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ABSTRACT

In this narrative inquiry, I analyzed art and music teachers’ stories of professional learning as they engaged in the study of their teaching practice in a collaborative inquiry group (CIG). During two years of data collection, I examined stories that arts teachers told when describing classroom photographs, images of student work, video recordings of teaching, written reflections, course descriptions, lesson plans, and other forms of documentation that they generated for the purpose of conveying their experiences to members of our CIG. My narrative analysis was focused on teachers’ indications of shifts in thinking about teaching and learning.

Participants were 10 art and music teachers who met in a collaborative inquiry group that was organized by a continuing education program and funded by a federal grant. I was both the facilitator of the CIG and narrative researcher. Our group met monthly from 2009–2011 to form a network of support, share experiences, learn to use new digital technology, inquire about teaching and learning as specific to art and music education, and to design and customize professional learning for continuing education course credit. Participants elected to focus their collaborative inquiry on investigations related to student-led learning, choice-based student learning, and inquiry as a framework for learning in the arts.

Chapters 4 through 7 are groupings of narrative data and analytic discussion that explore teachers’ narratives as indications of shifting, moving, and becoming in spaces of inquiry as professional learning. My interpretive discussion as narrative inquiry is represented in various narrative, literary, and visual forms throughout this dissertation.
These arts-based forms include descriptive prose, found poetry, researcher memos, images, interim texts, and dramatic scenes/play scripts.

The multiplicity of people, objects, time, and spaces of interaction are represented by narrative fragments interwoven to create complex *narrative intertextures* that retain the nuances of each teacher’s individual experiences but share a common narrative thread, topic, or theme. I developed a methodological and theoretical toolset for crafting *multivocal narrative intertextures* after studying and adapting the methods of several qualitative inquirers who have constructed intricate narrative research texts as constellations, juxtapositions, and assemblages of narratives that explore polyphonic perspectives (Conle, 1996; Craig, 2007; Glesne, 1997; Hasebe-Ludt, Leggo, & Chambers 2009; Heydon, 2010; Prendergast, 2006; Reilly, 2011).

Three theoretical perspectives informed my data analysis and interpretation: actor-network theory (Fenwick & Edwards, 2010, 2012), smooth and striated space (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987), and knowledge in the making (Ellsworth, 2005). I used these theories as conceptual tools to build on what Clandinin and Connelly (2000) referred to as the *three-dimensional narrative inquiry space* (described in Chapter 2). These three theories aided my analysis and interpretations of the interactions among (a) participants, ideas, narratives, digital objects, and material artifacts, (b) physical and virtual places and the processes where teaching and learning take place, and (c) ambiguous *spaces* of sensation, thinking, and reflection that can be conveyed through sharing of artifacts and other visual and textual chronicles of experience. The nuanced meanings of the conceptual vocabulary drawn from each theory specifically supported my analysis of
participants’ shifts. These shifts were not limited to shifts in thinking but also included shifts in practice, shifts in the arrangement of classroom spaces, and the notion of shifting as part of an ongoing process of professional learning as inquiry in the context of a CIG.

This research describes how shifts in thinking and practice can be seen and understood by teachers in a CIG through visual and written documentation with accompanying storied reflections that chronicle experiences in relation to specific teaching contexts. Pre-service and in-service arts teachers are likely to locate implications within these narratives for tailoring professional learning in community by documenting experiences and sharing reflections as specific to unique teaching contexts.

In the final chapter, I synthesize three key implications in relation to theoretical discussion: (a) documentation as inquiry and artifact when objects are linked to stories, (b) teachers reflect on shifts in pedagogy in relation to a digital object, and (c) self-directed/group-supported inquiry in flexible spaces of interaction supports shifts in thinking.
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Chapter 1

Introduction to the Study

I have begun to appreciate how the foundations of teaching can be learning, process, change, and becoming: foundations that are constituted in ethical relation to others. In this sense, encounters, relationships, and conversations are the basis of pedagogy, knowledge and identities are co-constructed in the midst of dissymmetric relations, and “teaching” is shared. (Kind, 2008, p. 168)

Sylvia Kind’s (2008) thoughtful words express a shifting and relational understanding of teaching. She continues, “It is teaching that thinks through alterity, dependency, vulnerability, and receptivity” (2008, p. 168). I echo Kind’s (2008) view of teaching as a shared enterprise in which knowledge and experiences are co-constructed. Teachers rely on professional relationships with other teachers and students to help interpret experiences in respect to unique teaching contexts. The daily life of teaching “practice” is not limited to the practical but also involves generating theories in action. This theorizing, embedded in practice, grows out of a process of invention and re-invention in the act of teaching as inquiry. By documenting teaching experience, educators can reflect on the past to inform the future (Roth, 2002).

In contemporary schooling, teachers are often viewed as part of a system of curriculum dissemination in which knowledge is delivered to students in a way that is not unlike the conveyer belt in a factory assembly line (Pinar, 2004). I am disheartened by the way the delivery view of curriculum has influenced the way teachers are trained, developed, and rated in narrowly defined definitions of efficiency and effectiveness. It is
for this reason that I question the word develop in the phrase professional development, which evokes the image of a brief in-service workshop in which an outside expert trains teachers in the implementation of replicable and quantifiable best-practices (Chapman, 2005). I, with others, question the professional development that is formatted in short episodes to train teachers to adopt and implement best-practices without regard to the particulars of their individual teaching circumstances (Darling-Hammond & Richardson, 2009). We must ask: “According to whom, in what contexts, and to what end” are best-practices best? (Wilson, 2010, p. 380). Instead of the designation, “professional development,” I elect to use the terms professional learning or professional becoming to describe the process of teaching that is rooted in ongoing inquiry.

The arts teachers who are participants in this study gathered together in a collaborative inquiry group (CIG) organized as part of the Arts Education Teacher Inquiry (AETI) program, a pseudonym (to protect confidentiality), for a professional learning and continuing education program structured through a regional public education center. Ten visual art and music teachers and I gathered for monthly meetings in 2009–2011 to engage in collaborative professional learning. The topics and explorations that the teachers elected to study were relevant to each participant’s teaching context. As a member of this CIG, I served in the roles of facilitator and researcher.

This dissertation is a re-presentation of the storied experiences of members of our CIG. Using narrative inquiry methods, I explore co-construction of knowledge through storytelling and sharing of artifacts and documentation of teaching as one of the ways that arts teachers in our group made visible their own inquiry processes. In this introductory chapter, I discuss approaches and contexts important to this research including ideas
related to teachers’ professional learning in community, professional learning for arts teachers, sustained inquiry to envision and theorize teaching practice, sharing documentation of teaching, and professional learning as a process of becoming. This discussion of context leads to the significance of the study, purpose of the study, research questions, and key terms.

**Teacher Professional Learning in Community**

Teachers identify and develop knowledge communities (Craig, 1992; 1995), which are small groups of people who co-construct knowledge through cooperative interpretation of experience. For example, a knowledge community might coalesce informally around a lunch table or in an impromptu conversation in the school hallway to talk about situations in teaching. Or, professional learning communities might organize more formally with the explicit intent of furthering professional learning as part of a structured group called a (a) community of inquiry,¹ (b) critical friends group,² (c)

¹ *Community of Inquiry* (Hagaman, 1990; Pardales & Girod, 2006; Splitter & Sharp, 1995; Vega & Taylor, 2005) is a model for classroom discussion rooted in methods of philosophical inquiry. Hagaman (1990) argues that if art teachers are to facilitate inquiry-oriented learning communities for students, then art teachers themselves will need to engage in communities of inquiry in order to learn and lead this method of knowledge construction.

² Teachers in critical friends groups convene with the intention of supporting one another in a process of constructive and critical feedback. Critical friends groups often adopt or develop specific reflective tools (Ballock, 2007) or meeting protocols (Curry, 2008) that guide feedback and propel discussion. Other teacher groups also structure dialogue with protocols (see Nelson, Slavit, Perkins, & Hathorn, 2008).
collaborative inquiry group and collaborative teacher inquiry,\(^3\) (d) community of practice,\(^4\) (e) practitioner inquiry community,\(^5\) or (f) shared teacher inquiry.\(^6\) These are all terms used to describe formally organized, small study groups in which teachers lead cooperative investigations into their own teaching and learning as it relates to unique classroom contexts.

\(^3\) The terms *collaborative inquiry group* (Bray, Lee, Smith, & Yorks, 2000; Bray, Yorks, & Kasl, 2002; Emihovich & Battaglia, 2000; Gates, 2011; Given, Kuh, LeeKeenan, Mardell, Redditt & Twombly 2010; Grove, 1996; Nelson, 2009; Nelson, Slavit, Perkins, & Hathorn, 2008; Weinbaum, Allen, Blythe, Simon, Seidel, & Rubin, 2004) and *collaborative teacher inquiry* (Slavit & Nelson, 2010; Slavit, Nelson, & Kennedy, 2009), describe types of professional learning communities that focus on co-constructing inquiry topics that teachers will collaborate on or cooperatively investigate together (Nelson, Slavit, Perkins, & Hathorn, 2008).

\(^4\) *Communities of practice* is a term most associated with teacher learning groups that adopt Lave and Wenger’s (1991) theory of situated learning and Wenger’s (1998) communities of practice (e.g., Graven, 2004; Gruenhagen, 2008; Riverin & Stacey, 2008; Seaman, 2008).

\(^5\) Cochran-Smith and Lytle (2009) have written an influential book, *Inquiry as Stance*, which informs many methods used by groups named above. Cochran-Smith and Lytle (2001; 2009) use the term, *practitioner inquiry communities* and advocate for practitioners (teachers working in the field of education) to see their everyday teaching as sustained inquiry and to be supported by inquiry communities.

\(^6\) Shared teacher inquiry is a model for “shared responsibility for developing and sustaining inquiry (SKIIP)” that is based on direct observation of teacher practice and takes place in a school setting (Siske-Hilton, 2009, p. 2). Sisk-Hilton describes research in the context of school-wide shared inquiry in which teachers “engage in inquiry about their own practice and also use the results of such efforts to support inquiry learning in their students” (2009, p. 1). Key structures of this model include: developing shared goals, engaging in joint planning, publicly analyzing classroom practices and student artifacts, and using data to make decisions about instruction (2009, p. 41).
Professional Learning for Arts Teachers

One of the challenges that art and music teachers encounter is a lack of high quality, sustained, content-specific, professional learning opportunities to promote reflection about a teacher’s unique teaching contexts (Lind, 2007; Sabol, 2006). Often, professional development for teachers is characterized as a one-day, in-service workshop given by an outside expert who delivers information by standing at the front of a room and lecturing to a large group of teachers. This workshop format is an example of a highly criticized deficit model of professional development in which an expert attempts to create change in teacher practice (Ball & Cohen, 1999; Borko & Putman, 1995; Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2001) in an effort to improve their effectiveness (Little, 2002; 2003). Lieberman urges, “The conventional view of staff development as a transferable package of knowledge to be distributed to teachers in bite-sized pieces needs radical rethinking” (1995, p. 581). This is especially true for teachers in the arts.

Too often art teachers are required to participate in professional development-as-information-delivery that is unrelated to the art content they teach (Sabol, 2006). Arts teachers (and all teachers) need professional learning opportunities where they can “encounter, negotiate, and articulate the complexities of classrooms alongside the input of other educators. In so doing, educators can live the language of praxis, valued as productive for everyone's professional growth” (Kim & Latta, 2010, pp. 137-138).
Sustained Inquiry in Community to Envision and Theorize Practice

In this dissertation study, I focus on a small group of teachers who are studying their teaching practice as a self-directed and group-supported approach to professional learning. Teachers engaged together in a collaborative inquiry group can support each other in an inquiry stance toward professional learning that is not episodic in nature but fosters sustained inquiry into a teacher’s particular teaching contexts (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009; Given, Kuh, LeeKeenan, Mardell, Redditt, & Twombly, 2010; Lamb, Philipp, Jacobs, & Schappelle, 2009, Lieberman, 2000; Lieberman & Miller, 2001). Cochran-Smith and Lytle (1999) view such practitioner learning communities as sites that “support teachers as they generate local knowledge, envision and theorize their practice, and interpret and interrogate the theory and research of others” (1999, p. 289). Scholars echo the need for further research oriented toward social constructivist methods of learning as inquiry for both teachers and students (Hagaman, 1990; Slavit & Nelson, 2010; Trumbull, Scarano, & Bonney, 2006). An inquiry-oriented approach to teacher learning in community is one that fosters a network of support for arts teachers to work together to design professional learning tailored to individual teaching contexts and interests (Brewer, 1999; Gates, 2010; Hagaman, 1990).

Teachers Generate Documentation of Practice for the Purpose of Sharing

Teachers can make their experiences understandable to other teachers for the purpose of deliberating practice and developing and testing theories as part of professional learning in community. Sharing documentation and stories of practice as a
process of reinventing and reconstructing possibilities, positions teachers to be active agents in improving the opportunities for teaching and learning in the arts (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009; Hetland, Cajolet, & Music, 2010).

Documentation can be generated and used by teachers to reflect, construct meaning from professional experience, and make teaching public (Lieberman & Mace, 2010). Aspects of teaching (that are normally private, localized, and situated interactions) can be rendered accessible to other teachers through the use of documentation, as a way to represent episodes of teaching. Photos, videos, and written notes are potential forms of documentation for this purpose. Teachers may also examine together examples of student outcomes and creative work (Langer & Colton, 2005).

Generating and sharing artifacts and records of teaching is potentially important to understanding the process of teaching as inquiry (Cochran-Smith & Lylte, 2009; Kazemi, & Franke 2004; Little, 2002; Roth, 2002). That is, sharing documentation of practice in a collaborative inquiry group offers teachers a view of personal and subjective experiences over time, a method of sustained professional learning as inquiry into one’s own practice and the practice of others.

Research about teachers sharing documentation as professional learning is needed to look at “how teachers, in and through their interactions with one another and with the material environment, convey and construct particular representations of practice” (Little, 2002, p. 934). Research that examines this process is likely to have implications for both professional learning in continuing education and pre-service teacher education. Specific accounts of situated interactions between teachers, students, and the material objects
associated with teaching and learning can help other teachers to visualize possible futures for their own teaching.

Professional Learning as Ongoing Process of Professional Becoming

Personal and professional development, like education should not be seen as static or unchangeable qualities achieved once and for all, but rather as process, an ongoing path that we follow from birth throughout our lives. (Rinaldi, 2006, p. 137)

We are concerned with possibility, with opening windows on alternative realities, with moving through doorways into spaces some of us have never seen before. . . . We are interested in breakthroughs and new beginnings, in the kind of wide-awakeness that allows for wonder and unease and questioning and the pursuit of what is not yet. (Greene, 2001 p. 44)

I view professional learning as an ongoing process of professional becoming through inquiry, a process that is perpetually unfinished but assumed by the teacher as an active stance toward future action. Cochran-Smith and Lytle (2009) encourage a mode of thinking and working in this active stance toward teaching as a sustained mode of inquiry. Promoting practitioner research, the authors assert *inquiry as stance* as a long-term and sustained engagement through inquiry to foster a “critical habit of mind” (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009, p. 121). This notion of *stance* is different from a view of practitioner research that might include short-term classroom research projects undertaken as part of coursework to demonstrate competency or effectiveness in implementing a particular strategy or approach. Sharing of experience with teachers engaged in inquiry as a *stance* toward professional becoming, teachers have the potential
to fuel inquiry as a process of envisioning possible futures while reflecting on specific moments in a life of teaching.

Maxine Greene once said, “I am who I am not yet” (Pinar, 1998, p. 1). Her process of becoming self is never finished. Elliot Eisner wrote, “the possibilities for growth in and through the arts cease only when we do. The ultimate aim of education is to enable individuals to become architects of their own education and through that process to continually reinvent themselves” (Eisner, 2002, p. 240). It is with a similar sensibility to being unfinished and an eagerness to continually reinvent oneself that I see the practice of documentation as part of a storied process of professional becoming. I use the term *practice of documentation* to describe a three part process: (a) a teacher’s process of gathering information about teaching and learning experiences, (b) the artifacts and documents that the teacher generates, and (c) the stories and reflections the teacher shares with others in relation to these artifacts and documents.

This process, the potential for teachers to story their experiences into narratives for others to understand (Carter, 1993), and the related artifacts and documentation that emerge, may help other teachers in a learning community see and understand another teacher’s ways of thinking about teaching. Through this dissertation research studying teachers’ documentation including their spoken and written story-sharing\(^7\), I study the experiences that 10 art and music teachers share in a collaborative inquiry group setting.

\(^7\) I use the term *oral* or *spoken story sharing* to describe the anecdotes and sharing of experiences that teachers spoke of as they showed photographs, videos, or other visual artifacts. Oral story sharing is a description of experiences that teachers shared when showing classroom photos in the context of a face-to-face group meeting. In addition, participants often shared written stories or written journal reflections in the form of blog posts.
Significance of the Study

There is a growing list of educational researchers who are studying teacher learning in community (e.g., Curry, 2008; Given et al., 2010; Lamb, Philipp, Jacobs, & Schappelle, 2009; Little, 2002; Slavit & Nelson, 2010). A few research studies specifically examine the role of teacher-generated documentation of classroom processes as part of teacher learning communities (Given et al., 2010; Little, 2002; Lyon & Donahue, 2009; Tegano & Moran, 2005). There is a separate body of research where pedagogical documentation (as it is used in the Reggio Emilia Italian education community) is applied to recommendations for teacher development in various educational settings (e.g., Goldhaber & Smith, 1997; Turner & Wilson, 2010). Additional research explores media and technological tools such as blogs, photographs, and digital video as supporting teacher inquiry (e.g., Lebak & Tinsley, 2010; Suarez, 2010).

When I narrowed my search of research literature to arts education, I located only one publication that addresses arts teachers specifically in collaborative professional learning contexts that are simultaneously focused on documentation as process and artifact. The one study I located focuses on a professional learning community of visual art teachers (Hetland, Cajolet, & Music, 2010) and their development of analytic descriptive categories that help teachers to label quality classroom experiences. Although it is possible that the results of my searches were affected by varying language used to describe documentation such as student work, artifacts, records, exemplars, reflections,

---

8 Appendix A includes a screen capture image of a detailed log I maintained of my literature searches, key terms, and databases.
etc.,

it remains that arts teachers’ experiences are underrepresented in the educational research literature. This dissertation is focused specifically on the narratives of arts teachers working together in collaborative professional learning as they use documentation of teaching practice and as they communicate in various ways that indicate their shifts in thinking about teaching and learning.

There is a need for additional research about arts education professional learning related to documentation of practice. I perceive a need, based on my review of literature, for research that makes known the experiences of arts teachers and their use of documentation as a method of sharing teaching experiences, as part of teacher-led and group-supported professional learning. Furthermore, I argue that a qualitative inquiry that uses narrative methodological tools is needed to bring forward the individual voices of teachers.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this narrative inquiry is to describe how shifts in thinking and practice can be seen and understood by colleagues in a collaborative inquiry group through visual and written documentation with accompanying storied reflection that chronicles experiences in relation to specific teaching contexts. Specifically, I am concerned in this narrative inquiry, with understanding complex stories that teachers share with the group over time in relation to the particular contexts in which they teach.

\[9\] I have accounted for these synonyms and phrases similar to “documentation.” I recorded these and other search terms in a database of search terms and results (see screenshot in Appendix A).
Individual teaching contexts are made visible to others in our group as participants\textsuperscript{10} show documentation of their teaching in the form of photographs, videos, student work, and written reflections as part of storied representations of teaching experiences (Peaslee, Snyder, & Casey, 2007). During the data collection period and in the writing process, I aimed to understand and examine the experiences of a specific group of arts teachers as they questioned, chronicled, shared, and interpreted their individual teaching practices using documentation in a community of inquiry.

The stories teachers told to members of a collaborative inquiry group is the focus of this study and the primary narrative data. I have focused my narrative inquiry dissertation research to investigate the ways these teachers reveal their inquiry into teaching through documentation and oral \textit{story sharing} in this collaborative inquiry group.

\textbf{Research Questions}

Two research questions are central to this narrative inquiry:

1. In what ways do participants use documentation (as processes and as material artifacts) to facilitate professional learning?

2. As participants share their documentation with the inquiry group and engage in dialogue, what indicates shifts in thinking about teaching and learning?

\textsuperscript{10} I use the terms \textit{teachers}, \textit{arts teachers}, and \textit{participants} to refer to the 10 art and music teachers who were participants in this study. In this dissertation, I use the terms \textit{researcher} or \textit{narrative inquirer} to refer to myself. For example, in the citation of a “researcher memo.” I also refer to myself as \textit{facilitator}. 


These two questions emerged from a broader and more general question that I posed at the outset of the study, in the fall of 2009, which was: How do teachers co-construct knowledge of teaching and learning in a collaborative inquiry group? Teachers’ “shifts in thinking” developed as my central focus coupled with ways teachers used, gathered, and shared artifacts to help make their emergent ideas visible to themselves and to the group.

**Implications of the Study**

This narrative inquiry has the potential to contribute to a body of research that helps educators find new ways to envision possible futures for arts education. This research may have implications for formats for professional learning for arts educators and may also show possibilities for using documentation of practice to advance our work as teachers. Throughout the writing and revising of this dissertation, I have had the opportunity to discuss themes related to this inquiry with pre-service art and music educators. Through these discussions, I sense that one of the most important implications of this study will be how it informs my stance toward pre-service teacher education as collaborative inquiry into teaching experience through the use of documentation. I also see potential value in using the narratives from this dissertation that retell teaching and learning experiences as part of pre-service art education coursework. Lastly, an important outcome I have personally experienced in writing this research text is my development of a “toolset” of narrative inquiry methods that will benefit other researchers as well as
assist me to continue in this line of research with both pre-service and in-service arts teachers.

**Introducing Key Terminology**

**Documentation**

I define *documentation* (noun) as a material object, artifact, or text (such as a photograph, video, or written reflection) recorded to represent and reflect on processes of teaching, learning, and classroom life. While artifacts of documentation are tangible and material *things* (nouns), the term documentation is simultaneously an active verb, or a *process* of gathering information about learning processes with a view of teacher and student as co-constructors of pedagogical practice (Dahlberg, Moss, & Pence, 1999). Documentation is a pedagogy of listening and noticing, a process that teachers and students engage in together (Rinaldi, 2006) as descriptions and interpretations of learning. “Documentation not only lends itself to interpretation but is itself interpretation. It is a narrative form, both intrapersonal and interpersonal communication, because it offers those who document and those who read the documentation an opportunity for reflection and learning” (Rinaldi, 2006, p. 71). It is important to note that while I refer directly to the Reggio Emilia understanding of pedagogical documentation in my own teaching and writing, I did not frequently share my view with research participants in a way that was intended to facilitate their adoption of a specific approach. This might have been appropriate if I were part of a participatory action research study that was situated in
our classrooms and this was what the teachers asked me to do. Rather, I emphasize in this narrative inquiry how teachers defined and enacted ideas about documentation, inquiry, and teaching in their own ways. Often this meant that they gathered their own resources and followed their own methods for gathering and sharing these resources.

In summary, I view documentation as simultaneously an ongoing process (verb) and a tangible artifact of experience (noun) (Turner & Wilson, 2010). As a verb, documentation is part of a process or strategy of reflection on teaching and learning experience as part of an inquiry stance. As a noun, it is a thing such as written notes, an image, video recording, audio clip, or other record of professional experience. Documentation as practice is a habit of mind that leaves one open to re-interpreting teaching (Turner & Wilson, 2010). Teachers working in professional communities use documentation as part of inquiry for professional learning to locate, analyze, and interpret teaching practice (Cobb, McClain, de Silva Lamberg, & Dean, 2003).

By recording process and thoughts related to teaching, teachers engaged in documentation as process are creating a visible and ongoing chronicle of experience (Giudici, Krechevsky, & Rinaldi, 2001; Krechevsky & Mardell et al., 2003). “Documentation is an essential tool for listening, observing, and evaluating the nature of our experience” (Tizania Filippini as quoted by Turner & Wilson, 2010, p. 5). Documenting for professional learning facilitates sophisticated understandings of teaching and learning and helps teachers develop a shared vocabulary that is specific in meaning and relevant to particular teaching contexts (Hetland, Cajolet, & Music, 2010).

In this study, documentation is part of the group’s process of sharing their teaching experience in the collaborative inquiry group. Documents teachers brought
forward for sharing are both texts that stand alone to represent experience and pivot points for story sharing and dialogue. Stories are important to the way a teacher describes his or her perspective to a collaborative inquiry group by inviting dialogue (Distad & Brownstein, 2004). In this way, documentation is process and text that articulates a narrative view of teaching as inquiry. Documentation has the potential to help teachers working in a collaborative inquiry group to reconsider their teaching past experiences in the present (Roth, 2002).

**Shifts in Thinking, Shifts in Practice**

I use the phrase, “shifts in thinking” throughout this dissertation. By shifts, I mean the moving, growing, evolving, or exploring that a teacher indicates in a written or spoken reflection. These reflections might include shifts in thinking, practice, teaching, learning, or any of the modes of being that are associated with being engaged in inquiry as an ongoing process of professional becoming. I elect to use the term shift instead of a term such as change because the purpose of this research is not to verify changes in teachers’ practice. Rather, this is a narrative inquiry into how teachers indicate shifts in thinking as related to sharing documentation and reflections of teaching experiences. The word shift is, in my estimation, the most open and all-encompassing term to indicate what I have begun to call during my thematic coding of participants’ narratives, moving in the inquiry space. Ellsworth’s (2005) concept of the learning self in motion informs my understanding as I inquire into teachers’ shifts as part of professional becoming.
It is important to note that I view the phrase “shift in thinking” to also include any shifts in practice, shifts in emotion, shifts in comfort level, shifts in attitudes, shifts in approaches, and other shifting that a teacher might personally experience in relation to studying teaching practice in a collaborative inquiry group that is focused on experimenting with new teaching approaches. Therefore the phrase, “shifts in thinking” is a figure of speech rather than a focus on modes of thinking or cognition. In Chapter 2, I discuss how three theoretical frames: actor-network theory (Fenwick & Edwards, 2010, 2012), smooth and striated space (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987), and knowledge in the making (Ellsworth, 2005) inform and extend my narrative analysis of teachers’ shifts in thinking. My choice of phrasing for my research question was affirmed when participant Rachel used the phrase “shift in thinking” in May 2010 to describe her experience working in collaborative inquiry (see Chapters 4 and 7).

**Collaborative Inquiry**

I use the terms community of inquiry, inquiry community, and collaborative inquiry group\(^\text{11}\) to describe the group of 10 visual art and music teachers and myself (a visual art educator and researcher) who met together over a period of two school years as part of a formally organized continuing education course. Our group met together in person, in online web conferences, and by keeping a group blog. In these contexts we shared stories of teaching accompanied by documentation such as photographs, video, and written notes.

\(^{11}\) The term collaborative inquiry is discussed in greater detail in Chapter 3 in order to clarify that collaborative inquiry is not my dissertation research methodology.
Overview of the Organization of the Dissertation Chapters

This dissertation is written in eight chapters. In this first chapter, I introduce the rationale for the study and outline its purpose and central research questions. In Chapter 2, I describe and explore the theories that I use to form my theoretical framework. In Chapter 3, I discuss narrative inquiry as the methodological and theoretical orientation to this research. Chapters 4 through 7 are narrative data chapters where I present narratives interwoven with discussion and analysis. Scenes I through IV, written in the form of dramatic scripts, appear between Chapters 3 through 7 as interludes. The content and form of these interlude scenes are integral to understanding the discussions in Chapters 4 through 7. In Chapter 8, I conclude by synthesizing key findings and themes, implications of the study, and directions for future research.
Chapter 2

Theoretical Perspectives to Approach the Space of Narrative Inquiry

Clandinin and Connelly’s (2000) *three-dimensional narrative inquiry space* is an overarching theoretical framework for understanding narratives as relational and constructed texts that are representations of experience (Nespor & Barylske, 1991). The *three-dimensional narrative inquiry space* is a broad and encompassing conceptual model that I used in this study to understand the spaces of interaction where participants’ narratives were constructed. In this chapter, I also draw from three theoretical perspectives: actor-network theory (Fenwick & Edwards, 2010, 2012), smooth and striated space (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987), and knowledge in the making (Ellsworth, 2005) to aid my narrative analysis of teachers’ stories of experience. These three theories help me extend and expand Clandinin and Connelly’s (2000) notion of the *three-dimensional narrative inquiry space*.

Introduction to Narrative Inquiry

Human experiences as they are embedded in temporal and contextual frames of reference are the central focus of a narrative inquiry. Narrative inquiry is well suited to aid in research about the nuances of human experience through story (Bruner, 1986; Chase, 2005; Clandinin, 2006; Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Creswell, 2007; Czarniawska, 2004; Ellis & Bochner, 1996; Ollerenshaw & Creswell, 2002;
Polkinghorne, 1988, 1995, 2010; Riessman, 2007). Narrative research has the potential to bring into view “issues of complexity and human centeredness” (Webster & Mertova, 2007, p. 3). The narratives themselves bear qualities and descriptions that may resonate or challenge readers’ experience while suggesting and inspiring new understandings.

Narrative inquiry is a flexible research methodology and a theoretical orientation in which the researcher is engaged in a sustained process of looking backward and forward, inward and outward. This inquiry process occurs in response to hearing stories that participants tell, observing events as they unfold, examining self and personal experience, and composing narratives that retell and interpret the stories.

Narrative inquiry is a way of understanding experience. It is a collaboration between research and participants, over time, in a place or series of places, and in social interaction with milieus. An inquirer enters this matrix in the midst and progresses in this same spirit, concluding the inquiry still in the midst of living and telling, reliving and retelling, the stories of the experiences that make up people’s lives, both individual and social . . . Simply stated narrative inquiry is stories lived and told. (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p. 20)

While there is no single narrative inquiry method, Jean Clandinin and Michael Connelly are widely recognized as leading narrative inquirers who are advancing an emerging methodology (Chase, 2005; Clandinin, 2007; Connelly & Clandinin, 1994; Clandinin, Pushor, & Orr, 2007; Polkinghorne, 2010). Their inquiry into teacher knowledge is part of a line of narrative research focused on constructing meaning through stories of educational experience as they are contextualized in particular times, places, and social interactions (Clandinin & Connelly, 1989; Connelly & Clandinin, 1988, 1990, 1994; Huber, Murphy, & Clandinin, 2011).
Thinking of Inquiry as a Space

Clandinin and Connelly describe the “three-dimensional narrative inquiry space” as a way to conceptualize the work of narrative inquiry as being “in the midst, located somewhere along the dimensions of time, place, the personal, and the social” (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p. 63). This space is a metaphor for the constantly shifting forward and backward, inward and outward nature of inquiry as research in particular times, places, and social contexts. By thinking about inquiry as moving in a three-dimensional space, or “back and forthing,” the work of narrative inquiry is never static but is always shaped by what has happened and what will happen next (2000, p. 167). Roth (2002) characterizes this back and forth as a process of engagement building theory from praxis, analyzing how particular moments affect our teaching.

Three Dimensional Narrative Inquiry Space

Connelly and Clandinin’s (2006) temporal, social, and placial commonplaces of narrative inquiry become the relational ground that educators’ narratives enter and navigate as the concrete realities of their classrooms increasingly draw their attention. (Kim & Latta, 2010, p. 140) Narrative inquirers who write about issues of time, space, and interaction and who use Clandinin and Connelly’s (2000) three-dimensional narrative inquiry space as a conceptual metaphor, typically cite a Deweyen view of continuity of experience as it is occurring on a temporal continuum, located in specific situations and interactions (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Clandinin & Huber, 2002). John Dewey’s (1938) notion of continuity in experience is a popular theoretical framework for narrative inquirers who are concerned with analyzing how human experience unfolds into further experiences on
a temporal continuum. Using a narrative view of experience, the researcher does not see experiences as isolated events, but rather sees how experiences continue and develop over time (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Craig, 2007). Experiences appreciated in “the living present” are those that are in continuity with past and future (Dewey, 1933, p. 23).

I see great potential for additional theoretical perspectives, beyond Deweyan (1933, 1934, 1938) views of experience, to inform how research is undertaken and data analyzed in the three-dimensional narrative inquiry space. In this narrative inquiry, I searched for theoretical approaches to support the analysis of spaces of interaction because a theory of temporality and continuity of experience was, in my view, insufficient to aid in the analysis of complex socio-material interactions. In this narrative inquiry, participants’ stories describe complex interactions that occurred in two years of collaborative inquiry where teachers were studying their own teaching practice as part of a continuing education course.

In this chapter, I first elaborate the meaning of Clandinin and Connelly’s three-dimensional narrative inquiry space. I then discuss three theoretical perspectives that guided my exploration of the nuances of interaction and experience in the inquiry space of this research. I used three theoretical underpinnings to inform my analysis of narrative data, interpreting participants’ stories of teaching practice. My analysis led to assembling collections of stories and interweaving interpretive discussion that helped me to understand and retell stories of ways that participants (a) used documentation of teaching experiences (as processes and material artifacts) in their collaborative professional learning, and (b) indicated shifts in their thinking about teaching and learning.
A Graphical Model of Metaphorical Space

The three-dimensional narrative inquiry space is a model to envision narrative inquiry as occurring in a metaphorical space of interaction. Narrative data, stories, are part of a specific research context. The research context is a space of relationships between individual research participants situated within the dimensions of a series of complex social interactions in specific times and places.

Chang (2011) created a visual diagram of a cube to show Clandinin and Connelly’s (2000) three-dimensional narrative inquiry space (Figure 2-1).

Chang (2011) labeled the three-dimensional solid shape along three dimensions to convey Clandinin and Connelly’s (2000) interpretation of Dewey’s (1938) theory of
continuity of experience: The first dimension is temporal continuity. Narratives represent experiences occurring in time and are expressed in ways that mark the passage of time as continuously unfolding. The temporal view helps the narrative inquirer attend to the way that stories are renderings of the past, present, and future on a narrative continuum.

The second dimension is situation. Narratives are stories of situated experiences, located in specific places, revealing how participants and researcher are in relationship to this situational space.

The third dimension is interaction. Narratives are embedded in a complex set of personal and social interactions in the participants’ and researchers’ day-to-day experience. Social interactions are not only human-to-human but also between humans and objects, humans and ideas, and humans and their environment.

Seeing the three-dimensional narrative inquiry space rendered as a literal cube, a graphical model that hangs in space as Chang (2011) has illustrated, causes me to reflect further on what Clandinin and Connelly called being “in the midst” and “being in the field” in narrative inquiry (2000, p. 63). Being present and engaged in narrative inquiry means being fully surrounded in the context of the research as a space.

CIG Space as Inquiry Space of this Research

My narrative inquiry research was a sustained engagement with people, places, objects, and ideas. It was comprised of a series of events over two years in which participants and I were learning together in a specific temporal-continual, situational, and interactive context within the space of the Arts Educator Teacher Inquiry project (AETI).
While AETI provided the overall place and space for us to assemble, the context of our collaborative inquiry group (CIG) was the immediate space of this research. It is the CIG space and its web of relationships that participants were addressing when they shared a story from their classroom experience or when they made a post to our group blog. It was in the CIG that our relationships were formed and sustained. Thus the *three-dimensional narrative inquiry space* is more than a model that describes three distinct categories for narrative data analysis (although it could function this way also). I use it as a description of the complex research space that researcher and participants engage in together. This complex research space is one that I visualize metonymically\(^\text{12}\) as an interwoven net, linked in a patchwork, or coalescing in moving and shifting assemblage, rather than rendered as a solid shape (Nespor, 2003 as cited by Fenwick & Edwards, 2012).

**Narratives Interwoven “Like a Net”: Theories of Shifting, Linking, and Entangling Lines of Inquiry**

The text is woven, not when its words are strung together to create a written manuscript, but when its written signs are interwoven with a speaker's voice. Thus the manuscript is the warp and the voice the woof of the woven textual fabric. (Dean, 1998, p.80)

The meanings of an event are constituted by hooking it up to moving networks of people acting, with, through, and by virtue of their entanglements with durable artefacts, structures and materials. Into these networks of action are woven so many commitments, identities and interests. (Nespor, 2003, p. 95 as cited by Fenwick & Edwards, 2012, p. 28)

---

\(^{12}\) I use metonyms (e.g., net, network, space) as concepts and descriptors with which to develop contiguous associations of meaning. These terms are not meant as similes, metaphors, nor direct comparisons. They are conceptual constructions that help to open possibilities of meaning (LaJevic & Powell, 2012)
Rachel paused and glanced around the room. Her eyes rested on the adjacent wall, where part of our CIG’s display was hanging. Long undulating strips of blue paper were taped to the wall in rows next to a photograph of each CIG member. One by one, the strips featured a teacher’s quote from our group blog. The quotes were each attributed to a member of the collaborative inquiry group (CIG).

Rachel made the blue wavy paper quotes in her art classroom and brought them to hang on the conference room wall as part of our display. Early that morning, we all transformed this bleak meeting room into a multi-sensory installation of quotes, sculptures, slideshows, audio recordings, and other artifacts designed and brought together by our CIG. Our intention was to display and communicate our CIG’s inquiry work to the other arts teachers who were associated with the Arts Education Teacher Inquiry program.

Rachel continued talking, “As I was puzzling over putting together these quotations for our interactive presentation today, I thought of a map. I thought, how do you map two years of inquiry? It’s like a brain. It’s not two dimensional.”

Rachel extended the flattened palm of her hand to show us. “And, our process . . . It’s not like we are just driving along together on the surface of the earth,” she said, motoring her right hand over her flat left palm in a steady unidirectional motion.

“It’s more like this,” she said.

She sent her interlaced fingers aloft in a tightly tangled finger-knuckle mass. Her arms extended up to the ceiling. “How the heck do you map that?”

Looking at her interlocking finger puzzle, the group was quiet. How do you map two years of inquiry?

“Maybe we should have criss-crossed these quotations,” Rachel offered. She disentangled her fingers to point out a traversing pattern in the air. “It’s like a net.” Reaching, she traced invisible interwoven lines that connected us.

Rachel thinks aloud in an impromptu revision of the space around her. She sees our quotations as better represented as “criss-crossed” to appear “like a net.” I view Rachel’s proposed change to the design of our group’s installation as resonating a concern that Nespor and Barylske (1991) raised about the need to understand narrative research data as relational and embedded in a moving network of interaction. Narratives
are not stand-alone, static accounts of experience; rather, narrative data should be understood as contextualized within the social network where it is constructed. “If all the world is relational, then so too are texts. They come from somewhere and tell particular stories about particular relations” (Law, 2007, p. 2).

Rachel (May 2011 CIG Meeting) was imagining a different textual form to represent our CIG’s ideas, one that was more crisscrossed to reflect how our group’s ideas are tightly entangled and difficult to separate. I have used this narrative fragment and the lingering image of Rachel’s knotted fingers to remember my own aim for this dissertation research text to represent our experiences as a CIG in a multivoiced and relational set of narratives. This narrative fragment in which Rachel proposed that our ideas are “like a net,” describes my aim for this narrative inquiry dissertation to be a narrative interweaving of participant’s stories as they were typically conveyed to our CIG through documentation as process and artifacts. Teachers indicated shifts in their thinking about teaching and learning as they shared their experiences with each other through documentation.

Chapters 4-7 and the corresponding scenes which appear between chapters are intertextures,\textsuperscript{13} sets of related texts that trace teachers’ stories, photographs, videos, and other documentation of shifts in thinking about teaching and learning. I discuss these narratives in the context of three different conceptual frames (i.e., actor-network theory, smooth and striated space, and knowledge in the making), each of which extend

\textsuperscript{13} I discuss the term intertexture in greater detail in Chapter 3 and in an interim text that appears in Appendix B.
Clandinin & Connelly’s (2000) narrative inquiry space as one of temporal, spatial, and social interaction.

The following three theoretical perspectives were integral to my narrative analysis:

- The concept of smooth and striated space (Deleuze & Guatarri, 1987) lends a way of thinking about physical spaces as places for change-processes to occur.
- Ellsworth’s (2005) concepts of knowledge in the making, the learning self in motion, and transitional objects are important in learning ways that our documentation of learning experiences in the making can be shared in the context of professional learning in relation to student learning.

These three theoretical ideas resonated with narrative data (participants’ stories) in ways that helped me to assemble collections of teachers’ narratives, which I began to call *intertextures*. These narrative intertextures coalesced in their own spaces of interaction and connection between emerging themes in narrative data and my immersion in the study of these three theoretical perspectives in educational processes. In the following section, I discuss these conceptual strategies that shaped my narrative analysis and organizing of teachers’ stories of shifts in thinking in Chapters 4-7.

**Socio-Materiality in Educational Processes: Actor-Network Approaches**

Actor-network theory is useful for interpreting the relational and situational qualities of the *three-dimensional narrative inquiry space* as a site of social and material interaction between the human and non-human. Drawing on actor-network theory (ANT), I focus not only on human interaction between members of our CIG, but I also consider
material objects to be influential in these interactions. The material objects that are frequently useful in educational processes and interactions typically include: desks, tables, chairs, computers, art supplies, cameras, lesson plans, and other objects that are not always considered as significant and visible actors in educational research studies (Edwards, 2012; Fenwick & Edwards, 2010; Fenwick, Edwards, & Sawchuck, 2011).

Actor-network theory offers a set of conceptual tools to investigate “social and natural worlds as a continuously generated effect of the webs of relations from which they are located” (Law, 2007, p. 2). This set of tools, approaches, and sensibilities are sometimes encapsulated with the single label actor-network theory or ANT. Law (2007) warns that actor-network approaches are not an individual theory in the sense that ANT can stand alone as one foundational underpinning to be applied to research. Rather, actor-network theory (ANT) is better understood as a set of descriptive tools, concepts, and vocabulary that are useful to understanding how things, people, ideas, texts, and other entities (both human and non-human) are linked in relational webs of interaction (Fenwick, Edwards, & Sawchuk, 2011; Latour, 2005; Nespor, 1997). “The actor-network approach is not a theory . . . instead it tells stories about ‘how’ relations assemble or don’t” (Law, 2007, p. 2).

**Actor-Network Theory Concepts: Translation, Symmetry, and Enactment**

In this study, I use three particular descriptive tools as analytical sensibilities (Boylan, 2010; Law, 2007) to explore and describe relationships between human and non-human entities (humans, objects, and ideas) in the social and material space of this
research. These changing relationships are one way to understand shifts in thinking about teaching and learning. The three terms translation, symmetry, and enactment are descriptive concepts that are important in my narrative analysis of how teachers described shifts in their thinking about teaching and learning when they shared and reflected on past teaching experiences with our CIG.

**Translation**

The concept of translation extends from Callon’s (1986) writing of the complex interrelated meanings that emerge in a constantly shifting set of phenomena where humans and objects are acting on one another to produce change in ways that are motivated by each entity’s interests and motivations. ANT examines these interconnections based on the assumption that “nothing exists prior to its performance or enactment” (Fenwick & Edwards, 2012, p. x). It is in the network (or fluid space) of relationships among actors (both human and non-human) that the active patterns of translations form. Translation occurs in the in-between space of these relationships in constant activity.

One of the ways socio-material translations are traced is by studying narratives. Extending the fluid network ontology of Callon’s (1986) notion of translations of interrelated meanings and interests, Boylan’s (2010) narrative study uncovers the nuances of “teacher-change process” or translations in narratives that are embedded in the context of a collaborative teacher-led professional development program. Boylan (2010) analyzes teacher narratives with ANT sensibilities, retelling stories of a “teacher’s knowledge,
beliefs and attitudes, the process of professional experimentation, the influence of the outcomes of change practice and external sources of information and stimulus” (Boylan, 2010, p. 383).

In this narrative inquiry, the ANT concept of translation supported my development of groupings of interpretive narratives. For example, one set of narratives retells the significance of the document camera as a digital object that exerted its pedagogical force (Ellsworth, 2005) in a network of collaborative inquiry and professional experimentation of methods among a group of arts teachers (see Chapter 5). Translation is an ANT sensibility that lends a particular meaning to the notion of shifting or changing because it includes non-human objects, ideas, and materials as objects capable of exerting force in a dynamic and ever-shifting process of translation.

Symmetry

Sensibilities arising from actor-network theory (Law, 2007) opened new ways of thinking in my inquiry process; it led me to consider the influence of non-human objects as equally important to the human elements in a network of collaborative inquiry among teachers as equally important to the human elements. Without an understanding of symmetry in ANT, I may not have regarded the document camera, physical spaces such as classrooms, and virtual objects such as digital photographs with the same attention and equal regard as the human participants in this study. This equal regard for the human and non-human is called symmetry (Latour, 1987) in ANT literature. Symmetrical human and non-human relationships form entities “held in balance with their interactions” (Fenwick
& Edwards, 2012, p. xii). Non-human objects are seen by ANT researchers as just as capable as humans in “exerting force, joining together, changing and being changed by each other” (Fenwick & Edwards, 2012, p. x). This equal capability or symmetry, strongly influenced the way that I assembled participants’ narratives in this dissertation to include and represent the strong influence of objects such as document cameras, teachers’ physical teaching spaces (or lack there of), and digital photographs.

**Enactment**

Research studies that are informed by ANT sensibilities are examining networks as the “assemblage or gathering of materials brought together and linked through processes of translation, that together perform a particular enactment [emphasis added]” (Fenwick & Edwards, 2012, p. xiii). I see the ANT concept of enactment as lending a new understanding to “shifts in thinking.” Viewing the term shift through an ANT lens emphasizes the force of materials that are assembled in particular ways, their interactions, and resulting translations. ANT concepts of translation and enactment bring to light the active processes of shifting in relation to the forces exerted by others. There are many theories of relational and social processes, but ANT with its symmetry of non-human and human objects helps a researcher assume a socio-material perspective to see where shifting translations are occurring. ANT sensibilities have the potential to “focus attention to the socio-material connections and their patterns . . . discern[ing] not only closures but also openings . . . spaces for flux and instability embedded within and floating apart from the network” (Fenwick, 2012, p. 114).
Part of my narrative inquiry process was to write as a method of thinking in response to my experiences in the field with participants and in response to reading and listening to their narratives. I wrote interim texts as working drafts throughout the two years of data collection and one year of writing of the research text. I include here a found poem (Prendergrast, 2006) as interim text that I crafted from direct phrases in Fenwick and Edwards (2012) book, *Researching Education Through Actor-Network Theory*. This synthesis of ideas using poetic devices and forms (Figure 2-2) is part of my method of narrative inquiry.
How do relations among objects bring about the world?
ANT lends important insights about the processes and objects of education.

Think of ANT not as a theory but as
a virtual cloud
continually moving
shrinking and stretching
dissolving in any attempt to grasp it

ANT’s language opens new questions
its approaches can sense phenomena in rich ways that discern
difficult ambivalences, messes, multiplicities, and contradictions
embedded in so many educational issues

Objects and parts of objects
capable of exerting force and joining together
to form networks that expand or dissolve

Materiality, meaning, and representation are one
ANT focuses not on what texts and other human and non-human things mean, but
what they do

Multiple forms, lines, and textures of materials
come together
to produce effects

Learning is not mental calculation or changes in consciousness
instead, any changes we might describe as learning,
such as new ideas, innovations, transformation
emerge through the effects of relational interactions

Figure 2-2. Found poem after Fenwick and Edwards (2012, pp. ix–xxi)
Fenwick and Edwards (2012) describe learning “not as mental calculation or changes in consciousness,” but rather as “new ideas, innovations, transformation” (p. xxii). This view of learning as the effects of relational interactions informs the way I understand and investigate the phrase, “shifts in thinking” in my second research question: As participants share their documentation with the inquiry group and engage in dialogue, what indicates shifts in thinking about teaching and learning? Following Fenwick and Edwards’ (2012) ideas above, shifts need not be just mental or cognitive. ANT shifts such as translation and enactment “coming together to produce effects” are all part of the processes that ANT sensibilities help researchers to analyze and understand. In Chapter 5, I assemble several narratives that retell stories of how teachers innovate their classroom practice as part of the influence of a document camera as a digital object that was an influential actor in the interactions of our CIG.

Network, Region, Space, or Field?

The perpetually assembling and disassembling relations are called networks by early ANT researchers (Callon, 1986; Fenwick & Edwards, 2012). The node and link structure of the network that is so often associated with ANT is sometimes criticized for being a simplification of complex relationships that are constantly in flux (Law, 1999; Fenwick & Edwards, 2012). But what term, other than network, is one that helps to explore the relational connections that coalesce between humans, objects, and ideas? What language can be used to better explore a researcher’s concern for the “gaps between the network knots?” (Fenwick, 2012, p. 110).
Some researchers choose more open metaphors that allow for understanding the ambiguity of this open space such as regions, fluid spaces, (Fenwick, 2012; Mol & Law, 1994) or open fields (Hamilton, 2012, p. 55). Hamilton describes the open field as a central metaphor of ANT as it is concerned with examining “competing social forces and projects that are continually shifting, with alliances being formed and dissolved” (Hamilton, 2012, p. 55). As described earlier in this chapter, I have adopted the term space to coincide and expand on Clandinin and Connelly’s three-dimensional narrative inquiry space while also using ANT concepts, Deleuze and Guattari’s (1987) smooth and striated space, and Ellsworth’s (2005) knowledge in the making. In the next section I explore Deleuze and Guattari’s (1987) smooth and striated space as a different way to describe shifting spaces of interaction that are typically called “networks” by ANT researchers.

**Smoothing and Striating Spaces of Interaction**

While listening to the ways that teachers described classroom spaces and arrangement of physical materials as central to their shifts in teaching approaches (see Chapter 6), I wanted to learn more about the ANT term fluid spaces (Fenwick, 2012; Hamilton, 2012). In my study of ANT, I simultaneously pursued a related but different line of inquiry into the Deleuze-Guattarian spaces of the smooth and striated. The narratives that I assemble in Chapter 6 coalesced as an intertexture of participants’ narratives about classroom spaces and my inquiry into smoothing and striating space. Deleuze and Guattari’s (1987) idea that spaces can be varying degrees of both smooth
and striated is relevant in understanding how people and objects interact within space, specifically in classroom spaces.

Spaces can be *striated* like the lines and linkages in a network, or the fibers woven into fabric. Spaces can also be *smooth*, like the open space of a field or the fluid sea. The concept and examples of smooth and striated space explored in the book, *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia* (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987) are part of a “conceptual toolbox” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. xiv) for the pragmatist philosopher. For Deleuze, “tools become, one by one, the very parts they were supposed to be working on, not in an assimilation but a disjunctive synthesis, for they produce a difference” (Roy, 2003, p. 178). To describe smooth and striated space, I paraphrase the first example as described by Deleuze and Guattari (1987), the “technological model” using fabric as an illustrative example (p. 475).

**Woven Fabric as Striated Space**

Woven fabric has the characteristics of *striated space*. Its threads are the warp and weft woven in an alternating over-under pattern of structure. A mobile thread passes over and under a fixed thread in a weaving motion. The edges of fabric are delimited, determined by the width of the fixed thread. The fabric can have unlimited length but limited width.
Felt as Smooth Space

Felt, on the other hand is a “supple solid,” an “anti-fabric” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 475). It has the characteristics of smooth space. Its threads are not separated in a uniformly repeating pattern. Rather, felt is formed from an “entanglement” of fibers, “an aggregate of intrication . . . in no way homogenous” (1987, p. 475). Felt is smooth. Its random structure contrasts with the predictable grid of the space of woven fabric. Felt (see Figure 2-3) has the potential to extend in all directions without care for top, bottom, back or front.
Figure 2-3. Photograph of a felted wool vessel I made in my process of thinking-through-making to explore the material process of felting as *smoothing*.

***

(*research memo, July 2012*)

I felted the wool roving\(^{14}\) by working and kneading the carded and dyed wool in my soapy hands. Soap and warm water were the catalysts to help raise the wool fibers and with friction, create an interlocked mass of felt. After rinsing, I cut open the felt to remove the ball that was a temporary form to support the wool as I formed it into felt. What started as individual fibers—strands of neatly carded wool roving, with all of the wool fibers laying in the same horizontal direction—changed through my kneading and manipulating into a felted sculpture with fibers densely and intricately enmeshed. I further *smoothed* the sculpture by photographing it using a wide aperture to blur the edges and soften its relationship to the background.

***

\(^{14}\) slivers of separate wool fibers
Striated space, such as Deleuze and Guattari’s (1987) example of a city with its grid of streets, limits, boundaries, and other marks of territorialization, is delimited and marked with structure. Smooth space, however (such as the fluid open sea or the vast sprawling desert) is open and unorganized (Deleuze & Guatarri, 1987). While spaces are characteristically striated or smooth, we can also see that striated spaces are becoming smoothed and smooth spaces are becoming striated (see Figure 2-4). This becoming and shifting, smoothing and striating can be described as “continual and subtle transformation” in “relations of potentiality” (Roy, 2003, p. 177).
Figure 2-4. Photograph of a watercolor and beeswax painting that was one of several conceptual and material explorations in smoothing striated space.

***

(research memo, June 2012)

I see possibility for considering smoothing-striating space in the process of painting—the watercolor paper ground is a topographical plane of mixed smooth and striated space. . . . The beeswax lines form the striations of a grid. The wax resists the water. The fluid watercolor pigments flow and mix until they reach the wax line and they are contained. The pigment mixes and flows and shifts, forming reticulations of color and value, edges defined by wax. Fluid, shifting, resisting.

***
Smooth and Striated Spaces Exist Only in Mixture

For example, Deleuze and Guattari (1987) offer that even the smooth space of the sea is marked with the grid of longitude and latitude to aid sailors in navigating and moving freely in this smooth space. In this example, the free movement in and amid the smooth space is made possible by striating it with a system of navigation. The smooth space is also striated. Deleuze and Guattari (1987) emphasize that smooth and striated spaces “exist only in mixture: smooth space is constantly being translated, transversed into a striated space; striated space is constantly being reversed, returned to a smooth space” (Deleuze & Guatarri, 1987, p. 474). Therefore, understanding smooth and striated space is not just an exercise in identifying one or the other. But rather, we look to see the process by which smooth spaces are being striated and striated spaces are being smoothed. Bayne (2004) explains, “What is important about this conceptualization of space is not so much the way the two types of space are opposed to each other as their tendency to pervade each other—for striation to appropriate the smooth, and for the smooth to emerge from the striated” (Bayne, 2004, p. 303). The following found poem (Figure 2-5) is one that I constructed to explore the ways that the smooth and striated pervade one another.
Smooth-striated Patchwork

Is it possible to define this multiplicity?
Patches of space
Connections, tactile relations

Rhythmic values translated into metric, striated space
Heterogeneous in continuous variation
Smooth space, amorphous, not homogeneous

Enveloped distances
We cross from the smooth to the striated, and from the striated to the smooth
To substitute the space traversed for the movement

Figure 2-5. Found poem after Deleuze and Guattari (1987, p. 480–481)

In this study, I used the concept of smoothing striated space (and striating smooth space) in exploring how teachers exerted change on physical learning spaces\(^{15}\) as part of

\(^{15}\) Research memo pertaining to the analysis of narrative:
A classroom is one of the most ubiquitous of learning spaces in schools. We assume that school teachers teach in classrooms. The concept of “classroom” as a physical space is striated with the structures of schooling including the bell schedule that determines the duration of activities that occur in the classroom, the arrangement of desks, chairs, and materials, and various other organizational characteristics that are part of typical classroom spaces. Some of these are structures that can be changed or smoothed by a teacher and students to make way for a new method of learning.

On the other hand, what about a teacher who is without a classroom? What about the art teacher who teaches “art on a cart?” The itinerant art teacher may long for the added structure and familiar pattern of routine that a classroom space would provide. Being able to act in one’s own territory could mean more agency to make decisions, changes, and improvements. Therefore, the teacher who travels between schools, and teaches in many elementary homeroom spaces, may be trying to find ways to striate their nomadic smooth spaces.
their experimentation with teaching methods. The topic of learning spaces was one that emerged in the research analysis and is explored further in chapters 5 and 6.

This language of smoothing and striating is more than a metaphor or a set of metonyms to describe the state of educational spaces. There is important meaning in the act of shifting between the smoothing and striating spaces. This Deleuze-Guattarian conceptual framework of smooth and striated space helped me to study not just space, but the way people exert themselves in spaces. These are ways of thinking about the relationships between physical classroom spaces and the stories that teachers shared about shifts they made in their thinking and practice. For example, teachers in this study described classroom spaces and objects and their experiences in these spaces and with these objects as intertwined with their ability to exert a change-process that they desired (see Emma’s and Kay’s stories in Chapter 6).

Reconceptualist Curriculum Theory and Knowledge in the Making

Our lived experience of pedagogy is what makes its features as pedagogy visible and remarkable. The educational qualities or value of a pedagogical effort—what, in other words, counts as “educational” in that effort—exist only in our response to it. (Ellsworth, 2005, p. 23)

In her book, Places of Learning, Elizabeth Ellsworth (2005) uses many examples of media and architecture that serve as pedagogical pivot places: fluid, dynamic, multiple, and uncertain experiences that fuel the learning self. The “learning self in motion” is a person who is “feeling the world’s newness” in embodied sensations of experience in the making. This sense of emergence is knowledge in the making, as
opposed to knowledge as a thing *already made*. Ellsworth builds on pragmatist philosophy including the writing and thinking of Henri Bergson and William James to develop a set of concepts that describe experiences in the making as a unification of reason and sensation in the process of learning.

Ellsworth’s book is full of rich narrative descriptions of her encounters with emergent experiences in response to direct encounters in the pedagogical spaces of media and architecture. She also includes her analysis of other artists’ and authors’ encounters of knowledge in the making. These rich accounts are part of what makes this book to be a very useful and inspiring theoretical and practical text to aid in the analysis of the stories that arts teachers tell when they are sharing documentation of a student’s learning experiences. I *use* Ellsworth’s ideas by studying her vocabulary of concepts to develop theoretical renderings of her own direct experiences with media, arts, and architecture. She explores shifts in thinking and experience as knowledge in the making, as a complex experience belonging to the learning self in motion in relationship to social and aesthetic experiences.

The following found poem (Figure 2-6) is one that I constructed directly from phrases in Ellsworth’s writing in *Places of Learning* (Ellsworth, 2005). I follow Monica Prendergrast’s and Carl Leggo’s (Prendergrast & Leggo 2007) found poetry method to synthesize of Ellsworth’s (2005) ideas.
The learning self in motion
is in qualitative transformation,
navigating topologies of relationality

The space of learning
is a space for finding pedagogical volition
in the simultaneity of interfering and resonating desires

Embodiment, mediated experience, lived spaces and times,
sensations of being in relation with the outside world
in relation to other selves

The learning self, usefully and inventively
breeches cognition’s sphere,
using productive irritations to delve deeper into emerging concepts

Feeling the ambiguity of knowledge in the making,
smudging the learning self, a body is blurred by its own indeterminacy,
by its openness to an elsewhere, potentialities unprecedented

New is the feeling of shifting,
a smudge set in motion,
movement as qualitative change, thought itself becoming sensible

Transitional objects are tools to use in these shifts,
permeable boundaries, zones of constant traffic
imagination, action, emergence

Engaged in the duration of knowledge and self,
the sensation of learning emerges
time is contemporaneous in the midst of an experience of the learning self

In the experience of knowledge in the making,
we shift, fringe, and draw outside of ourselves
set in motion toward undetermined destination

Figure 2-6. Found Poem after Ellsworth (2005, p. 77, 80, 117–122, 141, 146, 172).
Implications for Formal Learning

Ellsworth writes about unstructured encounters with media, art, and architecture in museums and public spaces. The pedagogical encounters that Ellsworth (2005) describes in her book are focused in places where people are experiencing media, art, and architecture. These places of learning are informal learning locations, outside of the typical places of formalized learning such as schools. I believe that her writing has many important implications for the way arts teachers approach the pedagogical address of learning experience in the making in school settings (formal learning sites). It is in school settings where teachers are often found prompting reiteration and recitation of knowledge. These are prevalent teaching “strategies that seek to stop the movement of the learning self” by asking students to reproduce knowledge as a thing made (Ellsworth, 2005, p. 175). Ellsworth asks:

What should we educators know of the experience of the learning self? What should we know of its indecomposable arc of movement? Our experiment in thinking pedagogy has brought us to this question, but it is a question that pedagogy must never answer of itself. If it did, it would be the end of pedagogy. The good news is that pedagogy can never answer the question of how it teaches—so its provocation will never end—but we can elaborate our understanding of pedagogy from within our experiences of its masterpieces, and there pedagogy is excessive. (Ellsworth, 2005, p. 174)

When teachers “elaborate understanding of pedagogy from within our experiences” (Ellsworth, 2005, p. 174) we are more likely to be able to see possibility for student’s learning selves to emerge in school settings. Ellsworth’s question persists: “What will we make of pedagogy’s inexpressible involvement in the continuous emergence of the experience of the learning self? The power of our work as educators
and as designers of places of learning is that it takes place in the midst of pedagogy’s continuous, unstoppable emergence” (Ellsworth, 2005, p. 175).

Ellsworth is careful to explain that educators cannot create or duplicate these experiences in the making for students. Educators should not presume to have the power to open spaces for emergence in any predictable way. It is self-awareness of the sensations of the learning self in motion that helps educators be attuned to and “in the midst of pedagogy’s continuous, unstoppable emergence” (Ellsworth, 2005, p. 175). I understand Ellsworth to be suggesting that I, as an art teacher, cannot and should not attempt to duplicate the flow of pedagogy as strategies for implementation. However, if I am able to recognize in myself the sensations of a learning self in motion experiencing knowledge in the making, then I am less likely to use my role as teacher to stand in the way of pedagogy’s force of motion in formal places of learning.

Temporality of “In the Making”

Ellsworth calls on the reader to be attune to the varied sensations of emergence that are feelings of the learning self. In so doing, she draws attention to temporal qualities of the learning self’s becoming. “The time of the learning self is contemporaneous. It is the duration of a learning self's participation in knowledge and in self as simultaneously in the making. It is the transitional time of self in motion toward an open future yet to be decided . . . The space of learning is the space of self in relation” (Ellsworth, 2005, p. 80).

The notion of time and duration is very important to understanding the conceptual difference between knowledge as a thing made (in the past) and knowledge in the making
(occurring in the present to lead toward the future). The verbs (made and making) help us distinguish between conceptualizing knowledge as replication of an idea already conceived versus active engagement in the present moment of newness.

**Knowledge in the Making and *Currere***

Similarly, curriculum theorists refer to the active, temporal, unfolding process of curriculum by the Latin root, *currere*, meaning *the running of the course.* In curriculum studies, *currere* is “a reflexive cycle in which thought bends back upon itself and thus recovers its volition” (Grumet, 1976, as cited in Pinar, 2004, p. 35). When I consider the theory of curriculum as *currere*, a process occurring in the present, with Ellsworth’s *knowledge in the making*, I see a relationship between their emphasis on duration and participation among active learners. Reconceptualist curriculum theorists have worked to reconceptualize curriculum as more than eligible content, lesson plans, and assessments. *Currere* draws attention to curriculum as a process that is in the making.

I see documentation of learning experiences as a very important part of curriculum as *currere* (Pinar 1975, 2004) and *knowledge in the making* (Ellsworth, 2005). The unpredictable living qualities of learning as experiences can be referenced in photographs, journal reflections, videos, and other media. It is the process of listening, observing, gathering and collecting ideas and information with students about the sensations of the learning self that might support and propel an active, living, unpredictable curriculum.
The currere is the life that unfolds in the arts classroom (Sameshima, 2008). While this life cannot and should not be replicated as a “strategy” (Ellsworth, 2005), I see documentation as potentially helping teachers and students to attend to the aspects of experience in the making that stimulate each person’s unique learning self. Currere as a descriptor of the overall active cycle of autobiographical reflection in lived/living curriculum (Aoki, 2005; Hasebe-Ludt, Leggo, & Chambers 2009; Miller, 2005; Pinar, 1994, 2004) is useful in thinking of documentation as an ongoing chronicle of events. I view documentation as part of the active/re/active work of supporting such a process. The curriculum as currere, re-conceptualized through the work of these and other theorists, is concerned with moving beyond curriculum as course objectives toward “a complicated conversation with oneself . . . an ongoing project of self-understanding in which one becomes mobilized for engaged pedagogical action” (Pinar, 2004, p. 37).

Similar to Pinar’s (2004) notion of engaged pedagogical action as a complicated conversation is Ellsworth’s (2005) call to challenge the commonly held assumption that pedagogy belongs primarily to teachers as methods for transmitting knowledge to students as a thing already made. “Rather, we might begin to think of pedagogical volition as a simultaneity of interfering and resonating desires distributed across the social body—across different people, practices, and disciplines” (Ellsworth, 2005, p. 28). Knowledge in the making is therefore an emergent process of thinking, feeling, and making that is continually shifting locations, media, and bodies (Ellsworth, 2005; Rajchman, 2000a). Ellsworth (2005) describes the sensations of her experiences as a learning self interacting in fluid teaching and learning experiences that propel a feeling of
Chapter 3

Narrative Inquiry as Methodology

In this chapter, I focus on the methodological aspects of narrative inquiry and the specific methods I use in this dissertation study. This chapter has five parts. Part I is a description of narrative inquiry in arts education and a description of the inquiry field where I was engaged in research. In Part II, I describe methodological details as they relate specifically to the context of this study. Part III is a description of the AETI research context specifically related to our CIG’s focus of shared study. In Part IV, I describe my methods of analysis and interpretation. In Part V, I review and discuss five narrative inquiry methodologies (Conle, 1996; Craig, 2007; Hasebe-Ludt, Leggo, & Chambers 2009; Heydon, 2010; Reilly, 2011) that were influential in my methods for developing a mixed and multivocal approach to re-presenting eleven voices in this narrative inquiry research text.

Brief narrative excerpts appear through this chapter to offer glimpses into the context-specific details of my research including the research site, participant selection, data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes. These narrative fragments introduce the reader to the context of the study as specifically related to methodology.

Part I: Narrative Research in Art Education

Qualitative researchers in art education often use narrative methods to study lived experience of artists, art teachers, and students by focusing data collection and analysis on stories lived and told. Varied examples of narrative research in art education include:
(a) inquiry into ways that artistic and pedagogical discourses overlap (Kind, 2008; Markello, 2006), (b) the experiences of art teachers and students engaged together in reflective practice (Collins, 2002; Vollrath, 2008), (c) generating resistance narratives to vision new possibilities for art education (Rolling, 2011), and (d) focusing self-explorations of personal/professional practice and identity (Liao, 2011; Ortiz, 2008).

Narrative inquirers who are working with participants typically elicit stories and use analytic methods to interpret and retell these stories. An important aspect of narrative inquiry is the way that the narrative inquirer uses literary, narrative, and visual forms to represent, assemble, and interpret participants’ stories in the research text to lend understanding to the three-dimensional narrative inquiry space (the temporal, social, and situational aspects of the research context). The artful representation of story and other narrative/literary forms (Leggo, 2008) make narrative inquiry a multimodal, visual-verbal genre of research that is often grouped within arts-based research (Barone, 2007; de Mello, 2007).

In this narrative inquiry, I studied participants’ stories. My analysis and interpretation of selected stories are represented in this research text by interweaving narratives with exploratory analytical and interpretive discussion in Chapters 4 to 7. The focus of my narrative inquiry research is the stories teachers shared about their shifts in thinking about teaching and learning, particularly in respect to the documentation of teaching that they shared with the group.

Teachers in our CIG studied their own teaching and shared reflections with each other. Our CIG was a supportive forum for professional learning as inquiry. Members of

---

16 Narrative inquirers also use autobiographical writing and methods of self-study.
our CIG were engaged in explorations of teaching methods that facilitate student learning as inquiry (interrelated processes of sharing, reflecting, and questioning). This narrative inquiry dissertation is about participants’ shared study of their own teaching. The teacher participants, members of our collaborative inquiry group (CIG), represented their classroom-based inquiries to our group using documentation they created in the forms of photographs, videos, written reflections and the oral (spoken) story sharing.

**Interim Texts**

Interim texts are working drafts of narrative descriptions, which I constructed to explore narrative forms and interpretive approaches (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). Narrative inquirers analyze, interpret, and re-present narrative data by drafting multiple versions of interim texts (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000) that are both descriptive and interpretive. Interim texts are descriptive because they are rich accounts of participants’ stories that include vivid descriptive details. Interim texts also help the narrative inquirer test various interpretive approaches and ideas (such as research memos that refer to theories, questions, or meaning) that begin to make sense of one story in relation to other stories.

I describe interim texts here, early in this chapter, because I interweave interim texts throughout the chapter as short illustrations of the methods I describe. Writing and organizing these in-between texts as working drafts is important to my process as a narrative inquirer who is re-constructing and re-telling participants’ narratives. Stories I retell in this narrative inquiry dissertation are stories that I constructed by building
relationships between narrative data (such as transcripts) and interpretive research memos. I write from raw narrative data (field texts, transcripts, notes, memos) to explore and develop narrative forms for descriptive language that lead toward representations of narrative data in the form of re-storied texts. These re-storied texts include 1) found poems, 2) dramatic scripts, and 3) descriptive prose.

The process of re-presenting a participant’s narrative is partly a process of drafting and revising interim texts as narrative fragments in an effort to convey meaning to a reader who has not been present throughout the inquiry. Retelling is also a process of tracing and re-tracing the relationships between stories that participants cite as being particularly important to them. Writing interim texts from transcripts and field notes is one way I observe and interpret layers of inquiry and overlapping themes in this research.

My interest in understanding the complexities of each participant’s stories of experience in relation to their shared study of teaching in a collaborative inquiry group is well suited to narrative inquiry methods. A detailed discussion of my methods including my research focus and questions, data collection, analysis and interpretation ensues.
Narrative Threads

Narrative threads coalesce out of the past and emerge in the specific three-dimensional space we call our inquiry field (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p. 70).

***

( interim text after October 2010 CIG meeting)

“What are our common threads?” April asks. We sit together around a conference table and discuss our ideas about teaching and learning in art and music as an open-ended process that is messy and difficult to track. “I am certain that we must have some common ground to stand on that will help us develop a form and shape for our work this year.” I make a connection between what April is saying and a blog post that she posted to our group blog following our last face-to-face meeting. In this post she expressed her interest in knowing if the group would like to work toward developing a plan for this second year of meeting together that would help us to show where our ideas about teaching converge and where each of us hold unique perspectives about facilitating student learning in the arts. Her use of the phrase, “common threads” interests me—reminds me of my own interest in literary métissage as a method of bringing stories together.

April, an elementary music teacher, posed this question to our collaborative inquiry group in October of 2010. We were together during one of our monthly Friday meetings in which we each took a day off from our regular job responsibilities to gather together at a meeting space provided by a local educational service agency to discuss matters of teaching in the arts. We had been gathering together regularly both in person and online in web-based correspondence since September 2009 as part of a continuing education program, Arts Education Teacher Inquiry (AETI).

In the fall of 2009, our newly formed collaborative inquiry group (CIG) identified an interest in studying iterations of student-centered, student-led, choice-based, interest-based learning in art and music. When April posed this question more than a year after our group met for the first time, she asked, “What are our common threads?” I learned from her a few weeks later in a follow-up interview, that she was referring to an emerging desire she felt to find ways to organize and share our individual explorations with issues related to student-centered learning.

***

As explained in Chapter 2, Clandinin and Connelly (2000) use “three-dimensional narrative inquiry space” (p. 60) to describe the experiential continuum of past, present,
and future in relation to a particular situation and social interaction. The back and forth quality of the inquiry process (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000) has been of special importance to me throughout my engagement with this study. I have grown to understand the back and forth nature of my inquiry process as one that spans years of listening to participants’ stories, locating relationships and rifts among ideas, and writing and re-writing descriptive and interpretive texts that follow along one or more narrative threads. In these ways, I have been working in the method of back-and-forthing that Clandinin and Connelly (2000) describe. I think of back and forthing as tracing narrative threads that extend into the past, present, and future.

I also understand back and forthing to be the attention that the researcher gives to the inward and outward nature of inquiry (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). That is, inward to self and self-awareness in relation to interaction outside of the self. As is expected of the qualitative researcher, I am not only investigating research questions with an outward focus on others, I am engaged in the inward-outward reflection and learning that is the reflexive work of researching my own method. Placing the theoretical conversation in dialogue with data helped me to construct multiple narrative forms for this research text that invite the reader to co-construct interpretations and find experiential relationships between theory and practice.

**Arts Education Teacher Inquiry (AETI) Program as a Context for Collaborative Inquiry Groups to Meet**

The Arts Education Teacher Inquiry (AETI) program was a four-year continuing education initiative focused on supporting professional learning in arts education and
educational technology. I was the facilitator of a collaborative inquiry group (CIG) that met in the context of AETI.

In 2009-2010, the second year of AETI, the format changed from a monthly, large-group, in-service workshop to collaborative inquiry groups. In September of 2009, 40 teachers from three counties enrolled in AETI and formed six collaborative inquiry groups (CIGs). One faculty facilitator worked with each CIG. Each CIG developed a focus of study as part of an inquiry-based approach to professional learning. The CIGs studied ideas and methods relevant to the unique interests and teaching contexts of group members.

The AETI grant-writers and program administrators chose the term **collaborative inquiry group** to describe the professional learning communities the AETI program would foster, emphasizing teacher-directed inquiry as the theoretical underpinning to reinforce sustained professional learning. It is important to note that while education literature frequently uses the phrase **collaborative inquiry group** to refer to a professional learning community, less frequently, **collaborative inquiry** is a term used to describe a collaborative, multi-researcher, participatory action research methodology (see Beattie, 1995).

In this study, I use the term **collaborative inquiry** to describe collaborative professional learning. I did not design this study with collaborative inquiry as my research methodology. Rather, I made the choice to use narrative inquiry and to position myself as the primary researcher. I did not want to risk placing an unfair burden on the participants by expecting them to assume the time-consuming role of co-investigators. It seemed unreasonable to ask them to work with me in the time intensive latter stages of
dissertation writing. However, I did view my participants as co-inquirers during collaborative inquiry group meetings. Narrative research was a natural fit for the notion of collaborative inquiry as professional learning through sharing of experience.

I elect to use both the terms collaborative inquiry group (CIG) and community of inquiry (COI) to refer to our group of art and music teachers who worked together to inquire into teaching practice within the context of a continuing education course. I tend to use the word community when I reference the relational aspects of our group. I use the word collaboration in respect to action and participation toward common endeavors that our group experienced.

**Entering the Research Setting as Facilitator and Researcher**

In March 2009, AETI program administrators invited me to attend one of the large-group teacher workshop days and a faculty-planning meeting. At the time of my March 2009 visit, AETI had already been underway for almost one academic year. In May of 2009, I received an invitation from the AETI administrators to serve as one of six CIG facilitators for the 2009-2010 academic year. This invitation was based on my previous experience as a faculty member and small group facilitator in a continuing education summer residency program for art, music, theater, and dance teachers. I made a second visit to the AETI program in spring 2009. Seeing that this would be a good site for my dissertation research, I wrote a proposal that outlined my plan to engage in research with one collaborative inquiry group.
The Penn State Office of Research Protection (ORP) approved my study, finding it to be exempt from full review, and offered suggestions for the informed consent form that I would use. The AETI program leadership and the administrative leadership of the educational service agency hosting the AETI program also reviewed my proposal and formally approved me to proceed with the research.

Participant Selection

I determined that AETI was a context in which I could engage in inquiry with teachers as a member of the group, thus gaining insights and having access at a level that would be difficult for an outsider. Selecting AETI as a research site narrowed the possible population to 40 teachers. However, I wanted to work with just one small collaborative inquiry group of 5-10 teachers to understand their particular experiences.

My goal was not to compare the experiences of participants across the whole AETI program, nor to study faculty and administrative leadership processes, nor to conduct an overall program evaluation of AETI. Rather, I wanted to engage in narrative inquiry to understand the experiences of a small group of teachers who were designing their own professional learning.

The seven initial participants in this narrative inquiry were selected in part because of feasibility and access (Maxwell, 2005). I was able to gain access to a collaborative inquiry group for this research as a facilitator in the AETI program. The selection of seven teachers for the first year (2009-2010) of this two-year research study was partly reliant on administrative procedures used by the AETI program leaders. The
selection of participants was also in compliance with Penn State ORP guidelines for ethical treatment of research participants. In the second year of this study (2010-2011), the participant group shifted to include three additional teachers, increasing my total participant group to 10.

The following is an explanation of how AETI leaders grouped 40 teachers into six CIGs. One of these CIGs was the participant group who engaged with me in research. On a survey distributed by AETI, teachers provided general information about themselves including where they were presently teaching, grade levels, subjects taught, and professional interests. They also indicated their interest in learning more about participating in research. The AETI co-directors used this survey to place the teachers into six groups of six to eight teachers. Another CIG facilitator and university researcher (who was also planning to conduct research with members of a CIG) and I assisted in this group formation process. We took part in the group formation in order to ensure that the process was within the parameters of ethical treatment for human participants in educational research.

The AETI co-directors’ primary considerations in creating initial groupings for teachers were the logistical and clerical factors related to two separate streams of public and private grant funding. Federal grant funding (and a comparably small amount of funding from a private foundation) provided the primary financial support for AETI. The AETI administrators found it necessary to organize the administrative accounting aspects of AETI according to the “high poverty” status used by the federal government to award specific types of grant funding. In other words, teachers who taught in “high-poverty” schools (as defined by federal guidelines) were eligible to utilize the federal grant funds
to support their substitute teacher reimbursement. Teachers who did not teach in a school where most students were living at poverty level were grouped together in the same CIG because the funding for their substitute teacher reimbursement was coming from the private foundation instead of the federal grant.

In 2009, the AETI co-directors thought it was imperative to simplify the paperwork and record keeping by grouping the teachers according to their eligibility to access federal and private funding streams. Of the total 40 teachers participating in AETI in 2009-2010, 27 teachers worked in high poverty schools and 13 did not.17

Two secondary factors were also considered in the initial grouping of teachers including: (a) teachers’ geographical proximity to one another in order to increase convenience for teachers to meet together frequently and (b) balancing groups according to teaching content area (art, music, or theater). The professional interests of teachers (as indicated by a survey administered by AETI) played only a minimal role in formation of groups because of the priority placed by AETI leaders on delineating funding streams and geographical convenience.

Lastly, AETI leaders attempted to balance members of the group so that not all of the music teachers were in a group with a facilitator who had a professional background in visual art. Of the six facilitators, only one was a music educator.

From the AETI administrators’ perspectives, the administrative streamlining, funding source allocations, and location convenience factors took precedence. I asserted that these would need to be loose groupings, designed to be a starting point for group

17 In our CIG, most teachers taught in high-poverty schools. In 2009-2010, all teachers in our CIG taught in high-poverty schools. In 2010-2011, all but two teachers in our CIG taught in high-poverty schools.
forming. It was necessary for the other researcher and I to make sure that the AETI administration understood that teachers must opt-in to research only after they heard a complete explanation of the study and were able to review the informed consent form. I took this process very seriously, wanting to make sure that teachers did not feel like they were already grouped. I sent a letter ahead of time to all of the teachers who had indicated an interested in learning about the possibility of participating in research. I then followed up with a phone call to each teacher to discuss and answer questions.

Our CIG met for the first time on September 25, 2009. At this time, we went over the informed consent letter and form again, and I invited discussion about them. Each teacher signed the form agreeing to be a part of the study. One teacher opted into the study but declined permission to allow photos and videos to be used at a professional conference.

Participants

During the 2009-2010 school year, teachers in our CIG were two elementary art teachers, one K-8 art teacher, two high school art teachers, one elementary music teacher, one K-8 music teacher, and I. I was the only group member who was teaching post-secondary students.18

18 During the 2009-2010 academic year, I was a graduate assistant teaching pre-service elementary education students in a course called, “Art for the Elementary Classroom.” During the 2010-2011 academic year I was employed as a full time instructor, supervising student teachers who were earning their degree and certification in k-12 art education.
At the start of the 2010-2011 school year, our CIG welcomed two new elementary art teachers and one new K-8 level art teacher who were assigned to us by the AETI administrators. Two of our original members, both elementary art teachers, had moved over the summer. We met together at the beginning of our second year together on September 24, 2010 as a continuing group with three new members. New members were invited to join our CIG by the AETI administration in accordance with the informed consent required for participation in research. AETI leaders attempted to balance the group based on the loss of two elementary art teachers and for convenience of geographical proximity as in the previous year. Two of the new members were elementary art teachers, and the third was a K-8 art teacher. The K-8 art teacher had recently accepted the position at the former school of one of our members who took a new teaching position at the high school level. Thus, in the 2010-2011 academic year, our group consisted of three elementary art teachers, one K-8 level art teacher, three high school art teachers, one elementary music teacher, one K-8 music teacher, and me. I include myself as a group member because I participated in discussions and shared my own teaching experiences from my years of experience teaching art in grades K-8.

**Collaborative Inquiry Group and Overlapping Contexts of Inquiry**

In this study, data collection occurred in the context of the collaborative inquiry group meeting spaces (face to face meetings, virtual meetings as web conferences, and blog post dialogue). I focused my research data collection on stories that teachers shared
in the context of the collaborative inquiry group. More specifically, teachers in our group were constructing their ideas with the CIG as the intended audience.

Our forum for communication was the collaborative inquiry group meeting space (whether in a face-to-face meeting, in a web-based meeting, or in the group blog). This space of our CIG is not simply physical meeting spaces or technological infrastructures that support our methods of communication. Our CIG space was also an assembling of people, objects, and ideas. We gathered in the context of the Arts Education Teacher Inquiry (AETI) program.

Our CIG constructed our own space using the few loose guidelines for earning course credit as outlined by AETI in cooperation with the state department of education. AETI required the following:

- Regular attendance at monthly daylong meetings. Teachers received substitute teacher coverage for their missed classes (a half-day meeting with AETI as a whole group and half day with just our CIG).
- Teachers were required to keep a log of their self-directed inquiry as it took place in their individual modes of working. This log recorded time spent. Teachers could also elect to document their experiences in other ways such as photographs or journal entries.
- Teachers should collaborate with members of their CIG in mutual support toward the investigation of a common theme for inquiry. This theme was not prescribed by AETI but developed by the CIG.

The half-day with AETI usually consisted of a morning workshop with teaching artists in the area of dance, theater, music, visual art, or poetry. The AETI project co-directors asked those participants who wished to receive course credit to keep a log of events called a “meeting log.” In addition to this required log, our group elected to use a separate and private blog site as an additional forum to record and chronicle our individual and shared explorations about teaching.
Potential Benefits for AETI Program Participants

Participants benefitted in several ways by participating in the AETI program. Teachers who enrolled in AETI could elect to receive course credit. Their school districts received funding to hire substitute teachers so that AETI participants could attend one daytime meeting per month. The teachers also received funding from the federal grant allocations to select and purchase digital technology equipment for their classroom.

Our CIG space was also strongly influenced by the federal grant funds that the AETI program made available to each teacher to purchase digital technology equipment for use in their classroom. Participants perceived this as a significant benefit for being a teacher involved with the AETI project.\textsuperscript{19} Our CIG communicated frequently about ways that teachers were selecting and using new technology. Our CIG space was also informed by each teacher’s teaching contexts (classrooms, carts, schools) where each teacher was exploring the ideas that the CIG discussed in meetings and via the blog.

Overlapping Spaces of Teacher Inquiry

The primary goal of AETI was to empower and support teacher inquiry. Teachers made their daily professional practice central to their professional learning inquiry. My narrative inquiry research occurred in the context of CIG meetings, which were a convergence of teachers’ overlapping spaces of inquiry. By overlapping spaces of inquiry, I mean the contexts of influence that informed each teacher’s individual

\textsuperscript{19} Most teachers purchased a document camera with their grant funds. The document camera became a significant object to members of our group and was the topic of many conversations and explorations.
professional learning. One space of inquiry where teachers were focused was their self-study of teaching practice in respect to individual classroom spaces. Another space of inquiry related to this research is the AETI program, which formed an important context for our CIG.

Figure 3-1 shows these three overlapping spaces: the AETI space, the CIG space, and each teacher’s unique teaching context (classroom) space. The three ellipse shapes are expanded in the diagram but can be conceptualized as superimposed on one another in a fluid relationship (the stacked order of the ellipses in the diagram should not imply a hierarchical order but a set of overlapping, layered, dynamic relationships and influences). The overlapping, layered contexts of the AETI program, our CIG, and teachers’ experiences in their own unique teaching contexts are the spaces of inquiry where teachers were thinking about teaching.
Figure 3-1. Overlapping and layered relationships between three contexts: Arts Education Teacher Inquiry (AETI) program, Collaborative Inquiry Group (CIG), and each teacher’s unique teaching context.

My primary attention for the context and site of this research was interactions that took place in monthly CIG meetings and in the blog posts where teachers wrote to members of our CIG. My research focus was not centered on the AETI program itself nor the individual classroom/teaching contexts where each teacher worked. However, these two spaces, AETI and individual teaching contexts (pictured in the diagram as layers
appearing above and below the space of our CIG), were important spheres of influence on our CIG and are present in participants’ narratives.

**My Roles as Facilitator/Researcher/Art Teacher**

Serving as group facilitator, I received monetary compensation from the AETI program budget (funded in part by a federal *U.S. Department of Education Professional Development in Arts Education (PDAE)* grant) to facilitate group meetings, acting in a supportive role and serving the group’s logistical needs as they designed their own professional learning experiences. I helped the group brainstorm, develop, and sustain a thematic direction for their inquiry work. I also assisted with logistical tasks by scheduling meetings, either in local meeting locations or via a Web conferencing tool. Clerical assistance was necessary when members were selecting digital equipment for their classrooms and making purchase requests to AETI. The educational technology equipment items, such as the document camera that group members elected to purchase, were purchased by AETI with grant funds.

I approached my engagement with our collaborative inquiry group as a facilitator, participant, and researcher, with my own experiences and subjectivity. My experience as an elementary and middle-level art teacher in two public schools, one urban middle school, and one rural elementary school, informs the way I think about art education and the way I interact with other arts teachers. My perspective is also informed by my interest in curriculum theory as lived curriculum in the making (Clandinin & Connelly, 1988; Ellsworth, 2005; Roth, 2002) and the empowerment of teachers and students to live out
curriculum as an experience rather than as a prescribed procedure (Kind, 2008; Pinar, 2004). My view of curriculum as active experience in addition to written lesson plans also translates to a view of professional learning that is individual to teacher experience, is rooted in the stance of inquiry (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009), and unique to individual teaching and learning contexts.

***

(research memo, November, 2010)

I am reading Janet Miller’s (1990, 2005) writing of her research collaborations. She reflects, I moved to “forms of collaboration that challenged any unitary representation of myself or of collaborative efforts” (Miller, 2005, p. 8). Like Miller (2005), I am aware of the mixed qualities of my own identities as I continue in my reflexive narrative inquiry journey. I recently resigned from my art teaching job to continue graduate school, but I still have a strong sense of my professional identity as a K-12 public school art teacher. I see myself in this CIG as an elementary art teacher more than a college professor, which I am aspiring to be. I am eager to share my teaching experiences and find myself feeling close to my former classroom as I talk with teachers in our group. All of them have become my friends and colleagues. I look forward to our time together. As a doctoral candidate engaged in dissertation research and working with the ethical guidelines approved by the Office of Research Protections, I am always aware of my role as a researcher. I talk a little less, and listen a little more closely. I am sometimes absorbed in thought. I make more notes and record more audio voice memos than I ever have done previously. I have embraced narrative inquiry as a way of speaking, writing, thinking, and listening. As a facilitator, I am charged (by the AETI administration and by my own desire) to support this collaborative inquiry group in carrying out their inquiry, supporting their needs. I want to lead well and empower others in our group to lead. Although, I am not one of the co-directors of (AETI), and I didn’t write the grant that funds this program, I find myself advocating when I can for the teachers in our group. I do have the ability to influence some of the work that makes [AETI] possible – such as meeting times and places, helping teachers place supply orders, and use other logistics that support the workings of the group.

***

Influenced by key ideas from Mackewn’s (2008) list of facilitation skills, I attended to the following ideas as a CIG facilitator: (a) preparing self, (b) observing, (c) listening and attending, (d) ensuring all voices are heard while dealing with dominant
voices and making space for quiet voices, (e) making meaning and inviting others to make meaning, and (f) following or leading the group’s agenda or process (Mackewn, 2008). I used a reflective listening approach during group meetings to position myself as much as possible as a *sounding board*, rather than an expert who would suggest new ideas at every opportunity. As a sounding board, I was listening carefully to participants’ ideas and reflecting them back in order to hear more and to encourage more discussion among group members. I tried not to redirect the course of conversations by imposing expert knowledge or authority.

For instance, when I heard someone making a suggestion for what the group should do, I mirrored the idea back to the group by stating it again, asking the group if there were ideas in response. I aimed to pose questions more frequently than I would suggest solutions. I viewed this reflective listening approach as different from an overt leader-expert approach. I was conscious of not over exerting my own ideas as a way to direct conversation. This is not to say that I reserved my opinions or kept private my own experiences and biases. I approached my facilitation in the same way I do my narrative inquiry research, inviting and listening to the stories of others and sharing my own stories.

I thought of myself as *participant-facilitator* because I was intentional about positioning myself more as a participant (art teacher) than expert (university researcher or solo leader of professional learning). I did not want to resemble the dreaded “in-service workshop presenter” standing in front of the room leading a workshop on best practices. I looked critically at the video recordings of our meetings to learn how I could be a better participant, supporter, and listener in the group.
Each facilitator had the freedom to support the AETI goals in their own ways in response to the interests and ideas belonging to members of each of the six collaborative inquiry groups. The five other faculty facilitators and two project administrators and I met about once a month to discuss our experiences.\textsuperscript{20} As a facilitator who was also conducting research, I sometimes shared my personal research memos and reflections related to my chosen methods of facilitation.

***

*(in a research memo, January 2011)*

Watching these videos and seeing myself as a facilitator makes me realize—I have to stop talking to open up opportunities for others to speak. Recently, I tend to leap into silent spaces with my voice, filling gaps with an enthusiastic thought rather than make openings for others to join the conversation. I genuinely enjoy these conversations, and our exchanges are often fast paced and joyful. But after watching this [December] meeting on video, I realize that my comfort level and our developing friendships may have caused me to forget my intent as a facilitator to open new spaces for others to talk. I am going to remember to talk a little less and listen more.

***

**Inviting Stories**

Another approach that I adopted was to invite storytelling. I encouraged participants to connect group discussion to specific experiences belonging to each teacher (Czarniawska, 2004). As a facilitator, the questions that I posed set the tone for the conversations that would follow. I intentionally posed questions in ways that invited story sharing. My goal at the outset of facilitation was to empower teachers to be designers of

\textsuperscript{20} These AETI administrative meetings were not part of my formal dissertation research data collection but could have easily been the focus of a different research study.
their own professional learning. Inviting story sharing was one way that I tried to encourage group discussions that were focused on our own experiences.

Initially, I chose to approach my facilitation as a reflective listener with a narrative orientation to professional learning. My choice was in accord with the AETI program vision of empowering emerging teacher leaders and supporting teachers to design and enact a personal professional development plan that was closely related to each teacher’s teaching context.

***

*(research memo and interim text, September 2009)*

We looked together at the wall. We were arranging and discussing square, repositionable, sticky notes. Brandon, a high school art teacher, was speaking about his successful experience coaching a student teacher this week, helping her to locate her “strong voice” (Brandon, September 2009). After speaking, he turned to attach a second Post-it note into the grouping on the wall. He paused to read the others. Finding a note with a similar idea he places his “triumph” next to another, in relationship.

Moments earlier I had invited the group to reflect: “Think back on the last few days. Focus your memory on a particular class period. As a way of introducing ourselves to the group, I invite each of us to write down and share a couple of specific moments from our teaching experiences this past week. For example—What was one triumph and one challenge that you encountered? Please be as specific as you can and write it down here on a Post-it note.”

We each paused to think about our personal teaching experiences and wrote short phrases down on the colored paper. I thought for a moment about my last two classes with pre-service teachers at Penn State and began to write. We shared about triumphs and challenges as a point of entry into introductions of ourselves in reference to our specific teaching contexts. We adhered our Post-it notes in proximity to one another.

That afternoon following our first meeting, I took some time to make memos about my feelings and impressions from our time together and the decisions I had made as the group facilitator about how to get our conversation started for the first time. *It was as good a way to start as any,* I thought, a bit unsure of myself. I was glad that we were able to begin by talking about specific teaching experiences and ways we were reflecting on them.

***
My past experiences as an art teacher and my emerging and often improvised experience as a facilitator has influenced the way I describe, interpret, and discuss this research. Therefore, I do not claim a distant, neutral, nor objective stance but rather an intimate and subjective relationship to the research context. Through this transparency, and my wakeful (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000) attention to my relationships to the research using research memos as a reflexive data collection strategy, I have included in my research memos, thoughts, and reflections that include my own subjectivity in this narrative inquiry.

**Part II: Narrative Inquiry as a Shifting View of Experience**

A well-formed narrative inquiry research question is one that guides inquiry in the phases of searching and re-searching. This process occurs over time and is an on-going observation of experience, storytelling, writing, and re-writing/re-storying. “Narrative inquiry carries more of a sense of continual reformulation of an inquiry than it does a sense of problem definition and solution” (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p. 124).

While the narrative inquirer is likely to pose research questions at the outset of a study, it is not uncommon for the phenomena under study, the questions, and wonderings to shift. Just as life does not stand still, neither does a “narrative view of experience” (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p. 127). In this way, this dissertation document is like a series of snapshots, organized as a set of living pictures of past experiences that are still being interpreted in the living present and in the imagination of possible futures (Roth, 2002). “The past is always included in the present, implicated, inextricably present with
the present” (Leggo, 2004, p. 22). It is through this temporal and interactive view of
narrative and experience that I acknowledge that this dissertation could be written a
number of different ways and would continue to change and shift with time and in respect
to new experiences.

**Research Focus and Guiding Questions**

In September of 2009, I entered the research setting in the roles of facilitator and
researcher with a broad question in mind: *How do teachers co-construct knowledge for
professional learning in a collaborative inquiry group?* It is typical in narrative inquiry
research for the questions and the focus of the study to become more focused in relation
to being in the midst of participants in the three-dimensional narrative inquiry space
(Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). In our April and May 2010 CIG meetings, participants
initiated conversations about the importance of sharing examples of stories and artifacts
in their group process. In response to these lively conversations, two emergent
investigations began to guide my data analysis in the summer of 2010. I wanted to learn
(a) the ways that participants used documentation (as processes and material artifacts) to
facilitate professional learning and (b) how participants experienced shifts in their
thinking about teaching and learning while sharing and discussing documentation
examples with other arts teachers.
Data Collection, Field Texts, and Articles for Analysis

The primary focus of my data collection was listening to stories told by participants. Clandinin and Connelly (2000) describe field texts as “memory signposts” that “are a source for the creation of a nuanced interpretation of the story” (pp. 142-143). Data collected in the form of field texts included observations, field notes, interview transcripts, research memos, letters, documents, blog posts, photographs, video recordings, audio recordings, artwork, and other data collected in the field (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Nespor, 2006).

In this study, the articles for analysis originated from: Records of our experience together in synchronous face-to-face and web-based21 CIG meetings, individual contributions to the group’s asynchronous web-based communication (emails and blog posts), and my interviews with individual participants. In addition, participants generated visual documents and artifacts (e.g., images of student work and video clips from classroom practice shared by participants). These were also important data especially when participants refer directly to the artifact22 in a group discussion or individual conversations.

21 We used web conferencing voice and video tools like Skype® (Voice Over Internet Protocol) and virtual classroom-like meeting spaces including Elluminate®.
22 For example, the *storycubes* that participants created in spring of 2011 were important because of the way significant events in our two-year CIG time were visualized and arranged by participants as interactive sculptures during our group meeting discussion.
Several times during semi-structured interview conversations, participants and I generated notes together, to help us process and put our ideas in relation to one another. The example below is a concept map that I drew in plain view while listening and talking with Carmen about her use of self-observation and reflection of teaching using video in her art classroom (see Figure 3-2). We referred back to these notes in future conversations.

Figure 3-2. Example of a conversation map that represented to Carmen and me the emergent flow of our conversation during one of our semi-structured interview conversations in May 2011.
Field Texts Generated from Collaborative Inquiry Group Meetings

Because I was in the active role of facilitation during collaborative group meetings and not a passive observer, I did not always find it appropriate to take extended field notes. I felt it was important to maintain eye contact with the group. My research notes were not my only concern during our meetings. As a facilitator, I was engaged in reflective listening and time keeping to help us make the most of our meetings. For example, I would help to synthesize ideas, ask follow up questions, encourage participation in discussion by inviting a quiet teacher to share his or her ideas, support the group in meeting their stated goals, and be a time-keeper to help us return on time to the large group wrap-up meeting at the end of the day. I would invite story sharing by asking participants to tell about their experience. I took brief notes to mark events, times, and to record ideas and questions that seemed immediately important or something we should revisit later. These notes would remind me to return to a particular idea later in the conversation or to ask a follow up question at a later time. Sometimes, ideas marked for later were the seeds for reflections and comments in my research memos.

Later, thinking again about the stories shared in the meeting, I would use these brief notes to return to sections of the video recording and continue my note taking, writing detailed descriptions of events in the collaborative inquiry meeting with particular attention to times. Thus, taking note of when teachers would tell of an event that occurred in their classroom or a story related to how they were thinking about their teaching. I also listened for shared dialogue between teachers that indicated co-construction of ideas and
shifting conceptualizations of teaching. I would often pause the video to write a more
detailed description, elaborating my brief field notes.

**Video Observation**

Video recording of meetings was necessary so that I could playback the video to
observe the meeting again. I used one video camera in the corner of the room to record
the entire meeting with a wide-angle view. I used the recordings to supplement
descriptive field notes and research memos made during meetings. I also created
transcriptions of sections of audio/video recordings for analysis. The transcription of the
video footage included spoken word and, when necessary to add understanding to the
meaning, summaries of non-verbal body language.

I have considered how the presence of the video camera and the act of recording
would influence the participants and our discussion. I considered how the presence of a
video camera in the small room during our face-to-face group meetings could be a
distraction. I anticipated that the camera would influence how participants select their
contributions to group discussion. Participants might perform for the camera, guard their
words, or act in a way that is different than they would without the video recording.

Although the influence of video recording in small group meetings was something
I took into account, I viewed the risks as minimal because the culture that was already
established within AETI that emphasized exploring new digital technologies as teaching
and learning tools. One of the goals of the project as a whole was to practice using new
technologies to support teaching and learning. Therefore, participants were accustomed to
using cameras and other recording equipment in the context of professional learning. Teachers, who were part of the AETI program in 2008, were given a small handheld video camera to use. It was common to see AETI teachers video recording part of the meetings for their own use or to practice using the device to document and remember an event.

To minimize the distraction that a video recording device would cause during face-to-face collaborative inquiry group meetings, I recorded each meeting beginning with our first meeting together and noticed that over time participants seemed comfortable with the video recording as part of our routine during group meetings. The informed consent form explained the purpose of the video recording. One area of the form also asked permission to show video excerpts at a professional conference or research presentation, as long as I offer them the opportunity to view the footage first. In retrospect, the benefits of using a video recording to generate field notes for data analysis outweighed the potential problems related to participant distraction or performing for the camera.

Transcription, Notes, and Research Memos

I transcribed sections of the video in which participants were engaged in dialogue about their inquiry process, ideas, and stories about teaching and learning, and about negotiating meanings of ideas. I did not transcribe the parts of meetings that were about logistical concerns such as the next available meeting time, or turns in the conversation that were not closely related to teaching and learning (such as the lunch menu).
I highlighted phrases and sections of the transcriptions using color-coded highlighting. During my transcription work sessions, I would take periodic breaks from transcribing and highlighting, to write memos—comments about thoughts and questions in an interpretive frame of mind (Butler-Kisber, 2010; Leggo, 2008). These research memos as I called them, were typed within the transcription, but I also kept a bound paper research notebook with hand written memos and sketches in which I mapped relationships between ideas. My research memos further developed questions and comments that I generated in relation to the themes present in the highlighted phrases. I returned often to the two sets of notes, (a) the descriptive notes with highlighted transcription of dialogue, and (b) the research memos as initial interpretive reflections, thoughts, and questions. I also kept a running list of the emergent phrases that I used to highlight and color code sections of the transcripts. The initial colors were three: yellow for ideas pertaining to documentation, green pertaining to shifts in thinking, and fuchsia to indicate ideas or questions that I wanted to talk to a participant about in a follow-up interview. A second list attributed themes, metaphors, and emergent coding categories to various participants so that I could begin to see continuities and discontinuities between the ideas they expressed about their shifts in thinking about teaching and learning. In the last three months of data collection, I employed a transcription assistant who transcribed audio recordings of interviews. I listened to them again while highlighting her transcription and generating research memos.

***

(research memo following Skype® conversation with Rachel, March 2011)
Rachel: I started out 11 years ago telling [my students] they were artists. Now I am treating them like artists (Rachel, Skype® conversation, January 31, 2011).

Rachel has developed several reflections around her understanding of how she has recently been able to support the child artist. This is a shift in her thinking not because the child artist is a new idea for her, nor did she attend a workshop in which the expert standing in front of the room suggested that art teachers should pay closer attention to the child as artist. Rather, she reflects on her ability to enact pedagogy in her eleventh year of teaching that is more closely aligned with an aspect of her teaching philosophy that has always been important to her.

***

I also generated records of my thoughts using a digital voice recorder. The research site was a three-hour drive from my home, and I would often use the driving time as reflection time. Soon after making the recording, I would listen back and create brief, typed outlines. These were saved in my computer according to date. I returned to listen to the audio recording often when I was writing various stages of the dissertation to help stimulate my emotional memories of events and my immediate impressions in that place and time.

As I collected data in various ways, I was both a notetaker and a notemaker (Frank, 1999). As a notetaker, I recorded rich descriptions and observations; first during the meeting and then again from the video group meetings and audio recordings of interviews. As a notemaker, I created research memos of reflections, inner thoughts, wonderings, and emotions as they occurred in response to observation. I practiced notemaking in increments of time following the observation/experience as part of a series of reflections that were immediately following and then later, in respect to other data. I used notemaking to trace and connect related ideas as time passed. My memos took the form of descriptive and interpretive comments and questions that developed over time.
This was one aspect of my method that mirrored what Clandinin and Connelly call the “back and forthing” of narrative inquiry.

**Blog**

During the first group meeting, I asked the group how they would like to stay in contact with each other between the monthly face-to-face meetings at the educational service agency. One group member, Kay, suggested that we start a website such as a wiki or a blog to record our thoughts and keep in contact with other group members. She suggested that it could also be a place to keep all of the resources and materials that we would likely gather. During the 2009-2010 school year, the CIG blogged on a Google® site [blog chronicle] that Kay started for us (see Figure 3-3). Then, during the following 2010-2011 school year, we blogged on a Wordpress® site (see Figure 3-4). We used these sites as our web-based center of communication. We uploaded narrative reflections, web links, questions posed to the group, notes from our group meetings, articles, as well as photos and videos from each of our classrooms. Both of these sites were password protected and only our group and the AETI program co-directors had access.

In Figure 3-3, Kay makes a blog post sharing an event from her teaching day and a video of a student’s reflection. Kay wrote, “Talking with students about our new TAB [Teaching for Artistic Behavior] approach this year, one sixth grade student said the best thing about it is, *you let us be who we truly are!* That struck me and stuck with me. What could be more important?” (Kay, blog post, April 2010). Rachel and I each comment below Kay’s written reflection.
Figure 3-3. Screenshot of a post by Kay on our Google Sites® blog, with follow-up comments. Names are edited or deleted to protect privacy.
Figure 3-4. Screenshot of blog post by Ann on our Wordpress® group blog. She makes a joke about “spamming the blog” referring to the many posts she had uploaded to the blog that week.

**Semi-Structured Interviews**

Periodically, I met with participants individually (either in-person or via Skype® web conference) to learn more about their experiences and to follow up with ideas. This was also a time when participants raised questions and were free to direct the
conversation. I conducted two semi-structured (Reinharz, 1992) research interviews with participants over the course of the two years. The first occurred in the spring of 2010 and others during the 2010-2011 school year. This allowed for a longer view of our experiences together and for reflection on our past.

I structured the interview conversation so that the participant was telling his or her own story as much as possible (Chase, 2005). I posed questions to follow up on ideas that previously emerged during group meetings or other correspondence. For example, I often asked a participant to further explain a blog post or a comment made during previous asynchronous web communication.

I followed Reinharz’s (1992) semi-structured interview format to support a free exchange of ideas as a conversation. Reinharz (1992) advocates for “focusing less on getting one’s questions answered and more on understanding the interviewee” (p. 24). I began each semi-structured interview by opening a discussion that focused on the participant’s experience and perspective (Reinharz, 1992).

I made audio recordings of the interviews and encouraged the participant to pause or stop the recording at any time. Through these conversations participants elaborated on their personal experiences, telling a story from their perspective in regard to their on-going inquiry into teaching. Audio recordings of interviews were transcribed for analysis.

In addition to scheduling interview appointments, informal and impromptu conversations were equally important opportunities to follow-up on ideas with participants. I talked individually with participants before and after scheduled group meetings or while we ate lunch together. I made memos as soon as possible following these conversations.
Organization and Tagging of Memos, Notes, and Interim Texts in Scrivener®

I used a software program called Scrivener® (version 2.2) designed by Literature and Latte software company23. This program was designed for novelists and authors constructing complex and lengthy writing projects. I used Scrivener® as an organizational management system and used its detailed options for recording meta-data to track and sort information about sections of writing. I utilized the tagging and search features to organize and retrieve research memos, notes, and interim texts and to group data associated with specific participants, events, themes, etc. Scrivener® (see Figure 3-5 for a screenshot image) supported my linking pages and other files which made it easy to locate versions of drafts created with my other word-processing software, Microsoft Word®. I used a combination of my Scrivener® software binder and a detailed digital file system to easily access all of my notes and digital media files. I developed this workflow over a period of a year. It facilitated quick access to any of my digital data without interrupting the process of writing.

Part III: Understanding Participants’ Focus of Shared Inquiry

In this section, I describe what participants were studying during the two years we met as a collaborative inquiry group. I describe here how teachers in our group selected a theme for study. This is important background information for understanding the AETI research context.

2009-2010 CIG Theme: Approaches for Supporting Student Inquiry

In the fall of 2009, our CIG identified a topic of interest and articulated a shared thematic focus for the group’s professional learning. Stating a theme for inquiry, or
articulating an *inquiry question* was strongly encouraged by the *AETI* project. Each CIG identified a theme and formulated a broad guiding question to support group cooperation around the investigation of a shared topic. Our group was interested in exploring *inquiry* as a method of engaging student learning.

In the group’s development of this topic of study, I listened to each teacher’s interests and reflected statements back to them as active listening. Even after we settled on a topic, I encouraged members of our group to experiment with the language they were using to describe their conceptualizations of inquiry as an approach to both teaching and learning. Over the two years, each teacher referred to our shared inquiry theme by different labels including: discovery learning, inquiry-guided learning, student-driven learning, emerging curriculum, inquiry learning in the arts, student-led learning, student-centered learning, choice-based learning, and teaching for artistic behavior.24

Six teachers posted meeting reflections in their meeting log following the October 2009 meeting. The 2009-2010 AETI meeting log was a web-based form with three questions/prompts: (a) describe your experience working with your collaborative inquiry group today. How is the inquiry process unfolding for you and your group? (b) What will

---

24 It is beyond the scope of this dissertation study to examine the various teaching approaches each teacher used and review the history and literature related to each of these educational approaches. I present information about what teachers were studying here in order to give the reader a greater sense of the research context. This is relevant to how I understand ways that teachers described shifts in their thinking about teaching and learning. My purpose is not to verify or track each teacher’s changes to specific methods of teaching, but to learn how teachers share about shifts in their thinking about teaching and learning in the context of a collaborative inquiry group. The reflections I include here from the October 2009 meeting are indications of how teachers were thinking about the possibilities for studying their own teaching practice in the context of a collaborative inquiry group interested in learning ways to facilitate inquiry-based learning.
you be thinking about and working on before your next CIG meeting? And, (c) How is
the work you are doing in your CIG likely to enhance your teaching?

The reflections below dated October 20, 2009, show how Rachel, Brandon, Kay, Abigail, Emma, and April (Jason was absent from our October meeting) were beginning
to conceptualize their own individual inquiries within the context of the group’s emerging
inquiry question and overarching theme. I include their meeting log entry below to show
specific examples of how teachers were framing their individual inquiries in fall of 2009.
These reflections foreshadow some of the themes that I elaborate in Chapters 4 through 7.

***

(written reflections in AETI meeting logs, following October 2009 CIG meeting)

**Rachel:** I feel that I am pretty good at teaching technique and offering up ways to
jump start creativity within parameters of a lesson/unit – but when it comes to
student driven [learning], I find that the students get stuck easily and begin
spinning their wheels. I want to be a community of learners, instead of me at the
top, dictating. What if we all stopped and wrote/drew in our sketchbooks the last 5
minutes of class? Even the little ones? Reflecting on what we learned that day,
how we felt about the experience we had—hmmm.

**Brandon:** I will be gathering information about student-based lessons. How can a
student’s input improve lessons? How can you get a student to take ownership in
his/her work and pride in what they do? I believe that we will be able to learn
techniques that each group member utilizes in their class and find better ways to
incorporate them in our class. This will be a good way to network and find new
refreshing ideas. We are often stuck in our rooms without any interaction from
others. We are left to our own devices and not really looked at as real teachers.
This could be a way to **soothe our souls** so to speak.

**Kay:** I anticipate that this line of inquiry will directly impact and enhance my
own teaching since I am already experimenting with Teaching for Artistic
Behavior. I look forward to entering into the dialogue with and receiving
feedback from my colleagues about this concept and the practice of emerging
curriculum.

**Abigail:** I will be thinking about student stimulated inquiry based learning that I
could use in my classroom and search for resources that would support student
inquiry. It is likely that I will be more able to choose activities that students will feel actively involved in and own their learning through their own inquiry.

Emma: I hope that this will strengthen my self-reflections and enable me to try various other ideas that are suggested by my group and learn from their experiences as well.

April: As we discussed where we are going with our CIGs several ideas were reiterated such as assessment and student inquiry lessons. There were many ideas shared on how some are already implementing these ideas/techniques in their classroom. I found it interesting that this was a common theme for most involved in the session. I believe that this is something that our group will continue to explore more in depth. On a whole I found the process productive.

***

These reflections show how each teacher is making plans to exercise independence in the ways that they study these approaches to teaching. Interestingly, they are simultaneously developing a sense of how their ideas and experiences relate to being self-directed and group-supported (Frost & Durrant, 2003). The wording of the group’s inquiry question was not yet fully articulated at the time participants wrote these reflections.

Rachel refers to our group’s inquiry theme as “student driven” learning. Brandon uses the phrase “student-based” and Kay refers to her growing interest in a specific method she is using called *Teaching for Artistic Behavior* (Douglas & Jaquith, 2009). Both Rachel and Brandon identify a puzzle or problem that they are working to overcome. Rachel feels confident teaching technical skills but she is interested in establishing a “community of learners” in which she is not always the one “at the top, dictating.” This became an important narrative thread that these three participants discuss again several months later in our February 2010 CIG meeting (see Chapter 5).
Brandon poses his own personalized question about how he can “get a student to take ownership.”\textsuperscript{25} Brandon describes his perspective as an art teacher “stuck” in the classroom and without “interaction.” He writes that the collaborative inquiry group work that we are embarking on “could be way to soothe our souls.” Brandon’s reflection about feeling stuck and looking for interaction helped me to focus my own inquiry on the interactions that we shared such as group meeting discussion, blog posts made to the group website, and images and video shared to the whole group. I chose this approach rather than following each teacher separately into their classrooms to inquire into their teaching methods directly.

April notices that this CIG theme is an idea that some members of the group have already been thinking about but that it is new to her. Emma notes how she is looking forward to the process of self-reflection. Abigail uses the term “student stimulated inquiry” and looks forward to locating resources that will help her try these ideas that were raised by the group in the October 2009 meeting.

\textbf{CIG’s Guiding Question 2009-2011: How can you lead a student to learning without creating the path they must follow?}\textsuperscript{25}

The next month, at our November 2009 meeting, Brandon helped the group synthesize discussion from the first two CIG meetings, helping us to compose the guiding question, “How can you lead a student to learning without creating the path they must follow?” The group liked the wording he proposed and adopted this question as their

\textsuperscript{25} The idea that student ownership of art making was something that developed over time was one that Rachel worked on extensively with her students. I bring forward these and other stories in Chapter 5.
overarching question\textsuperscript{26} for the 2009-2010 year. One year later, the group decided to continue using the question for the second year, 2010-2011.

***

(*written reflections, AETI meeting logs, November 2009*)

**Brandon:** We discussed how to lead students to creative discovery and how they can be the leaders of their own experiences in the classroom. We shared experiences of what we do in our classrooms and what our students get from the ways we teach. We shared experiences and lessons and had some feedback on our thoughts, which is really a good thing. Sometimes you may think you are doing well (or not so well) and you now have someone to acknowledge your work.

**Emma:** I think that our inquiries will promote self-reflection. I feel that with this fine-tuning of our group questions, we are going to really explore our own methods of teaching and better relate to our students’ need for discovery.

**Jason:** I am looking forward to using ideas and experiences from other teachers to enhance my own teaching style.

**Rachel:** We shared our thoughts and recent experiences regarding a more inquiry based approach in our own classrooms—real world. I see that “inquiry based” needs to be standards (assessment) driven. Not a free for all. Where do I want the students to get to and how can I guide them without handholding? The discussion and sharing is very helpful for me to formulate my thoughts. I will continue to gently work in more inquiry, student driven concepts into my classroom.

***

The group meetings taking place in December 2009 through May 2010 took the form of teachers sharing what they were exploring with their students. We also discussed each teacher’s methods. There was no prescribed format or formal meeting protocol in place, but the group developed a way of working. At the beginning of each meeting I invited the group to work with me to set the agenda as a guide for how we would like to use our meeting time. After hearing suggestions, I would help the group come to a loose

\textsuperscript{26} Each of the CIGs who gathered as part of AETI project created a similar guiding question.
outline for how we would spend our time. This agenda was usually formulated according to which teachers had brought ideas from their classroom to share. AETI rarely dictated our CIG agenda. One instance was in January 2010, when part of the focus of our meeting was to unpack the digital technology equipment orders.

2010-2011 CIG Concepts for Continued Inquiry

In the 2010-2011 school year, the group’s second year together, our CIG created a list of additional concepts to add to the broad guiding question. This discussion and listing of concepts happened at the same time that three new teachers joined our group in the fall of 2010. The list of concepts emerged as part of a group brainstorm led by elementary art teacher Carmen, a new member of the group, who recorded ideas on large chart paper as the group discussed in the fall of 2010. Ann, also a new member and art teacher, transferred the chart paper list to a blog post so that we could continue to use it as a reference.

Developing this list of ideas was both a way to define aspects of the group’s inquiry group for the coming year and also a way for new members to join in the idea development process while orienting them to what the group had been doing in the past year. During the November 2010 CIG meeting, Ann posted the following blog entry entitled Concepts for Inquiry as a synthesis of discussion about identifying a focus for the coming year of collaborative inquiry (see Figure 3-6). Figure 3-6 is a list of topics from this brainstorming session. Participants were discussing all of the ideas, questions, and
wonderings that they felt were closely or tangentially related to their collaborative inquiry work. These ideas tied together the previous year’s goals with those for the future.

The list that appears in Figure 3-6, *Concepts for Inquiry*, was generated by the group during a face-to-face discussion and was meant to further describe aspects of the guiding question, “*How can you lead a student to learning without creating the path they must follow?*” Individuals expressed their interest in studying their classroom practice and ways of thinking about inquiry-guided teaching and learning.
Figure 3-6. *Concepts for Inquiry* is a blog post made by Ann to synthesize our group’s discussion during the November 2010 meeting.

This narrative inquiry research does not follow the threads of each method of teaching that participants researched with students. Rather, this study is a focused investigation into the various ways that teachers expressed to the group how their thinking was shifting or changing in respect to the common topic of study that the group
adopted. Thus, I could have used a similar research design no matter what the collaborative inquiry group had elected to study together. Yet, participants’ expressions of shifts in thinking were usually descriptions of events that were described in detail to address one of the topics that the group was investigating. Therefore the narratives that teachers constructed together are deeply embedded in these overlapping spaces: AETI program, our CIG and the group’s chosen focus of study, and each teacher’s unique teaching context(s).

**Part IV: Methods of Narrative Analysis and Interpretation**

The analysis of stories told by participants began with transcribing, thematic coding, and organizing narrative data, and then writing interim texts, which are exploratory narratives based on field notes and research memos (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). To compose these interim texts as working drafts of interpretive memos and experimental narrative forms, I first looked for *critical events* (Webster & Mertova, 2007) in the group’s discussion, individual interviews, web-based dialogue, and follow-up interviews that pointed toward experiences that participants viewed as important to their inquiry process. These critical events often indicated shifts in a participant’s thinking about teaching and learning. Focusing my initial analysis on critical events helped me “see a way through” the vast amounts of data that I collected during this narrative inquiry study (Webster & Mertova, 2007, p. ix).

After about six months in the inquiry field with participants, I began to hear ideas resonating in our group (Conle, 1996). These resonant ideas were points of discussion in
our group, ideas that we returned to, through which meanings were negotiated, and that sparked more stories illuminating multiple interpretations. Critical events (Webster & Mertova, 2007) in this study were moments in the life of our group made accessible to research via our dialogue (conversation and blog posts) in which participants were describing ideas important to them. In this way, themes developed as topics that we would frequently discuss.

***

(research memo, May 2011)

During our last CIG meeting, we discussed critical moments that felt especially important in our thinking together over the past year. We used the story cubes\(^{27}\) we made

\(^{27}\) In March of 2011, our CIG began planning for the final day of AETI at the end of the 2010-2011 academic year. Teachers in our group were brainstorming how to share our two years of inquiry and experimental pedagogical processes with other teachers in the AETI community. One teacher suggested that we create an interactive mode of sharing with stories, photos, and objects that could be manipulated by visitors who would be invited to organize and rearrange our artifacts of inquiry. Another teacher suggested that this could be a set of mobile and interactive sculptures that could be configured in many ways and made from simple and easily attainable materials such as cardboard boxes. Another teacher suggested that each side of a box could have a quote, image, or reference to a key event in our inquiry process. By arranging these mobile components (boxes) a visitor could construct a visual story and create a sculpture. Developing these ideas, we began to call these cardboard box sculptures \textit{story cubes}. We met in one of the music teacher’s classrooms in mid-March to begin the design process for these interactive and collaborative sculptures that each teacher would construct out of several cardboard boxes. In May 2011, we put our story cubes together and talked about which events and ideas were particularly important to each of us. We arranged the boxes in many ways, and in doing so, looked for the relationships between the ideas that each of us found to be significant in the life of our CIG and in our own individual teaching inquiries. Each member of our CIG created a set of six story cubes. Each side of the cube told a particular story using text and image. These individual artifacts were an important way that I learned what CIG events and conversation topics were \textit{critical events} from the perspective of each participant. Furthermore, the way participants and visitors arranged the text and images on the sides of each cube showed ways of observing and constructing relationships between nuanced ideas to show common themes and resonating interests. The CIG’s discussion during the making, thinking, and collaborative construction episodes of these story cubes in March through May of 2011 was also influential in the way I selected stories to be represented in this dissertation text.
to remember and retell significant ideas and experiences. As we began to talk, I noticed that I heard Charity speaking about what I perceived to be Rachel’s story. Charity was retelling a story of significance to her but in relation to what Rachel had previously shared on several different occasions and in several forms about her experiences teaching a course. In response to the question, What is important to you?, Charity responded by retelling [what I perceived to be] Rachel’s story.

***

Drafting interim texts as exploratory narratives allowed me to see how to represent my own and participants’ voices in the final research text. Some of these in-between interim texts appear here in the dissertation as narrative fragments interwoven between discussions to give the reader a sense of the unfolding process of the inquiry. Inquiry as writing occurred when I was experimenting with ideas by writing various interim texts as exploratory liaisons between field texts and the public research text.

Interim Texts as Letters, Multivocal Narrative Intertextures, and Found Poems

Writing an interim text often led to experimentation with a variety of written forms. For example, sometimes I drafted letters to individual participants, recalling an idea raised in one of our meetings and posing some possible interpretations, or continuing the conversation. I would post these letters as comments (responses) to a blog post, accessible for all of the participants to see and respond.

In need of a way to see a lot of data in a small space, I drafted interim texts using Glesne’s (1997) poetic transcription and Prendergrast’s (2006) found poetry as methods to analyze, interpret and synthesize complicated and lengthy. Figures 3-7 and 3-8 show examples of my method of drawing out direct phrases from an asynchronous set of
participants’ quotes and the resulting *found poem* (Prendergrast, 2006) to place the nuanced of individual ideas in relationship.

I first constructed intertextures as close groupings of several participants’ quotes in a small space. Then I synthesized ideas by extracting phrases to create found poems as a process of narrative analysis to explore the nuances of a theme that emerged as prominent to participants. The following example (Figure 3-7) is an assemblage of narrative fragments/quotes related to the theme I termed “moving in the inquiry space.” This theme describes various types of moving and shifting that participants tell of their experiences working in our CIG and studying their teaching.
Multivocal Narrative Intertexture: Moving in the Inquiry Space

**April:** Just hearing how each of us was working with students made me more apt to think about how I could do that in my classroom and just trying to see if I could modify it to make it work. We were always sharing and then taking ideas and moving along with them. (Transcript excerpt, May 2010)

**Abigail:** Our CIG sharing helped me to consider and rediscover why what we do is important. I wanted to ask students a question that got their minds moving and asking more questions. (Blog post excerpt, March 2011)

**Rachel:** I definitely feel I have a style. I strive for openness in my classroom as well as a feeling of safety. I guess I am learning that it is OK to be me. Maybe the reason I wanted to make this our inquiry question is because it has been in my heart all along. (Blog post excerpt, March 2010)

**April:** My participation in [AETI] has given me new things to think about it my classroom and new ways to approach them. I felt that my CIG’s question fell directly in line with my steadily maturing philosophy of classroom music. (Blog post excerpt, May 2010)

**Emma:** I agree with you about the inquiry research feeling only part of the way finished. I think that we did take on a big concept, and I think that we will keep learning from our research and documentation. (Blog comment excerpt, May 2010)

**Ann:** I’m not necessarily changing my teaching philosophy, but rather, expanding it. (Blog post excerpt, March 2011)

**April:** It was just kind of this explosion of realizing that music doesn’t have to come out of a manual—like my elementary program that I was in. (Transcript excerpt, May 2011)

**Rachel:** Our group reinforced some thoughts that I have always held dear. The child as artist is something I said and heard often in pre-service instruction. I now feel that I honor the child artist more than ever. (Transcript excerpt, October 2010)

Figure 3-7. *Multivocal Narrative Intertexture: Moving in the Inquiry Space.* Interim text as asynchronous assemblage of direct quotes to form an intertexture that shows the nuances of multiple perspectives that coalesce around a complex theme.
This intertexture of quotations was a method I used frequently as part of reflexive cycle of analysis exploring interpretations of one or more narrative themes that emerged from field notes, transcripts, and research memos. I often synthesized an intertexture with a found poem (Prendergrast, 2006) to further synthesize ideas in a small space. See Figure 3-8.
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Our sharing helped me to consider, rediscover;
Minds moving and asking more questions.

I am learning it is OK to be me.
Our inquiry question has been in my heart all along.

My steadily maturing philosophy
Only part of the way finished
Keep learning
changing, expanding

Figure 3-8. Found Poem. Moving in the Inquiry Space.
I constructed this poem by arranging exact phrases that I found in the previous intertexture in Figure 3-7. The different fonts correspond to different participants and thus attempt to emphasize multiplicity of voices. The result is a multivocal poem that speaks to a theme but is polyphonic, representing multiple voices, and retains the nuanced words/phrases belonging to each teacher.

**Stages of Interpretation**

Leggo’s (2008) stages of interpretation (Figure 3-9) were also useful exercises to structure the writing and organization of interim texts. Leggo recommends the following as a set of steps to follow in moving from reading participants’ narratives to composing stories that retell as narratives with interpretive meaning. The steps appear below as a direct quotes.
Step one: Read

The researcher reads the whole narrative to gain a general sense of the story.

Step two: Interrogate


Step three: Thematize

The researcher reads the narrative again with a focus on a theme, and spells out the parts of the story, which relate to the theme.

Step four: Expand

The researcher expands on the theme by reflectively and imaginatively drawing connections and proposing possible meanings.

Step five: Summarize

The researcher summarizes the theme in a general statement or two in order to indicate clearly what is learned from the narrative.

_____________________________________________________________

Figure 3-9. Leggo’s (2008) strategies for interpreting narratives in five steps.

Strategies for Addressing Trustworthiness

As I studied the field texts and constructed interim texts, I looked for multiple ways to understand meaning in the data. Some of the questions I asked myself were: how might I be wrong? Or, what other perspective can I see here? What would another participant say about this idea? Clandinin and Connelly (2000) describe the data analysis as a process of asking questions of the field texts: What are the meanings of the transcript, the daily field notes, and the interim texts? What alternative meanings are possible in reading the field texts? These are questions I used to formulate questions and
topics in interviews. The following three strategies support trustworthiness (Given, L. 2008; Mischler 1990) in the present narrative inquiry: Transparency (Butler-Kisber, 2010), wakefulness (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000), and verisimilitude (Clandinin & Connelly, 1990; 2000). I discuss each in the following sections.

**Transparency**

I aimed to maintain a transparent and well-documented method in this research as one way to remain wakeful (aware and alert) and also to facilitate my learning process as an emerging narrative inquirer. I worked toward transparency by keeping detailed descriptions of the inquiry process, methods, and decisions at every stage of the research. Researcher memos have been an important part of my transparency because memos are tools for taking a reflexive self-interrogative stance on the research (Butler-Kisber, 2010). Also important to transparency is the presence of participant voices in the final research text. I hope that using excerpts from a broad range of sources brings forward participants’ lived experience, making it visible to the reader.

My resources include field notes, interview data, and actual examples of participants’ documentation of teaching (in the form of images and texts). I developed a method and form of multivocal narrative intertexture that expands on the multivoiced methods of narrative inquiry (Conle, 1996; Craig, 2007; Heydon, 2010; Reilly, 2011) and interwoven qualities of Hasebe-Ludt, Leggo, and Chambers’ (2009) multi-authored and multivoiced literary métissage as a concept and literary form to present multiple points of view in the research text.
Wakefulness

Wakefulness, a vigilant attitude of thoughtful reflection, is a stance of alertness that the researcher maintains. Clandinin and Connelly (2000) urge narrative researchers to be wakeful, aware, and reflective throughout the inquiry to guard against reducing a narrative to a simplified text in order to illustrate a theory. “For narrative inquirers, it is crucial to be able to articulate a relationship between one’s personal interests and a sense of significance and larger social concerns expressed in the works and lives of others” (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p. 122). The strength of narrative inquiry is to illuminate shades of intensity and varied textures surrounding a complex phenomenon.

One of the ways I have tried to be wakeful in this research is by reflecting on my dual role as facilitator of the collaborative inquiry group and as researcher who is studying our experience. Writing and revising several drafts of narrative fragments have also assisted in me in remaining wide awake to multiple perspectives and exploring the ways that research is re-presented. By maintaining wakefulness, I am both author and critic of the research text.

In this narrative inquiry, I learned that my goal was not to simply narrate one participant’s experience or turn our collective experiences into a dramatic plotline with a dominant and singular narrative sequence. I have not focused my writing as inquiry on filling the role of omniscient narrator, crafting and telling a single story to utilize literary devices such as rising action, falling action, and resolution. I understand my role as narrative inquirer not as a narrator but as a listener. Through my experiences listening to the multiplicity of voices in this narrative inquiry, I experienced a shift in thinking about
narrative inquiry as a research methodology. Narrative research does more than re-present stories as temporal events and plotlines. The narrative inquiry research text can engage the researcher, participants, and readers by creating interactive liminal spaces of on-going inquiry and interpretation. This is likely to occur when story fragments are assembled in ways that open spaces of inquiry in the juxtaposition of stories as multi-textured and interwoven perspectives. One possible outcome or form for narrative inquiry research is multivocal narrative intertexture. That is, a polyphonic and resonant narrative inquiry text created by a narrative inquirer whose priority is listening more than it is narrating.
I don’t want to be a narrator. It doesn’t always feel right. I don’t have one singular story to tell. I do want to help multiple participants tell their stories to a wide audience. Is there a difference? Inquirer, listener, researcher, facilitator, narrator, commentator, storyteller. Actor-network theorist John Law (1994) wrote about networks of writing:

Writing is work, ordering work. It is another part of the process of ordering. It grows out of a context. It is an effect of that context. But then it tends to go on to hide that context. When we write, we may conceal in various ways. Sometimes we make nature (or society) speak instead of us. Under these ordering conventions the author may disappear from the narrative altogether. Sometimes we allow ourselves a passive voice, and appear in text as rapporteur, or commentator. But the more we appear in our own narratives, the more . . . the writer becomes visible as composer, crafts-person, or even creative genius. So it is that the work of reading (not of writing) becomes more personal. . . . What happens if the author moves from a single voice (whether that of empiricist, craftsperson, or genius) to several voices. . . . I sometimes choose to break the narrative up and tell different and somewhat incompatible stories. (Law, 1994, p. 31)

A friend and colleague wrote a poem during our first semester as doctoral students. Through this poem, written in the context of a research course, she showed me that research is about a process of searching and (re)searching for meaning in everyday encounters that may seem familiar but can be understood and understood again in surprising ways (Dubin, personal correspondence, 2009).

I have been searching for a way to present narrative data as a (re)search text that is not a neatly packaged re-telling, but a challenging non-linear set of fragmented texts that honors the complexity of the search in our collaborative inquiry as collaborative research about listening to stories of teaching. In fragmentation there are gaps, silences, places of delay that create a sustained space for divergent viewpoints and vibrations that connect the reader to personal experiences. These gaps must remain present in the narrative inquiry research text so that the reader may also find and open wide space to search and (re)search as listeners.
Lather (2007) expands a definition of research beyond *searching* and focuses on the act of *getting lost* as a refusal to know. We “find what goes beyond what we know” (Lather, 2007, p. 13). Getting lost is a way to live out the searching so that we are open to working through the unexpected, only then to envision what is possible. By being wide awake to the feelings of getting lost in research, I open myself to the unpredictable possibilities of learning.

**Verisimilitude**

Verisimilitude is the sense of authenticity that the reader feels in response to the narrative. If the text resonates with a reader’s experience, they are likely to find value in the story. Connelly and Clandinin (1990) described a *good* narrative as being one that feels like an invitation to participate. Peshkin (1985) also wrote about the relationship between the value of research and the notion of invitation: “When I disclose what I have seen, my results invite other researchers to look where I did and see what I saw. My ideas are candidates for others to entertain, not necessarily as truth, let alone Truth, but as positions about the nature and meaning of a phenomenon that may fit their sensibility and shape their thinking about their own inquiries” (p. 280). This is one of the ways that narrative inquiry can be viewed as trustworthy. I attend to the notion of verisimilitude by including excerpts of rich descriptions throughout the research text. I want the reader to engage in the inquiry with me and thus extend Peshkin’s (1985) invitation to all readers, not just those engaged in formal academic research.
Part V: Review of Forms of Re-Presentation in Narrative Inquiry

This dissertation research text brings together my narrative inquiry methodology and re-presents our combined experiences from working together in a collaborative inquiry group. It is an opportunity to show “storied lives in storied ways, not to represent storied lives as exemplars of formal categories” (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p. 141). This leads to a form that facilitates an ongoing dialogue between descriptive narrative fragments, theories represented in the scholarly literature, and my interpretive memos/discussion. By placing these three types of texts together in the form of the research report, I connect poignant moments in our group’s experience with ideas that may have larger implications in varied educational contexts.

Thomas (2009) accomplished this connection in her research text by describing her teaching experience in respect to a larger conversation about philosophies of teaching and possibilities for re-visioning education. Thomas (2009) writes, “We recursively move from global to local perspectives, asking ourselves who we are amidst larger theoretical conversations about pedagogy and how our practices are informed by the larger scope” (p. 3). Using a metaphor similar to C. Richardson’s (2007) crystallization, Thomas (2009) describes her experimental process of inquiry as a prism refracting, illuminating, and “casting diverse strands of light” (Thomas, 2009, p. 24).

I have searched for and developed a methodology and corresponding form for this research that helps participants’ narratives stand as relational texts that interconnect, inviting the reader to participate in the process of interweaving and interpreting experience (Clandinin & Rosiek, 2007). As I considered possible forms for this research
In order to learn from examples of narrative research that bring forward multiple voices and retain the complexity of inquiry as a tangled and relational interaction, I searched dissertations and published qualitative inquiries that communicate both “commonality and variegations” (Barone, 2010, p. 149) in multivoiced narrative research methods. The goal of this literature search was to learn how to emphasize the multiplicity of voices in participant’s ideas. Feeling drawn to experimental and artful narrative forms, I went in search of narrative research exemplars.\textsuperscript{28} In the section that follows, I discuss five narrative research exemplars that I used to guide my method of constructing an interpretive form for this narrative inquiry. I feel it is important to describe specific methods and forms of narrative research that influenced and informed my own emerging method of narrative inquiry.

I draw from five specific narrative inquiry research methods: (a) resonance as a theory and method of understanding the experiences of a group (Conle, 1996), (b) story constellations as groupings of related narratives brought together through literary metaphors (Craig, 2007), (c) literary métissage (Hasebe-Ludt, Leggo, & Chambers 2009) as an interweaving of mixed experiences alike to narrative fibers woven into cloth, (d)

\textsuperscript{28} I conducted several searches using ProQuest and Eric databases with a range of search terms. I also conducted a manual search (by a method of manually searching titles, abstracts, and full text documents) of two journals, Narrative Inquiry and Qualitative Inquiry, which led me to Heydon (2010) and Prendergrast, (2006). I located Craig (2007), and Conle (1996; 2000) based a search of dissertations that used narrative inquiry methodologies. I then looked for each of these author’s published articles. In this search, I learned that both Craig and Conle are former advisees of Jean Clandinin, known for her narrative inquiry research about teacher knowledge and school reform.
knitted narrative as juxtapositions of narratives in similar and dis-similar contexts (Heydon, 2010), and (e) hybrid poetic transcription (Glesne, 1997; Prendergast, 2006; Reilly, 2011). I discuss ideas that originate with these authors in relation to my emerging method of narrative analysis and interpretive representation.

**Resonance**

*Resonance* is a narrative inquiry research methodology developed by Conle (1996) based on observations of pre-service teachers as they expanded meanings from stories told about practicum teaching experience and personal histories. In seminar meetings, pre-service teachers shared short pieces of writing that became “trigger stories,” which generated echoes, reverberations, and additional stories in response (Conle, 1996, p. 304). The echoes reflected “metaphorical connections” between stories of experience (1996, p. 305). Conle’s (1996) focus does not lie with the metaphors themselves, but with the linking of ideas as narrative movement or “metaphorical correspondences” (p. 305). “The stories come together, they interact and shape one another, and the personal practical knowledge implicit in the stories does not remain unaffected. What I call resonance describes the structure of the particular narrative movement” (Conle, 1996, p. 300).

Two points of affinity stand out to me as I compare Conle’s (1996) narrative inquiry with my own inquiry with a group of teachers. I have paid close attention to the way teachers in our CIG build ideas together. As a first phase of analysis, I tagged ideas presented by teachers according to themes and metaphors. Conle’s (1996) article urges
me to pay equal attention to the in-between space, the linking of ideas, and the narrative move from one shared experience to another. These “metaphorical correspondences” point toward a research text shaped to present excerpts of narratives together in a close-knit form, placing voices in relationship.

Conceptualizing a form that places narratives in close proximity is especially important to me as I explore shifts in thinking about teaching and learning, as described in my second research question. I learned from Conle (1996) that shifts in thinking do not just belong to a single teacher who is reconsidering an idea, but they also occur in the collaborative inquiry group as shifts among teachers. It is a thinking process that moves in correspondence with others’ metaphors. For a teacher, there is likely a re-interpretation that occurs in the act of making sense of an idea in respect to the particulars of one’s own teaching context.

Another important affinity I feel to Conle’s (1996) article is her examination of metaphor as propelling an active transaction that takes place in resonance. “When we carry over the expression of one thing and relate it to another, we do not build categories but follow our expanding experience of similarities through our capacity to ‘do metaphor,’ in the sense that our thought and language are propelled metaphorically” (Conle, 1996, p. 311).

I noticed that our CIG group developed metaphors as methods of verbalization that allowed each teacher to negotiate the way ideas were personally relevant to their teaching. Also, the metaphors seemed to facilitate the sharing of stories that illuminated their attempts to experimentation with new pedagogical approaches. Conle’s phrase “do metaphor” points again to the action of telling and the linking of ideas.
Story Constellations

Craig (1992; 2007) builds on Clandinin and Connelly’s (1996) matrices of stories as a method of seeing into the personal practical knowledge of teachers as they navigate specific circumstances. Craig’s (2007) narrative inquiry grouped multiple narrative plotlines into *story constellations* as a method of interpreting and re-presenting individual teacher’s experiences of school reform in the contexts of their respective schools. The constellations, alike to Geertz’s (1977) notion of *webs of significance*, are arrangements of nested stories, experiences that speak to metaphors in the data. Craig (2007) explains her story constellation method in respect to a study of four groups of teachers that were struggling with school reform:

A fluid form of investigation that unfolds in a three-dimensional inquiry space, story constellations consists of a flexible matrix of paired narratives that are broadened, burrowed, and restoried over time. The adaptability of this narrative inquiry approach is then made visible through introducing four story constellations separately, then laying sketches of the individual story constellations side-by-side. (Craig, 2007, p. 173)

Craig used geometric line drawings to represent four story constellations as diagrams. The first constellation diagram is a grouping of four stories that all exemplify the metaphor, the monkey’s paw (a gift that is not really a gift). The second, third, and fourth story constellations are summarized and symbolized by line art graphics and metaphors: Dueling Banjos, The Dragon in School Backyards, and The Rainbow Fish. Rather than presenting the stories themselves in the form of the research text, Craig (2007) elected (possibly due to limited space) to represent the relationships between stories in a series of graphics, circle drawings with various arrangements of smaller circles labeled with the names of the teacher.
It is difficult to evaluate Craig’s (2007) story constellations without reading the stories themselves. Conle (1996) was able to give the reader a sense of resonance as a methodology by using the narratives as a primary form for the article. This is a lesson for me in creating a narrative inquiry research text that uses the page as a field to present the narratives as rich descriptions and not merely summaries.

I found value in the three analytic and interpretive tools, broadening, burrowing, and restorying, described by Craig (2007) as her process of constructing the story constellations. Broadening and burrowing are interpretive actions that alternated her focus between the general and wider context of the inquiry and the particular stories of individual and social experiences. Restorying is the process of locating questions, tensions, conflicts, and meaning making in the stories as they play out over time and as they are reconstructed by the narrative inquirer in writing interim texts (Craig, 2007).

I interpret Craig’s (2007) descriptions of broadening, burrowing, and restorying as wide angle and close up views of a particular story. Stories told in a number of different ways, using a variety of literary structures, at varying levels of detail, and from different points of view are ways to enact burrowing and broadening. Craig’s methods are alike to Conle (1996) who uses varied styles of writing and increasing levels of detail to develop a story at paced intervals over time. These tactics help the reader to develop understanding over time and in reference to multiple iterations of a story. Thinking about these methodological techniques helped me to see how grouping and interweaving stories is not just about a juxtaposition of two or more stories, but interweaving parts of the same thematic idea as nuanced variations representing participants’ unique perspectives and
presented at carefully selected intervals. This was my aim for constructing Chapters 4 through 7.

**Literary Métissage**

While Craig (2007) used the metaphorical imagery of narrative *constellations* as clustered points of affinity that are drawn together by a common idea, Hasebe-Ludt, Chambers, and Leggo (2009) use images of *braiding* diverse story strands and *weaving* cloth from different fibers as a way of thinking about autobiographical experiences as represented in relational writing processes and forms. Hasebe-Ludt, Chambers, and Leggo (2009) write collaboratively in a multivocal research approach interweaving narratives that yield an “aesthetic product that combines disparate elements without collapsing or erasing difference. The act of creating new mixed forms, stronger and more resilient than the existing ones, gives métissage its generativity in the face of difference” (Hasebe-Ludt, Leggo, & Chambers 2009, p. 35).

Hasebe-Ludt, Leggo, and Chambers (2009) multivocal narrative research is based on the conceptual foundation and practice of *métisage* (from the Latin word *mixtus*), the weaving of *mixed* fibers into cloth (Lionnet, 1989; Roth, 2008; Zuss, 1997). Literary métisage, is the *braiding* or *weaving* of stories that give voice to lived experience and self-knowledge. By valuing what is “mixed,” the collaborators create space for a range of voices. Multiple forms of narrative (poetry, story, memoir) can be braided as métisage, presented together in the research text to represent more than one voice, each speaking of the rich and nuanced life of teaching and learning.
Using literary métissage as one exemplar to inform how narratives are selected and represented in a dissertation research text, I look for narrative *threads* of personal stories, teaching experiences, and shared experiences in the group inquiry and consider how they can be interwoven thoughtfully with theoretical discussion and dialogue with scholarly literature. In response to Hasebe-Ludt, Leggo, and Chambers (2009), I see my role of researcher as like an artisan, selecting a form of expression for the research text (such as vignettes, scripts, letters, story, photographs, collage, or a combination) and weaving together diverse narrative strands to aid interpretation of the multiple ways of knowing “shifts in thinking” as expressed and explored by members of our collaborative inquiry group.

**Knitted Narrative**

Heydon (2010) composed a riveting autobiographical narrative inquiry as a series of memories about her first year teaching in a remote First Nation community in Northern Ontario. She also fastens together narrative events from her childhood and early schooling, which contributed to how I began to know and understand Heydon’s lived experience through the narratives. Heydon (2010) artfully stitched together the narratives in three distinct autobiographical voices that speak from varied stages of her life. Juxtaposed between Heydon’s (2010) own personal voices are formal block quotes, dissonant passages excerpted from three published research articles in which she was represented by another scholar as a research participant and interview respondent. The other researcher studied her as a first year teacher and portrayed her as a privileged White
woman teaching in a desolate community of First Nation people. The author paints a picture of Heydon as *Lady Bountiful*, a generous but naive mother-teacher in the tone of a portrait written in an academic voice that rubs up against perspectives that Hedyon (2010) brings forward through her autobiographical narrative fragments written in first person. I appreciate the ways that Heydon (2010) uses several styles of writing to create vibrant and compelling scenes. She builds inference and imagery in ways that cause me to re-read sections and consider multiple interpretations. In the final passage of this multivoiced narrative knitting, Heydon (2010) uses the abbreviated, coded, instructional language for knitted stitches to join written lines of a violent memory. She creates sutures between written words that emanate fragmented pain—a memory that is made palpable to the reader. As a reader, I was a participant with Heydon in the struggle to knit together complicated, emotional interpretations of experience in awkward tandem with the other/researcher/outsider/interviewer’s notion of *Lady Bountiful*. It is rare that a narrative inquirer would have the opportunity to incorporate excerpts of another’s published research as it was written about her subject position(s). Reading the researched portrait of Heydon juxtaposed with Heydon’s (2010) own autobiographical narratives is startling and causes me to consider issues of representation in research. How does the researcher represent multiple perspectives in ways that are respectful and transparent? I returned to this text often as an example of a multivoiced narrative inquiry. Heydon’s (2010) performative text is an important methodological example of ways that a research text can be an educational drama (Denzin, 1997).
Hybrid Poetic Transcription

Reilly’s (2011) narrative inquiry is a performative assembly of perspectives, written from key excerpts of an interview. It is a creative non-fiction piece that presents four distinct voices: Two distinct voices belonging to interviewees, one voice representing the researcher’s silent private thoughts, and the researcher’s voice as it is heard aloud by the interviewees. Reilly (2011) creates this hybrid piece using a poetic transcription method (Glesne, 1997; Prendergrast, 2006) distilling the transcription to key phrases, wrought with meaning. Reilly’s (2011) poetic transcription yielded a form that reads much like a script but is also reminiscent of the stanzas of a poem. Each voice appears in a different typeset, bold, italic, etc. As each new voice is introduced into the dialogue, a name also appears to alert the reader of the shift in point of view. As the voices continue dialoguing, the names are omitted and the words on the page become dense, signifying interaction of voices with a chorus of inner thoughts and descriptions of the context.

Reilly (2011) describes her process as “distillations and crystallizations” of theoretical literature. She builds her method from a combination of poetic transcription (Glesne, 1997) and an arts-based method of found poetry (Prendergrast, 2006, p. 369). Prendergrast’s (2006) found poetry literature review represents a range of theories informing her dissertation research, presented in the poetic methods of senior scholars (Butler-Kisber, 2002; Glesne, 1997; Richardson, 1997). Prendergrast (2006) discretely cites theories and their authors using footnotes to free the page to be a field of possibility.
for the poem. The page is a *space* where poetic stanzas are arranged so the white of the page is a field of inquiry.

**Developing Narrative Forms: Multivocal Narrative Intertexture**

These five exemplars of narrative research have informed my narrative construction (Barone, 2007) of interpretive forms for this research text. I adapted elements from these published research texts to form my methodology for analyzing, interpreting, and re-presenting narrative data.

From Craig (2007) I learned methods of grouping narratives in a variety of configurations as part of analysis of themes. I also learned to listen to the iterations of metaphors and figures of speech that participants used and adapted to synthesize and proliferate their ideas in relationship to one another. Following Craig (2007), many of my analytic research memos were visual sketches of constellations, clusters, networks, or assemblages of stories showing relationships between themes that emerged in the narrative data. Many of these figures are included in Chapter 4.

Conle’s (1996) notion of *resonance* informed both my facilitation of our CIG discussions and my exploration of ways to bring narratives together in this research text. As a facilitator mindful of Conle’s (1996) notion of *resonance*, I helped the group make time for conversation that supported them to build ideas together in relationship or sometimes in dissonance with one another.

Throughout this written dissertation text and in my process as a narrative inquirer, I used Hasebe-Ludt, Leggo, and Chambers’ (2009) concepts of *braiding* and
interweaving to bring together participants’ diverse narrative strands. In this process, I was interested in ways of thinking and writing using multiple literary forms to represent mixed voices. Heydon’s (2010) method of juxtaposition as *knitting* narratives, Reilly’s (2011) *hybrid* poems, together with Hasebe-Ludt, Leggo, and Chambers’ (2009) *interweaving*, helped me to develop a working conceptual model for writing *narrative intertexture* as a multivocal, hybrid, assemblage of narrative inquiry texts.

*Intertexture* is the descriptive term I selected to conceptualize my emerging method of writing interim texts as groupings of multiple participants’ experiences in this narrative inquiry research text. I chronicled my process of selecting the term in an interim text that is too long to include here in the body of this chapter (see Appendix B). In my writing-as-inquiry process, I am writing *intertextures* as narrative groupings in three ways.

In the first way, narrative intertextures are close groupings of participants’ direct quotes that I assemble from asynchronous times, places, and interactions. By asynchronous, I mean that I have selected and arranged quotes which originated from different times, and placed them in close proximity on the page as if participants are in conversation. These dense clusters of quotes show participants’ ideas at various times and places during the research study (such as interviews, CIG meetings, and blog posts). Placing them together is like staging a synchronous conversation (see also MacLeod, 2009). Arranging the quotes in *intertexture* and in close proximity is an interpretive move

---

29 The Oxford English Dictionary defines the word intertexture as “the action of interweaving; the fact or condition of being interwoven” (intertexture, OED, 2012). I use the term intertexture to conceptualize my way of grouping interim texts. (See a detailed research memo describing my study of this term in Appendix B)
toward representing the nuances and complexity of participants’ perspectives and experience in unique teaching/learning contexts. I often further synthesized these intertextures by creating found poems. Each version of the grouping of quotes and the subsequent poems are an interim text, an in-process interpretation.

A second way I have thought of intertexture (as a way to characterize my narrative re-presentation of participants’ stories) is as a chapter that is structured to present a collection of narratives with analytic and interpretive theoretical discussion. Chapters 4 through 7 are each intertextures. Like a tapestry, each chapter is structured to bring together participants’ voices in interwoven narrative and visual forms: descriptive prose, poems, blog posts, quotes, excerpts from extended scenes/scripts, photographs, and still images from videos. These narrative and visual forms intersect with theoretical analysis and indicate implications that point to broader contexts to understand the value of the narratives.

Thirdly, multivocal narrative intertextures appear in this dissertation as extended scenes featuring the voices and actions of multiple actors. One scene precedes each discussion chapter. Each scene is an adaptation of the transcript and video recording from the CIG meetings and can be read like a play script.

(research Memo, May 2011)

I re-worked the transcript from the video recording of this [May 2010 CIG] meeting to create a dramatic script, also known as readers’ theater (Denzin, 2010), which re-tells the meeting as if it is occurring in the present. I watched and listened to the video recording of this meeting multiple times, carefully listening to ways that participants characterized critical events (Webster & Mertova, 2007). I was also listening for emerging themes that indicated types of shifts that participants shared about their experience.

The scene includes gestures, non-verbal communication, and indications of the setting and objects present in the room. These elements are important because the
transcripts of spoken word alone do not convey the richness of meaning that I am able to hear and see in the video, as well as remember from my experience. The script form gives the reader a sense of being among the group as the conversation is being constructed.

I introduce the first of four scenes that will appear in this dissertation as interludes between chapters. Scene I, *May 2010 CIG Meeting: Reflecting on a Year of Collaborative Inquiry*, is an extended narrative that immediately follows this chapter as an interlude or a break from the chapter and discussion form of this research text. The May 2010 scene is a chronological middle and the eighth of sixteen CIG meetings. The narratives appearing in later chapters extend from this “immediate middle” (Massumi, 2001, p. 1) toward themes that elaborate the complexity of teachers’ stories.

**Scene I: Beginning Immediately in the Middle**

We must learn to live in the middle of things, in the tension of conflict and confusion and possibility (St. Pierre, 1997, p. 176).

A line of becoming is not defined by points that it connects, or by points that compose it; on the contrary, it passes between points, it comes up through the middle. (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 293)

Something’s doing. That much we already know. Something’s happening . . . we find ourselves in the midst of it. There’s happening doing. This is where [we] must begin: immediately in the middle. (Massumi, 2011, p. 1)

In the May 2010 scene (which follows this chapter as interlude), all eight of us, seven teachers and I, sat down in our familiar CIG meeting place to reflect on past events, personal ways of thinking, and to make plans for the following year. Participants refer to
several events in the May 2010 group reflection that helped me to see how they were experiencing and sharing their shifts in thinking.30

When I read this scene, I can imagine the CIG meeting occurring in the present. I imagine meanings emerging when participants refer to ideas that are fastened to events occurring in the multiple contexts and spaces of inquiry. One of the reasons this May 2010 CIG meeting and group interview is significant to me as an interpretive middle is that participants share ideas that extend backward and forward in time (Webster & Mertova, 2007). Their ideas and oral reflections connect to past, present, and future stories that reveal personal perceptions and experiences as individuals who are acting in relation to the group (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Nespor & Barylske, 1991; Roth, 2002). Their stories also refer to objects and spaces of interaction that I use to build the multi-perspectival narrative intertextures in Chapters 5 through 7.

30 Analytic notations as footnotes appear in Scene I, May 2010 CIG Meeting. These are in response to my research question about how the teachers in our group indicated shifts in thinking about teaching and learning. These notes are descriptors for the types of shifts, which appear in bold followed by a quote attributed to one person. For example, Seeing possibilities of practice: “To hear the different ways was really eye opening for me” (Kay).
Interlude

Scene I

May 2010 CIG Meeting: Reflecting on a Year of Collaborative Inquiry

It is the second Friday of May, 2010. The place is a conference room/computer lab, one of many meeting rooms within a local educational service agency building. Here, a group of eight arts educators sit together talking during the afternoon segment of a collaborative inquiry group (CIG) meeting. This collaborative inquiry group, is one of six small study groups meeting today as part of the Arts Educator Teacher Inquiry (AETI) project, a multi-year professional learning initiative supported by federal funding allocated for arts educators teaching in high-poverty schools.

Today, the CIG members reflect on individual and collective work from the previous eight months with the anticipation of continuing group work in the 2010-2011 school year. The conference room/computer lab is dimly lit with the intermittent buzzing of fluorescent bulbs. The room is equipped with tables, chairs, computers, an interactive whiteboard, flat screen television monitors, digital projector, and a podium with various digital presentation tools. Two long tables line the walls on either side of the room and two smaller tables are placed together in the center of the room. Three people sit at one of the side tables, nearest the electrical outlets and 5 people sit around the center table. Each has a personal notebook computer, which was purchased for them using federal grant funding from the AETI project.

Mary Elizabeth: Earlier today, I added a new post on our CIG blog (indicating her notebook computer screen). The blog post for this meeting is under the title, “May 14 meeting.”

Members of the group also look back and forth between their individual computer screens and the people in the room. Rachel reaches to plug in her computer power cord to a nearby outlet in the wall.

I posted these questions as starting points for discussion this afternoon. This meeting is our last one of the year so it will be a review of our work and our thoughts in general about our time together. I encourage you to pose new questions as well. This conversation can take new directions if there are ideas that emerge that you would like to discuss further. You might also post new questions and comments on our blog here and as you think of them in coming days. Thanks to those of you who have already posted comments on the blog earlier today in response to these discussion questions. I am interested to talk with you about these ideas.
Just like always, I am video recording our conversation (points to small video camera and tripod) so that I can listen back to it as part of my research about our group process. As before, I encourage you to pause the recording at anytime, or ask that I pause it.

The first question I thought we could use to start our discussion is: (reading from the blog) Was there a time this year that you learned something from someone else?

Abigail: Was there a time when we didn’t!? 

Laughter and nods of agreement.

Jason: Almost every meeting I picked something up to take back with me.

April: Yeah, I mean from technology to teaching styles. It was a very broad range. We were always sharing and then taking ideas and moving along with them.

Mary Elizabeth: So technology—(makes a list on a pad of lined paper). When you say “styles” do you mean styles of teaching?

April: Yeah, definitely. Just hearing how each of us was working with students made me more apt to think about how I could do that in my classroom and just trying to see if I could modify it to make it work.

Mary Elizabeth: Okay, so can you think of a specific time when you felt like you learned something that was useful to you or that sparked your thinking about something?

Kay: (turns to face Brandon who is sitting near the wall outlet which powers his notebook computer) For me, it was hearing about your experience using the document camera with your students. When we were thinking about using that technology at the beginning of the year, to hear the different ways you used it in the classroom was really eye opening for me. Before, I had only thought of it as a demonstration tool.

Jason: It is hard for me to name a specific time. All the post-undergraduate classes I have done have been with a broad spectrum of educators. This (indicating the group sitting at the table) is so centered on the arts. This arts focus is a unique thing for me.

31 Theme: Moving in the inquiry  
32 Theme: Exploring possibilities of practice / how  
33 Theme: Exploring possibilities of practice / different ways
Jason turns to Brandon, arm stretched.

Brandon and I are both high school art teachers. And I have never had the opportunity to have the interaction (cycling both hands)—to get ideas. I mean, it is not so much even our inquiry question that has been so important to me. It is just listening to, for example, what Kay is doing in her classroom, or Rachel. I guess you could say stealing some ideas.

Brandon: (quickly chimes in) I think that’s a huge thing. It is just like that. You know, in a few weeks we are going to have these five days of end of the year in-service, five days of school when we are sitting there doing our trainings. I am the only art teacher in the entire school. I am one of two art teachers in the district. We are kind of like this island of—Ugh, I just wanna . . . (leaving his sentence trailing)

Mary Elizabeth: (playfully, as if partly joking) Maybe we should set up a group Skype® during the end of the year in-service days!

Group laughs in agreement.

April and Abigail: (speaking at once) Absolutely. That would be great. That would be awesome!

Chuckling.

Emma: (returning to a more serious tone) You do feel like a lonely island. They are talking about Response to Intervention, reading anchors. Nothing applies to you.

Jason: Then they say, ‘Go meet with your departments.’ I am my department.

Louder laughter. Talking at once.

Abigail: Our department is music, gym, and home ec. That is our department.

Nods of recognition.

Mary Elizabeth: (reads computer screen the questions posted on the blog) Did the inquiry process ever feel uncertain?

Emma: Yes.

34 Theme: Exploring possibilities of practice / get ideas
Kay: Absolutely.

Others nod.

Mary Elizabeth: Will you tell us more about that?

Emma: I was just getting ready to blog about how I would feel a wave of stress sometimes—scared of the technology at first. Then, I was a little more comfortable with using the tools we had available to us but more overwhelmed with what our inquiry question was, what it meant. My interpretation about what our group was studying changed along the way for me. I morphed my approach into less practice with teaching and setting up centers and letting the kids get there on their own, but more letting them get there on their own about their opinions. So, my ideas about how to facilitate inquiry learning, in my situation, kind of changed.

Mary Elizabeth: So, letting students get there on their own via their opinions instead of their work? Voicing their thoughts?

Emma: Yeah, because I never knew what classroom I would be in that day, or where they would move us, or how they would change our class, or what materials would be available. But we could always talk about artwork and talk about their artwork. And that was one way to think about it.

Mary Elizabeth: So with your mobility, as an itinerant art teacher, that was one way you could get an angle?

Emma: Right.

Mary Elizabeth: Yeah. Any other uncertain moments you would be willing to describe?

April: I remember not exactly knowing where I was going. I remember sitting here (gestures to the room) during our January meeting and thinking—How are we going to pull all of this together? I am a big picture person. I was thinking about things like, How do I relate to the majority of the group as a different discipline—teaching art, whereas I teach music? And how do I relate to

35 Theme: Moving in the inquiry / feelings, comfort level shift
36 Theme: Changing interpretation of group’s inquiry in respect to ones own teaching context
37 Theme: Changing interpretation of group’s inquiry in respect to ones own teaching context / my situation
38 Theme: Moving in the inquiry / living out questions / seeing relationships between ideas
Abigail who is a music teacher but teaches a completely different level? Her middle school kids comprehend things that my students are not yet ready for at the elementary level. I am back in my classroom doing basics.

**Mary Elizabeth:** Did that uncertainty ever resolve, or is there still a certain degree of uncertainty? Thinking about the “big picture” as you suggest is useful for reflection. Now as we review our time together in retrospect—are you visualizing anything differently, or are you seeing what your future goals might be?

*Pause.*

**April:** (thoughtfully) Yeah. I think in this meeting today and during our April planning meeting—the one I had to miss but Skyped into from school. I could see it coming together then when we decided to make a group video to show today. But I am still seeing a bigger picture. I am thinking about next year. Let’s keep rolling into next year and see what else we have, where else can we go with this? I think this picture is even bigger still.

**Abigail:** I think the nature of “the question” (indicates quotation marks with her hands) for us is about uncertainty. If you don’t have uncertainty or something that you are looking to define or know more about, then you don’t have a conflict or a question. A question like, “Did this work?” Looking at it, revising, assessing, trying it again. (swirls the air in front of her with an ascending spiraling gesture, her eyes following the shape as if she can see it). It is a constant process of travel around the pattern.

**Rachel:** Next year I will be even more uncertain because I am changing grade levels. I am moving up to the high school. I spent the day there on Wednesday. I realized that a lot of the things are going to be vastly different. Like the construction paper and masking tape sculpture exploration that I did with my little ones probably isn’t going to cut it.

**Kay:** You might be surprised!

*Laughter.*

**Rachel:** We’ll see what Jason says.

**Mary Elizabeth:** Jason and Brandon can help you out with high school.

---

39 Theme: **Seeing relationships between ideas**

40 Theme: **Moving in the inquiry space / living out questions**

41 Theme: **Moving in the inquiry / living out questions**

42 Theme: **Interpretation in respect to one’s own teaching context / my situation**
Jason: I made the jump from middle school to high school.

Mary Elizabeth: How many years ago, Jason?

Jason: Two. I would never go back.

Brandon nods.

Rachel: I’m excited for next year. I think I will definitely have more time for things like reflection. That has been one of my challenges. I wrote about this on the blog this morning. I reflect in the shower, I reflect in the car. That is my reflection time and I don’t get to document that—I don’t get to write it down. I think I will have more time as a high school art teacher with a slower pace during the day that what I am used to now.

One hand covers her mouth. She sits back in her chair in an exhausted slump.

(speaking now in a softer voice, sitting back in her chair) I just have to say in response to our first question—I learned so much from all of you. But especially from Kay. (sitting up) And now she is moving to another state! You can’t leave!

Kay laughs, sighs, and shrugs her shoulders. She smiles and looks at Rachel as she talks.

She has been my inspiration for sure. But all of you have (turning to her chair to face each member of the group in a sweeping pan).

It was a funny thing for me—driving here today and thinking. I was thinking about what it was like to be here seven times ago, then six times ago, and everything in between. It just feels—I feel like my brain has evolved. I really do. But at the same time, it wasn’t so hard. I feel I have had this huge shift in my thinking. But, it wasn’t the same experience that I might have had taking a college course. But, I have learned, let’s say, 100 times more than any college course I have ever taken.

When I explain this AETI project and our CIG to people—they say, “What? You get to out your own professional development? You get to decide what you want to learn?” Yes. I think that part is tremendous.

And that is just what we are trying to do for our students. It is the same thing. And they are going to be growing and evolving too because we are doing

43 Theme: Moving in the inquiry
that for them—well, we are figuring out how to do that—I don’t feel like I am 100% successful. But to me, what happened to me this year is what I am trying to do for my kids too.\(^4^4\)

**Mary Elizabeth:** So you think that your learning and the way you are feeling a sense of shifting is alike to the process that your students are going through?

**Rachel:** Absolutely.

**Abigail:** It’s amazing to be with people like this. Sometimes I find that teachers are some of the people who avoid learning the most! If I go to talk about ideas like this afterschool, I might get accused of talking shop!

**Mary Elizabeth:** Okay, speaking of which—let’s talk about what was rewarding. \((\text{reading aloud from the blog})\) Can you think of a time this year when our work felt especially rewarding?

**Emma:** I felt it was rewarding when I saw our finished video collage posted last night on here \((\text{points to the group’s blog on the computer screen}).\)

**Rachel:** Mm-Hmm.

**Emma:** Just the way it all came together and then it hit me, I thought—Oh! We are almost done now. We get to share our work.\(^4^5\) And we can see what other groups have been working on! I thought it was rewarding listening to each of the group’s share their inquiry process this morning.

**All:** \((\text{talking at once, in agreement.})\) Yes. / I thought so too. / Yeah, it was really interesting. / Me, too.

**Mary Elizabeth:** During the various CIG’s presentations this morning, did you notice themes or connections that relate to our group’s work?

**Abigail:** Yes, I did notice that one of the groups did have a lot of inquiry-guided and student-driven instruction examples where students were exploring some of their own ideas. I can’t remember which group it was, but they presented early in the morning.

**Emma:** I identified with the group that was dealing with issues of advocacy and administration. Because that is what I have been struggling with inside of our group work the whole year. I was dealing with that kind of stuff with

\(^{44}\) Theme: **Responding to students / seeing relationship between ideas**

\(^{45}\) Theme: **Seeing relationships between ideas**
the room set up, different schools. My own question within our group’s question was related to these kinds of issues.  

**Mary Elizabeth:** I noticed that we didn’t share the nuts and bolts of our working process, in today’s presentation, as much as other groups did. We shared more of a summary of ideas from each group member’s perspective, but we didn’t talk much about how we went about our work over the course of the year. I thought that was interesting.

**Rachel:** I felt kind of unique.

**Emma:** Maybe our group’s inquiry question was more abstract.

**Rachel:** Maybe. Although it doesn’t feel abstract to me. It feels concrete. I don’t know. I felt like we were different. Not in a bad way. *(laughs)* Did you all feel that way?

**Jason:** Yes. Our group presentation with the video and along with the group who made the series of sculptures. Most of the other groups presented in a way that was more informative—straightforward. Ours was more artsy! *(with a smile)*

**Kay:** We did a little bit of reading over the year, but I felt like there were a lot of other groups that mostly did that kind of research. They reported on a lot of reading and seemed to work in a way that reported a lot of facts. It might have resulted in a little bit of classroom practice change, but I felt that our group work was different because we really focused on our classroom practice.

**April:** Yeah.

**Mary Elizabeth:** I think so, too. I noticed, not only from the presentations this morning, but just from hearing facilitators talk over the past year that—I think our group was very much focused on classroom practice while others were primarily focused on collecting data in various ways and settings, not just with students.

**Jason:** The amount of people that said the word “surveys” today!

**Abigail:** Yes!

**Kay:** And graphs! Wow! *(swivels her chair in a half spin)*

---

46 Theme: **Interpretation in respect to one’s own teaching context / living out questions / sharing struggles**
All talking at once. Chatter.

Rachel: It was blowing me away! Pie charts?! Bar graphs?!

Kay: *(amused and looking around the room)* We don’t have a pie chart between us!

Laughter.

April: Did someone ask us today during the Q & A about our techniques being “trial and error?” I thought that was interesting in light of how everyone else seemed to be carrying out research. We were just kind of throwing ideas out to each other and saying, “Hey! Does this work?” And then we would modify from that.

Emma: *(joking)* We should have made bar graphs about that.

Kay: But we were trial and error.47

April: Yea, we took that path. I thought that was interesting. I prefer trial and error.

Abigail: I did some research, but it wasn’t quantitative.

Mary Elizabeth: You have a point, Abigail. We were doing research. We just didn’t use that word as much as we used the word inquiry. It was interesting for me to watch the presentations this morning and think about the outcomes that each group shared. I also found myself thinking about the facilitators of each group and what they told me over the year about their approaches. For example, take the group we were just talking about. The one that used charts and graphs to illustrate the findings of their pre/post research design. The facilitator of that group is also a college professor who uses quantitative research methods in his daily professional life. It was interesting to see the personalities and professional interests of each group member, including the facilitator, showing through in the presentations we saw today.

I am a qualitative researcher. I learn from people’s stories and the things they say and the experiences they tell. So, I come at this from a more narrative perspective.

I started to think about what influence I might have had in what you decided to present in our collaborative video of each of your experiences exploring inquiry as a teaching method.

47 Theme: **Possibilities of practice / trial and error / exploratory**
I think if you were to compare each CIG group just according to their presentation style, they tended to follow the inclinations of the facilitator. Even though we didn’t intend as facilitators to mandate. The goal of AETI was for each group to design their own professional learning experience. The group includes the facilitator as a participant. As you know, I am also doing research about our work so I am learning a lot about collaborative inquiry as professional learning as well as the inquiries that each of you are carrying out in your individual teaching contexts.

**Jason:** It seemed like the other groups were acting in response to assignments. Our group. *(looks at Mary Elizabeth)* Well, you kind of just said to us, “What do you think?” There was no assignment for us. Some of the other groups seemed like they agreed to work on the exact same set of tasks. We each went in our own direction. *(gestures with both hands up in the air, palms out, and fingers spread, pushing away as if to say, “Go to it!”)*

**Mary Elizabeth:** Based on the way the presentations went today, I think some of the other groups must have made uniform or highly specific assignments for themselves. For example, I heard one presenter speak as a spokesperson and say, “My job was to research this for the group.” Is that what you mean by assignments, Jason?

**Jason:** Yeah, it seemed like a reporting back to the group based on an assignment that was the same for each group member. Whereas we shared our experiences as they were tailored to us. As they happened. We were all studying the same broad theme, inquiry-guided student learning, but we each had our own way of exploring these ideas with our students and in our classrooms. We each had our own focus. *(looks about to the room to see if there are other comments and then reads the next question)*

**Mary Elizabeth:** *(looks about to the room to see if there are other comments and then reads the next question)* What are your hopes for our future?

**Jason:** I think what the last group said in their presentation, I think it’s true for us. Even though we have been working together for a year, it wasn’t time enough to make a final decision about what inquiry looks like in each of our classrooms. The student responses to our teaching are—to be determined. I tried some new things this year. I haven’t been doing this long enough to say for sure, “Hey, this is the way I am going to keep teaching.”

**Rachel:** We were asked at the end of our presentation, “Do you plan to keep doing this, or was it just . . . ?” At first I didn’t understand the question she was asking us. Because to me, this is like a philosophy, a way of teaching. It is

---

48 Theme: Moving in the inquiry / living out questions
deeply embedded in my way of being. I don’t think I could honestly say that I just changed my philosophy. I can’t just stop.  

Kay nods.

Do you know what I mean? It’s a mindset. But maybe in high school it will be different; maybe I will feel differently next year.

Kay: But I like the way you put that: It's a mindset. So how could you change your mind about—

Rachel: I guess you could.

Kay: —I guess you could. Yeah, I guess you could.

Brandon: I have been playing around with inquiry-based methods since I started teaching. So I believe it is instilled in who you are. You are who you are and if you have done it forever it is just going to be part of your process.

Mary Elizabeth: Hearing you talk just now about your methods, your philosophies, styles, and mindsets reminds me how over the year you have all shared with us examples. You’ve shared aspects of your classroom structures, and the particulars of each of your classroom situations, as well as your philosophical orientations toward teaching.

Emma: I am looking forward to a summer project of looking back at all of our blog posts again.

Nods in agreement.

Brandon: They asked me if I wanted to be in the same inquiry group for next school year. I heard that we have first dibs if we want to come back.

Rachel: I want to.

All: Yes.

Abigail: I think our inquiry question is something that is naturally progressing. It is part of that circle. It wouldn’t be as if we were doing the same thing again.

Members of the group nod in agreement.

Theme: Moving in the inquiry / teaching philosophy

Theme: Possibilities / my situation
Emma: Will we have time to talk about fulfilling the course requirements if we want to get [continuing education] credit for this year?

Mary Elizabeth: Yes. Karla, the project co-director, will answer all your questions about the course requirements. I heard her say that if you want continuing education units for this cycle, your reflections are due on Monday. If you don’t need the credit for this cycle of continuing education credit requirements, then you have the first part of summer to finish up your written reflections and still receive CUEs but for the next cycle.

Rachel: (looks at her handwritten notes and then turns to Emma) For course credit, you need 48 hours of time logged on the time sheet related to your inquiry and the written reflections. Each hour of time logged needs to have some kind of corresponding documentation in the form of reflections or pictures or something. My Powerpoint® slides are almost done. I am going to link my Powerpoint® as my reflection. How are you all uploading images? Are you resizing them?

Kay: Oh, we have five minutes. We have to head back to the large group meeting room for end of the day announcements.

The group conversation dissolves into several smaller conversations about course requirements, questions about resizing and uploading images to group blog, continuing education credits, and summer plans.
After talking with teachers in the May 2010 group interview, I wanted to understand more about what Rachel called a shift in her thinking. “I feel like I have had this huge shift in my thinking,” she told us. “I feel like my brain has changed” (Rachel, transcript May 2010 group interview).

Each member of the group shared an example of what had been most important to them about their experience in the group. Recognizing significance in what teachers were sharing, April asked, “How are we going to pull all of this together?” (April, May 2010 group interview). The words “shift” (Rachel: shift in thinking) and “pull” (April: pull all of this together) are important. They refer to the moving, active nature of inquiry as a process in motion and under tension.51

The May 2010 group interview helped me to see that participants were sharing many types of shifts, not just shifts in thinking. For example, participants described shifts in their professional practice, and shifts in comfort level and the way they used technology. The phrase in my research question, “shifts in thinking,” broadly encompasses all of these types of shifts.

---

51 In Chapter 2, I discussed three theories that aid me in understanding and describing the moving, changing, shifting qualities of inquiry as a space and inform my analysis of teacher’s shifts in thinking. In Chapter 2, I elaborated Clandinin & Connelly’s (2000) three-dimensional narrative inquiry space by exploring actor-network theory (Fenwick & Edwards, 2010; 2012) and smooth and striated space (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987) as theories to further interpret the situational, relational, and interactive spaces of this research. Ellsworth’s (2005) knowledge in the making is also one of the conceptual tools that aid me in investigating emergent experiences.
Scene I, the May 2010 CIG meeting, is more than a way to introduce my analysis for shifts. It is also a vivid living picture of the context and setting of this research (see Chapter 3, Part IV for more descriptions and detailed accounts of the context of this study). The contextual backdrop is the collaborative inquiry group, which was organized as a professional learning community within the AETI program. Many of the things that teachers say in the May 2010 scene serve as contextual introduction to the background details and circumstances of our CIG meetings as situated within the AETI. There are many more issues raised in this scene than can be investigated within the scope of this dissertation (as is true with most of the extended scenes that I include in subsequent sections of this narrative inquiry). However, in each of the scenes that appear in this dissertation as interludes, I chose to leave as much contextual information intact as possible. I intentionally quote participants at length in this dissertation and I resisted cutting sections that could help the reader sense the situation and context where the participants’ stories were constructed. Leaving the participants’ voices intact is important to me as I try to recreate a sense of the three-dimensional narrative inquiry space for the reader (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000).

While adapting the group interview transcript into the script form of Scene I, May 2010 CIG Meeting and writing analytical notes as an interim text (a working draft of a storied retelling that aids in my interpretation of meaning), I looked backward and forward in time at narrative threads implicated by participants. In reading for inferences that indicate stories and meanings that emerged in other meetings and in other conversations (past or future), I engaged the “back and forthing” that Clandinin and
Connelly (2000) describe as important to moving in the three-dimensional narrative inquiry space of time, situation, and interaction.

Figure 4-1 is an example of a list I used to organize the themes that emerged in my analysis of the types of shifts that participants voiced in Scene I, *May 2010 CIG Meeting*. I compiled lists of concepts from the analytical notations (appearing as footnotes below the scene) as working drafts of ways that I might eventually present the group’s narratives to further elaborate ideas that participants mentioned in the May 2010 scene as critical events (relationships, experiences, ideas) in their own process of inquiry (Webster & Mertova, 2007). Figure 4-1 shows the themes in bulleted outline form as a nesting of overlapping and related themes and sub-themes.
o Changing interpretation in respect to one’s own teaching context:
  • *The how* in translation to one’s own teaching context
  • My situation: classroom, cart
  • Role of the teacher

o Moving in the inquiry:
  • Moving along with ideas through reflecting, sharing
  • Posing questions, living out questions
  • Feelings and emotions are shifting, comfort levels change
  • Sharing joys, struggles, challenges
  • Extending my teaching philosophy to action in my classroom

o Exploring possibilities of practice:
  • Hearing “different ways” from others
  • Process thinking
  • Digital technology implicated in ways of teaching
  • Experimenting / Trial and error / trying new approaches
  • Arranging the classroom to match inquiry as mode of learning

o Responding to student outcomes:
  • Teacher’s ways of inviting student feedback
  • Teacher’s experience of shift of power from expert to supporter
  • Students take ownership of art-making process
  • Student work is different from one another
  • Students able/free to exercise creativity
  • Student reflections indicate what part of the process was important to them

o Seeing relationships between ideas:
  • Teacher inquiry as professional learning and student inquiry learning
  • Overlapping spaces of teacher learning and student learning
  • Common and uncommon threads between group members
  • Ways of sharing ideas among CIG and to a broader audience

Figure 4-1. Interim text: Types of Shifts. Example of my analysis to locate themes that implicate types of *shifts in thinking* voiced by participants in May 2010 group interview and extending to other stories shared during 2009–2011.
After working with this set of concepts in a bulleted list format, which I compiled from color coded highlighted and underlined phrases that I hand coded in the transcripts, I looked for other ways of thinking through making that would help me develop my understanding of how the narratives were entangled with one another. I changed my way of working in text dense bulleted lists to working in my sketchbook. I was developing curvilinear and overlapping shapes as conceptual sketches to understand and synthesize how the stories that are correspondent to these May 2010 themes are interrelated, overlapping, interwoven, and entangled. Making these visual and textual research memos as interim texts helped me to see many configurations for the narratives as intertextures. This thinking-making of visual sketches was part of how I began to conceptualize the organization of this narrative inquiry dissertation using (a) the shifts that teachers indicated in the May 2010 scene and (b) the other narratives that extended forward and backward from the May 2010 scene as narrative lines of connection.

The following poem is a research memo that I wrote about my thinking about narratives as interwoven and as following narrative threads as a myriad of themes running through multiple stories. Participant April often called these themes “our common threads” (April, blog post, October 2011).
(research memo: Interweaving)

strands
transverse
cut between
skip over
and turn back

Our stories
narrative threads
frayed edges of ideas still forming
notions of teaching, not yet formed, are forming
becoming
experiences linked in an overlapping of independence
in sharing documentation
becoming interdependent

What are our common threads? (April asks)

Interweaving
is a way of thinking in community
it is the relationship between ideas when those ideas are shared among multiple interpreters

Interweaving is interpreting stories of teaching
in a complex network of professional learning
we called collaborative inquiry

***

Figures 4-2, 4-3, and 4-4 show examples of these thinking-making sketches as interim texts. Several of these images use overlapping or intersecting lines to show the relationships between ideas. I spent time thinking about narratives as threads that overlap,
interweave, and extend backward and forward in time. My research memos and drawings reflect this concept of narrative threads represented by lines.

Figure 4-2. Sketch. Mapping relationships between types of shifts from the May 2010 scene as connected to narratives over the two years.
Figure 4-3. Sketch of possible configuration of emergent themes as they extend and connect to more stories. May 2010 scene appears here as a central critical event. Additional stories extend to form clusters of narratives that might appear as grouped together in one chapter of the dissertation. *Narratives in groupings* is an idea that was precipitated by Craig’s (2007) story constellation method.
Figure 4-4. Exploring the fluid quality of narrative themes that intersect in more than one participants’ story. Research memos in background, water color thinking-making process exercise in foreground.

These and other research memos/sketches were part of my process in deciding the forms and configurations to utilize as I organize and re-tell participants’ stories of experience in the dissertation. The following three memos and sketches (see Figures 4-5 and 4-6) show my early analysis of the overlapping and intersecting themes. I
synthesized from ideas that participants shared about their individual experiences as teachers in the May 2010 scene. I then traced and identified them as being strongly related to ideas raised in our February 2010 CIG meeting (see also Chapter 5).

Figure 4-5. Interim text: Early analysis of themes that are implicated in participants’ stories about the document camera. The cluster on the right represents a grouping of narratives that share intersecting/overlapping ideas and belong to multiple participants.
Thus far, in this chapter, I have re-presented the May 2010 scene as an interpretive middle in this narrative inquiry and described how I understand this scene as a central critical event from which many narrative ideas extend forward and backward in time. A second purpose for including the May 2010 scene as an interlude immediately preceding Chapter 4, is to describe the contexts in which these stories are told—our collaborative inquiry group as related to the AETI program and each individual teacher’s classroom context. What follows is a description of the overlapping AETI and CIG
contexts, elaborating what participants described in the May 2010 scene about their experience working in a small collaborative inquiry group within the context of the AETI program.

**Contexts: Collaborative Inquiry Group, Arts Education Teacher Inquiry Program, and Teachers’ Classrooms as Overlapping Spaces for Teacher Inquiry**

In the May 2010 group interview, teachers reflected on their own learning. They also discussed how they were making sense of our CIG in respect to the other CIGs in the overarching context of the AETI program. In some ways, our group was reflecting on our experience by situating our CIG in respect to how the other CIGs were characterizing their group work in a program-wide presentation that had occurred earlier that morning.

*(May 2010 CIG meeting)*

**Jason:** It seemed like the other groups were acting in response to assignments. Yeah, it seemed like a reporting back to the group based on an assignment that was the same for each group member. Whereas we shared our experiences as they were tailored to us.

I considered omitting the sections in the May 2010 scene in which the teachers are discussing the other CIGs. I did not cut this dialogue, thus rendering it irrelevant, because the participants’ reflections (such as Jason’s above) about our CIG and the AETI experiences are important contextual information about the forum where they are sharing their ideas and co-constructing knowledge.

In the next three chapters, Chapters 5 through 7, I present narratives that elaborate the types of shifts that teachers shared with the collaborative inquiry group. I have grouped narratives together that further analyze and interpret participants’ shifts in
thinking as related to the ways that participants share documentation of their teaching. These groupings or narrative intertextures are narrative fragments that I bring together in dialogue with analytic and interpretive theoretical discussion. Scene II, *February 2010 CIG Meeting* sets the stage for discussion in Chapter 5.
Interlude

Scene II

February 2010 CIG Meeting: Shifts in Teachers’ Role(s)

A short segment from our February 16, 2010 collaborative inquiry group meeting, which took place in a web-based conference with text, voice/audio chat. Rachel, Kay, and Brandon tell about their recent teaching experiences.

(speaking about her elementary art classroom)

Rachel: The camera and projector have become a part of our classroom. I rearranged the room so everything feels really fresh and new. When I am sitting at the desk with the Ladybug document camera, I feel like I am part of the class instead of standing in front of the room and feeling like I’m above everyone. What I started to get a sense of is that it is freeing up a lot of my energy so that—um. It is kind of hard for me to put into words but—A lot of the energy I was using, being up in front of the room, and putting on a show so to speak, is now—I am not doing that! I don’t need to do that.

Kay (via text chat): Being on stage

Rachel (continuing): It doesn’t seem as important now to do that, and for that reason, I feel like I am part of the class.

Kay: I feel the same way about [the document camera]. It’s almost like having another you—almost a little surrogate you. You know, that can extend the energy to give the information that you need to give and keep everybody’s attention.

Rachel (via text chat): an avatar!

Kay: Yeah, it is almost like the difference between being on stage. You know, you have all this energy to spend keeping attention, and transmitting what you are trying to transmit. And sometimes the example is small and they can’t see really well. You have to put a lot of energy into that to translate it to the students.

Mary Elizabeth: It does make a lot of sense to me. Being an elementary art teacher, I relate to what you are saying about being “freed up.” You know, there was a lot of energy, on the days that I was presenting or presenting a new idea, it was a bit of—as Kay says—it’s like being on stage or performing. I often thought of that. I think it is interesting to hear that this device might downplay the role of the teacher in some ways and then maybe in that sense—what I hear you
saying is that it might leave room for other things to happen that weren’t
happening before. Rachel, are you thinking of the idea of an avatar like the movie
or were you thinking of more like what Brandon was showing us last fall with
creating the Voki® web app avatars?

Rachel: I haven’t seen the movie [Avatar] yet... I think my
understanding of an avatar is another you that can do superhuman things or things
that you wouldn’t be able to do, so I guess that is why I shouted out, avatar!

Brandon (via text chat): Enhances the teacher’s role

Brandon: Yeah, I believe that it enhances the teacher’s role. I don’t think
that it necessarily downplays it as much. I think it gives you the freedom to be
more explorative, more energetic. I believe that Rachel and Kay were both talking
about the fact that it helps you feel better about what you're doing. I think it is a
great way to enhance what you are doing as a teacher. My students are working
on an inquiry-based collaborative group sculpture project that they are designing
together. I am moving from teacher to moderator. As the moderator, I step back
before I intervene. My students are starting to come up with ways to dictate their
own roles in the classroom. It is very interesting to see. It is also very strange for a
teacher to sit back and watch.

Mary Elizabeth: Have any of you experimented with the recording and
playback capabilities? Rachel said that the students wanted to replay the demo
video. Can you explain to me how that works?

Rachel: Well, if you are demonstrating anything that is a little bit
complicated, then it can just be watched as many times as they need to watch it to
grasp what you are doing. Also, the kids drawing or making something under the
[video] capture—their work is being captured and played back. I show students a
technique with a demonstration. They say, “Don’t forget to record this!” They
want to watch it over and over. They want to try and draw something, record it,
and then watch themselves doing it. They are excited about that.

I think there is more. We have discussed stop motion animation and things
like that. The older kids want to do more inquiry about how we can use the
camera to create. I have the art and math inquiry lessons recorded, and I also have
video of the kids talking about it, I have images of their finished work, which is
very exciting because so many of [the students’ artworks] are different from each
other, and their reflection that they wrote about it. I documented all of that. I just
haven't found a good way to put it all together to share with everyone. Kay’s
Wikispaces® [web site] is so excellent, and I want to have something like that. I
just really think it is amazing what she is doing in the direction she's going with it.

Kay (via text chat): Thank you! I would be happy to help you make a
wiki. I feel like it's always a work in progress
Chapter 5

Shifting Enactments of Teaching in Stories of Using a Document Camera

The narratives in this chapter are participants’ stories that indicate shifts in thinking about teaching and learning. These stories were shared among our collaborative inquiry group as we studied the possibilities of teaching practice. Participants told about shared enactments with digital technologies as influential in their explorations of teaching and learning. Actor-network theory assists in my analysis of teachers’ stories in ways that demonstrate the relationships between human and non-human entities in educational settings (Boylan, 2010; Fenwick & Edwards, 2010, 2012; Waltz, 2004).

I assemble the narratives in this chapter as a way of thinking about the interconnections that form between human and non-human entities. Actor-network theory lends understanding to how objects and humans are part of a shared set of shifts, or active translations that can occur between human and non-human entities. Participants’ narratives show how their pedagogical approaches were shifting in relation to material objects including the document camera,\textsuperscript{52} projector, tables, chairs, desks, artwork, and videos.

\textsuperscript{52} A document camera is a tabletop camera that captures an image and sends a live digital signal of that image to a projector. Typically, the image is projected on the wall in a live feed. The brand “Ladybug” is a document camera with a flexible gooseneck and the ability to capture and store still images, sound, and video for playback or editing. It is called a document camera because one of its intended uses is to project the pages of a book or other document large enough for an audience to see.
The conversation in Scene II, *February 2010 CIG Meeting* (that appears as an interlude directly preceding this chapter), occurred between Rachel, Kay, Brandon and I after I asked if they had used their new document camera with their students. Kay and Rachel were sharing stories about the set-up and use of their new document camera.\(^{53}\) Brandon had a document camera and projector his classroom prior to AETI and was already using them.

**Talking About the Document Camera Reveals a Sense of Shifting**

As the four of us talked about the document camera and its various functions as a device, I learned more about how Rachel, Kay, and Brandon viewed themselves as teachers and how they sensed that their teaching roles were shifting, moving, or in flux. Listening to the ways that participants used their teaching tools and physical teaching spaces, and the stories they told of their experience, enabled members of our CIG to learn more about how they were thinking about their pedagogical approaches. This meeting was typical of our CIG meetings, talking about teaching, telling stories of experience, and making plans to try new approaches.

During the February 2010 CIG meeting, teachers’ sharing focused on the document camera device. While we were indeed talking about the uses, design, capability and functions of the device, the conversation also indicated the meanings of the device,

---

\(^{53}\) AETI purchased the document camera and other technological tools with grant money for participants to use in their classroom settings and to become the property of the school district. AETI did not prescribe how the tools should be used other than to assist in teaching and learning.
roles of the teacher, and the meaning and feeling of teaching as shifting or being in motion.

“Moving from Teacher to Moderator”

For example, Brandon, a high school art teacher, told us how he was “moving from teacher to moderator” as part of his effort to support students in creating a large scale sculpture that they were designing largely without his explicit direction as a typical assignment. Brandon shared photographs and chronicled on our group blog the development of this life size sculpture of a popular rock star as it was initiated by students and supported by Brandon.

In the Scene II, February 2010, Brandon shares his exploration of ways to decenter his role as teacher and foster student ownership for the development of their own art projects. He explains, “As the moderator, I step back before I intervene. My students are starting to come up with ways to dictate their own roles in the classroom. It is very interesting to see. It is also very strange for a teacher to sit back and watch” (Brandon, February 2010 CIG meeting transcript, lines 58-59).

Shifting Role(s) of Teacher: Performative/Energetic/Listener/Moderator

Indications of decentering or shifting the role(s) of the teacher are an important theme in this February 2010 scene. Rachel and Kay referred to being “on stage” as they teach. Rachel described her role of teacher as shifting from “being up in front” feeling as
though she is “above everyone” and “putting on a show,” to sitting and feeling “part of the class.” She described moving the furniture around in the classroom to place the document camera at the center. Kay echoed Rachel’s reflections and described the energy that it takes “being on stage” to “transmit” ideas to students. For Kay, the document camera seemed to “extend the energy to give the information that you need to give and keep everybody’s attention.”

As I listened and participated in this conversation in February 2010, I saw in my mind’s eye a cartoon-like animation in which the document camera in Rachel’s classroom was assuming visible characteristics of Rachel, the performative and energetic elementary art teacher, on her behalf so that Rachel could then take on a different role. Rachel’s emerging role, which she said was made possible by the document camera, was one that allowed her to be with and among her students, engaging with them in a new way. Her shifting interactions with her students were allowing her to worry less about transmission of knowledge and act in ways that were more responsive to listening and thoughtful responding (research memo, February 2010).

I see this shifting, as related to what theorists in material semiotics and actor-network theory call translation. Translation is a mutual shifting. It is not a resolute unidirectional shift that occurs in a move from one human state to another, from human to device, or device to human. Rather, it is a mutual enactment in which the document camera is acting on the human and the human is acting on the document camera in an active translation (Boylan, 2010). ANT analysis raises awareness of this “process of reciprocal definition” when human and device are acting on one another (Akrich, 1992, p. 222). This translation happens when “entities, human and non-human, come together and
connect, changing one another to form links... Entities that connect eventually form a chain or network of action and things” (Fenwick & Edwards, 2010, p. 9).

The pedagogical and embodied shift that Rachel and Kay describe (see lines 7-31 in February 2010 scene) is one shared and transferred between the document camera and the teacher. Listening to Rachel and Kay’s descriptions of their relationship to the document camera we also learn the way that Kay and Rachel view themselves in relation to the network of relations in their classroom context (including Rachel rearranging the classroom furniture to make way for something new). The materiality of this shifting is enacted not only by the teacher and the camera but by a networked assemblage of the physical context that is the classroom space, complete with tables, chairs, camera, projector, projection screen, power cord, power outlet, art example, video image, teacher, students, etc.

Adopting the ANT sensibility of symmetry and translation, I interpret Rachel and Kay’s exploration of the functionality and role of the document camera as mirroring their own exploration of pedagogical shifts as relative to three contexts where they are studying their own teaching: their local teaching sites, the shared context of the CIG as a place of learning and sharing among arts education colleagues, and the context of the AETI project, which provided the funding to purchase the document cameras.

I created an interim text in the form of a multivocal found poem (Figure 5-1), performed in three voices, which I constructed directly from the February 2010 CIG meeting transcript. I arranged exact words and phrases spoken by Rachel, Kay, and Brandon to construct this found poem. It describes and synthesizes my analysis of teachers’ narratives of experience that explored the idea of networked interaction and
translation of digital and human entities in a classroom environment in February 2010. Each entity is linked. “At each of these connections, one entity has worked upon another to translate or change it to become part of a collective or network of coordinated things and actions” (Fenwick & Edwards, 2010, p. 9).

I rearranged the room
Now sitting with the document camera
I am part of the class
Freeing up my energy

No longer putting on a show, being on stage
You can extend the energy
Keep everybody's attention
A surrogate you

An avatar!

Transmitting
Translating to students
Performing

I am more explorative
Moving from teacher to moderator
I step back before I intervene
Strange to sit back and watch

____________________________________________
Figure 5-1 Found Poem. Document Camera as Avatar.

This poem in three voices speaks from teachers’ perspectives about their unique teaching spaces. The found poem is a fitting literary form to describe an intertwined
network in which teachers are working together, building ideas with one another in a
group meeting to share and interpret their experiences in relation and in response to one
another.

In our February 2010 meeting, I listened and engaged with this emerging
conversation with genuine interest in the way Kay and Rachel were theorizing the
performative qualities of teaching in respect to their own embodied feelings of “energy”
that now seemed to be shared with their teaching body and the document camera as
embodied surrogate or avatar (Rachel and Kay, Scene II, February 2010 CIG meeting,
lines 7-31). Listening to Kay and Rachel describe their first impressions in using the
document camera as part of their teaching explorations (February 2010 CIG meeting,
lines 7-31), I interpreted the conversation as more than a re-telling of their past
experience using the document camera. I also heard them building on each other’s ideas,
together constructing a possible new future where the document camera could have the
potential to downplay or shift the role of the teacher and refocus on student work or
student ideas. It seemed from their description that the document camera was at that time
automating the sage on the stage vision of the teacher’s role. I wondered in February
2010 if the document camera would stabilize as a stand-in for the sage on the stage and/or
if Kay and Rachel would be free to assume new roles such as being part of the class in a
different way, as a participant and a listener (guide on the side).

This was my line of thinking when I asked the group about this idea of
“downplay[ing]” the role of teacher in the meeting (Scene II, February 2010, line 37).
Brandon responded suggesting that the document camera was from his perspective,
enhancing his role as teacher rather than downplaying it (lines 48, 51). He then explained
that he was trying on a new role as teacher-moderator. He describes this shift by saying, “I step back before I intervene” and that it feels “strange to sit back and watch” when students are beginning to “dictate their own roles in the classroom” (Brandon, Scene II: February 2010, lines 56-59).

At the close of this February meeting I wondered if the document camera was just another mechanism to emphasize teacher-centered instruction. Perhaps the document camera was a tool for extending teacher-directed action, thus re-inscribing the role of teacher as performer, center of the classroom, and transmitter of knowledge. Knowing that teachers in our group were working together to find ways to emphasize student participation in their classrooms through method of inquiry-based learning, I wondered if the document camera might also be part of a network of enacting change in the classroom so that students’ perspectives and energy could be amplified.

I held a few questions in my mind and in my research memos so that I might follow the emerging narrative threads that we were weaving together at this meeting: “Document camera as avatar shifting the teacher’s energy and role—but how? And what about students? Do students have access to this new digital technology as well? Are teachers going to use technology to support their intentions to support student-led learning?” (Research memo, February 2010).

Digital Technology Supports the Enactment of a Teaching Philosophy

*(in semi-structured interview, March 2011).*

**Rachel:** The technology—I can’t underemphasize it. I feel like through the technology that I received and am now using, I’m so much better able to pursue
this line of this philosophy, this way of teaching. I think that the technology is supporting it, helping to create that environment that supports students in their independence, and helping them to see themselves as artists.

Rachel and I sat together afterschool in her high school art classroom in March 2011, more than a year after the February 2010 CIG meeting. She was looking back on the previous two years of time with our CIG. Rachel cited the digital technology as one of the factors most influential to her as she aligned her teaching practice with her long-held philosophy of supporting the child-artist as her first priority as an art educator. Rachel spoke emphatically about the role of technology as part of her network of interaction that she implicated in helping to create her current classroom environment. Looking back, the document camera and related technologies became a focus of many of our CIG discussions.

In January 2011, during our second year of inquiry as a CIG, Rachel cited the document camera in a lengthy description of her shifting from a teaching approach that was focused on skills and techniques to one that emphasizes the opportunities for students to build on what they know and develop in a sense of exploratory freedom using non-traditional media and symbolic representation (see Scene IV, January 2011, Chapter 7). Four art teacher members of our group (Rachel, Kay, Jason, Emma) were using a document camera and projector as part of the way they were exploring our CIG theme of inquiry into teaching and learning.54

Brandon (also an art teacher) was focusing his attention on exploring the technological functions and pedagogical uses of a new pocketsize digital video camera he purchased with AETI grant funding. His classroom had already been equipped with a document camera and thus it was not new to his practice and classroom environment. April and Abigail, the two music teachers in our group purchased digital audio recording devices.

54 Brandon (also an art teacher) was focusing his attention on exploring the technological functions and pedagogical uses of a new pocketsize digital video camera he purchased with AETI grant funding. His classroom had already been equipped with a document camera and thus it was not new to his practice and classroom environment. April and Abigail, the two music teachers in our group purchased digital audio recording devices.
Sharing New Ideas

Jason, a high school art teacher, who was not present at our February 2010 meeting, brought a movie to our March 2010 CIG meeting that he created after receiving his new document camera and projector. He explained how he made a movie to use as a demonstration tool for his *Foundations in Art* class. He enthusiastically shared with our group how he used the still-image-capture function on the document camera to create a time-lapse drawing of the evolving stages of his demo pastel drawing.

(*March 2010 CIG Meeting*)

**Jason:** Students and I were talking about the effects of light on an object. So I drew an example underneath the document camera—a picture of a football player. The camera captured a picture every three seconds while I drew. (*gesturing a repeated blinking action with both hands—fingers open and closed*). Later, I played the sequence back for them in a loop.

**Kay:** Oh, it captures every three seconds?

**Mary Elizabeth:** I didn’t know it could do that.

**Jason:** Yeah, the document camera can automatically take a picture at times and there are speeds that you can set. And when you fast-forward the playback, you get this! (*making an adjustment to DVD player—the series of still images plays in rapid succession showing the drawing as it becomes progressively more complete.*) I made the pastel drawing from the ground up and captured a photo every 3 seconds. When you play the still pictures in fast-forward, you can see how the drawing develops—like a time-lapse movie.

After our CIG learned more from Jason and one another about the technical specifications\(^{55}\) of the document camera and its capacity to create stop-motion movies,

\(^{55}\) The discussion of these technical specifications included the use of the photo and video capture modes. The group also talked about peripheral devices and software needed including memory cards, external hard drive, movie editing software, movie formats including file encoding, and DVD rendering.
we moved into a discussion of possible futures for the ideas that Jason presented. For our group, envisioning possible futures and seeing possibilities was often a process of listening to a story or series of stories as a retelling of the events of one teacher’s teaching and learning experience. We were simultaneously inspired to think of pedagogical implications and brainstorming new situations where this approach or a different approach could be useful.

(March 2010 CIG Meeting)

Brandon: My software is older than yours but you should be able to do a lot of different things with the software that came with your camera.

Jason: I haven’t loaded the software yet. But, students and I got this idea that we could start doing some stop-motion animation things with this document camera.

Mary Elizabeth: Yes, you could! That’s a neat idea. I’ll bet your students were really into this.

Jason: Yeah, the kids were amazed! They kept looking up, making sure they were doing stuff right. If they couldn’t get the right effect, they would watch it for a few minutes. I am addicted now.

Brandon: (with enthusiasm) That would also be really useful if you were teaching something like calligraphy which needs to be taught in a series of steps that build on one another and is hard for students to see because it is so small.

Jason: Yeah. That reminds me, we are planning a large-scale mosaic. And I thought that I could use the doc cam to show the process of it, a time-lapse video. And show it when we are unveiling the wall mosaic—have a video there at the unveiling.

Brandon: (talking faster) That would be really good! We have an art show where we have the music department play, we have the drama department do skits, we have people doing comedy, and I have a big display out in front of the auditorium of artwork. That would be cool to have a video for the public to look at to see what has been happening in art. And—awesome pastel drawing, by the way.

Jason: Thanks.
Jason described how he was using the document camera to create moving images of drawing demonstrations created from a series of time-lapse photos, Brandon and Jason began to imagine more uses for the document camera. Their rate of speech quickened in an animated conversation about the various possibilities for using the document camera in new situations, seeing possible futures for the document camera in new situations. Jason suggested that it could be helpful to generate a video that showed the in-process stages of completing a large-scale mosaic for a public unveiling event. Brandon suggested that replaying the time-lapse footage is one way to show “what has been happening” in the art studio classroom at an art show where typically only finished artwork is on display.

**Documenting Classroom Processes “As it Happens”**

The time-lapse video recording that Jason made documented a gradual change in his pastel drawing—from the early stages of an undeveloped sketch to the complete detailed and shaded portrait. The video he made was interesting as an artwork on its own. In response to watching this video, Kay remarked about the value of art as it is in-process, saying that she liked to see Jason’s drawing “as it happens.” The phrases, “what has been happening” (Brandon) and “as it happens” (Kay) are indications that teachers are interested in documenting the *processes* of art education.
(March 2010 CIG Meeting)

Kay: (to Jason) It is so neat to see your drawing as it happens.

Mary Elizabeth: What a good idea. It’s almost a work of art by itself. I mean we know the purpose is to demonstrate the drawing process, pastel technique, shading and highlighting, but I mean this [video] is beautiful and interesting to watch in itself.

Jason: Have you ever been to the Mattress Factory museum? There was an artist—you know how they rent the rooms to the individual artists in residence? There was an artist and all he did was paint the floor of that room. And he would have one of these cameras overhead and every three seconds it would take a picture. And then he would paint back over top of the floor again and again. And when you went into the museum, his museum display was the video of him changing that floor over and over again.

The story that Jason tells about the artist creating a video artifact of a work of art that was about change processes, is an allegory for how the group was beginning to think of documenting teaching and learning processes “as it happens” (Kay, March 2010). These excerpts of the March 2010 CIG meeting show a shifting that occurred in the conversation of group members who were initially learning about the functional characteristics and technical specifications of an unfamiliar digital object. Later, their conversation shifted to co-constructing flexible, malleable, and interpretive functions (Waltz, 2004) for the document camera and its moving images in future situations. Group members then envisioned the document camera in new contexts such as the (a) public unveiling of a mural, (b) a school-wide performing arts showcase where the visual arts are under-represented, or (c) as an artifact displayed by a museum to stand in for a fleeting change-process that was a temporal event occurring “as it happens.”
Shifting Methods of Demonstrating Drawing Techniques

One month after sharing his stop motion video, Jason reflected about his use of the document camera as it had “changed some of his approaches” (Jason, video reflection, April 2010).

*(speaking in a self-recorded video reflection, April 2010)*

**Jason:** The online resources and the technology that I have accumulated during my time here with AETI have changed some of my approaches to classroom management. It has kind of changed my classroom atmosphere a little bit and the way my room looks. I think the biggest use—the biggest technology advancement that I have had is the use of the document camera for demonstrations and animations. We use it to enlarge images. What used to be a group of students gathered around a table watching me demonstrate a specific technique or medium that they would only get to see once, has now become a stop-animation video that is recorded and can be looped for use during the entire project. It can be shown on the big screen during the entire class period. That recorded demonstration [is one that] I can also use for future classes, which is nice for organization.

Here, Jason describes a shift from one teacher-demonstration approach occurring with students gathered around the teacher, to a teacher-generated video that is looping and available to students as needed while they work through various stages in the project. He describes his first exploration of the document camera as a tool that he used to shift from one teacher-centered version of a demonstration to another iteration of teacher-centered demonstration. Students now have the ability to pause the video or return to a previous segment and watch it again. The digital version of the demo helps students to have more control of the pace and repetitions they see of the skills that Jason is showing. Jason shares how students are beginning to think of the process of documenting art making *as it happens* as an interesting medium and idea worth exploring further in their own work. Jason expressed that after working with our CIG in the context of AETI, he is
more open to inviting students to propose new projects that utilize new media technology in ways that he had not previously considered.

*(speaking in a self-recorded video reflection, April 2010)*

**Jason (continuing):** My high tech demonstrations have also planted a seed for some of my advanced art students to start developing ideas for their own stop animation projects. Currently, students are driven to create a short film using clay animation. They are using the document camera along with Movie Maker® which is another resource I was not familiar with until my CIG introduced it to me. I am seeing possibilities for student-directed learning through these tech tools that students now have at their disposal.

Now that Jason has familiarized himself with the still-capture function of the camera and demonstrated this to students, he is “seeing possibilities” for ways that students can begin using the technology. He notes that they are interested in creating short films in response to seeing his stop motion demonstration video. *(Jason, video blog reflection, April 2010).*

*Seeing possibilities* is a term that I used in my analysis of teachers’ stories as one description of the ways they indicated shifts in their thinking. Kay told us in the May 2010 group meeting that our CIG helped her to *see possibilities* for the document camera as a tool that had significance to her teaching beyond its obvious function as a tool to aid in teacher demonstrations. I elaborate Kay’s story of her shift in thinking about the document camera as more than a demonstration tool in the next section.

**Possibilities for Document Camera as More than a Demonstration Tool**

In our May 2010 group interview *(see Scene I, which appears as an interlude preceding Chapter 5)*, I asked the group if they could think back over the year and name
an important time in our group’s past, one that influenced their thinking. Kay recalled the way that Brandon helped her to start thinking of the document camera as more than just a “demonstration tool” (Kay, May 2010 group interview, lines 69-74).

When Kay cited this meeting event as a critical event (Webster & Mertova, 2007), one that influenced her thinking, I retraced individual participant’s stories about the document camera. In doing so, I learned that the way she told about the use of the camera also indicated how she was conceptualizing her teaching and the way her students were responding to her efforts. Kay’s reflection about the importance of the document camera is one of the reasons I have focused my attention on analyzing participants’ narratives that involved the document camera. Following Webster and Mertova’s (2007) critical event narrative inquiry method, I critical events to help me assemble groupings of stories that were of importance to participants. Periodically, I asked participants to reflect with me about past events and experiences that were important to them.

This meeting, which Kay told us was so influential to her, took place in December 2010. Brandon, a high school art teacher, shared with the group his various methods for using the document camera. It was this early conversation and several follow-up questions about the capabilities of the document camera that seemed to inspire many of the members of our group to select the document camera for purchase with their digital technology grant funds.

(talking in CIG meeting)

**Brandon:** They way I teach is, I am trying to guide the students to push the boundaries, or oppose my definitions. I’m not training them to be artists, I am training them to think differently. . . . Art is about perception and about an awareness of what is going on.
He explained that there were many ways to use the camera and that he sometimes turned it onto his class and projected their image on the large screen in order to raise their awareness of the idea that art is an experience. After this meeting, all of the art teachers decided to purchase a document camera for use in their classroom.

The document camera as a tool is not the focus of this research. However, the document camera is one of many objects that became an important entity in our group’s exploration of processes, practice, and thinking in respect to teaching and learning. I continue this chapter with narratives from several teachers’ experiences that indicate how non-human objects, digital tools, and classroom spaces are implicated in they way teachers document and share their shifts in thinking about teaching and learning.

In the Scene II, *February 2010 CIG Meeting* (the extended scene that precedes this chapter as an interlude) it seemed that the document camera was, in Kay’s view, redistributing the role and energy of teacher as the center of classroom processes. Kay posted on her wiki site the way that the document camera was beginning to function as a tool to amplify the voices, experiences, and energy of students. What follows are Kay’s descriptions of the document camera as “more than a demonstration tool,” which was a concept that she said was very important to her. Kay posted a reflection and two photographs on our blog (see Figures 5-2 and 5-3) that explain more about how students were using the document camera.
Kay: I've been using the Ladybug [document camera] in many of my classes this week. Today, with kindergarten students, we explored how you can use shapes to construct objects. I began with paper shapes, and rearranged them to make simple images, like a house. Then students took turns making images with the Ladybug before working on their own artworks. Then, as students completed collages, they shared them with the class using the Ladybug. Third grade explored ways to use watercolors on watercolor paper. I introduced the subject with a brief demonstration, and then students explored on their own. They were so excited to share their discoveries with the class.
Figure 5-2. A student using the document camera to project a large image of a paper sculpture during art class. Photograph taken by Kay and posted in her February 2010 blog post.
Figure 5-3. A student using the document camera to project a large image of the manipulation of paper shapes. Photograph taken by Kay and posted in her February 2010 blog post.
In her blog posts, Kay describes the document camera in respect to teacher and student demonstrations. Hours following our February 2010 CIG meeting in which we discussed the performance, the avatar, and the teacher’s energy, Kay added the following comment below her blog post. Here, she tells more about the episode she shared briefly during our CIG meeting about her third grade class’s use of the camera.

(comment posted below Kay’s own blog post February 2010)

Kay: One of the really interesting things to witness was how the class began collaborating in discovery learning using the document camera. They shared their individual discovery, which might prompt another line of inquiry by another student, and their results are then shared with the class. There certainly wasn't enough time for this to be exhausted!

In Kay’s account of her students’ experiences, the document camera served as part of a system of visual amplification of students’ ideas that was propelled by a particular way of thinking that Kay calls a “line of inquiry” (Kay, blog comment, February 2010). It is here that Kay shares how the document camera is more than a tool to help a teacher enlarge a demonstration or a set of directions that students are to follow (Rachel and Kay, February 2010 CIG meeting; Jason, April 2010 video reflection). The way Kay begins to use the document camera in late February and March of 2010 indicates her effort toward facilitating opportunities for students to develop inquiries into art-making that occur because they are being supported by Kay in “collaborating in discovery learning” (Kay, blog comment, February 2010). Kay continued to post on this topic in the weeks and months following including adding photos and video of her use of the document camera. These posts linked her use of the technology tools to her pedagogical goals, as well as her observations about her own teaching explorations.
I noticed how many ways participants and I began to engage in communication and idea-sharing in February 2010. We held a web conference meeting in which each teacher could log in to a private “room” and use voice chat, text chat, and screen share. We recorded that meeting and made the link to the recording available to all members. April, who wasn't able to attend the meeting, listened to the audio recording and then posted a long and thoughtful blog post in response to the ideas that we discussed and the questions we posed. Kay was able to continue the conversation from our meeting and blog in response to the discussion about the document camera. Seeing the time stamp on her follow-up blog comment caused me to think that our conversation had prompted her to add more detail about the document camera as a tool for students’ “discovery learning.”

**Shifts from Teacher Demonstration as Direct Instruction to Methods of Empowering Student Choice, Student Decision-Making, and Student Ownership**

In the following section I continue to trace the narratives that build on those already storied in this chapter surrounding one broad theme that emerged in the two years of data collection: “shifting interpretations about one’s teaching context.” Through this theme, I explore how Kay reflected on ways that she and her students documented shifts in their classroom. Kay’s blog posts document her shifting from a method of teaching where the teacher is the center of direct instruction, to methods where students are leading the learning experiences and the teacher is supporting and guiding. It is through Kay’s photographs of her classroom, blog posts, and the stories she tells about her experiences teaching that our group was able to learn from her. Following the story as it
unfolds in Kay’s written reflections, I retell Kay’s stories, focusing in particular on the ways that Kay described her moving toward and adopting pedagogical approaches that empowered student choice, student decision-making, and student ownership.

Kay wrote frequently in her blog and wiki chronicles about empowering her students to find “increased democracy and self-awareness” (Kay, April 2010) in their studio art classroom. She presented these ideas at a national education conference, which I attended, about how her “students learn more, and learn more about their own learning, when they are involved in the process of assessment” (Kay, national conference presentation, April 2010). Kay wrote several blog posts about how her approaches to assessment of student learning had shifted in response to her interest in issues of student choice. For example, she posted an image to the blog to show an image of the whiteboard in classroom she and students were co-constructing a visual mind map during class time as a way to invite them to take ownership of developing method to evaluate artwork in their art portfolio (Figure 5-4).
Over the 2009-2010 school year, she wrote several entries on her wiki and our group blog about how her students were using various digital technologies, including the document camera, as a way to support sharing ideas and artwork, as well as supporting students in evaluating their work and their learning. She reflected on her conference presentation, which she presented in a narrative style, telling the story of how her thinking had evolved: “The story unfolds when students take ownership” (Kay, wiki entry, April 2011). Kay describes shifts in her teaching that help students take ownership
of their learning through choice making, responding to open ended questions, and taking active roles in assessing their learning.

Kay chronicled her “experimenting with choice-based art education” (Kay, blog post, November 2009) in ways that generated a lot of interest among other group members. Rachel wrote in response to one of her blog posts, “I so want to visit your classroom!” (Rachel, blog comment, February 2010). In March of 2010, Rachel, Kay and I arranged to meet together in Kay’s art classroom after school to talk about our CIG work. Both Rachel and I were particularly interested in seeing how Kay had set up her classroom in learning centers and the way she was changing the format of her classes according to what she was reading about teaching for artistic behavior and choice-based art education.

The day of our visit in March, first grade students lined up behind the document camera near the end of art class time. They were taking turns showing their work. As students placed their artwork under the camera, the enlarged image was projected onto the classroom wall. I remember one student standing by the camera with a big smile. The student pointed, telling the class the steps he developed to create a red fox with a movable tail. He described the process of locating an image of a fox in a book and

---

56 I met with each CIG member in their teaching context at least once with the exception of Emma. The focus of each of these meetings was a semi-structured interview. I did not intent or need to observe teachers teaching. However sometimes, teachers invited me to their classroom during the school day. When I was on-site in classrooms I was thinking of my role as CIG facilitator and visitor, and not a researcher systematically collecting data in the school/classroom setting. This meeting with Kay and Rachel was the only time that another member of our group and I met together in a group member’s classroom. Rachel wanted to see for herself what Kay had been writing about and Rachel taught in the same school district as Kay so it was a short drive. Other CIG members lived and worked much farther from one another.
selecting shapes to recreate it out of paper. Looking up at the huge projection of his fox shining on the wall, he spoke in a clear voice, comparing this fox to the squirrel that he created. Kay asked him some additional questions about his work and the way he was thinking about how his two animals were related but not the same. He responded with more details about his thinking process and the decisions that he made during the class that led to the fox and the squirrel with the moveable tails. Some children looked up, interested to see his fox and listen to his description, while other children worked hurriedly to finish their own work and dash into the line of students waiting at the document camera to show and talk about their work.

My own description of Kay’s classroom and Kay’s blog posts shows the overlapping spaces of my narrative inquiry dissertation, the shared study of the CIG meeting space, and Kay’s inquiry into her own teaching practice in her individual classroom space. The main focus of this dissertation research project is the stories and documentation teachers like Kay shared in the forum of the CIG meeting and blog that describe shifts in thinking and practice related to teaching and learning. The focus is not on my validation or verification of their re-presentations of teaching through my own direct observation as triangulation. Although direct observation of teachers in the classroom was not part of the research design for this study, this visit to Kay’s classroom and seeing her in her teaching context added to my understanding and appreciation of what Kay was doing in her classroom that spring. I appreciated seeing how she was making way for students to voice their discoveries and share their learning after engaging into an open-ended inquiry into the shared characteristics of animals.
Kay wrote on the blog about her approach to the first grade lesson unit. She described the engaging open-ended question prompts that she developed for this lesson:

*(blog post, March 2010)*

**Kay:** Questions in the classroom. A new approach this week has turned out to be very interesting. As a result of our [AETI] inquiry process and my work with our artist-in-residence, I tried guiding a class with a question. In this case, they were derived from big ideas in the science curriculum. One was, “How can we create two animals that are related, but not the same?” and the other was “How can we create an animal in its habitat?” These questions were followed by lively discussion in large and small groups, research using library books, and individual creations. Students shared their works and the stories behind them using the document camera as a closing (assessment) activity.

I am going to try this again next week and document the process and results. It is becoming very obvious to me how important documentation is for this and similar approaches to teaching. It truly does make the learning visible! My next questions include “How can we as artists increase awareness of environmental issues?” (My plan of approach: ask question, discuss. Break into small groups, who respond using sticky notes under the document camera, and discuss. Then view and discuss related works by contemporary artists).

In this blog post, Kay describes the student sharing at the end of the class as a “closing assessment activity” *(blog post, March 2010).* She also makes plans for a future class in which students will use the document camera to share responses to an open-ended question. Kay reflects on a “new approach,” a process of guiding the class with a question “derived from big ideas” *(Kay, March 2010).* Kay’s shift from demonstrating what she wanted her students to do or make during the art class period to the approach of posing rich and engaging questions and inviting students to join her in an investigation is evident in this blog post. She remarks that her planning and preparation for teaching is
informed by the documentation that she generates about the “process and results” (Kay, March 2010).

After school on the day of my visit in March, Kay, Rachel, and I talked about the possible ways to evaluate student learning in response to an open-ended question. Kay emphasized the importance of understanding the choices students were making about selecting art materials and techniques that would support the idea they were developing in response to Kay’s carefully crafted open-ended questions.57

These open-ended questions, Kay explained, were important because they were focused in a way that motivated students and helped them to use their time in art class as an investigation or inquiry rather than to follow directions and create a copy of Kay’s teacher example/art work. Kay explained two classroom environments for studio practice and her shift toward empowering students’ choice-making. She described how they were two extremes on a “continuum of choice” (Kay, March 2010). Kay referred to a paper handout of a diagram that she had brought to one of our recent CIG meetings58. The diagram depicted, on one extreme, how art class could be a free period with so many choices that students felt overwhelmed. On the other extreme, there would no choices for students to make because they were executing a fully teacher-directed lesson in which

57 Abigail also wrote in her blog posts about the significance of “the question” in her own professional inquiry into teaching and as a method of facilitating student inquiry. See Appendix C to read this blog post and the accompanying visual documentation that Abigail made to share with our group in May of 2011. I noticed that many teachers wrote about the importance of open-ended questioning and inviting students to pose questions as part of their shift in thinking about teaching approaches that might facilitate student choice and inquiry.

58 This diagram was one of the resources she was using from the Teaching for Artistic Behavior website: http://teachingforartisticbehavior.org/CONTINUUM%20OF%20CHOICE%20chart%20b&W.pdf
students would follow a series of steps demonstrated by the teacher to create a piece of artwork that matched the teacher’s example. Kay explained that she had explored the continuum and was finding that the open-ended question was key to motivating student inquiry and moving along the continuum toward artistic choice-making. She explained that the open-ended question, posed again at the end of class time, also functioned (with the document camera as a device of amplification) to help her understand what students were learning and thinking about.

I asked her to elaborate about the document camera as a way to amplify student’s voices during this end of class sharing-of-thinking time. It was clear to me that students were very eager to share their work but also to tell about how they answered the open-ended question that she posed.

(Kay’s classroom, March 2010)

**Mary Elizabeth:** I can tell that your students are really thinking. This moment at the end of class using the document camera as a sharing platform seems to be working really well to help you see and understand what students are learning in their process.

**Kay:** It is! I wanted students to use the camera as a way to motivate and support the way they articulated choices they were making. It is a very important assessment tool. I am able to learn more about what students are learning based on how they describe their work and their process.

**Mary Elizabeth:** I noticed that the students’ homeroom/classroom teacher had come to pick them up at the art room at the end of her planning period. She was listening to the student sharing time. The teacher stood in the back watching and listening to the students who were sharing their process and talking about their thinking at the document camera.

**Kay:** I have been thinking more recently about how these documentation moments such as the one earlier today—with the students telling what they learned and showing their work—is not just a reflection that can I use to inform future teaching plans, but it is also an important way to assess student learning and share it with a wider audience including teachers, administrators, and parents. I think that what
students are doing in art is worth sharing. This is one of the reasons I recently re-designed my wiki website to include examples of students work and quotes from their reflections.

I learned from Kay’s blog posts and my conversations with her that she was thinking about documentation in at least two ways: The first was documentation as a reflection process she used in her own planning and preparation for teaching. The second was a method of gathering information about students’ thought and artistic processes during art class. She was also starting to think about how to share this documentation with a wider audience.

Our CIG responded to Kay’s detailed documentation as represented in her blog posts in a another way. We learned about the ways Kay was adjusting her teaching methods in the way she posed open-ended questions, set up her classroom space with centers, positioned the document camera as accessible to students and the research/book area to support “lively discussion in large and small groups, research using library books, and individual creations” (Kay, March 2010).

The stories I retell in this chapter describe some of the experiences that Rachel, Kay, Brandon, and Jason shared with our group about the shifts in thinking they were exploring as related to their early use of the document camera in their respective classroom settings in February through April 2010. Actor-network theory and specifically the ideas of translation, symmetry, and fluidity lend understanding to the ways that material objects and their arrangements are important to understanding the processes of teacher thinking and learning. A teacher’s experiences can be made apparent to an inquiry-oriented professional learning community when material objects are used to explain and explore concepts that are elusive, nuanced, or difficult to communicate.
Examples of difficult to communicate concepts include the teacher’s understanding of their role in the classroom, their motivations for specific methods, and the classroom events and teacher’s reflections that inform their future action.

Educational processes are not understood in the discrete spheres of the personal and the social but the socio-material life of objects, humans, and the processes that enact with one another (Fenwick & Edwards, 2010). In this Chapter 5, I retraced Kay’s description of the document camera during the May 2010 CIG meeting as being of great influence on her thinking (see also the complete Scene I, May 2010). I followed the document camera as object and idea to follow a common thread interwoven among several narratives, showing how teachers were documenting shifts in their thinking about teaching and learning in their own classroom spaces where digital objects associated with the function of the document camera were influencing their pedagogical enactments.

Influential objects included the document camera itself, the memory cards, hard drives, and other components that teachers learned to use to support its function. In addition, the digital photo and video artifacts that teachers and students generated, and the emerging ideas that the group co-constructed as shifts in their group meeting conversations turned from understanding the camera’s specifications to seeing possible futures for its use in social situations such as the mural unveiling, the arts show, and as ways to extend student voice in the art studio classroom by re-thinking and expanding the idea of a demonstration.

In the next chapter, Chapter 6, I continue to develop many of the ideas raised in these stories, especially the shifts in thinking that teachers indicate in description of their physical teaching spaces. In Chapter 6, three art teachers indicate shifts in their thinking
when they share their experience teaching in physical spaces. In Chapter 7, I further develop two of the issues raised here in Chapter 5, which are teachers’ rich photo and video documentation of students’ emerging experiences and the document camera as a *transitional object* in pedagogical visioning. I invite the reader to read Scene III, an interlude that precedes Chapter 6. The content of Scene III is the focus of Chapter 6.
March 2010 CIG Meeting: Sharing Documentation of Classroom Layout, Processes, and Student Response

March 2010 CIG Meeting. Kay shows the CIG recent changes she has made to her website. She uses the interactive whiteboard screen at the front of the room to scroll through her photos, videos, and blog posts. Stopping to talk about each photo, she reflects about her recent experience exploring a method of teaching known as “Teaching for Artistic Behavior,” or TAB, which is also known as choice-based art education.

Kay: I have this Wikispaces® website. As I am taking videos and pictures of what is happening in the classroom I am posting them on here. It has been especially important this year as I try out TAB and begin using choice-based centers. (Uses the smart board touch screen to scroll down on her wiki page. Brandon hands her the stylus to use.) And the first post is here (pointing to the page on the large screen).

Jason: “Collaborative sculpture!” (reading aloud the text caption on a photograph). Do you assign the groups?

Kay: No, actually the collaborative thing was spontaneous. I just opened the sculpture center, and I did a demonstration to orient students to the materials and tools that were there and ways that could combine things and attach things. One of the things I have noticed happening in my classroom since I have these centers set up and students have access to the materials is they have been collaborating with each other—spontaneously working together. So that is something interesting that is happening.

Jason: What grade levels again? K-6?

Kay: Grades K-6. Yes, I have seven classes to prep for—at this school. I also teach at two other schools.

Kay scrolls to next blog entry and then clicks on a video link.

This is fascinating. (video plays of one student showing his peers his artwork during art class. Student is heard saying, “Look but don’t touch, I am not done yet”).

Brandon: Ha! “Look, but don’t touch!”

Kay: “Look but don’t touch, I’m not done yet.” (Laughing as she retells.) That is what he said to one of his neighbors. (Kay acts out the scene again in the role of the student, extending her arms in a protective gesture toward artwork on
an imaginary table in front of her.)

(in video:)

Kay’s voice: Do you have a plan? What is your big idea?

Student’s voice: I am just going to put these somewhere in random order to make it look like . . . [inaudible] . . .

Kay’s voice: Interesting. How did you get that idea?

Student’s voice: Just by looking at artifacts and reading a history book from the library . . . [garbled and inaudible] . . .

Kay’s voice: I can’t wait to see what it looks like when it is finished.

Jason: What grade is he?

Kay: He is in fourth grade. I noticed that he was really into this collage. And I asked him about it. And that was what he had to say. And that is another thing that has come up, having centers in my room and letting the students direct their own work, I have found they are much more likely to bring their other experiences with them—what they are interested in, and create responses to that.

Mary Elizabeth: Why do you think that is?

Kay: I think it is because they feel like they can plan ahead in the making of their own work. I am not telling them what to do anymore. And plus, I introduce that in my classroom. You know, Okay—(aside) as part of closure: Let’s think about what we did today and you have a week—because I only see them once a week—you have a week to think about what you would like to do with this next week. Or, if you are going to start a new artwork next week, you have this week to plan and think ahead.

Mary Elizabeth: Oh.

Kay: And so I introduce that, too. Does that make sense?

Mary Elizabeth: Yes. They can then take ownership knowing you are inviting them to plan ahead. Whereas, maybe if you were to just spring this on them, “Okay, today we are going to . . .”

Kay: Right! (in a gregarious voice) “Today we are going to making a collage about ancient architecture!” (then, as if to predict the students’ response), “What!?”

Mary Elizabeth: Or, “Today we are going to make a collage about anything you want!”

Kay: (with her eyes wide) Deer in the headlights. “What do I do? Is this good?” (Kay acts out various students’ responses to the teacher prompt.)
(as if dialogue with her students) With the opening of the sculpture
center, I have expanded that idea of working on your ideas throughout the week to
include bringing materials from home. They would say: What if I have this green
tissue paper at home? Well, bring it! You can plan ahead and bring things! That is
something that is going to start happening more.

(Kay scrolls down on the screen with the stylus and resume her
descriptions of her visual images) I have another video I was going to post, but I
am having technical difficulties with that so—but I do have some images here
from last month. (She stops at a series of images of children’s artwork.) These are
some 3-D collage techniques by second graders, which I thought were kind of
fascinating.

(pointing and describing) This is a person watching TV. (pointing to
another photo) You can’t see it really well in the picture, but I thought that was
fascinating. This is a life raft with sharks.

(Continuing to scroll through images posted to her blog on her wiki site). I
took some pictures of my centers, too.

Abigail: I saw these online. Your centers are really cool.

Kay: You did? Thanks! Well, they are always under development. I am
always fixing and changing and scrounging! I scrounged this fabulous cart from
the supply room. I was in there with the custodian one day, and I said, “Oh! Are
you using that?” (pointing to the photo of the cart. The cart appears to be stocked
full of a variety of paper). So now it has this big sign with the word “Collage”
followed by general directions on this cart turned collage center.

(reading the sign on the collage center/cart from the photo:) 1) Find. 2)
Arrange. 3) Rearrange. 4) Attach. I introduced it by saying, “This is the way that
some collage artists work. You might think about this . . .” Then on the other side
of the cart is a whole collection of papers. Old magazine and art things, some is
sports related, some hunting, gardening catalogs—I try to keep a variety. Scraps
of leftover paper and paint swatches—I also inherited a whole bunch of books
that the library was de-acquisitioning. I tore the pages out and we use those for
collage too. The other side is all tools: Paper punches, hole punches, staplers,
string, glue sticks, all kinds of things.

(scrolling to next photo) This is the painting center (pointing to the photo
of another corner of her classroom). Some general directions here, some
eamples of different categories of painting like still life, portrait, landscape. The
supplies. Then over here where you can’t see are two buckets. One is clean water
and one is dirty water. This is to avoid the water pressure at the sink. When
everyone needs water, they can just scoop it up and go. In the dirty water bucket,
they put their palettes and dump their dirty water. So I wash the palettes later
because they only have 45 minutes. Then I keep a bucket by the sink where they
put their brushes, and I wash those later, too. And various types of painting paper
are here. I rotate this so that there are different choices of paper in there (pointing}
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...to the photo). So that is how that is all organized.

(scrolling to next photo) This is sculpture. This just opened this week.

Cardboard, craft sticks, tape, all kinds of found objects and recycled things. The directions I have (pointing to poster on wall above the sculpture center) are different ways to attach things and ways to test your attachments. And then, finishing the surface.

Mary Elizabeth: Is paint an option?

Kay: Absolutely! Yeah, they can combine centers. We talk about that.

They take these things back to their tables to work. I wish I had enough tables in my room that I could set up different work areas. I thought about this for next year—maybe going to this model for all my grade levels. Right now, I do more direct instruction with the smaller children. They use these centers to access materials, but they are not as self-directed. So, they are already familiar with the centers.

(scrolling to next photo) Here is the drawing center.

(scrolling to next photo) And then here is the visual resources center.

Things they can look at and draw from to get ideas. That’s it.

Jason: You must have a big, awesome room.

Kay: I do at this school! This school was recently remodeled. Obviously, things are much more developed there than they are at my other schools. At one school, I don’t even have centers set up because I only teach K, 1, and 2. I share that small room with three other teachers during the week. At the third school, I share the room with the music teacher. So I have limited centers using things I can set out and quickly put away.

Emma: This is good. I saw Kay’s site earlier and have been reading about Teaching for Artistic Behavior [TAB] and centers. I just—I would love for it to work, but I don’t think it could work for everyone—like in my situation. And I hate to always bring that up, but it is just so difficult. Even putting the new equipment on my cart is just—challenges! So—Centers. It would be great—and I see that it is working here (gesturing toward the images on the screen). (with emotion) It would be awesome to have the kids go and know where things are. (long pause) I like your photos.

Kay: Thank you (with empathy). One thing I am thinking about for the other two schools where I share the space is—I have been collecting boxes that the copier paper comes in. They have lids. I am going to make some centers in those boxes. They will be ephemeral centers that come and go.

(Emma nodding)
Chapter 6

Sharing About Shifts “In My Situation:” Smoothing and Striating Pedagogical Shifts in Physical Spaces

Two elementary art teachers, Kay and Emma shared extensively with our collaborative inquiry group about their teaching spaces. They spoke of shifts in physical spaces as related to their shifts in thinking about teaching and learning. Physical classroom spaces and the pedagogical planning and experiences that occurred in relation to these spaces are the focus of the stories assembled in this chapter.59

I approached analysis of stories in this chapter as a method of thinking about topologies of smooth and striated space (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987) and to develop connections (Rajchman, 2000b) between the stories of art teachers who smoothed and striated their pedagogical spaces as spaces of inquiry. Rajchman (2000) writes about Deleuzian philosophy as activating “resonances and interferences” in a “zone of the unthought that destabilizes clichés and ready-made ideas” (2000, p. 115). As I consider Rajchman’s (2000) call to destabilize clichés, I think of a cliché phrase that art educators

59 Several teachers shared stories about their classroom environments that are not elaborated in this chapter. For example, Jason also shared stories about his classroom space as shifting or changing in response to his inquiry about his own teaching and his explorations with educational technology (see discussion in Chapter 5). I do not elaborate facets of Jason’s story here because my aim is not to re-present every story shared by each teacher as it relates to this theme of “classroom space.” Rather, my approach in this chapter is to present the resonant perspectives of two teachers, Kay and Emma whose stories are closely intertwined because their ideas influenced one another in the context of the CIG group meetings and blog. In other words, the shifts in thinking that I bring forward in this chapter through resonant narrative intertextures are important because of the ways that two teachers stories come together to show their varied perspectives and experiences as they became understandable to our group through sharing, dialogue, and reflection.
often use. When talking about itinerant teaching situations, we often describe a teacher’s predicament in teaching *art on a cart*. Teaching in many different classroom spaces and toting art supplies is often dismissed as simply an unfortunate circumstance. However, the pedagogical and logistical concerns of the traveling art teacher are seldom addressed in teacher education programs or in educational research that focuses on exemplary models for teaching that others would want to emulate.

In the interest of exploring *resonances* and *interferences* (Rajchman, 2000b), I assemble an intertexture of stories in this chapter that are interwoven with my interpretations of Deleuze and Guattari’s (1987) philosophical topologies of smooth and striated space. I *use* smooth and striated space not as a ready-made concept to be applied as an explanation of narrative events. Rather, thinking about the resonances and nuances of teachers’ stories in dialogue with theory is a way that I “think the unthought” (Rajchman, 2000b, p. 116, citing Deleuze) in narrative intertexture as a mode of interpretive analysis. In this chapter, I explore the way that two teachers, Kay and Emma, created shifts of pedagogical thinking and practice in respect to their fluxing physical teaching spaces. Our CIG learned from Kay and Emma through visual documentation, written reflections, and spoken story telling about unique teaching situations.

**Kay’s Photos and Reflections Explore Physical Classroom Spaces and Materials**

Kay described her photographs during the March 2010 CIG meeting (see Scene III, the interlude which precedes this chapter), and showed our group how she was interpreting the idea of choice-based art education in combination with student inquiry.
She used the term, “noticing” to describe herself as an observer in her own classroom with the help of her photographic and video documentation (Kay, March 2010). She also shared how students were responding to her recent pedagogical changes to adopt TAB (Teaching for Artistic Behavior), which further influenced how she planned for future teaching-learning experiences.60

I selected this excerpt (see Scene III) from the March 2010 meeting to include in this dissertation, because it was a critical event (Webster & Mertova, 2007) in the life of our group that was remembered as important by group members in ways that caused them to refer back to it. This chapter is a discussion of themes in Scene III, *March 2010 CIG Meeting* as connected in intertexture with additional teachers’ stories of experience. In the next section, I present an analysis of Kay’s March 2010 sharing of photos and stories and then interweave the perspectives of Emma, Rachel, and Ann.

**Documentation Assists in Observing and Reflecting**

As Kay talked to our group, she alternated between detailed descriptions of the photographs of her classroom space and descriptive observations about how her teaching approaches and students’ responses had shifted in this physical space and in respect to a different way of managing materials. For example she says, “One of the things I have noticed . . .” (Kay, March 2010 CIG meeting, line 19). Rather than talk only about the

60 In a previous CIG meeting, Kay shared with our group that she had been reading a book, *Engaging Learners Through Artmaking: Choice-Based Art Education in the Classroom*, (Douglas & Jaquith, 2009). Kay liked that it explained learning centers as one structure to support student-directed art making (TAB) at the elementary level instead of teacher-directed art projects that are assignments to be replicated by students.
layout of each learning center and the objects and materials that appear there, she also voices a series of observations that are informing her past, present, and future actions as a teacher. She describes her methods as always “under development” and that she is always “fixing and changing” (Kay, March 2010 CIG meeting, line 88).

Phrases, like “I noticed that . . .” and “I have found . . .” indicated that Kay was observing and reflecting on her own teaching and students’ responses in ways that helped her to move forward, reflecting on her past experience and adjusting her methods for the future (Roth, 2002). Kay’s observations included physical changes in her classroom spaces, her methods of teaching (including her use of open-ended questions), and her responses to students’ learning and creative outcomes. For example, in the March 2010 meeting excerpt, she shared, “having centers in my room and letting the students direct there own work—I have found they are much more likely to bring their other experiences with them—what they are interested in, and create responses to that” (Kay, March 2010 CIG meeting, line 50).

In Scene III, Kay observes new ways that students “create responses” in respect to the new physical set up of the classroom in centers. Her observations about what students were saying, doing, and making were in response to the way she and students managed, organized, and distributed art materials. Students now had increased access to materials.

Kay also told our CIG how she helped students create work in response to a guiding question. Kay’s open-ended questioning acted as a framework for inquiry and formed a supportive armature for students’ artistic exploration. Kay invited students to carefully choose the materials that were the best match to constructing an idea in response to Kay’s open-ended prompt. The prompt, usually a question, was an invitation
for students to engage in their self-designed methods of creative response. The question that Kay posed and investigated with students was an important new structure that helped students guide their inquiry with materials.

**Smoothing Striated Space by Building New Regions and Territories in the Art Classroom**

Kay worked to create a set of new structures that supported students in their choice-based art making. These structures were both material and tangible (physical areas of the classroom transformed into learning centers) and also intangible (processes of open-ended questioning as a guiding framework for inquiry). Open use of materials, open-ended questions, and opportunities for student choice-making seemed to smooth the way for students to move toward self-directed art making. This was in contrast to her previous method, which was to demonstrate the steps of a lesson/project/assignment so that each student would imitate/reproduce it. But even as this smoothing was a process of creating opportunities for students’ movement between learning centers and freedom of choice to select materials, it was still reliant on structures and procedures (striations). Smoothing the way for students to make more choices was reliant on new striations.

Kay told me that in previous school years, she would only distribute the materials that were part of the teacher-directed art project. Students would receive only the supplies that she chose for them as part of her lesson planning. The control of materials and their location belonged to Kay. Now, Kay has developed a different system for supporting students as they select their own supplies from different regions of the room. By building new regions and territories in the classroom, Kay and students are smoothing the striated
space of art class with new structures, routines, and processes. Kay territorialized the art classroom in regions (learning centers) so that students could move more freely in a smooth and meandering pattern to access materials and make choices for methods of art making. Kay observes that one unexpected outcome of this is increased student collaboration.

(March 2010 CIG meeting)

Kay: One of the things I have noticed happening in my classroom since I have these centers set up and students have access to the materials, is they have been collaborating with each other. . . . I have found that they are much more likely to bring their [prior] experiences with them—what they are interested in—and create responses to that.

Mary Elizabeth: Why do you think that is?

Kay: I think it is because they feel like they can plan ahead in the making of their own work. I am not telling them what to do anymore.

***

(interim text)

I interpret Kay’s observations about students’ habits of work (in respect to the newly set up centers) as being a shift toward making smooth space in the studio art classroom where students freely navigate regions of the classroom as learning centers (Deleuze & Guatarri, 1987). Students navigate the room with a newfound sense of freedom and mobility—with free access to materials.

I listened as Kay spoke to the group, talking about her photographs. She was observing, noticing, and reflecting how students tend to work collaboratively, to develop and plan the ideas for their work. She spoke about ways that students were taking ownership of their work, planning ahead, choosing subject matter and methods.

This smooth space (free, open, full of choices) is also striated (structured). It is striated with new routines, structures, systems, that Kay has configured to make students’ smoothing possible. Deleuze and Guatarri (1987) describe smooth space as also striated space. The two spaces exist in mixture. Kay has provided new structures (learning centers, ways to access and choose a variety of materials, open-end questions, and methods for students to plan ahead) that serve as striations to make-way for smooth space. This smoothing-striating/striating-smoothing seems to be a mutual shifting that Kay and students are enacting.

***

I asked Kay about her adoption of choice-based methods in November 2009 when we were talking together via Skype®. At this time, she was just beginning to shift her classroom and pedagogy toward centers and student choice. Kay told me about her move from direct-instruction to choice-based art education. She explained that her motivation was based on her interest in helping students make artwork that was of interest to them and motivated by their own experiences. In November 2009 (during this transition of her classroom arrangement), I asked her what she was noticing about choice-based teaching. She said she felt somewhat disappointed by the lack of development in students’ drawings and other artwork.

(Skype® conversation)

**Kay:** There seems to be a sort of a typical range of choices that a lot of kids make—what I call pre-adolescent images of all the names, hearts, balls, etc. Depending on their gender. But you know, not going into other things that we have done before. Things like landscapes, or portraits. . . . I can point them toward resources, visual resources, then that helps them generate ideas. So maybe that is sort of a habit that I need to encourage. Or model. Or model and encourage.

Soon after our conversation, she elaborated in a blog post: “One challenge I have encountered so far involves students not developing rigor or depth in their artworks when they are working independently. How can I help my students become more involved with their work, more engaged with creating?” (Kay, blog post excerpt, November 2009).

In March 2010, Kay’s stories from her classroom, and particularly her video of the student speaking about his self-directed process of collage (Scene III, March 2010 CIG meeting, lines 37-44), indicated that students were finding motivation for their own
work, being “engaged with creating” by selecting and looking at visual images as part of visual research for their art making. In November, Kay described a lack of “rigor or depth” in students’ artwork (Kay, November 2009). However, Kay indicated to the group in March that this lack of “depth” had improved and she was pleased with the changes she was making but that it was always a work in progress.

Rich Documentation of Classroom Processes Accompanied by Thoughtful Reflections Show Shifts Over Time

Kay’s rich documentation of her classroom changes and students’ responses to her teaching (in the form of written reflections, photos of classroom spaces, photos/videos of students working, and photos of student artwork) gave our group a vivid picture of her teaching process as being responsive to the events that unfolded in the classroom. Her spoken reflections and stories that she shared in narration of photos and written reflections on her website, afforded insights into how her ideas were shifting. Kay’s blog posts were visual and textual chronicles of change over time. This web-based chronicle made her ideas accessible to others in our CIG for professional learning. Through Kay’s descriptions, we learned that one of the ways she enacted her inquiry as professional learning, was to exercise agency to make changes to her teaching space.

With and Without Agency to Make Change in Teaching Spaces

Kay’s spoken reflections that she shared with our group in March 2010 (see examples below about the sculpture and collage centers), show how Kay was exploring
pedagogical changes that necessitated experimenting with the arrangement of her classroom space, which she describes as expand[ing], fixing, and changing:

(May 2010 CIG meeting)

**Kay:** With the opening of the sculpture center, I have expanded the idea of [students] working on their ideas throughout the week to include bringing materials from home.

**Kay:** *(describing the photo of collage center)* I am always fixing and changing and scrounging. I scrounged this fabulous cart from the supply room. . . . So now it is adorned by this big sign with the word “collage” followed by general directions.

When Kay said, “I have expanded the idea,” she told how her shifting ideas and pedagogical approaches were closely related to changes she made to physical spaces.

“In My Situation—It is Just So Difficult”

As Kay shared her shift toward the TAB method and described photos of learning centers during the March 2010 meeting, I tried to imagine what Emma, an itinerant elementary art teacher, might be feeling in response to Kay’s sharing of photographs and descriptions of her newly re-designed classroom. Observing the group, I sensed that Emma, who was serving in elementary schools that did not have dedicated space for an art studio classroom, was feeling a mix of emotions in response to Kay’s sharing of classroom photos of art learning centers. I felt great concern for Emma’s feelings and wondered if Kay’s sharing reminded Emma of her disappointment about being without a studio art classroom to experiment in the way that she wanted.

Immediately following Kay’s presentation to our group, Emma voiced her doubt that TAB and centers were a practical method for everyone. I wrote in my notes that she
must have felt acutely aware of her lack of a stable physical space during Kay’s presentation (research memo, following March 2010 CIG meeting).

(March 2010 CIG meeting)

**Emma:** This is good. I saw Kay’s site earlier and have been reading about Teaching for Artistic Behavior [TAB] and centers. I just—I would love for it to work, but I don’t think it could work for everyone—like in my situation. And I hate to always bring that up, but it is just so difficult. Even putting the new equipment on my cart is just—challenges! So—Centers. It would be great— and I see that it is working here (gesturing toward the images on the screen). *(With emotion)* It would be awesome to have the kids go and know where things are. *(long pause)* I like your photos. *(Scene III, March 2010 CIG, lines 136-143)*

**On the Move Between School Buildings and Classroom Spaces**

Emma’s wheeled cart was her mobile teaching platform. She pushed this cart into other teachers’ classroom territories. She was constantly on the move between the two school buildings, inside the buildings, teaching in various spaces—none of which were assigned to her as spaces exclusively for teaching art. Emma talked about her evolving ideas—about how to enact the changes that she envisioned for her teaching, even without her own teaching space.

I was compelled by Emma’s phrase, “in my situation” and used it as a recurring tag in my research memos to make note of the importance of each teacher’s descriptions of daily teaching context in respect to their inquiry process. For example, Emma reflects on the challenges of her unpredictable schedule.

(May 2010 CIG meeting)

**Emma:** I never knew what classroom I would be in that day, or where they would move us, or how they would change our class, or what materials would be available.
Thinking about inquiry in respect to the shifting *spaces* of teaching (both physical *spaces* and the *spaces* of teachers’ shared inquiry as reflection, thinking, and story telling) is a complex theme that I heard in several teachers’ narratives. Several teachers’ stories resonate with Emma’s descriptions in May 2010 about her “chang[ing] interpretation about what our group was studying” (Emma, May 2010 CIG Meeting). For example, Rachel was re-interpreting the group’s inquiry theme as she prepared to leave one teaching site and settle in to another.

*(May 2010 CIG meeting)*

**Rachel:** Next year I will be even more uncertain because I am changing grade levels. I am moving up to the high school. I spent the day there on Wednesday. I realized that a lot of things are going to be vastly different.

Teachers’ physical teaching spaces were inseparable from the ways that they studied their own teaching and learned from others in the CIG. Emma’s words, “in my situation,” caused me to look carefully at the ways that teachers were talking about classroom and teaching-learning spaces and the stories and images that seemed to lend insights into teachers’ thinking.

Emma’s frustrations were not just limited to the spatial confinement of a cart but she also felt limited in her ability to act on her ideas and explore new teaching methods. The unpredictable and unstable nature of her temporary teaching spaces were hindering her confidence to take risks in the same way that she saw other teachers in our group exploring new methods. Each of the other art teachers in our CIG taught in art studio classrooms where they freely interacted with their physical classroom spaces as sites of experimentation to support their teaching goals. Emma sometimes reminded our group
during our discussions that as a mobile art teacher, some of the new teaching approaches and experimentations that other teachers were reporting as successful were simply not possible for her.

In the following blog post, which I include here in its entirety, Emma writes about challenges she encounters on a daily basis, her shifting feelings about her professional becoming in relationship to her college degree program, and her feelings of anticipation as an early career art teacher. Figure 6-2 is Emma’s blog post and comments from members of our group in response.
“Unless You Have Taught From a Cart, You Cannot Know the Challenges”

Emma: When I finished college, I truly felt that my art education classes and more importantly, my student teaching experiences had prepared me for my first teaching job, but that was assuming I would be teaching in a classroom. I was prepared to handle discipline problems and ordering supplies, and even for dealing with difficult parents, but when I walked into my new job and was shown the cart that I would be teaching from, I felt overwhelmed and a little cheated. Not one of my college professors had ever talked about how to teach in a dimly lit cafeteria during breakfast hours, or while the lunch ladies yelled to one another that the tater tots were done. No one discussed what it would be like to load all of my art supplies for the day onto a small cart and wheel it into other teachers’ classrooms, where I would then have to maneuver around a maze of weekly-changing desk arrangements; math problems written on chalk boards that I was not allowed to erase; and not a single surface in the room that was cleared off to use for demonstrations or drying projects. The daily challenges of having a “mobile classroom” were daunting, to say the least. I felt at first, (and still feel on particularly bad days) that I could not be the kind of teacher I wanted to be because of the limitations of my situation. I felt that no one would take Art class seriously if I was reduced to shouting instructions to my students during lunch and if Art class was always the first one that was interrupted so that the students could get their heads checked [for lice] by the nurse, go to the book fair, or have their class pictures taken. It seemed like Art and other special classes were just a prep period for the regular classroom teachers.

I travel to two different schools where I deal with two sets of students, two sets of teachers, and two sets of administrators to please. One thing those schools have in common is a traveling art teacher. At one of my schools, I share a very small, and dimly lit supply closet with the phys. ed. teacher, the music teacher, and the custodian. At the other school, my supply closet has been turned into a makeshift classroom for our tutor, and at most times throughout the day I have no access to my supplies, except for a small metal cabinet that is kept on the stage. With literally no time in between classes, I have had to fine-tune my sense of time-management to keep everything on schedule. As soon as one class in the cafeteria is over, I have to push the cart to the other side of the school and set up (adapting to the classroom teacher’s room setup) for another class. I feel like my instructional time has been cut in half.

So when the CIG came up with the inquiry question of “how do we guide student discovery without choosing the path they must follow,” I immediately saw red flags. How was I going to give the students more freedom in art class when we were already working within such a limited context?

I have talked to many art and music teachers who have had to teach from the “home-base” of a cart, at one point or another during their careers. My mother has been an Art teacher for over 35 years and she has gone from cart, to
classroom, to trailer, and back again. But though these teachers have all shared
many useful tips and words of encouragement, I feel like this situation is only
getting worse and new teachers are not going to be prepared for it. Even though
this is only my third year of teaching, I feel like a seasoned veteran now, after
having my eyes opened in my current situation. The truth is, unless you have
taught from a cart, you cannot know all of the daily challenges that come along
with that arrangement.

(Blog post, Emma, May 2010)

Comments (4)

Kay:
You have so many rich and thoughtful experiences to share with other art
teachers who face similar challenges as you. I can see an article here, or
maybe a series of articles!

Emma:
Sometimes it feels like I'm just complaining, but I can see how this topic
of mobile teaching is one that needs to be addressed, so that others can at
least prepare themselves.

Mary Elizabeth:
You have so many experiences to share that are relevant to so many art
teachers. I am glad that you are representing your specific teaching context
here and sharing your perspective. I have great respect for what you do. I
agree that these issues are not adequately addressed in pre-service art ed
courses. I really value the work you have done to interpret the group's
inquiry according to your own teaching life. And as importantly, you have
shared your process here so that we can learn from you.

Emma:
Thank you! Though, I wish that administrators and regular ed. teachers
could have as much empathy for their specialty teachers, as the specialty
teachers have for one another.

Figure 6-2. “Unless You Have Taught From a Cart, You Cannot Know the Challenges . . .” Emma’s blog post with comments.
Reading this blog post that Emma wrote in May 2010, helped me understand just how complex her *situation* was and that her unpredictable and inadequate physical teaching spaces were causing her to feel limited as a teacher. She wrote, “I felt—and still feel—that I could not be the kind of teacher I wanted to be because of the limitations of my situation” (Emma, May 2010 blog post, lines 15-18).

Emma was often quiet during our CIG meetings, but her blog posts were profound in helping our group see and learn from how she was interpreting the notion of “inquiry” with students. The blog space was a comfortable place to tell a vivid story and to describe all of the complex issues that surround it, including reflections on college classes and hopes for the future. Emma rarely elaborated at this level of detail during our face-to-face meetings.

“I Morphed My Approach”

In March 2010, Emma reflected about feeling limited in her ability to explore some teaching methods (that were likely to support students in making artistic choices) because of the limitations and practical challenges of teaching from a cart. In May 2010, Emma shared her solution. I “morphed my approach,” she said in May (May 2010 group interview). She adapted her methods to explore her own reflections about her teaching context, while simultaneously adjusting methods for facilitating student discussion critiques as reflective inquiry into their art making, findings ways to help students develop and voice their opinions (May 2010 group interview). She found she was able to adjust her teaching approach in the way that she, together with her students, were thinking and talking about works of art. This was possible even when she was not able to
make changes in physical classroom layouts or radically reconfigure the way that art materials were distributed.

Kay’s Choice-Based Centers Influence Ann’s Inquiry Stations

A year later, after both Kay and Emma moved away. Ann (a new member) shared with our group how she had been studying Kay’s wiki website from the previous year. Ann was thinking about how media/learning centers could work in her K–8 art classroom. She developed a method of encouraging student experimentation with watercolor techniques and wrote about developing inquiry stations inspired by Kay’s choice-based centers.

The following intertexture (asynchronous but related narrative reflections) by Kay, Emma, and Ann shows how each shared shifts in their thinking about their teaching approaches in the context of conversations about unique teaching situations in their schools. Over time, Kay, Emma, and Ann showed many photos of their teaching spaces, sharing also detailed descriptions of how their thinking was connected to these spaces and ways they were changing their teaching spaces.61

61 It is not possible to include each of the photos that teachers posted to our private blog because of the permission that is needed from a student’s parent/guardian to publish pictures of student’s faces. This is beyond the scope of the study. When possible, I have included photo documentation provided by teachers that doesn’t reveal a child’s face. Each teacher in our group secured formal permission from their schools and from parents to use these photos, but that permission does not extend to this research study.
**Emma:** Throughout this entire experience, I have struggled with the concept of incorporating more choice-based instruction into my “classroom” because I have felt inhibited by my spatial limitations and my use of a cart. I have read quite a bit of research about TAB (Teaching for Artistic Behavior) and the use of “centers” and various assessments that go along with choice-based education, and I hate to rule it out as a way to approach instruction, but realistically, I just don’t have the physical space to set up that kind of environment at this point. (Blog post, March 2010)

**Kay:** One of the things I have noticed happening in my classroom since I have these centers set up and students have access to the materials, is they have been collaborating with each other—spontaneously working together. So that is something interesting that is happening. (CIG meeting, March 2010)

**Emma:** My interpretation about what our group was studying changed along the way for me. I morphed my approach into less practice with teaching and setting up centers and letting the kids get there on their own, but more letting them get there on their own about their opinions. So, my ideas about how to facilitate inquiry learning in my situation kind of changed. (CIG meeting, May 2010)

**Ann:** I am inspired by Kay’s previous studies with stations and have attempted to use them in a different way (that is conducive to the way my classroom is set up). The learning environment is important. Students need to know that it is okay to try things that may or may not work out without being defeated. (Blog post excerpt, January 2011)

Figure 6-1 is a found poem I created to further synthesize this intertexture and show the nuance of ideas expressed by three teachers quoted above.
One of the things I have noticed happening in my classroom is students have access to the materials collaborating, spontaneously working together.

My interpretation changed along the way; I morphed my approach to facilitate inquiry learning in my situation.

I am inspired to use stations in a different way, conducive to my classroom. Students need know it is okay to try things without being defeated. The learning environment is important.

---

**Figure 6-1. Found Poem. The Learning Environment is Important.**

This poem further synthesizes the intertexture of Kay, Emma, and Ann’s three perspectives. Emma and Ann seemed to be strongly influenced by Kay. They both made changes to their teaching spaces as both physical spaces and as spaces of thinking about teaching in a new way. In the following section, I build up a textured tapestry of stories that continue to trace how each teacher was smoothing the striated spaces of an already structured classroom, or striating the unstructured and unpredictable spaces of the itinerant art teacher with no art classroom.

On our last CIG meeting day in May 2010 our group presented a video to the whole AETI project as a summary of our collaborative inquiry outcomes. Emma recorded her voice speaking concurrently with a slide show of images in which students were pictured engaged in critiques of student work, pointing and speaking about images. In
one photo, students were gathered together in a circle on the floor with Emma talking about student work. In another photo, a class looked together at an arrangement of student’s self portraits fasted to a chalkboard. Each portrait was tagged with a light yellow repositionable sticky note that had a written comment from a peer as part of a strategy of supportive peer critique.

**Creating a Space for Students to Develop Responses and Reflections About Peers’ Artwork**

Emma described in the voice-over narration of her slide show and in a series of blog posts that she found the inspiration for inviting students to inquire with her. She invited students to join in her reflections about teaching art.

*(blog post May 2010)*

**Emma:** As a mobile art teacher who travels from room to room to teach, my challenge with my group’s inquiry question was to incorporate more choice-based projects and the use of portable technology into my teaching and documentation process. As I became more comfortable using technology to teach I found that my own inquiry process was leading me toward more reflective critiques and discussions with my students.

She described to our CIG how she shifted her teacher self-reflection to group reflection that included students. She worked on developing methods to invite more student reflections in responding to artwork, and sharing written and oral responses. She began experimenting with many different ways to engage students in discussions and reflection of their experiences making art and responding to the artwork of their peers. This inquiry into student reflections was the way that Emma explored a new inquiry
space as one that supported students in sharing their opinions. This new space was not a physical space, but a space of inquiry where she and students could forge new territory in generating ideas together through peer critiques of artwork.

Emma was able to develop a set of structures and approaches for peer critique and shared reflection time that could occur in almost any physical space. Emma’s approach was to striate or structure the smooth space of her unpredictable and mobile teaching day. In each new situation, she brought with her a set of approaches to accomplish what she thought was important, which was inviting students to think with her about the value and importance of art and art making (Emma, December 2009 CIG meeting).

(blog post November 2009)

Emma: I think that with no set Art curriculum in place within my district, I am trying to raise awareness, first and foremost. I feel that I am constantly trying to introduce my students to new techniques, art history, and self-discovery. Because Art plays such an important role in a child's development of creativity, I think that the student needs to be exposed to as many artistic experiences as possible. When a child leaves my class, it is my goal for that student to be able to think artistically about anything in everyday life.

Emma was able to overcome her struggle to visualize and actualize her goals in a situation where she longed for the stability of a consistent classroom space. I learned so much from Emma and appreciate her candid and honest accounts of her feelings and experiences. I have never had to teach from a cart and I have great respect for what Emma was accomplishing within limits of time (short classes) and space (many spaces with changing conditions). I am changed as a result of Emma’s inquiry and documentation of her experiences and reflections. I think twice before using the word, “classroom” to describe a ubiquitous learning space that is assumed to be the basis of all
learning activity. Our CIG adjusted some of our language, becoming more thoughtful about the meaning of the word, “classroom” in the second year of our inquiry as a result of learning from Emma about the realities of a mobile art teacher.

Emma helped me reach a shift in my own thinking because she raised my awareness about the classroom as not always being the fundamental structure of a learning environment. In fact, Emma’s efforts to “morph” her approach (Emma, May 2010) lead her toward the notion of dialogue as her method of facilitating inquiry with students through “richer critiques” and “learning to question art” (Emma, blog post, May 2010). These structures were not depending on a physical space, but a space of interaction that she and her students could sustain through “conversations” (Emma, blog post, May 2010).

(blog post May 2010)

Emma: My attempts have led me to a better-structured way to create a dialogue with my students. I have found that we have richer critiques because students are learning to question art, and art-making, and artists for themselves. They are becoming better observers. I wanted to capture the best parts of our conversations, and after several failed attempts at having the students write their own responses (the younger ones just don’t have the vocabulary or writing skills yet to truly express their thoughts), I have found that the students do best when they just share their thoughts verbally with me and I write them down as they say them. I have made critiques a more integral part of elementary art class, and I really feel like I have tapped into something valuable and interestingly enough, the students are excited to participate. Whenever we are near the end of a project, the students start asking if we are going to talk about it!

Processes of Smoothing and Striating Physical Classroom Spaces and Spaces of Inquiry

In this chapter, I have assembled a set of story fragments that focused primarily on two teachers, Kay and Emma. Assembling these narratives in respect to the conceptual
framework of smooth and striated spaces has caused me to think about teachers’ shifts in respect to smoothing and striating both physical teaching spaces and the spaces of inquiry as reflection.

These stories and narrative fragments work together to explore art teachers’ shifts in thinking about teaching and learning in respect to physical spaces of teaching such as classrooms and also the non-physical inquiry spaces of reflection with students. I interpret Kay’s stories as assembled in this chapter to be descriptive of smoothing the striated space of one art studio classroom. This smoothing occurs when Kay works with students to create a new more open structure that includes regions and territories for students to access their own materials and a method of open-ended questioning that Kay uses to initiate her new teaching method. Interestingly, smoothing occurs through striation of a different kind when new structures facilitate the support of student’s open-ended work habits. The nuances of the smoothing-striating processes are made visible to our CIG through the spoken story telling that accompanies Kay’s sharing of photographs and videos she has taken of her classroom space.

I interpret Emma’s stories and reflections to be striating the open, precarious, unstructured experience that Emma describes as a mobile art teacher. Emma “morphs” her way of thinking to gain release from the challenges of the fluxing physical spaces and her lack of agency to make change in areas that are out of her control (such as scheduling of classes and lack of a classroom space). She focuses on creating an inquiry space based on shared teacher and student reflections that extend from her interest in building understanding in the school district for the value and importance of art. Emma uses the virtual blog space as a space to develop her detailed and honest reflections that are
addressed to our CIG. Emma also creates a new space, a new way of thinking about her
time and focus of discussion with students. This space is not defined by physical spaces
or art materials but is focused on sharing and generating a reflective mode of student
inquiry through interactive discussions with student artwork. Emma’s narrated slide show
reveals this shift as one that is personalized to Emma’s unique teaching situation. Each
member of our group is influenced by Emma’s accounts of her experiences.62

In this chapter, I have explored the shifting spaces of inquiry as related to physical
teaching spaces that Kay and Emma described to our group by writing reflections,
describing photographs of classroom spaces, describing observations and evidence of
students’ creative work. Kay, Emma, and Ann’s experiences resonated with one another
showing how documentation of teaching can influence the thinking of other teachers in
ways that helped members of our CIG realize their own goals as were fitting and relevant
to their individual situations. The narratives that I traced and assembled in this chapter
coalesced as an intertexture in relation to my exploration of Deleuze & Guattari’s (1987)
notion of smoothing and striating spaces as a way of activating thinking about resonant
change processes that teachers explored together as part of their shifts in thinking about
teaching and learning.

In Chapter 7, I explore concepts that Elizabeth Ellsworth (2005) uses in her book,
*Places of Learning* to interpret and discuss examples of documentation of experience that

62 Over the summer in August 2010, our CIG received a cheerful email from Emma. She
said she had been hired to teach in another school district and therefore would not be
participating in our second year of CIG activities. Kay also moved that summer. I felt a
terrible loss. They were two thoughtful people who made important contributions to our
CIG discussions. In the fall of 2010-2011, we welcomed three new members to our CIG,
Ann, Carmen, and Charity.
Rachel shared with our CIG during January 2011 CIG Meeting (Scene III). I also recall and refer to our May 2010 group meeting where Rachel talks about her experience in our CIG as one that promoted feels of moving and shifting as qualities of inquiry that she would like to help her students experience.
January 2011 CIG Meeting: How Am I Going To Teach Techniques and Skills, and Help Students Inquire and Experience?

January 2011. Looking between the projection screen and back to her computer, Rachel points her mouse cursor to select a photograph from her digital photo library. The other eight members of the CIG gather together, returning to the meeting room after a lunch break. Sitting together at a long conference table, they look with Rachel at the large screen.

Rachel: I’ll share some things my students are just finishing up. The lesson is a continuation, extension of our realistic self-portrait drawings with shading and detail. It was part of a Betty Edwards\textsuperscript{63} unit.

(Rachel turns to look up at the big screen, simultaneously checking the cable connection between her netbook computer and the LCD projector.)

Rachel looks at the grid of 12 images of student artwork projected on the screen.

We used the document camera to enlarge the student’s previous drawings. We made them really big. I called this a “somewhat symbolic self-portrait” (she gestures to indicate quotation marks) because I encouraged them to use symbolism, but it wasn’t required. The one thing that I did require was, here are some of them, (pointing to the images on the screen and clicking on one to enlarge) the use of non-traditional media. They used the doc cam to project and enlarge their original drawing to start this work. They are huge.

Rachel clicks though a slide show of each single image of student artwork. She stops to talk about one portrait.

This student. Well, I have a lot of feelings about this piece. This looks exactly like her. What is funny about this is – this is her third painting. There was so much paint and tissue paper—there was paint everywhere—she would be working and there would be a huge mess around her. Stuff everywhere. (Rachel flails her arms, and moves her torso, demonstrating the chaos.) And then she would clean up every drop of it.

\textsuperscript{63} Betty Edwards is the author of books about teaching and learning drawing methods and methods of seeing. Here, Rachel is referring to the book, \textit{Drawing on the Right Side of the Brain}. 
The next day she would come in and she would say, “I am starting over!” She would throw away the other one and get started again (cheerfully supportive and amused). So she finally got a piece that she was happy with.

Ann: What grade is she?

Rachel: She is a sophomore. (changes the slide to the next portrait) This is really powerful. There were all these little eye designs from (pointing) paper sheets of eyes laying around the classroom from the previous art teacher. This student cut them up and made them part of her face. Those are CDs that were broken. She is crying. (Rachel points to the regions of the face with the shiny cd fragments. She stops at the lower right hand corner.) Down here is her grandma, and St. Anthony, and there is something in each corner that means something to her.

When you see these in person, I was just really excited about these portraits because they are vastly different from each other. Even though students were all working on the same thing, they are so different from one another.

(Rachel clicks her mouse to advance the next image.)

Now this student had something very important to say about this in her spark journal. In general, she went above and beyond with this painting. But she had the most interesting things to say about self-portraits in general in her written reflection. She wrote, “When I looked in the mirror, I drew exactly what I saw and I came out looking really sad in my drawing. I realized that the face I show to the world is sad. But I’m not really sad.” She wrote to me, “I think your students should do this self-portrait project every year because it helped me learn about myself and the face I am presenting to the world.” She did always have a sad expression in the beginning of the semester and now she doesn’t.

(Rachel speaks after a pause with emotion in her voice.)

She wrote that, and I thought that was really powerful.

Group: (at once, quietly, with interest) Wow. Hm. That is interesting.

Rachel: This is my personal favorite (switching to a new image). This student is so free and spontaneous. She let the ink flow here so freely (points to the hair in the portrait). We had done an ink experiment before where you would find the pictures in the inkblot, and so she treated the ink that way and she just let
Rachel: (continuing in a more upbeat tone, with energy) I think it was so good for them to take this very realistic thing that they did—the first portrait—and then blow it up, enlarge it, and do something crazy with it. Their creativity! I was excited about it. I feel that for high school kids, that creativity seems like it’s difficult. It was harder for me to get to that place with them than it was with the littler ones. I do think that is important. I keep thinking, okay—How am I going to teach them techniques and skills, and let them inquire and experience? I think the Ladybug doc cam gives the freedom for that. Because they think, “Oh, I traced it once, I can trace it again—no big deal.” So instead of having this piece that they worked so hard on that they don’t want to do anything to it that might destroy it, it seems like it gave them more ability and confidence to explore. They are all really comfortable using the doc cam.

Rachel: Do you all just let the kids use it in your classroom—the document camera?

(Brandon nods.)

My students just use it. It is like an extension of the room, they don’t really feel like it is an odd thing. It is just part of the room. It wasn’t like that with my younger students last year at my other school. I didn’t just give them free reign. I didn’t just say, “Yeah, you can do whatever you want with that.” But the older kids seem to use it independently.

---

Researcher’s analytic memo: Rachel’s oral descriptions of each photograph of student artwork are focused not only on a description of the visual image we are seeing. Rachel retells stories from her experience with students. Each of these story descriptions is striking to me. The stories emphasize the individual choices and process that each student selected. Rachel describes each photo with excerpts of stories that refer to a set of experiences that happened over time. Rachel’s voice is full of emotion as she describes each student’s process. Hearing Rachel’s stories of classroom episodes that correspond with the photo of student work, our CIG begins to understand how Rachel is finding ways to draw students into her inquiry process as she described in May 2010. For instance, Rachel shares what a student wrote in her reflective “spark” journal about her process of making the self-portrait. The student tells about the feeling of seeing her self as sad and understanding her self in a new way, in the way that she thinks the outside world sees her, “the face [she is] presenting to the world.” In this story, Rachel is sharing a shift in thinking and feeling that the student experienced and shared with Rachel through a journal entry. I see this as a layered or nested set of documentation practices (photograph of student work, teacher’s oral story sharing of experiences among students, teacher’s sharing of student reflective and in-process documentation in the form of spark journal entry).
(Concluding, Rachel begins to disconnect her netbook.)

Mary Elizabeth: A moment ago you posed a question. You said something like “How can I design a lesson where they still get the basics but they have this artistic freedom also”—is that a fair paraphrase?

Rachel: Yeah.

Mary Elizabeth: Do you have an answer now, or one possible answer? You said that the document camera plays an important role in their technical explorations. But I am curious about—how are you now, as a result of teaching this unit with these self-portraits, how are you thinking about your role in that lesson planning process?

Rachel: Mm-hm. (Pausing to think) Well, it was still very planned. It was still very planned on my end in a way. But, in a way, not. Because I didn’t make an example—which I had always done before. Before last year, I had always made an example and said, “This is what we are going for.” “It doesn’t have to look like mine.” But, then they are seeing it and the image of the example is in their head.65

Mary Elizabeth: (chuckling as if familiar with the scenario) Here it is! But don’t copy it!

Rachel: (talking at once) Yeah, here it is but it doesn’t have to look like mine! Laughter.

Rachel: So that was new. That part of the process was definitely new. And without the aid of that document camera technology, I don’t think it would have been as seamless to transition from this very realistic portrait that they drew to taking it to another place. As far as the non-traditional media goes, that was tricky. When I introduced it the students said, “What do you mean?” 66 I resisted giving them specific examples of what I thought non-traditional media meant. I didn’t want to name any specific thing (smiling). I didn’t want to

65 Researcher’s analytic memo: Rachel refers to a typical teaching method that art teachers often use to teach a skill or technique—that is the teacher created exemplar and demonstration that leads to student imitation. Rachel reflects here about how her lesson planning has changed as a result of her shifted interest in issues of student inquiry and exploration of non-traditional media.

66 Researcher’s analytic memo: Rachel views document cameras as central to the transition from realistic to experimental self-portrait. It seems this device was used as a segue. I see it as a transitional object (Ellsworth, 2005) in the way that Rachel emphasizes its instrumental role in her facilitation of this lesson.
I didn’t want to give them any ideas. So I kept saying, “ Anything other than paint, chalk, pastel, pencil. You have to think of it.”

Rachel: I have lots more images, but I don’t want to take up any more time on that, but I do want to show you my rubric because the evaluation is difficult. Right now my rubric has 4 categories. (reading and listing out loud) The first is “work.” Did they fulfill the requirements of the assignment? The second is “effort.” The varying levels of effort. “Originality” is the third category, which is tricky to judge. But it can be done. The last category is the reflection part that they have to do. I require that and it is part of their grade. Those are the categories on my rubric, but I don’t know.

Mary Elizabeth: So is that where you are in this process now—thinking about the evaluation and rubric? You also talked about evaluation approaches this morning and shared your rubric with us.

Rachel: Yeah, I feel like I am questioning myself about that. So—I’ll be doing some more thinking about it and let you know.

Mary Elizabeth: Great. We can continue to think about evaluation and assessment together. (turning to the whole group) Did Rachel spark any ideas in you for your different classes?

Jason: Yeah. Those images are pretty big, those are probably 2 feet by 3 feet aren’t they?

Rachel: Yeah. They could make them as big as they wanted. We used the big white butcher paper on the roll. They are pretty huge.

Jason: Mm-hm. I am thinking about stealing the lesson!

Group: Laughter.

Rachel: You may! I will send you my lesson plan!
Chapter 7
Knowledge in the Making: Teachers Reflect on Documentation of Students’ Creative Experiences

What really exists is not things made but things in the making. Once made, they are dead (William James, 1996, p. 263).

We need concepts and languages that will grasp without freezing or collapsing, the fluid, continuous, dynamic, multiple, uncertain, nondecomposable qualities of experience in the making. (Elizabeth Ellsworth, 2005, p. 8)

To think about things in the making is thus to think, and think of ourselves, “experimentally” (John Rajchman, 2000b, p. 11).

Regarding pedagogy as experimentation in thought rather than representation of knowledge as a thing already made creates a profound shift in how we think of pedagogical intent or volition—the will to teach. (Elizabeth Ellsworth, 2005, pp. 27-28, emphasis added)

Elizabeth Ellsworth describes the teacher and student as “subjects in motion,” thinking and feeling learners who are exploring the world’s newness (personal correspondence, 2009). She observes, “both art and education give place to what does not previously exist” (personal correspondence, 2009). Ellsworth emphasizes the emergent process of learning by distinguishing between knowledge that is made versus knowledge in the making (Ellsworth, 2005; Rajchman, 2000a). By attending to knowledge in the making as learning that is open to emergence and unexpected experiences, we open a space for learning in the unexpected. We unite the goals of teacher and student in the process of making and constructing experiences that are part of a curriculum in the making.
Ellsworth’s (2005) ideas of the learning self in motion, knowledge in the making, and transitional objects inform my analysis and discussion of participants’ descriptions of shifts in their thinking about teaching and learning as they examine and share information they are gathering about student learning in the form of journal entries, videos, and photographs. Participants used these and other forms of visual and written documentation for reflecting on their teaching and to share their experiences with the CIG.

Multivocal Intertexture: Various Methods of Gathering Information about Student Learning

Kay: Assessment is still on my mind. Today I started a dialogue with my 5th and 6th grade students about evaluating our mini-portfolios built around a theme chosen by each student. We made a mind map of our ideas. (Kay, blog post, March 2010)

Carmen: My videos are a compilation of several different lessons from the beginning of my process in the fall, to just a few weeks ago... After watching the video, the pivotal take back from this lesson was what the students knew based on prior knowledge as well as bouncing ideas from classmate to classmate on where the lesson was to go with this idea in mind: the process and design of a sculpture. The video tells the story and inquiry process. (Carmen, blog post, May 2011)

Kay: As I have been thinking about assessment, I was considering the difference between teaching skills and teaching concepts. Then, after reading a student journal reflection, I realized I was also teaching another category—behaviors. This student is saying that he now plans his artwork ahead, where before he didn’t. To me, that is a huge change! (Kay, blog post, April 2010)

The above intertexture is an assemblage of blog post excerpts that represent three teachers’ perspectives as they reflected on ways to generate and use various forms of documentation that represent and reflect on students’ experiences. Each teacher wrote
how thinking about teaching and learning is connected to generative processes of gathering information about student learning. On the blog, teachers wrote reflections addressed to our CIG that included images and videos of ideas generated by students. We learned how teachers connected their own thinking with student processes.

When teachers shared visual documentation (images and videos) of their teaching experiences that included students’ reflections, our CIG was able to see how experiences were unfolding in each teachers’ classroom from the perspective of both teachers and students. Although the focus of my dissertation is on teachers’ shifts in thinking as part of professional learning in a collaborative inquiry group, some of the most profound shifts that teachers shared with our group occurred in relation to their observing students’ experiences and artistic outcomes.

In this chapter, I explore concepts that Elizabeth Ellsworth (2005) used in her book, Places of Learning, to interpret and discuss examples of documentation of experience that one teacher, Rachel, shared with our CIG during our January 2011 group meeting (see Scene IV, January 2010, the narrative interlude that precedes this chapter). Rachel described a strong connection between her professional learning experience (with our CIG) and the ways that she was shifting her teaching. She hoped that her students might also have the opportunity to experience the open ended, “growing and evolv[ing]” (Rachel, May 2010) that she was exploring as a learning self (Ellsworth, 2005) working in collaborative inquiry.
Sensations of Shifting, Growing, Evolving

I recall what Rachel told our group in May of 2010 about how her learning process as a member of our CIG was connected to the learning process and experiences she hoped her students would also experience:

(May 2010 CIG Meeting, Group Interview)

Rachel: Driving here today I was thinking about what it was like to be here [meeting with our CIG] seven times ago, then six times ago, and everything in between. It just feels—I feel like my brain has evolved—I really do. But at the same time, it wasn’t so hard. I feel I have had this huge shift in my thinking. But, it wasn’t the same experience that I might have had taking a college course. But, I have learned, let’s say, 100 times more than any college course I have ever taken.

When I explain this [AETI] project and our CIG to people—they say, “What? You get to figure out your own professional development? You get to decide what you want to learn?” Yes. I think that part is tremendous.

And that is just what we are trying to do for our students. It is the same thing. And they are going to be growing and evolving too because we are doing that for them—well, we are figuring out how to do that. I don’t feel like I am 100% successful. But to me, what happened to me this year, is what I am trying to do for my kids too.

Mary Elizabeth: So you think that your learning and the way you are feeling a sense of shifting is alike to the process that your students are going through?

Rachel: Absolutely.

Rachel referred to her personal teaching/learning process as a “shift.” She linked her own shift in professional learning to her desire to, in turn, find new ways to provide supportive architectures of participation for students to take ownership of their learning, to inquire together, and to make choices. Rachel’s described “growing and evolv[ing]” and a “huge shift” as connected to what she hoped could be possible for her students (May, 2010). There were many informal conversations with Rachel when she stated her
desire to continue to find ways to help her students discover their own feelings of evolving and shifting through the art making process.

Planning for Possible Futures

At the time of this group interview, in May 2010, Rachel was planning for the upcoming 2010–2011 school year when she would take a new position teaching high school art after more than a decade of teaching K–8 art. Rachel was looking forward to her new position when she predicted, “[Students] are going to be growing and evolving too because we are doing that for them—well, we are figuring out how to do that” (Rachel, Scene I, May 2010).

She spoke about her students in the future sense, as “going to be growing and evolving” in the same way that she felt empowered to “decide what” she wanted to learn in her “professional development” journey (Rachel, May 2010) with our CIG. Rachel indicated that she felt unfinished in her process of learning to facilitate students’ explorations. “I don’t feel like I am 100% successful. But, what happened to me this year [experiencing collaborative inquiry], is what I am trying to do for my kids too” (Rachel, May 2010 group interview). Rachel stated her intention to think of student learning in the same way she was thinking of her professional learning, as growing and evolving in the experience of knowledge in the making “rather than representation of knowledge as a thing already made” (Ellsworth, 2005, p. 27).
Describing Students’ Experiences in Explorations of Non-Traditional Media

In the January 2011 scene (see Scene IV, which appears as an interlude preceding Chapter 7), Rachel tells our group about a new format she has structured for students to explore non-traditional media. It is one that she hopes provides opportunities for the “growing and evolving” that she spoke of in May 2010. Rachel begins by describing the background of her lesson unit development. She then shows our CIG photos of the finished self-portraits students made. Rachel describes students’ unique and individualized processes of making. Rachel’s rich descriptions of photographs of student work include her observations of the unexpected, personal outcomes of each student’s experience in-the-making (Ellsworth, 2005). The stories Rachel tells about her recent teaching experiences in January 2011 resonated with her May 2010 reflections about her desire for her students to experience sensations of growing, evolving, and shifting.

During this January 2011 CIG meeting, Rachel described detailed and individualized experiences that she and students shared in what was primarily student-directed art making. Knowing Rachel’s intention to help students find opportunities for exploration and experimentation in their art making processes (Rachel, May 2010), I listened carefully to the ways that Rachel talked about her photographic documentation of the finished artwork that students in her art classes produced.

The following two themes are important to the way I understand Rachel’s sharing of photographic documentation to be indicative of her continued exploration of her shifts

---

67 The flow of the script format in this scene is interrupted in several places by footnotes which include excerpts of my researcher analytic memos, written following this January 2011 CIG meeting.
in thinking, feeling, and practice related to teaching/learning. First, Rachel responds to images of students’ creative work, interweaving stories of individual student’s working process in respect to the photographs she was showing our group. Second, I noticed the importance she placed on the document camera, which I interpret as a transitional object (Ellsworth, 2005). In talking about students’ artwork, Rachel reveals her own reflective thinking about her move from a lesson unit that emphasizes skill and technique toward the structuring of a learning opportunity that “let[s] them inquire and experience.” Rachel discusses the document camera as integral to the transition from a structured drawing lesson to a semi-structured lesson unit in which they had great “freedom.”

I elaborate these two themes in the following sections of this chapter. Rachel told several short stories of students’ experiences as intertwined with her own reflections about teaching/learning. Rachel indicated shifts in her thinking and practice through oral story sharing and the prominent question that she posed mid-way during sharing photographs of students’ completed self-portraits. She asked, “How am I going to teach them techniques and skills, and let them inquire and experience?” (Scene IV, January 2011, lines 81-82).

Photographic Documentation of Student Artwork as Story Tapestries Interwoven with Accounts of Emerging Experience

The photographs Rachel showed our CIG in January, were close-up images of each student’s portrait, presented one-by-one in a slide show format. Rachel used these images to prompt her narrative descriptions of students’ experiences in the making (Ellsworth, 2005). In telling our group stories about the events of classroom life, she was
weaving together a set of experiences, stories, impressions, and sensations that were elicited by the photographs (Scene IV, January 2011 CIG Meeting). Without Rachel’s descriptions of how these photographs represented to her the varied experiences of students’ self-directed discovery and exploration, they might have appeared as simply visual records of students’ artwork as already made (Ellsworth, 2005; Rajchman, 2000a).

Rachel used these photographic images to weave a textured story tapestry during our CIG meeting, reliving for our group specific experiences with materials, processes of thinking, students’ reflective journal entries, and her own reflections about how to facilitate teaching. Rachel voices each of these descriptions with energy and emotion that seemed to be indicative of the intense care that Rachel has invested in helping students find what she called “freedom” (Rachel, Scene IV, January 2011, line 81-83). This freedom is part of the “huge shift” that Rachel described to us in May of 2010 (Scene I, line 231).

As Rachel spoke about her photographs of students’ artwork and intermingled her own observations and reflections, our CIG could better understand how students began to investigate symbolic self-portraits using non-traditional media. Rachel’s spoken story sharing and visual documentation conveyed ideas about her students’ processes, experiences, materials, reflections, and evaluations. Both Rachel’s photos and her stories were significant to me in learning how Rachel was thinking about her teaching as learning.
Document Camera as Transitional Object

The document camera has made many appearances in participants’ narrative reflections. It appears again in our January 2011 meeting, playing a significant role in Rachel’s account of her teaching. Rachel talks about the function of the document camera as part of a “seamless way to transition from this very realistic portrait that they drew to taking it to another place” (Rachel, Scene IV, January 2011, lines 127-130). Because the document camera has taken such varied and prominent roles in teachers’ explorations of pedagogical approaches and their reflective documentation of their experiences, I think it is important and useful to examine the importance that Rachel placed on the document camera. It was part of her move from teaching that was focused on skills and techniques to facilitating inquiry and experience.

In February of 2010, while in her tenth year teaching K-8 students, Rachel talked about the document camera as an extension of self (see Scene II, February 2010). In Chapter 5, I wrote about the document camera device using the interpretive concepts of translation as informed by actor-network theory. The theory of translation was useful to understand how human and non-human actants exert force on one another. In the discussion that I am developing here in relation to the theoretical framework of Ellsworth’s (2005) knowledge in the making, I think it is important to attend to the way that Rachel used the document camera as a cultural tool to shift the focus of her lesson unit from developing a particular drawing technique to developing a spirit and attitude of experimentation and exploration with non-traditional media. The way that Rachel describes her use and reflection about the document camera in January 2011 is as a
transitional object. Ellsworth (2005) describes how people use transitional objects to lead to transitional experience. A worldly material object captivates our imagination and we begin to muse, moving toward a virtual world of possibility. The possibility is not inherent in the object, but in our interpretation of it’s meaning as significant to our experience.

Rachel explained that she thinks students were more likely to free themselves of the preoccupation with the technical qualities and time invested in the first self-portrait because they were tracing their original drawing using the document camera to project an enlarged image of their original, which they then traced. While students may have seen this as just another tool, Rachel attributes this document camera object with the ability to guide and shift her teaching approach from a technical drawing exercise to a semi-structured experiment with media and symbolism. Rachel revisits the role of the document camera several times in her January 2011 presentation to our group as an integral part of her experiences. “Without the aid of that document camera technology, I don’t think it would have been as seamless to transition from this very realistic portrait that they drew to taking it to another place” (Rachel, Scene IV, lines 127-130).

Building on Winnecott’s theory of the transitional object, Ellsworth (2005) emphasizes how our creative use of an object can open a “pedagogical pivot place” where our imagination is activated (2005, p. 76). We use objects in ways that expand our own ability to discover and help us stretch our limits. One of Ellsworth’s examples of a transitional object is Albert Einstein’s compass, which his father gifted to him as a young boy. The compass became a transitional object to Einstein not because it was a gift but because of the way that Einstein chose to use it as a device that helped him to focus his
imagination on the mystifying force that enabled the needle to move. Contemplating the needle and the force behind it fueled a lifetime of wonderment. Ellsworth explains, it is not the compass itself that is inherently a transitional object. Rather, it was the way that Einstein put himself in relation to the object and his creative use of it as a tool to fuel experience. The object “becomes pedagogical when we use it to discover and creatively work and play at our own limits as participants in the world” (Ellsworth, 2005, p. 78).

For Rachel, the document camera was a transitional object that she used to open new possibility; a pedagogical pivot place, where she could see an opening to facilitate a lesson unit in her high school art class that would allow students to build on and develop “ability and confidence to explore” (Rachel, Scene IV, lines 83-86). It is Rachel’s use of the document camera as a bridge between her two teaching approaches that make it transitional for her as a pedagogical tool. Her story telling reveals how she was thinking about this tool as helping her enact ideas that were important to her.

Listening to Rachel describe the use and function of the document camera, I learned that she associated this object with making possible her ability to facilitate teaching toward freedom and creativity, two things that she was aspiring to shift in relation to her own learning and student experiences (Rachel, May 2010 group interview). Speaking about the role of the document camera in her new teaching context at the high school level she explained, “I think it was so good for [students] to take this very realistic thing that they did—the first portrait—and then blow it up and do something crazy with it. Their creativity! I was excited about it. I feel that for high school kids, that creativity seems like it’s difficult” (Rachel, Scene IV, lines 78-79).
In March 2011, we gathered together again to hear other members of our group share their individual inquiries and to make plans for how our group would present our year of collaborative inquiry to the AETI program participants in May. Rachel wrote on the blog at the end of our March meeting about hearing two teachers share student work:

(blog post, March 2011)

Rachel: Today I heard Carmen say, “art comes from somewhere.” It fired up my thought process on sparking creativity in young artists. Then Jason shared about the shoe project. I actually plan to use it in my classroom. I am so impressed by all of the teachers in my CIG. Everyone is so intelligent and thoughtful about what they are doing. The time we spend sharing is very powerful in the way it stimulates my teaching process and how I approach it. Sometimes it is also very affirming. I usually feel too isolated in my building, being the only art teacher and being physically so far from the music and other related arts people. I get very little feedback, positive or otherwise from anyone except the students. I can get discouraged and begin to feel that I am really not getting anywhere. I will miss our CIG when this is over.

Rachel tells that hearing another teacher share their video documentation of classroom processes, “fired up [her] thought process” (Rachel, blog post, March 2011). I felt the same sense of stimulation hearing each teacher share experiences and reflections on teaching using various forms of documentation and accompanying stories that lend understanding to students’ experience in the making.

I conclude this research text in the following Chapter 8. I summarize my methods and return to several participants’ narratives in a discussion of three important themes: (a) Documentation as Inquiry and Artifact: Objects Linked to Stories, (b) Teachers Reflect on Shifts in Pedagogy in Relation to a Digital Object, and (c) Self-Directed/Group-Supported Inquiry in Flexible Spaces of Interaction to Support Shifts in Thinking.
Chapter 8

Bringing Experiences into Connection

We have been aided, inspired, multiplied (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 3).

Multiplicity, more than a matter of logic, is something one must make or do, and learn by making or doing . . . We must always make connections, since they are not already given. (Rajchman, 2000b, p. 6)

When we write stories . . . we bring our experiences into connection with the lives of others, and in these connections there is a dynamic dialogue, a polyphonic conversation. We learn about ourselves, and we learn about others, and we learn about the world. (Hasebe-Ludt et al., 2009, p. 179)

As I conclude the revision of this manuscript as a process of writing-as-inquiry (Richardson, 1997; Richardson & St. Pierre, 2007), I think back to the various stages of my experiences as a narrative inquirer: entering the context of AETI in 2009 and forming relationships among teachers in our CIG, facilitating and supporting our group processes, learning among teachers in our group, analyzing participants’ narratives, selecting stories to retell, and reliving these experiences in interpretive processes of writing-as-inquiry. These processes and interactions occurred in a *three-dimensional narrative inquiry space* (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000) that I understood to be three overlapping spaces of inquiry including (a) the broad context of AETI, (b) our CIG meetings as the main focus of my study, and (c) the individual teaching contexts that teachers referred to when sharing stories of experience with our CIG.
Guiding Questions

My data collection and analysis was focused on the stories and reflections that teachers shared with our group as related to the following two research questions:

1. In what ways do participants use documentation (as processes and as material artifacts) to facilitate professional learning?
2. As participants share their documentation with the inquiry group and engage in dialogue, what indicates shifts in thinking about teaching and learning?

In this chapter, these research questions guide my discussion as I synthesize the ways that teachers’ stories work together in narrative intertexture to form a multiplicity of ideas that lend understanding to professional learning in community.

Narrative Intertextures: Methodology, Form, and Theories

I selected stories for this dissertation by learning what critical events were important and influential to teachers (Webster & Mertova, 2007) that also elaborated my understanding of teachers’ “shifts in thinking” (Rachel, May 2010 CIG Meeting). The narrative intertextures in Chapters 4 through 7 and the corresponding Scenes I through IV (which appear as narrative interludes between chapters), are collections of stories that represent several participants’ perspectives at various times and places during the two years of data collection.

This research describes how shifts in thinking and practice can be seen and understood by colleagues in a collaborative inquiry group through visual and written documentation with accompanying storied reflection that chronicles experiences in
relation to specific teaching contexts. The multiplicity of people, objects, time, and spaces of interaction are represented by narrative fragments interwoven to create complex narrative intertextures that retain the nuances of each teacher’s individual experiences but share a common narrative thread, topic, or theme.

Teachers’ narratives indicated that sensations of shifting, changing, or moving in inquiry as professional becoming were not limited to shifts in thinking. Their sense of shifting also included shifts in practice, shifts in use of digital technology, shifts in the arrangement of classroom spaces as active extensions of inquiry, and the notion of shifting/moving/becoming as a quality of inquiry in ongoing processes of professional learning in a collaborative inquiry group. Teachers’ stories of experience, elicited by visual and written documentation of classroom life, were important to understanding their experiences.

I developed a methodological and theoretical toolset for writing multivocal narrative intertextures after studying and adapting the methods of several qualitative inquirers who have constructed intricate narrative research texts as groupings, juxtapositions, and assemblages of narratives that explore multiple perspectives (Conle, 1996; Craig, 2007; Glesne, 1997; Hasebe-Ludt & Hurren, 2003; Hasebe-Ludt, Leggo, & Chambers 2009; Heydon, 2010; MacLeod, 2009; Prendergast, 2006; Reilly, 2011). This narrative intertexture method is worth mentioning here in the conclusion of this dissertation because it is one of the outcomes of this research that is most valuable to me as I continue narrative inquiry research that explores the multiple perspectives of teachers’ and students’ storied experiences.
I assembled collections of stories to form intertextures where the resonances and dissonances of multiple perspectives were amplified through the use of interpretive theoretical tools. The theoretical ideas extending from actor-network theory (Boylan, 2010; Fenwick & Edwards, 2010; 2012), smooth and striated space (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987), and knowledge in the making (Ellsworth, 2005) helped me to analyze the complex interactions and shifting in what Clandinin and Connelly (2000) refer to as three-dimensional narrative inquiry space. The analytic and interpretive theoretical discussion in this narrative inquiry reflects on the ways teachers energized and characterized their professional learning, their shifts in thinking, and their use of documentation in these processes.

The following conceptual vocabulary drawn from each theory supported my analysis and interpretation of participants’ shifts:

- Actor-network theory and the sensibilities of translation, enactment, symmetry, and fluidity (Boylan, 2010; Fenwick & Edwards, 2010; 2012)
- Smoothing and striating mixed spaces (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987)
- Sensing and embodying the learning self, sensations of the learning self in motion, knowledge as a thing made versus knowledge in the making, transitional objects as part of a process of pedagogical volition, and the ambiguity and emergence of experience in the making (Ellsworth, 2005)

I used these three theories to supplement and extend Clandinin and Connelly’s (2000) three-dimensional narrative inquiry space beyond a Deweyan view of experience in narrative, temporal continuum. These three theories are integral to interpreting the entangled complexity of narratives in this research text, and they work together to help illuminate the qualities of moving/shifting/becoming as shared interactions among (a) people, ideas, narratives, digital objects, and material artifacts, (b) physical and virtual places and the processes of change where teaching and learning take place, and (c)
ambiguous spaces of sensation, thinking, and reflection that can be conveyed by teachers through sharing of artifacts and other visual and textual chronicles of their experience. Narrative intertexture then, is both a form for narratives in the research text and an interpretive method that relies on these three theories (actor-network theory, smooth and striated space, and knowledge in the making) as ways of thinking to expand and explore the relations of overlapping and shifting spaces of inquiry in multiple times, places, and social contexts.

**Implications of this Research**

The theoretical discussions in Chapters 4 through 7 indicate ways that teachers’ narratives are potentially meaningful and significant to an audience beyond the immediate context of our CIG (Kim, 2008). In their book, *Inquiry as Stance*, Cochran-Smith and Lytle (2009) discuss the perceived meaning and value of teacher-practitioner research and the important tangible outcomes of teacher inquiry, such as documentation, that are shared by teacher learning communities. They warn that while stories and artifacts may be of profound importance to those who are closely involved in one professional learning community, the implications often remain “invisible except to the immediate participants” (2009, p. 7). “Many of the ‘outcomes’ of participation in inquiry communities are palpable and relevant only to those who are in them.” (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009, p. 7). I contend that this dissertation research brings together narratives that are of broad relevance and have potential to hold implications for a wide audience of educators who are inquiring about professional learning.
The analyses of teachers’ stories in this dissertation have implications beyond the local context of a single grant-funded professional learning program, AETI. The diverse narratives in this dissertation are records of experiences that when considered together, inform lived (and living) theories of professional learning as shifting, moving, and becoming. Teachers’ collaborative inquiries into teaching and learning show concern for what is practical in specific teaching contexts. However, more importantly, when analyzed together, these stories are also generating theories in action that inform professional learning as a lived/living process of becoming.

Kim (2008) wrote, “Lived theory is organic and ontological; it is not bound to a metanarrative. It is constantly in the process of evolving and recurring while traveling from place to place and from person to person” (p. 258). What, then, are the important implications of this research that are likely to resonate in multiple contexts, traveling from “place to place and from person to person?” (Kim, 2008, p. 258).

In response to this question, I draw from three theoretical perspectives, actor-network theory (Boylan, 2010; Fenwick & Edwards, 2010; 2012), smooth and striated space (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987), and knowledge in the making (Ellsworth, 2005), in interwoven discussion to revisit important themes that emerged from narrative data and that may be used to inform collaborative inquiry professional learning in a variety of contexts. Therefore, my goal in this chapter is to bring forward the polyphonic narrative threads (Hasebe-Ludt, Leggo, & Chambers 2009; Kim, 2008) and theories that amplify the meaning of salient themes in this narrative inquiry dissertation as relevant to the field of education and readers whose interests overlap among the following:

• Facilitation and support of professional learning communities.
• Teaching as inquiry into lifelong professional becoming.
• Pre-service teachers’ and teacher educators’ collaborative inquiry into becoming teachers in the arts.
• Educational researchers (both practitioner researchers and scholars) pursuing qualitative inquiry methods to chronicle, analyze, and interpret educational life in ways that show the multiplicity of teachers’ experiences and attend to professional learning as spaces of interaction.

Three Themes

Important ideas emerged from the stories that teachers told (during our collaborative inquiry group meetings and shared via the blog) that are specific to the experiences of our CIG and are also ideas that are likely to be important to a wide audience. For the purpose of synthesis in this chapter, I have organized these ideas into three themes:

1. Documentation as Inquiry and Artifact: Objects Linked to Stories
2. Teachers Reflect on Shifts in Pedagogy in Relation to a Digital Object
3. Self-Directed/Group-Supported Inquiry in Flexible Spaces of Interaction to Support Shifts in Thinking

In the following section, I discuss these themes in relation to theoretical discussion that interweaves actor-network theory (Fenwick & Edwards, 2010; 2012), smooth and striated space (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987), and knowledge in the making (Ellsworth, 2005).

Theme I

Documentation as Inquiry and Artifact: Objects Linked to Stories

Teachers shared their teaching experiences by showing and talking about visual artifacts and objects (such as photos and videos) as storied accounts of experience in the
making (Ellsworth, 2005). Documentation artifacts and the accompanying stories that teachers told about them helped our group to see into or make connections with otherwise difficult to access places and spaces of personalized professional inquiry. During CIG meetings, these visual artifacts elicited teachers’ reflections about their experiences and helped teachers to convey and construct ideas in ways that created overlapping spaces of inquiry shared among members of the group. The object or artifact (such as a photo) functioned in cooperation with teachers’ narratives to form links/connections/relations between “moving networks” of people, objects, structures, and materials that were otherwise isolated by the physical distance of each teacher’s classroom contexts (Nespor, 2003, p. 24). Analyzing objects and stories in our CIG meeting spaces, I was able to see how we (both people and things) were “brought into being in a process of reciprocal definition” (Akrich, 1992, p. 22). This process of sharing opened the nondelimited space (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987) of possibility where teachers could try, test, and invent a variety of interpretations of past events and posit possible futures for shifting and moving in pedagogical volition (Ellsworth, 2005). Teachers’ shifting and moving among spaces of inquiry (both figurative spaces of thinking/communicating physical places of teaching/learning) were supported by our CIG as a forum to share ideas in process and then to co-construct possible futures for these ideas.

Examples of the teaching/learning spaces that our group was able to access through a teacher’s sharing of documentation included: Jason’s explorations with demonstrating drawing (Chapter 5), Brandon’s methods of helping students develop their thinking (Chapter 5), Kay’s elementary art classroom and choice-based learning centers (Chapter 6), Emma’s mobile teaching sites and ways of (re)thinking about inquiry
(Chapter 6), and Rachel’s stories of students’ experiences in exploration of non-traditional media in relation to her professional becoming (Chapter 7).

Members of our CIG were able to engage with the individual teaching contexts of each teacher when teachers shared their documentation of teaching while telling stories of experience. These visual teaching artifacts were accompanied by the teacher’s descriptive stories of the *learning self in motion* (Ellsworth, 2005) and supported the group’s understanding of individual teacher’s specific pedagogical explorations. Stories propelled the active and unfolding cycle of *curriculum-as-currere* (Pinar, 2004) and *experience in the making* (Ellsworth, 2005), which occurred uniquely in each teacher’s daily professional life. Therefore, it was not simply the act of collecting or generating the artifact that was important to our group, but sharing the artifact as they were connected to a series of stories in both face-to-face and virtual meeting environments.

**Theme II**

**Teachers Reflect on Shifts in Pedagogy in Relation to a Digital Object**

One of the findings from this research that was most interesting and surprising to me was the role that the document camera played (and the its related digital media such as videos) in ways that teachers talked about their pedagogical shifting and shifts in conceptualizing their role(s) as a teacher. Specifically, teachers shared these shifts in respect to levels of teacher energy and participation (Kay and Rachel, February 2010), moving from teacher to moderator (Brandon, February 2010), analyzing and adjusting teacher-directed demonstrations (Jason, March 2010), encouraging students to share their thinking and making by demonstrating their choice-making to a classroom audience.
Kay, February through March 2010), and citing the document camera as a pivotal object in the transition to a different pedagogical approach (Rachel, January 2010).

The document camera emerged as an important actor in the collaborative inquiry group (Scene I, May 2010, lines 69-74; Chapter 5; Chapter 7). Teachers elected to purchase this camera after hearing how one teacher, Brandon, used the camera in unexpected ways (Scene I, May 2010). Early in the study, Kay, Rachel, and Brandon characterized their use of the document camera by indicating that it was a partner in the ways that they conceptualized and enacted shifts in their teaching (Chapter 5). Rachel spoke of the document camera in ways that implicated it as a transitional object (Ellsworth, 2005) that helped her enact shifts in her teaching practice (Chapter 7).

The broader implications of this need not focus on the document camera as a special device. Rather, the narratives in this dissertation indicate the mutually influential roles that humans and objects play in networks of interaction in educational settings. Objects and humans are defined in relationship to one another. An actor-network analysis of teachers’ narratives can trace how both objects and people are transformed in the translations of their mutual articulation in different contexts. Both actor-network theory (Fenwick & Edwards, 2010; 2012) and Ellsworth’s (2005) notion of transitional objects informed my analysis of teachers’ stories that were focused on the document camera in Chapters 5 and 7. These concepts lend a set of analytic constructs with which to consider the role of the document camera as more than simply an anthropomorphized pedagogical object (Waltz, 2004) to which participants were attributing human characteristics.

In Chapter 5, I focused on an ANT analysis of the document camera as part of a network of interactions that showed how teachers were experiencing and sharing their
shifts in thinking and learning. The ANT concept of symmetry lends understanding to how participants repeatedly spoke about the document camera in ways that placed it as equitable among humans and objects in their educational settings (i.e., classrooms) where pedagogical shifts were taking place.

In Chapter 7, I interpreted Rachel’s use of the document camera in relationship to Ellsworth’s (2005) transitional object. Rachel characterized her use of the document camera as a tool that aided her in shifting the trajectory of her teaching from a prescriptive and structured drawing lesson to a lesson unit that would support and encourage students in their exploration of mixed media and non-traditional media. The document camera was a transitional object for Rachel because she chose it as a tool to emphasize how students developed the possibilities for exploring the unexpected in both media, scale, and subject matter in a self-portrait.

I think there is more potential for the investigation of teachers’ uses of digital tools as part of documentation and reflection on daily encounters with theory as praxis. I am interested in developing additional lines of inquiry to guide investigations into the function of digital objects, documentation, and artifacts as part of teachers’ re-visioning the roles of teachers and students in art classroom studio learning.

Theme III
Self-Directed/Group-Supported Inquiry in Flexible Spaces of Interaction to Support Shifts in Thinking

Teachers spoke of the importance of designing their own professional learning experiences, citing the relevance of meeting among arts teachers on a regular basis
The procedures that AETI provided for our CIG were systems of support to encourage teachers to design their own professional learning explorations to be responsive to their individual teaching contexts. These included:

- Provision for common meeting times (with substitute teaching reimbursement) for teachers of like content area focus (art and music) to meet;
- Funding to purchase technology equipment that would support teachers’ inquiries into teaching;
- Virtual and face-to-face meeting environments for both asynchronous and synchronous communication;
- Flexible support of a facilitator to keep time, provide resources and assistance, synthesize key ideas, and encourage new ideas to emerge.

These were characteristics of organized yet flexible teacher-directed professional learning that teachers in our group valued (Scene 1, May 2010).

**Virtual and Face-to-Face Meeting Spaces**

Multiple sites and modes for sharing were important structures of participation supported by AETI, emphasized as part of my facilitation, and encouraged by members of our group. It was Kay who suggested, at our first meeting in 2009, that we start a CIG website/blog as a venue for frequent communication. The private group blog, the web conference platforms (Skype® and Elluminate®) for synchronous virtual meetings, and the monthly face-to-face CIG meetings at a central location outside of school, were three sites for sharing artifacts of documentation and conversation.

For example, Emma used the blog web site to write detailed and thoughtful blog posts about her concerns regarding physical teaching places that were challenging her daily routines and her ways of thinking (Chapter 6). Her comments and contributions
during face-to-face interactions were not as frequent, detailed, or as vivid as her written blog-post reflections. Using the blog, she was able to exercise care and take ample time, *striating a smooth space* of interaction and communication where she could freely compose and revise written reflections addressed to our group (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987). These written reflections were fitting for the sensitive experiences Emma was conveying, as part of her ongoing shifting as a *learning self in motion* (Ellsworth, 2005), and in response to meeting her daily challenges and “morphing” her approach to understanding and undertaking teaching as inquiry (Emma, May 2010, Chapter 6).

It is useful to think of the blog space, the face-to-face meeting spaces, and our virtual web conference spaces as mixed *smooth-striated* spaces (Deleuze & Guatarri, 1987) that participants used to engage multiple modes of interaction in order to put their ideas in relationship with others. Learning from Emma and drawing on Deleuze and Guattari’s (1987) topographies of smooth and striated spaces,68 I interpret the mixed spaces (the virtual and face-to-face spaces where our group interacted) to be important for supporting professional learning that is supportive of teachers’ *shifting*. Deleuze and Guattari (1987) use the example of *patchwork* to illustrate the mixed qualities of smooth-striated space, asserting that smooth space and striated space exist in mixture. I see these three sites (blog, face-to-face meeting spaces, and virtual web conference space) as a *patchwork* of spaces that are in proximity and relationship. Deleazue and Guattari (1987) wrote that a patchwork space is “an amorphous collection of juxtaposed pieces that can be joined together in an infinite number of ways. . . . The smooth space of patchwork is

68 In Chapter 2, I elaborated “the technological model” that Deleuze and Guattari (1987) illustrate using the examples of the smooth entangled and unorganized topology of felt in contrast to the striated grid of the woven fabric’s warp and weft (p. 475).
adequate to demonstrate that ‘smooth’ does not mean homogeneous . . . it is an amorphous, *nonformal* space” (Deleuze & Guattari, pp. 476-477, emphasis added).

By using a variety of methods to document, share, and communicate ideas, teachers in our group were navigating modes and spaces of interaction in a number of ways that helped them to enact what Deleuze and Guattari (1987) called, “nonformal space” (p. 477). It seemed participants were creating, in collaborative inquiry, an assemblage of recordings, ideas, experiences, and reflections, which they joined together like a patchwork. This *joining together* (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987) or *translation* (Latour, 1987) happened in various virtual and face-to-face meeting forums. Thus, smoothing and striating are “movements” (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987, p. 475) of shifting. I think it is important to the *emergence of the learning self* (Ellsworth, 2005) to *move* in a variety of learning spaces, and to have the freedom to exert this action of smoothing and striating.

The actor-network theory (ANT) concept of *translation* further explores the *movement* of joining or shifting that occurs when humans and objects work together in various spaces of interaction to build modes of communication, to express ideas, record experiences, and enter in dialogue. Translation describes what can happen when human and non-human entities come together to interact, connect, and influence one another, thus forming affinities or alliances (Latour, 1987). Teachers and the digital communication objects (blog posts, web meeting platforms, digital devices) acted in translation with one another to develop a method and mode for sharing unique circumstances, recording perspectives, and constructing new ideas.
For example, members of our CIG responded by offering numerous supportive comments to Emma’s detailed blog posts, which enacted a space of interaction on the blog that was supplemental to our face-to-face-meetings (Chapter 6). The various spaces of interaction where our CIG worked were each spaces where teachers could reflect on shifting views and methods of teaching and learning. Together, these spaces of interaction formed our CIG’s *three dimensional narrative inquiry space* (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000).

Another example of this joining/translating/moving/emerging is evident in Scene II, *February 2010 CIG meeting* where teachers co-constructed ideas in a virtual, web-based, meeting space called Elluminate®. This February 2010 meeting was our second virtual, web-conference meeting. Teachers spoke and listened via a microphone and computer speakers, using audio voice chat. Often, those listening to the person speaking simultaneously typed comments (instant-messages) in the text chat window. It was in this meeting that a resonant synergy of ideas came together.

Early in the meeting, teachers described their uses of the document camera as a tool for teaching. Their descriptions included possible uses for this tool and uses that they had recently explored with students. Embedded in the descriptions were insights into how each teacher was conceptualizing their roles as shifting in response to their inquiry into teaching.

The discussion progressed into an emergent, active, co-construction of interpretations of the document camera as extending or “enhancing” (Brandon, February 2010) the roles they were experimenting with as teachers. The group conversation during this virtual meeting was a fast-paced, synchronous, spoken, and instant-messaging
conversation in which teachers theorized the document camera as a “surrogate” teacher, an “avatar”, and as sharing the teacher’s “energy” (Brandon, Kay, and Rachel, February 2010). In this February 2010 scene, the idea sharing was occurring between teachers via multiple modes of communication (voice and text) while the group was at a physical distance.

I sensed during this virtual meeting, the energy and emergence of multiple teachers’ experiences and ideas that were converging in a palpable sensation of what Ellsworth (2005) calls *knowledge in the making*. Teachers’ descriptions of their experiences gave way to co-constructed interpretations of the document camera as it was taking on the qualities and energy of the teacher.

*(February 2010 CIG Meeting)*

Kay: . . . another you— a little surrogate you—
Rachel: —an avatar!
Kay: . . . being on stage . . . all this energy to spend.
Brandon: . . . it enhances the teacher’s role.

**Sharing Documentation of Teaching as Inquiry in Multiple Forms and Forums**

Analyses of teachers’ stories of teaching experiences (Chapters 4 through 7 and the corresponding scenes as interludes between chapters), have led me to understand the importance of sharing documentation of teaching in multiple forms. Rich forms of media such as images, videos, and audio recordings accompanied by teachers’ written or spoken story sharing as narrative descriptions of their significance, were important to teachers’ sharing. This sharing was amplified through the flexibility to engage in multiple sites, both virtual and face-to-face.
In my supervision of student teachers at Penn State University, from 2010-2012, I applied what I was learning from our CIG about sharing documentation in virtual spaces. I set up a blog for pre-service teachers to use during their student teaching semester as an open, semi-structured forum for supportive communication and sharing of images and stories. The blog space was an extension of our face-to-face senior seminar classes. One former student teacher emailed me recently to thank me for facilitating the blog structure as a method to chronicle teaching experiences over time. She wrote that she had elected to continue blogging about her experiences throughout her first year of teaching and was now developing a professional network of fellow art teachers who were sharing ideas via their blogs. After reading her letter, I imagined her blog as one among a cluster of media-rich sites that served to keep art teachers connected in ways that supported an informal professional learning network held together by the common interests and concerns of these teachers.

I use a combination of face-to-face and virtual communication in my teaching of pre-service art educators and pre-service elementary educators because of the potential I see for students to choose to engage in multiple spaces of interaction. I see potential for lines of continued research that investigate the methods, modes, and qualities of documentation that support collaborative inquiry for pre-service and in-service teachers. I plan to continue using narrative methods to study documentation of teaching practice as storied imagery because it is partly the stories that teachers tell of specific teaching experiences in relationship to forms of visible documentation (such as photographs) that allow colleagues to think about possible futures for collaborative professional learning as it is relevant to teaching as experience in the making (Ellsworth, 2005).
The Significance of Group Supported Freedom of Choice in Collaborative Inquiry

Quite possibly the most broad and significant influence that supported participants’ ability to envision and explore shifts in thinking and learning, was the fundamental structure of AETI as a space for collaborative inquiry that encouraged individual teacher’s explorations of the CIG’s self-chosen topic of study. This freedom of choice translated to freedom of motion within each teacher’s unique teaching context. Teachers were free to be experimental in methods of thinking, teaching, learning, and experiencing knowledge in the making (Ellsworth, 2005).

I think often of Emma’s phrase, *in my situation*, which reminds me that meaningful professional learning is embedded in particular teaching situations (Emma, Scene I, May 2010, line 136; Scene III, March 2010, line 138; May 2010 blog post). Re-reading Emma’s and others’ reflections remind me that this professional learning experience was one that teachers designed together. Their design evolved and shifted, as participants supported each other while they studied their own teaching, in ways that were highly relevant to their unique and sometimes troubling teaching contexts. The yearlong CIG format (different from a one time, in-service workshop format when an outside expert delivers *training* on how to *implement* best practices) allowed teachers to learn from each other. Teachers made adaptations in their specific teaching contexts, then shared their shifting interpretations with the group—over an extended period of time.

Freedom of choice to select a topic of study and to further interpret and re-interpret its meaning, in the way that Emma did when she “morphed her approach” to fit her *situation*, was integral to teachers’ inquiries as processes of documentation and
storied reflections on *the learning self in motion* (Ellsworth, 2005). Without the loose but supportive structure of AETI as an architecture for facilitating freedom of choice in self-designed and group-supported inquiry, teachers would not have been able to document and share emergent experiences that, in turn, helped others to energize their own shifts in thinking about teaching and learning.
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Appendix A

Literature Review Search Records

Figure A–1. Screenshot of database to record each literature review search with keywords and results.
Appendix B

Selecting the Term Intertexture

(November 2011 research memos to form an interim text. Exploring concepts and terminology to describe narrative groupings to represent multivocal, polyphonic narratives)

I consider the terminology I might use to refer to sets or groupings of narrative fragments. Arrangements or collections of narrative data excerpts that belong to multiple participants. I care less about themes and categories as discrete packages and more about resonant groupings of narrative reflections—groupings that are loosely fit so there is space to reconsider. This is the space of delay. Rupture. Dissonance.

Is there a word that encompasses? My search for terminology ensues as I search the Oxford English Dictionary.

assort, n. A company, group.
assort, v. To consort, keep company, associate with.
constellate, v. To cluster or congregate together, as stars do in a constellation.
cluster, v. To grow or be situated in a cluster or in clusters, to form a cluster.
cluster, n. A number of persons, animals or things gathered or situated close together; an assemblage, group, swarm, crowd.
shift, v. To change.
shift, n. A movement to do something, a beginning.
collection, n. A number of objects collected or gathered together, viewed as a whole; a group of things collected and arranged.
collection, v. The action of inferring or deducing; an inference, deduction, conclusion. 2. The action of collecting or bringing under control (ones’s thoughts, etc.); the action of collecting oneself, or state of being collected; composure.
collection, v. To collect, make into a collection.
recollection, v. A recapitulation.
recollection, v. The action or an act of gathering things together again.
recollection, v. The ability or power to recall something to the mind; the extent of recall, the memory.

The act of collecting (v.) results in display of a collection (n.) Conceptual language as descriptors function to open up spaces for consideration rather than close the gaps between data and meaning. I engage in this exercise of finding definitions of words in noun and verb form to continue my exploration of temporality in the way research texts are brought together by the narrative inquirer. This interim text is a chronicle of my
exploration of words and their definitions that might describe narrative groupings of ideas.

**shift, v.** To change.

**shift, n.** A movement to do something, a beginning.

**knot, n.** An intertwining or complication of the parts of one or more ropes, cords, or strips of anything flexible enough, made for the purpose of fastening them together or to another object, or to prevent slipping, and secured by being drawn tight; A tie in a rope; A tangle accidentally drawn tight.

**knot, v.** To combine or unite firmly or intricately; to associate intimately, to entangle, complicate.

**complicate, v.** To fold, wrap, or twist together; to intertwine; to entangle one with another.

**complicate, v.** To combine or mix up with in a complex, intricate, or involved way.

**complicate, n.** Composed of parts or elements intimately combined or mixed; compound, complex.

**complicate, n.** with the addition notation of intricate, involved, difficult to analyse or unravel.

When I began to think of the word curriculum originating from the Latin word *currere*, a verb, I understood it to be an active process of living out a process of teaching and learning. Focusing on the verb form of the word, (and its meaning as action), I shifted the way I think and talk about curriculum. The word curriculum is most often used as a noun, it is most often thought of as a thing, like a lesson plan or a set of lesson plans. Such as a *collection* of lesson plans (noun). Here I consider the word, collection. If I think about art collection, I am likely to imagine a set of art objects. However for this narrative inquiry, I want to focus on the temporality of an active and sustained process that is represented by a word. Collection is then a process of collecting. I continue to collect words and studying their meanings in both noun and verb forms.

**resonate, v.** To cause (a sound) to be prolonged, echoed, or modified by resonance.

**resonate, v.** To produce a corresponding or sympathetic response; to evoke some emotion or reaction; to strike a chord.

**resonate, v.** To act as a resonator for; to tune so as to produce resonance; to amplify by resonance.

**resonance, n.** The reinforcement of prolongation of sound by reflection or by the synchronous vibration of a surrounding space or a neighboring object.

**resonance, n.** Corresponding or sympathetic response; instance of this.

**resonance, n.** The power or quality of evoking or suggesting images, memories, and emotions; an allusion, connotation or overtone.

**interweave, v.** To weave together, as the warp and woof of a fabric; to interlace; to intertwine.

**interweave, v.** To intermingle (thoughts, ideas, relations, etc.) as if by weaving; to interlink or intertwine intricately, to blend intimately.

**interweaving, n.** An interwoven texture or structure.
interweaving, n. The action or process of weaving together or intermingling intricately; intertexture.

intertexture, n. Latin intertext—The action of interweaving; the fact or condition of being interwoven.

Through this dictionary search, I have located a term to label the narrative fragments that I will present in the research text: Intertexture. I like the implications of the word texture as a material and visual quality we use in the field of art. I like that the root connect to the word text which connects to narrative as an idea and a object. The prefix inter is present in interweaving, intertextual. The term intertexture is not problematic in the way that “braid” is as part of interweaving. Intertexture sounds to me like a quality – texture. Whereas a braid is a discrete thing, a repeating pattern of uniformity. Braid has a separate meaning as noun and verb. A braid (n) to braid (v), whereas intertexture is more ambiguous in its state of being, its quality, and its action. It is also interesting that the word, intertexture is similar to the phrase interim text which is an important methodological tool in narrative inquiry.

intertexture, n. Latin intertext—The action of interweaving; the fact or condition of being interwoven.

Texture. Nubby, craggy, soft, stippled. Full of texture. Intertexture. The word inter seems to indicate that there is a relational quality, one of inner and outer. Inter. Being between or in and out of. Through. Through-ways. Different from through-lines. Texture leaves room for discontinuity. Through lines are related to plot lines. Both cause me to wonder. Inter is different from intra. Inter is active and moving. Texture is felt in the act of feeling or visual texture is seen. Enmeshed, smooth, felted, striated, diverse strands, still visible.

After locating the term intertexture in a dictionary search and selecting it to describe my narrative inquiry method, I searched research literature databases (ProQuest, WorldCat, and Google Scholar) to learn how other researchers are using the term, intertexture. I learned that Hasebe-Ludt and Hurren’s (2003), Curriculum Intertext explores the overlapping and open spaces of place/language/pedagogy. Scholars in the converging fields of theology, literary analysis, and rhetoric use the term intertexture. These scholars are writing critical socio-rhetorical analyses and interpretations of the narratives in biblical texts (such as the synoptic gospels) as intertextual criticism. They are studying the language of stories which point toward intersecting cultural and historical perspectives (e.g., Dean, 1998; Focant, 1993; Robbins, 1996, 1998). Robbins (1996, 1998) uses the metaphors texture and tapestry to proffer methods of interpretive analytics in socio-historical criticism.

(all definitions taken directly from Oxford English Dictionary)
Appendix C

The Limitless Nature of Questioning

When I think of [2009–2010] year in [AETI], I think about–THE QUESTION. . . The questions that we ask ourselves when we are reflecting upon our class, the questions our students ask us, and the questions that students ask themselves–I consider the limitless nature of questioning, and how the process affects student product.

I wanted to ask students a question that got their minds moving and asking and answering questions. [“How does it sound?”] was a question I used to begin my exploration with student inquiry. I feel like the work of my CIG and our sharing helped me to consider and rediscover why what we do is important.

(Blog post, Abigail, music teacher, March 2011)

The above blog post was written by Abigail to describe her plan for creating a set of story cubes that each responded to a key question that she was asking during her inquiry. She also included in her story cube display a audio listening station so that visitors could hear her students’ music. Below are story cubes that Abigail created (Figure C–1) for our final May 2011 sharing day.

Figure C–1. Story Cubes and Abigail’s digital recording for playback.
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Informed Consent for Research Participants
The Pennsylvania State University

Project Title: Arts Educator Professional Knowledge Construction through Collaborative Inquiry

Principal Investigator: Mary Elizabeth Meier, Ph.D. candidate
207 Arts Cottage
University Park, PA 16802
[phone and email omitted for purpose of Appendix in Dissertation]

Advisor: Dr. Karen Keifer-Boyd
210 Arts Cottage
University Park, PA 16802
[phone and email omitted for purpose of Appendix in Dissertation]

Purpose of the study: This is a research project being conducted by Mary Elizabeth Meier, a doctoral candidate at The Pennsylvania State University. You are invited to participate in this research project because you are participating with about 8 others in a collaborative inquiry group for the purpose of professional development. The purpose of this research project is to document and describe arts teachers’ experiences and professional knowledge, and consider how professional knowledge construction occurs in the collaborative inquiry and small group discussion formats.

Procedures to be followed: The procedures involve your participation in the collaborative inquiry group meetings that take place within the [AETI] project. The meetings will be held at [location], and at other locations nominated by group members. Discussion will be conducted online as scheduled by the group. Participants will be asked to consent to allow the researcher to videotape all physical meetings and to record all electronic meetings. Participants will also be asked for permission to use documents produced by the group or individuals within the group (e.g., lesson plans, memos, email correspondence, notes) as a means for data collection and analysis, and to engage in 3 interviews lasting approximately 1 hour each and taking place throughout the 2009–10 school year and summer of 2010. The interview questions will ask about your experiences as an art educator and participant in the collaborative inquiry group (e.g., Please describe your experience at the collaborative inquiry group meeting today; What stories from your professional life were you reminded of during the collaborative inquiry process?)

Duration: This research study will take place from October 1, 2009 through June 15, 2010.

Statement of confidentiality: Teachers who consent to participate will have the option to have their names changed to pseudonyms to protect their identities. The actual name and
location of the school will be replaced in any reports, presentations, or publications that might result from the study.

Types of information collected for the purpose of research include: (a) written information (observational notes, correspondence), and (b) digital recordings and digital photographs, video/audio recordings. These materials will be securely stored in password-protected computer files (for digital formats) or a private home locked filing cabinet (for non-digitized correspondence, and observation notes). Only the researcher will have access to these files.

Participants have the option to grant permission for photographs and video/audio to be archived and used in future settings (i.e., to show at conferences, seminars, and/or include as visual illustrations in publications, or to be used as examples for educational purposes). Additionally, participants may stipulate that photographs and video recordings be destroyed before January 1, 2016.

Some of the correspondence related to this research will be conducted electronically using email, Web-sites, and Web-mediated communication. Your confidentiality will be kept to the degree permitted by the technology used. No guarantees can be made regarding the interception of data sent via the Internet by any third parties.

**Risks and Benefits:** The risks to participants are primarily the same risks that many teachers face when engaging in small group discussion as reflective practice, namely their concern about exposing their professional practice to others and possible fears about how others may judge their ideas or perceive their teaching skills. Participant risk is reduced by the following: First, the researcher has no responsibility within the structure of the professional development course to evaluate teachers’ practice and has no evaluative authority within the school districts in which group members’ work. Second, the researcher will not be in the position of evaluation for the purpose of awarding continuing education credits. This will be handled by the course administrator.

**Right to Ask Questions:** You are encouraged to ask questions about this research process and may withdraw your consent to participate in this study at any time without penalty. Participation in the research is completely voluntary. Please contact Mary Elizabeth Meier at [omitted for publication] with questions, complaints or concerns about this research. You can also call this number if you feel this study has harmed you. If you have any questions, concerns, problems about your rights as a research participant or would like to offer input, please contact The Pennsylvania State University's Office for Research Protections (ORP) at (814) 865-1775. The ORP cannot answer questions about research procedures. All questions about research procedures can only be answered by the principal investigator.

**Voluntary Participation:** Participation is not an AETI course requirement. Your decision to be part of this research is voluntary. You can stop at any time. You do not have to answer any questions you do not want to answer. Should you decide to withdraw your consent to participate in the study, you can choose to take part in another collaborative inquiry group that is not part of this research or you can continue your membership in this group. Should you choose to continue as a member of this group, your individual comments and correspondence that occur as part of your participation in the group will not be recorded or used as data for the purpose of this study.

You must be 18 years of age or older to consent to take part in this research study. If you
agree to take part in this research study and the information outlined above, please sign your
name and indicate the date below. You will be given a copy of this consent form for your records.
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I have read all of the above material concerning this study, have had my questions answered, and
consent to participate in the research.

___ I do not agree to be [videotaped/audiotaped/photographed] during my participation in this study.

___ I agree to be [videotaped/audiotaped/photographed] during my participation in this study.

If yes, see the questions that follow:

_____ I do not give permission for my recordings and photographs to be archived for future research projects. I understand the recordings will be destroyed on January 1, 2016

_____ I give permission for my recordings and photographs to be archived for use in future research projects in the area of art education.

_____ I do not give permission for my recordings and photographs to be archived for use in the following way: (i.e., to show at conferences, seminars, include as visual illustrations in publications, or to be used as examples for educational purposes). I understand the recordings will be destroyed on January 1, 2016.

_____ I give permission for my recordings and photographs to be archived for use in the following way: (i.e., to show at conferences, seminars, include as visual illustrations in publications, or to be used as examples for educational purposes).

_____________________________________ _________  ___________
Participant Signature        Date

_____________________________________ _________  ___________
Person Obtaining Consent      Date
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Purpose of the study: This is a research project being conducted by Mary Elizabeth Meier, a doctoral candidate at The Pennsylvania State University. You are invited to participate in this research project because you are participating with about 8 others in a collaborative inquiry group for the purpose of professional development. The purpose of this research project is to document and describe arts teachers’ experiences and professional knowledge, and consider how professional knowledge construction occurs in the collaborative inquiry and small group discussion formats.

Procedures to be followed: The procedures involve your participation in the collaborative inquiry group meetings that take place within the [AETI] project. The meetings will be held at [location], and at other locations nominated by group members. Discussion will be conducted online as scheduled by the group. Participants will be asked to consent to allow the researcher to videotape all physical meetings and to record all electronic meetings. Participants will also be asked for permission to use documents produced by the group or individuals within the group (e.g., lesson plans, memos, email correspondence, notes) as a means for data collection and analysis, and to engage in 3 interviews lasting approximately 1 hour each and taking place throughout the 2010–11 school year and summer of 2011. The interview questions will ask about your experiences as an art educator and participant in the collaborative inquiry group (e.g., Please describe your experience at the collaborative inquiry group meeting today; What stories from your professional life were you reminded of during the collaborative inquiry process?)
**Duration:** This research study will take place from September 15, 2010 through July 1, 2011.

**Statement of confidentiality:** Teachers who consent to participate will have the option to have their names changed to pseudonyms to protect their identities. The actual name and location of the school will be replaced in any reports, presentations, or publications that might result from the study. Types of information collected for the purpose of research include: (a) written information (observational notes, correspondence), and (b) digital recordings and digital photographs, video/audio recordings. These materials will be securely stored in password-protected computer files (for digital formats) or a private home locked filing cabinet (for non-digitized correspondence, and observation notes). Only the researcher will have access to these files.

Participants have the option to grant permission for photographs and video/audio to be archived and used in future settings (i.e., to show at conferences, seminars, and/or include as visual illustrations in publications, or to be used as examples for educational purposes). Additionally, participants may stipulate that photographs and video recordings be destroyed before January 1, 2017.

Some of the correspondence related to this research will be conducted electronically using email, Web-sites, and Web-mediated communication. Your confidentiality will be kept to the degree permitted by the technology used. No guarantees can be made regarding the interception of data sent via the Internet by any third parties.

**Right to Ask Questions:** You are encouraged to ask questions about this research process and may withdraw your consent to participate in this study at any time without penalty. Participation in the research is completely voluntary. Please contact Mary Elizabeth Meier at [omitted for publication] with questions, complaints or concerns about this research.

**Voluntary Participation:** Participation is **not** an [AETI] course requirement. Your decision to be part of this research is voluntary. You can stop at any time. You do not have to answer any questions you do not want to answer. Should you decide to withdraw your consent to participate in the study, you can choose to take part in another collaborative inquiry group that is not part of this research or you can continue your membership in this group. Should you choose to continue as a member of this group, your individual comments and correspondence that occur as part of your participation in the group will not be recorded or used as data for the purpose of this study.

You must be 18 years of age or older to consent to take part in this research study. If you agree to take part in this research study and the information outlined above, please sign your name and indicate the date below. You will be given a copy of this consent form for your records.
If you agree to the information shown above, please complete the following questions and sign below.

___ I do not agree to be [videotaped/audiotaped/photographed] during my participation in this study.

___ I agree to be [videotaped/audiotaped/photographed] during my participation in this study. If yes, see the questions that follow:

_____ I do not give permission for my recordings and photographs to be archived for future research projects. I understand the recordings will be destroyed on January 1, 2017

_____ I give permission for my recordings and photographs to be archived for use in future research projects in the area of art education.

_____ I do not give permission for my recordings and photographs to be archived for use in the following way: (i.e., to show at conferences, seminars, include as visual illustrations in publications, or to be used as examples for educational purposes). I understand the recordings will be destroyed on January 1, 2017.

_____ I give permission for my recordings and photographs to be archived for use in the following way: (i.e., to show at conferences, seminars include as visual illustrations in publications, or to be used as examples for educational purposes).

________________________________________________________________________

Participant Signature                                      Date
________________________________________________________________________

Person Obtaining Consent                                     Date
Dear Arts Educator,

My name is Mary Elizabeth Meier. I am a graduate student in the Art Education Program at The Pennsylvania State University. I am also serving in the role as a facilitator of collaborative inquiry with the [AETI] project.

I would like to extend an invitation to you to be a part of a research study affiliated with my doctoral studies in art education at The Pennsylvania State University. The study will document and describe arts teachers’ experiences and professional knowledge, and consider how professional knowledge construction occurs, in collaborative inquiry. Detailed information about the study can be found in the consent form attached here as a PDF.

In the next few days, I will be contacting you by phone. I would like to talk with you about this invitation and answer any questions that you may have. Those who elect to participate will need to sign the informed consent form. I will provide a printed copy of this form for participants to sign at [location].

Best regards,

Mary Elizabeth Meier

[Note: The email and phone contact information are marked as placeholders.]

Letter of Invitation Approved by Penn State ORP

[Letter to prospective participants intended a recruitment invitation for the study. The informed consent form will be attached to this email. The researcher will make a follow-up phone call to each recipient of this email to answer general questions about the study and the informed consent form.]
VITA
Mary Elizabeth Meier
mmeier@mercyhurst.edu

Education

The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA
Ph.D. in Art Education 2012

The Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL
M.S. in Art Education 2002

The Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL
B.S. in Art Education 2001

Selected Teaching Experience

Assistant Professor of Art
Program Director of Art Education 2012 –
Mercyhurst University, Erie, PA

Instructor of Art Education
Supervisor of Pre–service Teachers 2010 – 2012
The Pennsylvania State University, University Park

Graduate Teaching Assistant and Instructor of Record 2008 – 2010
The Pennsylvania State University, University Park

Studio Faculty 2009 & 2010
West Virginia Governor’s School for the Arts, West Liberty University

Art Teacher 2003 – 2008
Union City Elementary, Union City, PA
Union City Area School District, Union City, PA

Art Teacher 2002 – 2003
Two Rivers Magnet Middle School, East Hartford, CT
Capital Region Education Council, Hartford, CT