In this well-reasoned exploration of the need for the interpersonal dimension of the classroom, Pradl argues that we have overemphasized the autonomy of the individual self. He suggests that changing to a collaborative model requires a shift in sensibility which no longer characterizes life as a zero-sum game. Beyond the realm of simple winners and losers lies the heart of negotiated victory. He concludes that instead of isolated competition the learner thrives much more on mature dependency.

"Our current society unrealistically regards simple independence as the solution to all personal dependency problems. It fails to recognize the need for an ever-growing consciousness about the importance of negotiating the need for the interpersonal dimension of the classroom."
what we may have answers ready in each instance, but we probably underestimate how deep-seated is opposition, how both an emotional and an intellectual dimension need to be addressed.

And there are other mind sets that must be confronted if collaboration is to prosper. Consider this subversive argument for one: The school's rightful role is (1) to reduce human agency, and (2) to defuse human expectation levels, because we live in a culture where there will never be enough rewarding work to go around. To offer students opportunities to control their own destinies, to show them ways to participate in the shaping of their education levels, because we live in a culture where there will never be enough rewarding work to go around. To offer students opportunities to control their own destinies, to show them ways to participate in the shaping of their education levels. This submerged idea in fact dominates many of our institutional arrangements in education, which sends a message to people about the futility of cooperative effort. In a similar way, any elementary school curriculum which provides genuine audiences for writers and encourages self-expression provokes hazardous shock waves in the system: it can place subversive pressures on already beleaguered high school teachers and leave students unprepared for the "real" world of high school and college composition.

At issue here is a central question dividing teachers: How will authority be determined and valued in teaching/learning situations? Inevitably this question of authority turns on how we construe "role" and "role relations." Our thinking in this area, I would argue, has overemphasized the autonomy of the individual self. We believe it is natural to feel that we are the same person, the same unified identity, regardless of the circumstances or the people we're with. While a core self may regulate our interaction with the world of others, this self is seen as being separate from others' selves—social reciprocity seems to figure little in how we perceive our self-image.

Ours notions about an autonomous self, and the unitary motives that drive it, have tended, at the cultural level, to reflect the myth of the individual in splendid isolation—self-sufficiency, rugged individualism, and all that. We cling to the platonic ideal which sees the atomistic individual as the source of invention and creativity. Further, we show little tolerance for mixed motives; we cling to the binary ideal in which success or failure in any field consists of an either/or. This way of thinking, I believe, is profoundly antithetical to cooperation, both in scholarship and in teaching. If, in fact, we are to encourage in our students the spirit of cooperation, we must first encourage them to see their own human nature; to see how their human nature is shaped by circumstances and by the circumstances in which they find themselves. To see that, they will need to develop a capacity for self-knowledge, to see the world in which they live as a world of change and difference. To see human nature as changeable, not predetermined, we are inclined to self-scrutiny, not self-determinism. We are inclined to self-examination, not self-definition. We are inclined to be open to new experiences, not closed off to them.
endless. The more we express them, the more we may have to express. Learning from Forster's concerns, we must come to realize that the educational perspectives we hold can no longer be captured in terms of zero-sum games. Beyond the realm of simple winners and losers lies the heart of negotiated victory, the ecological imperative. A collaborative sensibility celebrates this mediated tension between self and community, it does not deny it by questing after a self apart. But once we acknowledge the centrality of personal relationships informing community, we face the difficulty of bridging the chasms that separate us from one another. Despite our culture's worship of precision, we must finally accept the sheer impossibility of complete communication. How then is collaboration possible, given the indeterminacy of information and experience? By necessity, our connections with others are characterized by continual adjustments and reinterpretations, the kinds, for example, that modulate any invested conversation. Paul Ricoeur explores this process of mutual meaning-making: the possibility of any dialogical structure of discourse, appearing as a way of transcending or overcoming the fundamental solitude of each human being. By solitude I do not mean that fact that we often feel isolated in a crowd, or even that we live and die alone, but, in a more radical sense, that which is experienced by one person cannot be transferred whole as such and such an experience transferred as such into another. Yet, nevertheless, something passes from me to you. Something is transferred from one sphere of consciousness to another, passing as a possibility of any dialogical structure of discourse appears as a way of overcoming the radical non-communicability of the lived experience as lived. The intersubjective dialogue Ricoeur privileges defines our experience of self(s). Our feeling of identity, of individuality, grows out of the mutual support and validations it receives from others. Whenever we resist our natural urge to divide the world into two categories, to cognitively and culturally divide up the world, we must remember that the realities surrounding us are shaped directly from referential social connections, contingent and mutually defined by the ways in which we act on various relational scripts in large part determined by how we interpret the meanings of my colleagues' actions. This is a core condition of consciousness, meaning depends on context, thus the area in which philosophy comes into play in the practice of philosophy. But once we recognize this, we must remember that the meanings of our actions are always given to the interpretive contexts in which they are situated. Even in the case of the physical sciences, the interpretive context is always significant. So where once we acknowledged the contingency of personal relations, we now begin to question the very possibility of interpretation. A collaborative sensibility, we finally must accept the sheer impossibility of interpretation as experienced, as lived, forming property, by the experience as experienced, but its meaning. Here is the experience as experienced, something is transferred from one sphere of consciousness to another, passing as a possibility of any dialogical structure of discourse appears as a way of overcoming the radical non-communicability of the lived experience as lived.
cloning word processor gone wild; instead he chose to confront the student over a case of fraud. And indeed the student admitted that the duplicate pages were an attempt to pad the journal, to give the appearance of bulk, suspecting that the instructor was more likely to weigh rather than read the entries. No plagiarism here, but a deception nonetheless; still, an act of contrition at this point would have met the instructor's role expectations, and the incident might have been forgotten.

Alas, the student was taking his cues from another script (one highlighting a different kind of honour with a need to save face), so there was no humbling apology, no admission of wrong doing or vow never to do such a stupid thing again. On the other hand there was no attempt to evade or deny the "truth" the instructor had uncovered. Still, even though he was aware that the student might be operating under a contrasting set of principles, the instructor was caught in the aesthetics of his own conventionalized script regarding the guilt that must be played out on such occasions of scholarly crime and punishment. Bending, and passing the student, would have been an admission of weakness on the part of the instructor, would have been to deny his duty to uphold the standards of conduct sanctioned by the academy (especially, he reasoned, as such fraud would not have been allowed at his own undergraduate college). So in the face of options, with a series of opportunities to avoid confrontation, particular roles became locked in place and an incident arose. Whereas if another set of interpretations had predominated, if there had been a less rigid adherence to pre-determined roles, the problem might have had a happier resolution.

These various and conflicting interpretations of experience which absorb any one person signify a multifaceted self. Each of us is but some distillation or cluster of our contingent responses to a range of social encounters. And even if we choose to cling to the view that a person's behaviour reflects the consistency of a unified self, we can still see this same behaviour as simultaneously displaying great variability depending upon the shifting constraints of audience, or the changing contexts of social intentions and exchanges.

Sociolinguists and ethnographers are forever offering new examples of this role dichotomy. On the one hand people are shown to command a variety of codes depending upon the meaning situation they find themselves in. On the other hand, these same people offer up a consistent core script when they feel they are being asked to display their true identity. Some inner-city children, for instance, are able to mimic the teacher accurately on the playground, but then when isolated in a linguistic interview these same children appear to speak only a non-standard dialect. So there is continually this tension between who we think we are and what we are actually able to do. Thus the concept of role figures prominently in any consideration of collaborative learning simply because it is finally role that is the repository of the conflicting value schemes or epistemologies underlying our classroom behaviours.

One psychological theory which gives us a better feel for how role relations are governed by the dynamics of interdependence has been developed by George Kelly. This theory focuses on the nature of an individual's system of personal constructs, a series of opposed qualities (selfish-altruistic, rich-poor, religious-sceptical, dominant-submissive) used to categorize the world of social experience. Seeing how these personal constructs provide the value basis for the ways in which people come to anticipate events can help extend our understanding of collaborative learning. In viewing the role-taking self as an amalgam of personal and social constructions, Kelly emphasizes that a person's view of the world inevitably helps determine the individuality of others. Indeed he offers an updating of the seemingly paradoxical description given by Soren Kierkegaard of the instructional relationship, "all true effort to help begins with self-humiliation."10

"Humiliation" here refers not to a state of disgrace or embarrassment; rather, it signals the hierarchical nature of the roles that are normally played out in the instructional game and suggests a shift be made to some more egalitarian plane. Further, "self-" means the responsibility for initiating this shift rests with the one on top, the teacher. Yet how are we to understand such a role "reversal" in the light of conventional authority arrangements? Isn't the powerful instructor or the helper the one holding the superior position? Shouldn't the powerless student or the person receiving help be the one worrying about how to display properly deferential behaviour?

The secret, of course, lies in how we perceive and act on the roles others play in relation to our own. And in all cases our perception of the situation dominates our capacity to even receive the message sent by the other person's role. To connect requires that the teacher, helper,
oradvice-givercomprehendtheperspectiveofthestudentself,andyet
toachievethiscomprehensionone'sownroleandauthoritymustbe
heldinabeyance.Indoingsowedeflecttheabsorbingpowerofthe
authorityvestedinour"adult"role,asitistraditionallydefinedby
institutionssuchasschools,andthroughthisdeflection,thiserasure,
weprojectandadoptarole(s)appropriatetotheintentionalstates
ofthepersonwearehelping.Learners,inotherwords,aremore
receptivewhentheyinfluenceandhelpdrive theteaching.

Understandingournaturalproclivitytosociallyconstructavariety
ofselfsorrolesisasapreludetoourgetting abettergriponwhat
collaborationentailsfromtheinsideout.Ingivingustheperson's
perspectiveonhowtheworldisrepresentedandthendealtwith,
Kelly'stheoryofpersonalityhelpstocapturewhat'sgoingoninside
thelearner'shead(why,forinstance,ateacherneedstofunctionas
*servant,notsovereign),andbeginstoexplainwhyapatternof
collaborativeteacher-studentrelationscontributestolearning.In
doingthisKellyforcesustoreplaceprescriptionswithdescriptions,
reversing"ourhabitofasking(theperson)toanswerourquestions
ratherthannoticingthenatureofthequestionswhichheisasking."12

TheeleventhandfinalcorollaryofKelly'spsychology ofpersonal
constructs,thesocialitycorollaryrelatesthe"individual"tothe
"social"andthussuggeststhatcollaborationisnotamereactivitywe
somehowchoosetodo,butisindispensabletolifeitself: "Tothe
extentthatonepersonconstruestheconstructionprocessesofanother,
he/Themayplayaroleinasocialprocessinvolvingtheotherperson."13
Thepointhereisthatwhentwoormorepersonsareengagedin atask,
somesocialendeavour,theyneednotsimplybeonthesame
wavelengthorseeeyetoeye;rather,iftheventureistobe
constructive,theremustbesomemutualacceptingoftheother's
point(s)ofview,evenwhen,aswilloftenbethecase,substantive
disagreementexists.

AsKellyexplains,"thepersonwhoistoplayaconstructiverolein
asocialprocesswithanotherpersonneednotsomuchconstruethings
astheotherpersondoesashemusteffectivelyconstruetheother
person'soutlook."13Thismeansthatcollaborationisbasedonneither
commonality,norrivalry;rather,theidindividualmusthavewhatKelly
 calls"asubsumingconstructsystem."Tobeabletosubsumethe
diverseandconflictingperspectivesthatothersmighthold,wedon't
denyyourownindividuality,ratherwecommitourselvestoprocesses
ofinclusion.Weseethatoursystem ofmeaningsisloosetoapply
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our culturally expressed preferences for the values of individuality, ownership, selfishness, and competition, others are what make it all possible. And most importantly, to be an other is to in turn have the capacity to recognize and participate in the ongoing construed lives of others. Role is not reducible to a static "self-concept;" instead, role is a dynamic process, the activity of relating one set of hypotheses to another, and frequently getting our own hypotheses out of the way for a time. For the challenge is always before us: will we hold the roles of others at arm's length in order not to render our own constructions vulnerable, or will we try to remain permeable to the experience of the other?

Kelly highlights the dilemma of becoming seduced by our own viewpoints when he describes some of his early work with teachers in Kansas. Operating under a system of interpreting student behaviour which emphasized "motivation," many teachers had come to rely on the construct of "laziness" when they complained about students who were out of sync with the mandated curriculum. The root of this problem, Kelly believed, resided in "the traditional rationale of science that leads us to look for the locus of meaning of words in their objects of reference rather than in their subjects of origin. We hear a word and look to what is talked about rather than listen to the person who utters it." Thus when a teacher referred to a "lazy" child, this word became the diagnosis, and then some external treatment, some more powerful motivating agent, was supposed to provide relief. But as Kelly wondered, "What does one do to cure laziness?" The trick, of course, was to realize that "complaints about motivation told us much more about the complainants than it did about their pupils." So Kelly tried reversing the construction process by asking the teachers what the student would do if no external motivation was attempted:

Often the teacher would insist that the child would do nothing — absolutely nothing — just sit! Then we would suggest that she try a nonmotivational approach and let him "just sit." We would ask her to observe how he went about "just sitting." Invariably the teacher would be able to report some extremely interesting goings-on. An analysis of what the "lazy" child did while he was being lazy often furnished her with her first glimpse into the child's world and provided her with her first solid grounds for communication with him. Some teachers found that their laziest pupils were those who could produce the most novel ideas; others that the term "laziness" had been applied to activities that they had simply been unable to understand or appreciate.

In finding that the learning solution grows out of discovering what happens when children are left to their own devices, Kelly allows us to see that collaboration in education is very much a function of our ability to construct alternatives for any given teaching/learning event. If we are to establish a collaborative role relation with our students we will have to press beyond our immediate labels which invite closure and find ways of subsuming the student's point of view.

What we are after as educators, I would finally claim, are those social scripts which make others (learners) accessible, which encourage others to enter into interpersonal role relationships with us. Such a condition I would label mature dependency. Infants, because they are unable to survive without their parents, determine the immature end of the dependency continuum. At the opposite end is not independence as it is usually associated with individualism, but rather the kind of relationship that is possible between two friends, or two learners, or two workers, or a wife and a husband. Each case involves a kind of reciprocal dependency which in fact defines maturity (a social term) as opposed to self-sufficiency (an individual term). For obvious reasons mature dependency means risking exposure. While we realize we're not going to be perfect even a small fraction of the time, we may not necessarily have developed adequate scripts to support us through moments of anxiety and insecurity; thus, total avoidance often seems the easiest way out. From the point of view of the teacher, it is easier to set the "learning" agenda than to invest all the energy required to evoke and understand the range of students' interests and intentions. Similarly for students it is difficult to hold back and really listen to what their peers are saying. Kelly's stark description of the role options available in a specific teaching/learning situation highlights the importance of being self-less, which really means adding other selves to our own, not dominating or denying them:

A teacher examines her pupils' arithmetic papers. She may approach the task in either of two ways: she can look at the answers only, and mark them right or wrong, or she can look
and Writing to Learn.

Learning is learning itself.
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