

**AN INTEGRATION OF COLLABORATIVE AUTOBIOGRAPHY AND PEER
SUPERVISION TO IMPROVE INSTRUCTION IN ADULT EDUCATION**

LONA M. TARNEY

B. Ed., University of Lethbridge, 1983

A One-Credit Project
Submitted to the Faculty of Education
of The University of Lethbridge
in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF EDUCATION

LETHBRIDGE, ALBERTA

December, 1990

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to acknowledge the guidance and assistance of certain individuals. Dr. Richard Butt and Dr. David Townsend, of the Faculty of Education of the University of Lethbridge, were instrumental in encouraging my interest in this project. Colleagues David George, Maureen Glaeser and Ian Sewell encouraged and shared my excitement. I wish to thank Ruth Hunter for her editorial expertise. Heartfelt gratitude must be extended to Ed, Gillian, Greg, Lonnie, Ann, Debbie, Arnold, Debbie, Florence and Monika for allowing me to work with them. Finally, my gratitude and respect is extended to Shelley for so willingly allowing me to enter into her teaching world.

ABSTRACT

This creative project used collaborative autobiography, where two teachers shared their professional life histories, in order to identify individual agendas for professional development, build mutual understanding and a trusting working relationship. The common professional interests identified from these life stories served as a basis for a professional development project which used peer supervision as a means of improving the teaching of English to adult native students. This creative project documents the project which involved the study of a play through dramatic expression.

Chapter one of the creative project includes a literature review of collaborative autobiography and peer supervision and presents an argument for the integration of these two methods of teacher development. The second chapter describes the methods and procedures of the collaborative creative project. Chapters three and four include the two teachers life stories. The fifth chapter summarizes the professional concerns. Chapter six includes a daily account of the collaborative project. The formal evaluations of the drama unit are discussed in chapter seven. A summary of the peer supervision activities is included in chapter eight. Chapter nine includes a detailed analysis of the student and teacher responses to the summative evaluations. The collaborative project is concluded with a summary in chapter ten.

Kary and Hally

may you stay forever young

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW ON COLLABORATIVE AUTOBIOGRAPHY AND PEER SUPERVISION	1
Introduction	1
Collaborative Autobiography	2
Peer Supervision	6
An Integration of Collaborative Autobiography and Peer Supervision	10
II. METHODS AND PROCEDURES OF THE COLLABORATIVE CREATIVE PROJECT	14
III. BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF SHELLEY G. WILKINSON	20
Introduction	20
Early Influences and Public School Experiences	21
Post Secondary School Experiences	23
Public School Teaching Experiences	26
Adult Education Teaching Experiences	30
University and College Entrance Preparation Program (UCEP) Experiences	33
Future Plans	35
IV. BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF LONA M. TARNEY	38
Early Influences and Public School Experiences	38
Post Secondary School Experiences	40
Adult Education Teaching Experiences	42
Post Secondary Education Experiences	49
Sunrise Project Experiences	50

	PAGE
V. PROFESSIONAL CONCERNS OF SHELLEY AND LONA	53
VI. DISCUSSION OF WEEKLY ACTIVITIES	57
Week One	57
Week Two	67
Week Three	73
Week Four	79
Week Five	82
VII. SUMMARY OF PEER SUPERVISION ACTIVITIES	85
VIII. ANALYSIS OF FORMAL EVALUATIONS FOR THE DRAMA UNIT	88
Written Assignments for the Drama Unit	88
Participation in the Drama Unit	90
Students' Creative Assignment	91
IX. ANALYSIS OF THE STUDENT EVALUATION FORMS	96
Analysis of Specific Responses to <u>Student Evaluation- Death of a Salesman</u>	97
Summative Thoughts on the Drama Unit	103
Analysis of Specific Responses to <u>Student Evaluation- Creative Assignment</u>	106
Summative Thoughts on the Students' Creative Assignment	109
Analysis of Specific Responses to <u>Student Evaluation- Collaborative Teaching</u>	112
X. SUMMATIVE THOUGHTS ON THE COLLABORATIVE CREATIVE PROJECT	117

	PAGE
XI. REFERENCES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY	126
XII. APPENDICES	132
A. The Modern Drama	132
B. Arthur Miller	137
C. Students' Consent Letter	142
D. Shelley's Consent Letter	144
E. Divisions of Drama	145
F. The One-Act Play	146
G. Review Questions - <u>Death of a Salesman</u>	150
H. Drama Unit - Mark Sheet	153
I. Creative Assignment - Final Mark Sheet	154
J. Student Evaluation - <u>Death of a Salesman</u>	155
K. Student Evaluation - Creative Assignment	157
L. Student Evaluation - Collaborative Teaching	159

INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW ON COLLABORATIVE AUTOBIOGRAPHY AND PEER SUPERVISION

INTRODUCTION

It has been recognized that a crisis exists within the education profession. The need to enhance the professional development of teachers is paramount. Research regarding the failure of many of the educational reforms implemented in the past few decades suggests that reformers tried to do things that teachers often resisted. The classroom environment or contextual influences were seldom given careful attention by researchers (Shiffer, J., Sarason, S., & Mann, 1978). Williams (1978) reported that staff development efforts were more effective when designed and experienced at the school site, and when staff were trained in collaborative problem solving skills. Hartmann (1978) argued that what was necessary for professional development was a self-appraisal strategy that tapped the intrinsic motivation of the teachers themselves. Collaborative autobiography and peer supervision are two approaches which have been developed as a successful means of overcoming this crisis. By examining the theoretical assumptions of each of these methods, it is easy to determine why they serve to meet the needs of professional development. Recently, the amalgamation of these two research methods has produced exciting results. The creative project that follows is a result of this combination.

COLLABORATIVE AUTOBIOGRAPHY

Various qualitative research methods have attempted to define the nature of a teacher's working reality. Ethnography has been used extensively to study the professional development of teachers (Woods, 1985; Chilcott, 1987; Gardner, 1981; Raymond, D. & Surprenant, M. 1988; Weaver, 1983). The intention is to learn the meaning of actions and events within a teacher's world. The reconceptualist curriculum theorists have used biographies and autobiographies for a number of years to gain the sense of teachers' self understanding as a means of professional development (Grumet, 1980; Pinar, 1980, 1981, 1986). Biographical studies have been used to reveal the commonalities between the lives and careers of teachers (Goodson, 1981; Ball & Goodson, 1985; Woods, 1984, 1985, 1986; Woods & Sikes, 1986; Aspinwall, 1985, 1986, 1988). Other individuals have used forms of biographical inquiry to determine a teacher's personal practical knowledge (Elbaz, 1981; Connelly & Clandinin, 1987). These individuals are attempting to show that a teacher's practical knowledge is imbued with all the experiences that make up that person's being. This knowledge is then applied to the teacher's working world. Its meaning is derived from, and understood in terms of, a person's experiential history, both professional and personal (Clandinin, 1985a, p. 362).

These forms of research and others not specifically mentioned have arisen out of a serious need for reforms within education. Recent attempts at change and reform have not been successful for a variety of reasons. Most attempts have been designed and implemented by theorists who do not understand the nature of the teachers' working

worlds (Butt, 1987). Having no sense of ownership or responsibility towards these changes, the teachers have resisted these efforts at change.

With this crisis in mind, the use of collaborative autobiography as a research method and a means to enhance teachers' professional development has come to the forefront in the past decade. It has been argued that this approach is better than other forms of professional development because it is built upon the professional skills and personal knowledge bases that teachers themselves possess (Butt, 1983, 1986; Butt, Raymond & Yamagishi, 1988).

The advantages of using collaborative autobiography to develop and enhance teachers' professional development has been well documented (Butt & Raymond, 1985; Butt & Townsend, 1989; Butt, Townsend & Raymond, 1990; Raymond, Butt & Townsend, 1989; Townsend & Butt, 1989). In order to understand the world of a teacher, we need to know it in the way that the individual teacher does. We need to examine what influences, past and present, interact to cause the teacher to teach in the way that he or she does. We also need to determine how teachers develop, evolve and modify their professional and personal knowledge. Butt & Raymond (1989) state

"the overall process of teacher development and nature of the knowledge that results, and is applied in the classroom, is rooted mostly in individual experience. This characterises teacher development as personal, unique, and since it takes place over a lifetime, autobiographical in nature" (p. 16).

These examinations presuppose that the teacher is a unique person who possesses a special kind of knowledge which is significantly influenced and shaped by experiences in various situations and contexts.

The two most predominant sources of influence on teacher development are the teacher's professional experiences of teaching and his or her own private life history.

Previous school experiences, be they negative or positive, also affect the development of the teacher. Finally, formal and informal efforts towards professional development play some role. Through the collaborative autobiographical process, a teacher becomes cognizant of these influences. She or he can take steps to actively direct her or his own professional development (Butt, Raymond, McCue & Yamagishi, 1986; Butt, Raymond & Ray, 1988).

The process of conducting collaborative autobiography centers around four main themes. The participants work through a description of their current working reality, pedagogy or andragogy and curriculum-in-use. An account of reflections on past personal and professional lives as they relate to an understanding of present professional thoughts and actions is discussed. A projection of their preferred personal and professional futures as related to a personal critical appraisal of the previous three themes is also considered (Butt, 1987). The value of such an exercise comes from the collaboration that occurs amongst the participants. People voice their feelings and concerns in a trusting, supportive and non-judgemental environment. As well as verbal discussions, the participants record issues which are discussed.

The value of this method of research is that each autobiographer initiates and controls the interpretive activity. Each individual can attach his or her own labels, images, metaphors or themes to the interpretation of the data. The researcher/co-autobiographer assists this interpretive stage by discussing these aspects with the teacher/autobiographer. At no time does the co-autobiographer try to direct or categorize any of the feelings or interpretations of the teacher. In this way, the teacher feels a sense of ownership towards the inquiry. The teacher comes to define

the reality of her or his teaching world.

The purpose of such efforts is to define and understand the working knowledge and nature of teachers. By examining teachers' stories, it is possible to build a foundation of what is common and unique about teachers. This does not suggest that the individual importance and significance of each teacher's story is insignificant. Pertinent common experiences and contexts can be derived from the differing knowledge bases of the teachers. Through teachers' stories, theorists and reformers are able to gain a strong sense of the reality of the teachers' world, and can present more realistic proposed changes. Through autobiography, teachers, feeling a sense of ownership towards providing this knowledge base, will more readily accept the relevance of the changes being proposed for the contexts of their working world.

This active reflection generates energy and renewed commitment to teaching as the individuals begin to feel a sense of empowerment over their personal professional development (Brandt, 1989; Karant, 1989). These individuals, through the collaborative autobiographical activities, have come to realize their own strengths, weaknesses and areas of potential growth and change (Lieberman, 1986; Nelson, 1986). This understanding can then be applied to their teaching. Feeling a sense of ownership and commitment, the individual teachers can then make sense of, participate in, and personalize school-based projects, innovations or curriculum reforms that are being mandated from outside the classroom. The reenergized teacher can then participate in self-initiated activities, such as peer supervision activities, to take ownership for his or her teaching world. Bringing teachers back to the centre of their teaching world, which is personally authentic, can only improve the quality of

PEER SUPERVISION

The use of peer supervision to enhance the professional development of teachers has also begun to receive much attention in the past two decades. By examining the development of this method of research, it can be argued that this has become an effective and viable means of enabling professional self development in teachers.

The pioneers of the clinical supervision model of teacher supervision were Goldhammer (1969) and Cogan (1973). Their work was in response to the need for more effective means of supervision of instruction (Blumberg, 1974). Generally teachers equate supervision with evaluation, and the majority of teachers feel threatened by the supervisory process. Far too often supervision is infrequent, subjective and lacks teacher input. As well, teachers question the competence of administrators to advise teachers on classroom practices and to supervise (Acheson & Gall, 1987).

There are certain assumptions that can be identified with clinical supervision. It is an approach which attempts to resolve the subjective and evaluative practices of supervision. It combines objective feedback on first-hand observation of teaching episodes with active participation of teachers and supervisors in face-to-face conferences for the planning and analysis of these episodes. The model is interactive rather than directive, democratic rather than authoritarian and teacher centered rather than supervisor centered. The major goal is to bring about the improvement of teaching and enhance the professional development of teachers. Pre-observation conferences, observations of the classroom activities and then a post-observation

conference are necessary components of the clinical supervision cycle. These conferences serve to discuss the concerns and observations that are made about the individual peer/teacher's teaching (Sergiovanni, 1976; Acheson & Hansen, 1978). Instruction can only be improved by direct feedback to a teacher on aspects of teaching that are of concern to the teacher. The main argument for the use of clinical supervision is that if you want teachers to change, then it is necessary to work with them, rather than on them (Smyth, 1984).

Peer supervision has gradually evolved as a separate and distinct form of clinical supervision. Traditionally, ad hoc forms of peer supervision have always existed as more experienced teachers have usually acted as mentors to inexperienced teachers (Alfonso, 1977). In essence, teachers have always turned to other teachers for assistance, guidance, leadership and moral support. It only makes sense that a formalized system of peer/teacher support could effectively enhance professional development.

There have been a wealth of terms and definitions used to describe the activities undertaken within peer supervision. Alfonso (1977) stated peer supervision was a "process of peer observation, analysis, feedback and evaluation of classroom performance by one's peer for the purpose of improving instruction" (p. 600). Colleague consultation occurs when the principles of team building are combined with direct observation and conferral to improve teachers' classroom performance (Warren and Goldsberry, 1982). The most succinct definition is that peer supervision is the same as clinical supervision, with one's peer filling in for the role of supervisor (Thompson, 1979).

Regardless of which definition one wants to accept, there are specific benefits to be gained when school systems involve themselves in peer supervision activities. As with collaborative autobiography activities, peer supervision is more likely to be successful if it receives total support from the school administration. These individuals must be cognizant of the concepts and processes of conducting first clinical and then peer supervision. Adequate provisions must be made by the school administrators to ensure that the peer supervision project succeeds. The peer supervisors must receive the same training in clinical supervision methods as the school administrators. The school authorities must be willing to provide the teachers with adequate release time to complete such an undertaking. Substitute teachers must be provided on a consistent basis to allow the peer supervisors the opportunities to discuss their concerns. The substitute teachers, be they central office staff or paid teachers, must be viewed as effective by the peer/teacher. If the peer/teacher feels that the academic progress of her or his students will be adversely affected, the teacher will be reluctant to leave her or his classroom to participate in peer supervision activities. If the administrators show support and enthusiasm for such activities, the teachers will feel this is a viable method for professional development (Krajewski, 1982).

Equally important is that the peer supervisors must be encouraged to share their perceptions with other teachers and administrators who are not participating in the project. This should include formal and informal discussions to eliminate some of the mystery and threat of engaging in such a project. This will hopefully encourage more individuals to become involved in the process (Hopfengardner & Leahy, 1988).

While engaged in peer supervision activities, teachers have the opportunity to establish trusting and collegial relationships with each other. They can seriously examine aspects of their teaching worlds that have proven to be problematic to them. Because the teachers have been trained in effective clinical supervision methods, they can objectively attempt to solve these concerns (Acheson & Smith, 1986). Since these concerns are being examined with peers, the threat of being evaluated is minimized or eliminated (Clarke & Richardson, 1986). As well, when teachers begin to collaborate constructively, the effectiveness of their teaching improves as they are in a supportive, non threatening environment (McFaul & Cooper, 1983, 1984). By working together, the teachers have the opportunity to engage in meaningful activities for themselves. A teacher who has always wanted to include more student centered activities in her classroom would be encouraged to do so within the reassuring environment of a peer supervision project. The security of the environment will enable teachers to try new and stimulating forms of teaching strategies that she or he might have been reluctant to try before.

It has been well proven in research that peer supervision does benefit the individuals who have become involved in such a process. It creates an atmosphere of collegiality and change within the teaching environment. This method is one that can definitely enhance the professional development of teachers.

THE INTEGRATION OF COLLABORATIVE AUTOBIOGRAPHY AND PEER SUPERVISION

The idea of integrating collaborative autobiography and peer supervision in the facilitation of teachers' professional development appears to be receiving more attention. It is well known that changes must occur; therefore, these changes would be most effective if they originated from teachers themselves (Smyth, 1982).

I had the opportunity to become involved in collaborative autobiography and peer supervision activities while working on a graduate degree at the University of Lethbridge (Butt & Raymond, 1989; Butt, Townsend & Raymond, 1990; Engel, 1990; Onwuzurike, Engel, Townsend and Butt, 1990; Townsend & Butt, 1990).

While enrolled in a teacher supervision course, a number of graduate students volunteered to work with interested teachers within a nearby school system. We met with the teachers half a day, once a week for a two month period of time. Needless to say, this arrangement was not entirely adequate to establishing a successful peer supervision relationship. The teacher I worked with was struggling to control the pandemonium of her first year of teaching. Lacking adequate curricular supplies and resources and faced with inadequate administrative support, she was struggling to meet the needs of her elementary aged students. My presence did little to alleviate her feelings of loneliness, isolation, anxiety and despair. Unfortunately, I could not, given the inadequate time frame, dispel her fears that I was there to evaluate her teaching performance. Therefore, she consistently blocked any attempts I made to engage her in talking about her working environment. As a result, I became more of a teaching

assistant than a peer as she actively engaged me in working with individual students.

However, there were positive aspects gained from this experience. I quickly realized that the theoretical assumptions of peer and/or clinical supervision are not always easily applied to the realities of the classroom. Key components, such as the availability of time and a trusting and collegial relationship, must be established before any meaningful communication can occur.

My first opportunity to engage in an integration of collaborative autobiography and peer supervision activities occurred in the spring of 1989. Six graduate students volunteered to work with volunteering teachers from the same school system. This pilot project had a somewhat different focus, however. Two different, although somewhat similar, focuses were blended with this project.

The idea of examining a teacher's personal and professional biography was presented to the graduate students and teachers in an intensive two-day workshop as we concentrated on "getting to know each other." We discussed our past to understand the contexts of our teaching world. From this basis, we then planned an appropriate peer supervision project. Although time was of the essence, the two-day workshop allowed the graduate student and teacher to establish the beginnings of a collegial and trusting relationship.

The teacher I worked with had three years teaching experience, and this was his first year with the school system. Our curricular interests were carefully matched as we had both taught the high school social studies curriculums. He indicated that he was interested in viewing and developing new teaching strategies as he wanted to more actively engaged his students in the process of learning. He also had specific concerns

about new subject curriculums that he wanted to address.

Certain major components were missing in our peer supervision relationship. In the six weeks that we worked together, our collaborative relationship remained stilted and cautious. There were a number of occasions where we almost "began" to examine some critical issues. However, the teacher's anxiety and mistrust would not allow him to open up to me, and he quickly diverted my inquiries.

In essence, our relationship was not entirely collaborative. He expressed that he was concerned about improving upon or experimenting with different teaching styles. To accommodate this request, I modelled specific styles for him. When asked to coplan such an activity, he very reluctantly agreed to participate. The activity was not as successful as it could have been due to his reluctance. In addition, any attempts that I made to discuss his curricular concerns were ignored or treated superficially by this teacher. He obviously did not feel that my knowledge or skills were of any value to him.

This particular teacher could not overcome his fears that I was evaluating his teaching abilities. Realizing this, the project coordinator, supervising professors and a graduate student-teacher team informally and formally spoke to him about this to no avail. The element of trust and collegiality was lacking throughout the entire project. Unfortunately, it was not possible to achieve a successful collaborative relationship with this teacher.

Matters were entirely different when Shelley and I began discussing the possibilities of completing a peer supervision project. Although not entirely cognizant of the requirements of such an undertaking, Shelley enthusiastically expressed her interest. Shelley had recently completed a university course on clinical supervision

and was anxious to become involved in such an examination of her professional development. With ten years of teaching experience, she was delighted about the opportunity to critically reflect on her teaching world.

Support and encouragement towards our collaborative creative project was offered by the school administrators in a number of ways. Both Shelley and I received release time from our duties to complete the requirements of this project. Equally important was the interest and concern generated by the administrators towards this project. The adult education institution that we work for has recently implemented a professional staff development plan based upon the methods of clinical supervision (Gongos, 1989). Shelley and I appreciated the support and enquiries that these individuals made about the progress of our work.

It was very easy for Shelley and me to collaborate on this project as our relationship was already built on trust, respect and collegiality. We had previously worked together for four years on the planning, implementation and evaluation of English curriculums for the high school upgrading programs. Although we continually discussed our concerns, neither one of us had ever "crossed the threshold" into each other's classroom. Although we intuitively sensed what each other's teaching style was like, we had never viewed each other actively teaching.

Therefore, all the necessary ingredients existed for the exploration of a collaborative autobiography and peer supervision project. As the following discussions illustrate, the venture was successful for the professional development of Shelley and me.

METHODS AND PROCEDURES OF THE COLLABORATIVE CREATIVE PROJECT

Shelley and I began work on the collaborative creative project by discussing our biographies, following the format designed by Dr. Richard Butt of the Faculty of Education at the University of Lethbridge. We met for six one-hour formal interviews to discuss our personal and professional life histories. Each interview was audiotaped and then transcribed. The transcription was then reviewed by Shelley, and any additional comments were added. Each of the interviews had a designated theme which allowed us to succinctly focus our thoughts. As well, it often provided supporting data from previous and for subsequent interviews. Shelley and I also spent six hours planning our collaborative creative project. The planning portion of the creative project was a rewarding process. I had previously completed such an exercise so was cognizant of the requirements. On more than one occasion, Shelley expressed that it was a cleansing exercise; it gave her the opportunity to objectively examine aspects of her past that she did not often think about. Her enthusiasm, seriousness and depth of thought were incredible.

About two weeks before we began the collaborative creative project, Shelley and I discussed our plans with the students. The eight adults, Willy, Betty, Kane, Mark, Michelle, Christine, Jane and Sue (names changed), were very serious about their educational experiences. After explaining how and why Shelley and I would be collaborating, one student asked how that would benefit them. Their concerns about our work possibly disrupting their studies were alleviated when we explained that the students would benefit from the combination of our years of teaching experiences.

Our collaborative creative project took approximately one month to complete. The English class was held every day from 8:30 a.m. to 9:20 a.m. and 9:30 a.m. to 10:20 a.m. The two-hour time block provided us with enough time to develop and meet our daily objectives.

Aware of the personalities and learning characteristics of the students, Shelley and I were able to specify the learning activities for the drama unit. The eight students ranged from twenty-two to thirty-seven years of age. The majority of them had not completed twelve years of formal education. As well, most of them had unsatisfactory employment experiences. Therefore, their decision to return to the educational process had not been made lightly.

The objectives of the UCEP program were to enhance the students' mathematical and English skills to allow them to enter college and university programs. The students did not want to become involved in any learning activities that would not meet these educational goals. Their concern and dedication to their studies was admirable. They took nothing for granted in the process of learning and questioned everything that was being done. That does not suggest that they were resistant to new experiences; they just needed to understand the benefits of working on a particular unit of study.

The personalities of the students within the group were fairly characteristic of any group. Three students were assertive and gregarious. One student had little dedication to her studies and was asked to leave the program midway through the study of the drama unit. One student left the program midway through the drama unit; she was starting a college program in another town. The remaining three students were not as assertive as the other three, but that does not suggest that they were not involved in

their learning processes.

The students had worked together for six months before the study of the drama unit began. In that time, they had developed close relationships with each other and Shelley. That cohesiveness lent itself well to the study of drama as they had the confidence to experiment with new learning experiences. Therefore, the students quickly accepted my presence in their classroom.

With this knowledge in mind, Shelley and I had particular objectives to be addressed when planning our collaborative creative project. We concentrated on Arthur Miller's drama, Death of a Salesman. Each of us had previously taught this unit four times to different groups of students. Our objectives, understanding of the content and structure of a drama, and learning activities for the delivery of this unit had been well established and successful. However, we were both tired of this organization and wanted to improve upon this presentation. We both wanted to experiment with new teaching and learning activities that would engage the students fully in the activities.

The major objectives of our project focussed on student motivation and participation. We also wanted to foster an environment where the students would feel a sense of responsibility towards their learning. These objectives would be achieved through specific learning activities for the students.

Formal clinical supervision observations occurred regularly to determine whether our objectives were being achieved. Quantitative data gathering instruments were constructed and utilized during the observations. Qualitative observations were aided by the use of scripted narrative notes and daily pre- and post-conference discussions. Shelley and I were also concerned about strengthening certain observable

and effective teaching and learning activities. For example, we wanted to strengthen our skills in motivating students to become more actively involved in class discussions and activities. We were also interested in specific activities such as the questioning techniques we used to draw thoughts and interpretations from the students. We were also interested in the forms of feedback that we gave to the students, whether this feedback merely acknowledged a student's response or encouraged that individual to probe deeper into his or her thoughts. These various forms of clinical and peer supervision methods enabled us to determine whether changes to the planning, implementation and evaluation of the daily activities and overall project were necessary.

To begin the drama unit, a short one-act drama was read by the students in class. This provided an introduction to the various components of a drama, such as the methods of character presentation. We also concentrated on how the setting enhanced the mood and tone of the drama. The students gained a sense of how to interpret the meanings of dialogue and action through the advent of stage directions. In essence, this short one-act drama provided an introductory mindset to the more intensive study of Death of a Salesman.

The main focus of the collaborative creative project centred on the drama, Death of a Salesman. Shelley and I tentatively decided upon a number of teaching and learning activities for the study of this unit. The students were then consulted regarding the planning, implementation and evaluation of the objectives for the drama unit as much as possible. Rather than merely reading the scenes from their seats with little interaction, the students chose specific characters, read, rehearsed and then actively

presented the scenes in class.

To offer valuable insights to their character portrayals, the students videotaped the presentation of specific scenes. By reviewing each recorded scene, discussions resulted about the actions, intentions and feelings of each character. The students also gained an understanding of how special effects were achieved through physical movement on the set and the inflections and tones of their voices. They also came to appreciate how the use of lighting, sound and stage properties enhanced the mood of a specific scene.

The students were also given the opportunity to choose an activity for their formal evaluation. The students, Shelley and I held a brainstorming session to determine the activity for the students' creative assignment. These creative activities could have included writing and presenting a drama or short story based on the concepts from the drama, Death of a Salesman. They could have also chosen to write a short story or essay based on their own personal experiences in relation to the drama. The students decided to adapt and present two critical scenes from the drama itself. Shelley and I were not involved in this decision to any great extent; the decision was reached by group consensus.

The study of the drama unit reinforced and expanded upon the working knowledge that the students possessed. Through the study of other forms of literature, the students had assimilated such concepts as plot, character, setting and theme. They were, therefore, able to transfer these concepts to the study of the drama unit. They were also able to evaluate the extent to which the drama achieved its purpose. Through their involvement, the students understood the specific themes of the drama and

evaluated their validity in terms of milieu and universality. The students also developed confidence and expertise in oral communication experiences as they participated in class discussions and their creative assignment. Through these diverse activities, the students strengthened their understanding of the effective study of a drama unit.

After consultation with the students, the formal evaluation of the drama unit focussed on their written assignments, efforts in participation, and their involvement in the creative assignment. Upon completion of the drama unit, the students completed evaluation forms on the drama unit, their creative assignment and the collaborative teaching completed by Shelley and me. The students appreciated being given the opportunity to offer their opinions as it gave them a sense of control and responsibility for their learning experiences.

The description of the drama unit will include a discussion of the daily activities for the entire drama unit. An analysis of the marking scheme will also be given. The interpretations from the clinical and peer supervision data will be presented. Within the context of the information gained from the student evaluation forms, the organization of the drama unit, the students' creative assignment and the collaborative teaching project will be discussed. In conclusion an analysis of Shelley and my perceptions regarding the collaborative teaching project will occur.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF SHELLEY G. WILKINSON

INTRODUCTION

Destiny sometimes has a way of shaping people's lives. In Shelley's and my case, I believe that has occurred. I first met Shelley when my family moved to Three Hills in 1974. Although she was in a grade ahead of me, we became good friends. We remained in contact in the ensuing years as we both completed our secondary and post secondary education and progressed in our teaching careers.

During the four year period, 1985 to 1989, that we worked together, our personal and professional relationships deepened. I was a beginning teacher, and Shelley was a beginning teacher with adult students. We provided support and guidance for each other. We collaborated to enhance the English curriculums for the high school upgrading program. Shelley's techniques for dealing with students also provided excellent role models for me. Without this relationship, our professional development would not have reached the heights that it did.

Words can not adequately express my appreciation to Shelley for so joyfully participating in this project. Her enthusiasm and willingness to speak candidly about her personal and professional lives is greatly appreciated. Without her confidence to experiment with new experiences, this project would not have been possible.

EARLY INFLUENCES AND PUBLIC SCHOOL EXPERIENCES

Shelley Gail Wilkinson (nee Empey) was born on February 20, 1958 to John and Mae Empey. Shelley grew up on the family farm near Swalwell, a hamlet 20 kilometres south of Three Hills, Alberta. This East-Central part of the province is known for its rich farmland. John and Mae, owning five sections of land, grew wheat and canola crops and raised cattle. The influence of her parents is evident when Shelley spoke of them. She described her parents as intelligent, hard working farmers. Their humanitarian attitudes extended into the community as they were always offering their time and support to friends and family. As a result, the Empey family was well respected in the community.

Shelley, the fifth child, was virtually raised as an only child. She does not remember much about her two older sisters and two older brothers. She remembers the youngest boy, eleven years her senior, living at home when she was young. As a result, Shelley became very independent and developed her own forms of entertainment; thus, she developed a strong love for literature. "I could lose myself in a good book for days."

Neither of Shelley's parents had the opportunity to receive much formal education. Therefore, it was very important that their children be educated. Although these expectations were never specifically verbalized, Shelley realized that her parents expected her to receive an education. Therefore, she graduated with a Bachelor of Education degree in 1980.

Shelley perceptively realizes what influences her parents had on her. Shelley has

always been willing to work diligently at any task. She loves a challenge and fails to understand why some people are not satisfied with their occupations and/or situations in life. This optimism extends into her professional and personal lives.

Shelley attended grades one to twelve at the small, rural Three Hills school. When Shelley was six-and-a-half, she started school in 1964. In addition to doing well academically in elementary school, Shelley was involved in sports, music and a girls' group. Once into senior high school, Shelley entered what she called the "classic rebellion years." School began to lose its importance as it was replaced by "boys, jobs and money." Although somewhat diversionary, these attractions did not deter Shelley from graduating from high school in 1976.

All of the teachers in the school had an impact on Shelley. She was expected to succeed in school because of her family's reputation and position in the community. They were, therefore, willing to give Shelley the "benefit of the doubt" and give her a second chance when it was necessary. This accepting attitude was beneficial to Shelley; she realizes the importance of those attitudes when dealing with her own students.

Two high school teachers were very instrumental in channelling Shelley's thoughts towards the field of education. The physical education teacher, the students' friend in the school, made learning fun. The biology teacher, an authoritarian teacher in the school, demanded attention and respect. It was this teacher who suggested Shelley enter teaching because "she had a strong voice."

Shelley's decision to enter the field of Education came easily. She had always wanted to work with children in a structured environment. Since school had not been a particularly fulfilling or challenging experience for her, she realized that the

learning environment had to be structured but also enjoyable. From the influences of her two high school teachers, Shelley knew what type of teaching personality was the most effective.

"It is important that a teacher be friendly and concerned, but it is not possible to be too friendly with your students. That puts too much strain on the relationship as you are not able to be objective towards that student's efforts or abilities. However, being an authoritarian teacher is not very effective either. Too much in terms of sincerity and caring is lost if the students are not comfortable or are scared of you. I knew that I would be able to find an equilibrium in terms of my personality."

POST SECONDARY SCHOOL EXPERIENCES

Shelley enrolled in the Faculty of Education's University Transfer Program at Red Deer College in the fall of 1976. She initially enrolled in the Early Childhood concentration. As she was growing up, she wished for a younger brother or sister. She thought that she would be suited to this area as she loved being with younger children. Although determined to do well, Shelley suffered culture shock during the first year. This was the first time that she had lived away from her home town, and she lacked self discipline. College was a true learning experience for her. Lacking the most basic studying and writing skills, Shelley almost failed her first year.

However, a student that Shelley met became her mentor. This woman taught her how to write "by having me write. She also taught me how to think by discussing my ideas with me." Through patterning and being shown examples of good writing, Shelley taught herself how to learn.

Shelley also accepted a personal and professional challenge from a professor of

English. Unable to complete her Introductory English course, this man reluctantly agreed to tutor Shelley to develop and improve her writing skills. When they first started working together, he told Shelley that she was a hopeless cause because she could not write. Shelley's determination and diligence quickly rose to the surface. She changed from an Early Childhood concentration to that of Secondary English when she transferred to the University of Calgary. Shelley learned valuable lessons from this tutor/mentor. She realized that through this man's individual attention, she had been motivated to succeed in the task. Her personal experiences could then be transformed into her own personal teaching style. "I realized how important it was to build a personal as well as professional relationship with a student. A student can then motivate himself or herself." Upon graduation from the University of Calgary, Shelley wrote and thanked her tutor for his dedication. Without him, Shelley would not have succeeded as well as she did in post secondary education.

Shelley also had other motives for switching to a Secondary English major. She realized that if she had difficulties in English, then other students would probably have the same difficulties. She did not feel that the high school English curriculums adequately prepared students for college or university skill levels. Shelley knew that if she had difficulties that she could solve herself, then she could work with students who were similar.

In Shelley's second year at Red Deer College, she had a short student teaching practicum at an elementary school. Shelley and another student team taught a grade six physical education class. This practicum exhilarated Shelley as she loved the energy, enthusiasm and acceptance of these students. This experience also reinforced why

Shelley entered the Faculty of Education. "Since my school experiences had not been all that wonderful, I realized that I had the potential to correct that. I could hardly wait until I entered my own classroom."

Shelley transferred to the University of Calgary in the fall of 1978. The two years were intensely busy as Shelley worked part time and attended school full time. She and two other students quickly developed supportive relationships and constantly exchanged ideas and experiences while completing their degrees.

The month of June 1980 was very fulfilling for Shelley. On June first, she was hired by a School Division to teach junior high English and social studies at a small, rural school in Northern Alberta. On June sixth, Shelley graduated with a Bachelor of Education degree in Secondary English. On June seventh, Shelley and her partner Larry Wilkinson were married at her parent's farm in Swalwell.

When discussing these events, Shelley reflected as to her "state of mind" at the time. "Neither one of us had been in Northern Alberta so we did not have a clue about living in the north." She had a vague idea of what the life of a teacher was like. She knew that it would be a demanding task, but she did not realize how intellectually and emotionally taxing it could be. Shelley did know that she loved interacting with students, whatever their ages. She loved the excitement, the enthusiasm and the energy generated by students. She also loved the challenge of motivating these students as she felt she had not been during her public and post secondary school experiences. With excitement and anticipation, Shelley and Larry moved to the small village of approximately 500 people in the summer of 1980.

PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHING EXPERIENCES

Shelley taught junior high English and social studies from September 1980 to May 1984. Shelley explained that credit had to be given to the school division for training her as a teacher. The Division always held specialized workshops on discipline or yearly planning strategies. These were extremely valuable to Shelley as she felt these concerns had not been adequately addressed in her university training.

As well, one of Shelley's supervisors was instrumental in her professional development.

"He taught me how to be organized, how to have structure and how to have good classroom management skills. He used to scare me when he came into my classroom because he was an authoritarian supervisor. The students were very cooperative and supportive when he arrived. I knew then that the students and I were building a strong relationship because they did not perform or misbehave when he was in my classroom."

Shelley's principal also had a profound effect on her. Through his guidance, Shelley realized the importance of having concise objectives for each unit of study. She found that if she had a clear focus of her objectives, it was relatively easy to plan learning activities to meet these objectives. The principal also told Shelley that "any student in school was worth the effort to motivate." Shelley, internalizing this philosophy, realized that she worked well with students who were motivated to learn. She also recognized that she needed to learn motivational techniques for those students who were less willing or not able to learn. That concern has remained a constant throughout Shelley's professional development as she often attends workshops or courses to learn new motivational techniques for the classroom.

Shelley's second year of teaching was equally enlightening. A new supervisor encouraged her to develop the positive aspects of her teaching personality. He told her that the relationships she had developed with the junior high students were much like the relationships that elementary teachers develop with their students - sincere, caring and positive.

Although Shelley was not yet a certified teacher, she received a student teacher from the University of Alberta. She is still amazed that she was given a student to supervise.

"It was an extremely challenging task. I had to quickly fuse my university training, one year of teaching experience and my own professional knowledge together. I then had to transmit this knowledge to the student teacher. At that point in my career, I do not feel that I was even teaching. I was just maintaining control and getting to know the demands of the curriculum. My supervisor, however, must have seen something in me that I was not recognizing. I am certainly glad that I had that opportunity though. The student teacher and I became good friends; she is living and teaching in a community near here, and we have kept in touch over the years."

During Shelley's third year of teaching, her curriculum assignments became specialized. She taught Social Studies and Language Arts Seven, Eight and Nine. She had never taught the entire social studies curriculum before so she spent hours preparing for it. She also learned to mark holistically; she incorporated aspects of both subjects into the curricular emphases.

Shelley took sixteen grade nine students on a field trip to southern Alberta that year. She had been working with that particular group of students for three years and had become very close to them. It was a rewarding experience for all of them as the students got to see Shelley's home in Swalwell. By doing that, the students realized that

Shelley really did care about them.

During Shelley's fourth year of teaching, the reality of her working environment changed. The school was being evaluated by the Department of Education. Uncharacteristically, Shelley did not rise to the challenge. She did not respond well to the evaluative comments made about her teaching.

"They told me that my teaching methods did not work, and I would have to change. I felt I knew the best possible methods of presenting the curriculum to my students whereas the experts came in and criticised me for not using a different approach. Unfortunately, they did not really offer any suggestions on how I could improve my teaching. I felt completely misunderstood, which was a devastating feeling."

Shelley went on to describe the particular characteristics of her students.

"I became a constant in those students' lives. They wanted discipline and a safe and reliable environment. I gave that to them. I felt I knew what kind of an environment they needed because some of them had poor home environments. Therefore, I taught in a very structured way. The school evaluators told me that I should have been teaching thematic units, not genre units like I was. I felt that they did not understand the characteristics or needs of my students or of the surrounding community. Therefore, I could not accept what they were saying."

As well Shelley experienced a professional conflict with the new principal. She felt that he was more concerned with looking good in the face of the school evaluators. "He did not care about what was actually happening in the classroom; he was only concerned about appearances." Staff morale plummeted throughout the school. Shelley's concerns regarding the curriculum and students were being repressed. Aware that she was facing burnout, Shelley was very concerned about her teaching responsibilities and performance. A difficult pregnancy only added to the turmoil. In May of 1980 Shelley took maternity leave with the school division.

In the seven month hiatus before Shelley returned to teaching, she did much "soul

searching." Although she had grown personally and professionally, she did not feel she had "mastered" her teaching skills. She had developed the necessary organizational and classroom management skills. However, she felt that by her fourth year she was only really beginning to teach. She felt she was only beginning to grasp the implications of the importance of the curriculums she was teaching. She was also coming to perceive what effects she was having on her students.

Shelley also perceived that she had a tendency to be overly concerned about the personal lives of her students. Time and again, her attempts to change or alter or improve the home environments of certain students was thwarted by comments from parents, other teachers or principals that "it was none of her business." Rather than becoming disillusioned, Shelley realized that her concerns needed to be modified.

"I realized that I could only act as a role model for the students. I was not a counsellor or social worker. My efforts were limited in these situations. I could only express my concerns and genuineness to the individual, and if it was possible, I could spend time with the student outside of school. However, it was ultimately the responsibility of that student to bring about effective changes."

That aspect of caring remains a dilemma for Shelley. Her concern is so great that she often experiences frustrations and dissatisfactions.

"I want my teaching to be as student-centred as possible. I want the student to be motivated and take responsibility for his or her own education. If he or she is unable to do that, I feel that I have somehow personally failed that individual or have failed as a teacher. Fortunately, working with adult students has allowed me to strengthen this aspect of my professional personality."

Shelley also realized her foolishness in failing to accept the constructive criticisms given to her.

"Another thing I discovered, after I left, was that change is worthwhile if you are willing to put the effort into it. I had completely disregarded the recommendations of the school evaluators because I had not tried them, which was stupid. I just kick myself now."

Shelley was, therefore, determined that if she taught again, she would be more willing to accept change. She was also determined to be loyal to her supervisors and the institution she worked for. If she could not be loyal, then she could not effectively apply her energies towards teaching. Shelley, however, had decided that she would not return to work after her maternity leave. She looked forward to staying at home, raising her son Tyler, who was born on August 14, 1984, helping Larry with their farm and business and continuing with her volunteer activities in the community.

Since then, the students from the village where Shelley taught have recognized her contributions. She has been the key note speaker at three graduations. She has also influenced the career decisions of various students. One man recently told her that he entered the Education occupation because of her inspiration. That appreciation is very dear to Shelley.

ADULT EDUCATION TEACHING EXPERIENCES

Shelley carefully deliberated before returning to teaching. In January 1985, Shelley accepted a part time position with a local adult education institution.

Shelley emphatically expressed how teaching junior high English to adult students differed from teaching junior high English and social studies to adolescents.

"It was a dream. There were no strict curriculum guidelines to follow. There was no one telling me that I was not teaching correctly. There was no one looking over my shoulder wanting these plans all the time. If I was not following the exact plan, why had I not handed in a new one? There were not discipline problems. I just could not believe the change. It was relaxed. I was so happy. That was actually teaching."

Shelley missed the enthusiasm and energy of the junior high level, however. Her personal challenge, therefore, was to motivate the adult students so that they would react to a learning situation in the same ways. Shelley wanted to get the adult students as excited as she was about the learning process. She knew that she had the teaching skills to succeed. She brought her organizational skills, her animation and her love of learning.

Used to the structured environment of the public school system, Shelley was stimulated by the opportunities that the institution had to offer. She could enrol in night courses. She could become involved in distance education and teach teleconference courses to outlying centres. She could modify course curriculums to meet the specific needs of the adult students. She could attend specialized workshops to improve her knowledge and skills. "This was an ideal situation, where I could further strengthen my skills in a teaching situation." The opportunities were endless, and Shelley thrived on the challenges.

In Shelley's second year, she instructed the junior high and some of the high school English courses. As well, she was responsible for the Job Readiness Skills (JRS) Program. This program focussed on life skills management and preparing students for possible career areas. Shelley particularly enjoyed this program as it offered the opportunity to interact with students in a less rigid academic atmosphere.

She recognized the necessity of such a program and worked hard to make it successful. Unfortunately, budgetary restraints forced the cancellation of this program to the dismay of Shelley and the students.

Shelley's third year was equally as busy. For the fall semester, Shelley was on maternity leave with her second son Nathan, who was born on September 8, 1987. When Shelley returned for the second semester, she was responsible for some of the high school English courses. In addition, she teleconferenced the English 13 course to 40 students in ten outlying educational centres. In describing that experience, Shelley stated that:

"It was a very difficult transition to make. My entire teaching repertoire had to be changed. Because I could not receive nonverbal feedback, I had to strengthen my questioning techniques to ensure that the students were grasping the concepts. For years after, I would meet students at functions, and I would recognize their voices first. It was always fun to meet them then. Overall, it was a unique experience, and I would participate again if the opportunity ever arose."

During her last year of teaching, Shelley was responsible for the junior and senior high English courses. She felt a tremendous sense of satisfaction in helping the students enhance their skills. In describing that year, Shelley stated that:

"I did not associate with the staff because I could not have any professional discussions with them. I, therefore, spent all my time with the students. I learned what their concerns, problems and dreams were. I could develop a professional relationship with them, which created a better working relationship for us."

Shelley continued to develop her professional interests. One specific area was learning disabilities. "There are reasons why adult students dropped out of school. Many adults have abused substances, which has affected their learning. "I could not reach these people, and I wanted to know why." During that time, Shelley's son Tyler

contracted spinal meningitis. The awareness that Tyler could be faced with possible learning disabilities further enhanced Shelley's interests in these areas.

Therefore, Shelley completed a number of university courses that dealt with learning disabilities. She realized that the concepts or techniques that were taught were good teaching techniques that could be applied to any classroom in any situation. Her knowledge in this area further enhanced her professional skills.

When reflecting, Shelley made some perceptive evaluations about her former working environments.

"When I taught junior high school, I thought I was doing an excellent job. The students responded well to me, and the administrators seemed pleased with my efforts. Why else would I be given a student teacher in my second year of teaching? Suddenly in my fourth year, I was told that I was not an excellent teacher. I believed them and started to doubt my professional my professional abilities. I was burned out, and the only way to solve that problem was to leave. When I began teaching adult students, I had my first-year enthusiasm back. I had confidence in myself as a person. As a teacher, I could make professional judgements as to what was best for the students. In essence, I matured as a teacher. I knew that the little bit of supervision that I did receive was meaningful. I knew that the administrators were just not criticizing me; they were giving me meaningful information that I could incorporate into my teaching personality. I knew that I wanted to be a teacher, and I knew that I could be an excellent teacher. That was a turning point for me."

UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGE ENTRANCE PREPARATION PROGRAM (UCEP) EXPERIENCES

After four years with the High School Academic Upgrading Program, Shelley began looking for a further challenge. She accepted the English 100 Instructor position, in September 1989, with the University and College Entrance Preparation

(UCEP) program. This was the first year of the program, and Shelley was very determined that the program be successful.

Whenever Shelley changed her working environment, she critically reflected on the realities of her former position and the future possibilities of her new position. Moving to the UCEP Program allowed Shelley to formulate what her thoughts about education really were. Shelley has made a conscious decision to create a strong student-centred educational environment. Her concerns about being a facilitator of the learning process became stronger. She was now in a position where that was possible to implement.

Shelley easily described how working with the UCEP students differed from working with junior high students or the adult upgrading students.

"With junior high students, you could not give them very much control. You were bound by rigid curriculum demands. As well, they did not really have the maturity to give them that option. The adult upgrading students were much younger in age as well. They were not as mature. They were not already in situations where they were used to taking much responsibility. I could certainly give them more than the junior high students, but not as much as I would have liked. Things were much different with the UCEP students. The students are older with more life experiences. They have tried a number of different things. They were very goal directed. Suddenly they could take control of their learning environment. It was really exciting to see them able to do that. I was much more satisfied working in that kind of environment as well."

The English 100 curriculum did not have a rigid structure. Using her professional judgement, Shelley built the curriculum with very specific goals.

"I kept remembering that my high school English courses did not prepare me for college or university. The course objectives were too general. My course, following an English 30 type curriculum, particularly prepared students to enter these types of programs. Therefore, we concentrated on what I felt the students required, and what they thought they needed. We could then focus on essay writing through the study of literature. We could build critical thinking

skills and concentrate on how to make their ideas powerful through writing. It was a wonderful experience to see them grow and develop confidence in their abilities."

Shelley's teaching methods were, therefore, governed by these philosophies. Her classes were structured around group discussions which allowed the students to learn from themselves rather than depending solely upon Shelley. This created a more flexible, open and rewarding learning environment. Shelley also involved the students in the planning, implementation and evaluation of the curriculum.

"They planned how best to approach a particular theme. They decided when the various stages of the assignments would be completed. As well they gave input as how to best evaluate their work. It was a wonderful working environment. Even though I was actively teaching less, I learned more and more from the students than I ever have before. What an exciting place to be. I loved it!"

One thing that attracted Shelley to the program was the presence of a full-time counsellor. Through previous experience, Shelley realized that trying to counsel students, while teaching them, was not effective.

"Often a student would come to me, and I would listen to his or her concerns. However, I did not have the training or skills to effectively help him or her. That was where the counsellor was so crucial. That individual could best handle the student's problems and concerns or know where to get outside help from other agencies."

FUTURE PLANS

Shelley's future plans focus on becoming an excellent teacher. She expressed that even though she has ten years teaching experience, she does not feel that she is an excellent teacher.

"That is a state that can never be entirely achieved. There are too many things that keep changing. I must keep growing and changing to keep improving my professional skills. Through out my professional career, I do not feel that I have received consistent supervision and evaluation. The public school system trained me very well. Unfortunately, the adult education institution did not train me as well. There was always a manpower shortage, and the administrators did not have time for teacher evaluations. I wish that they had. One year I almost had the opportunity to become involved in a project much like this. The staff would not participate because they were too afraid to take the risks. When this opportunity appeared, I jumped at the chance. I felt it was necessary to receive a candid perspective on my teaching. I get so involved in what I am doing that I sometimes lose my perspectives. This project allowed me to stand back and critically view my professional skills."

Within the immediate future, Shelley was determined to make the English 100 curriculum of the UCEP program a success.

"I wanted to get the students prepared for post secondary education. I want to follow through on that. If they go into a program in town, I want to be able to keep track of them to see if they are successful. I need to know if I was doing the right things. That will be my indicator."

Shelley's quest for professional development continues. With a desire for variety, she will continue to participate in a variety of workshops or conferences. The employment opportunities with the adult education institution are ever changing and dynamic. As the institution continues to grow, so will Shelley.

Shelley is also considering completing a certificate or diploma or Master's degree concentrating in Adult Education. However, she is a bit uncertain about this. She is not sure whether such a program of studies would enhance her skills, knowledge and techniques in the actual classroom. Shelley does not have any great desire to become an administrator. She explained that administrators lose touch with the students, something she is not anxious to do. As well, her two boys are too young for her to leave

to return to school. With their farm and business, it would not be possible for the family to move to an urban centre. Shelley would have to move herself. At this point she is not willing to do that. When the children are older, Shelley will give serious consideration to returning to school.

Shelley's strongest concerns are to improve her teaching skills. One future goal she has also been considering is returning to the public system one day.

"I would like to go back to an upper elementary classroom and teach in the public system to redeem myself. I have learned so much in my ten years of teaching that I want to see if I can be an effective teacher with those kids at that level. I want to take my student-centred approach to education back into the public school system. The students want to learn, but they do not know how to do that. Learning loses its excitement because the system is grade-driven, and it becomes work. The students can be devastated by that. That is why we get them as adult students. I know that good teaching does not depend on any one subject area or grade level. I would like to have the opportunity to prove that to myself and others."

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF LONA M. TARNEY

EARLY INFLUENCES AND PUBLIC SCHOOL EXPERIENCES

As I think back on my life, it is not difficult to determine why I am a teacher; I was born into and live within a teaching family. I was born on December 2, 1958 in Brooks, a small town in Southern Alberta. My parents and two older brothers had moved from Slave Lake to Duchess, Alberta in July, 1958. My dad accepted the principalship at the small, rural grades one-to-twelve school. My mother, although a teacher, had quit working to raise my brothers and I. My mother reluctantly returned to teaching when I was four years of age; there was an extreme shortage of teachers in the district, and the school superintendent convinced mom to go back into the classroom until a replacement could be found. That was twenty-five years ago; mom retired in June 1989.

My family moved south to Brooks in the summer of 1969. Dad accepted a high school English position; mom accepted a junior high English and social studies position. In 1974 my family moved to Three Hills, Alberta. My oldest brother, having completed high school, remained in Brooks. Dad was teaching in the senior high, and mom was at the junior high. My dad suddenly died of a heart attack shortly after school started in September. Griefstricken, we managed to finish the year in Three Hills, then returned to Brooks in the summer of 1975. Mom returned to her former position at the junior high school. My older brother completed his high school diploma in 1976, and I completed mine in 1977.

After talking to numerous teacher friends and relatives, who were raised by "teaching parents", common elements that reflect my entrance into the teaching profession were revealed. With teaching parents, I was well aware of the hours spent on preparation and marking and the frustrations and rewards of teaching. The majority of my parents' friends are teachers. Even within my circle of relatives, teachers abound. My older brothers are both industrial arts teachers in Alberta. The majority of my friends are also teachers, which is no great surprise as members of a occupational group tend to associate with each other. However, I actively cultivate friendships with individuals who are not teachers. This adds different perspectives to my life as it enables me to gain an "outsider's" viewpoint on my occupation.

During my public school years, I was involved in extracurricular activities such as sports and student council activities. Once into junior and senior high school, I began to lose interest in school. I felt unchallenged by the system, the subjects and the teachers. During these years, certain teachers unwittingly motivated me at times when my interest was waning. A grade eight social studies teacher "opened my eyes for me." I was rebelling against the expectations of being a "teacher's child" and was determined to prove that I was not any different than any other student in the school. This teacher took a special interest in me and helped me to understand how foolish I was being. In high school, I admired the animation, knowledge and skills of one of my social studies teachers. Through their guidance and inspiration, I realized that I wanted to be a teacher. I wanted to teach secondary social studies because the field seemed so relevant. I could see connections between what I had been taught and what existed in the "real" world. I wanted to share that with other people.

I can only speculate as to the full extent of my parents' influence on my life. Both

of my parents came from humble middle-class families. There were expectations that each of us would receive some form of post-secondary education to ensure that we had certain securities in our lives. My mother expressed amazement that all three children entered the education profession. My mother and father neither encouraged or discouraged us to enter the profession; they provided exemplary role models for my brothers and me.

Even though there were many influences upon my choice of a profession, the ultimate decision was mine to make. I felt that I had an adequate and realistic knowledge of the profession. I also felt that I had the abilities to be an effective, compassionate and skilled teacher.

In reflection, I can easily say that my five years of teaching experiences were rewarding. I do not regret the occupational choice that I made as I feel that I made an impact on the adult students that I worked with over the years.

POST SECONDARY SCHOOL EXPERIENCES

After high school, I worked for a year as a "parts-assistant" for a local car dealership. Although I had an enjoyable year, I realized that I was not satisfied working in an occupation that did not challenge me. I decided to return to post-secondary school to complete a Bachelor of Education degree. I attended the Faculty of Education's University Transfer Program at Red Deer College from 1978 to 1980. I completed a Bachelor of Education degree, with a major in Secondary Social Studies, from the University of Lethbridge in 1983. Employment possibilities were

limited in Southern Alberta so I packed my dreams and headed north. I could hardly wait to experience and demonstrate my newly formed skills.

I am not really sure why I decided to enrol at Red Deer College; I did not know a single person who lived in Red Deer. I could have just as easily gone to Medicine Hat College or Lethbridge Community College; both centres were closer to Brooks than Red Deer. However, I was seeking new and unusual adventures. I had heard from a good friend that the Red Deer program was strong so I thought it would be a good place to start my education. I knew that I was not ready to go to university just yet.

My first year at college required many adjustments. I was a kid from a small town living in the city. As well, I suffered from being away from my comfortable world at home. I was overwhelmed for a few months, but settled down quickly when I realized that the "education" process required a serious commitment. One of the Education professors, recognizing my confusion, provided me with a certain amount of stability during periods of uncertainty.

My student teaching experience at a local high school, during my second year, reinforced my career decisions. It was invigorating to work with the social studies students as they were highly motivated towards their studies. When I left Red Deer in the spring of 1980, I was looking forward to continuing my studies at university. I worked in Brooks during the fall of 1980 before returning to university. I entered the Faculty of Arts and Science at the University of Lethbridge in January 1981.

University became very interesting when I entered the Faculty of Education in September 1981. I had the opportunity to work in elementary, junior and senior high social studies classrooms. This further strengthened my convictions about being a social studies teacher. There were only twelve students in the social studies section.

We quickly developed strong support systems to exchange ideas and perspectives on the experiences we were having. One particular professor inspired me to great heights. His gentle and passionate love for learning showed me that the learning process could be demanding, intense, yet gratifying.

ADULT EDUCATION TEACHING EXPERIENCES

In the fall of 1983, I moved to Slave Lake, Alberta. I was familiar with the area as my mother's family was from a village twenty kilometres west of Slave Lake. I was hired by a local adult education institution. During my five years of employment, I was an instructor with the High School Academic Upgrading Program. During those years, the staff increased from three to eight instructors, and the program gradually expanded to provide a small, adult basic education to grade twelve school. An English-as-a-Second-Language program was also in operation.

My first year of teaching was quite an experience. I was adapting to living in a small community in Northern Alberta after life in urban centres for the previous five years. I engaged in very little active teaching that year. The majority of my time was spent working individually with the twelve students in my classroom. I was responsible for marking the following Alberta Education correspondence courses: Accounting 10 and 20; English 10, 13, 20, 23, 30 and 33; and Social Studies 10, 20 and 30. In addition to my room, there were four other classrooms operating in such a fashion. Needless to say, the working conditions were less than desirable as each classroom basically operated in isolation from each other.

I quickly became involved in extra curricular activities, such as the Students'

Council, the Yearbook, the Graduation, various sports events and field trips. As well as being enjoyable, these activities helped break down some of the student-teacher barriers that existed. Knowing each other in a non-academic way helped the students and I understand and work better together.

I was very excited when the start of the second year saw organizational changes being made to the program. The senior instructors and staff integrated the classrooms into a small, grades one to twelve school. Many problems resulted as the transitions were made to this system. Resistance occurred from the staff and students, and there was inadequate support and guidance from the senior instructors. However, the direction improved when a senior instructor was hired to oversee the program. The instructors themselves began to specialize into subject areas. Despite all the initial difficulties, the quality of education improved for the students.

My teaching areas became more subject concentrated. I was responsible for the junior and senior high English courses. It was a more satisfying year as I began to familiarize myself with the English curriculums. My involvement in extra curricular activities continued to enhance the relationships with my students. Overall it was an enjoyable teaching year.

By my third year of teaching, I was beginning to feel comfortable with my professional roles and responsibilities. I was now teaching in my areas of expertise. I instructed the grades eleven and twelve English courses; another teacher had taken over the grades seven to ten English courses. I was also responsible for the high school social studies courses; I was very excited about finally being able to concentrate on these curriculums.

It was a rather distressful year as there were problems with staff activities and

morale. However, I isolated myself from that as much as possible by concentrating on my teaching and the students. In addition to my regular extra curricular involvement, I was a field trip supervisor. We took 30 students on a "Experience Expo '86" adventure. It was a wonderful experience.

My fourth year of teaching was equally as busy. My teaching assignment began to narrow again as I was teaching English 33 and 30 and the Social Studies 10, 20 and 30 courses. I also had a number of social science options. I was comfortable with these assignments as it allowed me to concentrate my energies into a smaller number of courses. Having mastered the content of the courses meant I then had more freedom to experiment with different teaching and learning activities.

The staff difficulties continued although a new senior instructor was hired. However, I directed my energy into my teaching and interacting with the students. I spent part of July marking the English 30 Diploma Examinations in Edmonton. This allowed me to determine how best to adapt the specific curriculum demands to the particular needs of my students.

My fifth year of teaching was an unsettling year. My teaching assignments did not change this year. I was allowed to experiment with the social studies curriculum. By modifying the Social Studies 10 and 20 curriculums, more students succeeded in the Social Studies 30 course. As well as my usual extra curricular activities, I was a field trip supervisor for the 60 students that went to the Olympics in Calgary. We sure enjoyed ourselves.

In spite of all these activities, I was very dissatisfied with the working environment. The problems and concerns of the staff and students seemed endless and unsolvable. Although the new senior instructor worked extremely hard to overcome

these problems, nothing seemed to change. Therefore, I realized that I needed a change. I realized that I had been teaching adult students for five years without really having any theoretical knowledge about working with these students. I was not sure if the instinctual knowledge and skills I had been working with were relevant or adequate. I was not sure if I had been adequately meeting the needs of my students. I needed to remove myself from the situation to gain a new perspective on what I had been doing. I, therefore, enrolled in a Master's degree in Education program. During the year that I was away, I was able to critically reflect on my years of teaching, the characteristics of my students and the characteristics of the institution I had worked for.

The Academic Upgrading Program was housed in a two-story building in the industrial section of town. As well as the classrooms, the building housed the warehouse, photocopying department, carpentry shop and garage. The very nature of the building did not provide a "traditional" school setting. Coffee pots percolated in every classroom, and the Student Lounge, continually filled with cigarette smoke, contained a concession booth. Fortunately the building did not possess an intercom system nor did bells ring. Being on a first name basis with everyone also helped to create a more casual atmosphere. The students were able to feel more comfortable within their academic environment.

The majority of the students were native, single-parent women. It was always easier for a man to work in the forestry or oil industries; therefore, the male population at school was always a very small minority. The students, for a wealth of reasons, had not completed their public school education. They realized that an education was now a necessity. However, some of them returned with very tentative feelings. Their previous experiences with the educational process were not necessarily

positive. Therefore, I felt it was particularly important for the educational institution to respond to the needs of these students. The staff attempted to create a more adult and comfortable learning environment for the students.

The majority of the students were self-motivated and concerned about completing their education as quickly as possible; most of them had plans to continue on to post-secondary programs. This concern for expediency often caused academic dilemmas however. Often the student's academic aspirations did not match her or his actual abilities. Each student wrote standardized achievement tests upon entry and then was placed in the appropriate level of studies. Some of the students, although having previously completed some high school credits, would often "test out" at junior high skill levels. We knew that the standardized tests were culturally biased against the rural, non-white, Northern Albertan students. However, experience also told us that the results from these tests were often fairly indicative of the students' actual abilities.

It was a delicate and diplomatic task to justify to the student that it would be more advantageous if he or she started at a lower level and worked upwards, rather than being placed in a program that was too difficult. This practise was adopted after many long and agonising staff meetings. Ethically the staff could not reproduce the public school "mentality" of promoting students even if their academic needs had not been met. Because the students had taken the risk of returning to school, we felt it was important that we responsibly dealt with the academic needs of the students.

Understandably then, the provincially legislated curriculum was not completely suited to the needs of adult students. Learning resources, woefully inadequate, were written for young children and/or adolescents. A tremendous demand exists for lower

level skill materials with an adult orientation. However allowances were frequently being made to suit the students' needs and interests. The staff sometimes felt that a rigid adherence to the curriculum did little for the affective needs of the students. These students were often young adults struggling to be responsible for events in their lives that were sometimes out of their control. Sometimes it was more relevant and effective to just spend time talking with students about relationships, families, health concerns and raising children. This demonstrated to the students that the staff recognized and was concerned about their lives outside of the academic realm.

However the existence of the adult educational program was dependent upon provincial monies. Therefore, the curriculum had to be adhered to. Fortunately opportunities existed to enrich the standard curriculum. This transpired into dealing with as many current and native issues and events as possible. Field trips, audio and visual materials, student council activities, sports events, trips to the public library and guest speakers were utilized as often as possible. As well as meeting the curricular needs, these activities gave the students exposure to outside resources.

As with public school students, adult students sometimes did not appropriately apply their energies entirely to school. However discipline problems with adults were markedly different. If an adult student was facing distractions in his or her personal life, he or she did not act out in destructive manners at school. He or she simply did not come to school. Therefore, we had to adopt measures, such as probation and/or suspension, to deal with these problems. I always felt that interventions should not be necessary as the students, being adults, should be able to maturely govern their behaviours. Such was not always the case.

As with any educational program, the students' attitudes and motivations vary.

The majority of students received an educational training allowance, either from the provincial or federal government - Alberta Vocational Training, Canada Manpower or the various Indian Bands. Unfortunately, some of the students attended because they were paid. They did not remain long in attendance, though, as the academic rigours and expectations of the program were too demanding. At that point in their lives, education was not yet a high priority. Although the regulations stated that a student had to be seventeen years of age, younger students were frequently accepted into the program. The success rate of these students was minimal as they had difficulties adjusting to the program. In essence they were not mature enough to handle the inherent freedom or responsibilities of the program. The most successful student tended to be older, or between twenty to thirty years of age. This individual had already experienced the freedom of not being in school. She or he had also experienced the reality of menial and economically unsuitable employment. Therefore, that student was all the more determined to get her or his value out of the educational program.

In essence I can say that I enjoyed working with adult students. I found their quest for knowledge to be challenging and stimulating. My attention to academic concerns was particularly fulfilling. It was a rewarding experience to watch a student grow in his or her confidence and academic abilities. As well my attention to affective concerns was successful. Occasionally former students contact me to express their appreciation for my support and guidance. Those sentiments are very important to me as it indicates that I made an impact on my students.

POST SECONDARY EDUCATION EXPERIENCES

In June of 1989, I took educational leave to return to the University of Lethbridge to begin working on a Master's degree in Education. It was time to reflect upon my five years of teaching experience. After examining the theories of andragogy, the art and science of helping adults learn, I was able to view my teaching experiences with a new perspective. I realized that my teaching approaches reflected these theories. I only wish that I had been cognizant of those theories while I was teaching. It would have reinforced what I was instinctively doing in the classroom.

Unfortunately not all the students were highly motivated and/or dedicated to their educational goals. I found it very easy to work with students who were anxious to learn. It was a more difficult task to inspire and motivate students who did not share the same feelings. Gradually, however, I became more skilled in this area. I gained ways of drawing out students through classroom activities. I found it was necessary to use learning activities, such as individualized activities and small group work, to ensure success for these students. Then I could gradually broaden the activities to include larger group discussions, role plays, case studies and simulations. When necessary, I also spent individual time with these students. It all came down to the necessity of creating a relationship based on mutual trust and respect. Only then could a working relationship be established.

The working conditions over the years became less desirable. Certain staff became very resistant to change, even though it would have been most beneficial to the students. The constant change of senior instructors, four in five years, meant that the continuity and philosophy of the program sometimes faltered. As this was happening,

my own motivation and dedication began to wane. Realizing that I was becoming less effective in my work, I took active steps to prevent this.

During this five year period, certain individuals within the institution, in teaching and management positions, acted as personal mentors to me. Shelley Wilkinson was the most dominant mentor. Her knowledge, skills, dedication to teaching and concerns for the students was an inspiration to me. Two women in management positions have also assisted in my professional development. Their dedication, concerns and perseverance have not only helped me but have been an asset to the students and the institution as a whole.

SUNRISE PROJECT EXPERIENCES

In September 1989 I returned to the employment of the adult education institution I had previously worked with. I am the Educational Counsellor for a university transfer program. I am responsible for assisting students with course choices for their degree programs. I advise students on any matters pertaining to student finance. When necessary, I offer tutorial assistance to students working on assignments for their courses. In essence, I provide support and guidance to students starting their educational pursuits.

The transitions of becoming a student again are not always easy tasks. Some of them need to learn how to learn again. Others have difficulty coping with the necessary financial and family changes that must occur. Others are faced with tremendous fears of failure that can hamper their academic performances.

My role as a personal counsellor seems to supersede my other duties. As I gain

more experience and knowledge in this area, my interpersonal skills have been strengthened tremendously. I have learned that my counselling style is very non-directive. I believe that a student can take control of his or her own learning environment and become an independent and confident individual.

It is necessary to be adaptive in my counselling style however. At times, I must be non-directive in order for the student to take responsibility. At other times, I must intervene to help the student see the "reality" of his or her situation. This flexibility is very important for my counselling skills and techniques.

My function as a counsellor is to act more as a consultant and facilitator. Given the opportunity to establish a relationship based on mutual trust and respect, I attempt to gain an understanding of the student's "world." Through this understanding, we can then investigate all the alternatives available to the student. This process becomes a valuable learning process for the student as well. The student comes to realize that she or he has the interpersonal skills to deal with these situations. It is ultimately the student's responsibility to make appropriate choices. I will not take that opportunity away from the student.

It is important to me to increase my effectiveness as a counsellor. This professional development will be enhanced by participating in workshops, conferences and university courses that deal with the counselling of others. I am also considering completing a certificate or diploma to compliment my knowledge and skills about adult education theories and teaching and learning techniques. I am particularly interested in increasing my knowledge and skills in the area of motivation. This facet is of the utmost importance when working with any students, be it in the classroom or in a counselling situation.

Upon completion of my Master's degree in Education, the opportunity to teach university courses part time will be an option. I am particularly anxious to apply my renewed energy and perspectives to the classroom again.

The recent transitions in my life, from teacher to student to counsellor, have given me renewed perspectives on the learning experiences of a student. As a teacher, I lost my direction as my concerns for content and curriculums seemed to supersede my concerns for meeting the affective needs of the students.

Becoming a student again made me realize how important effective teaching is. I realized that it was my responsibility to ensure my learning was effective. I knew that I had to take the initiative to ensure that my personal objectives were being met. I wished to know more about adult education so directed my learning experiences towards those goals. All of the learning experiences gave me a feeling of control over my educational pursuits.

Therefore, I brought those perceptions and expectations to my counselling position. It is important that the students take responsibility for their learning. Only through these means can their educational experiences be more meaningful.

PROFESSIONAL CONCERNS OF SHELLEY AND LONA

Shelley and I had the pleasure of working together for four years, from 1985 to 1989. Our personal friendship quickly expanded to include our professional relationship. We both instructed the English curriculums within the High School Academic Upgrading Program. We had a rewarding working relationship as we continually exchanged our ideas and concerns. As a result of our collaboration, the English programs were very relevant to meeting the needs of the students.

When examining various facets of Shelley's and my biographies, the similarities are quite evident. I completed my biographical sketch in June 1989, and Shelley completed hers in January 1990. The interesting fact is that many of our concerns were similar.

When examining the context of our working realities, we felt it was necessary to have realistic expectations towards working with adult students. Therefore, it was often necessary to modify the provincially legislated curriculums to meet the needs of our rural, predominantly native, adult students. If a relationship based on mutual trust and respect was established, then working with adult students was a rewarding experience.

As was sometimes the case, Shelley and I both experienced frustrations by the more negative elements of our working realities. It was difficult to respond to the negative attitudes and never changing problems of the staff and students. As a result, we both found ourselves unconsciously turning towards the students to meet their intellectual and emotional needs. On occasion, frustrations resulted when a particular student could not be motivated or "reached."

Adult students who returned to school were sometimes not ready to accept the responsibility of governing their own actions and behaviors. They were still operating with the "mind set" they had from previous school experiences. These individuals still tend to externalize their problems or concerns as they looked for someone or something else to take the responsibility or blame. Shelley and I worked hard to discover methods to aid these students in maturely dealing with these aspects. It was not an easy process. We celebrated in the successes and suffered in the defeats. Sometimes we had to, unfortunately, let go of a student as he or she was just not ready to accept our guidance. When that occurred, we would discuss what methods had been used, and what methods could possibly be used in future situations. However, our dedication to the pursuit of adult education did not prevent us from continuing in our efforts.

Equally alarming was the drop out rate of adult students. The ever changing group of students caused frustrations in a number of ways. At times our students were faced with disruptive elements in their lives. Some of them gave up all too quickly on education as that seemed to be the easiest way of coping. Shelley and I had difficulty accepting that the educational process was not as important to others as it was to us. Our zealous dedication was frequently tempered by these aspects of our working reality.

Proponents of andragogy, or the art and science of helping adults learn, stressed that the best learning environment is one in which the adult learner was given control and responsibility. Shelley and I, although naive about these actual theories, conducted our professional practices on this basis. Although responsible to provincially mandated curriculums, it was important that the curriculum be relevant to the students' lives.

Efforts were taken to ensure that the units of study, within the English curriculums, could be transferable to the students' daily lives. The students were involved in the planning, implementation and evaluation of units of study as much as possible. As well the actual delivery of the course content was tailored to the students' needs. These efforts were taken to allow the students to have as much control as possible over their learning environments.

When planning components of the curriculums, our particular emphasis was on the application of this knowledge to the students' daily lives. It was important that the students be able to engage in critical thinking. Clarity of thought, when speaking and writing, was an important aspect of the curriculums. In essence, efforts were taken to encourage the students to take responsibility for their own learning processes. If the students could not or would not do this, Shelley and I felt that we had failed the students.

Our teaching methods were adaptive as well. Much more instructor-student interaction occurred. The lecture method was used sparingly; it was more relevant to have group discussions about material that had been read. These discussions allowed the students to exchange their ideas and reveal different ways of thinking. It allowed the more mature thinkers the opportunity to verbalize their thoughts. This also provided modelling for the less mature thinkers as they examined the arguments of other students. In essence, these methods were utilized to more actively involve students in the learning process.

Neither Shelley or I were comfortable with having a strongly teacher-directed learning environment. After teaching in the public school system, Shelley was enjoying the relative freedom of the adult education environment. Having had no

experience in the public school system other than student teaching practicums, I was interacting in an environment that I felt was the most suitable to my philosophies of education.

Classroom management with adult students was not really a serious issue. Very rarely did an adult student use disruptive behaviors in a classroom. The issue of management referred more to the motivational elements of instruction. We both established a classroom atmosphere based on mutual trust and respect. A relaxed yet structured environment prevailed. This encouraged a mutual interest in the educational process. Students felt comfortable enough to enjoy interacting with knowledge.

It is not surprising that Shelley and I shared the same concerns and goals for our students. We have been personal friends for almost two decades. We worked closely to develop the English curriculums for our students. When discussing these aspects, common concerns began to occur. We both wished to have a learning environment that was structured yet flexible. We both felt that we were highly skilled and dedicated educators. However, our discussions regarding the motivation of students were the most extensive and intense. Therefore, when discussing the supervision project, this component remained foremost in our minds.

DISCUSSION OF DAILY ACTIVITIES

WEEK ONE

Our first day of class was very busy. Kane was the only absent student. Shelley and I discussed what our agendas were for the creative project and generally explained how the drama unit would be organized. With the drama, Death of a Salesman, the students would choose characters and read the drama in class. As well, they would videotape specific scenes from the drama. The students' curiosity was piqued, and they asked many questions. We also explained that the students would complete their own creative assignment. We brainstormed ideas for this; their ideas included videotaping scenes from the drama or writing their own drama to present. They also suggested that they could do a creative dance or music video. Other possibilities included completing a writing assignment in response to the drama. They seemed particularly enthusiastic about completing their own creative assignment as they enjoyed feeling in control of their learning situations. This feeling was not new to them as they had consistently been given the opportunity to make choices about their major assignments.

Shelley created a mindset for the study of drama by asking specific questions of the students, such as what was the purpose of studying dramas and had any of the students seen or participated in a live presentation. We also discussed the similarities and differences between novels and dramas by examining a chart from the handout, "Modern Drama" (See Appendix A).

As an introduction to the study of drama, we read and discussed a short, one-act drama, Five in Judgement. The play was action packed, and the students enjoyed

reading it aloud. Their enthusiasm was infectious. We also distributed the "Arthur Miller" handout and discussed Miller's biography (See Appendix B). To conclude the class, I discussed and had the eight students and Shelley sign the consent forms, agreeing to participate in the creative project (See Appendix C and D). To ensure confidentiality, I asked the students to choose a different name to identify themselves. One student commented that she was not sure why they were signing the formal form when they had already agreed to participate in the project. Another student replied that because they were adults, they should be given the opportunity to agree to participate.

That statement signified the philosophies of these students. Their learning experiences were tremendously important to them, but they also had enough confidence to willingly participate in new and unusual experiences. Equally important was that the students were comfortable enough in their learning environment to allow an "outsider" to become involved in this process. They inherently trusted Shelley enough to accept her enthusiasm towards this project. Although somewhat initially protective of themselves and Shelley, they quickly came to accept me. They realized that Shelley felt this project was as important as I did.

We began the second class with a discussion of the housekeeping duties and daily objectives. These items were written on the white board by Shelley. This activity gave every one the opportunity to exchange news and concerns that were pertinent. This practice was also a regular feature of each class. Sue was the only student absent. We quickly reviewed the similarities and differences between novels and dramas. From the handout, "Divisions of Drama", we examined the different divisions of comedic and

tragic dramas (See Appendix E). The students decided that the drama, Five in Judgement belonged to the comedic division because the protagonists had achieved their goals. The students also discussed the key elements of a drama as outlined in the handout, "The One-Act Play" (See Appendix F). Shelley then asked the students to identify these elements, such as plot, character, setting and theme, from the drama, Five in Judgement.

After completing a poetry unit, the students expressed the desire to know about an author's life and how his/her life influenced his/her writing. We focussed on how the major influences on Arthur Miller's life, such as his experiences during the Great Depression of the 1930's, affected his writing. We also discussed the specific dramatic techniques, foreshadowing and flashbacks, that Miller used to achieve special effects. We evaluated the differences between a Shakespearean or Aristotelian tragedy and a modern tragedy after reading the sections from the handout, "Modern Drama."

After that, the students chose their characters and read aloud scenes one and two from Act One of Death of a Salesman. Willy took the part of Willy, Christine took the part of Linda, Betty chose to be Biff and Kane was Happy. The students were rather self conscious when they first began to read, but they quickly became comfortable with their characters.

Shelley and I frequently stopped them to offer explanations or questions about the significance of certain events or stage directions. The students responded well as they speculated about the importance of certain events or statements made by the characters. When reviewing the content from the previous class, Shelley and I naturally alternated between questioning the students. The students responded well to

my questioning as they have accepted that I am a part of their learning process.

To begin day three, I reviewed scenes one and two from Act One by asking open-ended and specific questions. We examined the technical features of the play by discussing the use of setting and lighting, the establishment of the mood and how examples of foreshadowing and suspense were developed. We then had a general discussion about videotaping scenes one and two, with the students choosing specific parts. We also talked about how the stage properties and lighting and sound effects could effectively be created. Then the students read scenes three to eleven, to the end of Act One. I had originally intended to stop the reading after scene eight to discuss the events, but the students were so involved that they did not want to stop reading.

During the class, Shelley completed a verbal flow observation. For example, we wanted to determine whether a student responded directly or volunteered answers that were relevant or irrelevant to the teacher's questions. As well, we wanted to gather information on whether we asked open-ended or specific questions to the students. This observation provided valuable insights into my questioning techniques and the response patterns of the students. My questioning strategies were very consistent. The students would volunteer answers to my open-ended questions. I would elaborate or clarify their responses and then ask further questions from these responses. That same student would answer again, or another student would respond to elaborate on previous statements or add his or her own opinions.

The students seemed to respond in their regular patterns. Willy was preoccupied so was not participating as much as he normally would. Betty and Kane compensated for his verbal absence. Betty, a very vocal student, always participated in discussions

with on-task comments and questions. Kane participated in discussions as much as Willy and Betty. An analytical thinker by nature, his participation was always pertinent.

Michelle tended to be a quieter student. Although she did not verbally participate as often as Willy, Betty or Kane, her contributions were always valuable. Mark was a fairly quiet student. He often sat back and let the other students interact. However, his attention was usually focussed on the task at hand as he would frequently nod his head in agreement with a student's comment. Christine was also a quiet student. English was her second language so her confidence in her abilities tended to waver sometimes. Her responses tended to be a little slower in coming, but when they were offered, they were succinct. Because of her hesitation, the students sometimes interrupted and overruled her responses. Jane, who sat beside Christine, did this fairly often. Fortunately, Christine would wait until there was a natural break in the conversation to add her opinions.

Sue was also a quiet student. Having missed the class the day before, she did not appear to be prepared for class. Although she responded a few times with relevant comments, she was off-task for most of the class; she read the play and examined the contents of her purse. Jane participated fairly well during class, but her attention tended to waver. She was aware of this and would consciously bring herself back by contributing to the class discussions.

Shelley and I had a very valuable discussion from the verbal flow observations. This was the first class that I had taught by myself. I was not certain how the students would respond to me so I tended to ask more open-ended than specifically directed

questions. I felt that this would create a less threatening environment for the students as it would give us some time to become familiar with each other. This pattern of questioning was fairly indicative of my methods and was definitely something that required more concentrated efforts as not all of the students responded equally to me.

Shelley explained that the response patterns of the students were very typical. Willy, Betty and Kane tended to carry the discussions. Michelle, Mark, Christine and Jane interacted less frequently, and Sue's interaction was very limited.

The physical arrangements of the classroom would also affect the verbal flow patterns. The tables were arranged in a U-shape. Shelley and I sat at the front of the class, to the right of the white board. Christine sat to our immediate left so it was difficult to have direct eye contact with her. Jane, sitting to the left of Christine, tended to sit back in her chair. In essence, she was hiding from direct eye contact with us.

Willy and Betty sat directly across from us; eye contact was excellent. Being outgoing individuals, good eye contact would only enhance their interactions. Sue and Michelle sat off to our right, beside Willy and Betty. Their table was covered with a border of books and kleenex boxes. Although good eye contact was possible, they did not interact as often. Good eye contact was possible with Mark and Kane, who sat off to our right. However, Mark did not interact as often as Kane did. These seating arrangements would, therefore, have enhanced the verbal flow patterns of the students.

I felt that the discussion with the students faltered at times. A number of factors could have caused this. Willy was not his usual gregarious self. That put more emphasis on Betty and Kane to carry the discussion. As well, the students were well

aware of the fact that I was teaching alone, and Shelley was busy doing something. Her noninvolvement piqued their curiosity. They kept an "eye" on Shelley during the discussions.

On day four, Shelley reviewed the scenes from Act One by concentrating on character sketches. Her specific questions were directed to the student who had read that specific character's part. Shelley also reviewed specific techniques that Miller had used to advance the plot and character development, such as the use of flashbacks, music and lighting.

The students were given a writing assignment to conclude the activities for Act One. The questions came from the handout "Review Questions - Death of a Salesman (See Appendix G). The assignment was worth ten possible marks; four marks would be given for mechanical skills (spelling, punctuation and grammar), and six marks would be given for their composition skills, or how well they answered the content of the question. The question was due the next day. Shelley explained that she and I would collaborate on the marking of the assignments. The students seemed to accept this as no one voiced any concerns about this request.

An interesting discussion ensued after Shelley had explained the writing assignment to the students. She asked the students if it bothered them that she had not participated in yesterday's class. Most of them said it did not bother them, but they were certainly wondering what we were doing. I explained that we were examining our questioning strategies. Some of them were a little skeptical as they felt that we were evaluating them. However, they accepted our explanation about our supervision activities. Their concerns were very valid as it again revealed their seriousness about

their learning experiences.

While Shelley was teaching, I conducted a verbal flow observation. It was interesting to see the patterns that developed from Shelley's questioning techniques. Willy, Betty and Kane responded actively. The other students were less active, but they responded well when they were explaining their "character." Although Shelley asked equally as many open-ended as specific questions, the same students responded; the quieter students allowed the more vocal students to participate for them.

Shelley and I also speculated as to some of the reasons for the successful question-answer exercise. The use of specific questions allowed the quieter students an opportunity to participate in class discussions. Many general questions would be answered by the assertive, confident students. The quieter students seemed to hold back from answering the general questions, knowing that some one else would answer.

Shelley also explained that having worked with the students for six months allowed her to ask the assertive students to hold their thoughts until another student had a chance to contribute to the discussion. The familiarity also permitted a smaller personal space between Shelley and the students. This allowed her to make physical contact with a student to emphasize a point. Shelley's physical movement around the classroom and use of the white board for making notes also gained the students' interest and attention.

For day five, Shelley quickly reviewed the characters the students had discussed the day before. They responded well to the general and specific questions. Shelley then concentrated on a review, with general and specific questions, of the technical aspects used in Act One. The students also handed in their writing assignment that had been

assigned the previous day.

To conclude the class, we discussed how the videotaping of scenes one and two from Act One would be achieved. The students freely chose the character parts and decided what students would act as technical assistants. We also brainstormed ideas for what stage properties would be necessary for the set, and how the special effects would be achieved. Although the students were rather nervous about being videotaped, their enthusiasm and willingness to try new experiences was infectious. Every one left anticipating the completion of the videotaping on Monday.

While Shelley was teaching, I completed a time-on task observation. Shelley and I both agreed that the results were a fair indication of the activities of the students. Willy, Betty and Kane were again the main contributors to the class discussions. They listened intently to what was said in class and then commented or formulated their own thoughts to share with the other students. Mark listened but contributed little. He experienced the occasional lapse in on-task behavior. We decided that if he contributed more to class, he would find it easier to stay on-task.

Michelle had been designated the official "note taker" of the students. She would participate if she felt strongly about an opinion that was expressed. Most of the time, however, she took notes from those written on the board by Shelley. Jane engaged in a number of activities during the class as she listened, talked and made notes. Sue was inattentive for most of the class as she seemed to be daydreaming. When she was on-task, her comments tended to be irrelevant to the class activities. Christine was absent from class that day.

After a discussion of the results of the time-on task observation, Shelley and I

also reviewed the results from the verbal flow observations we had completed. It was easy to identify the students who actively participated and those who did not. We realized that activities had to be organized so that the quieter students would be encouraged to participate. We realized that the videotaping of specific scenes from the drama would ensure this occurred. In order for the videotaping to be successful, all of the students would have to become involved. As well as the students being relatively inexperienced with the acting process itself, the physical arrangements of the room would present difficulties with achieving the necessary special effects. However, Shelley and I were certain that all the students would become involved in the process.

By the end of the first week of collaborative teaching, Shelley and I were very comfortable with each other. We know each other well enough that we could anticipate each other's teaching objectives and strategies. Equally valuable was our ability to analyze our daily activities to suggest revisions that needed to occur. Our clinical supervision observations resulted in lengthy, objective discussions about the achievement of our objectives. Both of us had enough confidence in our teaching abilities to not be threatened by the scrutiny of our teaching strategies.

WEEK TWO

We started day one of week two with the usual housekeeping items and discussion of the daily objectives. Because it was Monday morning, we were busy discussing concerns and local news. This enabled all of us to make a gradual transition from the weekend to our school related duties. Sue and Jane were absent.

We spent the morning arranging the stage properties, furniture, microphone and videotaping equipment to tape scene one from Act One. Willy portrayed the character of Willy, and Christine was Linda. After we viewed the tape, we discussed how to rearrange the room to achieve the best sound and lighting effects. This required particular ingenuity as the room was not suitable for this kind of activity. We also discussed how to present the acting, through physical movements and tone of voice, to establish the appropriate mood of the first scene.

We were pleased by the students' efforts. Willy and Christine read their script from the text so their voice inflections and physical movements were rather stilted. The students had some experience working with videotape equipment from a different course within the program. However, they were not very familiar with the requirements of producing a drama. They were not used to facing the camera while speaking or ensuring that they were speaking loudly enough for the microphone to pick up the sound of their voices. They had to make considerable efforts to overcome these fears. As well, they were not used to making drama presentations in front of their peers and/or instructors. After viewing the videotape, they decided to revideotape the scene as they were not pleased with their performances.

The students were fairly slow in setting up the room for videotaping. They seemed to be looking to Shelley and me for direction. The students also were not very familiar with the requirements of a drama, such as the use of stage properties and stage directions. Shelley and I had agreed before hand that we would remain as nondirective as possible. Attempting to be facilitators rather than leaders, we wanted the students to take as much ownership for their learning as possible. Willy, Betty, Kane, Christine and Mark eventually began to take responsibility for setting up the room. Michelle did not participate much in the organization of the room; she appeared to be looking to us for direction, but we did not intervene. Initially, the students frequently consulted with Shelley and me. After it became evident that we were not going to take control, they began making their own decisions.

After class, Shelley and I discussed how we had individually marked the students' written assignments. It was startling that our evaluations were so similar. The influence of having worked together for four years on English curriculums was evident. We agreed that we should not have been surprised by the results, but we were. Shelley compiled the comments and marks and returned the assignments to the students. They were equally amazed that our marking was so similar. Generally, the students had no difficulties with our collaborative marking practice.

On day two, the students immediately began to arrange the room for the videotaping of the scenes from Act One. The preparations went smoothly as the students knew what had to be done. Willy and Mark took responsibility for setting up the microphone and videotaping equipment. Kane, Betty and Michelle were busy arranging the stage properties and furniture. Jane did not participate much in the preparations.

The other students seemed to ignore this fact so Shelley and I made no comment. Christine was forty minutes late, and Sue was absent from class.

We videotaped scene two first with Betty portraying Biff, and Kane portraying Happy. Betty was very natural in front of the camera. Once Kane overcame his nervousness, he gave an excellent character portrayal. After viewing the scene, the students immediately made suggestions as to how the scene could have been improved through more natural physical movement and lighting and sound adjustments.

Willy and Christine then revidetaped scene one. They had obviously internalized the comments made about their videotaping from the previous day. They also observed some of the effective actions taken by Betty and Kane in scene two. Their acting was more natural with the second videotaping. Christine was still rather hesitant about acting, but she displayed more emotional responses the second time. Willy also did a much better job as he was concerned about physical movement and the emotional impact of certain statements he had to make.

To conclude class, the students volunteered to bring whatever stage properties would be necessary for the videotaping of scenes five and six. We read through scenes five and six to familiarize the students with these scenes for the next videotaping session. The amount of enthusiasm and cooperation that the students generated was refreshing. As they became more acquainted with the limitations and possibilities of videotaping, their ideas became more focussed and specific. They became more aware of how to effectively make use of sound and lighting effects. As well, they became skilled in determining what stage properties would be the most suitable. It was obvious that the students were becoming very involved in the presentation of the scenes from Act

One.

Day three was not a typical day. Rather than continue with the drama unit, we decided to attend the interactive theatre presentation on AIDS awareness at the local high school. Being adults and parents, the students were particularly interested in the topic. The presentation was well done. Interactive theatre meant that the actors and actresses interacted with the audience by asking for questions or comments. Although we were surrounded by high school students, Kane and Betty asked some very legitimate questions. Sitting at the back, it was hard to see the set on the floor of the gymnasium. However, the students decided that if the set was up on the stage, the audience interaction would not have been as effective.

The students also agreed that the information on AIDS was effectively presented. They were concerned that the presentation used medical terms that a high school student might not understand. As well, the troupe seemed to treat the prevention of contracting AIDS very lightly. A number of students were concerned about this and talked to some of the actors and actresses after the performance. One student commented that he wished he had signed his daughter's consent form to see the play. He realized that he could not present the information to his daughter in the same way that the play had. Seeing the presentation was quite a learning experience for him and the rest of us.

On day four, we briefly discussed the AIDS presentation we had attended the previous day. Sue arrived forty-five minutes late for class. The students quickly prepared the set for the videotaping of scenes five and six from Act One. All of the students were involved in this activity; they realized that a total group effort was

necessary to ensure that the videotaping was successful.

Scenes five and six were difficult scenes to videotape as the use of special effects, such as lighting and sound, to portray flashbacks were required. The students used incredible creativity to overcome these limitations. After completing a lengthy rehearsal, the students videotaped these scenes. Their character portrayals were much stronger as they had gained an in-depth understanding of the characters and plot.

The students worked well together. Any difficulties that arose were quickly solved through discussions and negotiations. Shelley and I were not very involved in this process; we let the students solve their problems. Some of the students were aware that not all of the students were offering equal input. After a diplomatic discussion, it was agreed that the students would switch characters for Act Two to ensure that all the students had an equal opportunity to act for the videotaping of the scenes from Act Two.

The class for day five was cancelled. The students attended the Northern Alberta Institute of Technology open house in Edmonton. Each student was particularly interested in certain programs offered at NAIT. Some of them had also arranged meetings with counsellors or coordinators of the programs. The students asked if I wanted to attend. Unfortunately, I had to decline; it would have been an enjoyable day with the students.

The second week of classes saw the interests and motivations of the students building. Shelley and I were very pleased that the students took responsibility for the completion of the videotaping. Shelley and I did not complete any formal peer supervision observations during the week. We felt that if one of us was sitting back in a corner observing the class, the natural flow of the students activities would have

been adversely effected. The organization of the classroom for the videotaping sessions involved the efforts of all of us - the students, Shelley and me. Shelley and I merely assisted in these activities; we did not actively make decisions, for example, as to where the videotaping equipment or stage properties should be placed.

Through observations and pre- and post-conferences, Shelley and I noticed that the quieter students became more involved in the activities. They realized that their participation was essential to the success of the videotaping sessions.

Shelley and I realized that the students were rather uncertain about the videotaping process. Had one of us been sitting back observing, the students would have felt intimidated by this. At that point in the drama unit, it was important to be absolutely nonjudgemental about the students' activities. This encouraged them to continue their efforts as Shelley and I did not evaluate them in any fashion.

Shelley and I also felt that the students were gaining a sense of ownership for their activities. Through their efforts, they were learning to cooperate and collaborate. The students also gained a deeper understanding and knowledge of the characters they portrayed. They began to appreciate the technical problems that had to be considered when producing a drama. As their level of knowledge and increased daily, so did their sense of control and ownership.

WEEK THREE

On day one of week three, things got off to a slow start as the students seemed to be tired out from their weekend. Originally we had planned to videotape scenes ten and eleven from Act One. However, Kane and Jane called to say that they would not be coming to school. The other absent student, Sue, did not call. Two of the three absent students were portraying main characters. None of the remaining students seemed particularly anxious to attempt the videotaping without them. When one of the students suggested that we read Act Two, every one quickly agreed.

To create a mindset for Act Two, Shelley and I asked review questions from Act One about specific events and actions of the characters. The students demonstrated their understanding of the drama by easily answering our questions. The students participated well in the reading of scenes one to eight for Act Two. Their understanding of the characters was revealed in the inflections and tones they used when reading the parts. Shelley and I frequently stopped the reading to ask indepth questions about the events of each scene. The students answered readily as their understanding of the drama had become very insightful. One student gave a thoughtful analysis of one of the characters. He then went on to explain that he felt he knew the character very well after playing the character in the videotaping of scenes five and six. Every one was disappointed when the class was over. The climax of the drama had started to build, and the students became very involved with the action of the drama. Shelley and I were very pleased with the class as the students' intensity was naturally gaining momentum. We were also pleased at how naturally we collaborated when questioning the students.

If I did not appear to be getting the responses from the students that I was seeking, Shelley took over the questioning as she intuitively knew what responses I was looking for. I also did the same with Shelley. We both agreed that it had been an enjoyable experience.

Shelley began day two with a brief review of Act One. She used open-ended and specific questions and then concentrated on a more indepth review of scenes one to eight from Act Two. Christine was absent from class.

The students then read scenes nine to fourteen from Act Two. Their animation and intensity was reflected in the pace and seriousness of their emotions while reading. At the end of scene fourteen, Willy (from the drama) drove off in his car to commit suicide. The students reacted to this tension by imitating the sounds of a car quickly driving away and then crashing. Some one else loudly imitated the sound of some one moaning and then dying. Shelley and I were surprised by the students' reactions. We did not expect that they would react in a comical manner. It seemed that they had to use humour to deal with the serious ending of the scene. To conclude class, Shelley assigned a writing assignment from the review questions for Act Two. This was due the next day.

While Shelley was teaching, I wrote narrative script notes to get a sense of the atmosphere of the classroom. The students were well aware that I was not participating. However, this did not distract them very much from their discussions.

The script notes revealed some interesting observations. Neither Shelley nor I realized how many distractions there were during a "typical" day. The telephone had an extension in the counsellor's office and in the classroom. If the counsellor did not answer the telephone when it rang, one of the students had to. The telephone

interrupted our classroom atmosphere on more than one occasion. As well, interruptions occurred whenever a student left the room or a visitor entered the classroom. Some students coped better than others with these distractions. The students who tended to have less on-task behaviors were the most easily distracted while the on-task students were often not even aware of these interruptions. Unfortunately, the awkward physical arrangements of the classroom could not be altered to effectively eliminate these distractions.

Day three was a busy day. Sue and Christine were absent from class. Shelley asked open-ended and specific review questions about the events of scenes nine to fourteen from Act Two. The students then read the Requiem and discussed the review questions. The discussion became very animated at times as the students had a deep understanding of the drama. Shelley also assigned a review question for the Requiem, due in two days time.

The students handed in the written assignment from the previous day. Shelley and I individually marked this assignment and then collaborated on the final mark. The students did not do as well on this assignment as their treatment of the content was rather superficial. Shelley explained that the students often needed time to assimilate an assignment before they could start writing. Had the assignment been due in two days time, for example, the students would have probably completed more thoughtful responses.

I discussed the purpose of the script notes taken the previous day. I also read excerpts from it as examples. Ironically, when Shelley and I were commending them on how well they handled distractions, the telephone rang, and the math instructor and

counsellor both came out of their offices at the same time. These individuals looked rather confused as Shelley, the students and I were laughing about this situation.

Shelley and I also reviewed the students' ideas or plans for their creative assignment. We discussed that they could videotape some scenes from Act Two or the Requiem, or they could complete a written assignment based on the drama. The students were rather hesitant about making a decision so we agreed to discuss it at a later date.

While Shelley was teaching, I completed a specific student's behavior observation. Willy, Betty and Kane contributed to the class discussions at their regular rates. Mark spent most of his time reading, taking notes or listening quietly. Towards the end of the class, he began to concentrate more as he made more verbal contributions. Jane missed most of the previous day's class so she spent the majority of her time reading the scenes. Michelle was more vocal than usual. Shelley and I speculated that with Christine and Sue absent and Jane not participating, Michelle had more opportunity to contribute to class discussions. Shelley and I concluded that these results were not out of the ordinary. The other clinical supervision observations supported the data gathered today.

When day four began, Shelley and I again discussed the students' creative assignment. Christine was absent from class. We settled down to watch the made-for-TV movie of Death of a Salesman, starring Dustin Hoffman and Kate Reid. The math instructor and counsellor joined us. Unfortunately we had to stop at the end of scene seven in Act Two as the English class was over. The students were vocally disappointed that they could not conclude the movie that day.

For the first part of day five, the students finished watching the video. Christine

was absent again. Two students followed the video with the play and made comments when the video strayed from the written script. They also enjoyed commenting, throughout the movie, on the various characters they had played. Many of the video characters were different from how the students had imagined them. The students also expressed that the setting and use of special effects were very effective.

The students had different reactions when we discussed the timing of when the movie was shown. Some felt that it would have assisted them to understand the plot and characters more if they had viewed the movie before reading the drama. Other students felt that their understanding or interpretations would have been affected if they had viewed the video first. They would not have been able to create these characters in their own minds as they would have always been referring back to the movie. Shelley and I agreed with the latter statements. We felt that the students needed to develop their own individual levels of understanding first, before being exposed to some one else's interpretations.

Day five was not a good day for the students. They were feeling the loss of two of their classmates. Sue had been asked to leave the program because of academic and personal difficulties. Jane had been accepted into a college program in another town. The remaining students were in a particularly sober mood as these individuals had been working together for the last six months. Sue and Jane would be missed by the remaining students.

However, their enthusiasm began to build when Shelley discussed their creative assignment. They decided to videotape scenes six and seven, the restaurant scenes, from Act Two. They surprised us when they chose the characters they would portray. Most of

them chose parts that they had not read or portrayed before. The students then discussed what stage properties would be necessary, and how the lighting and sound effects would be achieved. Enthusiasm was high at the end of the class.

Shelley and I sat down and marked the written assignments for the Requiem together. We had previously marked the first two assignments individually. We were curious to see if our marking would be different. There were no noticeable differences however. The students achieved much better marks on this assignment than the second assignment. They had two days to complete the Requiem assignment, and the time difference was more evident in their analysis of the question.

Through observations and pre- and post-conferences, Shelley and I felt that the students' motivational levels remained high. The students had not videotaped any scenes from the drama during the week. We noticed, however, that the quieter students participated well in the reading of specific scenes from Act Two. As had been previously agreed by the students, the students chose different characters to portray. Mark, Michelle and Christine did an admirable job with the main characters they portrayed. As well, their participation in the class discussions had noticeably improved. This was encouraging to Shelley and I as we felt that the quieter students were becoming actively engaged in their learning processes.

WEEK FOUR

On days one, two and three of week four, Shelley and I attended the course "Techniques in Adult Education" at the University of Alberta. Shelley and I had registered in this course a few months before and did not realize that there would be a time conflict. We did not feel very comfortable about being away for three days while the students were videotaping their creative assignment. We discussed this fact with the students, and they were not concerned that we would be absent. They subtly expressed that they would feel more responsibility towards their creative assignment if we were absent because they could not consult with us about it. In our absence, the students worked on videotaping scenes six and seven from Act Two.

In the morning of our second day away, Shelley and I discussed whether we would telephone and speak to the students about the progress of their work. We eventually decided not to as we felt the students had a clear enough focus on what their creative assignment could be like. As well, we wanted the students to feel total ownership for their efforts. If we telephoned them, our comments might have influenced some of their decisions. As it turned out, they did not need much input from us.

When we returned on day four of week four, the students were anxious to tell us about the progress of their videotaping. They were particularly proud of their creativity in overcoming certain limitations. For example, the dialogue was written on flip chart paper. The turning of this paper created a very distracting noise. To counter this, they had the counsellor, from the program, sit in as a customer in the restaurant. When the flip chart paper was turned, the counsellor rustled a newspaper to mask this

sound.

Although they had videotaped three or four versions of the scenes, the students were not satisfied with the results. Therefore, the students requested that they use the entire class to complete their final videotaping. When Shelley and I agreed, they asked that we leave the classroom. They felt our presence might affect their creative processes. Shelley and I were a little taken aback by this request, but we willingly left the classroom. We spent the morning compiling questions for the student evaluation forms.

On day five, we watched the videotape that the students completed. It was a tremendous creative assignment. Their originality and creativity in designing the set, and the use of lighting and sound effects was very inventive. As well, the students showed personal growth as their acting abilities were extremely credible.

The students were very pleased with our responses. They were so anxious to tell us about every thing that had occurred that the conversation was very animated. The students used a collaborative group effort approach. Rather than designating one person as the director, the students made collective decisions. That was not an easy process with six individuals, but they accomplished it. We all felt that it created a stronger project as every one's opinions and input were necessary and important. One student discretely suggested that the project had gone so well because there were only six students to work with. This veiled comment suggested that the students did not really miss Sue and Jane, the two students who had left the program. The students knew that each individual student could be depended upon to give his or her total effort towards making the creative assignment successful.

After a lengthy discussion, the students agreed to ask a local citizen, very active in the local musical theatre group, to view their videotape. This man, with directing, producing, acting and technical experience, would be able to offer them an objective, "outside" opinion.

We determined, with the students, how the marking for the drama unit would be designated. Three designated categories were suggested for the unit: written assignments, participation and the students' creative assignment. The students also suggested the mark value for each of the three categories (See Appendix H).

We then determined the breakdown of marks for the students' creative assignment. The students provided descriptors to assist us in determining a mark for the group video, their self-given individual mark and the instructor-given mark. The students then provided us with a written value for their group video and their self-given individual mark. In this way, the students had input into the evaluative nature of the drama unit (See Appendix I).

Shelley and I had roughly predetermined how the creative assignment and drama unit would be marked. Interestingly enough, the students' contributions were very similar to our draft plan. They, however, placed more weight, within the drama unit marks, on the written assignments and participation categories than Shelley and I had originally intended. We certainly had no difficulties in making these adjustments as the students' input was very valuable.

We ended the week on a very high note. The students were exhausted from working on the creative assignment. They repeatedly assured us, however, that they enjoyed the entire process. Shelley and I agreed that the students had gone to

tremendous lengths to make the creative assignment successful, and it was understandable that they were tired.

WEEK FIVE

After discussing the housekeeping items and daily objectives for day one of week five, we watched the students' videotape again. Christine arrived one and a half hours late for class. Although the students were very proud of their assignment, they immediately began to suggest how they could have improved their presentation.

Shelley and I explained that we gave the students 50 out of 50 for their group video mark. We felt that their technical expertise in the production of the videotape was strong. Their understanding of the mood and intentions of the characters was also revealed by their portrayals. We were also very impressed by how well the group successfully collaborated on the creative assignment. Initially the students reacted quietly to this news. When Shelley and I expressed surprise, the students livened up and began to joke around. One of the students said that they were not surprised because they deserved the mark anyway. We got a good laugh out of that. The students were particularly pleased that we recognized and rewarded their efforts.

We culminated the drama unit by discussing a number of questions from the handout, "Review Questions - Death of a Salesman." The students' answers were very perceptive as they verbalized their knowledge of the drama. We also discussed the social impact of the drama and why it has remained so popular. The students easily related these aspects back to the influences of Arthur Miller's life and writing style.

I then distributed the student evaluation forms on the drama unit, the students' creative assignment and our collaborative teaching. I asked the students to carefully and honestly complete these evaluations as their feedback was very important to Shelley and me (See Appendix J, K and L).

On day two, Shelley and I engaged the students in a discussion to give us more feedback from the evaluations that the students had completed. It was a lively discussion, and the students made many candid comments and suggestions.

The students expressed that if they had more time, they would have liked to work on the creative assignment again. After having had time to think about it, there were definite improvements that they would have liked to make. Unfortunately, time constraints and curriculum demands did not allow this. The students were as disappointed as Shelley and I that this was not possible.

On day three, the students participated in a discussion with Bill (name changed) about their creative assignment. Bill had extensive experience with the local musical theatre group. He previewed the videotape three times at home before speaking to the students. Bill's opening remarks were fairly general, and then he began making specific comments. He was impressed by what the students had accomplished in four days time. As well, he felt the set and use of stage properties were very effective. Although he did not know the plot of the drama very well, he gained a sense of it because the students portrayed the characters so convincingly.

Bill was particularly impressed that the students had not chosen a specific director. He congratulated them on their "troupe" efforts as he said collaborative agreements, in the creative arts field, are almost impossible to achieve.

The majority of Bill's comments were very complimentary. The suggestions he made to improve the creative assignment were well taken by the students. For example, Bill explained how the physical organization of the set could have been changed to achieve better visual effects. It was interesting that many of Bill's comments had already been analyzed and discussed by the students. The students often explained to Bill how or why some aspect of the creative assignment had been presented in a particular way. Shelley and I also discussed that the students had received very little input from us on the completion of their creative assignment.

Bill also suggested that the students should consider presenting their creative assignment in the regional one-act play competition that is held every year. The students were very pleased with that suggestion. Overall, the students were impressed with Bill's contributions and evaluative remarks. Shelley and I felt it was important for the students to receive an objective opinion other than ours.

Before class concluded, Shelley and I returned the students' mark sheets for their creative assignment and the drama unit. Characteristically, there was much kibitzing from the students about their marks.

On our last day of working together, the students, the math instructor, the counsellor, Shelley and I went out for lunch. There was a sense of nostalgia in the air as every one realized that the creative project was completed. Although the project was completed and I was not working with the students on a daily basis, I still saw them frequently. The UCEP program was in the same building as the Sunrise Project. The students frequently asked about the progress of our creative project. I appreciated their inquiries as it signified their concerns about our learning experiences.

SUMMARY OF PEER SUPERVISION ACTIVITIES

During the course of the collaborative teaching project, Shelley and I engaged in a number of supervision activities. These observations and discussions allowed us to effectively address specific concerns we held. During the first week of classes, three formal clinical supervision observations occurred. Both Shelley and I completed the "verbal flow observation" chart. As well, I completed a "time-on task" observation. The information gained from these observations was very valuable to Shelley and me. For Shelley, the results reinforced what she intuitively knew about the levels of performance and participation of individual students. For myself, these observations garnered immediate and observable information. I quickly gained a sense of who the major contributors to class were. I also realized who the quieter students were and what types of activities they engaged in during class time. From this information, Shelley and I could then plan learning activities that would encourage the quieter students to take more active roles.

In addition to the formal clinical supervision observations, Shelley and I had daily pre- and post-conferences. Shelley and I met every morning about half an hour before class began. We discussed the previous day's activities and reviewed what the activities for the upcoming class were. During the coffee break, Shelley and I would discuss how our plans were progressing. More often than not, the students were involved in this process and made valuable suggestions if any revisions were necessary. This collaboration between Shelley, the students and me strengthened our working relationship as the students felt a sense of ownership and responsibility

towards their working environment.

When the class ended, Shelley and I spent the remainder of the morning discussing the project. These discussions focussed on the progress of the morning's activities and the planning of the next day's class. As well, any concerns about students would be addressed at this time. We met in her office for these meetings. Quite often we were interrupted by a student who had a question to ask us. Frequently, this student would become involved in the discussion and planning of the learning activities. The discussions that Shelley and I had were not confined by our working schedules. In addition to our daily meetings, we frequently spent time in the evenings and on the weekends discussing learning strategies and activities.

The students were actively engaged in videotaping specific scenes from Act One during the second week of classes. After much discussion and anxiety, Shelley and I realized that it would not be possible to complete any formal clinical supervision observations. The students would have felt intimidated by this; they were self-conscious enough as it was about their acting in front of a videocamera, their peers and Shelley and me. We felt that the natural flow of the classroom would have been hampered had one of us been sitting back to complete an observation.

However, we observed that the students were improving their cooperative skills. They came to realize that everyone had to work together. The physical arranging of the room for the videotaping occurred faster and faster every time. As well, the students often discussed how the stage properties and lighting and sound effects could be changed. If they did not or could not work together, their efforts at videotaping the specific scenes would have not been successful.

I completed narrative script notes during a class in the third week of classes. Shelley and I chose this qualitative instrument because we wanted to gain a sense of the classroom environment. These notes revealed that the atmosphere was very open and trusting. The students felt comfortable enough to freely express their opinions or raise pertinent questions. The script notes confirmed our earlier observations. The quieter students were more actively participating in the class discussions and reading of the drama in class. The group discussions were more animated and intensive because the majority of the students were participating. It was much more difficult for the three gregarious students to continually contribute to class as the other students were being much more vocal. Fortunately, these three students allowed the other students to contribute equally as much as they did. These results were supported by the time-on task observation I completed. Shelley and I were encouraged by these changes in the students' behaviors; they were taking a more active role in their learning experiences.

The formal clinical supervision observations and pre- and post-conferences presented valuable and pertinent information for us. Although the nature of the project did not allow many formal observations, we naturally compensated through our continual discussions. These observations were particularly valuable to Shelley and me. Neither one of us, in our teaching careers, have received much supervision and/or evaluation. It was very valuable to receive an "outsider's viewpoint" of what was happening in our classroom. It allowed us to focus our energies upon creating activities that would actively involve the students in their learning. Through these activities, Shelley and I were able to obtain a realistic view of our individual and collective teaching strategies.

ANALYSIS OF FORMAL EVALUATIONS FOR THE DRAMA UNIT

When Shelley and I established the objectives for the creative project, we were concerned about increasing the opportunities for student motivation and participation. Therefore, when designing the marking scheme for the drama unit and students' creative assignment, the majority of the marks were given for participation. The drama unit itself was out of 115 marks. Thirty marks (30) were designated for the three writing assignments, each being worth 10 marks. A possible ten marks (10) were given for participation during the drama unit. The majority of the marks, seventy-five (75), was given for the students' creative assignment. By examining the individual student marks, it can be determined that the objectives for our creative project were met.

WRITTEN ASSIGNMENTS FOR THE DRAMA UNIT

The written assignments were marked for mechanical skills, such as spelling, punctuation, vocabulary, and sentence and paragraph structure. A possible four marks were given for these categories. A possible six marks were given for content or how thoroughly the student answered the question. One mark was deducted from the total if the assignment was handed in late. The students were well aware of this policy as Shelley had implemented it when the UCEP program began in the fall of 1989.

Shelley and I had no difficulties in marking the students' writing. We individually marked the first two assignments and then compared results. We marked the third

assignment together. Our marking patterns were uncannily similar. Although I had no previous knowledge of the students' writing abilities, I concentrated on the same errors as Shelley. Our analysis of content was equally similar. The influence of previously working together, in our former teaching positions, on the high school English curriculums was particularly evident in this case.

The students' marks showed a range of abilities. Michelle received 23 of 30 marks for the writing assignments. Her command of the mechanical skills and understanding of the content was exceptional. Willy received 19.5 out of 30 for his assignments. His mechanical skills were adequate. His analysis of the content of the assignments sometimes tended to be superficial. Betty received 19 of 30 possible marks. Her mechanical skills were fairly weak, but her understanding of the content was excellent. Mark received 23.5 marks. His mechanical skills were strong, and his analysis of the content was insightful. Kane received 16 out of 30 possible marks. The mechanical skills were weak, but his analysis of the content was much stronger. Christine received 8 out of 30 possible marks. She only handed in the first assignment. She became seriously ill and did not complete the other two. When we spoke to her about this, she said she did not want to complete the assignments as she was too far behind in her math course. Sue left the program before the students began working on their creative assignment. Of the three written assignments, she handed in two, for a total of 8 out of 30 marks. Her command of mechanical skills was minimal, and her analysis of the content was superficial. Jane also left the program before work began on the students' creative assignment. She failed to complete any of the written assignments. When we asked her about it, she stated that she did not choose to hand

them in because she did not have time to complete them. (She was packing in preparation for a move.) Overall, Shelley and I were pleased with the students' efforts in completing the written assignments. As well, we were delighted that our interpretations while marking the students work was so similar. This lack of discrepancy meant that the students performance was not adversely affected by our collaboration in marking.

PARTICIPATION IN THE DRAMA UNIT

A possible ten (10) marks were given for participation in the drama unit. These marks were determined by how well the student interacted in class discussions, and the student's efforts in the reading of the drama in class. As well, consideration was given to the student's individual efforts while videotaping scenes one, two, five and six from Act One. This category did not consider the students' efforts in their creative assignment.

Michelle received a seven out of ten for participation marks. Although quiet in class, she was on-task as she was usually took notes from the class discussions. Her assistance during the videotaping of the scenes was adequate. Willy received a nine for participation. His comments and opinions were always being presented in class. His leadership qualities were also evident during the videeotaping of the scenes from Act One. Betty was also given a nine for her participation. Her natural leadership lent itself towards active participation in class. She worked particularly hard during the video taping to ensure that the special effects were credible. Kane received a

participation mark of eight. He always participated in class discussions and provided valuable input and assistance towards the videotaping of the scenes. Mark received a seven for participation. Although he was fairly quiet during class discussions, he was usually on-task. His expertise in using the video camera equipment was an asset to the students. Christine was given a six for participation. Although she missed a number of classes due to illness, her limited contributions to class discussions were valuable. As well, her assistance during the videotaping of the scenes was useful. Although Sue left the program before the students began work on their creative assignment, her participation mark was five out of ten. When present, she rarely became involved in class discussions as she was frequently off-task. Her assistance towards the videotaping of the scenes was minimal. However, she displayed particular interest when the drama was being read in class. Had Jane completed the drama unit, her participation mark would have been six out of ten. She regularly participated in class discussions, but her involvement during the videotaping of the scenes from Act One was minimal. Jane left the program before work began on the students' creative assignment. Our formal and informal observations of the individual student activities were used to determine the mark value. Therefore, the students' marks realistically represented their contributions to the drama unit.

STUDENTS' CREATIVE ASSIGNMENT

The majority of the marks, within the total drama unit, were given for the students' creative assignment. The mark designation was divided into three categories.

The group mark for the videotape was out of fifty (50) marks. The self-given student mark and the instructor-given mark, both out of twenty-five (25), were averaged. Therefore, the total possible mark for the creative assignment was seventy-five (75) marks out of a possible one hundred fifteen (115) marks for the drama unit.

The determiners for the group video mark considered how well the students used initiative, creativity and inventiveness to overcome obstacles and limitations. Credibility of character portrayals and the establishment of an appropriate mood and tone was also considered. The effective use of stage properties, setting, special effects and the physical and verbal flow of the presentation were also key determiners.

The results were not all that surprising when the students were asked to designate what their group video mark should be. One student suggested that the group should receive 46 out of 50, and two students suggested that 48 would be an adequate mark. Three students suggested that 50 was an appropriate mark.

After deliberation, Shelley and I decided to give the students 50 out of 50 for the group video mark. We felt that their initiative, creativity and inventiveness to overcome obstacles and limitations was exemplary. They were faced with producing a videotape production in a classroom that was not suited for this type of activity. As well, they were somewhat unfamiliar with the requirements of presenting a dramatic production. All of their efforts overcame the difficulties associated with the use of stage properties, the setting and lighting and sound difficulties. They effectively created the mood or atmosphere of the restaurant scene through the use of the music, the costumes, the setting and the stage properties. They overcame the problem of memorizing their lines by writing the dialogue on flip chart paper. The distracting

sound of flipping this paper was overcome by having the counsellor turning the pages of a newspaper at the same time. As well, the students creatively changed the dialogue to better suit the characters. For example, some of the colloquial terms were quite dated, and the students, feeling they were inappropriate, changed them. As well, Shelley and I considered the group effort that was required to complete this assignment. The students learned more than just how to operate videotaping equipment and how to act in front of a videocamera. The students elected to work under group consensus - a formidable task at the best of times. However, the group cohesiveness enabled the students to overcome any difficulties. The students were particularly pleased when we told them our decision. They felt that they had worked extremely hard, under adverse conditions, to deserve the mark we gave them. Their pride in their accomplishments was heart warming.

In addition, each student was asked to assign himself or herself an individual mark, out of 25, for his or her efforts towards the creative assignment. The student would consider what she or he had to overcome in order to participate in the activity. The student was also asked to determine what he or she had gained from the learning experience.

Shelley and I also assigned a mark for each individual student. Determiners included how effective the student's characterization was. We also considered how well the student performed his or her task. This included acting as well as technical assistance. Finally, our overall impressions of the individual's contributions would be included in the mark. The self-given student mark and instructor-given mark were averaged and added to the group video mark to arrive at a total out of seventy-five

(75) marks.

The students were much more critical of themselves when assigning a mark. A number of student's marks differed from the mark Shelley and I assigned. Michelle stated that she should only receive a mark of 20 because she could not memorize her lines. Shelley and I gave her a mark of 22, which averaged out to 21. Michelle, therefore, received a final mark of 71 out of 75. After initial hesitations, Michelle learned to overcome her fear of being in front of a video camera. As well, her efforts in organizing the "behind the scenes" activities were characteristically strong.

Willy was particularly critical of himself as he felt his acting was not very convincing. He gave himself a mark of 19. We disagreed and gave Willy a mark of 21, which averaged out to 20. The creative assignment final mark was, therefore, 70. We felt that Willy's efforts were commendable as he chose to portray a character that he was not very familiar with. As well, his efforts with the technical aspects of the production were obvious.

Shelley and I were in agreement with Betty's mark of 23. Her creative assignment final mark was 73. Although Betty's character role was minor, her efforts and contributions towards the setting and special effects were apparent. Her natural leadership within the group was also evident.

We also agreed with Kane's mark of 23. His creative assignment final mark was 73. He chose to portray Willy, a character he had not had much experience with. He made Willy old and defeated through his physical movements and voice control. His collaborative group efforts were evident as he persevered to overcome the difficulties associated with the videotaping of the creative assignment.

Mark's assignment of 20 was consistent with our mark. His creative assignment mark was 70. Although somewhat camera shy, Mark worked diligently to overcome this and credibly portray his character. As well, his work "behind the scenes" with the videotaping equipment was evident. Shelley and I were also in agreement with Christine's mark of 20. Her creative assignment mark was 70. Christine had strong reservations about being in front of a video camera but overcame them. Her skills as a video camera person also improved over the course of the creative assignment. Sue and Jane left the program before the students began working on their creative project.

As previously mentioned, the drama unit was worth 115 marks. Michelle received 89%, Willy received 86%, Betty received 87%, Kane received 84%, Mark received 87% and Christine received 72%. These marks will be entered into the quizzes and assignments category, worth 20% of the English 100 course mark. The final mark for the English course, as determined by Shelley and the students, would also include 10% for participation, 10% for the students' journals and 60% for essays and written assignments. We felt that if we split the drama unit mark into these specific categories, the context and purpose of our work would be lost.

Shelley and I were encouraged by the marks earned by the students. Our objectives of increasing student motivation and participation were achieved. As the drama unit progressed, the students became more comfortable with reading the script aloud with appropriate emotional responses. As well, they became accustomed to using the videotaping equipment to dramatize the scenes. This caused the students to become more internally motivated. This was particularly evident by their involvement and efforts directed towards their creative assignment.

ANALYSIS OF THE STUDENT EVALUATION FORMS

The students had been extensively involved in the planning and implementation of the learning activities for the drama unit. Shelley and I, therefore, felt it was important for the students to complete evaluation forms for the drama unit, their creative assignment and our collaborative teaching project. The format of the evaluation forms was designed to allow the students to use their judgement when evaluating each question. The written questions also allowed the students to make pertinent comments.

After Shelley and I examined the written responses, we discussed the results in class. The students honestly and willingly gave us additional feedback. As well, Shelley spoke to the individual students who disagreed with certain questions. Fortunately, these students were confident enough to express their honest opinions to Shelley. This clarification allowed Shelley and me to critically reflect on the organization of the drama unit, the students' creative assignment and our collaborative teaching project. These reflections will be examined within the context of the questions from the evaluation forms.

**ANALYSIS OF SPECIFIC RESPONSES TO
STUDENT EVALUATION - DEATH OF A SALESMAN**

"The objectives for the study of drama were clearly stated at the beginning of the unit."

On the first day of class, Shelley and I discussed the objectives for the drama unit. We explained that the study of Death of a Salesman would be accomplished by reading the scenes aloud and presenting specific scenes to be videotaped. We also discussed that the students would complete their own creative assignment, based on their interests and abilities. We drew parallels and discussed the similarities between novels and dramas. This discussion concluded with a discourse on the purposes of studying drama units within the realm of literature. Shelley and I, therefore, assumed that the students understood why dramas were written and studied. Unfortunately, our assumptions were not entirely correct.

Four students agreed with this statement, and one student made no comment. One student disagreed with this statement. Unfortunately, this student, absent from the first day of class, missed the explanations of how drama related to the study of literature and why it was necessary to study drama units. He also explained that he was not comfortable with asking Shelley or me to explain this process because he was afraid he would not understand our answers. He stated his hesitancy related to his former school experiences; he was not anxious to appear foolish or "stupid" in our eyes. Unfortunately, we were not aware of this student's feelings or anxieties.

This student's honesty provided very valuable information for Shelley and me.

Because the activities for the drama unit were going so well, we did not complete perception checks with the students as to their levels of understanding. However, this was not due to our naivete. With the honest and trusting relationship with the students, Shelley and I felt that any concerns the students had would be presented to us. Unfortunately, in this student's case, we were not intuitive enough to realize his inner confusion and reluctance to approach us.

Shelley and I also sensed that the students were unfamiliar with the process of considering if they had achieved the learning objectives. It was a new and unusual process for them to consider such things. Undoubtedly, their former school experiences had not prepared them to be involved in the planning, implementation and evaluation of the learning objectives to any great extent.

To ensure that the students have a deeper level of understanding of this process, Shelley determined that she would make adjustments to the future presentation of this material. Shelley would diagram exactly what the objectives were for each unit of study. This information would appear on a wall diagram, and the students would also be given a copy of the diagram. Periodically, Shelley would refer back to the diagram to complete a perception check with the students. This check would also occur at the end of the unit of study. Using these methods, Shelley would know whether the objectives for the learning activities were adequately understood and achieved by the students.

"The study of Death of a Salesman was interesting and challenging."

Obviously, the students enjoyed actively participating in reading and videotaping

specific scenes from the drama. Three students strongly agreed, and three students agreed with this statement.

"The daily lessons were organized in a clear and logical format."

The daily objectives were written on the board and discussed with the students. If necessary, any revisions were made after consultations. Two students strongly agreed, and three students agreed with this. One student disagreed with this statement because she was unsure as to the focus of the drama unit. She felt that all the activities completed in class lead to the completion of the students' creative assignment. She did not really understand that a drama uses a particular style or structure to convey its meaning. This student's confusion stemmed back to her lack of understanding of the drama unit's objectives. Unfortunately, the student's level of understanding was hampered by this confusion.

"The class discussions contributed to my understanding of the content of Death of a Salesman."

The students' discussions were lively and intense. Their level of understanding deepened daily as we worked through the drama. As well, the students gained a deeper level of understanding from the concepts and ideas being discussed by themselves. Shelley's and my levels of understanding of the content also deepened. Often when discussing a certain scene, the students' would have a different interpretation. Through these discussions, Shelley and I came to more appreciate the dominant themes of this drama. Four students strongly agreed, and two students agreed that the class

discussions were beneficial.

"The written assignments contributed to my understanding of the content of Death of a Salesman."

These assignments served as review exercises and required the students to write interpretive analyses of the main characters of the drama. Three students strongly agreed, and one student made no comment because he did not feel that he had a significant opinion regarding this question. The student who disagreed felt that the written assignments contributed to his understanding of character development and the theme of illusion versus reality. He also stated that very little else was developed. This student, however, saw very few themes or motifs, beyond illusion and reality, while studying the play. Therefore, his level of understanding was not as deep as it could have been. Shelley and I did not spend as much time as we should have discussing the written assignments in class. Had the questions been extensively discussed in class, more ideas and themes could have been developed. This would have ensured that the students had a deeper level of understanding regarding the interpretive character sketches they had completed. However, the objectives of the drama unit did not stress the students' written work. The emphasis was placed more upon motivation and participation within the drama unit.

"The videotaping of specific scenes contributed to my understanding of the content of Death of a Salesman."

The videotaping of specific scenes caused the students to examine the motivations of the characters they were portraying. Once they understood the character, it was

easier for them to portray the dramatic role for the videotaping. One student strongly agreed, and four students agreed with this statement. One student disagreed. This student felt the videotaping of the scenes became too much of a character study and not enough emphasis was placed on how these scenes fit into the play as a whole. Closer examination of the content of the videotaped scenes would have contributed to the students' general understanding of the play.

"The videotaping of specific scenes contributed to my understanding of the production aspects of Death of a Salesman."

Videotaping specific scenes enabled the students to sense the challenges of producing a drama. They creatively learned to overcome the various difficulties encountered. Four students strongly agreed, and two students agreed with this statement. The classroom size and shape was not conducive to videotaping a dramatic production. The students, through creative experimentation, effectively overcame these obstacles. Their efforts to achieve the special effects for stage properties, lighting and sound were admirable. The students also gained a sense of how a playwright would organize all the elements into an effective dramatic presentation.

"My knowledge and skills increased as a result of studying Death of a Salesman."

The students' knowledge and skills increased as a result of studying the drama and then producing the specific scenes for the creative assignment. This also enabled them to understand the technical aspects that affect the production of a drama. Four students

strongly agreed, and two students agreed with this statement.

"Explain what you liked least about the drama unit."

Initially the students were very hesitant about acting in front of a video camera. The students were familiar with working with videotaping equipment from another component of the UCEP curriculum. Most of them eventually overcame their reservations and came to enjoy the process, but a few still remained uncomfortable in front of a camera.

The students also felt that the drama unit was too short. Obviously they enjoyed the activities from the drama unit. They suggested that we should have studied two dramas instead of just one. Unfortunately, the confines of our collaborative teaching project and time restrictions within the English 100 curriculum did not allow this.

One student suggested that it would have been more beneficial to view the made-for-television movie before studying the drama. Shelley and I showed the movie after the students had finished reading and studying the drama. We wanted the students to not be swayed by some one else's interpretations.

"Explain what you liked most about the drama unit."

and

"What suggestions can you make to improve the study of drama."

The students appreciated being given an introduction to the elements of a drama at the beginning of the unit. They also found the biography of Arthur Miller useful as it

gave them a foundation upon which to better understand his writing. The students enjoyed reading the play, and then having the opportunity to act out the scenes on videotape. This enabled them to gain a deeper understanding of the content of the drama. They came to understand the motivations of the characters through their portrayals. The students also particularly appreciated being able to work together as a group. This activity enabled them to strengthen their cooperative skills. A number of students recommended that more time be given for the creative assignment as they felt that four days was not sufficient time to present their best efforts. As well, one student recommended that a discussion of the written assignments would have given the students an insight into their levels of understanding.

SUMMATIVE THOUGHTS ON THE DRAMA UNIT

When considering the outcomes of the drama unit, a number of factors must be considered before implementing this drama unit in the future. More emphasis must be placed on the explanation of the unit's objectives. This explanation must occur to ensure that the students' level of understanding is reinforced. This would also ensure that the students understood why a drama unit was being studied. This explanation would also provide a clearer focus to the purposes of the daily lessons.

Although the students' written assignments were not the focal point of the drama unit, the students felt that the assignments should have received more emphasis. They felt that these assignments merely provided character sketches and did not have much interpretive value. Some of them failed to see that these assignments did in fact have

interpretive value. As well, some were uncertain as to how the written assignments fit back into the study of drama itself. More discussion about these aspects would have enabled the students to make these interpretive levels of understanding.

The videotaping of specific scenes should have received more extensive treatment. The scenes should have been discussed in light of what the students learned about the characters they portrayed and how this knowledge contributed to the development of the themes within the drama. As well, the production aspects of videotaping specific scenes could have been enhanced by further discussions about the use of stage properties, lighting and sound effects. These discussions would have also reinforced the principle objectives for the drama unit.

Shelley and I both felt that our presentation of this drama unit was much more effective than our previous methods of presentation because the students' levels of motivation and involvement in the learning process increased dramatically. They came to enjoy reading and presenting specific scenes from the drama to be videotaped. The students also gained a sense of ownership in the process as they came to realize that the success of the drama unit was dependent upon their participation. Had Shelley and I been more directive, we would have denied the students the opportunity to be instrumental learners in their own learning environment.

Unfortunately, Shelley and I did not reinforce the students' levels of learning strongly enough. More emphasis should have been placed on relating the specific activities back to the objectives of the drama unit. For example, Shelley and I did not make many evaluative comments on the videotaping of scenes one, two, five and six from Act One. We consciously realized that the students were very self-conscious about

their efforts. Had we directed the students' attention to how they were portraying the motivation of the characters they were playing, the students would have become very uneasy about their acting abilities. Shelley and I considered it more important to let the students govern the process of their learning. Had we intervened, at critical points, to offer our evaluative comments, the students' levels of enthusiasm, cooperation and creativity would have been tempered by their own doubts.

Overall though, Shelley and I were pleased with the outcomes of the drama unit. We felt that the students' knowledge of drama increased dramatically because of their active involvement in the classroom activities.

ANALYSIS OF SPECIFIC RESPONSES TO STUDENT EVALUATION - CREATIVE ASSIGNMENT

"The objectives for the creative assignment were clearly stated at the beginning of the drama unit."

One student strongly agreed, and two students agreed with the statement. Three students made no comment. The students admitted to being uncertain as to the meaning of "objectives". Therefore, they chose the category of "no comment" as it seemed the most logical. The students also stated that they chose this category if they felt that "every thing went well" or "their input was not strong enough to make a comment." The choice of the option occurred frequently within this evaluation.

They also stated that our objectives were too broad. Even though we brainstormed possible activities for the creative assignment and frequently discussed it, it was difficult for the students to grasp what they were going to be doing. They stated that it would have been better if we had narrowed down the choices for them, rather than leaving them to uncertainty.

Shelley and I had strong reservations about providing too much direction for the students' creative assignment. We wanted to encourage the students' levels of creativity. We also wished the students to take more control over their own learning opportunities. Had we provided more direction, we would have been stifling their educational opportunities.

"There were frequent opportunities for discussing your understanding and ideas for the creative assignment."

The students agreed that throughout the unit, the creative assignment was

frequently discussed. This allowed them to formulate possible ideas of activities they could complete. Three students strongly agreed with this statement. Two students agreed, and one made no comment.

Unfortunately, our perceptions of the creative assignment did not match the perceptions of the students. Shelley and I felt that the students had a good grasp of the requirements because we frequently discussed it in class. The students agreed that the discussions were valuable, but they were still uncertain as to the objectives and requirements. Unfortunately, the students were uncharacteristically quiet about their misunderstandings and did not bring them to Shelley's or my attention to any great extent. They expected Shelley and I to provide more direction, something we actively tried to avoid.

"You gained a greater understanding of the technical aspects of producing a drama through the completion of the creative assignment."

The students came to appreciate the difficulties and triumphs of producing a drama. They learned how to effectively use lighting, stage properties, sound and the videotaping equipment. Four students strongly agreed, and two students agreed with this statement.

"You gained a greater understanding of the content of Death of a Salesman through the completion of the creative assignment."

Five students agreed with this statement, and one student made no comment. Perhaps the students would have gained a greater understanding of the content had a director been chosen for the project. A director could have given a more objective

analysis of the characters' motivations. This director could have then drawn upon the motivation of the characters, and their understanding of the content would have been greater.

However, the students chose to work within a group to collaborate on decisions. They were more comfortable with this decision making process. Because the students had developed such a close relationship, no one student would have felt comfortable being the director. As well, experience had proven to the students that group decisions, although harder to achieve, were more inventive and suitable.

Shelley and I were certainly not disappointed with this decision. We felt that the students' efforts were strengthened because of it. Individually the students had to demonstrate cooperation and group decision making skills in order for the creative assignment to be successful.

"For future drama units, would you recommend the use of a creative assignment, such as the one you completed?"

and

"Do you have any suggestions regarding your creative assignment?"

The students commented that four days to prepare, rehearse and videotape the creative assignment was not an adequate length of time. By the fourth day, they were exhausted and just wanted to get the project finished. Therefore, they felt that the final videotaping was not as good as their previous rehearsals had been. They suggested that perhaps two weeks would have been adequate. They could have had a break over the weekend to revitalize themselves for the final videotaping. The students also expressed that their understanding and appreciation of the drama deepened as they worked on the

creative assignment. They came to understand the characters more as they had to credibly portray these characters on videotape. Acting and videotaping the scenes also helped them to understand the technical aspects of producing a drama. Learning to collaborate within a group was perhaps the most pertinent learning experience for the students. They realized that they had to work together to produce a successful creative assignment. Their efforts in this regard were exemplary. A tremendous learning experience was gained through the use of the creative assignment. The students were able to take artistic control and gained incredible skills from it. Individually each student gained confidence in his or her ideas and contributions towards the project. Collectively the students realized that a group effort was necessary to successfully complete the creative assignment.

SUMMATIVE THOUGHTS ON THE STUDENTS' CREATIVE ASSIGNMENT

Although the creative assignment was a successful experience, Shelley and I spent considerable time discussing how the project could be revised. Obviously more emphasis had to be placed upon carefully describing the objectives for the creative assignment. Even though the creative assignment was frequently discussed in class, some of the students were uncertain about the whole process.

The students suggested that more time should be given for the completion of the creative assignment. Due to time constraints, the students only had four days to complete the assignment. They felt that they became too tired of the work and rushed to complete it. However, the dynamics of the group would have to be carefully considered.

Since this group worked so well together, more time would have been effectively used. If the group had lacked cohesion, more class time would have probably hampered this process as their time would not have been used as effectively.

As well, the timing of this particular unit, within the curricular year, was crucial to its success. The students had had six months time to settle any personal difficulties amongst themselves. They were comfortable with themselves, Shelley and me. Had this drama unit occurred earlier in the year, it would probably not have been as successful; the students would not have been able to work together so effectively. If the students had not gained confidence in themselves or the efforts of the other students, the levels of cooperation would not have been as strong. The students would not have had such a vested interest in the successful completion of their creative assignment.

Shelley related that the dynamics of the group changed after completing the drama unit. The students had always been a particularly close group before the drama unit, but this aspect changed. The students made a quantum leap in terms of their cooperative skills. They began to work together more cooperatively as their experiences with the creative assignment had proven that they were capable of successfully doing so.

After the drama unit, the students completed a major research assignment in the English course. The students began to exchange ideas and editorial comments more freely. There was less individual and more collaborative work occurring. The students also began preparing for their final examinations. Being the first UCEP graduating class, it became very important that all of the students succeed. The emphasis of each individual student changed from succeeding for herself or himself to succeeding for all

of the other students.

Shelley and I realized that the changes in the group dynamics were a result of the drama unit. The students proved to themselves that they were capable of working together collaboratively. They also realized that their learning experiences could not have been possible if they had not been able to cooperate. In essence, we felt that these experiences were more important than a strong grasp of the academic requirements of studying a drama. Our objectives of increasing motivation and participation had been achieved.

**ANALYSIS OF SPECIFIC RESPONSES TO
STUDENT EVALUATION - COLLABORATIVE TEACHING**

"Shelley and Lona clearly stated their objectives at the beginning of the drama unit."

One student strongly agreed, and two students agreed. One student made no comment, and two students disagreed. The students who disagreed with the statement admitted that they had misinterpreted this question. They both understood why Shelley and I were working together. They thought that the question referred more to the objectives for the drama unit. Uncertain as to why we were studying drama itself, they disagreed with this statement.

"Shelley and Lona were well organized during the drama unit."

At the beginning of each class, we outlined the daily activities. Any revisions that had to be made were always discussed with the students. The consistent organization was a result of Shelley's and my effective collaboration. The necessity and usefulness of our pre- and post-conferences was evident as our daily objectives were always clearly stated to the students. Two students strongly agreed, and four students agreed.

"Shelley and Lona knew the subject matter well."

Shelley and I had both taught Death of a Salesman numerous times within our former English 30 and 33 curriculum assignments. We both felt comfortable working with this drama because of the depth of our knowledge. As well, we knew that the

students would have enough life experiences to understand and relate to the concepts within this drama. Two students strongly agreed, and four students agreed.

"Shelley and Lona's presentations in class were clear and unambiguous."

Due to the pre- and post-conferences, Shelley and I knew what objectives we would concentrate on for the individual classes and for the whole unit. This direction also came after daily consultations with the students. If necessary our plans would be revised according to the needs of the students. This success also came from our years of teaching experiences. One student strongly agreed, and five students agreed with this statement.

"Shelley and Lona's answers to questions were concise and comprehensive."

Our responses to the students' questions came from our individual and collective understanding of the drama itself. Three students strongly agreed, and three students agreed with this statement. Interestingly enough, the students felt that their questions and contributions were equally as important as Shelley's or mine. This was indicated by a student's comment that, "we also let them [the students] answer their own questions too."

"Shelley and Lona helped me to understand the drama material."

Through the use of questioning and reading the drama in class, frequent opportunities arose to discuss the content of the individual scenes and Acts. The completion of the creative assignment also aided the students' levels of understanding. Three students strongly agreed, and three students agreed with this.

"Shelley and Lona encouraged group discussions and/or group problem solving in class."

The students felt that these activities allowed them to discuss their concerns or uncertainties with the other students. This enabled the students to come to a deeper level of understanding of the content of the drama as they learned from each other. As well, it strengthened the cooperative skills of the students individually and collectively. They realized that they could solve their own questions or concerns together. Three students strongly agreed, and three students agreed with this statement.

"Shelley and Lona demonstrated respect and concern for students' opinions."

The responses demonstrated that the students felt their opinions made valuable contributions to the class. This also revealed that the students felt a sense of ownership for their learning experiences. Four students strongly agreed, and two students agreed.

"Shelley and Lona were fair and impartial in marking the written assignments."

Three students strongly agreed, and three students agreed. The students stated that three written assignments were adequate for the drama unit. The fact that the students were comfortable with my marking their assignments attested to the confidence in their own abilities. Less confident students might have objected to me evaluating their writing. Shelley and I were very similar in our marking skills. Both of us emphasized the same mechanical details, such as punctuation and grammatical constructions. As well, our analysis of content was very similar. These concerns revealed our common teaching expectations, and our collaborative teaching methods from the past were very evident.

"Did you feel comfortable with Shelley and Lona collaborating on the presentation of the drama unit?"

and

"Do you have any recommendations for improving the methods and/or approaches of collaborative teaching?"

The students predictably reacted to my collaboration with Shelley. They had certain reservations at first because they did not know me. They were also concerned about how my presence would affect their studies, their group relationship and Shelley's teaching style.

Fortunately, they quickly accepted my presence in their learning world. One student commented that it would have been useful to have me work alone with the students for a few days; that would have allowed us to establish a mutual relationship. One student also commented that, although the project was collaborative, she still felt

that Shelley was in charge. That interpretation could be made because it was Shelley who always wrote the daily objectives on the board and dealt with the house keeping details. The students also saw Shelley all day long whereas they only saw me in the morning during the English class. This sense of security enabled the students to readily accept my presence. Equally important was the fact that the students, after being together for six months, were a very cohesive group. They were confident enough to accept our collaboration. Had this project occurred earlier in the academic year, the students might not have accepted my presence so readily.

SUMMATIVE THOUGHTS ON THE COLLABORATIVE CREATIVE PROJECT

When considering the results of our collaborative creative project, there are many aspects that must be examined. There were benefits to the students, Shelley and me that must be considered. As well, our recommendations regarding the future use of the drama unit must be considered.

The students benefitted from this project in a number of ways. Within the UCEP program, the students were exposed to the teaching styles of two instructors and the counsellor. Shelley expressed that the students often felt rather isolated as they did not often have the opportunity to interact with other students or instructors. Therefore, she felt it was beneficial for the students to have exposure to someone else's ideas, expertise and style.

One student used an analogy that described our different styles. He said that Shelley's style was "like driving on a freeway whereas Lona's style was like driving in the country." Interestingly enough, this colloquialism aptly described our styles. Shelley realized that her high levels of energy and animation sometimes did not suit the learning styles of all the students. Likewise, I realized that my more relaxed style was sometimes not as suitable to meeting the students' needs.

After working together for a few days, we realized that our styles started to become synchronized. I observed strategies that Shelley utilized to motivate individual students and began to incorporate them into my repertoire. As well, Shelley began to use some of my techniques to enhance her style. We felt that the blending of our styles benefitted the students as their learning styles could more effectively be met.

Throughout the collaborative creative project, the students were also exposed to modelling behaviors by Shelley and me. The students perceived how relaxed Shelley and I were personally and professionally. Some of the students were amazed to discover that our personal relationship was sixteen years old. Others commented that they could tell we had worked together for years. One student laughingly commented that, "they even used the same red pen!" The confidence with each other that we exhibited was reassuring to the students. They sensed that my presence was not going to cause dramatic changes in Shelley's personal and/or professional behaviors. They also realized that my presence was not going to drastically disrupt the "natural order" of their learning environment. As a result, the students' behaviors and efforts towards the drama unit were not noticeably altered.

Shelley and I also felt that our successful collaboration provided a good model for the students when they were engaged in the learning activities for the drama unit. They often observed how Shelley and I discussed and revised our daily objectives. Their opinions were often incorporated into our discussions as well. The students realized that Shelley and I worked well together. We felt that this modelling had a direct effect on the students' efforts towards their creative assignment as they learned how to cooperate and compromise during this activity. After the completion of this assignment, the students talked about how difficult it was at times to reach an agreement on some specific aspect of the presentation. At various points, disagreements arose, but the students persevered and solved them. Had the students' dedication to the creative assignment been lessened or had they not been exposed to Shelley's and my collaborative skills, their efforts might not have been as successful.

After the completion of the drama unit, Shelley and I spent many hours discussing the organization and outcomes of the drama unit. We realized that certain aspects of the unit would have to be revised before it could be used again. After the students completed the evaluation forms, we realized that two main focal points had emerged: the academic content and the affective content.

We realized that we had not given enough treatment to the academic content of the drama unit. The students indicated that they did not entirely understand the purposes for studying a drama unit. Some of them did not understand how the drama unit fit into the realm of studying literature. Therefore, they were a little uncertain as to the necessity of the daily activities and written assignments.

Shelley and I realized that we did not reinforce these concepts strongly enough. We should have discussed more specifically what the students were learning about the motivations of the characters and how the technical aspects of producing a drama were being achieved. We decided that, when the drama unit is used in the future, these discussions would occur after the conclusion of the students' creative assignment. This would summarize and enhance their learning.

We had to consider the dynamics of the personalities and learning styles of the students very carefully when completing this unit, however. The students very willingly participated in the learning activities for the drama unit, but they were rather hesitant about portraying the motivations of the characters in front of a videotape camera. They were naive about the technical aspects of producing a drama as they were not really aware of the importance of arranging the stage properties and lighting and sound equipment to achieve the best effects. Therefore, Shelley and I had to

be very nonjudgemental about their efforts. We had to be very subtle in making suggestions about how to improve these aspects. More importantly, though, was the fact that we attempted to be as nondirective as possible. We wanted the students to become more independent towards their learning activities and environment. We wanted the students to feel that the activities within the drama unit belonged to them. The students had to take the responsibility for the decisions that had to be made. Had Shelley and I intervened at critical times, the students would not have felt this responsibility, and their motivation and willingness to participate would not have been as strong.

Shelley and I believe that the students' levels of learning increased despite the fact that we did not place specific emphasis upon the academic content of the drama unit. The students had previous knowledge of the elements of studying literature, such as distinguishing the plot, setting, character development and the development of dominant themes, through their studies of the short story, novel, poetry and essay. They easily recognized these elements, within the drama unit, as those aspects frequently arose during class discussions. Therefore, Shelley and I felt that the students' academic knowledge had been adequately reinforced.

Through out the six months of the English 100 course, Shelley involved the students in the planning, implementation and evaluation of the individual units they were studying. The students' familiarity with this process was evident when the students completed the three evaluation forms. These forms allowed the students to critically reflect on their learning activities. They had to critically consider whether they had learned what Shelley and I determined they would. This process also gave them

the opportunity to honestly evaluate the entire learning process. The students' honesty revealed their concerns about the treatment of the academic content of the drama unit. Had the students not been familiar with evaluating their learning activities, Shelley and I would have never been aware of this fact. The use of the evaluation forms allowed the students to exercise their rights as independent adult learners. Directly involving the students in the planning, implementation and evaluation of the drama unit only increased its success. This strengthened the students' sense of responsibility as they knew that their opinions were very important to Shelley and me.

Shelley and I believe that the activities also met the students' affective needs. Through modelling and the completion of the creative assignment, the students strengthened their cooperative and collaborative skills. Their interpersonal relationships were tested while working on the creative assignment. Disagreements arose at various times, but the individual members of the group realized how important the assignment was to them. Therefore, they worked extremely hard to compromise to settle the differences.

The effects of the students having worked on the drama unit and their creative assignment were quite obvious to Shelley, when she began working with the students again. Their sense of collaboration continued with the completion of their research paper and preparations for final examinations. On the night that the UCEP students graduated, one of the students told me that his attitudes towards education had changed. He said that he had always hesitated to work with other students as it always seemed unproductive. After the students had to work so hard together on the creative assignment, he realized that he had been rather foolish in feeling that way. He realized

how important it was to work together as the process was more enjoyable and educationally rewarding.

Shelley and I also benefitted from the collaborative creative project. We were both ready for the opportunity to critically examine our teaching worlds. Shelley, with ten years experience, felt she had never received adequate direction and/or supervision. With five years experience, I held the same sentiments. We were looking for the opportunity to reflect upon our teaching activities and styles. With a strong personal and professional relationship, the elements of trust and honesty were already evident. In essence, all the necessary ingredients existed to begin a collaborative creative project.

The informal and formal supervision observations provided valuable information to Shelley and me. We both felt a certain sense of isolation in our former teaching positions. As the years passed, both of us started to question whether our actions in the classroom were being effective. With no opportunity for consistent supervision, guidance or discussion, we kept using the learning activities and teaching strategies that we felt had been successful in the past. When the opportunity arose to gain an "outsider's" viewpoint, both of us were anxious to become involved. The peer supervision activities that we engaged in provided feedback and constructive reassurances. Shelley expressed it best when she realized that the teaching methods she had been using were successful. The peer supervision activities reinforced what Shelley knew intuitively about her students. She realized what learning activities most suitably met the learning needs of her students. These observations strengthened Shelley's feeling about her teaching abilities.

The observations also gave us the opportunity to address our concerns about how to best engage all of the students in their learning activities. Because of the activities chosen for the drama unit, we realized that the quieter students became more actively involved in classroom discussions and the videotaping of specific scenes from the drama. As the motivational levels of the students increased, so did their levels of participation. Equally important was the sense of responsibility that the students developed towards the drama unit and their creative assignment. They came to view the drama unit as their own. In essence, the students took control of the drama unit away from Shelley and me. At the time, we did not realize it because the dynamics of the daily activities clouded our vision. Our role became merely one of facilitators as the students began to make major decisions about the progress of the drama unit. With hindsight, Shelley and I realize that the students taking responsibility for the drama unit was the most effective action they could have taken.

Shelley and I were also very satisfied with the collaborative marking of the students' written assignments. When teaching together, Shelley and I alternately taught the English 30 and 33 curriculums. Although we constantly discussed our actions, we never consistently examined how our emphases on marking the students' work compared. We were rather delighted and surprised when we realized that our concerns were strikingly similar. This helped to relieve our sense of isolation.

Working together collaboratively offered Shelley and I the opportunity to try different teaching strategies from our well established methods. Neither one of us had ever presented an interactive study of drama such as the one we presented to the students. Both of us had considered trying various derivatives of this approach before

but had never actively attempted it. Working together gave us the confidence to expand our teaching methods. Because Shelley and I had a strong sense of trust and respect in each other's teaching abilities, we knew that we could trust each other's opinions and observations. At no time was there any element of mistrust or hesitancy in our collaborative relationship. Our discussions became intensive, teacher "soul searching" experiences. Both of us were ready for such an experience and enjoyed it immensely.

At critical points in an individual's career, it is advantageous and very important to "step back" and take a critical look at the progress of his or her career. This opportunity was presented to both Shelley and I during the collaborative creative project. Through the collaborative autobiography, we both gained a stronger sense of the context of our teaching worlds; we had a better understanding of how we constructed our personal practical knowledge. This enabled us to quickly sense how our teaching personalities would be presented to the students. Combined with the peer supervision activities, Shelley and I were able to address some key concerns, such as how to motivate students to take a more active role towards their education. In this regard, Shelley and I felt that our objectives had been achieved.

All of the activities that we engaged in served to strengthen the dedication to our teaching careers. Both Shelley and I felt a sense of renewal after completing this project. After years of working together, we finally had the opportunity to actively collaborate and interact with each other's teaching style. The exchange of ideas, perceptions and strategies was tremendous. It served to rejuvenate our perspectives towards what we were actually doing in the classroom. It also reinforced that our efforts were meeting the academic and affective needs of our students.

It is unfortunate that teachers tend to become very insular and isolated within their teaching "worlds". Engaging an in activity such as this one, with the integration of collaborative autobiography and peer supervision, would allow a teacher to open up her or his world to gain new perspectives.

It is difficult to adequately express my gratitude to Shelley for so willingly participating in this project. Through the years of our personal and professional relationships, Shelley has always served as a mentor for and to me. We were fortunate to have the opportunity to work together. The importance of engaging in this type of activity can not be stressed strongly enough. Both Shelley and I benefitted from this experience in ways that can not be immediately recognized or measured. However, in the years to come, our perspectives towards our teaching styles will be strengthened.

REFERENCES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Acheson, K. A., & Gall, M. D. (1987). Techniques in the clinical supervision of teachers. Preservice and inservice applications (2nd ed.). New York: Longman, Inc.
- Acheson, K. A., & Hansen, J. A. (1978). Classroom observations and conferences with teachers. Eugene, Oregon: Teacher Inservice Programs and Services.
- Acheson, K. A., & Smith, S. C. (1986). It is time for principals to share the responsibility for instructional leadership with others. OSSC Bulletin, 29(6), 1 - 21.
- Alfonso, R. J. (1977). Will peer supervision work? Educational Leadership, 34(8), 594 - 601.
- Aspinwall, K. A. (1985). A biographical approach to the professional development of teachers. Unpublished M.Ed. dissertation. University of Sheffield, England.
- Aspinwall, K. A. (1986). Teacher biography: The in-service potential. Cambridge Journal of Education, 16(3), 210 - 215.
- Aspinwall, K. A. (1988, September). The teacher as a person: The impact of biography work on professional development. Paper presented at St. Hilda's College, Oxford Conference on "Histories and Ethnographies of Teachers at Work."
- Ball, S. J., & Goodson, I. F. (Eds.). (1985). Teachers' lives and careers. London: Falmer Press.
- Blumberg, A. (1974). Supervisors and teachers: A private cold war. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Brandt, R. (1989). On teacher empowerment: A conversation with Ann Liebermann. Educational Leadership, 46(8), 25 - 26.
- Butt, R. L. (1983, October). The illucidatory potential of autobiography and biography in understanding teachers' thoughts and actions. Paper presented at the Journal of Curriculum Theorizing Annual Conference, Dayton, Ohio.
- Butt, R. L. (1986). The autobiographical course as teaching, learning, self-initiated professional development and research. Paper presented at the Invitational Conference on Quality in Curriculum Research at the University of Ontario, London, Ontario.

- Butt, R. L. (1987). An integrative function for teachers' biographies. In G. Milburn et al. (Eds.), Reinterpreting curriculum research: Images and arguments. London, Ontario: Falmer Press and Althouse Press.
- Butt, R. L., & Raymond, D. (1985, December). An exploration of the nature, sources and development of teachers' personal practical knowledge using an autobiographical approach. Paper presented at the International Symposium on Classroom Studies of Teachers' Personal Knowledge, Toronto, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- Butt, R. L., Raymond, D., McCue, G., & Yamagishi, L. (1986, April). Individual and collective interpretations of teacher biographies. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.
- Butt, R. L., Raymond, D. & Yamagishi, L. (1988). Autobiographical praxis: Studying the formation of teachers' knowledge (Notes 1, 2). Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, 7(4), 87 - 164.
- Butt, R. L., Raymond, D. & Ray. (1989). Biographical and contextual influences on an "ordinary" teacher's thoughts and actions. In J. Lowyk, C. Clarke, & R. Halkes (Eds.), Teacher thinking and professional action. Lisse, Holland: Swets and Zeitlinger.
- Butt, R. L., & Raymond, D. (1989). Studying the nature and development of teachers' knowledge using collaborative autobiography. International Journal of Educational Research, 13(4), 403 - 419.
- Butt, R. L., & Raymond, D. (1989, February). Teacher development using collaborative autobiography. Paper presented at an International Invitational Conference on "Teacher Development: Policy, Practices and Research", Toronto, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- Butt, R. L., Townsend, D. & Raymond, D. (in press). Bringing reform to life: Teachers' stories and professional development. Cambridge Journal of Education.
- Chilcott, J. (1987). Where are you coming from and where are you going? The reporting of ethnographic research. American Educational Research Journal, 24(2), 199 - 218.
- Clandinin, D. J. (1985a). Personal practical knowledge: A study of teachers' classroom images. Curriculum Inquiry, 15(4), 361 - 385.
- Clarke, C., & Richardson. (1986). Peer clinical supervision: A collegial approach. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 276 696).

- Cogan, M. L. (1973). Clinical supervision. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1987). On narrative method, biography and narrative unities in the study of teaching. Journal of Educational Thought, 21(3), 130 - 139.
- Cooper, J. A. (1984). Developing skills for instructional supervision. New York: Longman, Inc.
- Doll, R. C. (1983). Supervision for staff development: Ideas and applications. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.
- Elbaz, F. (1981). The teacher's "practical knowledge": Report of a case study. Curriculum Inquiry, 11(1), 43 - 71.
- Engel, S. A. (1990). Peer supervision: An analysis. Unpublished M.Ed. dissertation. University of Lethbridge, Alberta, Canada.
- Gardner, C. H. (1981, April). Friendly strangers: Reducing teacher isolation through ethnographic observation. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Reading Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Glatthorn, A. A. (1987). Cooperative professional development: Peer-centered options for teacher growth. Educational Leadership, 31 - 35.
- Glickman, C. D. (1985). Supervision of instruction: A developmental approach. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, Inc.
- Goldhammer, R. (1969). Clinical supervision: Special methods for the supervision of teachers. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Goldhammer, R., Anderson, R. H. & Krajewski, R. J. (1980). Clinical supervision: Special methods for the supervision of teachers (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Goldsberry, L. F. (1984). The realities of clinical supervision: Polaroid snapshot or "Star Wars" movie? Educational Leadership, 41(7), 12 - 15.
- Goldsberry, L. F. (1984). Reality - really? A response to McFaul and Cooper. Educational Leadership, 41(7), 10 - 11.
- Gongos, C. (1989). Staff development... A practical approach. Unpublished M.Ed. dissertation. University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon.
- Good, T. L., & Brophy, J. E. (1987). Looking in classrooms (4th ed.). New York: Harper & Row.

- Goodson, I. (1980/81). Life histories and the study of schooling. Interchange, 11(4), 62 - 76.
- Grumet, M. (1980). Autobiography and reconceptualization. Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, 2(2), 155 - 158.
- Hartmann, C. (1978). A longitudinal look at self-appraisal strategies. Journal of Teacher Education, 29, 11 - 12.
- Hopfengradner, J. D., & Leahy, P. E. (1988). Providing collegial support for experienced teachers. Journal of Staff Development, 9(2), 48 - 51.
- Karent, V. I. (1989). Supervision in the age of teacher empowerment. Educational Leadership, 46(8), 27 - 29.
- Knoll, M. K. (1987). Supervision for better instruction: Practical techniques for improving staff performance. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Krajewski, R. (1982). Clinical supervision: A conceptual framework. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 15, 38 - 43.
- Lieberman, A. (1986). Collaborative research: Working with, not working on.... Educational Leadership, 43(5), 28 - 32.
- Lovell, J. T., & Wiles, K. (1983). Supervision for better schools (5th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Mann, D. (1978). Politics of inservice. Theory into Practice, 17, 212 - 217.
- McFaul, S. A., & Cooper, J. M. (1983). Peer clinical supervision in an urban elementary school. Journal of Teacher Education, 34(5), 34 - 38.
- McFaul, S. A., & Cooper, J. M. (1984). Peer clinical supervision: Theory vs reality. Educational Leadership, 41(7), 4 - 9.
- Nelson, B. S. (1986). Collaboration of collegueship: A program in support of teachers. Educational Leadership, 43(5), 50 -52.
- Noseworthy, D. (1989). Enriching teacher evaluations with peer supervision. The Canadian School Executive, 8(9), 3 - 5.
- Onwuzurike, C. A., Engel, S. A., Townsend, D. & Butt, R. L. (1990). A pilot study of the feasibility of using collaborative autobiography and peer supervision in facilitating teacher development. University of Lethbridge, Alberta, Canada.

- Pinar, W. (1980). Life history and educational experience: Part I. Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, 2(2), 59 - 212.
- Pinar, W. (1981). Life history and educational experience: Part II. Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, 3(1), 259 - 286.
- Pinar, W. (1986, April). Autobiography and the architecture of self. Paper presented at the annual conference of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.
- Raymond, D., & Surprenant, M. (1988, April). Investigating teachers' knowledge through ethnographic and biographical approaches: A case study. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Conference, New Orleans, LA.
- Raymond, D., Butt, R. L. & Townsend, D. (1989, February). Contexts for teacher development: Insights from teachers' stories. Paper presented at an International Conference on Teacher Development, Toronto, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- Sarason, S. (1982). The culture of the school and the problem of change (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Schiffer, J. (1980). School renewal through staff development. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1976). Toward a theory of clinical supervision. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 9, 20 - 24.
- Smyth, W. J. (1982). A teacher development approach to bridging the practice-research gap. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 14(4), 331 - 342.
- Smyth, W. J. (1983). There's got to be a better way! A follow-through approach to introducing clinical supervision into schools. The Canadian School Executive, 3(2), 2 - 5.
- Smyth, W. J. (1984). Teachers as collaborative learners in clinical supervision: A state-of-the-art review. Journal of Education for Teaching, 10(1), 24 - 38.
- Smyth, W. J. (1985). Developing a critical practice of clinical supervision. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 17(1), 1 - 15.
- Thompson, J. C. (1979). On models of supervision in general and on peer-supervision in particular. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 192 462)

- Townsend, D., & Butt, R. L. (1989, December). The collaborative relationship and professional development: Life history and peer supervision. Paper presented at an International Conference on "School-Based Innovations: Looking Forward to the 1990's", Hong Kong.
- Warren, D., & Goldsberry, L. F. (1982). Developing teachers collaboration through colleague consultation. Texas Technical Journal of Education, 9(2),101-109
- Woods, P. (1984). Teacher, self and curriculum. In I. Goodson & S. Ball (Eds.), Defining the curriculum. Lewes: Falmer Press, 239 - 261.
- Woods, P. (1985). Conversations with teachers: Some aspects of the life history method. British Educational Research Journal, 11(2), 13 - 26.
- Woods, P. (1987). Life-histories and teacher knowledge. In W. J. Smyth (Ed.), Educating teachers: Changing the nature of professional development. Lewes: Falmer Press.
- Woods, P., & Sikes, P. J. (1986). The use of teacher biographies in professional self-development. In F. Todd (Ed.), Planning continuing practitioner education. London: Croom Helm.
- Weaver, R. A. (1983, November). Ethnographies in adult education: An analysis of their use and value. Paper presented at the Midwest Research-to-Practice Conference in Adult and Continuing Education, Northern Illinois University, Dekalb, Illinois.
- Zumwalt, K. K. (1986). Improving teaching. 1986 Association for supervision and curriculum development yearbook. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

APPENDIX A

THE MODERN DRAMA

With the rise of the novel in the eighteenth century, the interest in drama waned, and it was not until the last years of the nineteenth century that drama again flourished. Modern drama differs in many ways from the classical drama of Queen Elizabeth's time. While Shakespeare found his subject matter in medieval history, modern drama concerns itself with matters of contemporary interest. The social, psychological and economic situations of the day become the subject matter of modern plays. The characters are taken from life around us; they represent people we could know. Thus the modern play becomes in setting, subject and characterization, realistic and convincing. The stage is set with all the necessary things, requiring no name boards as in Shakespeare's time. Modern plays are shorter than the classical ones, which were usually in five acts. Plays today are often in one or two or three. In summary then, the modern play is a simple one, quite conversational throughout, serious in content, realistic and portrays ordinary people and the problems they face in ordinary life.

Henrik Ibsen, a Norwegian, and George Bernard Shaw, an Irishman, are the most famous playwrights of the twentieth century. They deal mainly with comedy, not tragedy. Other names of note from England include Galsworthy, Barrie, Noel Coward, Priestly and Somerset Maugham. Lady Gregory and Lord Dunsany, two Irish dramatists, have also written popular plays. Some well known contemporary American playwrights are Eugene O'Neill, Tennessee Williams and Arthur Miller. Their plays are usually presented first in New York City in the theatres on and off Broadway and then are presented in legitimate theatres in other cities.

Both Shakespearean and modern dramas are presented on today's stage. While professional theatre is more concerned with the longer play, amateur groups, student productions and drama competitions often make the greater use of the one-act play. Sometimes several one-act plays are grouped together for an evening's entertainment.

Though many playwrights write for the stage, a great many also write for radio, television and motion picture screens. While the people of Shakespeare's time could enjoy drama only by going to the theatre, today's audiences can enjoy drama in their own living rooms. In the 1940's, radio drama was popular, and though there is still much drama presented on radio, television has taken a lead and has become a more popular medium for plays. Much of the drama presented on television consists of filmed sequences, but some serious stage drama is also presented on some programs that are live. People who would not have the opportunity to see drama presented in a theatre now are able to access this entertainment because of television. Those who have no television can still get drama on radio.

The motion picture screen has also brought drama to the modern public. The advent of the "talkies" in the late 1920's turned motion pictures into a multi-billion dollar industry. Technicolor, cinemascope, and stereophonic sound have enabled motion picture drama to become colorful and spectacular.

Drama, whether presented on stage, on radio, on television or on the motion

picture screen, is still drama. Each is written for a different medium. Each serves its own purposes. One of the objectives of studying drama is so that the reader may understand what constitutes a good and bad drama. The reader may then select wisely and discriminatingly what will be viewed on the stage, the television and the movie screen.

UNDERSTANDING THE DRAMA

The purpose of studying drama is so that the reader will understand a specific play and through it also understand the nature of drama as an art form distinct from poetry, the novel or the essay.

The drama has much in common with the novel, but it is a unique form in itself. Like the novel, the drama has plot, conflict, setting, characters and theme. Like the novel, the drama tells a story, but the manner in which the story is told is what distinguishes the drama from the novel. The essential difference between the drama and the novel is that a novel is written to be read; the drama is written to be staged. It is meant to be heard and seen. The novelist works independently to present the ideas, situations, setting and characters to the reading public. At this point the work is finished as the reaction of the public indicates success or failure. The dramatist also presents the ideas, situations, setting and characters. When the drama is finished, it must be presented to a theatre audience. In this sense, the playwright does not work independently; he or she is a collaborator and part of a team. He or she must depend upon others to present the play to an audience. To make the drama come to life, the dramatist depends upon stage craftspeople to provide the stage setting, upon fashion designers to create the necessary costumes, upon technicians to control the lighting and sound effects, upon the director and actors and actresses to interpret words and actions convincingly and upon the producer to make the production possible. For the playwright, the production is as important as the story. Whether he or she is writing for the stage, radio, television or the movie screen, the playwright must always consider the possibilities and limitations of the production medium.

The fact that drama is written to be staged limits the scope of the writer. Unlike the novelist, the dramatist is limited by time. The reader can read the novel, put it down and come back at will. The theatregoer wishes to see the whole production at one sitting with only brief interruptions for intermission and scene changes. The dramatist must also limit the setting of the play; he or she cannot move backwards and forwards in time and space as can the novelist.

Just as a novelist establishes the setting and mood of the novel in the opening chapter, the dramatist establishes the setting, mood and atmosphere in the opening scenes of the play. For this reason, the first scene of any play is usually comparatively short since it serves as an introduction. As the curtain goes up and the play opens, no important conversation is given in the first lines so that the audience has time to grasp the scene, to see the details and to gain an impression of what has gone before and of what is to come.

The nature of drama is such that it gives an illusion of life unfolding before the

audience so that the past and future become explicit in the present. Every story is forward moving. Drama lives on the stage in front of the audience. The audience sees the situations happen and sees the characters reacting towards these situations. Drama takes place "in a perpetually present time."

To hold the attention of the audience, the dramatist must be selective to make every action and speech significant. In a play the entire story is presented through dialogue. Any significant action that cannot be presented on stage must be reported by some character in the play. In any play conflict, whether it be mental, physical or moral, must be demonstrated so that the audience can see and understand it.

Though action is basic to the play, it is the language that gives substance and spirit to the action. Dialogue must always be significant and never serve as mere ornamentation or as a time filler. The characters' speeches must either advance the plot, reveal character or develop the setting. Since characters must be individuals, their speech and actions must seem fitting and consistent with their natures. In constructing the play, the playwright makes dialogue vary in rhythm, diction and sentence form.

Characters in a drama are similar to characters in a novel or a story. The dramatist, however, reveals the characters through the medium of the play, and there is never any direct author revelation as in a novel. Character is revealed by what a person says, does and what others in the play say about that person. Like the novelist, the dramatist must make his characters credible.

In the study of drama, the reader should carefully consider the limitations of the stage and note how the dramatist constructed the play to fit these limitations. If a drama written specifically for the stage is later produced for the television or a movie, the drama is usually revised and adapted for that particular medium. Though many dramas are written directly for the stage, many are adaptations from stories and novels.

SHAKESPEAREAN PLAYS AND MODERN PLAYS

SHAKESPEARE

1. medieval subject - usually royal subjects. NOT about the common man
2. often includes ghosts
3. employs "name boards" for scene indicators
4. the unreal is used
5. usually five ACTS
6. monologues are common
7. serious content
8. written for theatre only
9. tragic flaw in character results in catastrophe of enormous proportions

MODERN

1. usually of contemporary interest (social or psychological)
2. involves real characters
3. uses only necessary sets
4. everything has realistic basis
5. Usually one to three ACTS
6. conversational dialogues common
7. serious content
8. written for stage, radio, TV, film
9. tragic flaw of the common person who often attempts the impossible dream

SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES BETWEEN NOVELS AND DRAMAS

NOVELS

1. contains plot, setting, character and theme
2. written to be read
3. author works independently to deliver to an audience
4. story line is usually the most important

DRAMAS

1. contains plot, setting, character and theme
2. written to be staged
3. playwright collaborates to deliver to an audience
4. production is as important as the story

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>5. scope of the story is unlimited</p> <p>6. story can move back and forth in time with little difficulty</p> <p>7. mood is determined in the opening chapter</p> <p>8. concerned with what happened in the past</p> <p>9. author has license and flexibility to elaborate on scenes, characters, etc.</p> <p>10. techniques other than dialogue can be used</p> <p>11. conflict can be described or implied. Vocabulary is the only limit</p> <p>12. point of view reveals characters and develops the setting</p> <p>13. dialogue and diction vary to make characters seem more real. It is not as important as in the drama</p> <p>14. direct author revelation is optional. It depends on the point of view and the style</p> <p>15. characters must be credible</p> | <p>5. limited scope depending on the medium it is being presented upon</p> <p>6. drama has difficulty moving back and forth in time due to limitations in scope</p> <p>7. mood is determined in the opening scene</p> <p>8. perpetually in the present tense</p> <p>9. every action and speech is significant. No unnecessary elaboration is tolerated</p> <p>10. entire story is presented through dialogue</p> <p>11. conflict must be demonstrated. It can not be described.</p> <p>12. dialogue is used to advance plot, character and setting. Dialogue must have a purpose.</p> <p>13. each character's dialogue must vary in rhythm, diction and sentence length to make characters seem more real</p> <p>14. never any direct author revelation. Character is revealed through dialogue, action and what others say about the character.</p> <p>15. characters must be credible</p> |
|---|---|

APPENDIX B

ARTHUR MILLER

Arthur Miller was born in Harlem, New York on October 17, 1915. His Austrian-born father, Isadore Miller, was a prosperous clothing manufacturer before the Great Depression reduced him to near poverty. Arthur had a featureless school career, was more interested in football than in studying, and made no impact on his teachers. In later years, when Arthur had gained fame as a dramatist, his teachers could not even remember him. When he graduated from Brooklyn's Abraham Lincoln High School in 1932, he had hoped to attend the University of Michigan because of its nationally known football team, but he did not have the money for tuition fees. To earn money, he worked for over two years as a loader operator and shipping clerk in an automotive parts warehouse. During this time, Miller developed an interest in reading and read many novels and plays while riding on the subway to and from work. Miller claims that he was inspired to become a writer after reading The Brothers Karamazov by Dostoevsky.

While attending the University of Michigan, Miller wrote several plays, won three drama prizes, and in 1936 won the Avery Hopwood Award for The Grass Still Grows. The prize money, plus a part-time newspaper job and aid from the National Youth Administration, helped him finance his four years at university. Upon graduation in 1936, he joined the short-lived Federal Theatre Project. For it he wrote a tragedy about the conquest of Mexico, but the play was never presented.

In 1940 Arthur Miller married Mary Grace Slattery, a University of Michigan classmate. During their years of marriage, the couple had two children. Miller continued writing a number of plays on themes chosen at random, but these plays remained unpublished. To support himself, he worked at a variety of jobs such as driving trucks, unloading cargo, and waiting on tables. He also wrote radio scripts chiefly for the "Columbia Workshop" of the Columbia Broadcasting System and for the "Cavalcade of America" workshop. While working as a fitter in the Brooklyn Naval Yard, he was asked to write The Story of G. I. Joe, a film script about army training. His first book, Situation Normal, based on this material was published in 1944.

Miller's first Broadway play, The Man Who Had All the Luck, was produced in 1944. It closed after four performances. Then in 1945 Miller published Focus, a novel against anti-Semitism. His first successful Broadway play, All My Sons, won the New York Drama Critics Award when it appeared in 1947. Miller had planned to give up playwriting if this play was a failure. In 1949 his Death of a Salesman broke all records by winning the Drama Critics Circle Award, the Pulitzer Prize, the Antoinette Perry Award, the Theatre Club Award and the Front Page Award. After this achievement, Miller came to be ranked among the foremost contemporary American playwrights. Some of his other plays are The Crucible (1953), A View From the Bridge, A Memory of Two Mondays (1955), After the Fall and Incident at Vichy (1964).

Though Miller has become a successful playwright, he has been less fortunate in his private life. In 1956 Miller and his first wife were divorced, and in June of that year, he married Marilyn Monroe. With her in mind, Miller wrote The Misfits and adapted the story for the screen. Marilyn Monroe starred in the film with Clark Gable and Montgomery Clift. Miller's marriage to Monroe ended in November of 1960. Arthur Miller now lives in Roxbury, Connecticut with his third wife Ingeborg Morath, an Austrian-born photographer whom he married in February, 1962. Between plays he does free-lance writing.

INFLUENCES ON HIS WRITINGS

Arthur Miller's experiences and his searching for an understanding of life and people are reflected in his writings. Miller grew up during the 1930's at a time when many people were gropingly trying to understand how the Great Depression came about. Many were talking wildly of Socialism as the solution to further economic ills. As a young man Miller was influenced by what he heard, and in seeing his father's and other peoples businesses fail, he learned to distrust success. He became concerned with the fate of the common man and woman and felt a compassion for peoples' insecurity in a modern industrial society. Death of a Salesman showed that Willy was at least partly defeated by a society which drained the common man or woman of his or her energy and then drops him or her.

From his experiences of living during the Depression, Miller developed a belief in social responsibility and a moral earnestness which caused him to occasionally make unsympathetic criticisms of the "Affluent Society". There are several incidents of social criticism in Death of a Salesman. The play illustrated a family-oriented morality that caused people to lose sight of their responsibility to the larger social groups of which they are also members. Willy Loman would not presumably steal from his sons, but he was tolerantly amused when Biff and Happy "borrowed" footballs or building materials that belonged to others. Howard Wagner, though apparently a devoted family man, was callous to the fate of Willy, his aging employee. Willy, who wanted his sons to rise rapidly in the business world, did not even consider the possibility that in their rise, they might hurt others by using them as stepping stones. Miller showed that a lack of social responsibility led to ruthless competition and a double standard of morality. Willy showed several instances of this double standard when he tried to condone a wrong simply because it was done to achieve some result he considered important.

In addition, Death of a Salesman viewed critically the importance that many people place upon material success as the primary value in life. The play exposed the hollowness of Willy's dreams of success. His belief, that a jolly "locker room" personality made one well-liked, acted as a substitute for real accomplishment. The play also illustrated modern man's concern with the superficial. Willy acknowledged that people who play tennis and have their own private court must be "fine people". Equally impressive are symbols of French champagne, magazine cover girls and

professional football. Willy symbolised the American preoccupation with football when he made an excessive fuss over that one important game. He implied that a boy with an athletic scholarship need not bother to study mathematics. Throughout the play, there was the implication that though muscles are admirable on the football field, muscular trades such as carpentry must be rejected in favor of more respectable "white collar" jobs. All three Loman men longed for a chance to work outdoors, but all tried to conform to standards set by the business world. When Miller used his drama to critically view certain values held by our contemporary society, he was following the tradition set by Henrik Ibsen and other dramatists who, through their writing, also criticised the values and attitudes of their societies.

TRAGEDY FOR TODAY

Miller called Death of a Salesman a tragedy of the common man or woman. By doing this, he promoted the belief that the common man or woman is a fit subject for tragedy. In advancing this belief, Miller attacked the Aristotelian view of tragedy as something fit only for kings and queens and heroes. Conforming to this view, the ancient Greek or Elizabethan dramatists chose as their protagonist an exceptional individual who occupied a high and influential position. Though basically a good person, the hero had some "tragic flaw" or weakness of character that caused him or her to fall from the great heights of fame, wealth, power and respect to the depths of misery and often destruction. Aristotle theorised that the audience, upon seeing this noble character fall, experienced a "catharsis" or a purifying of the spirit because they were moved by pity and fear. They felt pity for the woes of this admirable character, and they felt fear because they became more aware of those forces which are so powerful as to topple even the mightiest of heroes.

Death of a Salesman contrasted with the Aristotelian view of tragedy since Willy was never rich or famous nor had he in any way been influential outside his immediate family circle. Since Willy had never occupied a high position, he could not "fall" in the sense of the Greek or Shakespearean hero. Willy, the common man, did not wish to conquer the world or secure a throne. His dreams and aspirations were ordinary for all he wanted was to be well liked, to make some money and to have his sons be popular and prosperous.

In defending Willy Loman as a tragic hero, Miller argued that if tragedy is to be meaningful, it must deal essentially with thoughts and feelings that have some universality. Miller maintained that, like the high ranking officer or noble prince or princess, the common man or woman could be a good human being with a "tragic flaw" struggling against formidable odds to transform some vision into reality. In his essay, "Tragedy and the Common Man", Miller stated that the tragic flaw need be nothing more than man's inherent unwillingness to remain passive in the face of what he conceives to be a challenge to his dignity, his image of the rightful status." The common man or woman gains the stature of a tragic hero by his or her total commitment or the "readiness to lay down his or her life if need be to secure one thing - a sense of

personal dignity." Willy Loman, in Miller's view, was a tragic hero because he totally committed himself to an impossible dream, heroically maintained this vision and died rather than live as an acknowledged failure. Since Willy's problems were more comprehensive and meaningful to the modern generation than are the problems of an Aristotelian hero, Miller argued that modern tragedy may perhaps help to elevate the spirit of the modern audience. In choosing the common man as his subject for tragic drama, Miller advocated nothing completely new or revolutionary. Ibsen and other dramatists dealt with middle-class individuals involved in tragic situations, and there was much talk of the common man throughout the whole Romantic period of literature.

MILLER'S TECHNIQUES

Miller, a contemporary dramatist, followed in the traditions of modern drama developed by Ibsen. Like Ibsen, Miller was more concerned with the development of the individual under the stress of living, rather than with the narrative. His plays are dramas of the mind and spirit rather than dramas of plot and action. Ibsen had discarded the older dramatists' use of coincidence and melodrama to present a well-made play, but Ibsen's plays were tightly structured. Miller was an admirer of Ibsen, and his plays, like Ibsen's, are economical in that all the characters, even the minor ones, have an integral relation to the theme. No characters are introduced merely to illustrate or facilitate the mechanics of the plot. Death of a Salesman, however, has a carefully planned plot; Miller skillfully used such typical Ibsen devices as foreshadowing, irony and symbols.

In Death of a Salesman, Miller observed the traditional unities of action, place and time. The play has one main story line that developed in and about a small area and within a brief one-day period. Like a classical tragedy, it became very hopeful in the middle. At the beginning of Act Two, there was an air of optimism and happiness that contrasted sharply with the tragedy at the end of this Act.

Besides relying on the time-tested older stage methods, Miller used certain techniques associated with the more modern experimental writers. During the 1920's, a group known as the Expressionists had attempted to create special effects by freely shifting action from place to place and altering the customary time sequences. In depicting Willy Loman's last hours, from his return to his house Monday night until his suicide late Tuesday, Miller actually kept to standard chronological order and conventional home and office locales, but he used the interposed flashback scenes to represent past experiences now preying on Willy's distracted mind. These flashback scenes cut across the more rigid plot lines and achieved fluidity. In order to break down ordinary barriers, the set itself was designed for unhampered movement, and the same actors played the characters in both current scenes and in flashbacks. In addition, skillful use of lighting and background music made transitions from past to present more easy and natural.

Furthermore, in Death of a Salesman, Miller adapted some techniques from the modern experimental dramatists who tried to show on stage the curious workings of

the modern man. In Death of a Salesman, Miller used flashbacks to reveal how inner tensions could impel a man to self-destruction. Miller let us know not only what Willy said to his wife, Linda and his son, Biff but also what memories were causing him to become mentally disturbed. Thus Miller combined the tight structure of an Ibsen play with the free flowing movement of the Expressionists and the psychological analysis favoured by other experimental dramatists. Miller exhibited his technical proficiency as a playwright. He did not use the same style or techniques for all his dramas, but rather adapted his style to the material. His other plays follow the more conventional forms of drama.



The
University of
Lethbridge

4401 University Drive
Lethbridge, Alberta, Canada
T1K 3M4
403-329-2251
FAX: (403) 329-2022

FACULTY OF EDUCATION
FAX: (403) 329-2252

APPENDIX C

1990 03 02

Dear Student:

I am conducting a study of how to improve instruction within the English curriculum of the University and College Entrance Program. On a broader basis, the purpose of this study is to improve instruction in the field of adult education.

I anticipate that you and others will benefit from this study by participating in the planning, implementation and assessment of the supervision project. As part of the research, you will be asked to actively engage in the study of Arthur Miller's drama, Death of a Salesman.

My particular interest is in gathering data to help Shelley Wilkinson understand and improve her teaching skills. I will visit the classroom daily during a five-week period in order to gather this data. None of this data will relate to any individual person but will be used in summary forms.

All and any information will be handled in a confidential and professional manner. When responses are released, they will be reported in summary form only. Further, all names, locations and any other identifying information will not be included in any discussion of the results. You also have the right to withdraw from the study without prejudice at any time.

If you choose to do so, please indicate your willingness to participate by signing this letter in the space provided below.

I very much appreciate your assistance in this study. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact myself, Lona M. Tarney, at the Sunrise Project at 849-7169 or Dr. Richard Butt at The University of Lethbridge's Faculty of Education at 329-2434. Also feel free to contact any member of The University of Lethbridge's Faculty of Education Human Subjects Research Committee. The chairperson, Dr. Nancy Grigg, can be reached at 329-2260.

Yours sincerely,

Lona M. Tarney
Sunrise Project
849-7169

AN INTEGRATION OF COLLABORATIVE TEACHER AUTOBIOGRAPHY AND PEER SUPERVISION TO IMPROVE INSTRUCTION IN THE FIELD OF ADULT EDUCATION.

I, _____, agree to participate in this study.

Name

Signature

Date

APPENDIX D

1990 03 02

I, Shelley G. Wilkinson, have been fully informed as to the nature of the research project entitled "An Integration of Collaborative Teacher Autobiography and Peer Supervision to Improve Instruction in the Field of Adult Education" to be conducted in collaboration with Lona Tarney.

I understand that in agreeing to ethnographic and biographic interviews that I have the right to disclose only what I wish and that I have the right to refuse to answer particular questions. As well, when Ms. Tarney has written my biographical sketch I have the right to edit that document, delete and add any sentences I so chose and change person and place names to protect confidentiality and privacy as I see fit.

As well, I understand that Lona Tarney will visit my classroom and gather data according to guidelines agreed with me and conduct clinical supervision interviews for a duration of five weeks. Once again, I will have the right to vett and edit the final case study that results from clinical supervision.

I understand that I can call Dr. Richard Butt (329-2434) or Dr. Nancy Grigg (329-2260) if I have any questions.

I agree to participate in the above study.

Shelley Wilkinson
Signed

March 29, 1990
Date

APPENDIX E

DIVISIONS OF DRAMA

There are two main classifications of drama: comedy and tragedy.

1. A comedy is a play in which the protagonist achieves his or her goal and usually ends happily.
2. A tragedy is a play in which the protagonist fails to achieve his or her goal and thus ends tragically.
3. A tragicomedy is a play which seems to be tragic throughout but ends happily.
4. A problem play is a play which has the outcome neither happy or tragic.
5. A melodrama is a play to arouse immediate and intense emotion. The protagonist has a lot of problems to solve and takes them very seriously. It usually has a happy ending.
6. A One Act play is short, and the action occurs in the single unit of time we call an act. It is also more concentrated than a full length play. The action takes less time and normally consumes less space.
7. A farce is a play that depends on comical situations and overplaying and underplaying. The ending is usually happy. Overplaying is overemphasis of a speech, action, emotion or reaction. Underplaying uses restraint in action or speech, usually for emphasis. It also implies a hidden emotion rather than displaying it openly.

APPENDIX F

THE ONE-ACT PLAY

INTRODUCTION

THE ONE-ACT PLAY:

- revolves around a single clearly discernible theme or idea
- has an organization that can afford the reader and the audience a sense of orderliness, cohesion and harmony
- is a work written primarily for a performance that reflects the possibilities and restrictions of the theatrical medium
- the representation of life is brought about by dialogue and action
- dialogue carries or suggests a good deal of the action and sometimes constitutes an action
- dialogue may also be a reaction on the part of a character or a reflection on what he or she is doing or on what is happening to him or her
- the action not directly or indirectly conveyed by speech or accompanying it in the form of the actor's movements, gestures or facial play must be pantomimed instead of being described in words

THE ORGANIZATION OF THE PLAY

EXPOSITION

- introduces the characters, their environment and their circumstances
- usually short
- takes the form of action rather than dialogue

DEVELOPMENT AND RISING ACTION

- starts with some inciting situation or event or even frame of mind
- must acquire intensity and momentum
- piling up of events leading to the climax

CRISIS OR CLIMAX

- crisis of maximum intensity
- determines the outcome of the complications that have arisen in the course of the play

FALLING ACTION

- tying together of consequences of climax

RESOLUTION OR DENOUEMENT

- concluding portion of play
- involves the total action of the play

CONFLICT

- provides the greatest source of excitement in a play
- external: between characters or groups of characters
- internal: conflict of desires and intentions within a single individual
- may motivate the initial incident - the point of attack
- may introduce complications that provide the dramatic development
- may precipitate the minor crises by means of which the play proceeds forward towards its major crisis or climax of the rising action
- may also complicate the falling action by giving it an extra twist of events, delaying for a time the resolution and end of the play
- shows individuals in maximum states of agitation and action
- contrasts of character add interest to play

OTHER ELEMENTS IN THE PLAY

CHARACTERIZATION

- relationships between characters determine how and why the persons will behave and relate to each other
- determines the rise and development of those critical situations by means of which a play moves forward

TOPE OR MOOD

- conveyed by all the elements of the play
- affects the nature of the play
- frivolous: farce or comedy
- serious: melodrama or problem drama
- exalted: tragedy

SUSPENSE

- strengthened by surprise
- well-motivated action on the part of credibly portrayed characters

FORESHADOWING

- by setting the mood or tone of the play with the help of expressive or symbolic settings and atmospheric lighting
- planting an object or stage property prior to that part of the play where it figures prominently so that it is fixed in the minds of the audience
- established through actions and dialogue of characters

TECHNIQUES OF DEVELOPING THE PLAY

DRAMATIC ACTION

- may start at some some distance from the outcome or denouement
- many complications are presented on stage before the conclusion
- most common in historical dramas spanning many events
- start of dramatic action may be extremely close in time to the climax
- development consists largely of an unfolding of the past, point after point, in the present
- may revolve around a single outstanding character or two
- central action may, however, involve a group of characters such as a family or even a miscellaneous collection of persons who belong to the same occupation or class or who share a common goal

VARIETY OF STYLES

- each has a special justification and special effects
- play can be written in verse or prose
- may be rich in fantasy "poetic" or realistic

VARIETY IN ORGANIZATION

- may be distinctly formal and follow more or less rigid pattern
- may be loosely organized and give impression that things happen in a relatively unplanned or casual way
- may constitute an allegory in which a moral is demonstrated by means of generalized situations and abstract characters who represent an idea or concept such as Death or Love or Good or Bad
- may consist of absurdly connected or disconnected elements

FEATURES

- makes particularly entertaining or absorbing in that characters move rapidly from one crisis to another with as little intervening detail as possible
- actions and motivations are simplified for this purpose

- explanations are frequently omitted or greatly abbreviated by comparison with the detailed attention they are apt to be given in a novel
- actions are chosen for maximum effect

SPECIAL FEATURES OF THE ONE-ACT PLAY

- action occurs in a single unit of time called an ACT
- action takes less time and normally consumes less space
- can succeed on the strength of a single notion, a single mood, a single tension, a single briefly realized action or atmosphere or mood
- the characters do not need a past or complex personalities or involved motivations
- skill is needed for achieving effects and developing themes within its narrow confines
- decisive advantage is the superior concentration on the essential subject matter and close agreement between ends and means
- involves the elimination of secondary detail from the governing themes
- presents a single distinct impression

UNDERSTANDING THE ONE-ACT PLAY

- looking for a dominant theme involves determining how the dramatic units of the work cohere and deducing from this the idea or theme that governs them individually and collectively
- the mood or spirit or tone adopted for the treatment of the characters and events is important

ONE-ACT PLAY PRODUCTION IN THE HISTORY OF THE THEATRE

- helped revolutionize the theatre at different times with fresh subject matter, unconventional attitudes and relatively new insights
- has immense educational interest and value
- develop ability of expression in performers
- sharpens comprehension in the audience
- to study the one-act play is to become familiar with virtually all types of dramas
- lead one to understand life as a process of change, experience as a happening rather than a mere state of being and understanding as a discovery rather than a foregone conclusion attained without effort

Glassner, J., Little, F. H. Reading and Staging the Play: An Anthology of One-Act Plays. Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston of Canada, Limited, 1969.

APPENDIX G

REVIEW QUESTIONS - DEATH OF A SALESMAN

ACT ONE - SCENES 1 AND 2

1. Willy Loman is the protagonist of the play. From the opening scenes, what insights can you make about his personality, disposition and temper?
2. What observations can be made about Linda, Willy's wife?
3. Biff and Happy are different men, and the same men at the same time. Justify how this can be.
4. How do Biff and Happy feel about their father's present state of mind?

ACT ONE - SCENES 3 TO 6

1. What do these scenes reveal about Willy as a salesman and as a man?

ACT ONE - SCENES 7 TO 11

1. The rift between Willy and Biff is partially revealed. What are Willy and Biff's feelings towards each other?
2. Does Biff's proposition for Bill Oliver seem plausible?
3. What kind of roles does Happy appear to be playing?
4. Why does Biff become so defensive towards Linda whenever Willy speaks to her?

ACT TWO - SCENES 1 TO 6

1. How is Willy's emotional instability revealed?
2. How do Willy's friends and associates treat him?

ACT TWO - SCENES 7 TO 10

1. Biff learns something about Willy that upsets him. This finally sheds some light on Biff and Willy's relationship. What was this event?
2. Why does Happy act the way he does during the restaurant scene?

ACT TWO - SCENES 11 TO 14

1. What revelation has Biff finally made about himself, his father and his family?
2. How does Willy react to Biff's emotional outburst?
3. Is Happy a static or dynamic character?
4. What type of decision is Willy struggling to make?
5. Does Linda understand Willy's intentions? Is there any relation between her doing nothing now and her inability to remove the rubber tubing earlier?

REQUIEM

1. Will Biff, Happy or Linda's lives change after Willy's death?
2. Should any of them feel responsible for Willy's suicide?

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

1. Throughout the play, Willy makes many references about Biff's greatness. Since Willy's life is so full of illusions, we can not be sure that Biff actually did possess great potential. What evidence is there to prove that Biff really did have qualities of greatness?
2. Explain whether the ending of the drama is realistic. Could the play have ended in any other way, or did Willy have to commit suicide?

3. Willy Loman is a tragically pathetic figure. He has the wrong dreams, the wrong sense of values and a twisted view of morality. He is, however, as Linda says, " a human being, not a great man and not the finest character," but he is hardly a despicable person nor is he the "phony little fake" that he once seemed to Biff. Write a character sketch of Willy, bringing out his "tragic" qualities.
4. To what extent, if any, was Linda responsible for Willy's failure and suicide?
5. Biff has stolen, he has spent time in jail and he has no steady job. Compared to him, Happy has a more socially acceptable position. Why then is Biff the more admirable character? Why do we have more sympathy for Biff than for Happy?
6. Death of a Salesman is Arthur Miller's most popular play. It ran for 742 performances on Broadway from February 10, 1949 until November 18, 1950. It has played in countless theatres in American and was lauded in Britain and Europe. The movie version, starring Frederick March as Willy Loman, won first prize at the Venice Film Festival. Discuss the reasons for such an appeal to audiences.
7. "Motif" means a recurring idea, thought or phrase which acts as a unifying device in a drama. Sometimes a motif develops as a commentary on the characterisation or the ideas presented in a play. A motif may recur so frequently that it enhances the meaning of the play and may even rise to symbolic importance. In Death of a Salesman, some of the motifs blend together in the last act to form a paradoxical or ironic comment on the play. Choose one of the following motifs, and show how this motif unifies the drama: "Vital to New England; personal attractiveness; being well liked; stealing; debts - all used up; being boxed in; the silk stockings; the woods are burning; the flute music."

APPENDIX H

DRAMA UNIT - MARK SHEET

WRITTEN ASSIGNMENTS _____
30

CREATIVE ASSIGNMENT _____
75

PARTICIPATION _____
10

TOTAL _____
115

STUDENT: _____

APPENDIX I

CREATIVE ASSIGNMENT - FINAL MARK

1. GROUP VIDEO MARK -----
50

- Initiative - Creativity - Inventiveness.
- Overcoming obstacles and limitations.
- Credibility.
- Appropriate mood and tone.
- Effective use of stage properties, setting and special effects.
- Physical and verbal flow.

2. SELF-GIVEN STUDENT MARK -----
25

- What did you personally have to overcome?
- What did you gain from the learning experience?

3. INSTRUCTOR-GIVEN MARK -----
25

- Effective characterization.
- How well you did your job.
- Overall impressions.

TOTAL: Total Group Video Mark	50
Self-Given Student Mark	25
+	
Instructor-Given Mark (Averaged)	----- 75

STUDENT: _____

APPENDIX J

STUDENT EVALUATION - DEATH OF A SALESMAN

This evaluation refers to the organization of the drama unit on Death of a Salesman.

Please answer the following questions according to the rating guidelines given below:

- 1 - Strongly Agree
- 2 - Agree
- 3 - No Comment
- 4 - Disagree
- 5 - Strongly Disagree

Please answer each question by circling only one response.

- | | |
|-----------|---|
| 1 2 3 4 5 | A. The objectives for the study of drama were clearly stated at the beginning of the unit. |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | B. The study of <u>Death of a Salesman</u> was interesting and challenging. |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | C. The daily lessons were organized in a clear and logical format. |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | D. The class discussions contributed to my understanding of the content of <u>Death of a Salesman</u> . |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | E. The written assignments contributed to my understanding of the content of <u>Death of a Salesman</u> . |

APPENDIX K

STUDENT EVALUATION - CREATIVE ASSIGNMENT

This evaluation refers to the organization of the students' creative assignment.

Please answer the following questions according to the rating guidelines given below:

- 1 - Strongly Agree
- 2 - Agree
- 3 - No Comment
- 4 - Disagree
- 5 - Strongly Disagree

Please answer each question by circling only one response.

- 1 2 3 4 5 A. The objectives for the creative assignment were clearly stated at the beginning of the drama unit.
- 1 2 3 4 5 B. There were frequent opportunities for discussing your understanding and ideas for the creative assignment.
- 1 2 3 4 5 C. You gained a greater understanding of the technical aspects of producing a drama through the completion of the creative assignment.
- 1 2 3 4 5 D. You gained a greater understanding of the content of Death of a Salesman through the completion of the creative assignment.

APPENDIX L

STUDENT EVALUATION - COLLABORATIVE TEACHING

This evaluation refers to the organization of the collaborative teaching efforts of Shelley and Lona.

Please answer the following questions according to the rating guidelines given below:

1 - Strongly Agree

2 - Agree

3 - No Comment

4 - Disagree

5 - Strongly Disagree

Please answer each question by circling only one response.

- | | |
|-----------|---|
| 1 2 3 4 5 | A. Shelley and Lona clearly stated their objectives at the beginning of the unit. |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | B. Shelley and Lona were well organized during the drama unit. |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | C. Shelley and Lona knew the subject matter well. |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | D. Shelley and Lona's presentations in class were clear and unambiguous. |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | E. Shelley and Lona's answers to questions were concise and comprehensive. |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | F. Shelley and Lona helped me to understand the drama material. |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | G. Shelley and Lona encouraged group discussions and/or group problem solving in class. |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | H. Shelley and Lona demonstrated respect and concern for students' opinions. |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | I. Shelley and Lona were fair and impartial in marking the written assignments. |

