was intending to discuss with Ms. Everland her role as either a research participant or collaborator and wanted to have this clarified first.) He then showed me the way to Ms. Everland's classroom and we said goodby.

When I got to Ms. Everland's classroom she was talking to two students and my contact person. We chit-chatted a few minutes and then the two women discussed some plans for a future lesson and my contact person left. I talked to Ms. Everland about the two possible roles she could assume in this research and explained the log to be kept by the collaborative researcher. She didn't think the time commitment required for keeping the log would be too much and wanted to know which of the two roles I preferred she assume; she wanted to be accommodating. My response was that it really made no difference to me; the issue was which role would be most comfortable for her.

Without ever reaching any resolution on the question of Ms. Everland's research role, the conversation turned to a discussion of how I had been presented to the students and a general description of her classroom. She

said she had forgotten that I was coming at the end of the day and had told the students that I was a student coming to observe in their room, and that they were excited about it and all day long whenever the door opened, had looked around expecting to see me.

She talked about the transition she was in with regard to the amount of freedom students were allowed and said she needed it a little more quiet than it had been with the student teacher. She also said she had been uncomfortable with comments from other teachers who remarked about the noise her students made, wondered why she had some students down at the creek collecting rocks, some students (somewhere else), and apparently other teachers had disapproved of students being out in the halls, etc. She was, she said, the only one in the school who was different, although it was hard to know. After some change that had occurred last year, she never got to talk to any of the teachers in the early grades and for all she knew, maybe she wasn't the only one who had been trying to do a whole language approach. I responded that it was hard to make changes like she was doing and to be the only one in the school who was different.

We talked about the students who would be the focus of the research and then wanting to reach some resolution on the issue of Ms. Everland's role in the research, I asked again about the role she preferred. She said she

would go ahead and work with me, meaning she would work as a research collaborator and keep a log. By now one of the women she carpooled with had stuck her head in the door and we hurriedly gathered our things together and prepared to leave. On the way out I asked her if Whitestone was a town in its own right or a suburb of the nearby city; she answered, "Oh, it's a town of its own, all right. If you want to build anything here, you'd better be from Whitestone."

This last statement intrigued me, but I could make no sense of it and mentally filed it away. Ms. Everland's decision to accept the role of research collaborator also left me with an uneasy feeling because I did not have the sense that she carefully considered her choice; it felt more like a decision made with the toss of a coin. Nevertheless, I was relieved to have the question of her role decided.

Life at Whitestone Elementary School

Two weeks after my initial visit with Ms. Everland I did my first full-day observation period at Whitestone. What follows is a detailed description of that first day. On this particular morning in March the principal and office staff were all wearing purple t-shirts, sweatshirts, etc. When I arrived Mr. Roman told me that today was quite unusual and the kids would probably be a little wild. The local high school athletic team had made

the state playoffs (for the first time ever) and there was a pep rally scheduled for this afternoon so that the school could cheer them on.

Someone in the office asked if she could show me to Ms. Everland's room, which she did. As I entered the room, Ms. Everland smiled broadly and said, "Hi." She asked the students to carry on with their duties (taking attendance, lunch count, etc.) and came over to talk with me. After asking me to pronounce my name, she asked me where I would like to sit and I indicated a table at the back of the room. She got a chair for me and asked if I would like to introduce myself before she had the students introduce themselves.

I told the students my name and that I was studying something called social interaction, which meant who was friends with whom, who talked to whom, who liked to spend time studying alone or with one friend or with a whole group of people. I explained that I wanted to know how learning was effected by these things. When I asked if there were any questions, one student wanted to know if I was a student teacher. I said, "No," that I was just there to observe and talk to some of the students. I described how I had randomly selected the six students who would be the focus of my research and clarified that I would not be assigning grades or looking for good or bad ways to be. Instead, I was just looking at differences

between students. Later, privately, a student asked me who the six randomly selected students were, and I responded that I first had to talk to each of the six students and get their permission to participate, as well as their parents' permission.

Following my introduction, the teacher began a spelling lesson that dealt with analogies. A student raised her hand and said, "I thought we were going to introduce ourselves." Ms. Everland said, "Oh, that's right. We need to do that." She asked a student to begin by telling his name and telling a little about himself. He told his name and his age and so did the next few students. Then Ms. Everland said, 'Come on now; you can tell a little more about yourselves.' A few then added an interest of theirs, but soon they began mentioning their sibling relationships by noting that they had a bratty little sister, were an only child, etc. Introductions continued in a pattern which included name, age, and sibling relationships.

My response to the student introductions was generally a thank you, and/or a request to repeat their name for me. Ms. Everland asked me if I had any further questions or comments and, smiling, I wished her luck if she continued teaching until all the reportedly "bratty" little brothers or sisters reached the fifth grade. I was able to identify all the previously-selected focus students except for Aaron and Brian, who were absent.

After the introductions, several students asked Ms. Everland a question. Samantha wanted to know something about the book fair and there was a question about the science fair. My recollection is that there were a few minutes more of silent work from the spelling books, which gave me a chance to take in the physical characteristics of the classroom.

The room was bright and new and fairly neat and was situated so that, when facing toward the front of the room, the wall on the right was the backside of the indoor corridor of the school. In the middle of the front wall was a large blackboard with rolled maps mounted at its top. Near the back wall, up by the door, was a desk on which were stacked work baskets for the students' completed papers. Next to the desk, and running parallel with the back wall, was a long work table that held a globe and a game called GeoSafari. I sat at the end of the table furthest from the door. Further along this wall was a bulletin board that had been decorated by students who had signed it, "By Dillon, Trevor, and Trey." Underneath this bulletin board was another long table that extended to the corner of the room and held paper shamrocks and some coloring markers. The left hand wall of the room (facing toward the front) was an outside wall that contained a small window. At the base of this wall were low built-in shelves which held construction paper

and a few books. Above these shelves were three more bulletin boards, one for displaying students' birthdays, another to showcase good papers, and a third for a calendar of upcoming events. The front, left corner of the room had the traditional tall, narrow teacher closet where teachers hang their coats and lock up their personal possessions. Ms. Everland's desk faced diagonally out ten or fifteen feet from this corner, and held more in/out baskets, a small U.S. flag set of crossed flags, and a little decorator basket that looked homemade and had red and white checked cloth gathered around it. To the right of the teacher's desk was a small bookcase. Another blackboard ran across the right hand wall of the room, also with a rolled map above it. A floor map was on a stand in the front right hand corner of the room.

The students' desks were arranged in three groups, two of which contained nine desks. These nine-member groups were arranged by pushing a five-member row and a four-member row up against one another so that all but one individual faced another student, and both adjacent and opposing desks touched each other. The rows went from the front of the room to the back, meaning that students were facing sideways in the room. The third group of desks was divided into three separate groups and these students faced the front of the room. In the front of the room three desks stood side-by-side, occupied by Trey, Trevor, and Samantha. Behind them were three more desks, side-by-

side, but only the middle desk was occupied. Edward sat in this desk. In the back were two desks, also side-by-side, occupied by Dillon and Chad. This latter group of eight desks was on the side of the room by the outside wall and closest to the teacher's desk. The arrangement of desks, I learned later, was controlled by Ms. Everland.

After a few minutes of silent seatwork, students were told to line up for the book fair and we proceeded down the hall a couple of doors to an empty classroom that had been set up for the book fair. Students wandered freely around the room, looking at the books and talking amongst themselves. I didn't see anyone who was not occupied either in talking to others about the books or in looking at them. They could not buy the books directly, but had to write down the titles for later purchase.

Tamara talked to me in a feigned irritated tone because there weren't any books on horses. Maggie told me that The Secret Garden was a good book. Edward and Chad got into a shoving match, the beginning of which I did not see. Both boys were obviously angry at one another, but when Ms. Everland spotted them and told them to stop, they did, and went on looking at books. There was something said by the boys about who did what, but it all ended about as quickly as it had begun.

From 9:30 to 10:00 the students had library time and, because they were being punished for last week's

misbehavior (hitting each other with the books, etc.), there was to be no talking except to the teacher or librarian. This was not adhered to, particularly when students asked one another about books they were interested in, etc. At least three times Ms. Everland cautioned them about the talking, saying, 'This would have been fine last week, but because you could not behave last week, you have had the privilege taken away...' They had been told earlier in their classroom that they would not be allowed to go to the pep rally later that day if they were too noisy in the library. By the third admonition, it was clear that Ms. Everland was irritated with them and thought she should not have had to remind them so many times.

Once the students had selected and checked out their books, they sat down at a table and were to read silently. Ann selected two tooks, one of which was Pick of the Litter. Samantha spent most of the time (if not all of it) totaling up the cost of the books she'd selected at the book fair. She used a calculator and totalled $28. Tony asked something of Samantha (apparently about paying for them) and Samantha told her her mother would require her to earn the money to pay for them. Tony said all she had to do was ask for the money and her mother would say, "Here," and give it to her.

There was a disagreement between Andrew and Chad, who were standing in line waiting to check out the books.

Chad, who had been accused of cutting in line, maintained that Andrew hadn't been in line, but when Ms. Everland asked Andrew, he said he had. Chad, told to go to the end of the line, became angry and slammed his books together. Ms. Everland walked over to him and said, "Chad, why are you angry?" I didn't hear the rest of the conversation, but he apparently got over being angry because I saw no further evidence of his irritation.

Ms. Everland handed me the day's newspaper and asked if I'd like to read it. She had remarked earlier that she remembered how boring it was to just sit and observe. I was grateful for something to do because I didn't feel I should talk either and the library, which was really just a big-sized classroom, was too intimate a place for me to feel comfortable taking any notes.

On the way back to the classroom I asked about a natural disaster which, I had been told, several years ago destroyed all the school buildings in this town. Ms. Everland said that it had been on a Sunday and had completely destroyed the schools, so everyone assumed that had it been on a weekday, most of the students would have been killed. The spelling lesson was begun, but interrupted by several questions from students who wanted to know what they would do in the case of a similar disaster. They wondered what would happen if there was no warning at all and Ms. Everland told them what they would

do. They inquired about the plan of action for a scenario that did not permit them to make it to shelter, but did give some warning. She again explained what the plan would be. It was clear that this was no idle attempt by the students to stall on their classwork. Their faces and the questions they asked were serious.

The spelling lesson continued with the teacher asking the students questions about "er" and "est." Someone asked when their Facts Master Test was. Finally, the teacher presented a lesson on the use of "more" and "most," which was apparently a review lesson. She provided some sample sentences and had individual students choose the correct adjective. At about 10:30 she assigned problems 1-13 in their text and said, "Ok, you are to be working on your own."

While the other students were doing their English lesson, a younger student knocked on the door and Ms. Everland talked to him quietly. He was participating in a mock election campaign and wanted people to raise their hands for their presidential candidate. 14 students raised their hands for Bush, 3 for Clinton (including Trey). Quite a few students didn't vote (approximately seven). (By this time of the day, there had been three announcements over the intercom and two children had come knocking at the door.)

The students worked very quietly with almost no talking going on. I didn't see anyone who was just sitting. Students who needed help, raised their hands and

Ms. Everland went to their desk and talked quietly to them. Eventually, she said that she was going to sit at her desk and grade some papers. They could raise their hand if they needed help and she would call them to her desk. I doubt that she got to grade many papers; students kept raising their hands and asking for assistance. I volunteered to help but she said it was ok.

When a student finished his paper, he would put it in one of the out-baskets by the door. Apparently students were free to move around the room, quietly working on a game, bulletin board display, drawing, etc. Once a student named Tony complained to Ms. Everland that the boy next to her was rocking her desk. He said he wasn't and she said that he had to be because why else would her desk be wiggling. Ms. Everland said she'd watch and see. Then she said, "Trey, if you know you're causing the problem, I'd like you to stop." (Trey was next to the accused boy.) I didn't hear anything more said, nor did I hear Tony complain any more. There was no visible reason for Ms. Everland to suggest that Trey was causing the problem and I assumed her comment was based on past behavior.

Toward the end of this work session, Ms. Everland asked Samantha why she was standing and she said, 'There's nothing else to do and only one minute left.' Ms. Everland told her to return to her seat, which she did. However, very soon she and another student went to a

table at the back of the room where the shamrocks were being made.

At about 11:00 the students were told to start returning to their seats to get ready to discuss social studies. There was a little commotion between Trey, Chad, and Dillon that began when Dillon flashed something that looked like a gumball and then quickly closed his hand. It ended without Ms. Everland speaking to anyone or seeming to even notice.

The social studies lesson was about a film on Sir Francis Drake. Chad volunteered to tell about the film and went on and on with his description of it. Edward quietly corrected the things Chad said and rolled his eyes and shook his head, "No." Someone else corrected Chad and Chad said, 'Oh well, I slept through part of it. Whatever...' Eventually, someone said, "Why did you have to call on him?" (meaning Chad). There was, by this time, much whispering and the kind of noise that accompanies shifting in seats, under-the-breath comments, etc. This was about as noisy as the room got on this day. Several more students volunteered to tell about the film, one of whom was complimented by Ms. Everland for doing a fine job. The lesson continued with Ms. Everland calling on students to answer questions about the accompanying unit in the book.

At 11:30 it was time for the students to go to Ms. Lantern's room for science class. Ms. Everland

introduced me to Ms. Lantern, having told me previously that Ms. Lantern had agreed to let me accompany the students into her room. When the students first entered I was struck by how harshly Ms. Lantern spoke to them about being quiet. In fact, by this time I was very conscious of how often during the day the students were told to be quiet and I was beginning to wonder when they were permitted to talk.

Ms. Lantern's room was physically very similar to Ms. Everland's, but there was no student bulletin board, unless the one that was empty was the student one. Once inside, a student went to Ms. Lantern, said he'd forgotten something, and she responded very sternly that he wasn't going to be allowed to go get it because he was always forgetting something. I think she made a reference to being a babysitter. Immediately afterwards Ms. Lantern became very angry in the hallway with a student who later entered the room, sat down, and quietly began working. I never saw this student talk at all while in Ms. Lantern's room. I could not hear what the disagreement was about, but the degree of anger surprised me. I heard her say, "I don't care!"

After sitting quietly for a while, working on a science worksheet, the students were told that they could work with a partner. Even after they had paired up, the room was so quiet you could not hear even a low

whispering. At the end of the period, when told to line up, the students silently collected their things and lined up; then they all filed back to wait outside their own classroom door until Ms. Everland was finished with the group of students she had.

They waited a long time in the hallway - at least five minutes. After a few minutes, two students started fooling around, stepping on one another's feet. Several students said, "Shh," and for a brief time the girls did settle down, but only for a few seconds, at which time they started it all over again. Eventually, the noise involved more than just these two girls and those who were trying to quiet them, but the majority of the class seemed very serious about not wanting to get into trouble.

Finally, the door to Ms. Everland's class opened and the students returned to their own classroom. One of the students told Ms. Everland that someone had left something at his desk and she told him to take it into Ms. Lantern's room. She said, 'Let's see, I think that is ... .' (naming the student who sat in that seat). I noticed the difference between her reaction to a forgotten item and Ms. Lantern's. I think Ms. Everland may even have made a general announcement that if anyone found something on his/her desk, just go take it to its owner.

By now it was lunch time and the students sat quietly at their seats. Ms. Everland commented on the 'nice way they sat quietly', which was appreciated, except that it

was too bad they had waited this late in the day before deciding to behave. She began a mini lecture that expressed her disappointment with their behavior in the library and continued with the theme that it was unacceptable to misbehave most of the day and then change right before the pep rally. The students looked very serious throughout Ms. Everland's lecture and I had the impression that they either thought they were not going to the pep rally, and were sad, or that they believed this special treat now hung in the balance, dependent upon their future behavior. As the students lined up for lunch, the lecture was concluded, leaving it unclear as to whether or not they were going to the pep rally.

On the way to lunch, Ms. Everland explained to me the process for buying a school lunch, and told me that I could stay in the lunchroom with the students, but she was going to the teacher's room and I was also welcome there. I was impressed with the way she helped make sure I was acquainted with the lunch procedures; she even stayed in the lunchroom while I got my lunch.

I elected to go to the lounge with her, and arrived to find only two or three teachers there, all complaining about the students being wild. Every teacher there said their students were either not going to the pep rally, or they were holding back those students who hadn't finished their work. Ms. Everland was asked if she was going to

hold back the students whose work hadn't been done. She said she felt bad about keeping them from going to the pep rally because this was the only thing they had done like this all year. The other teachers immediately jumped on this statement, replying that they had known all year what was expected of them and should be able to behave.

Ms. Everland seemed undecided about using the pep rally to discipline the students and at one point told me that she just didn't know what to do. She didn't feel right about punishing the whole class, but also knew her students were in the habit of misbehaving right up until an anticipated event, when they would suddenly do an about-face. Later in the day when we talked about it, I commented upon the pressure I'd observed her receiving from the other teachers to influence her to withhold the pep rally. She did not seem to understand me and I said that the other teachers all appeared to believe that unacceptable student behavior should result in the students losing this privilege.

She responded by saying that she hadn't really felt pressure from the other teachers. In fact, they had only recently decided to hold back those students who had not completed their work, and she did not have an up-to-date record of who did and didn't have their work done. Her issue was not whether to hold the students back for their academic deficiencies, but whether or not to hold back the whole class for their behavioral shortcomings.

Specifically, the conflict was about punishing the whole class for the actions of a few, but she could not identify "the few" who were responsible for the noise. Eventually, she asked me directly what I would do in this situation. I said that I, too, always had trouble punishing the whole class, and may have added that sometimes it was necessary. (I don't remember whether or not I added this latter comment.)

Lunch lasted only about twenty minutes and then Ms. Everland had playground duty. It was a nice day outside, but I was cold in the strong wind. The other teacher on playground duty was introduced to me by Ms. Everland and we chatted for a few minutes until Ms. Everland spotted some trouble across the playground and left to investigate. She was busily engaged in one problem or another almost the whole time we were outside and I stayed and talked to, first one teacher on duty, and then another. In between problems, I got a chance to ask Ms. Everland about her playground duties and learned that she had three weeks on duty and then one week off. I was surprised at this much extra duty and expressed my surprise. When recess ended, there was no bell or whistle used to alert the students; Ms. Everland just called to a few students, and I called a few others. They all came quickly and lined up.

Once back in the room (at 1:05), students were reminded twice about being quiet and not chewing gum. There were some questions. Two students needed pencils and some were found for them. By now it was time for Facts Master, timed tests of math tables' memorization. There was a problem obtaining the necessary student forms, in that the office was out of those for the younger grades. Apparently, Ms. Everland had told her students that they could take the test on the forms for the lower grades, but was now having to renege on that agreement. Samantha, who was disappointed, grumbled and said, "You said you...." (FN3/11-12). Ms. Everland got irritated and said she knew she had told them they could do some from the lower grades, but, like she explained, the office was out of those forms. 'There was nothing she could do about it,' she said. She said to Samantha, "Why did you say that? You act like you're mad at me. If you listened you'd understand why I didn't have them. Why did you say that? Why are you angry at me?" Then, more gently, she said, "You need to think before you talk. That's something you need to think about." (FN3/11-12). I was surprised that Ms. Everland hadn't distinguished between Samantha being mad at her and Samantha being disappointed and venting her anger at Ms. Everland. At this point, the students cleared their desks and got ready for the Facts Master test. Saul was going for six minutes, Patty for eight, and everyone else was going for ten minutes. I

think that Adam and Patty met their goals, but no one else did.

In the afternoon, the fifth grade students all leave their regular classrooms and disperse to band, music, or physical education. As they lined up to go their separate ways, they were admonished several times by the other fifth grade teachers to be quiet.

After they left, Ms. Everland and I sat down and I went over the papers I had brought with me - the consent forms, the proposal, the information to potential teacher volunteers, etc. I explained that some of the things were going to sound very formal because I was required to follow some guidelines. The changes in keeping the teacher log were explained, changes necessary because the students' schedule precluded full-day observations. Instead, I would be doing twice as many half-day observations and, until mid-May, she would write in the log once a week (rather than three times a week).

The discussion of the teacher log turned to how it would be done and what topics would be addressed. I told Ms. Everland that she could do an audiotape or write out her comments; she did not want to do an audiotape. She wanted to know what she should write about in the coming week, and I suggested she look over the papers I had given her and then discuss herself in terms of "agency" and "communion." I assumed that by next week she would have

some questions about agency and communion and I expressed this assumption. Next week, I said, I would have some suggestions for her to refer to when writing in the log. She told me she would read everything over by next week and reminded me about their spring break in two weeks.

I do not remember how the above conversation concluded, but I suspect there was a natural break in the conversation and that I wanted some coffee. My notes indicate that I took copies of the consent forms and a copy of the proposal to Mr. Roman and retrieved my coffee cup. I remembered that earlier in the day one of the teachers had joked that I was a spy for Mr. Roman and I began to wonder if there was some distrust between the teachers and Mr. Roman. When I got back to the classroom, Ms. Everland was not there and did not come back until about 2:25, when it was time for the students to go to the pep rally. Apparently, all the fifth grade teachers were in one room because I think Ms. Everland indicated that they were in the process of looking over math textbooks for adoption next year. I stayed in the room, writing notes.

From across the hall came a student who had been left alone in her classroom. She was afraid the other students were leaving for the pep rally without coming back to the classroom, and that she would be left there alone. I told her they weren't leaving for a few more minutes yet and felt sure they would come back to the room. She said okay

and went back to her class, but soon was back with another similar question. I assured her that I would check on her before going to the pep rally so that she would not be left alone. That seemed to satisfy her and she went back into her classroom, followed shortly thereafter by the returning fifth grade teachers and then the students.

The students arrived and sat down quietly. Ms. Everland talked to them about their behavior that day, informing them that they had not behaved well enough. She mentioned that she hated to punish the whole class for the behavior of some and then asked who felt they did not deserve to go to the pep rally. A few raised their hands without hesitation. I believe one of them was Chad. More hands began to go up until there seemed to be more up than down. I was surprised and feared Ms. Everland would make these students remain in the room. At the conclusion of her talk, however, she told them that she was going to let them go. They all looked relieved. She warned them, though, that the next time she would expect better behavior in the beginning - not just right before the event. Before we left for the pep rally, there were two more announcements over the intercom and someone hand-delivered something from Ms. Hawkins in the office.

The pep rally was attended by the whole school (except for those students who had been kept back for unacceptable behavior or insufficiently completed

schoolwork). There were some cheers, some speeches by the seniors on the team, a skit that starred the superintendent dressed as a cheerleader, and a cheering competition. A casual remark by a reporter from a neighboring community, led me to inquire about the number of African American students in the school. Ms. Everland invited me to look around the gym; there were no more than four or five black students in the entire district! Shocked, I remembered Ms. Everland's comment on my last visit that Whitestone was definitely a community in its own right and that if I wanted to find out, just try to build something in the town. I wondered about the implications of this statement and its relation to the exceedingly small number of African American students in the district. As the pep rally concluded, I said good-by to Ms. Everland and left.

The Students

Samantha

For several reasons, Samanatha was one of the more visible members of this classroom. She called attention to herself by getting out of her seat, asking questions, stating her opinion, and generally "marching to her own drummer." At times, her assertiveness was more dictatorial than affirming of her personal position.

On my first full day of observations, Samantha was one of the students who sat facing the teacher. She was in the front row of the three rows of three desks, each. She got out of her seat, walked over by me twice, stood near another student, and was finally told by the teacher to return to her seat. In the library, she did not look for a book, but sat figuring the cost of the books she wanted to buy at the book fair.

She was one of the students who was fooling around out in the hall during the long wait before returning from Ms. Lantern's room to her classroom. She was also the one who was admonished by Ms. Everland for grumbling when the correct Facts Master sheets were not available.

At one time, she had been the class president, but had been removed from this position for some reason that I never inquired about. At the end of the day after my second observation period, Ms. Everland told me that

students needing frequent assistance, drove her nuts. She specifically mentioned Samantha as one who "drove her nuts." (FN3/18-32) I saw evidence of this later when the students were making Mother's Day cards and Samantha kept walking around and asking for help instead of getting started (FN5/7-104,106).

Samantha was confrontive, and sometimes ill-concerned with the emotional tone of those around her. During my second class observation, she turned to me and said, "Is that all you're going to do?" (referring to my note taking) (FN3/28-24). This was not said angrily and I smiled and said, "Yes." She responded with 'Oh,' or something similar and went back to the game the class was playing. When the principal came into the classroom and talked very angrily to the students, Samantha unabashedly responded to his, "Do I make myself clear?" by asking, "When you say 'pay attention,' pay attention to what?" (FN4/15-51). Her question was sincere and not sarcastic or confrontive. The significance of this remark was that, while everyone else sat absolutely still as the principal's obvious anger hung heavily in the air, Samantha appeared totally unaffected by the strongly emotional milieu.

The previous examples of Samantha's assertiveness present the picture of a child who is not afraid to ask questions or state her opinion. They do not illustrate

the occasionally dictatorial nature of Samantha's assertiveness. During one of my later visits, a group of about five students, including Samantha, were preparing a play. One of the students, Dillon, was assigning parts and directing the operation. Twice Samantha refused to go along with his suggestion, and when another student made a derogatory remark about Samantha, she took over the leadership position by ignoring what she was told and directing the students herself. This was accomplished by saying, "No," she wasn't going to do as told and by very curtly telling others to erase the board or write something down or telling someone to stop fooling around. Just like E.F. Hutton, when Samantha spoke, people listened.

Ann

Ann was as inconspicuous as Samantha was conspicuous. Often my notes about Ann indicated that she was quiet, or just sitting, or waiting, or being ignored. On my first visit to the classroom, the only mention of Ann was a note as to which books she picked in the library, a comment that Samantha went and stood by her, a note that Ann looked on while two others used a calculator, and that when the teacher told the students to work with a partner, Ann and her partner sat near one another but did not really interact with one another.

On my second classroom observation, the notes on Ann were similar to the first. There were several notes that she was just sitting, that she was ignored or not called on for class participation, and that when she was called on she spoke so softly that she could not be heard. Twice during this observation she was teased by Edward. On the first occasion, she had indicated during a class discussion that she didn't know anything about the Whitehouse and Edward said in a derisive manner, "You don't know anything about the Whitehouse?" (FN3/18-20). Ann either said nothing in response to Edward or said, "No" very quietly. The second teasing episode was while the students were getting ready to take a test and Edward was teasing Ann (FN3/18-25). She told him to stop and, by the tone of her voice and her facial expression, was obviously angry. He did stop, but a few minutes later while Ms. Everland was reading off a list of students who had papers missing, he made a noise and Ann turned around toward him with a disgusted look on her face.

My observations of Ann suggested a very shy girl of few words, who either did not make her wants known or did so with facial expressions or a few words. She was the antithesis of Samantha, and, interestingly, the two girls were friends.

Trey

Like Ann, Trey was not noticed by me because of his verbal skills; however, he was noticed. He was noticed on my first visit because of the actions of the teacher, because of his schoolwork, and because of Trey's own actions.

Trey's was one of the desks set apart from the other students, facing the teacher in groups of three. His was in the front row, separated from Samantha's by another student. When the teacher had a complaint from a student that someone was wiggling her desk, Ms. Everland said, "Trey, if you know you're causing the problem, I'd like you to stop." (Trey was next to the student accused of causing the problem.) Nothing more was said about the problem, nor had I seen any visible reason for Ms. Everland to suggest that Trey was causing the problem. At the time, I assumed Ms. Everland's remark was based on past behavior.

On my second visit, Trey was again admonished by the teacher. This time he was told to take a rubber band off his finger, to do something or not do something, (exactly what I couldn't remember), and then to read outloud. He stumbled over the words to be read and did not know what an article was, which was part of the English lesson they were doing.

As described above, difficulty with schoolwork was another reason why I noticed Trey in the classroom. Not only did he seem to have difficulty with the work, but several times during my first two visits I noticed that Trey was still working while most of the others had finished their assignments. Additionally, he was one of several students in this classroom who received special services for learning difficulties.

The third reason I noticed Trey was because of his own actions. On a couple of occasions he was whispering when he was supposed to be quiet, but more noticeable was the fidgeting, especially during class discussion or during lessons that the whole class did together. On my first visit, he was seen repeatedly banging his elbow against the back of his chair during a class discussion. During another discussion, he had his forehead down on his desk and was sharpening a pencil or playing with something under his desk. Also, on my second visit while everyone else was working quietly at their desk, I watched him walking around the room, continually hitting his hip with his fist. Occasionally the action that drew my attention to Trey was talking or what is generally referred to as fooling around (teasing, etc.), but usually this was an interaction that Trey was a passive participant in, rather than an active one. Once on my first visit there was a little commotion when someone flashed a closed fist with

something like a gumball in it. Trey was part of this group, but he was observing the activity, not talking or really participating.

My impression of Trey was that he was anxious in the classroom, unsure of himself and his ability, desirous of companionship, but insecure about obtaining companionship. He seemed to stand on the fringes with those who were most visible in the classroom, but he, himself, was noticed only when he had done something undesirable in everyday classroom life.

Aaron

Aaron was absent on my first classroom visit so there were no notes of him then. Even when he was present, though, it was hard for me to get a clear picture of who he was. Most of the observations I made on my second visit involved Aaron interacting with someone else. In the library he and another student were good-naturedly hitting each other with their books and then hitting each other with some little sticks. Later, he was smiling and grabbing something away from Ann, who seemed to feign a frown at him. Shortly after these incidents he began blowing air into the face of the person standing next to him. This latter activity escalated into a little game with about four boys who started stomping on each other's feet.

Besides the above and talking several times when he was supposed to be quiet, you'd think Aaron would be characterized as an annoying child. He wasn't. Except for one time when Samantha told him to stop fooling around, I never saw anyone get angry or even irritated with Aaron. He was kind of child-like. When he was obviously fooling around in class and the teacher saw him, she would tell him he would have to write a little story about what he was supposed to be doing or she would say, 'I hope that isn't the reason you're having trouble with this,' but there was no angry emotion there. He was never seen angry either.

With regard to his schoolwork, several times he was last to complete his work or was told his hadn't been turned in. When he read outloud, he did not read with proper reflection, nor did he pay attention to punctuation. I could not see how he could have understood what he was reading. Unlike Trey, however, Aaron didn't seem to mind when he was not performing adequately in the classroom. Once when he was working with two other classmates on spelling and they were clearly having a difficult time getting him to learn his words, he good-naturedly kept at it, smiling, laughing at himself, saying "Ahhh" when he messed up, and finally saying, "Hallelujah!" when he got one right. It seemed to me that Aaron would fit in a t-shirt that showed a student

daydreaming with the bubble above his head saying, "I'd rather be fishing." (Fishing, in fact, was one of his interests.)

Maggie

During my first classroom visit, there were four notes on Maggie: 1) She volunteered to me that The Secret Garden was a good book, 2) She was one of the first ones finished with their seatwork, 3) She was once seen talking quietly to another student, and 4) A notation about who she was paired up with when Ms. Everland told them they could work with a partner.

My notes after visit number two were similar. One of the things I learned while observing at James Walker Elementary was that some students would have no notes written about them unless I made a conscious effort to check up on them every so often and note what they were doing - they were just not visible students. Such was the case with Maggie, so my notes would say, "Maggie was sitting alone and seemed to be doing nothing, just looking around;" "Maggie is in line waiting to check out a book;" "Sitting together are Maggie, Stephanie,...;" "Maggie answered Ms. Everland's question correctly;" etc. These are, in fact, my notes on Maggie during my second visit. The one interaction in which Maggie actively participated is described below.

After a language lesson where Ms. Everland called on volunteers to answer a question she gave them, Maggie said she hadn't gotten one single turn. Ms. Everland said, "Not one single turn? I'll have to double up the rest of the day." That was the end of the interaction.

It is interesting that for Maggie, the two interactions about which I've given any information are interactions with adults. During my first two observation periods, there are four interactions recorded about Maggie that involve behavior initiated by Maggie. Of these four, three are with an adult - either me or Ms. Everland. All of the interactions centered around a book or schoolwork.

Patty

Patty was an interesting student to observe. There was not a wealth of notetaking on her either, but every so often she did something outstanding, so it didn't take long to know who Patty was. She was the class secretary, one of two taking the most advanced Facts Master test, and one of a very small minority who preferred to work alone, instead of working with the rest of the class while the teacher directed them. On one occasion Ms. Everland gave the class a choice of working alone or reviewing a lesson together. The class voted to do it together, but Patty preferred to work alone. Patty asked if the ones who wanted to work alone could do so while the rest reviewed

together. She was told, "No, the majority rules" (FN3/18-23). She made a face to show her irritation.

Other notes on Patty are observations about her sitting and working alone, or who she is sitting with, or that she had completed her work quickly or handed it in after the deadline. She appeared to be a high achiever, assertive, knowledgeable about her wants and needs, independent but liked by others, and interested in talking to her teacher, one-on-one.

Ms. Everland

One of the first things I noticed about Ms. Everland was her struggle with decision making. During our introductory meeting she had difficulty deciding whether to be a research participant or research collaborator. She asked me which role I preferred she take and left me with the impression that she did not understand that both roles had pluses and minuses, making the decision at least somewhat dependent upon her individual wants and needs.

Two other decision-making issues surfaced in my first two meetings with Ms. Everland, one over classroom structure, the other over student discipline. The struggle over classroom structure followed the semester when Ms. Everland's student teacher had initiated a less structured classroom environment than had previously existed. Although Ms. Everland apparently valued some things about a less structured learning environment, she

was uncomfortable when other teachers questioned this approach and/or complained about the noise. The dilemma with student discipline occurred when part of the class was not behaving up to par, but those involved couldn't be identified. Ms. Everland struggled over whether or not to punish the whole class or let the misbehavior ride. There was no acknowledgment that any other options existed for handling this problem.

In each of these dilemmas I had no sense that Ms. Everland appreciated the involvement of differing needs and wants among those people involved in the situations. Just as I saw no indication that Ms. Everland understood how the choice of her research role depended upon her personal needs and wants, I saw no indication that she approached the issue of classroom structure with a similar understanding. There was no mention of teachers differing in beliefs and values and the resultant necessity for negotiation; instead Ms. Everland seemed to be carrying on an internal struggle, determining for herself the correct amount of classroom structure and deciding whether or not to discipline everyone for the actions of a few.

The other observations I made about Ms. Everland had to do with the ways she differed from Ms. Smith, the teacher at James Walker Elementary. The extent to which Ms. Everland was attentive to my needs was especially

noticeable to me. She introduced me to students and teachers and requested that students introduce themselves to me. She provided information about how lunches were obtained and invited me to participate. She supplied me with a newspaper in the library and made sure I had a chair that provided a good vantage point. In general, she anticipated my needs or emotions and tried to make me as comfortable as possible.

Two other observations showed remarkable differences between Ms. Smith and Ms. Everland, and deserve brief mention. The first was the degree to which Ms. Everland taught the whole class at once. Unlike Ms. Smith, who rarely did any large group instruction, Ms. Everland relied almost exclusively on this approach. Secondly, whereas Ms. Smith never acknowledged students'emotions and discussed emotional reactions with students (at least in my presence), Ms. Everland did. Although I think

Ms. Everland sometimes misunderstood her student's emotions or responded differently than I would, she did respond to students who were angry or unhappy and acknowledged that she understood the emotions of her students. In both of these ways, teaching style and responsiveness to students' emotions, Ms. Everland differed dramatically from Ms. Smith.

Mr. Roman

When I made my first visit to James Walker Elementary I neglected to schedule an appointment with the principal, Mr. Anton. Because I regretted this omission, I was particularly conscious of this oversight when I first visited Whitestone Elementary. Up to this time, all communication had taken place with the principal's secretary, Ms. Hawkins, so I was especially interested in making contact with the principal, Mr. Roman.

Wearing a suit, Mr. Roman had been particularly easy to spot out in front of the school building. When we did meet, he was polite, concerned that Ms. Everland might feel pressured to participate, anxious that pseudonyms be substituted for real names, and mindful of the need to be informed in case parents called with questions. Interestingly, he was also inquisitive about classroom structure and informed me that Ms. Everland was in a period of transition.

On the day of my first classroom observation, Mr. Roman was in the office when I arrived and explained that the purple t-shirts were in celebration of an upcoming athletic tournament; he also volunteered that the students would probably be wild in anticipation of the day's pep rally. By the end of the day, I had written in my notes that perhaps there was some distrust between the teachers and principal. This note was written after the

second of two comments made by Ms. Everland about information being shared with Mr. Roman. The second such comment was made to another teacher and was laughed about between the two of them.

During my third classroom observation (April 1st) Ms. Everland told me that Mr. Roman never came into the classroom unless the kids had been bad. This latter comment made me realize that I had never seen Mr. Roman in the hallways or lunch room talking to students and/or teachers. My notes at the conclusion of this day included a remark that Ms. Hawkins, the secretary, seemed to be in charge of the school because she was the one heard complimenting or admonishing students (often via the intercom), while Mr. Roman was seldom seen or heard.

Also on April 1st, in response to a conversation Ms. Everland initiated about the students being noisy, I asked her if Mr. Roman was particularly interested in the students being quiet in the halls. She said "Yes," that he wanted it quiet so that teachers could leave the doors to their rooms open if they wanted and not be disturbed by students passing by.

During my next visit to Whitestone an incident occurred which confirmed Ms. Everland's assertion that Mr. Roman was concerned about the noise level in the school building. The incident occurred while the students were having a science lesson, and since students changed teachers and classrooms for science, this meant that

Ms. Everland's students and I were in another fifth grade classroom, Ms. Tucker's. In the middle of the lesson, Mr. Roman entered the room and Ms. Tucker stopped what she was doing to let him speak. He began addressing the students with, "To say that I was (something I can't remember) would be an understatement; I'm disgusted." He went on to say that he was angry and for a while I could not tell what he was disgusted about. Eventually, he said he was talking about their behavior in the cafeteria, especially before school and during lunch. He said they were so loud that teachers were in there blowing whistles and the students didn't hear them. (This was true; I had seen this happen.) It especially made him angry, he said, because they'd quiet right down while he was in there, but then would get noisy again when he left. He said he couldn't be in there all the time.

At one point, he said, "How many of you here agree with me that the behavior has been disgusting?" Many students raised their hands. Whether it was fair or not, he said, the fifth grade students set an example for the whole school and their behavior influenced the behavior of other students. He said if it was necessary he would take away all their privileges, including the field trip and the spring party (which was to be the next day). 'From now on, when you come through those doors in the morning your mouths are to be closed. If you don't behave, you'll have

an angry principal on your backside.' "Do I make myself clear?"

I heard a number of "Yes, sir's" before he asked a question which I assumed was rhetorical. The question was something like, 'Is there anyone here who doesn't understand what I'm saying?'. Samantha quickly raised her hand and said, "When you say 'pay attention,' pay attention to what?" (Earlier he had told them to pay attention in the cafeteria.) He responded, "to the adults in the room." Samantha's question seemed genuine, and indicated that she had not understood some of what he was talking about. I, too, had not understood some of his lecture but had assumed it was because I wasn't there everyday and was missing some necessary information. After Samantha's question, I began to wonder how many other students hadn't understood part of what Mr. Roman had said.

Finally, Mr. Roman apologized for interrupting the class and left. Ms. Tucker repeated some of the rules after Mr. Roman's departure and then continued on with the science lesson. No one spoke except for her. The lesson she'd conducted had been a review for a science test and the test was then passed out to the students. During the test several announcements came over the intercom, the last of which was one by Mr. Roman. He said that he had now been to almost all of the classrooms and wanted to reiterate his earlier comments. He stressed that the

teachers were to expect quiet behavior from their students.

Because of the interruptions, there was not time to finish the science test and the fifth grade teachers conferred about what to do. It was decided that the tests would be picked up and redistributed the next day and students were told not to confer about them. Before the tests were collected, another announcement came over the intercom about several lost-and-found items and how the appropriate individuals could claim them.

As the students made their way back to their own classrooms some smiled, some looked relaxed, and others appeared serious. I had been surprised at the vehemance with which Mr. Roman spoke. It was dismissal time and other matters where brewing for Ms. Everland and another teacher to discuss, so Mr. Roman's behavior was not discussed until I later asked some of the students about it.

Summary

Introductory meetings with the teacher and principal were described in this chapter. The teacher, Ms. Everland, was observed to have difficulty making decisions and in several ways differed noticeably from Ms. Smith, the teacher at James Walker Elementary. Unlike Ms. Smith, Ms. Everland was very attentive to my needs.

She did a lot of her teaching in large group settings, and she was visibly responsive to the emotional tone of her students. Mr. Roman, the principal, was rarely seen in the school, but his presence was nonetheless strongly felt; especially conspicuous was his strong concern for a quiet school. The six student research participants were also presented in this chapter.

CHAPTER VI

ANALYSIS

Introduction

Michael Agar (1986), in defining the role of the ethnographer, discusses the function of "breakdown" in ethnographic research. He defines a breakdown as a situation where one is unable to make sense of one's observations, "perfect coherence is violated" (p. 20). It is the job of the ethnographer to resolve the breakdown and make sense of the situation. Breakdowns, according to Agar, can be categorized as either core breakdowns or derivative, the former being the main focus of one's research and the latter being less important. There are no mandates determining which breakdowns are core and which are derivative; in fact, one of the strengths of ethnography is that a researcher's perception of a derivative breakdown can be overcome when the data forces a derivative breakdown into a core breakdown.

At both James Walker and Whitestone elementary schools, interpersonal issues arose that strongly influenced individuals' happiness in their respective educational settings. Making sense of the emotional

reactions to these interpersonal issues became the primary goal of this analysis. At James Walker, the emotional reactions of students to their teacher became very intense at times and caused me to wonder where this emotion was coming from. Also, student response varied among students, but the cause of this variance was not clear to me. Students at Whitestone, in contrast, did not appear to react to what I considered a very repressive school climate and were far less emotionally reactive than I would have expected, given the relative lack of concern for individual freedom. In fact, unlike the situation at James Walker, the students at Whitestone were unanimously positive about their teacher. Although later in my research I began to see evidence of negative teacher and student reaction to repressive treatment from the principal and other teachers, initially this negative response was not apparent to me. I found the disparity in emotional responsiveness between the two schools a puzzling situation and set about to resolve the breakdown, as Agar (1986) would put it.

A Breakdown at James Walker Elementary

I entered James Walker Elementary School, prepared to conduct this research as grounded research, which meant that the students and teacher would present the data to me. They did a very good job of it. Nevertheless, trained as I was in the positivist perspective, it was no

easy task for me to hear what my research participants were telling me. My intent from the beginning was to look at autonomy and inclusion in the classroom. The teacher and students kept talking about issues of fairness and gender discrimination or charges of the latter. I tried to brush this aside and continued my pursual of autonomy and inclusion, but they were insistent. Finally, their persistence won out and I decided to join them in their agenda.

The major spokepersons on the issues of fairness and gender discrimination were Ms. Smith and John. On the day of my fifth observation at James Walker Ms. Smith talked to me about this subject. During class, one of the students had objected to a writing assignment, which required them to write about a woman from long ago. At issue was the requirement that it be female (a requirement that was ultimately dropped). Ms. Smith described this opposition as just one of several continuing points of contention that centered on the issue of fairness and frequently divided the class by gender. For instance, Ms. Smith cited a recent argument where students objected to the order in which she called them up for their individual conferences. The boys, she said, insisted that the girls were always called first, despite the fact that she had made a concerted effort to be fair about this. John, in particular, had remarked to his classmates that Ms. Smith

was "traditional," which I assumed meant that boys were to let girls go ahead of them (as per Ms. Smith in FN3/26-4). Ms. Smith related this last comment with a half-smile and shrug of one shoulder, as if to say "Can't win."

My initial reaction to the above discussion was that it was age appropriate, developmentally consistent with others' descriptions of typical fifth grade students (Kegan, 1982; Lickona, 1983). However, an incident occurred which led me to conclude that what was going on in this classroom was not simply a matter of age appropriate behavior. The pivotal incident involved John and Ms. Smith and will be recounted in detail below.

Several visits after the visit where the issue of fairness was discussed, I was observing on an unusually quiet morning as students copied their assignments from the blackborad. I heard John say, Ms. Smith!" and then Ms. Smith say, "John Bradley." At first I thought John had a question he wanted answered, but that did not seem to be the case. It seemed Ms. Smith wanted to discuss something with John - his work maybe? There began a conversation which it turns out related to his unsold raffle tickets. Very quickly it became obvious that a real argument was taking place between John and Ms. Smith. The tone of John's voice was very angry, though it was still controlled and not loud. Both were trying to be quiet, but obviously extremely agitated with one another. I heard some mention of John calling his Dad, but could

not make out the exact words. The tone of his voice suggested that a call would be to his advantage - not Ms. Smith's.

The two argued back and forth long enough that I began to wonder why she didn't call a halt to it and continue later when they had both calmed down or when they could continue privately. In a very controlled voice, Ms. Smith said, "I want you to stop talking to me like that right now" and John replied, very indignantly, "That's how I talk!". Ms. Smith said, "John, be quiet," to which he responded, "No!". Finally, she said, "John, go sit down. I've had enough." and he said, "Yeah, well I've had enough too!" (FN4/9-2&3).

As he said this, however, he did go sit down. He went over and talked to his classmate, Chris, but not in a manner that suggested he was discussing this incident. Instead, it looked like he was doing schoolwork. He smiled once, with what seemed like a genuine smile, and continued working. Class life went on as usual and it was later that morning when I learned the content of the argument.

Ms. Smith came over to me and said, "Did you by any chance hear the conversation...(between John and me)?". I told her that I had heard a few words and got the gist that there was an argument. She said, "He doesn't want to sell his raffle tickets under his own name." (FN4/9-5). (The raffle tickets were for a schoolwide fundraiser.)

Instead, she said, he wanted to give them to Luke, who wanted more tickets to sell. However, all disseminated tickets were to be accounted for, which meant that John should bring back his tickets and then they should be redistributed to Luke. That way, any unsold and unreturned tickets would be Luke's responsibility, not John's. Nonetheless, John refused, which was why Ms. Smith wanted to call John's Dad. Before relating my succeeding conversation with John, I should point out that another conflict between John and Ms. Smith had occurred during my previous visit. It had been at the end of the day, while waiting for the students to be called over the intercom for their buses. Ms. Smith had been telling me about the fundraiser described above.

In the background, I was aware of something going on between John and some of the girls. Suddenly, it seemed that everything was happening very fast and John was furiously involved in an altercation over a poster of his. Someone (maybe John) said, 'Now let's see if she does anything about this!' (referring to Ms. Smith). After questioning, it was learned that one of the girls, Stephanie, had written on a poster on which John and another boy were working. Stephanie, realizing her error, had tried to correct the markings, but the result was unacceptable to John.

With everything happening very fast, I was unable to remember exactly what Ms. Smith's comments were, but my impression was that she was inclined to accept Stephanie's position which was that the poster was really not ruined and that John was making too much of it. Before anything else could be said or done, an announcement came over the intercom that "the walkers" were to leave and on the way out of the room John yelled in an obviously furious manner to Ms. Smith, 'Oh, who cares!'
(FN4/5-4).

With the two previous incidents as backdrop, I arranged to interview John after lunch. To say he was cooperative, would be a gross understatement. He wanted his story told! With regard to the present argument, he thought it senseless to return the tickets, only to have them redistributed to Luke. However, this not being the first argument between him and Ms. Smith, as he put it, he was, "tired of sucking it up." (FN4/9-6). He explained that in this classroom there was a group of four boys and a group of four girls, and Ms. Smith was consistently harder on the boys than the girls. By "harder" he meant that she would punish the boys for an offense that she would only warn the girls about.

He described how he had taken on the task of proving Ms. Smith wrong by keeping track of every time the girls talked when they weren't supposed to, so that at the end of the year he could "blow her away" (Ms. Smith) with all

the stuff she'd done that was unfair. His Dad, he said, would be really mad when he found out all that had gone on. He said he knew he was making it harder on himself this year by not letting go, but he said he just had to. As he put it, he "just wanted justice." (FN4/9-6). While he was explaining just how bad it was, he said it was like "black and white; I'm black and she's white." (FN4/9-6). He talked as though the injustice had gone too far and he had to right the wrong.

I had not expected or anticipated the depth of John's emotions, nor had I fully appreciated the scope of this issue of fairness as presented by Ms. Smith. In the wake of what I had just witnessed, I resolved to question the other six student participants to find out whether or not they shared John's beliefs about gender discrimination. One of the students, Teresa, was asked about the cliques in the room and she never mentioned the group of boys. Her concern was two female cliques. I did not specifically ask her to tell me about a problem between the boys and girls and she did not volunteer any information on the topic. She did, however, talk about Ms. Smith getting mad at the students and singled John out as someone whom Ms. Smith got mad at 'all the time.' The only other student who gave me no information on the boy/girl conflict was also not specifically asked about it by me. This student, Daniel, stated that he was happy in

Ms. Smith's classroom and mentioned no problems. I had trouble communicating with Daniel because his answers were frequently evasive or contradictory. It appeared to me that he was uncomfortable saying anything negative at all but, in fairness to him, it may just have been that he was quite content in Ms. Smith's classroom and honestly didn't see any problems. As to the responses of the other four student participants, they are detailed below.

My first interview after my discussion with John was his friend, Nathan. I asked him if there was a problem in his class between the girls and the boys. He knew immediately what I was talking about and named the same group of boys and girls as had John. He, however, thought that everything was more in fun than really serious. He said they were keeping track of the girls' "messing in their business" (FN4/16-6) and so far they had counted 36 times. (Later interviews and discussions indicated that this habit of messing in one another's business was a complaint of both the boys and girls and one that the boys had focused on to prove their contention that for similar offenses, Ms. Smith punished the boys more than the girls.) Also, Nathan reported that Chris had had Rebeccah over to his house and Chris's mother had asked Rebeccah if the teacher got on the boys more than the girls. According to Nathan, Rebeccah had said, "Yes." (FN4/16-7).

When I questioned Rebeccah about the situation between the boys and the girls she talked at length about another

boy whom she blamed, at least in part, for the continuation of this altercation. When asked about John's part in this controversy, she dismissed him as problematic for any teacher. Finally, I asked her to talk to me about the boys and girls in general and Ms. Smith. Immediately, she asked if I'd noticed the four boys in the four corners of the room. (These are the four boys John had said comprised the group that was monitoring the disciplinary injustices.) It was true, she said, that Ms. Smith had placed them there for disciplinary reasons, but she didn't think they really minded it so much because "...the girls don't really...um...if a girl...like, let's see, the girls that they're sitting by right now aren't very...umm they're...I don't know. They just don't... they...I don't know. One of them I kind of think likes one of them." (FN5/2-12). I interpreted this to mean that either she thought it wasn't really so bad or she was in conflict over this issue.

Another student, Shannon, provided information about the controversy between the boys and girls. She had been talking to me about cliques in the classroom and about several groups receiving differing treatment from Ms. Smith, but had not directly addressed the boy/girl controversy. I asked her to tell me about the boys and girls being treated differently. She said that Ms. Smith was harder on the boys and then proceeded to talk about

two students who "back-talked" to Ms. Smith and two others who were Ms. Smith's pets. Since both the back-talkers and the pets included one male and one female, I pointed out a potential discrepancy between Shannon's statement that Ms. Smith was harder on the boys and the information about Ms. Smith's pets and troublemakers. Shannon was not to be dissuaded from her opinion that Ms. Smith was harder on the boys. She said that the boys got harder treatment, like the four boys being separated (referring to the four boys in the corners). There were, she said, four girls who should also have been separated because, due to talking, the girls didn't get their work done. The remainder of my interview with Shannon dealt with other issues not really relevant to this discussion.

The topic of the seating of the four boys in the corners of the room had also come up earlier when I talked to Nathan. At that time I had been surprised to learn that these four boys had been assigned these seats because I was under the impression that the students selected their own seats in Ms. Smith's classroom. There was, in fact, a student assigned the role of real estate agent, whose job it was each Friday to assist students in any requested changes in their seating arrangements. After my conversation with Nathan, which was two months into my observations, I realized that these four boys were the only ones who had assigned seats. (There had been one girl with an assigned seat, but that had lasted only for the

first month I was visiting the class.) Nathan told me that the boys had been assigned the seats before Christmas, probably in November and that the understanding had been that the boys would remain in those seats for the remainder of the year.

At the conclusion of my interviews with Ms. Smith and the six student participants, I felt confident that the charges of gender discrimination were supportable. Not only were the four boys the only students who had been assigned seats, but when Ms. Smith was asked how her students had responded to the type of classroom she had, Ms. Smith only mentioned male students. During the latter discussion, Ms. Smith named three students who had really come a long way during their year with her, students whom she described as only average students. To the contrary, she named three students, who she felt were particularly bright, but who had not taken full advantage of their year with her. All six of these students were male. No mention was made of any female student, except that early on in my conversations with Ms. Smith she told me that she had a particularly hard time motivating the girls in her classroom.

What puzzled me about this topic, however, was that the students' response to this discrimination was noticeably varied. Of the six students I questioned, two did not mention a problem with gender discrimination, one

acknowledged it but discounted its significance, two thought it was a serious problem, and one acknowledged it, but alternated between thinking it unfair, a game, a result of individual personalities, or simply the prerogative of the somewhat misguided teacher. Considering that I had come into this classroom with an agenda of looking at agency and communion, not only did I feel far afield of my original purpose, but confused as well. I continued to sift through the data looking at the themes of agency and communion, but also began making plans to continue the research in another classroom.

A Breakdown at Whitestone Elementary

Introduction

Because at James Walker Elementary, the breakdown centered around the teacher and her students, I naively assumed that I would encounter a similar situation at Whitestone Elementary. I left James Walker Elementary School and entered Whitestone Elementary with an agenda pertinent to fairness and gender issues between teachers and students. Unlike the situation at James Walker, where I kept encountering an issue I wasn't looking for, at Whitestone I kept looking for an issue I couldn't find, namely the aforementioned fairness and gender issues. What I did find was a sharp contrast between life at James Walker and life at Whitestone.

Whitestone: A Contrast from James Walker.

In fact, had I intentionally set out to find a classroom that was the antithesis of Ms. Smith's, I could scarcely have found a better example than Ms. Everland's classroom. Noticeable differences were evident before I even visited the school or met any of the primary research participants. The principals in the two schools were very different and, consequently, the school climates contrasted strikingly. The classroom organization and methods of instruction were remarkably dissimilar, and finally, the teachers were different, as were my relationships to them.

The first recognition of differences between James Walker Elementary and Whitestone occurred during my initial contacts with Whitestone. At James Walker it had been the principal, Mr. Anton, who had talked with me about the research and secured the teacher participant, Ms. Smith. After reading my research proposal and obtaining administrative clearance for my research, Mr. Anton's communications to me had been helpful and cooperative, seemingly for the purpose of assisting me. He gave directions to the school, provided the name of the school secretary, and identified times Ms. Smith might be available to talk to me. I was very impressed with Mr. Anton's sensitivity and considerateness.

In contrast, repeated attempts to talk to Mr. Roman were unsuccessful. Since a fellow graduate student had been the contact person who secured Ms. Everland as a teacher participant, my initial contact with Mr. Roman had not been to obtain his assistance in the same way that Mr. Anton had done. I wanted to secure Mr. Roman's permission to conduct the research in his school and meet with him personally, which I had neglected to do on my first visit to James Walker. After making several phone calls to Mr. Roman and finding him unavailable, I was asked by the school secretary, Ms. Hawkins, to allow her to relay my request to Mr. Roman. This she did, and it was through her I learned that permission had been granted for me to coduct the research at Whitestone Elementary.

My first conversation with Mr. Roman, on the day I arrived at Whitestone to talk to Ms. Everland about the research, was very different from the conversations I had had with Mr. Anton. Mr. Roman's questions and comments related to his school and concerned protection for the teacher, students, and himself. He wanted to know that Ms. Everland was a willing participant, not one who'd been pressured into the research. He wanted assurances that pseudonyms would be used and asked to be sufficiently informed so that he would not be 'caught in the middle' if parents called. He did show me the way to Ms. Everland's

classroom, but there was none of the friendly, cooperative chit-chat that I had enjoyed with Mr. Anton.

Although I noticed the differences between Mr. Anton and Mr. Roman, I did not leave Mr. Roman with a negative impression. Perhaps, I was grateful that he had granted permission to do the research, and that had been sufficient for me; but also I had regarded Mr. Anton as an exceptionally cooperative principal and, therefore, simply regarded Mr. Roman as the norm. Furthermore, to say that during my initial contacts with these two men I recognized their differences, did not mean that I duly attended to those differences. The specific differences in their behavior were noticed, and I had recognized the communal nature of Mr. Anton's behavior, but I had not recognized the degree of protectiveness exhibited by Mr. Roman, and consequently the highly agentic quality of his behavior; instead, I observed the absence of communal orientation to his behavior. In lieu of the above, I had been at the school for more than a month before I began to realize that the observations of Mr. Roman were a significant part of my research.

Methods of Instruction and My Relationship to Teachers

Meanwhile, what I did notice at Whitestone was the difference in the methods of instruction used by Ms. Smith and Ms. Everland and the differences in the teachers' relationships to me. Whereas students had worked

individually in Ms. Smith's room, with relatively little work done in a large group, the exact opposite was true at Whitestone. At Whitestone, much of the class work was done in a large group with the teacher directing. In terms of my relationship to the teachers, Ms. Everland made a remarkable attempt to make me feel welcome and comfortable in the school. She introduced me to the students and teachers and vice versa, and acquainted me with the procedures in the lunchroom. Ms. Smith, on the other hand, had never introduced her students to me or me to them, rarely introduced me to other teachers, and only provided information about the lunchroom when asked. With regard to agency and communion, what I noticed on my first classroom visit to Whitestone was that Ms. Everland exhibited more communal behavior than had Ms. Smith (friendliness, sociability, and merging with others in the environment).

The Teacher/Pupil Relationship.

Introduction. As already noted, my observations at Whitestone, influenced by my experience at James Walker, began with a focus on Ms. Everland and her students. The first issue, and one which absolutely screamed for attention, was a concern over the students not being quiet enough. This issue surfaced within the confines of the classroom, but also was a big concern when students left

the classroom and either were in more shared public places like the hallways and cafeteria, or went to another teacher's classroom. Another issue arose when students wanted individual attention - help with academic work, a question answered, or a request for accommodation to a private agenda which differed from the teacher's or groups's agenda.

Concern for Quiet. The concern for quiet was evident on my first classroom visit to Whitestone. During the 30-minute library time students were not allowed to speak except to the teacher or librarian, but they were reminded of this at least three times and Ms. Everland, clearly irritated, threatened them with the loss of the afternoon's pep rally. By 11:30 on this day, when the students changed classes (and teachers) for science, the reprimands over being quiet had become so numerous that I wondered when students were allowed to talk.

After this class, while waiting in the hallway to return to Ms. Everland's classroom, the students were again spoken to harshly about being quiet, lectured by Ms. Everland and threatened with the pep rally. The pattern continued in line after the noon recess, back in the classroom again (two more warnings) and then again when lined up for physical education, band, or music.

On my second visit to Whitestone, the morning went better, with students even being complimented on their behavior in the library. Before lunch, however, one class

activity (a contest) was stopped because of the noise level, and on at least two other occasions the students were reprimanded for not being quiet.

As I entered the cafeteria for lunch, I noticed that the lights were all out and that no one was talking. One of the teachers was patrolling the area and telling the students who talked that they would have to go to an area designated for students in need of babysitting. I saw no talking, not even whispering, though a few students communicated with facial expressions or head movements. When finished eating, students stood up in line against one of the walls of the cafeteria and continued in this silent state. Fifth graders were allowed to run around outside on the playground after lunch, but all third and fourth graders were being punished on this day and they all sat against the outside walls of the building without talking for the duration of their recess.

After lunch there was a test, which also meant no talking, and then science class in another teacher's classroom. This teacher, Ms. Tucker, was one of the teachers who was very insistent on quiet and, as she was not there when we entered, we sat waiting quietly for her return. When she did not return, Ms. Everland, knowing there were other students already in her classroom waiting for her, asked if I would stay until Ms. Tucker arrived. Five minutes passed, no one arrived, and I got

concerned that the students would get noisy before Ms. Tucker arrived. I needn't have worried. No one said a word the entire time. When Ms. Tucker appeared, she began at a very fast pace to hand out test papers that the students were to grade for one another. Students who asked questions were ignored or answered in short, terse responses, sometimes with only a shake of the head. When the scores were reported orally to the teacher, two of the students whose names were called were absent and had been reported absent by the students. No acknowledgment was ever made of this and the fast pace continued into the day's lesson. Students who couldn't keep up were simply passed over.

During the lesson on body parts, one student reported she had a metal piece in her hip. Ms. Tucker responded with, "In your hip? Oh," and the lesson continued (FN3/28-29). At the conclusion of the lesson she said, "Stand up, push your chair in; take everything with you that you brought in and only what you brought in." (FN3/28-29). They were then sent out into the hall to wait to go back to Ms. Everland's class - and, of course, they were admonished to be quiet.

The dismissal bell rang before the students got back into their classroom and there was much confusion and hurrying about as students tried to prepare for going home. Students were reminded about homework and an announcement came over the intercom from the secretary,

Ms. Hawkins, that there had better not be any more missed busses.

After the students left that day, Ms. Everland apologized to me for her behavior, saying that she felt like a bitch. I had been comparing her to Ms. Tucker and from that perspective, she looked pretty good. To Ms. Everland I expressed surprise, saying, "Do you really?" (FN3/18-31). She responded by telling me that she got frustrated with the students when they didn't have their assignments done on time and that she felt like she was constantly on their backs. When she mentioned that she was working on her resume, the conversation shifted to a discussion about her personal life, that she was fairly recently divorced and feeling regretful about it, etc. When I asked why she was considering leaving Whitestone, she said that she really liked the kids here, but... well... . (At this point her voice trailed off and she motioned toward the door and said no more.) I assumed she was referring to the other teachers here, but was not sure. She may have said something which insinuated that there was a problem between her and the people with whom she worked, but she was very diplomatic about not pointing the finger at anyone. After an extensive conversation about her personal life and my sharing some about mine, I said goodby and left for the day.

On my next visit, the concern for quiet reappeared after an announcement came over the intercom about upcoming field trips. Ms. Everland told the students that Mr. Roman was very unhappy about the recent noise level in the building and the field trip was going to be cancelled if things didn't improve. For the remainder of the morning there was no appreciable problem over student noisiness, but at lunch time the lights were once again off in the cafeteria, signifying that the no-talking rule was in effect.

At recess time the students reported that everyone was having to sit against the wall for five minutes, which prompted Ms. Everland to talk more to me about the pressure of constantly riding the kids for being noisy. Again, she said she felt like a bitch about it and this time asked me directly if I thought the kids were being told too often to be quiet. I said that they did hear about it frequently, not just from her, but in the lunchroom, out in the halls from other teachers, etc. This is when I asked if Mr. Roman was particularly interested in the students being quiet and was told, "Yes." (FN4/1-40). We talked a little about the problem and Ms. Everland asked me if I had any suggestions. Not wanting to adopt the role of expert, I reported that the problem seemed so pervasive, not just in her room, but throughout the school, that I wondered if the students weren't just tuning out some of the reprimands. I brought

up the problem of disciplining a group for the behavior of a few, mentioned a technique used by a former principal, but generally reflected that it was, indeed, a problem. Ms. Everland concluded by saying that maybe she'd try not telling them so often to be quiet.

This did not quell the restriction from other teachers, however. After lunch I saw the physical education teacher making the students sit for five minutes because they had been too loud and the science teacher, Ms. Tucker, held a tight rein on her class again. While the students worked on worksheets in this class, I watched for talking and saw absolutely no one even whispering.

This issue over the students being noisy continued throughout my observations at Whitestone. On my next visit the lights were again turned out in the cafeteria, though not for the entire lunch period. When I asked a student about it, he said they were turned off everyday. Further inquiry revealed that this was not meant to be an exaggeration; they were literally off every day, meaning that talking was rarely allowed during lunch. Every day that I was there, the lights were turned off for at least part of the lunch period, usually for more time than they were on. This visit was also the one where Mr. Roman entered the classroom and talked at length about the students being noisy, leaving no question about the seriousness of his concern.

Student Requests for Individual Attention. What had begun as a follow-up to my research at James Walker (watching the teacher/student interaction), had by now drawn me to observations over the problem of student noisiness. While attending to this issue, I noticed several interesting things related to student requests for individual attention. At first, all I noticed was that Ms. Everland seemed to spend a lot of time answering individual questions or providing one-on-one assistance whenever students were supposed to be working independently at their seats. The need from students seemed to be so great that Ms. Everland never had any time in the class when she wasn't actively teaching. The first time I noticed this, an assignment had been given, after which Ms. Everland went up and down the aisles answering questions of those whose hands were raised. There was no end to the student's need for help and finally Ms. Everland said she was going to grade some papers at her desk and call those who needed help to come up to her desk. I don't think she ever got any papers graded, because the students kept coming up to her desk for help. On my next visit I noticed a similar incident and wrote in my notes that it was common for there to be several children wanting help and for Ms. Everland to be answering one child's question while three more sat with their hands

up. I also noticed that it was common for Ms. Everland to say, 'Ok, I'll take this one more question and then I need to get some work done.'

Eventually, I began to write down the names of students who frequently needed individual assistance. This led me into a discussion with Ms. Everland about these students, where I learned that the continual need for assistance from students drove Ms. Everland "nuts" (FN3/18-32). In fact it had arisen as a problem early in her teaching career when a parent complained that her child was not being allowed to talk to the teacher. As a result, her current behavior was intentional and hopefully would prevent this kind of accusation from parents.

I had noticed that three of the six students in the row farthest from the teacher were students who asked for frequent assistance, so asked Ms. Everland about the seating arrangements of the students. (By this, my second visit, the seats had been rearranged in four rows of six students each, with the teacher's desk off to the left of the front of the classroom. The seats remained this way for the rest of the time I observed at Whitestone, except that each Friday the student at the front of the row went to the back and everyone moved up one place.)

Ms. Everland told me that she had arranged the seats because she wanted the students seated individually, boy/girl/boy/girl... . I mentioned my observation about the students who needed assistance being seated in the last row

and Ms. Everland said, "Yeah..." (FN3/18-32). She said that Samantha, who was one of the three, particularly drove her nuts and I silently pondered about the dynamics behind this situation. Out loud I said that I was looking at the condition in terms of agency and communion and wondering what motivated the students to seek out that individual attention. If they wanted closeness to her, they were seeking communion; if they wanted attention, they were being driven by agency needs. Ms. Everland did not seem to relate to what I was saying and I closed with the remark that I didn't have any of it figured out yet. After this, I continued observing the behavior associated with student requests for assistance and over three of my succeeding visits to Whitestone, entries were made in my notes about the problem of students needing frequent assistance from Ms. Everland.

While watching the above phenomenon, however, I was drawn to what seemed a curious ritual in Ms. Everland's classroom. Frequently, between activities time was spent with Ms. Everland answering questions posed by individual students. This was done with the whole group listening as students, whose hands were raised, were called on for their questions to be answered. Often the students requested information about school-related topics, such as when the science fair was, or where the students would go in the case of a tornado. Sometimes someone might be

asking for pencils or wanting to attend to a personal need like getting a drink of water. The mood during these times was relaxed and comfortable and Ms. Everland was usually accommodating to the students' requests. Most often the time ended with Ms. Everland putting a limit on how many more questions would be answered and when one more or two more questions were answered, the session was over.

The issues related to students' request for individual attention included, not only the need for academic assistance and the peculiar question ritual, but also occasional direct requests from students who wanted accommodation to their own personal agendas. An example of this type of request occurred on my second classroom visit to Whitestone. One of the students had apparently worked ahead in her text and had already completed the assignment on which the others were currently working. I did not hear her question to Ms. Everland, but inferred that she had asked to continue working ahead.
Ms. Everland said, "I don't want you working ahead. You can just sit there." (FN3/18-18). The student asked to do something else, but was told, "No, you can just sit there. I think we've had a talk about that before." (FN3/18-18). Afterwards, the student sat idly in her chair, picking at the glitter on a shramrock she or someone else had made. Later that day this same student groaned when the majority of the class elected to review a lesson in group, as

opposed to doing individual reviews. She was reprimanded during the review for writing while the review was in progress. Tony's response was that she was going along with them and writing, but Ms. Everland told her to stop and just listen.

Another request for accommodation took place when a student, Patty, reacted negatively to the class vote to review the lesson in group and asked if the people who didn't want to do a group review could do it alone. Ms. Everland told her, "No, the majority rules." (FN3/18-23). A similar incident concerned a choice between reading a story out loud as a group or reading it silently and individually. Again, the class vote was to read it together and dissenters were obliged to accommodate to the wishes of the majority. Another time, Ms. Everland allowed students to select a partner to work with and the last individual to choose a partner objected to being placed with the only remaining unselected individual (who was of the opposite sex). This objection fell on deaf ears, though, and the two were required to work together on a regular daily basis until they had finished reading a library book.

I am embarrassed to write that for two months I watched the interactions between Ms. Everland and her students, anticipating the expected breakdown, particularly watching for issues of fairness and gender discrimination. In retrospect, my efforts remind me of a Laurel and Hardy film

where Stan Laurel is totally oblivious to the real action, which is blatantly visible to the viewer. Finally, after two months of observations, I realized that the action in this setting was not an issue of fairness involving the teacher and her students; the action was within the relationship between the principal and the teacher and the students.

As indicated in the section of this paper where I described life at Whitestone, and particularly in my previous description of Mr. Roman, it is obvious that Mr. Roman could be a commanding figure. A full appreciation of this fact took place on my fourth observation when he entered the science class to deliver his lecture on expected lunchroom behavior. Mr. Roman's interactions with and effect on Ms. Everland, however, were not appreciated until a month later.

Mr. Roman and Ms. Everland

Near the end of April I visited Whitestone and, during the course of the day, was asked by Ms. Everland if I had heard the discussion about the field trip. She assumed that I had overheard some talk about a problem with the number of buses scheduled to take students on an upcoming field trip. When I responded that I had not heard anything about this, she filled me in.

It seemed that Mr. Roman had not scheduled enough buses to transport all the third and fifth grade students,

plus the required number of parent chaperones, to their destination. One of the other fifth grade teachers had talked to Mr. Roman about the problem and had been told to tell the parent chaperones that they would have to take their own cars. Since this involved approximately 48 parents and only two days remained before the field trip, the teachers were loathe to do this. Upon mentioning this to Mr. Roman, however, the teacher was told that she..."could either go, or...not go." (FN4/29-76).

Ms. Everland's response indicated that she felt caught between parental and student expectations and Mr. Roman's mandate. Additionally, her own standards of correct behavior toward parents would have been violated by telling the parents to drive themselves. It was also evident to me that she thought Mr. Roman had failed to adequately plan for this field trip.

The above conversation took place quietly in the teacher's lounge and, as we were talking, Mr. Roman came in to the lounge and sat down. He waited a few minutes and either he initiated the conversation or Ms. Everland did. He said that it was ok; he would talk to her later. He didn't realize she was busy (or talking, etc.). I had the distinct impression that he really had expected us to stop talking and talk to him and for a second I considered acquiescing, but since we were in the middle of a discussion, I decided against it.

Mr. Roman told Ms. Everland that he wanted to talk to her about the student of the month. She said something about forgetting to check...and Mr. Roman responded that he wished he had a dollar for every time a teacher told him they had forgotten. The mood was only slightly apologetic on Ms. Everland's part, like "I know I forgot...it happens... etc.". Mr. Roman wasn't real stern or angry, but neither did I have the impression that he was just kidding. After he left, Ms. Everland explained to me what had happened.

She had chosen a student of the month who was doing well in her class, especially considering that his parents were going through a divorce, which, in fact, had been a consideration in her selection because she said she thought he needed a little boost. She was supposed to have checked with the music and P.E. teachers before announcing her selection, but had forgotten to do so. As it turned out, these two teachers had had a lot of problems with the student and objected to his being selected. Unfortunately, Ms. Everland had already called the student's mother, who had been elated and was planning to take off work to come for the presentation of the award. Ms. Everland thought it unfair now to take the student off the award list and, considering the personal problems in the family, to disappoint the student and his mother. This was the situation that Ms. Everland was

going to have to straighten out with Mr. Roman, and I didn't envy her the task.

About a week and a half later I asked Ms. Everland about her relationship with Mr. Roman and she described a critical point at which their relationship had changed. While the student teacher had been teaching in Ms. Everland's room, the students had been 'all over the school grounds' (FN5/12-108). However, both she and the student teacher felt okay about this because it was organized, they knew what the kids were doing, and there was a lot of learning going on. The kids were loud, Ms. Everland said, but it was normal kids' noise.

Mr. Roman had scheduled a time to come observe Ms. Everland for her evaluation, but he had put it off and put it off until finally there was no time left to do it, so he had just arrived unannounced one day. As it happened, Mr. Roman's visit coincided with the changing of the bulletin boards, an activity for which the students were responsible. On this Friday afternoon at 2:15 Mr. Roman observed one group of kids at a bulletin board, and several others studying in various locations. Ms. Everland said it was noisy, but not a ruckous and all the students were appropriately engaged in one or another planned activity. Mr. Roman had stayed about 10 minutes and left mad.

"He was mad," said Ms. Everland. "You could tell he was mad." He went over to another fifth grade teacher's class and said, "How can you get anything done with that noise next door?" (FN5/12-110). (This latter comment had been reported to Ms. Everland by the other fifth grade teacher.) He then apparently went back to his office, where Ms. Everland went to talk to him because she had known he was angry. She said she had told him that this particular Friday was not a typical time and I believe she said she'd even suggested he come back and observe again another time, but he never did. Ms. Everland said her whole evaluation was done on that 10-minute observation and ever since, she had the feeling that he didn't like her. He had thought the students had had too much freedom and he blamed the student teacher for what looked like chaos. Ever since, said Ms. Everland, he looks at her differently. "I avoid him," she said. She said he'd be in the teachers' lounge and everyone would be laughing at something someone had said and she'd say something and he wouldn't laugh. She said she agreed that it was proper for children to be quiet sometimes - like in the library. No matter which library a child went to, he'd be expected to be quiet and children needed to learn how to behave, but at Whitestone it was overdone.

Mr. Roman and the Students

After Mr. Roman delivered his address to the students about being quiet in the lunchroom, I began to watch for signs of his relationship to students. Although, I had begun to wonder about the concern for quiet in the school and had been told by Ms. Everland that Mr. Roman valued quiet in the hallways, until the previously discussed conversation took place with Ms. Everland, I really had no idea how others in the school felt about Mr. Roman.

After Mr. Roman's address to the students, I asked the students if it had gotten quieter in the lunchroom. One of the girls, Tony, told me that it had and when I asked why she said it was because they were afraid of him. He might take away their recess for the rest of the year or suspend them, she said. Another student, Brandy, agreed that it had gotten quieter because the students didn't want to get in trouble. Since Mr. Roman wasn't in the cafeteria and I had heard that he usually wasn't, I asked from whom would they get in trouble. Brandy named a teacher and Mr. Roman. "But Mr. Roman isn't here," I said. The custodians would tell him, she said. I had noticed that the custodians were a visible component of the staff and had talked to one earlier who had worked at the school for ten years. We had not discussed Mr. Roman, however.

Another student, Chad, talked a great deal about Mr. Roman. He said that Mr. Roman jumped to conclusions, which upon further questioning meant, that if the lunchroom was noisy on one day, Mr. Roman assumed it would also be noisy on other days. Chad said that the lunchroom used to have less children in it at one time, but Mr. Roman, who had just come to this school two years ago, had divided things up differently so that there were more students in the lunchroom at once. There are too many students in there, said Chad; that's why it's so noisy. Mr. Roman had never asked the kids about the problem, Chad volunteered. Later, when I asked Chad who added to the tension in the school, he immediately mentioned Mr. Roman. Chad, who was moving to another school, said he would be glad to get away from Mr. Roman and some of the teachers who expect fifth graders to do what the other grades can't (meaning expecting fifth graders to set a good example).

Probably the most powerful illustration of the students' attitude toward Mr. Roman was the bulletin board I noticed in Ms. Everland's room near the end of the school year. The bulletin board for which the students were responsible had a drawing which showed Mr. Roman being attacked by students who looked like Ninja Turtles. Mr. Roman, wearing a black suit and dress shoes, his tie swinging way out, was carrying a briefcase and apparently throwing out report cards. The kids looked like warriers and Mr. Roman was getting hit in the face with something.

The scene looked like a picture from Mad Magazine - with a bloody brain coming out of the front of his face. The clock drawn on the bulletin board showed 3:18 and the calendar was set for the last day of school. Four of the male students in the class, including Aaron, had created this picture that was unmistakeably a fantasy about the last day of school.

After the above observations and conversations it was obvious to me that I could not limit my focus at Whitestone to Ms. Everland and her students. This classroom had to be understood within the context of the school as a whole. Once I saw the strong influence of Mr. Roman when he delivered his lecture about quiet in the lunchroom, and heard Ms. Everland's dissatisfaction with her relationship to Mr. Roman, I began to appreciate the very significant admonitions against personal autonomy at Whitestone. When this occurred, I went to talk to Mr. Roman, in hopes of understanding his perceptions and values, and learning how he fit into the scheme of things at Whitestone.

I explained to Mr. Roman that I wanted to learn something about the town of Whitestone, which I really didn't know anything about. He began by saying that he, too, knew relatively little about Whitestone because he didn't live there. He reported that most people who lived in Whitestone, did so because of the surrounding lakes,

had little investment in the town, and probably didn't know who the mayor was and couldn't name the police chief. The inhabitants lived scattered out and worked in the nearby city, Allen. In fact, Mr. Roman, informed me that Whitestone had no main street in town. The community was, according to Mr. Roman, narrowminded and, unfortunately, not progressive. Several requests for new business had recently been turned down and most of the established businesses were family owned and had been there for years and years.

The schools, he said, were good, had taken first place in a recent academic contest, and had students who were respectful of authority. The staff was also good, conscientious and creative, for the most part. When asked about the needs of the school, Mr. Roman identified several subjects that should be added to the curriculum, with accompanying teachers, and mentioned the need for a media center and computer lab. We closed with a discussion of a natural disaster that had occurred in this community eight or ten years ago. The disaster had taken one life and destroyed a great deal of property and was frequently discussed by Whitestone inhabitants as if it had happened only a year ago.

At the conclusion of the day, I followed up on this conversation with Mr. Roman and asked Ms. Everland about the school climate. She immediately responded with, 'Oh, you mean how the teachers don't like one another?' and

then referred to the cliques among the treachers, dependent upon what church they attended. She said she didn't know many of the other teachers in the school; for example there were third grade teachers who she didn't know. At a later date Ms. Everland told me that they had a teachers' meeting every Tuesday, but since Mr. Roman did all the talking, the teachers never got a chance to talk to one another.

Resolving the Breakdowns

Introduction

Amid the discussion of fairness and gender discrimination at James Walker Elementary and before and after the emergence of the student/teacher/principal relationship issues at Whitestone, I continued to watch the dynamics of agency and communion in these schools. It was not apparent to me if and how all these topics were related to one another (fairness and gender discrimination, the relationship issues at Whitestone, and the forces of agency and communion). In fact, the core breakdown seemed to be explaining the variety of emotional reactions to these school/classroom settings that varied so much in terms of agency-related and communion-related characteristics.

What was apparent was that agency and communion came in many different guises, not all of which were easy to

recognize. In the paragraphs that follow, I will turn, first of all, to a discussion of agency and communion and their numerous visages, and secondly, to my findings regarding agency and communion in the two schools.

Agency and Communion Across Developmental Stages

Agency, as defined by Bakan (1966) occurs when one attempts to master her surroundings, to persuade others, or when one adopts an authoritative leadership strategy. It is evident when one assumes responsibility, organizes activities, gives advice, or adopts an instrumental orientation. Conversely, communion, as defined by Bakan (1966), is manifested when one surrenders the self through contact, openness, and cooperation. It is yielding, compassionate, and affectionate. We act out communion when we recognize that we are part of a larger whole, in which our welfare is inseparable from the welfare of the whole.

The above definitions for agency and communion do not differentiate between differing developmental manifestations of agency and communion, and are, in fact, geared toward the mature adult. For example, running away from one's parents is a clear example of agency in a two-year old, but this act is not explicitly defined as such in Bakan's definition. Similarly, cooperative play in the preschool-age child would be an expression of communion, but few of us would say that the children were

surrendering their selves through openness. Before proceeding to discussions of agency and communion in the two school settings, it, therefore, seems appropriate to consider how agency and communion might be exemplified at other developmental ages.

Referring to Kegan's (1982) theory, agency in the young child would take the form of gaining control of one's senses, movement, reflexes, impulses, and perceptions. This is the time when the child is learning to differentiate between self and non-self, between self and one's impulses and perceptions. Agency may play itself out in motor activities or in fantasy games, superheroes, magic, etc. Later, when the child is striving for self-sufficiency and competency, agency may take the form of competition, testing limits, acquiring skills, experimenting with roles, etc. Still later, in adolescence and adulthood, agency is evident when one develops an identity separate from parents and peer group, when one becomes independent and responsible, and involved in some life work. All of the above are manifestations of agency, and dependent upon the level of development, we can expect to see agency exhibited in many different ways.

With regard to communion, here too, there is variety in its appearance over time. In the young child communion will be seen in physical closeness, in proximity-seeking, imitation, and modeling behavior. An older child will

seek out peers, learn to play cooperatively, become part of a peer group, and learn to share. Adolescents and young adults learn to listen, to consider the needs of others, to be loyal, etc. Affection and sexual behavior are also examples of behavior signifying a desire for communion. Finally, adults develop the capacity for intimacy; they learn to value others as much as themselves, and they may become deeply spiritual. Although most of us could imagine ways in which the above characteristics could be utilized in the service of agency-directed motives, generally it would be safe to expect that these characteristics represent manifestations of communion.

Agency & Communion in James Walker Elementary School

Because of the overall atmosphere at James Walker Elementary School, Ms. Smith's interest in my research on social interaction and her behavior toward me, and because of the students' freedom to move about and talk in her classroom, I initially assumed that her's was a classroom where communion was highly valued. Communion, exemplified through contact, friendliness, and sharing, was evident when I first walked through the doors at James Walker. Each day at James Walker began with an opening ceremony attended by the whole school, where congratulations were delivered for those with birthdays, favorite songs were sung, and farewells were said for those leaving.

Throughout the day, parents seemed to be wholeheartedly encouraged to participate in activities with children, as there was always at least one group of students working in a hallway with what appeared to be a parent. Mr. Anton was friendly and welcoming, as he moved about the building, seemingly facilitating warm interaction among people.

On my first visit Ms. Smith illustrated communion when she talked with me about her parents, that they were recently retired, not healthy, and not adjusting very well to retirement. On a later visit she also showed communion when talking about her mother when she said that she worried her mother might die before she got a chance to see her. (Her parents did not live close by.)

By the end of my second observation period, however, I was beginning to question my assumption about the value of communion in this classroom. My notes on this date included a comment about the very business-like nature of the students' individual conferences with Ms. Smith. Additionally, there was a comment about the procedure for using the bathroom, and another about the seating arrangement where nearly everyone, except the teacher, faced an outside wall.

The individual conferences between Ms. Smith and her students were a continuous activity each morning that I visited. Learning was structured for students to each

work on their own assignments; they copied their assignments from the board, completed them, and returned them to their individual folders where they were evaluated and discussed, individually, with Ms. Smith. There was a strong emphasis on independence, personal (as opposed to communal) responsibility, and instrumental or goal-oriented behavior. I never saw Ms. Smith teach a lesson to a small group or to the class as a whole. She read a story to the whole class each day I visited and on several occasions she had the whole class listen while individual students or small groups presented something, e.g. a rap, a report, or a game show. The majority of the time, however, the lessons were organized to be done by individuals, rather than by groups.

The classroom organization, modeled as it was on the American economic system, was very individualistic in orientation. Each person was expected to assume personal responsibility for completing his work or accomplishing his assigned role, e.g. custodian, real estate agent, attendance clerk, personnel clerk, etc. Completed work was paid for and misbehavior was fined. The money that was earned was to be used individually to buy small items at the class sale held once a month.

A comment in my notes about the procedure for students' using the bathroom resulted from what I considered to be a blatant absence of communal behavior. When a student needed to use the bathroom, he would ask

Ms. Smith for permission, and before giving him permission, she would ask a language or grammar question, such as, "What do you put at the end of a declarative sentence?". I never heard her deny permission when a student answered incorrectly, but the impersonalness of such a personal act was very noticeable to me.

The seating arrangment in Ms. Smith's classroom, at first glance, seemed to be open and flexible. Students appeared to move freely about the room, sitting wherever they chose. It was much later that I realized there was more to the seating arrangement than I had originally noticed. Students did, in fact, have desks of their own which were permanent until Friday when the real estate agent could assist them in a move. As discussed previously, four students had permanent seat assignments, which could not be moved. Sometimes, due to too much noise or poor work habits, Ms. Smith revoked their privilege to move freely about the room and students had to stay in their assigned seats. One day when I arrived students had for three days not been allowed to talk or leave their assigned seats without permission from Ms. Smith.

In time, I realized that simply the arrangement of the desks was counterproductive to communion. Although students sometimes moved about the room, the desks remained in a permanent arrangement, which was side-by-

side around the perimeter of the room, all facing toward the outside walls. Ms. Smith commented about this arrangement, saying that the students knew they could move their desks into groups of six or seven, but that they never elected to do so. Also, she said they did not treat the wall space above their desks as personal property, which she thought strange because that was permissible to her. When I interviewed the students about the seating arrangement, I got some interesting responses.

John said that Ms. Smith had moved the seats the way they were and implied that it was not open for negotiation. Nathan told me that Ms. Smith had originally placed all the seats in the center of the room with some of the display cases, but it had been too cramped, was difficult to walk around, and prevented the students from seeing Ms. Smith. (I noticed that with the current arrangement almost all the students had their back to Ms. Smith, and had to turn around to see her.) He said that the students chose to move their seats the way they were now. Teresa told me that Ms. Smith had made the seating change and said that she, Teresa, preferred it the way it was before, implying that that was not permissible. Rebeccah's and Daniel's opinion was that Ms. Smith had chosen to move the seats; Rebeccah, when asked if the students could change the arrangement, characteristically dodged a direct response by justifying their current arrangement. Daniel veered off to another topic and was

not asked any more about this issue. The prevailing opinion was that Ms. Smith had made the change in seating arrangement and the students either didn't question the current arrangement or thought it was not open for negotitation. The discrepancy on this issue between Ms. Smith's position and the behavior of her students would have surprised me if I had not witnessed two incidents in this classroom which shed some light on the inconsistency.

The first incident was a class discussion that took place on my fifth visit to James Walker Elementary. By this time, I had begun to notice the highly agentic quality of the classroom, that Ms. Smith almost never talked to me during class time, and that I never saw her carry on a personal conversation with a student during class time, except those involving academic tasks.

On this particular visit there was a discussion of a pizza party that was supposed to have taken place on the day I first visited the class, but which had still not occurred. It was a party earned by the students for good classroom behavior, the only such party to be earned all year. (It was late February.)

Shannon asked about the pizza party and a discussion ensured about how the pizza was to be distributed and when the party should take place. Originally, I had understood, as appartently the students had, that each

student would receive a given number of pieces unless they brought money for extra. One of the students had figured out how many pieces their money would buy, but Ms. Smith said that they would each get an equal amount. Some of them wanted to know what would happen to the extra pieces and Ms. Smith answered evasively, saying that they would wait and see if they could work it out equally. As a result, John and Luke wanted to know if they could get back the extra $.50 they had paid, having assumed that would entitle them to an extra piece. They were told, "No."

Then the discussion turned to a consideration of when in the day the party would be, whether it would replace lunch or be in addition to lunch. John suggested another time so that they could have longer than the usual 15 minutes allotted for lunch without infringing on their outside recess time. Ms. Smith questioned the feasibility of this and John recommended continuing class on through the usual lunch time, taking the outside recess time, and then returning for pizza afterwards. Ms. Smith said she thought they should keep it the way it was; 'besides,' she concluded, 'you voted to have it for lunch, so that's when we'll have it.' (FN3/26-3).

Unfortunately, I had not been present during the previous discussion when the vote had taken place and did not attend the pizza party, so did not see how the pizza was actually divided or paid for. In an interview after

the party, Nathan told me that some had probably not gotten enough, though he had gotten two extra pieces. He said that it had taken three weeks to have the party and that Ms. Smith would not let them talk about it (planning it). Luke, he said, had it all figured out, but someone said something and Ms. Smith stopped the discussion. The above information was relayed by Nathan in a matter-of-fact way without much emotional expressiveness. Ms. Smith and the other students were not questioned about the party because over the next two visits I was busy following up on the heated arguments between Ms. Smith and John.

The second incident I witnessed demonstrated just how individualistic was the orientation that Ms. Smith brought to her classroom, and how her orientation reflected on the policies she set for her students. It was toward the end of my observations, on the day that John stormed out of the classroom angry at Ms. Smith for not punishing a female student who had written on his poster. Immediately before John's eruption, Ms. Smith called me from across the room to show me a letter that was going home with the students. It was in reference to a prize being awarded for the raffle that had also been a source of conflict between Ms. Smith and John.

The letter explained that whichever class sold the most raffle tickets would receive a $25 gift certificate from a local merchant. Ms. Smith explained to me that in

her class the gift certificate, if won, would be auctioned off to individual students who could bid on it with money earned for completed work. I was surprised by Ms. Smith's emotional tone when explaining this plan to me. She seemed especially pleased, which puzzled me, until I understood the reason. Several times during my conversations with Ms. Smith she had expressed concern about motivating students academically. Once, she said she had a particularly difficult time motivating the girls; another time, she talked about the school's policy of giving no grade below a C, which eliminated this external motivator. Paying students for their work had been Ms. Smith's means of encouraging student achievement and this $25 award allowed Ms. Smith to introduce an added incentive to her reward system.

It seemed that some of the students had not valued the money earned for academic work, had lost their money, or given it away. Luke, in particular, had combined his money with Rebeccah's so that between the two of them, they would have more money than John. (This was done in revenge because John had resold a gift from Luke, which originally had been a disappointing purchase at the monthly class sale.) Ms. Smith's pleasure with this potential addition to her reward system was that the $25 certificate might cause some of the students to reevaluate their past use or misuse of their money.

It is interesting to look at these incidents in terms of agency and communion. In the first incident, agentic behavior as displayed by planning, was very much evident. Students had brought money for pizza, including extra for additional pieces. One of the students had figured out how much their money would buy and how many pieces that would entitle each of them to. Efforts to control, persuade, and manipulate were also present and indicative of an agentic orientation. On the other hand, communal behavior expressed by openly discussing problems was noticeably absent.

In order for a problem-centered discussion to be considered communal, it must have an interpersonal orientation, where needs, feelings, and viewpoints are shared, and where cooperation and mutuality predominate. Ms. Smith and the students needed to negotiate whether this party was to replace the regular academic schedule or, more simply, substitute for the usual lunch arrangements, but this discussion was cut short by the teacher before differences of opinion were aired. Throughout the discussion, both teacher and students attempted to control the other, either by persuasion or the utilization of authority. The character of the debate was instrumental (planning the party), not an interpersonal orientation of mutual support.

With regard to the second incident, it surprised me that Ms. Smith would convert a group award into an

individual award, especially since I knew that students were also receiving individual awards for exceptionally high ticket sales. Furthermore, I was astounded that Ms. Smith would place such a high value on individual achievement with no apparent insight into the impact her behavior might have on her students. Ms. Smith did not seem to appreciate how the motivation to earn this $25 award might have promoted cooperation, sharing, and group harmony. It was unfortunate that a classroom beset by continuual bickering and much ill-well had missed out on this opportunity for group solidarity.

Agency and Communion in Whitestone Elementary School

In constrast to the highly agentic atmosphere at James Walker, the message conveyed in the majority of my observations at Whitestone was that here agency was not highly valued in students; it was expected that individuals would conform to the established roles of the institution. In fact, it seemed almost as if the individual did not exist at Whitestone. When Ms. Everland addressed the class, she did not call them "students" or "boys and girls" or any term that implied a collection of individuals; she called them "class" (FN4/29-65, 4/29-69, 4/29-72, FN5/6-87, FN5/7-99). Classwork was done together in a group and anyone who worked faster than the others was admonished to stay with the group. Talking was not

encouraged, and frequently not allowed, unless you were a spokesperson for the insititution, meaning teachers, principal, or school secretary, or unless you were responding to one of these individuals. Students' grades and other academic evaluations were public property; Ms. Tucker had students report their grades to her orally after an assignment or test was complete and Ms. Everland orally reported the names of students missing assignments or not doing well on assignments.

All the student bathroom doors were left open in the building and students were supervised while using the bathrooms. (Whole classes lined up in the hall for this and three individuals went in at a time. I never heard anyone ask to use the bathroom at an unsupervised time, though Ms. Everland told me that this was permitted.) During group class work, participation was not even achieved by individual volition. Ms. Everland controlled student participation by going up and down the aisles, calling on students in order of their placement in the room. She always began at the front of the room, in the row closest to her, and always ended at the back of the room, in the row furthest from her. No one ever objected to this.

Once I heard one of the more assertive students challenge Ms. Everland on one of her beliefs. Tony said, "Ms. Everland, you know that saying, 'Practice makes perfect,' well it isn't true." (Her contention was that

perfection was an illusion, not really attainable by humans.) Ms. Everland disagreed and there was a discussion about it. Another student, Dillon, agreed with Tony and Ms. Everland told a story about how, as a child, she had played "Mary Had a Little Lamb" over and over on the piano until she had it right. Ms. Everland said she guessed she didn't see what was wrong with the saying and challenged Dillon by asking him what was wrong with it. He said, "Well, I guess sometimes you <u>can</u> do it perfect."

Another time Tony complained that the story they were going to read together was boring. Ms. Everland said, "Tony, what kind of tone do you think you just set for the rest of the class?" (FN5/7-96). She then said that growing up involved keeping your negative thoughts to yourself. This same theme was reiterated on another occasion when a student was being reprimanded for name-calling. Ms. Everland said, "...what's my favorite saying?" (FN4/29-69). Then, after an incorrect guess, she replied, "No, it's 'If you can't say something nice about someone, don't say anything at all.'" (FN4/29-69). Dissention was clearly not valued, especially if it negatively impacted the group or was negative in content.

The lack of regard for autonomy was not limited to student autonomy; teacher autonomy was not valued either. One of the first times I noticed this was on a day when there seemed to be no end to the interruptions via the

intercom. First, students and teachers were informed that the bond issue had passed the night before. Then students were reminded that picture day was tomorrow and anyone who wanted a picture had to bring their money. Next came a knock at the door and another teacher introduced Ms. Everland to a gentleman who was there to grade the science projects. Someone in the office then called over the intercom to find out why the lunch count hadn't been sent in yet, and since Ms. Everland had accompanied the aforementioned gentleman down to the gym where the science projects were, the students were told to tell Ms. Everland that they needed the lunch count right away. In fact, this woman said, Ms. Everland was to be told, "I need those every day by 9:00." (FN4/1-35). At 9:15 there was another announcement, this time for "two stout fellas." (FN4/1-35). By 9:30 I had counted seven interruptions and I had written in my notes that Ms. Hawkins, the school secretary, seemed to be in charge of the school.

Several other indications of the lack of teacher autonomy were noticed by me. One involved the field trip that caused the conflict between the teachers and Mr. Roman because there were not enough buses scheduled. The location of the field trip had also been disappointing because it had been arranged by someone in the office, without teacher input, and, consequently, was to the same location the students had gone the year before.

A second indication of the failure to value teacher autonomy became apparent when I asked Ms. Everland about student breaks. Students took a bathroom and drink break at the same time each day and I had asked Ms. Everland how it had been determined when the breaks would be. Since the entire fifth grade took breaks at the same time, one right after the other, Ms. Everland thought I was inquiring about how it was decided who went first, second, third, etc. I explained that I wanted to know how it had been decided that everyone would all take breaks at the same time. (I learned, in fact, that all fifth grade classes had identical schedules for teaching their subjects, meaning that math, reading, social studies, etc. were taught at the same time in each fifth grade class.) Ms. Everland's response was particularly telling. She said it had just always been that way since before she had come to Whitestone. I found it intriguing that this policy was accepted, without question, and that Ms. Everland's initial response to my question connoted implicit acceptance of this arrangement.

A third sign of teacher autonomy, or lack thereof, was illustrated by Mr. Roman's behavior on the day he delivered the lecture to the science class and interrupted a test which, then had to be postponed a day. His behavior relative to Ms. Everland's evaluation also signified a lack of respect for teacher autonomy, as did

his response to the fifth grade teacher who questioned the feasibility of conducting the field trip with insufficient busses.

The very evident disregard for individual autonomy might cause the reader to question why it was so difficult for me to resolve the breakdown at Whitestone. The denial of personal autonomy was exceptionally prominent at this school. However, what I found disturbing was that no one, but me, seemed to have any problem with the way things were. Until quite late in my research, Ms. Everland gave little or no indication that her autonomy was an issue here. Even when she did share some of her frustrations, autonomy wasn't the issue; being accepted was. The students, also, expressed negligible discontent. Although three or four of the more assertive students might complain when they had to work in a large group, rather than individually, they expressed satisfaction with their school and affection for their teacher. Of the six students who were the focus of my research, five expressed positive feelings for their school and teacher and the sixth talked about things she liked in school and appeared to like her teacher, but never said so explicitly.

The varying responses to the negative regard for personal autonomy at Whitestone resembled the observed responses to fairness and gender issues encountered at James Walker; they too had been inconsistent. I struggled to understand this nonuniformity. I also labored over the

appropriate way to characterize the dynamics of communion at Whitestone. My dilemma drew me back to Kegan's (1982) theory of constructive developmentalism. I was interested in that aspect of Kegan's theory which describes cultures of embeddedness. Although Kegan differentiates six developmental stages, he makes it clear that his is a theory of movement, where each stage is a relatively more balanceed period of time than either the preceding or succeeding periods of relative inbalance. Like Piaget's theory of cognitive development that describes the assimilation/accommodation process, Kegan's theory describes a similar process involving the issues of autonomy and inclusion. At certain periods in our lives we come to resolve the issues of autonomy and inclusion in generally predictable ways, which Kegan defines as evolutionary stages. In conjuction with each of these stages, that which is not understood or resolved, that which we are blind to by virtue of our frame of reference, is what Kegan calls that which is embedded. Kegan (1982) says:

> There is never 'just an individual'; the very word refers only to that side of the person that is individuated, the side of differentiation. There is always, as well, the side that is embedded; the <u>person</u> is more than an individual. 'Individual' names a

> current state of evolution, a stage, a maintained balance or defended differentiation; 'person' refers to the fundamental motion of evolution itself, and is as much about the side of the self embedded in the life-surround as that which is individuated from it. The person is an 'individual' and an 'embeddual.' There is never just a you; and at this very moment your own buoyancy or lack of it, your own sense of wholeness or lack of it, is in large part a function of how your own current embeddedness culture is holding you. (p. 116)

The embeddedness culture is that aspect of the real world which nourishes or fails to nourish the person's current evolutionary progress. For example, the infant's culture of embeddedness is the primary caretaker. It is he or she who must assist the infant in the realization that others are separate from himself. The experience of wholeness which makes no distinction between self and other gives way to this new more differentiated understanding, and it is through the interaction with the primary caretaker, that this process evolves. (The process continues with the young child subsequently embedded in a new frame of reference where his perception is indistinguishable from the perceived object. In this

stage the culture of embeddedness now, typically, becomes the family.)

This evolutionary process continues throughout life and the culture of embeddedness changes from primary caretaker to family, to school and family, to peers, to partners, work mates or others with whom one identifies or is loved. For each of these stages, Kegan says the culture of embeddedness serves three functions: holding on, letting go, and staying put in order to be reintegrated. By "holding on," Kegan means that the supportive culture must recognize, affirm, and attend to the person as she is at the present moment. The second function of the culture of embeddedness, letting go, requires that the person be allowed to grow into the next stage of development. The supportive culture cannot be so invested in the child as she is that she is not allowed to become a more integrated/differentiated person. Lastly, the culture of embeddedness must not disappear just when the person is entering a new stage of development because this is the time when what was formerly part of the self becomes available in relationship.

For example, the school-age child is heavily invested in becoming a competent individual and learning the nature of adopting roles. The emphasis at this age is on autonomy, but soon there will be other expectations. When the child becomes a young adolescent, she will be expected to attend to the needs of others as well as her own.

Suddenly, her needs are no longer part and parcel of her self; they are something from which she can stand apart and either attend to or delay. Kegan asserts that during the transition from one stage to another, there is a sense of personal loss as we reject those parts of ourselves that were previously undifferentiated. If, during this time, our supportive culture leaves us, he believes the loss is felt as unrecoverable; it is as if we were rejected. In contrast, when the supportive culture remains, the loss is mourned and then resolved, as one experiences the joy of relating to that which was formerly considered part of the self.

In my research at Whitestone, it occurred to me that I might find it useful to think in terms of cultures of embeddedness. For fifth grade students, this culture would be the family, the school, and the peer group. My research interest was the school and peer group. Many students would be in Kegan's Imperial Stage (Stage 2) and the role of the embeddedness culture for this stage would be, as described above, threefold. First, the culture must accept, support, and affirm the person as she is, which is heavily invested in personal autonomy. The competitive, argumentative, ritual-loving, materialistic, collector must be confirmed, but not constrained. Second, the culture of embeddedness must let go, so that this self-sufficient little person can become more other-

directed. Finally, the embeddedness culture must remain present during this evolutionary movement toward the Interpersonal Stage so that the transition does not produce a feeling of unrecoverable loss and the person can begin to understand what it means to have needs, interests, and a disposition that can be examined, evaluated, and managed.

It did not take a microscopic eye to figure out that Whitestone Elementary, as one culture of embeddedness for a child in the Imperial Stage, was not a supportive environment. Children at this age need a chance to compare themselves to others, to argue, to bargain, to play out rituals and try out differing roles, and basic to all of these activities is the need to communicate. Children at this age are industrious and achievement-oriented so they need opportunities to make things, to compete, and be proud of their accomplishments.

With regard to the former, it hardly needs stating that Whitestone Elementary fell significantly short of the mark when it came to facilitating student interaction. The deterrents against talking, for both students and teachers; the inability to tolerate expressions of divergent viewpoints; and the hierarchical, as opposed to egalitarian nature of the school, worked against the expression of communion.

With regard to the latter, Whitestone provided opportunities for competition and recognition of

outstanding achievement. Ms. Everland frequently set up competitve matches between students. Mr. Roman took out to lunch the winners of the academic contest held toward the end of the year. Students of the month were announced and awarded each month. Even the school secretary used the intercom system to announce which grades and students were doing well on their Facts Master tests.

There was, however, a problem at Whitestone with the system for encouraging student achievement. It is critical at this age when students are striving to become competent, self-sufficient beings, that the mechanisms for recognition not publicly humiliate students and that avenues are found for all students to achieve competence and self-sufficiency. This was not reflected at Whitestone. The competitive matches arranged by Ms. Everland were often one-on-one matches designed by her, where the contestants were not volunteers. Students like Trey, who had difficulty with schoolwork, could not escape public humiliation in such a setting, and, indeed, that is what I witnessed on two occasions when Trey not only lost, but was also teased by other students when he did lose.

Two of the other fifth grade teachers were particularly negligent in providing supportive environments where the students would feel accepted, competent and self-sufficient. Ms. Tucker totally

controlled the interaction in her classroom and belittled or blatantly ignored students who could not measure up to her expectations. Once I heard her tell the students that she didn't want to hear any more sob stories from students who didn't have their assignments ready. Another time, she suggested that her students needed babysitters.

Most impactful, however, was the overall tone in her class, which was cold, mechanical, and rigid. Words could not convey the effect of being dismissed by Ms. Tucker if one did not know the correct response to her question or had become disoriented in the fast pace of the lesson. It was as if one were not worthy of the effort it took to utter a response. Ms. Tucker did not seem to even recognize the students, let alone accept them. Once she called a student by the wrong name and only after several seconds did the student realize who Ms. Tucker was really addressing. She said, "You mean me?". "Yes," said Ms. Tucker, without acknowledging the mistake (FN4/15-51). (It was April 15th, near the end of the school year.) On this same day, another student had a wet paper towel folded over her mouth, suggesting that she had been hurt. No mention was ever made of this.

The other fifth grade teacher who was very unsupportive, Ms. Lawson, become extremely angry one day when a student forgot her book, and yelled loudly for everyone to hear. Another time she, too, was heard suggesting that some students needed babysitting. What

could be more humiliating to a child who was trying to prove his competence and self-sufficiency than to have it implied that he was a baby?

The most notable shortcoming at Whitestone Elementary, with regard to the needs of children at this developmental stage, however, was the overall school climate that so devalued student autonomy. Examples of this have already been given. As an institution, Whitestone was extremely antagonistic to the needs of a child in the Imperial Stage. Mr. Roman defined the relationship between he and the teachers in the school and he established accepted patterns of behavior for students. Argument, negotiation, and even simple dialogue were, at worst, harshly punished, and, at best, strongly discouraged. The type of education created at Whitestone Elementary was what Paulo Freire (1970) described as "banking education." The teacher was the repository of knowledge and was expected to deposit this knowledge in an orderly manner into the minds of passive students, who then withdrew this knowledge, upon request, in the form of tests. The teacher did the talking, thinking, and choosing, and the students meekly complied. The teacher acted, and, through her, the students had the illusion of acting. Institutions of domination, like Whitestone, coerce, manipulate, and control; they leave

little room for their citizens to become autonomous, self-reliant, capable people.

Seth Kreisberg (1992), in his book, Transforming Power: Domination, Empowerment, and Education, examined the theme of domination in schools. Exploring the culture of domination in education, he quoted McLaren (1988) on the definition of culture, which was "the particular ways in which a social group lives out and makes sense of its 'given' circumstances and conditions of life. ...(a) set of practices, ideologies and values from which different groups draw to make sense of the world" (p. 171).

One of the "given circumstances" at Whitestone Elementary was that the principal was in control. He dictated the rules of order to be followed in the school, and order was a high priority. He valued quiet, and his response to Ms. Everland's class when he visited for her evaluation, indicated that he believed too much activity indicated a lack of control. He had the freedom to interrupt classes, as he did on seveal occasions when I was there, even when it meant a test would have to be postponed. (I never heard any objections to this, by the way, except that one student looked disgusted when Mr. Roman used the intercom to reinforce the comments made earlier in the classroom.) When I interviewed Mr. Roman, it will be remembered, that he described the students as "respectful of authority," and clearly implied that this was a desirable quality (FN5/6-85). There were many other

indications that Mr. Roman was in control at Whitestone, including his control of student field trips, who talked in faculty meetings, even what teachers were allowed to drink in their classrooms.

Although, I heard some infrequent criticism of Mr. Roman's abilities to govern, I never heard any question of his right to govern. For example, the teachers were critical of the arrangements made for the field trip, but no one ever questioned Mr. Roman's right to make those arrangements. Similarly, although Ms. Everland critized the way faculty meetings were organized, she never suggested that Mr. Roman had no right to run them as he did - without teacher participation. Correspondingly, when students were questioned about the no-talking situation in the lunchroom, students expressed fear and even disdain of Mr. Roman, and one student questioned his judgment, but no one ever questioned his right to dictate how the lunchroom should be run. One student even said that the problem rested with the "hard-headed" ways of the students (FN5/7-107).

What is obvious from the above, is that the culture at Whitestone Elementary included an ideology of domination. This, according to Kreisberg (1992), is a set of beliefs, values, ideas, and assumptions which "constitute individual consciousness and both justify and conceal domination" (p. 15). Along with hegemony, the body of practices and

expectations that shape our understanding of people and the world, ideology effects the roles we adopt, the institutions we create, the society we advocate, but also the kinds of people we become and the people we wish to become.

In attempting to understand why others at Whitestone did not share my concern about the issues of quiet, control, and stymied opportunities for the development of student autonomy, I began to consider the impact of the dominant ideology at Whitestone Elementary. Students and teachers and administrators had, for the most part, accepted a belief in banking education. It was expected that Mr. Roman, via the teachers, would implement a system of education that promoted domination of the students and passive acceptance of that condition. Kreisberg (1992) writes that that is exactly how domination is maintained. It is "...through more subtle processes than the exercise of brute force. Domination is perpetuated through the ability of those who dominate to gain the consent of the oppressed <u>without the awareness of the oppressed that they are participating in their own oppression</u>" (p. 14). Perhaps that explained why I found little opposition to the system of control at Whitestone Elementary. The system may not have been questioned, because few even recognized that they were being oppressed.

The preceding discussion about Whitestone Elementary and its effectiveness as a culture of embeddedness

centered around students who would have been in the Imperial Stage of evolutionary development. Some of the students could also have been in transition between stages, or in other stages, such as the Impulsive Stage (1) or the Interpersonal Stage (3), both of which are characterized by an overemphasis on communion or inclusion. For the sake of brevity, I will examine the Interpersonal Stage only, but begin by looking at some facets of the transition from the Imperial Stage to the Interpersonal.

The transition between these two stages involves the loss of one's needs and feelings, etc. as part of what one <u>is</u> and the recognition that these are states that one <u>has</u>. Before this transition is complete, the individual may feel that he is losing these parts of himself, or losing control of these parts of himself. Consider the preadolescent with all his mood swings and inconsistencies. What the preadolescent needs from the embeddedness culture at this time is understanding of the fluctuations, and acceptance when mutuality is not honored. Nevertheless, the embeddedness culture must maintain a consistent expectation for growth and the increasing ability to consider the needs of others.

For the child in the Interpersonal Stage, the first function of an embeddedness culture is to accept and affirm that one's social affiliations define who one is.

Moreover, since the person at this stage of development has now acquired the ability to regard her needs, interests, emotions etc. as something she has, rather that something she is, it is now possible to reflect upon these states, and negotiate with others. The embeddedness culture, therefore provides opportunities for persons in this stage to share feelings, consider the needs and interests of others, and to keep commitments.

The other two functions of the embeddedness culture at this stage, letting go and staying put, are not really applicable for the student at this age because the transition to the next stage would not occur until much later. Therefore, they will not be discussed.

How did Whitestone measure up as an embeddedness culture for students who were transitioning to the Interpersonal Stage or who were in this stage? In terms of the whole school, as contrasted with Ms. Everland's classroom, the school did poorly. In 32 single-spaced pages of notes that made reference to Mr. Roman, not once did I hear him appeal to any variation of the Golden Rule. He never asked or even demanded that students consider the needs of others, not even his needs or the teachers' needs. Once he came into Ms. Everland's classroom because someone had reported that students were calling one another gay. Mr. Roman said that was the nastiest thing someone could call another person and he didn't want to

hear any more about it. No reference was made to the feelings of others in this discussion.

With regard to providing opportunities to share feelings, keep commitments, and affirming the importance of the peer group, Whitestone also did poorly. I never heard any other individual at this school validate the significance of peer relationships for preadolescent students. No one, except Ms. Everland, discussed feelings or emotions at all, and never did I hear any mention of keeping commitments. Communion, in general, was sorely lacking from Whitestone Elementary, which was why I found it so interesting that Mr. Roman commented upon the lack of this orientation in the town itself. The cultural ideology here did not positively affirm the value of community.

Ms. Everland's classroom, however, fared much better in its support of communion-oriented behavior. On several occasions, I saw Ms. Everland address a student who was emotionally upset over some incident. Once, in the library a student involved in a dispute about his placement in line, became angry and Ms. Everland said, "... why are you angry?" (FN3/11-6). By the time she was finished talking to him, he showed no further evidence of anger. Another time when students were changing their seats, Ms. Everland broke the customary policy of moving everyone up one seat because one student complained about

not be able to see the board. When the seats had been changed, Ms. Everland asked if everyone was happy and there emerged some vague mumbling. I could not tell what the problem was, but Ms. Everland persisted until finally two students explained that the student who had just been ousted from his front row seat was unhappy. Ms. Everland found a compromise that was agreeable to all concerned and peace was restored.

Humor, representative of communion, was also used effectively by Ms. Everland. Once, she told a joke and then listened as several students shared similar jokes. Twice, I watched her use humor to ease the students through the last half hour of class before lunch. (This was always a hard time for the students, who yawned, slumped in their chairs, and generally just seemed to count off the minutes until they could eat.) On several occasions Ms. Everland teased students in a friendly way, as she did one day when only two girls remained in their seats following the process by which students were excused. (The students had been excused according to the colors they were wearing.) When these last two girls remained, Ms. Everland said, "If you're a boy you may leave." (FN4/1-41). Then she smiled and excused them.

Ms. Everland's responsiveness to my needs has already been pointed out as symbolizing an orientation toward communion. She remembered to introduce me, and the

students to me; she thoughtfully extended a newspaper when in the library. In general, she was well acquainted with the rules of polite behavior and she taught them to her students. She practiced the Golden Rule and expected her students to do the same. I would be less than truthful, however, if I did not point out that Ms. Everland had not sufficiently internalized the ability to put herself in another's position, i.e. she had not developed the capacity for genuine empathy for others.

She had difficulty sharing differences of opinion. Students who expressed negative viewpoints, as Tony did when the story they were reading was boring to her, were cautioned to consider the impact of their statements on the group. The harmonious functioning of the group superceded the value of honest, open communication as an end in itself; the latter is a bench mark of Kegan's stage 5, Interindividual Stage.

Second, although Ms. Everland was sensitive to my needs as a guest in her school, she was not always so sensitive to her students. Once Ann came to school with a bandaged hand, which was apparently hurting. Several times I noticed Ann raising her hand, but being ignored until she finally gave up and lowered it. I watched her during a class discussion and she seemed to be struggling to stay with the discussion. She did not participate, looked at her hurt arm occasionally, and put her arm up to

her face. When she talked to Ms. Everland about going home, which she did twice during the afternoon, Ms. Everland encouraged her to stick it out. Ms. Everland said that the arm would probably hurt just as bad tomorrow and then she'd have all that work to make up.

Another example of Ms. Everland's lack of sensitivity was more humorous. During the oral reading of a story, a character was described who resembled Olive Oil. Ms. Everland asked the students who this character resembled. It was clear to me that she was fishing for the answer, "Olive Oil," but no one was guessing correctly. Ms. Everland asked her students to think again; who did this character sound like? Samantha said, jokingly, that it sounded like their former student teacher. She was admonished for this (because the student teacher was overweight). Ms. Everland said, "How would you like it if someone said that to you?" Samantha, incredulous, responded, "that I was tall and skinny? Fine!" (FN5/7-99). (Samantha, also, was overweight and obviously amazed that Ms. Everland didn't understand she'd be perfectly happy to be characterized as tall and skinny.)

There were other incidents where Ms. Everland insensitively drew attention to someone's height or lack of academic competency. In each case, the insensitivity was in all probability not recognized by Ms. Smith. I assumed that Ms. Everland was, developmentally, in Kegan's Interpersonal Stage, (4). She practiced the Golden Rule,

symbolic of this stage. She regularly encouraged students to consider the group. The students told me that, when asked if she was going to have any kids, she said she already had 24. Once, when I commented on the difficulty of negotiating between her values and those of other teachers and Mr. Roman, Ms. Everland said, "If it's my kids, I'll stand up for them" (FN5/12-110).

Because of her strong affinity for the group of which she was a part, and her difficulty in dealing with differences of opinion and negativity, it is not surprising that Ms. Everland reacted to Mr. Roman's evaluation of her as she did. To be negatively evaluated by a significant member of the group that defined her identity, was very painful for Ms. Everland. She said she, "doesn't feel like he likes me;" and she said she avoided him (FN5/12-110). On the other hand, the students were "her kids" and she would stand up for them when they were being ridden too much about being quiet or when it would be hurtful to recant a Student of the Month award. We can imagine the dilemma in which she found herself, caught between two group identities, and incapable of finding some ground on which to stand in order to make a just decision.

James Walker Elementary: Implications of the Whitestone Research

My research at Whitestone had implications for that done at James Walker. First of all, I was interested in looking at James Walker as a culture of embeddedness for its students. With regard to agency, I can say relatively little for the school as a whole; this had not been my focus at this school. However, because I was told by Ms. Smith that instruction was to be planned, as much as possible, by the teacher without the use of textbooks, I assumed this meant that individual autonomy was strongly encouraged at this school. There were several indications of this.

During the opening ceremonies every day, there was some evidence that personal autonomy was respected. Children's birthdays were announced each day, but there was no pressure applied to students who chose not to go up on stage for the singing of "Happy Birthday." Also, each day one class selected their favorite song to be sung and classes presented skits which they had designed. In music class, the students wrote raps to be presented at a school program and the teacher accepted negative feedback from the female students in Ms. Smith's class. Each of these activities or policies supported student autonomy and contributed to my belief that agency was encouraged at James Walker.

Looking more specifically at Ms. Smith's classroom, with regard to a child in the Imperial Stage, we would want to see opportunities for affirming an autonomous orientation. In such an environment, students would be free to argue, compete, and play out various roles. We would hope there would be some rituals and recognition of materialistic interests, as well as opportunities to make things and show off their accomplishments.

Students in Ms. Smith's classroom frequently had opportunities to argue and they had the economically-related roles to fulfill in the organization of their classroom. I saw no evidence of rituals in their classroom, but there were opportunities to become competent in academics. Several times when I came, students were practicing a skit, and once they were conducting a survey amongst themselves. Another time they had each made a diahrama and were to describe it to their classmates. In general, then, Ms. Smith's classroom supported the needs of a child in the Imperial Stage. There was, however, one exception. When student assertion ran up against the will of Ms. Smith, student assertion was squelched.

One example of this was the discussion about the pizza party when students were questioning the time of the party. Ms. Smith stopped the discussion short by telling the students that they had already voted on this. I

suspected that the students had voted on this before a full understanding of its implications became apparent and before the suggestion had been made which would have allotted more than the normal recess time to this party. To be specific, I didn't think the students were being given much of a reward for their good behavior by having a pizza party that they paid for, but which replaced their lunch and was held during their normal lunch time, which was about 15 minutes. It seemed particularly unfair given that it was the only such party the students had received all year and that if they went overtime on the party, it would cut into their outside recess time. Nevertheless, Ms. Smith was reluctant to allot any additional time for this party.

There were other times when I observed students asserting themselves with Ms. Smith and getting nowhere. One was the confrontation between she and John over the raffle tickets. It would have been easy for Ms. Smith to write a note to John's parents explaining the situation and allowing him to proceed as he wished if he or they would be responsible for the tickets. Instead, Ms. Smith got into a heated debate over this.

Another time one of the students wanted a brad for a poster on which she was working. She tried to describe to Ms. Smith what it was she wanted, but didn't know the correct term for brad. Rebeccah said, "She wants a brad" (FN4/9-3). Ms. Smith, who obviously wasn't familiar with

that term, did not understand. Finally, a box of them was found in Ms. Smith's desk and the box was labelled "brass fasteners," whereupon Ms. Smith said, "Rebeccah, they're called 'brass fasteners.'" (FN4/9-3). Later, I could not remember if Rebeccah had responded, but the whole interchange resembled one of those little battles-of-the-will, and seemed rather childish on Ms. Smith's part. For whatever reason, Ms. Smith seemed incapable of accepting that one of the names for those little brass fasteners was "brad."

In the preceding paragraphs I have discussed the culture of James Walker and Ms. Smith's classroom with reference to a child in the Imperial Stage. How did this culture support and confirm the child who was in transition to or in the Interpersonal Stage? Such a child would be more invested in communion than would one in the Imperial Stage. She would need recognition of the importance of social affiliations and opportunities to share feelings and negotiate interpersonal needs with others. In addition, a child in transition would need understanding and acceptance of instability in emotions and moods.

In reference to James Walker as a whole, what information I have suggests that it was supportive of the above needs. The principal, Mr. Anton, was certainly very communal in orientation. He was often visible in the

hallways or cafeteria and was talking to people in a friendly way. When he addressed the cafeteria on the first day I was there, it was about an upcoming school event of which he was reminding students. I never saw a student being disciplined by him. The school began each day with an opening ceremony that shared personal issues like birthdays and good-bys and congratulations. The atmosphere was warm and welcoming, as was the music teacher who directed this ceremony. Students and adults both seemed to pass freely through the building, though visitors were asked to sign in. Over the course of my observations, I followed the students to three other instructional settings, the library, music, and a first grade classroom. All three settings were warm and allowed students to discuss topics amongst themselves. Once in music they played a game; another time they practiced and discussed raps. All-in-all the one feature of James Walker that impressed me was its communal orientation. In fact, I had never visited a school that was as interpersonally oriented as was this.

Ms. Smith's classroom, unfortunately, was another story. As stated previously, Ms. Smith just did not address emotions. She seemed to have a blind spot in this regard. If students snickered at one of their fellow student's incorrect responses to a question, nothing was said about it. Over the two months that I visited in her classroom, only once did I see her address an

interpersonal issue. One day while the students were practicing their raps, something unkind was apparently said between the groups. Rebeccah and Daniel were called to come talk to her. They were joined by another girl, who came to tell her side of the story. After listening to both sides, Ms. Smith said, "Be nice to each other. That wasn't very nice." Then she sent them back to their seats. Even here, emotions were not discussed; right and wrong was decided upon by Ms. Smith. I found it reminiscent of Mr. Roman's response to students calling one another gay.

Individual Differences in Agency and Communion

Introduction. Up to this point, I have examined the issues brought to me by my research participants, namely issues of fairness and gender discrimination (or charges of the latter) and relationship issues involving the teacher, students, and principal at Whitestone; and I have described the dynamics of agency and communion as I saw them in the two schools. What I have not done is considered the individual differences in agency and communion exhibited by the people in this study. There were some interesting similarities and differences noted, and it is to these similarities and differences that the discussion now turns.

Differences and Similarities in Agency at Whitestone. As the reader has probably discerned, even within one elementary school class, there were marked differences noted in the expression of agency . At Whitestone, there were three or four students who definitely exhibited more agency than did the other students in their class. Patty and Samantha were among these students.

Both of these girls would sometimes ask to work alone and would sigh and act bored when this request was denied in group lessons. When students were given a choice of working with a partner or small group or working alone, these two girls usually chose to work alone. Both of them told me in interview that they preferred to work alone where they could work at their own pace. Samantha was one of those students who was continually wanting attention from Ms. Everland and drove Ms. Everland "nuts." Patty, on the other hand, concerned Ms. Everland because she seemed to be pulling away from her teacher.

There were also students in Ms. Everland's class who seemed to have little orientation toward agency. Ann and Maggie were two of these. Once Ms. Everland introduced the word "rebel," explained it and then asked the students if they considered themselves rebels. Out of only a handful who did not raise their hand (meaning they did not consider themselves a rebel), one was Ann. My observations of Ann were that she was almost never acting

(as opposed to being passive). In my notes I described her as watching others, not being called upon by the teacher or the last to be called upon, not volunteering, being ignored, quiet, hurt, or absent. The only other characteristic that appeared several times in my notes was that she was being teased. The latter occured because she was friends with Samantha and that was how Samantha good-naturedly drew Ann into interaction. The last entry made by Ms. Everland on Ann was this: "I don't feel I have really focused in on Ann much. I guess she is one of those children who are quiet and tend to get lost in all the activity."

Maggie was another student who was not very agency-oriented. She and Aaron were the only students about whom Ms. Everland wrote nothing in her log. When I first asked Ms. Everland about her students, she told me that Maggie was one of the better students because she was responsible and giving, was willing to do things for the teacher, had a positive attitude, and was able to draw others out. On one of my last visits, however, she told me that she was concerned about Maggie. She said she was a good student, but she wished she was friendlier. She said that Maggie smiled, but wasn't the kind of person you approached. Also, when she talked, she kind of whined and often she did not complete her thoughts when she spoke to you.

Many of my notes about Maggie were in reference to her work, simply that she did or did not have it

completed, or that she was working. It was common for Maggie to be working alone or silent. She also seemed to talk to adults more often than did other students. Once the students were making Mother's Day cards and, sensing that I did not really know Maggie, I watched her extensively. She could not get started. Instead, she walked around the room and watched others. Twice, she went and got more paper even though she had done nothing with what she had. She played gopher or assistant to other students. Eventually, she showed her new shoes to Ms. Everland and then said she couldn't find the glue. When lunch time arrived, Maggie had still done nothing on her card, so she stayed in for noon recess with the other students who hadn't yet completed theirs.

Because I needed to interview several students over the recess time, I asked Ms. Everland to watch how Maggie got her card done. Ms. Everland left me a note about what happened. Patty had told Maggie everything to do in order to make the Mother's Day card. Patty told her to get the paper and had told her what to write, but then on several occasions had done the work herself. I understood that the card had been finished because Patty had taken charge.

Differences and Similarities in Agency at James Walker. Interestingly, in Ms. Smith's class, I found no one low in expression of agency. What I found were differences in the way this was expressed. Shannon

manifested her needs for agency largely through her school work, on which she did well. She also took a leadership role when working with others. Another way that Shannon expressed agency was in her reaction to authority. On one occasion I heard her telling other students that she had written on a school table, adding that she didn't know why she had done it. In my interview with Shannon, she told me that several days previously when Ms. Smith had gotten mad, she had told her, 'I think you drive us crazy about as much as we drive you crazy.' (FN5/7-2). She said she hadn't meant to say it out loud. According to Rebeccah, Shannon also expressed agency by bragging, which I, too, noticed on several occasions.

Daniel, another student who was far more agentic than communal, also expressed agency by doing his schoolwork and, reportedly, by bragging. However, another way that I saw him assert himself was by contradicting others. On the day that the boys were conducting a survey on energy sources, Daniel refused to answer their questions. When I asked the boys about it, I was told that Daniel had been messing around, refusing to answer, "smart-mouthing" them, and turning around and ignoring them.

Another time Daniel was studying with a partner. Over and over again I heard him contradict the partner, saying, "You don't know what it is." "No, we don't!" or telling his partner that they were to be doing something else. While they were studying another student asked

Daniel to hand her a book that was behind him. He refused. When I interviewed Daniel I got very confused by his answers and had trouble understanding him. After I played back the audiotape, I understood why. He used a lot of "kinda"s and let sentences trail off. He didn't answer questions directly, spoke too softly to be heard, and sometimes contradicted himself. At one point I was just trying to find out how long he and another boy had been friends. I asked how long they'd been friends and was told he'd been to the other boy's house four times. Then he mentioned that the other boy had moved, but it wasn't clear if he meant he'd recently moved or moved some time ago. The conversation went on and on like this and when it was over, I still could not figure out whether the two were new acquaintances or had been friends for years. I'm not sure whether Daniel was asserting himself by being contradictory or if he was cautious about asserting himself because I was an adult.

Both John and Nathan expressed agency through competition. They competed on the basketball court and in games of tag or keep-away. They competed verbally, arguing about whose uncle had the neatest car, who knew the most about a particular ethnic group, etc.; and, of course they competed with the girls to see who messed in each other's business the most. One of the things that distinguished the two boys, however, was their response to

authority. Nathan deferred. He said he didn't argue and, indeed I never did see him argue with Ms. Smith. Several times I watched him repeat rules for students in defense of the teacher. John, on the other hand, was in a war with Ms. Smith.

Teresa was another very agentically oriented student. She used passive aggression to express agency. When she disagreed with someone, she would turn her back and refuse to talk to her. She was also good at leading from behind. I watched her feed suggestions to the louder, more visible girls who would then act upon the suggestions. At other times, Teresa led by directly telling others what to do.

There were a few behaviors that seemed to express agency, but which were unusual either because they rarely occurred or because they were used by one student only. One of these was anxious or self-stimulating behavior which was witnessed a couple of times in Patty during large group discussion when I suspected she was bored, but it was especially noticeable in Trey. He was observed banging his elbow against the back of his chair, playing with something under his desk, hitting his hip with his fist, wrapping a rubber band around his finger, etc. One day he was asked twice about chewing gum, but did not have any in his mouth and said he was just chewing his tongue. When I asked Ms. Everland whether he had ever been characterized as hyperactive, she seemed surprised and said no.

Several seemingly agentic behaviors were observed only once or twice by several different students. One of these was requesting positive feedback, e.g. "Do you like my story?". Another was sulking, which Teresa did when she was mad at someone. A third example of this unusual agentic behavior was spreading one's body out so that it took up more physical space, as in placing the shoulders back with the arms outstretched and stretching out the legs. Surprisingly, out-and-out disobeying the teacher was very rare. When John said "No" to Ms. Smith during the raffle ticket discussion, that was one of the few times I ever saw a student directly disobey the teacher. The last behavior which I characterized as agentic, but which did not occur very often was making a request to have one's needs met. Examples of this included asking for help in putting a notebook together, asking for advice, and asking for a suggestion.

What I found most intriguing when watching how students expressed agency and communion, was the way that certain activities seemed to express both agency and communion. In Ms. Smith's classroom, the group of four boys who sat in the corners were often engaged in an activity that seemed to orient to both of these dynamics. One of the ways this was done was through playful banter. Nathan would walk up to a male student, grab his cheeks with both hands, and turn the student's mouth into a

smile. One day I watched him fiddle with John's earlobe. He played keep-away on the playground with another boy and a girl. The sports activities on the playground seemed to address both communion and agency.

Sometimes, communion and agency were both expressed by talking. This was more often the province of the girls. While doing a spelling lesson, one of the words would remind someone of something that had happened this weekend and off they would go in a discussion of this event. During a story-writing exercise, the girls would create characters that resembled the boys and they would read their stories to one another and to the boys, laughing as they did so. Maybe one of the boys would argue that a particular characteristic didn't resemble him, but then he would suggest another attribute that should be included. The girls, also, were seen sharing candy while doing their schoolwork.

At other times, the girls would cooperate on an assignment; one would dictate and the other would write. Or they'd give the spelling words to one another. Once I saw several of them exaggerate everything being done in a film and laughing together about it. The competition between the boys and girls was another means by which both agency and communion were expressed. The same-sex friends cooperated with one another and between the sexes they competed.

Differences and Similarities in Communion at Whitestone.

Probably because of the lack of individual freedom in Ms. Everland's classroom, there were not students who stood out from the rest because of their communion-oriented behavior. It was also not easy to discern what behaviors were likely motivated by communion. This is understandable if we consider the developmental age of these students. Few, if any, would be expected to be much past Kegan's Imperial Stage, which meant that, for the most part, the developmental task for these students was agency-directed, rather than communion related. Kegan would assume that students at this age, generally, would not understand that their needs and interests, wishes, and moods were something that could be reflected upon and negotiated with others. Other developmental theorists, such as Kohlberg, Loevinger, and McClelland, would characterize children at this age as instrumentally motivated, opportunistic, and power oriented. (See Kegan, 1982.)

Two students in Ms. Everland's class who did exhibit noticeable interest in communion were Samantha and Aaron. Both of these students made extensive use of teasing. They would grab or mess up someone's hair in a playful manner, or try to stomp on a friend's foot, or grab something that was not their's. Samantha, also, teased verbally. She would tell Ms. Everland that Ann wanted to

share something with the class, when she knew Ann, who was shy, did not. There were few times that the teased friend responded negatively; generally the teasing was reciprocated or, at least, tolerated.

Both Samantha and Aaron also used physical proximity to indicate a desire for communion. They would sit by a friend, even though there was no other interaction. They both smiled and laughed a lot with peers and, to a lesser extent, just talked. However, because Samantha was also so agency oriented, her talk quickly progessed to that orientation. She would object, or disagree, or begin directing her friend. Aaron, on the other hand, was so reluctant to assume an agentic orientation, that he would often move into a dependent position with a peer, asking for help, or claiming imcompetence. At this point in the interaction, when it became more unequal between partners, the interaction took on a more agentic than communal quality.

There were also two students in Ms. Everland's class who less often engaged in communal behavior. These are the same two students who were described as lacking in agency, Ann and Maggie. Because I have already given extensive descriptions of their behavior, I will not repeat that here. In general, the two were shy and passive and did not often engage others. They both made use of physical means of expressing communion, such as smiling, standing or sitting close to others, and making eye

contact with others. They both would play a game with a peer and would watch or listen to others, but did not often talk. Ann, who was friends with Samantha would go along with her teasing, but did not initiate it herself.

Differences and Similarities in Communion at James Walker. In Ms. Smith's room, where students had more individual freedom, communion was easier to observe. Here, too, two students stood out from the rest in terms of communion, John and Rebeccah. I found both of these students to be fascinating to watch and extremely versatile in their efforts to engage others.

They laughed and smiled a lot and participated in discussions, even to the point of "butting into one another's business," as they called it. They both talked, extensively, to friends and sat closely to their friends. They listened to friends and John, expecially teased and joked with others. (By the way it was specifically these two groups of friends, John's group and Rebeccah's group, who were accused of messing in one another's business and were involved in the related record-keeping.)

Despite the many similarities between John and Rebeccah, there were also some major differences. The most outstanding was that John's interactions were very, very visible and Rebeccah's were very inconspicuous. Time and time again I found my eye drawn to the actions of John

and his compadres, whereas I had to intentional observe Rebeccah and her friends to see their interaction.

John and his friends were, first of all, just louder than Rebeccah and hers, but, in addition, John used more competitive-type interaction than did Rebeccah. He and his friends would physically joust with one another, e.g. hoisting each other up in the air like cheerleaders, imitating the actions of each other, etc. They also competed verbally, as I described in the section on agency; but they were noticably more physical than Rebeccah and her friends. John and his friends touched each other more. They would put their hand on one another's shoulder or put their arm around each other while walking. I watched John once fixing the shoe of his friend, Nathan, and another time on the playground, put his arm around Nathan, in comfort, when Nathan had been hit by a ball. On the other hand, Rebeccah and her friends expressed communion more often by quiet talk and even by writing notes, which was very inconspicuous. It was rare for them to be very loud and extremely rare for them to be very physical.

As for students in Ms. Smith's classroom who showed little interest in communion, one student stood out from the rest - Daniel. In all my notes on Daniel, there are very few which show any evidence of communion. Most often Daniel was seen working beside a friend, but not

communicating; and when he was communicating it was very combative. The only instances where he was observed interacting with others in a more communal way were when he participated by singing during the opening ceremony (and he sang the patriotic song only), when he listened, when he smiled as he showed a drawing to a first grader, and when he spoke to a friend next to him. I almost never heard him speak in a non-combative manner; and when he listened, he did not make eye contact or respond in an additive, as opposed to combative way.

Before discussing the results of the Friendship Motivation Measure given to the students by a graduate student, I want to explore a few of the more unusual ways that communion was expressed. There were few, and very few instances of a student apologizing to another student. Both Rebeccah and Nathan apologized one or two times. Teresa was twice observed helping her friends reach consensus on a work related project. She was very nonassuming in making a suggestion, which was accepted and resolved a minor conflict. It might be debated as to whether this was a communal act; I considered it so. Finally, John was observed sharing supplies and comforting Nathan. These, too, were rare occurences.

Friendship Motivation Scale

The Friendship Motivation Scale was given, as a measure of friendship motivation because it is

hypothesized to detect preferences which may in actual behavior, be confounded by either lack of awareness or temperamental variables, such as extraversion and sociability. Listed below are the results of this assessment.

Table 1

Ms. Smith's Students		Ms. Everland's Students	
Name	Score	Name	Score
Nathan	1	Ann	2
Daniel	2	Aaron	3
Teresa	2	Maggie	3
Shannon	5	Patty	4
John	5	Trey	5
Rebeccah	7	Samantha	6

Interrater reliability for Ms. Smith's students was 97.9% and it was 100% for the students in Ms. Everland's class.

The results of the Friendship Motivation Scale deserve some discussion. In the majority of the cases, the scores were consistent with my observations, but there were some exceptions. Nathan and Aaron both scored on the lower end of the scale, yet were seen by me as exhibiting more communion-oriented behavior in the classroom. I was somewhat surprised by Shannon's score, but not completely. While observing her, and especially when I interviewed her, I wondered if she might be more communion-oriented

than she exhibited. When I first interviewed her, for instance, I was surprised at her verbal ability and her willingness to talk to me. In the classroom, I didn't see her as talkative as she was with me. Her hair hung down in front of her face and in class it was often difficult to tell whether she was silent or not, especially because she didn't make eye contact when she spoke. She often had a furrowed brow, too, which gave me the impression that she was sullen, but when she spoke she became more animated and did not seem sullen at all.

Particularly surprising, was Trey's score. He was very shy in class and did not often initiate verbal exchange. During the making of the Mother's Day cards he set right to work and was very diligent. At one point I observed him talking to two of the more verbal girls in the class, asking them how to spell something and commenting on something one of them had done. I was enough intrigued by this behavior, which was inconsistent with that previously observed, to ask Ms. Everland about his sibling relationships. She was not sure, but thought he had two younger sisters.

There is insufficient data for me to do more than provide plausible explanations for the scoring/observational discrepancies relative to the above-mentioned four students. Nathan and Aaron were not very verbal children and I cannot help but suspect that the

Friendship Motivation Scale, which is a story telling exercise, penalizes less verbal students.

Secondly, McAdams' conceptualization of friendship motivation is heavily influenced by his corresponding conceptualization of intimacy motivation (which applies to older individuals). The conceptualization of friendship motivation measured by this scale may be more representative of the developmental capabilities of a mature preadolescent or adolescent. It may fail to detect the friendship motivation of developmentally younger children who are not yet capable of more sophisticated orientations. These younger children may also have "a recurrent preference for having friends over and against other experiential goals," but their friendships may differ in such a way that the scale does not detect this preference (McAdams, 1984, p. 13, 14).

Finally, it could well be that Trey and Shannon, especially, were students who did desire friendship, but lacked the skills to successfully nurture friendships or they may have had difficulty meeting their communion-oriented needs because of interference from agency-oriented behaviors. Examples of the latter explanation would be that students were "put off" by Shannon's reported bragging and that Trey's shyness prevented him from approaching other students in a friendly manner.

Ideal Pupil Q-Sets

The California Child Q-Set and its modification were given to the two teachers as a means of validating my own observations about the teachers. Because I was unable to discuss the results with the two teachers, they did not provide a means for me to approach the teachers regarding their preferred pupil characteristics. Nevertheless, they did provide some interesting information.

It is quite noticeable that for Ms. Smith the majority of the items in the scale labeled extremely salient were communally oriented. The items described someone who would get along well in a group and were consistent with the belief that one should think about others, not just about one's self. On the other hand, the items in the next most salient group, labeled quite salient were almost exclusively agentic in orientation. These were the items that proclaimed the importance of autonomy, independence, resourcefulness, diligence, etc. Ms. Smith gave a pretty clear picture of where she stood with regard to the relative value of communion-oriented, as opposed to agency oriented, behaviors. What she communicated, via the Q-set, was that communion was more highly valued. This, of course, was not consistent with my observations of her behavior in the classroom. In the next chapter I will suggest that Ms. Smith's Q-set, along with several other behaviors, may be indicative of a

dawning realization on her part of the shortcomings of her developmental position.

As stated in Chapter III, the Q-set done with Ms. Smith had so many obviously negative pupil qualities, that Ms. Smith was not forced to make as many choices about her values as I would have liked. Therefore, the one done with Ms. Everland was greatly reduced of these negative characteristics so that she would have to choose between the more positive characteristics.

In the most valued category, Extremely Salient, Ms. Everland placed a mixture of agentic and communal characteristics. In the least valued category, Somewhat Salient, she placed two of the characteristics that are strongly associated with Kegan's Interindividual Stage. (The items referred to the value of close relationships and the expression of negative feelings.) These same items were also placed in less valued positions by Ms. Smith. In fact, except for one item that referred to openness, which Ms. Smith said was extremely salient, all the items in the least important category were similarly valued by Ms. Smith. The difference between these two teachers was that Ms. Everland placed a mixture of agentic and communal qualities in the most favored position and Ms. Smith valued communal qualities over agentic. One other interesting difference was that Ms. Smith rated a competition-oriented item fairly negatively salient and Ms. Everland rated it quite salient.

Summary

At both schools key issues, called breakdowns, were identified. At James Walker, the breakdown concerned issues of fairness and gender discrimination. At Whitestone, the issues were initially overshadowed by my expectations based on the research at James Walker. Early observations, therefore, focused on differences between the two schools, differences in methods of instruction, my relationships to the teachers, and differences in the teacher/pupil relationships. Eventually, I realized that the key issue at Whitestone involved the teacher/pupil/principal relationship and information was provided in this chapter relative to that issue.

A large portion of this chapter dealt with agency and communion in the two schools and looked at these two constructs from a developmental perspective. It was noted that Ms. Smith's classroom was counterproductive to the communion-oriented needs of her students, whereas Ms. Everland's classroom faired better in this regard. Whitestone Elementary, however, as a whole, discouraged agency in both students and teachers. James Walker Elementary, as a whole, was not carefully examined for its support of students' agency needs, but Ms. Smith's classroom, in particular, was found to be insufficiently supportive of her students' needs for agency. The

remainder of the chapter examined individual differences in students' expressions of agency and communion. Both the manner of expression and the frequency of expression were explored.

CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Research Question 1

This study began with a question about differing intrapersonal and interpersonal needs in students. Specifically, this research question was 1) How do students differ in their needs for agency and communion? When I wrote this question, I actually did suspect that students differed in their needs for these two orientations. Now I'm not so sure. A number of differences (and similarities) have been cited in this research, indicating that students differ in the way they express agency and communion. It was also observed that some students exhibit more or less agency-oriented behavior than do others; correspondingly, some students exhibit more or less communally-oriented behavior than do others. Whether these differing behavioral manifestations indicate differences in need or whether they indicate suppressed recognition of these needs, or inability to express these needs, or accommodation to the needs of others, is unclear. At this point in time I would not want to say that students differed in their needs for agency and communion, although the students certainly did manifest these needs in differing ways.

This first question will, thus, be answered as if it read: 1) How do students differ in the way they express agency and communion? In answer to this question, there were a number of differences observed in the students at these two schools. Students differed in the visibility of their expression of these two orientations. They also differed in terms of passive versus active responses to these orientations. There were agentic differences pertaining to whether or not the responses were more interpersonal or intrapersonal; and finally, there was a difference that, for lack of better terminology, I will say varied between working within the established educational system and working against that system.

Visibility of student response was one of the first things I noticed when I began observing at James Walker. The four boys who were seated in the corners of the room expressed communal behavior very openly, and it called attention to them. This visibility was generally by virtue of their being louder and more physical than others. In contrast to others (all of whom were not female), these boys used more physical contact and louder voices. The less visible students used verbal exchange and softer voices or written communication to express communion.

This same difference applied to the expression of agency. Some students were louder and more physical, while

others were quieter and/or less physical. A more visible agentic response was loud, confrontive language, along with very expressive body language. Less visible responses came from those, like Teresa, who quietly withdrew and sulked.

A second noted dissimilarity in the expression of agency and communion related to the passive/active nature of the response. Some students initiated more of these behaviors than others. Others responded when approached or directed, but did not often initiate. Samantha and Ann were good examples of this dichotomy. Samantha nearly always initiated the interaction between the two girls, and Ann usually played along; but Ann did not initiate much interaction on her own. (Ann named Samantha and Patty as friends, both of whom initiated more often than Ann, so Ann's reluctance wasn't due to a one-sided friendship.)

Another variation of this active/passive dichotomy had to do with how intrusive one's behaviors were in relation to others. The act of standing near a friend, for example, was not as intrusive as trying to stomp on your friend's foot. Similarly, raising your hand to volunteer in class was not as intrusive as blurting out the answer. Some of the less intrusive communal acts were using close physical proximity to others, smiling, making eye contact, and listening. More intrusive acts included

touching, talking, and teasing. With regard to agency, students who were more intrusive were louder verbally, confronted or contradicted, and moved into another's personal space. Less intrusive agentic behavior consisted of a facial expression that showed disgust, asking a question, or making a suggestion.

A third dichotomy around which students varied their agentic behavior was in the use of interpersonal versus intrapersonal behavior. Some students were more self-sufficient than others and their agentic behaviors did not include others. An example of this was the use of schoolwork to express agency. The use of self-stimulation was another type of intrapersonal agentic behavior. In contrast, students who used interpersonal means to display agency, directed others, asked for advice, information, or feedback. The use of the interpersonal to express agency often resulted in a single act satisfying both needs for agency and communion. An example of this was the verbal competition engaged in by the boys in Ms. Smith's classroom. They shared about what cars they liked, but they also competed with one another when they disagreed about which car was the best or when they bragged about whose relative had the best car. Playing basketball and other physical acts in which they engaged seemed to express both agency and communion.

The last noted variation in the expression of agency and communion involved the students' ability or choice to

work within, rather than in opposition to the established educational system. Students who used a storywriting exercise to communicate with peers were well able to work within the established educational setting. On the other hand, students who met their needs for communion by teasing and touching often were reprimanded by the teacher because they were not acting in conjunction with the teacher's educational goals. Some of the behaviors that were particularly suited to working within the system were: studying together, sharing, and talking.

Research Question 2

Introduction

The second research question, like the first, did not anticipate the complexity of this research. The research question was: 2) How do students' needs for agency and communion interact with the corresponding needs of fellow students and their teacher? This question should have included an acknowledgement that others, besides the teacher and her students, affected the classroom members. Because at Whitestone the principal was such a central figure, the expression of his needs was a significant factor in the classroom experience. The other fifth grade teachers were also an important influence, so this question will be rewritten as: 2) How do students' expressions of agency and communion interact with one

another and how do the agency/communion behaviors of the principal and teachers impact the classroom experience?

As has been evident in the interactions described on the foregoing pages, expressions of agency and communion do not operate in a vaccuum. Some behaviors complement one another; others conflict. Students who used many passive behaviors to meet their needs for communion, needed more active cohorts with which to participate. Similarly, students who resorted to interpersonal means for meeting agentic needs, required an engaging partner. It did not always happen, however, that individuals' expressions of agency and communion found a complementary environment within which to operate.

When I began this research, I suspected that teachers organized their classrooms around their own intrapersonal and interpersonal needs for agency and communion; this research supported this supposition. When Ms. Smith organized her classroom to suit a highly agentic mode of interaction, students who valued communion had difficulties. Those difficulties were exacerbated when the students could not meet their needs by working within the system. Loud, attention-getting behavior in a classroom geared toward quieter, independent classwork spelled trouble. In Ms. Everland's classroom which was organized around a more communal orientation, students who lobbied

for more self-sufficiency, were denied opportunities to express those needs.

James Walker

The issues between Ms. Smith and John developed within a system where neither of their needs were complementing one another. John had high needs for agency and communion. His needs for both agency and communion were frequently met through interpersonal means. His behaviors were very visible and active, and often his means of expressing his needs did not work well within the educational system established by Ms. Smith.

John was, in all probability, in the Imperial Stage. He was argumentative, and heavily involved in issues of fairness. His peer gang was extremely important to him, and he often used them to express his competitive spirit. One of the statements he made which was clearly indicative of the Imperial Stage, was his response to Ms. Smith during the raffle ticket discussion. She told him she wanted him to stop talking to her "like that..." and he told her, "That's how I talk!" (FN4\9-2). Like my son who said, "If you don't like baseball, you don't like me!", John was unable to distinguish between a personal characteristic and the person who had this characteristic. Ms. Smith, however, did not arrange her classroom in accordance with the needs of a child in the Imperial Stage. The physical arrangement, the way lessons were

planned, the means of evaluation, even her student/teacher interpersonal manner were all consistent with her agentic orientation, but not John's.

What I saw in Ms. Smith's behavior was a fairly good example of someone in Kegan's Institutional Stage. Here was the overdifferentiated, self-sufficient, self-regulating person described by Kegan as characteristic of the Institutional Stage. The institution to which she was bound was the institution of academic achievement. Of the individual caught in the Institutional Stage, Kegan (1982) says the following:

> If the strength of the institutional balance is its autonomy, it would be as true to say that its weakness lies in its embeddedness in this autonomy. Its self-naming and self-nourishing converts the world within its reach to operatives on behalf of its personal enterprise. What is experienced from within the balance as independence and self-regulation might as accurately be seen from beyond the balance as a kind of psychological isolation or masturbation. From within the system this constraint is a matter of vulnerability to whatever threatens self-control, a vulnerability the institutional balance shares with its

evolutionary cousin (the imperial balance)...
(p. 223).

Although the institutional balance was cousin to the imperial, we can see how very different these orientations were, how difficult it was for John to operate within a system espousing self-reliance, and how equally difficult it was for Ms. Smith to appreciate the importance of competition, negotiation, and the peer gang.

Despite the similarities between Ms. Smith's behaviors and the characterisics of Kegan's Institutional Stage, there was something about Ms. Smith that was not totally consistent with the characteristics of this stage. Ms. Smith had volunteered to participate in my research and had told me that she thought it was very important for students to learn how to get along with one another. She thought if they didn't learn this in school, they would have little opportunity elsewhere. In addition, her Q-set had shown a high regard for communal needs.

Remembering the conflict Ms. Smith had felt regarding her parents' being so far away, it occurred to me that perhaps Ms. Smith had encountered the vulnerabilities of the Institutional Stage. She <u>seemed</u> sealed off, isolated. At one point she had told me that she sometimes wondered what she was doing here in the Midwest with her family on the East coast. She said she would advise young people today to not move away from home. This was not a

statement representative of someone in the Institutional Stage.

Kegan (1982) says that every evolution "can be expected to involve a specific loss, including the loss of a home or culture..." (p. 225). Perhaps it was just this sense of loss that prompted Ms. Smith to look at interpersonal relationships in her classroom. Remembering Ms. Smith's statement that kids needed to learn how to get along with one another while still in school, I wondered if interpersonal relationships had not become another subject which she had incorporated into the educational institution of which she was a part. The task she set me to doing, creating a set of cards on personality descriptors, was what I would expect of an institutionally-oriented person who was beginning to look more favorably on interpersonal relationships.

Whitestone.

The foregoing discussion about the interaction of various expressions of agency and communion focused on Ms. Smith's class at James Walker Elementary. The students and teacher at Whitestone also had problems negotiating their needs for agency and communion. To what extent Ms. Everland's classroom organization reflected her own needs for order, as opposed to Mr. Roman's need for order, was unclear. I did not see students working at the same

time on a variety of projects as was purportedly happening on the day Mr. Roman came to evaluate Ms. Everland. On several of my visits students were working on class plays; and there was less order at these times, but I had no way to assess whether or not these times resembled the previous time when Mr. Roman had observed. I could not, therefore, gauge the degree to which Ms. Everland had compromised her own organizational preferences for the sake of pleasing Mr. Roman, especially since the student teacher had left right before my arrival and Ms. Everland may have changed her organization to please herself, after the departure of the student teacher. In any case, whether for Mr. Roman's needs or Ms. Everland's (or both), this classroom did not encourage the expression of student autonomy. Some of the students would have preferred a more self-reliant instructional mode at times; there were agentic needs that were not fulfilled because of the way Ms. Everland structured the competitive matches. In particular, students' needs for feelings of competence were sometimes sacrificed in these competitive matches.

Accommodating to communal desires, such as ensuring opportunities between students for discussion, sharing, and negotiation was also limited, although the question ritual that I found so intriguing may have served this purpose. The question ritual was highly structured to be a limited exchange between student and teacher, while at the same time, including other students in the act. This

ritual may, in fact, have been a means of meeting both agentic and communal needs. Both students and teacher could satisfy their needs for agency, the teacher by structuring the activity so that it was controlled, and the students by gaining information, securing an audience, etc. On the other hand, the time could also be spent communally, sharing with one another; this communal activity included students who only listened, and also the speaking partners (teacher and student).

Unlike the situation at James Walker, the incompatibilities between student needs and teacher/principal needs never reached the emotional pitch that they did in Ms. Smith's classroom. Instead, the relationship between Ms. Everland and her principal, Mr. Roman became the focal point of my research at Whitestone. His desire for agency, manifested in his authoritarian leadership style, created dissatisfaction between the two of them. Ms. Everland, with her strong loyalty to her group-defined identity, found herself torn between two camps when she thought her students required something different from that which Mr. Roman prescribed.

Kegan says that for the individual in the Interpersonal Stage being approved of is of paramount importance. It is not just something one is concerned <u>about</u>; it is what one <u>is</u>. When one's identity is dependent upon the opinions of others, a negative opinion

is a loss of the self. This is altogether different than the situation for a person further along in his evolutionary development, who, when evaluated negatively, can stand separate from that evaluation and still exist. In the latter case there is still a self who can relate to this evaluation and accept, refuse, or ignore it; but for the person caught in the Interpersonal Stage, no such option exists. They are not separate from the negative evaluation; it <u>is</u> their self. For Ms. Everland, Mr. Roman's negative evaluation literally tore her apart.

Research Question 3

The third research question was 3) How do the needs for agency and communion and the interaction of such needs among students and between student and teacher, contribute to/detract from the learning process, as designed by the classroom teacher? Again, this question needs to be somewhat modified to reflect the complexities of this research. It will be reworded as 3) How do the agency/communion interactions described in research question 2 contribute to/detract from the learning process in the classroom?

In Ms. Smith's classroom the problems described in question 2 seemed to detract from student motivation to learn. John was one of the students Ms. Smith named who she felt did not take full advantage of her classroom. She said he learned just what was required to satisfy his

parents, but was not personally motivated. Interestingly, the students Ms. Smith named who did take good advantage of the educational environment she had created were boys who were very quiet and unobtrusive. Whenever I saw them they were working quietly with little or no interaction with anyone else. One of these students was Daniel, who Ms. Smith said had come a long way that year. Three students, all male, were named who were not making the most of their educational opportunities. These three were three of the four boys who sat in the four corners of the room. Unlike the previously named boys, these three were thought by Ms. Smith to be very bright, but not really excelling. John was among the three.

Another time when I asked Ms. Smith about the academic progress of the six students chosen in her class for intensive observation, she remarked that Rebeccah and Shannon were above average; in fact Shannon was really a grade above her age-mates. Nathan, she said, was below average. She said that Teresa was below average and that, she, like most of the girls, was particularly hard to motivate academically.

It was interesting to me that of all those named by Ms. Smith as either doing particularly well in her class or taking good advantage of the class, only one was not the self-reliant, self-absorbed student type. The one exception to the above was Rebeccah. Rebeccah was unusual

in many ways. She was obviously bright and well-liked by peers. She expressed agency in a variety of ways: passive, active, verbally, physically, through her schoolwork and through interpersonal relationships, and both within and in opposition to the educational system. In short, she was a very versatile child. Most often, though, she expressed agency in such a way that it did not interfere with the system established by Ms. Smith.

Rebeccah also had the highest score on the Friendship Motivation Scale. Her score of seven outstripped all other scores by two points. When Rebeccah was asked how she liked being in Ms. Smith's class, she said she liked it. She liked the freedom and responsibility and she liked Ms. Smith. She enjoyed the stories that Ms. Smith sometimes shared about her own mistakes, stories that were meant to help students who were having difficulty. (I never saw this behavior and assumed that this was one of those things I did not see because of my presence in the room.) For Rebeccah, then, her needs for agency and communion were well met within the classroom and both she and Ms. Smith agreed that she did well academically.

Daniel's situation resembled Rebeccah's, in that he expressed satisfaction with Ms. Smith's classroom and Ms. Smith agreed that he was progressing admirably. He, too, was able to match his agency/communion needs with what was offered in the classroom. He did not require much communal behavior, and his agency needs were met

through his schoolwork and the oppositional role he took with peers.

Unfortunately, the other four students who were the focus of my research, did not fare so well. None of them liked being in Ms. Smith's classroom and all of them were vehement about this. John's opinion is well known to the reader. Shannon and Teresa shared a similar complaint. They did not like Ms. Smith's frequent angry outbursts. Shannon said the work was boring and Teresa said she only did it to avoid Ms. Smith's anger. Nathan said that Ms. Smith allowed them too much freedom. He didn't like the responsibility of all the jobs and he thought they should not be allowed to get up out of their seats as much as they did. He said that Ms. Smith treated them like grown-ups, instead of like kids. Kids, he said, should not have all the responsibility she assigned them, and kids needed to talk.

For these four students, Ms. Smith's classroom was not a satisfactory environment. Shannon was reported to be doing well academically, though she was not mentioned in this way by Ms. Smith, until specifically asked. Teresa, John, and Nathan, however, were not progressing adequately. All of them had difficulty meeting their needs for agency and communion. John and Nathan had agency-related issues in this classroom and all three of them experienced problems with communion-related issues. We can

only wonder if the academic progress of these three students would have improved had the environment in Ms. Smith's classroom been more supportive of their needs for agency and communion.

Before leaving the discussion of Ms. Smith's classroom to examine the learning issues in Ms. Everland's classroom, there is one final topic to be addressed; that is the charge of gender discrimination in Ms. Smith's classroom. It was quite apparent to me that the students' charge of gender discrimination was justifiable. Ms. Smith just seemed to orient more to the males in her class, whether she was discussing troublesome students or impressive academic progress. When there was a job to be done, Ms. Smith often called on Chris, the male student I encountered on my first visit. At times, he functioned as her "right-hand man," even though he was one of the four who sat in a corner.

The females, on the other hand, were, according to Ms. Smith, difficult to motivate and, I found them to be generally less visible in the classroom. In attempting to account for the discrimination, it is useful to look at the issues of agency and communion between Ms. Smith and her students. The boys who had difficulty with Ms. Smith, who sat in the corners of the room, and who claimed that Ms. Smith was harder on the boys than she was on the girls, were a very visible group. Their communal and agency expressions were more physical than were the

girls' and they were louder. Also, they didn't seem as able to meet their needs within the educational setting, as were the girls. For this reason they presented more of a control problem for Ms. Smith, and we can see why she disciplined them more readily than she did the girls. Had the classroom been organized differently, in accordance with the previously mentioned needs of children at this age, perhaps many of the problems for the boys (and, consequently Ms. Smith) would have been alleviated.

Why the girls were harder to motivate, may be another issue. Not having interviewed but three of them, one of whom was doing well, I have insufficient data to adequately address this problem. One intriguing possibility, however, is that the motivational problem with the girls was not another issue, that the girls' needs for community were also insufficiently nurtured. It may have been that they were more prone to please their teacher and adapt to her highly individualistic classroom. However, by doing so the peer gang was neglected. The community of females may have needed more of an identity than they had. Like the boys, they too may have adapted better to an educational setting that more strongly favored groups. Among the girls, there was a definite interest in the boys, which might have been put to good use in the learning environment. As it was, they

literally had to go to the four corners of their world to visit four of the more popular boys!

The issues discussed in research question 2 also had implications for the learning process in Ms. Everland's classroom. Because of Mr. Roman's need for control, and Ms. Everland's need for approval, students were denied the flexibility of engaging in a variety of activities at the same time. Instead, their learning, which was done as one unified group, often proceeded at one set pace. Students who wanted to go faster, got bored. When students complained and started yawning, Ms. Everland would pick up the pace, leaving the less able students behind. It was very noticeable, then, when these less able students could not compete with their classmates. One of the students that Ms. Everland named as anxiety-provoking for her was one of these less able students. He would get very frustrated when he could not fit in, even to the point of threatening to kill himself. Other students who did not react so severely, like Trey, simply quit participating.

On those occasions when Ms. Everland gave the students a choice of working in the large group or working individually, the group always chose the former. Students who wanted to work alone frequently lost interest at this time and many of the other students appeared to become bored also. I suspected that they sometimes chose the large group lesson because it required less energy on their part, and the eventual monotone was considered worth

the lesser energy requirement. Had the students been given a broader range of choices including the possibility of working in small groups, the end result might have been more satisfactory to the teacher and students. The result might not have been more satisfactory to Mr. Roman.

Regardless of some student dissatisfaction with the way their learning was organized, none of my six Whitestone student research participants voiced criticism of Ms. Everland or their classroom. (Except Samantha who said Ms. Everland used the word "etcetera" too often.) They all liked Ms. Everland and they liked their school. I, too liked Ms. Everland.

Ms. Everland was always very positive in her emotional tone. She seemed happy and appeared to genuinely like the children. They, in turn, liked her. At the end of the year when they were allowed to write on a bulletin board what they would miss in the coming year, the most frequent response (by far) was, "Ms. Everland." Ms. Everland provided a learning environment that was more supportive of the developmental needs of fifth grade students than did Ms. Smith. To what extent the student satisfaction was due to her emotional tone, or the organization of the classroom, or to some other factor, I do not know, but it is interesting to speculate on the differing students' reactions to Ms. Smith and Ms. Everland.

The conclusion that Batcher (1981) reached in her study of classroom emotions was that emotions function as the language of interpersonal events, that they convey the relation of an event to ourselves. The emotion that Ms. Smith's students complained about was anger. As noted previously, De Rivera (1977) conceptualizes anger as a communication to the other which says, "Remove that from me," or "I do not want you to belong to me." If the students in Ms. Smith's classroom understood anger similarly, we can see why they thought Ms. Smith did not like them, as Teresa did; or why John felt, "I'm black and she's white." Interestingly, the student, Bell, in Batcher's research reached the same conclusion, that he was not liked by his angry teacher.

Ms. Everland, however, did not have a similar reaction to her anger, and she <u>did</u> get angry at students. Why the students reacted differently is not known. The difference that I noticed between the two teachers was that Ms. Everland's response to the emotional needs of students, implied that she was interested in them as people, not just as students. This kind of message counteracts the message of anger, which says, "I do not like you." Additionally, whenever Ms. Everland got angry at a student, I always saw her come back later and see that things were okay between the two of them. She might have apologized for her behavior, or, in a gentle way explained to the student why she had reacted the way she

had, or even in a kinder way expressed her expectations of the student. This behavior also reiterated to the child that she was important to Ms. Everland, and that she did care about the child's feelings and about her as a whole person.

In contrast, Ms. Smith did not address the emotional state of her students, did not check on them later to see how her anger had affected them; and I did not see her apologize to students. The absence of these behaviors may have reinforced the communication students felt they had received via her anger, and it may have encouraged some students to believe that Ms. Smith did not care about them, except as receptors of knowledge.

Returning to the lack of dissatisfaction at Whitestone, the fact that the students here were not more critical of their school in general worried me. In retrospect, however, this does not surprise me. It may have been that personal autonomy was so discouraged at this school, that students were not aware of the oppressive nature of much of their school environment. It might also have been that these students failed to discriminate between their classroom and the school in general, leaving their evaluation of the latter synomymous with the former. Another explanation is that the "school" represented their friends, past teachers, or other individuals who were liked or with whom they identified,

and "school" as an institution had no meaning for these children. Of course it is always possible that I misread the situation for these students, but I didn't misread their opinion of Mr. Roman, which was almost unanimously negative. This, too, could have been where the students focused their negative evaluations -- on Mr. Roman, rather than on the school in general.

Implications and Recommendations

Probably the most glaring implication of this research is the obvious necessity for more research to uncover the means by which individuals manifest and negotiate their needs for agency and communion. It is clear from this research that individuals do differ in the way they express these two human needs. What is not clear is how individuals change over time and how individuals come to display differing manifestations of agency and communion.

A consistent feature of this research was the inability to correlate a given behavior or set of behaviors with either the agentic or communal orientation. This is, of course, in keeping with the dialectical perspective which views human development as a process that cannot be defined in terms of polar opposites. Nevertheless, it ought to be possible to better explain how people are consistent and inconsistent in resolving the inherent tensions between agency and communion.

It is these agentic and communal consistencies and inconsistencies which must be better explained by modern theories of human development and personality theory. Kegan (1982) has done a fine job of beginning the task, but more work is needed. Because of the complexity of this research and the necessity for frequent interviewing in order to understand the motivations behind behavior, it is advisable to approach this research with a team of researchers.

A second implication of this research has to do with the messages that emotions communicate to students and teachers, particularly what anger may communicate about one's sense of self. Appropriate displays of anger must be balanced with other messages which indicate that others are valued as human beings and not just as instruments of the specific role they fulfill. This research suggested that validation of one's sense of self worth is extremely important for teachers and preadolescents. Validating one's sense of worth may counteract the negative effects of a teacher's inattention to student need for autonomy, and failure to validate the personal worth of students may undermine student motivation to learn and student satisfaction with the teacher and learning environment. Similarly, adults who are the recipients of anger directed at them from administrators or colleagues, may feel devalued. This is especially troublesome when teachers

and administrators are, for developmental reasons, unable to separate their personal identity from their professional identity. For teachers and students, alike, expressions of anger may communicate that one's self is objectionable when one's behavior is objectionable.

A third implication of this research is in regard to the Friendship Motivation Scale, where it was suggested that further research be undertaken to determine the degree to which this scale penalizes less verbal students.

Additionally, it was observed that the Friendship Motivation Scale was based on a conceptualization of friendship motivation that may be developmentally too advanced for preadolescents. The need for inclusion in preadolescents may be qualitatively different than the corresponding need in more mature adults. McAdams & Losoff (1984) hypothesized friendship motivation to be a precursor to intimacy motivation and conceptualized friendship motivation as qualitatively similar to the more advanced intimacy motivation. If, however, the orientation toward inclusion is qualitatively different in preadolescents than it is in mature adults, which is what Kegan (1982) asserts, then any measure of inclusion-oriented behavior in preadolescents will have to reflect that qualitative change.

A fourth implication of this research applies to agency and communion in the research process. I learned that it was important to consider the

participants' needs for agency and communion when undertaking a research project. Ms. Smith had a high need for personal autonomy and self-control. She did not appreciate the value of open communication, particularly if it impacted her negatively. Despite my efforts to be tactful and delicate (and I did not always succeed at this), Ms. Smith withdrew from the research before I would have liked. I assumed that my mistake was in not giving her enough control over the research in which she participated, so when I developed a proposal for Ms. Everland, I included an opportunity for more personal control.

Ms. Everland, however, did not truly want more personal control, which also meant more individual responsibility. She was loathe to enter the diary entries and really did not want a significant role in this research. She wanted some suggestions and she wanted to feel accepted. Had I paid more attention to these differing orientations for agency and communion in my teacher participants, perhaps I could have improved my relationships with these teachers.

Kreisberg (1992) encountered a similar situation to my own in his research on teacher empowerment. He said of his research participants:

> (They) did not particularly want to be equal owners of the project. Rather we all

> saw my research as one of my contributions to the group. They would do their part by entering into the dialogue, but they did not have the time or the interest to be "equal owners" of the project. Rather, through the process of dialogic encounter we were able to contribute in the ways with which we all felt most comfortable. The results were synergistic: We all learned, we all grew; we all got something out of the process;... (p. 230-231).

As researchers, we must be continually aware of the differing needs of our participants. We do not all express the same needs for autonomy and inclusion. Much of the current drive toward cooperative research with classroom teachers ignores the possibility that teachers may not want equal ownership in their research projects. Researchers who are sensitive to their participants' expressed needs for autonomy and inclusion, may experience more success in their research efforts than those who ignore such individual differences.

Finally, because this was a study that began with a question about school satisfaction and the importance of negotiating human needs, I would like to close with a discussion about our expectations for mutually successful outcomes. The assumptions about power to which our society has traditionally ascribed are stated eloquently

by Jean Baker Miller (1976) and quoted by Seth Kreisbert (1982). She says:

> Power has generally meant the ability to advance oneself and simultaneously to control, limit and if possible destroy the power of others. Power so far has at least two components: power for oneself and power for others... . The history of power struggles as we have known them has been on these grounds. The power of another person, or group of people, was generally seen as dangerous. You had to control them or they would control you. (p. 116)

Kreisberg goes on to say that this notion of power is unacceptable to Miller, who believes that to control or be controlled (quoting Miller):

> in the realm of human development is not valid formulation. Quite the reverse. In a basic sense, the greater the development of each individual, the more able, more effective and less needy of limiting or restricting others she or he will be. (p.116)

Miller's belief about power does not stem from a dualistic theoretical framework that is the basis of much of our Western philosophical orientation. Like Kegan's theory of human development, this conceptualization is dialectical. Power is not a limited resource available to

a few. My power, rather than limiting yours, adds to yours; and vice versa. Kreisberg (1922) goes on to define an alternative conceptualization of power that is derived from the work of Surrey (1987) and Miller. This conceptualization of power includes the terms "power together," "power in connection," and "relational power," and demands that individuals work together in mutually enhancing ways. Again, quoting Surrey (1987), Kreisberg says:

> This process creates a relational context in which there is increasing awareness and knowledge of self and other through sustained affective connection, and a kind of unencumbered movement of interaction. This is truly a creative process, as each person is changed through the interaction. The movement of relationship creates an energy, momentum, or power that is experienced as beyond the individual, yet available to the individual. Both participants gain new energy and new awareness as each has risked change and growth through the encounter. Neither person is in control. (p. 7)

Kreisberg points out that the above form of power links power with themes of connection, nurturance, community... . How similar this sounds to this research on agency and communion, where the satisfaction of these

desires demands complementarity. We cannot assume that satisfaction for one individual negates the possibility of satisfaction for others. How different might it have been for John and Ms. Smith, for Ms. Everland and Mr. Roman, and for Ms. Smith and myself if we had recognized the potential for "relational power!"

Summary

Chapter VII examined the original research questions of this research and found that students did, indeed, differ in their expression of agency and communion. They differed both in the way they expressed these dimensions and they differed in the degree to which they expressed agency and communion. Additionally, it was found that some students had difficulty negotiating their needs for agency and communion because their expression of these needs conflicted with the teacher's expression of her similar needs and/or conflict arose because of the organization of the classroom. Furthermore, it was observed that emotional tone, and in particular the expression of anger, had implications for students' and teachers' sense of self. The implications of this research were noted and recommendations were made for educators and researchers.

REFERENCES

Agar, M. H. (1986). Speaking of ethnography. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publ.

Ainsworth, M.D.S. (1982). Attachment: Retrospect and prospect. In Parkes, C.M. & Stevenson-Hinde, J. (Eds.) The place of attachment in human behavior. New York: Basic Books.

Ainsworth,M., Blehar, M., Waters, E., & Wall, S. (1978). Patterns of attachment. Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum.

Bakan, D. (1966). The duality of human existence. Boston: Beacon Press.

Batcher, E. (1981). Emotion in the classroom: A study of children's experience. New York: Praeger.

Baxter, L.A. (1988). A dialectical perspective on communication strategies in relationship development. In S. Duck, (Ed.), Handbook of Personal Relationships, (pp 257-273). New York: Wiley.

Beckwith, L. & Cohen, S.E. (1989). Maternal responsiveness with preterm infants and later competency. In Bornstein, M.H. (Ed.) Maternal responsiveness: Characteristics and consequences. New Directions for Child Development, 43, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bellak, L. (1975). The Thematic Apperception Test. The Children's Apperception Test and the Senior Apperception Technique in Clinical Use. (Third Edition). New York: Grune & Stratton.

Block, J. & Block, J. (1980). Instructions for the California Child Q-Set. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Blumstein, P. & Kollock, P. (1988). Personal relationships. Annual Review of Sociology, 14, 467-490.

Bochner, A.P., Cissna, K.N., & Garko, M.G. (1991). Optional metaphors for studying interaction. In Montgomery, B.M. & Duck, S. (Eds.) Studying interpersonal interaction. New York: Guildord.

Bornstein, M.H. & Tamis-LeMonda, C.S. (1989). Maternal responsiveness and cognitive development in children. In Bornstein, M.H. (Ed.) Maternal responsiveness: Characteristics and consequences. New Directions for Child Development, 43. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cornforth, M. (1953). Materialism and the Dialectical Method. New York: International Publ.

Cowan, P.A. (1982). The relationship between emotional and cognitive development. In Cicchetti, D. & Hesse, P. (Eds.) Emotional Development. New Directions for Child Development, 16. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

De Rivera, J. (1977). A structural theory of the emotions. Psychological Issues Monograph, 10, (4, Whole No. 40).

Duck, S. (1988). Handbook of personal relationships. New York: Wiley.

Duck, S. (1991, May). New lamps for old: A new theory of relationships and a fresh look at some old research. Paper presented at the Third Conference of the International Network on Personal Relationships, Normal/Bloomington, IL.

Freire, P. (1970). Pedagogy of the oppressed. NY: Continuum.

Hinde, R.A. (1976). On describing relationships. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 17, 1-19.

Kegan, R. (1982). The evolving self: Problems and process in human development. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard.

Kegan, R., Noam, G.G., & Rogers, L. (1982). The psychologic of emotion: A neo-Piagetian view. In Cicchetti, D. & Hesse, P. (Eds.) Emotional Development. New Directions in Child Development, 16. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Klein, J. (1987). Our need for others and its roots in infancy. London: Tavistock.

Kreisberg, S. (1992). Transforming power: Domination, empowerment, and education. Albany, NY: State University of NY Press.

Lickona, T. (1983). Raising good children. NY: Bantam Books.

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

Lock, A.J. (1986). The role of relationships in development: An introduction to a series of occasional articles, Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 3, 89-99.

Lofland, J. & Lofland L.H. (1984). Analyzing social settings: A guide to qualitative observation and analysis. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

McAdams, D.P. (1988). Personal needs and personal relationships. In Duck, S. (Ed.) Handbook of personal relationships, (pp 7-22). New York: Wiley.

McAdams, D.P. (1984). Scoring manual for the intimacy motive. Psychological Documents, 14, no. 2613.

McAdams, D.P. & Losoff, M. (1984). Friendship motivation in fourth and sixth graders: A thematic analysis. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 1, 11-27.

McAdams, D.P. (1981). Themes of intimacy in behavior and and thought, J. of Personality & Social Psychology, 40, 573-587).

McKeachie, W.J. (1961). Motivation, teaching methods, and college learning. In M.R. Jones (Ed.) Nebraska Symposium on Motivation: 1961. Lincoln: Univ of Nebraska Press.

McLaren, P. (1988). On ideology and education: Critical pedagogy and the politics of education. Social Text, 19-20, 153-185.

McClelland, D.C. (1985). Human motivation. Glenview, Ill.: Scott Foresman.

Montgomery, B.M. & Duck, S. (Eds.) (1991.) Studying interpersonal interaction. New York: Guilford.

Powell, R.G. & Nicholson, J.L., III (1986, February). Teacher affect in the classroom: Implications and directions for future research. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of Western Speech Communication Association, Tucson, AZ.

Reichardt, C.S. & Cook, T.D. (1979). Beyond qualitative versus quantitative methods. In T.D. Cook & C.S. Reichardt (Eds.) Qualitative and quantitative methods in evaluation research. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Rubin, L. (1983). Intimate strangers: Men and women together. New York: Harper & Row.

Rizzo, T.A. (1989). Friendship development among children in school. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.

Rosenwald, G. (1985). Hypocrisy, self-deception, and perplexity: The subject's enhancement as methodological criterion, Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 49, 682-703.

Schutz, W.C. (1958). FIRO: A three-dimensional theory of interpersonal behavior. New York: Rinehart.

Schmuck, R.A., Luszki, M., & Epperson, D.C. (1963).Interpersonal relations and mental health in the classroom. Mental Hygiene, 47, 289-299.

Schmuck, R. & Van Egmond, E. (1965). Sex differences in the relationship of interpersonal perceptions to academic performance. Psychology in the Schools, 2, 32-40.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

TEACHER CONSENT FORM

TEACHER CONSENT FORM

I, _____, hereby authorize or direct Barbara Carlozzi to perform the following procedure:

Observe in my classroom for approximately 40 hours beginning on _____ and concluding on _____. It is understood that Barbara will be observing the social interaction in the classroom, focusing the research on six students and myself. It is also understood that Barbara will be as nonintrusive as possible so that normal class routines are not disrupted.

Interview me about my thoughts, feelings, etc. related to observed situations. Interviews will be conducted when students are not under my supervison and at times which are mutually agreeable to Barbara and I.

Take the modified California Child Q-Sort which will require me to describe the "ideal" student by sorting 26 cards containing descriptive personality characteristics. (This measure will not be administered by Barbara; a graduate student in the College of Education at OSU will administer the CCQ.)

Collect a log kept by me on a weekly basis, recording my thoughts and experiences on the classroom interaction. This log will be my own spontaneous expression, but will be augmented by possible questions provided by Barbara for me to consider. (An audio record is an acceptable alternative to a written log.)

I understand that all information collected will be kept strictly confidential. Scores on the CCQ, audio tapes made with my permission, and observation notes made by Barbara will be kept in her possession. Additionally, the field notes and the dissertation will be written using pseudonyms for individuals and places. If at some later date this research report is published or presented at a professional organization, pseudonyms will be used for individuals and places to protect the identity of the participants. I understand that the six students who are the focus of this research, the parents of these students, and I may request a summary of the final research results. This summary will be written without reference to particular individuals and

without direct quotes so that confidentiality may be maintained. However, since I am the only teacher participant in this research and my position is unique, I will be given an opportunity to read this summary before it is distributed to any other participants; if I so desire, I can add my own comments, clarifications, or dissenting opinions which will then be included in the summary before it is distributed to other participants.

My participation in this research is with the understanding that I have the option of refusing to comment in circumstances which I feel are personal or private. I also understand that I may ask that previously-made comments be deleted from the notes and not included in the final research report.

It is expected that my participation in this research will promote a better understanding of the ways in which interpersonal relations and, especially needs for agency and communion, effect the classroom learning process.

This is done as part of an investigation entitled "Interpersonal Relations in the Classroom: Needs for Agency and Communion." The purpose of the administration of the modified California Child Q-Sort, the observations and interviews, and the weekly log is to further that understanding of interpersonal relationships and learning. The results of this research will help the researcher identify the direction of further research.

I understand that participation is voluntary, that there is no penalty for refusal to participate, and that I am free to withdraw my consent and participation in this project at any time without penalty after notifying the project director.

I may contact Barbara Carlozzi at telephone number (405) 377-8612 (home) should I wish further information about the research. I may also contact LeAnn Prater, University Research Services, 001 Life Sciences East, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, OK 74078; Telephone: (405) 744-9992.

I have read and fully understand the consent form. I sign it freely and voluntarily. A copy has been given to me.

Date:_____ Time _____(a.m./p.m.)

Signed _____
(Signature of Subject)

I certify that I have personally explained all elements of this form to the subject or his/her representative before requesting the subject or his/her representative to sign it.

Signed _____
(project director or his/her authorized representative)

APPENDIX B

SAMPLE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

WHITESTONE ELEMENTARY

SAMPLE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

WHITESTONE ELEMENTARY

Initial questions at Whitestone were of the following kind:

How long have you gone to Whitestone?

How were the groups chosen for the plays?

You didn't talk it over with friends ahead of time and decide which group you were going totry to get?

How did you learn your lines?

Who acted as the leader?

Later questions were of the following variety:

Did your parents go to school here?

Who are your friends?

How would you describe your school?

What do you like the most about school? Least?

Are there cliques in your school?

Who lightens the mood in your class?

Who adds tension to the mood?

What are your thoughts about the lunchroom situation?

How do you feel about Ms. Everland? About Whitestone?

VITA

Barbara Lehman Carlozzi

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Thesis: INTRAPERSONAL AND INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS IN THE CLASSROOM: NEEDS FOR AGENCY AND COMMUNION

Major Field: Applied Behavioral Studies

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Holly, Michigan, October 20, 1946, the daughter of Joseph and Sally Jane Lehman. Married Alfred F. Carlozzi, June 25, 1977; Children: Brian Michael Carlozzi and Sara Beth Carlozzi.

Education: Graduated from Holly High School, Holly, Michigan in May, 1964; received Bachelor of Arts Degree from Michigan State University in August, 1971; received Master of Education degree from University of Houston in May, 1978; completed requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy degree at Oklahoma State University in December, 1993.

Professional Organizations: Iowa/International Network on Personal Relations, Oklahoma Educational Association.

Professional Experience: Teacher of the Emotionally Disturbed, Lincoln Center, September 1971 to June 1972; Special Education Teacher, Appraisal and Treatment Center, August 1972 to May 1973; Elementary School Teacher, Houston I.S.D., October 1974 to March 1975; Special Education Teacher, Lamar I.S.D., September 1975 to May 1979; Teacher Assistant Coordinator, UPDATE Teacher Center, January 1980 to August 1981; Instructor, Oklahoma State University, September 1981 to May 1982; Graduate Research Assistant, Oklahoma State University, January, 1988 to May 1988; Graduate Teaching Assistant, September 1990 to May 1991; Graduate Research Assistant, Oklahoma State University,

September 1991 to May 1992; Counselor, Perkins-Tryon Schools, September 1992 to present.