

Teacher Research and the Teaching of Writing in Urban High School Classrooms in the U.S.

Denise Patmon, Associate Professor, University of Massachusetts/Boston, MA - USA

Richard L. Freed, Latin Teacher, Boston Latin Academy, Boston, MA – USA

Josh Katzman, English Language Arts Teacher, Charlestown High School, Boston, MA - USA

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this article is to examine an action research program model supported by specific teacher designed research inquiry projects concerning the teaching of writing in diverse classrooms in two schools in Boston, MA. Since 2010, Patmon's research study funded by the Calderwood Writing Initiative, has explored how providing teachers with time, space, composition theory and practice, teacher research methodology, and expert facilitation creates a context for teachers to deeply explore questions concerning the teaching of writing that they themselves identify. Action research remains an under-utilized method for teacher professional development in the United States and is at the core of Patmon's work. In this article, Patmon presents the program overview, review of research concerning teachers as researchers, core principles of her work, and describes her focus on Face Theory to focus teacher researchers' lens. Next, two teacher researchers (i.e. Freed and Katzman) share their Calderwood Teachers as Writers inquiry projects. Freed's study examines how to improve students' use of textual evidence and analysis in a Latin language classroom. Katzman's study explains his use of personal narrative writing in relation to positive psychology in his 10th grade English course. Data for all studies has been collected by both structured and unstructured approaches, continuously analyzed and interpreted to improve delivery of writing instruction at all levels. Patmon, Freed, and Katzman recommend that similar teacher-centered, action research professional development communities be created to focus on improving the practice of literacy instruction in K-12 schools.

Key Words: teacher research, professional development, teaching in urban schools, literacy instruction, teaching writing and Latin instruction, narrative writing, Endo/Patmon's Face Theory

PROGRAM OVERVIEW

Founded in 2003 as the bequest of U.S. philanthropist Stan Calderwood, the Calderwood Writing Initiative is dedicated to improving the teaching and practice of expository writing. In 2010 Dr. Denise Patmon, along with Boston Writing Project colleagues, wrote a successful multi-year grant which supports the Calderwood Teachers as Writers Program at the University of Massachusetts/Boston. The Teachers as Writers Program admits ten teachers per year to participate in an intensive professional development action research experience. Teachers from public, parochial, and independent schools from all disciplines and grade levels are welcome to apply, with those who are selected known as Calderwood Writing Fellows. Admission into the program is highly competitive.

To date, 48 teachers have successfully completed the Calderwood Fellowship in Writing Program resulting in 240 graduate credits awarded to teachers by the University of Massachusetts/Boston. The courses provide teachers with opportunities to:

- advance their professional knowledge and skills through engagement with existing research and theory in composition
- investigate current instructional practices and trends in the teaching of writing to all students
- learn and conduct rigorous, inquiry-based practitioner research concerning questions that arise from thinking critically about their work and its context
- take action in their classrooms to promote student learning and well-being, and pursue social justice in their schools
- develop theory with colleagues and the broader education community about the teaching of writing
- serve as a contributing member in an intellectual community of colleagues

The first of the two courses is a comprehensive weeklong summer institute, which begins in July and meets daily from 8:30am-4:30pm. This graduate level course is designed to equip teachers at all grade levels and academic disciplines with knowledge and skills to effectively teach expository writing. The course provides Calderwood Writing Teacher Fellows with opportunities to study research, to read composition theory, to write, to question and to investigate their instructional practices and current trends in the teaching of writing. Fellows take an inquiry stance to develop a classroom-based research study, which they explore the following school year. Course content is delivered through experiential, participatory and process-oriented strategies that build inquiry and reflective practices in the classroom. The summer institute is a three-credit graduate course.

In the second half of the program, Calderwood Writing Fellows meet monthly to discuss the progress of the research inquiry project they have designed during the former summer session. The purpose of this 3 credit graduate course is to introduce teachers to methodology and methods of teacher research, characterized by a careful documentation and analyses of one's practice over time. Calderwood Writing Fellows ask critical questions, analyze methods, develop and execute their projects while working as intellectual thinking partners with colleagues in their cohort. Teacher Researchers in this program visit each other's classrooms in their respective schools throughout the Greater Boston area.

All Calderwood Writing Fellows who successfully complete both courses and all aspects of the program of study receive a \$1,000 stipend and six (6) graduate credits. In addition, the Trustees of the Calderwood Foundation provide three (3) monetary prizes, totaling \$6,000 for the best research essays.

REVIEW OF RESEARCH

“On Teacher Inquiry”

Inquiry is a deep, sustained method of professional learning that includes documenting, learning and sharing the experience and outcomes with other educators. Teachers gain a deeper understanding of teaching and learning by engaging in an academically rigorous, hands-on, research-based approach, investigating a question that has arisen from their practice. Teacher inquiry allows practitioners to make adjustments to practice. These beliefs

serve as the core of this program. Cochran-Smith and Lytle (2004) define practitioner inquiry “as a kind of conceptual umbrella to overview a number of different forms of practitioner-based study of teaching, teacher education, and related issues (p. 601).” The definition expands to note:

Inquiries of K-12 teachers and prospective teachers, often in collaboration with university-based colleagues, who work in inquiry communities to examine their own assumptions, develop local knowledge by posing questions and gathering datum, and—in some versions of teacher inquiry—work for social justice (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2004, p. 607).

Bickel and Hatstrup (1995) state, that inquiry is a way in which knowledge is generated by both the local school community and larger educational community. Other terms used to describe teacher inquiry include “action research,” “self-study,” “narrative inquiry,” “the scholarship of teaching and learning,” and “the use of teaching as a context for research” (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2004, pp. 603-604).

Teacher inquiry in the context of this study is aligned with the work of Lieberman (2002) who asserts that the best practice in professional development allows teachers to talk about the way they think, initiate change in their classrooms, go public with their knowledge and practice, and are thinking partners for fellow colleagues. It is this “collegial practice” whereby teachers are active participants in research and support that is meaningful to them and not seen as “conduits” of information where the professional development “expands cognitive complexity, leads to thoughtful planning and reflective practice, and increases teachers’ satisfaction with their work” (Lieberman, 2002, p. 79). Teacher inquiry in the Calderwood Teachers as Writers Program is connected to teacher transformation and change in classroom practice. It respects the teacher as thinker, scholar, and generator of knowledge.

On Endo/Patmon’s “Face Theory”

Teaching in culturally diverse urban classrooms in the U.S. creates unique opportunities and challenges. Who we are and how we see and speak about ourselves and our realities have a

tremendous impact on our relationships within and outside of our classrooms, particularly in the teaching of writing. As one teacher in a colleague's school noted, "What you speak is who you are in the U.S." Issues of identity and language development are central to the pedagogy of the teacher practitioner, particularly those teachers from cultural backgrounds representing the dominant culture, which in many instances in urban U.S. do not reflect the majority of the cultural backgrounds of their students.

Born out of the work of Endo Shusaku, late Japanese author with whom Patmon studied, Endo's Face Theory was originally designed to help Japanese writers and readers analyze character roles in fiction. The role of literature in Japan may serve the purpose of eliciting conversations about tough subjects through the voices and experiences of characters in stories. When we ask Americans why they read fiction, responses range from – "I read fiction to escape reality, I read fiction to learn about a different place/situation, I read to imagine..." In Japan, the protection of family honor is so critical in its cultural context that talk about intimacy and personal challenges beyond the family is absolutely off limits to discuss with a wider audience. Endo argued therefore, that the Japanese novelist has a particular responsibility to provide readers with opportunities to gain various perspectives about any one issue from the experiences of characters in their stories to serve as a springboard for inquiry and discussion of real life challenges. Hence, Endo proposed that this literary character analysis be done through the exploration of FACES that we all don at different times throughout our lives.

The FACES are:

- Outside Face – the face we don to the external world; the face we use to negotiate our way through life on a day to day basis.
- Inside Face – the face we don to those with whom we are intimate.
- Pure Face – the self-reflective face that only you see.
- Unknown Face – the face that is inside of us that only reveals itself under extraordinary circumstances.

Having learned this theoretical construct from Endo when he was alive, Patmon has altered and applied this paradigm to assist Calderwood Writing Teacher Research Fellows to reflect about their classroom practice, philosophy, and pedagogy concerning the teaching of writing, particularly in reference to their inquiry projects. The key question for Calderwood Writing Fellows to ponder was: What is happening with writing instruction in my classroom?

- OUTSIDE FACE – What does a visitor notice/observe about writing instruction once he/she enters my classroom space?
- INSIDE FACE – What do my students and I recognize about writing instruction that is unknown to the outsider's eyes?
- PURE FACE – What do I, alone, see about my writing instruction?
- UNKNOWN FACE – What might be a true surprise to me about my writing instruction? What new risk(s) in expository writing instruction might I try which is connected to my Calderwood Inquiry Project?

TREATMENT

Patmon uses this Face Theory as a core principle for her action research work. The research of Moffett and Britton are other cornerstone theorists impacting the work of this Calderwood Teachers as Writers study. The 3 basic areas of expressive, transactional, and poetic writing constructs are married to the ideas of face as an image of the self as a teacher of writing in the classroom. Calderwood Writing Fellows apply the aspects of Patmon/Endo's Face Theory to the examination of their classroom practice to deepen consideration of what, how, and whom they teach concerning expository writing. Richard Freed and Josh Katzman were Calderwood Writing Fellows during the 2014-15 year and document their action research studies herewith.

FREED'S TEACHER INQUIRY PROJECT

How can students in a Latin language class (L2) use expressive writing to improve their use of argument and evidence in L1 expository writing?

This study examines how to improve students' use of textual evidence and analysis in a Latin language classroom. Students in an upper-level Latin Poetry Honors class at Boston Latin

Academy (Massachusetts, U.S.A.) were asked to write a series of expressive and expository writing assignments. Students who are more personally engaged with a text are consequently better able to understand and explicate that text, particularly when they attend to their own metacognition. By recording their own personal thoughts and reactions to the text first by writing in what Britton (1970) termed an expressive mode, students kept track of their understanding, and then felt more comfortable writing about the text. As a result, students became better able to explicate the text in expository essays. Not only did students' subjective ease with writing expository essays improve, but their use of textual evidence in support of an argument also improved in objective observation and evaluation by a teacher.

Introduction

One of the main goals of the high school where I teach is to prepare students for higher academic study. Teaching students how to write an expository essay is a core skill in most college/university courses. Yet students struggle with expressing their own ideas in academic writing and often resort to regurgitating someone else's ideas, or worse still, plagiarizing. How can students learn to express their own ideas in the format and tone required in an academic essay?

In my summer session with the Calderwood Teachers as Writers Program, I had a chance to reflect on my own practice as a teacher of writing. Even though I teach Latin, I nevertheless think of myself as a teacher of students first, and only second as a teacher of a certain subject area. As a result, helping students learn how to write is a critical concern of mine—particularly, how to write expository essays. I had noticed in previous years that students struggle to formulate their ideas into a concise thesis statement, and also struggle to muster textual evidence to support their ideas. I wondered how I could better help them write essays.

At the same time, I also frequently see teenagers grapple with their identity and place in the world, as they struggle with the basic psychosocial problem of ego identity vs. role confusion, as they seek to answer existential questions, such as "*Who am I?*" and "*Who can I be?*" This essential struggle of the adolescent has been described by Erik Erikson (1968) among other child development psychologists, and is important to consider in any secondary education.

Review of Research

Endo's Face theory, as explicated by Patmon (2009), gives us a critical lens that can help us view such questions of identity. Endo's Face theory can help students not only learn about their various Faces, but also help them to improve their expository writing. During an immersive summer week together with my Calderwood Fellows, I confronted one aspect of my own self: the Unknown Face. I had never conducted an inquiry research project like this before. My university training is as a Classicist, a philologist. I am a trained Latin teacher, not a researcher of pedagogy. It was unknown to me what I would find as I began to conduct research on my own teaching, and sought to find answers to questions such as: How could I help my students improve their academic essay writing? How could they write better essays in English about the Latin texts they were reading?

The theories and research of James Moffett (1968) and James Britton (1970) provided the theoretical underpinning for my inquiry project into writing.

Working at the University of London's Institute of Education, James Britton asserted that reading and talking and writing are complementary processes. After reviewing thousands of student writing samples, in order to devise a means of classifying writing according to the demands placed on the writer, Britton posited three modes of language: expressive, poetic, and transactional. These three categories are not a distinct trichotomy, and Britton suggests that they are transitional categories along a continuum.

transactional ← expressive → poetic

Expressive language is "language close to the self," and is primarily written-down speech, in which the voice of the author stays in the writing. Students feel most comfortable using language in the expressive mode, since it most nearly reflects their daily experience. As the use of language moves away from the private and into the public, it changes towards either a poetic or transactional mode.

Poetic language exists for its own sake or to please the writer. It is the language of pleasure, being, and becoming. It is the language of poems, plays, drama, and stories.

Transactional language aims to instruct, persuade, argue, or theorize. Transactional language is language to get things done. In an academic setting, the essay and the article are typical forms of transactional writing.

Britton's contemporary teacher of English in the United States, James Moffett (1968) suggested that there is a "spectrum of discourse," that includes four modes: Reflection,

Conversation, Correspondence, Publication. Moffett's modes of discourse form a progression moving from inner to outer, from private to public.

Basing my work on Britton's idea that students find writing in an *expressive* mode easier, that's where I planned to start. Then, following a progression similar to the one Moffett envisioned, I wondered whether writing in an expressive mode first and frequently would then result in better expository essays, which use language in a *transactional* mode, as well.

Setting

Although Josh Katzman and I both teach in the same urban Boston Public Schools (MA, USA) district, our high schools have a different student population. Boston Latin Academy (BLA) is an exam school, which means that students must pass an entrance test to be admitted. The mission of BLA is to prepare students for higher academic study at the college/university level. We serve over 1,700 ethnically diverse students in grades 7-12. Of our graduates, more than 85% attend a 4-year college/university. More than 90% have immediate plans for tertiary education.

Given the nature of my school, expository writing is highly valued. Yet students at my school struggle with academic writing no less because they have passed an entrance test. Academic writing is hard for high schools students, and a skill that needs to be developed. As Bartholomae (1986) suggested, each student has to "invent the university" every time he/she writes an essay. Therefore, it was my objective to help students become better at writing expository essays.

Student population

N = 24 students, aged 17-18, in a Latin Poetry Honors elective course (4th or 5th year of L2 study). Time Period: School year 2014–2015.

Hypothesis

I hypothesized, that students who first write in an expressive mode about texts would become more personally engaged with those texts, and would consequently be better able to understand and explicate those texts. I posited that expressive writing could be used to help students explore and learn, and then subsequently express their ideas more clearly in expository writing. Observations were made in two ways: (i) through students' own

subjective self-reporting, and (ii) through teacher observation in student use of textual evidence to support their arguments.

Treatment

Students wrote a variety of expressive writing assignments at the beginning of a class period. Some of these were “free writing” exercises at the start of a class, in which students wrote expressively to a prompt, without fear that their work would be collected, graded, or critiqued. Other expressive writing exercises encouraged gathered reflection at the end of a class, connected to some aspect of the text under discussion. Each student was asked to keep a journal notebook in which they would write their responses and keep them. In addition, regular metacognitive writing exercises were also part of this journal notebook. These metacognitive exercises asked students to attend to their own personal development, to their own connections to the texts, and to their own writing. There was also a series of expository essays assigned on the texts read, including selections from the Latin poems of Catullus, Horace’s *Odes*, and Vergil’s *Aeneid*.

Findings

My findings suggest that a progression of writing, starting with expressive writing and then moving towards academic expository writing, results in students being more comfortable with writing scholarly essays, and with observably stronger use of evidence in those essays. Students reported more subjective ease with writing expository essays. In addition, their use of textual evidence in support of an argument also improved in the objective observation and evaluation by a teacher.

In their reflections, students wrote statements such as these:

“Latin Poetry Honors (LPH) [this course] has probably developed my writing more. I’ve figured out how to include Latin evidence to back up a statement and I’ve been able to explain it. I’ve really liked writing in this class because I don’t have to be formal when I write (unless otherwise stated), I can write the way I speak and that gives me freedom I don’t have in other classes, besides creative writing.”

“Latin Poetry Honors has affected my writing in many ways. Before LPH citing evidence was always a very hard task for me. In LPH I learned the proper way to quote evidence and the appropriate places to put the evidence in my essay. I also learned how to use context to give the audience an idea on what the evidence mean. Latin Poetry Honors has also helped to improve my analysis. I am now able to make a more detailed

analysis.”

“This class has helped me integrate more evidence in my writing no matter what the subject is.”

From my perspective as a teacher, I went from reading essays that contained zero Latin quotations and only a vague thesis statement to paragraphs like this:

Horace says that a man who is pure will never have to worry about anything, he will always be safe in any situation because his conscience is free. “integer vitae scelerisque purus non eget mauris iaculis neque arcu...” He specifically says that an “untouched” man will never need any weapons, because being good will bring good into your life. He then clues in to the fact that he is a virtuous untouched man, because of his incident in the woods. “namque me silva lupus in sabina, dum meam canto Lalagen”. He says that he was in the woods singing about his love Lalage and the wolf ran away from him, which is unheard of. He implies that although he was walking beyond the boundary, because he was an “untouched” man he could walk without any anxieties. He matches what he says the benefits of an untouched man are, with his own experiences.

Conclusions & Next Steps

Although many Latin teachers ask their students to write expository essays in English, there is little discussion in the field about ways to teach writing. My research this year suggests that initial writing in an expressive mode can help students make a personal connection to the text, which subsequently helps them write better expository essays.

KATZMAN’S Teacher Inquiry Project

Introduction

Stories are a fundamental part of being human. We craft the narratives of our lives subconsciously, continually editing and revising. What happens when these narratives don’t tell the story we like? We become depressed, anxious. We fail to reach our goals. Positive psychology is a proposed remedy to these ills, an approach to life that gets people to focus on their greatest character strengths, ultimately helping them flourish. This study was conducted by teaching students key elements of positive psychology and having them apply those principles to their own narratives, as well as analyses of literary works.

*There are these two young fish swimming along, and they happen to meet
an older fish swimming the other way, who nods at them and says,
“Morning, boys, how’s the water?” And the two young fish swim on for a*

bit, and then eventually one of them looks over at the other and goes,

“What the hell is water?”

- David Foster Wallace, This Is Water (2005)

As a human being, Sajad impressed me from the day I met him. As a student, Sajad struggled mightily. He is a relatively small, thin kid, which belies the fact he is older than most of his classmates. He is polite and respectful. He is hardworking. Still, Sajad was clearly uncomfortable speaking aloud, his English skills not very strong. Who could blame him? Just a couple of years before, he had moved from Baghdad, a fact whose meaning I did not fully appreciate until I asked him to tell me his story.

The story that most people involved with education in America will hear about Sajad comes down to what he *lacks*. It is a narrative of numbers. As an English Language Learner (ELL), he lacks confidence in the language of instruction at Charlestown High School. As a student at Charlestown High School, an urban school in Boston, Massachusetts, with about 1,000 students, most people see that he is part of a group of students that, in aggregate, rank in the 7th to 9th percentile on state-wide standardized test scores - a group of students that typically do not fare well on the SATs, a college-entrance exam. This story most often involves numerical scores on tests, and final grades. My work through the Calderwood Teachers as Writers Program sought to revise this story. I sought out to explore, and tell, the story of Sajad (and other students) not as *pupils*, not as numbers (Endo’s “outside face”), but as *people* (Endo’s “inside face,” and potentially the “unknown face”). By doing so we are able to see a much richer picture of these students’ strengths. By doing so, teachers are instilled with *passion* to teach every child. By doing so we begin to recognize the “water” that connects human beings across culture, age, language, or economics.

Approaching this work with my students was based on two distinct principles that I saw as intricately intertwined. First, there were the lessons of psychology, espoused by Seligman (2000, 2011), a method of approaching life that examines the means through which human beings *flourish*. It asks people to reflect on their greatest *strengths* and use those in ways that will increase PERMA (**P**ositive emotions, **E**ngagement in life’s activities, strengthening personal **R**elationships, finding **M**eaning, and the ability to recognize and appreciate

personal Accomplishments). By increasing PERMA, people are able to lead happier, more fulfilling lives, regardless of personal or economic circumstances. Second, was the belief that stories are not only an important, fundamental characteristic of being human (Gottschall, 2013), but are also an effective means of building empathy and positive relationships with other people (Keen, 2006, 2010). Built into this is the understanding that telling our stories in writing has significant therapeutic benefit, as demonstrated by Pennebaker (1999).

I have the honor of working with the same students for two consecutive years. In our first year together, Sajad taught me the power of story on a day that I struggled to find a way to, yet again, tell him that what he had written in response to the text we had read in class, just didn't make sense. These exchanges often featured *a lot* of me asking, "*Do you understand?*" Usually he didn't, but *a lot* of smiling and head-nodding can too often suffice as understanding in a classroom with many ELLs and students from a wide-range of personal backgrounds. From a growing sense of frustration, I simply asked him to tell me his story from Iraq. From there, with Sajad's English almost stuttering, our exchange went something like this:

"I worked at a, you know, a place, a mahal."

"What's a mahal?"

"You know, it's like a place, like a store. I sold chickens."

"You sold chickens?"

"Not really. Sort of. I kind of cleaned and the people liked me and I made money for my family. You know, it is like the Chicken Spot [a restaurant that serves fried chicken near our school. Almost every kid stops there before and after school]

"Oh. It was like a restaurant."

"Yes! A restaurant!"

"How old were you?"

"Nine."

I was captivated by this tale. For the next fifteen or twenty minutes, I was enthralled as Sajad told of his childhood in Baghdad. The next day, after struggling to complete assignments all year, he arrived with the following piece for me to read:

There is a young boy who used to work at a chicken store in Baghdad. And he was 9 years old. He was the only young boy to work for his family to get money. He used to work hard and was happy when he get the money to his family every month. He work at the store for 3 years to help his family and he used to be happy all the time b/c he get a lot of money and his family used to like him b/c he work hard to help them. He changed his family's life from poor into kind of rich. He used to go to school from 8:00 am to 12:00 noon and then after he would go to his work. He went back to his house at 9:00 pm and he did all of that to help his family by earning money. People used to come to the store to buy chicken from him and make him have money. He make the customers happy when they come to the store he said asalum alakom to greet each customer. He make his family to buy what they want on that 3 years he was keeping all the money that he get from his work. At the store he used to be so proud of himself that he get a lot of money.

It was as if a new student had emerged. Every day he arrived with more parts of his story to share. His confidence grew. At the beginning of our second school year together, I had all of my students explore their own character strengths by taking the VIA Survey, an online questionnaire that assesses a person's personal character strengths (created by Seligman, available at www.viacharacter.org). We then wrote *Who Am I* pieces, personal narratives that explored student's core identities by describing specific events from their lives. The main instruction was for students to frame this around their strengths. Among Sajad's greatest strengths were gratitude and hope. Here is an excerpt of Sajad's piece, in which he highlighted these characteristics:

One day i went to work with no money. I was about 11 years old. I saw a little game for my sister's to play with i walked inside the store to buy the game. When i tried to get the money out putting my hand inside my pocket I realized there was no money inside my pocket. I sat down and started to crying I apologized and I said am sorry to my sister's I asked the employed at the store "can you save this game for me" he said "you can take the game and then after work bring the money to me and if you don't it okay". I stood up hugged the guy and said thank you".

Sajad's writing has continually improved as this school year continued and we've kept our focus on personal character strengths. He was able to connect lessons from texts to the lessons of his own life, to see his strengths being played out in the stories of others. He was empathetic and thoughtful about the lives and stories we read (most of what we read in class was nonfiction). What surprised me the most however, was Sajad's reflection on what he had learned from the book *Unbroken*, and how this focus on his strengths and shaping his own narrative had helped him make positive decisions that directly impacted the way in which he was living in the present. *Unbroken* is the story of Louis Zamperini, a "difficult" kid, who, with the support and encouragement of his brother, Pete, became an Olympic runner. Here is part of what Sajad wrote of his experience reading the book:

In class I learned how to write my own stories I used to don't know how to write my own stories but getting into that class and challenging myself to write my stories. How to compare my life to other characters life I compared my life to Louie Zamperini and see the similar between us. The Unbroken book taught me a lot one of these things was how to take step by step and don't just jump on it. How to challenged things like Louie Zamperini Louie challenged the ocean 47 days fighting sharks that was one of the biggest challenge . . . how to figure out things with other students I worked with other students to figure out words that we don't know by reading the text and butting [putting] the word where it belong and we did it and both of us were happy about this because the words were so hard to find but we did it with each other. In the writing center Josh [a student in our class who has autism] asked me to help him and I did help him to send his letter to Mr. Katzman I just did what Pete did to his brother Louie and helped him to be a good runner and he became a champion. That was me being Pete and helping Louie. These things helped me a lot and I think they will help me in the future they will help me in the future by thinking about them and how he was a brave person and never gave up on life.

Findings and Next Steps

Just as he had inspired me by telling his story, it was with this piece, that Sajad began to help me answer the question posed by the fish in David's Foster Wallace's piece at the beginning of this paper: "*What the hell is water?*" Sajad was showing here that *water* is a recognition of all the bonds that connect us as human beings, a recognition of the need to do well by others.

Here was a student who had grown up in Baghdad, with limited English, supporting a student with autism, who had been born worlds away in Boston. Both had experienced significant trauma in their lives, but here they were, helping one another *flourish* in a classroom. And Sajad spoke to how this connection, this swimming in the “water” of life, would help him lead a fuller, happier life in the future. As a teacher, this helped me redefine what Education meant. I no longer looked at Sajad as simply a pupil. His value was no longer shaped by a number on a test or a grade on a report card. His stories had connected us. His stories had moved the water between us and added richness and fullness to *my* life. I was able to look beyond the narrative of numbers. *That* is the power of story and positive psychology along with Face Theory in the classroom.

OVERALL REFLECTIONS

Anzaldua (1990) states that, “Face is the surface of the body that is the most noticeably inscribed by social structures. We are written all over – carved and tattooed with the sharp needles of experience.” Professional development and helping Calderwood Writing Fellows take an inquiry stance with their research projects helped teachers transform their classrooms, their pedagogy, and themselves. Classroom based protocol for teachers as researchers developed in the U.S. based on Japanese literary theory reflect the globalization of education in today’s times. The adaptation of Patmon/Endo’s Face Theory applied in real classrooms with real teachers struggling with real issues locates action research professional development in Japanese literary tradition in this instance – a global shift in thinking. Creating teacher research groups for the exploration of classroom practice in a collaborative fashion enriches all who are involved. Such a creative intellectual community of teacher practitioners as researchers results in transformative improvement in practice.

Other Calderwood Teacher as Writers Voices

“It [Face Theory work] gave me a new paradigm for thinking about and new language for talking about the culture of relationships and classroom teaching.”

“”Endo’s Face Theory requires multiple points of view on one’s work. Face Theory work allows us to stand in different places at different times to look at our work which must constantly change as it remains the same.”

“Face Theory work can transform a classroom teacher to see with new lenses.”

WORKS CITED

- Anzaldúa, G. (1990). *Making Faces, Making Soul/Haciendo Caras: Creative and Critical Perspectives by Feminists of Color*. San Francisco, CA: Aunt Lute Books.
- Bartholomae, D. (1986). Inventing the University. *Journal of Basic Writing*, 5(1): 4-23.
- Bickel, W.E., & Hatrup, R.A. (1995). Teachers and Researchers in Collaboration: Reflections on the Process. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32(1): 35-62.
- Britton, J. (1970). *Language and Learning*. London: Allen Lane.
- Cochran-Smith, M. & Lytle, S. (2004). Practitioner Inquiry, Knowledge, and University Culture. In Loughram, J.L., Hamilton, M.L., LaBesky, V.K. & Russell, T. (Eds.). *International Handbook of Self-Study of Teaching and Teacher Education Practices*. (pp. 601-649). Dordrecht: Kower Academic Publishers.
- Erikson, E. H. (1968). *Identity, Youth and Crisis*. New York: Norton.
- Gottschall, J. (2013). *The Storytelling Animal: How Stories Make Us Human*. NY: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
- Hillenbrand, L. (2014). *Unbroken: An Olympian's Journey from Airman to Castaway to Captive*. NY: Random House.
- Keen, S. (2006). A Theory of Narrative Empathy. *Narrative*, 14(3): 207-236.
- Keen, S. (2010). *Empathy and the Novel*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lieberman, A., & Wood, D.R. (2002). *Inside the National Writing Project: Connecting Network Learning and Classroom Teaching*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Moffett, J. (1968). *Teaching the Universe of Discourse*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.
- Patmon, D. (2009, December). The Multiple Faces of the Classroom: Using Endo's Literary Face Theory for Critical Teacher Reflection. In *The 21st Annual Conference of the Japan-United States Teacher Education Consortium (JUSTEC)* (p. 31).
- Pennebaker, J. W., & Seagal, J. D. (1999). Forming a Story: The Health Benefits of Narrative. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 55: 1243-1254.
- Seligman, M.E.P. (2011). *Flourish: A Visionary New Understanding of Happiness and Well-being*. New York, NY: Free Press.

- Seligman, M.E.P. & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive Psychology: An Introduction. *American Psychologist*, 55, 5-14.
- Wallace, D. F. (2005, May 21). *This Is Water*. Commencement speech. Kenyon College. Gambier, OH.