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Resurrecting Winter's dilemma analysis: a democratic and collaborative approach to analysing interview data in action research.
Overview

- Introduction and contextual information about my research
- Look at the origin’s of Winter’s dilemma analysis
- Set out how it can be operationalised
- Use some examples from my work to illustrate how I am using it
- Concluding remarks
What is modelling?

• “the practice of intentionally displaying certain teaching behaviour with the aim of promoting student teachers’ professional learning (cf. Gallimore & Tharp, 1992).”

(Lunenberg et al. 2007, p.589).

• Lunenberg et al. (2007,p.597) “a powerful instrument” that can shape and influence changes in student teachers’ practice...little or no recognition of modelling as a teaching method in teacher education”.

Inspiring tomorrow’s professionals
“However, even though it may be desirable, it is complex and difficult to do and is particularly difficult to develop alone.”

Korthagen (2001 in Loughran, 2006, p.1)

“[B]eing a teacher educator is often difficult…in most places, there is no culture in which it is common for teacher education staff to collaboratively work on the question of how to improve the pedagogy of teacher education.”
Aim of the research

• To work collaboratively with a team of teacher educators from a further education college to explore their use of modelling in their practice

The three research questions

• How do teacher educators from the further education sector use modelling with their student teachers?
• What factors affect the use of modelling by teacher educators from further education colleges?
• what happens when teacher educators work collaboratively to improve the pedagogy of teacher education?
My research methodology

• Second-person approach (Chandler and Torbert, 2003, p.142)
• Research “with” rather than “on” people…” (p.143)
• Working collaboratively with a group of teacher educators based at one further education college
• Using stimulated recall interview (with teacher), semi-structured interview (with teacher) and focus group (with teachers’ students)
• Through “craftmanship” (Kvale and Brinkmann, 2009, p.260) of my research to have a “professional conversation” (p.2) with each participant about their use of modelling
Dilemma analysis

- A democratic and collaborative alternative “method for summarizing (sic) interview data” (Winter, 1982, p.166)
- Aims to provide an ‘objective’ account of the research that can be agreed by the different participants, a situation which he calls “parallel rationalities” (p.167)
- Recognises that the “formulation of practical action is unendingly beset by dilemmas” (p.168)
- Foregrounds “the systematic complexity of the situations within which those concerned have to adopt (provisionally at least) a strategy” (p.168)
Dilemma analysis
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The ‘bricoleur’ and their ‘bricolage’ (Kinchloe, 2004, p.2)

• Creating methodological rigour
• recognising that research is a ‘power-driven act’ (p.2)
• Seeking to clarify their own “position in the web of reality...and the ways they shape the production and interpretation of knowledge” (p.2).
• Bricoleurs inhabit ‘the domain of complexity’ as they seek to interpret the elaborate world we live in (p2)
• The bricolage “is grounded on an epistemology of complexity” (p.2).
• Bricoleurs ‘attack this complexity, uncovering the invisible artefacts of power and culture, and documenting the nature of their influence...on their own scholarship’ (p.2)
The 4 steps of the dilemma analysis schema (Winter, 1982, p.168)

- Analyse transcripts and create categories of “Ambiguities, Judgements and Problems”
- Create a perspective document which captures the range of responses for each of the three categories
- “Member check” (Merriam, 1998 in Lunenberg et al. 2007, p.594)
- Share the document with other practitioners and collaborators who are interested in the subject
Applying dilemma analysis to my own work

• **Judgements:** Concerning when to use modelling

• **On the one hand** there is the view that modelling should permeate a teacher educator’s practice; **on the other hand** there seems to be time pressures that shape and determine when their use of modelling is unpacked. Teacher A suggested “...it comes back to that idea that there isn’t enough time to do it in the depth that you want to do it”.
Judgements: Concerning how to use modelling

• On the one hand there is an expectation that the teacher educators should be using modelling; on the other hand there is preference for modelling those aspects of their practice they feel most confident about. Teacher A said they found modelling challenging behaviour difficult because they had limited experience of it.
Problems: concerning the pedagogical knowledge of the teacher educator

- On the one hand the teacher educator is expected to be an ‘expert’ and knowledgeable about the pedagogy of teacher education; on the other hand pedagogical knowledge is something 2 of the 3 said they were least confident about (Teachers B and C).
Concluding thoughts

• Adopts an ‘a posteriori’ (Wellington, 2000, p.142) approach to data analysis and summarises in a formal and structured way the diverse perspectives of the co-collaborators (Winter, 1982).

• The document or documents are able to “present with equal rational force and elaboration points of view which are otherwise subordinated in the usual hierarchy of status and hence of "credibility" (Becker, 1970)” (Winter, 1982, p.173).
Concluding thoughts

• It is well suited to classroom-based research because of the way it recognises two things: the complexities that surround teacher’s practice and that “formulation of practical action is unendingly beset by dilemmas” (p.168).

• For my own work, it uses some of the same language, such as like complexity and dilemmas, used by the key authors on modelling, for instance, Loughran, Berry, Korthagen, Lunenberg and Swennen.
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