Editors' Introduction

In this issue of *RTE*, we confront the question, Who is an author? Perhaps more critically, posing the question from both a conceptual and ethical perspective, we consider, Who counts as a co-author?

The dilemma of authorship has become a particular concern of the academy as long-standing values behind university tenure and promotion decisions have begun to clash with alternative beliefs developing within the field. Traditionally, university faculty have been evaluated according to their ability to make it on their own, as evidenced by their production of sole-authored publications. With publication often the key factor in tenure and promotion decisions in the humanities and social sciences, rare is the faculty member who succeeds without a corpus of sole-authored work. The value on individual productivity is rooted in both traditional beliefs about individualism and in (at times well-grounded) skepticism of the extent of any individual's contributions to multiple-authored projects.

Despite this emphasis on sole-authored manuscripts, there is a long-standing recognition in the academy that one does not write in a vacuum. The interrelationship of ideas has long been recognized in scholarship through the tradition of citation; an author is expected to stand, in Merton's (1965) words, on the shoulders of giants in publishing any new scholarly work. Some (e.g., Shulman, 1997) have argued that without such attribution to one's predecessors, one is not producing scholarship at all. The gesture of referencing new work in terms of old illustrates the traditional recognition that scholarship is cumulative. Good scholars, in this conception, are not only well-read and conversant with relevant thinkers but quick to acknowledge their antecedents as, to use Wertsch's (1991) phrase, their own *voices of the mind*, their internalized conversational partners and collaborators in inquiry.

Bakhtin's (1981) notions of *heteroglossia* and *dialogism* provide a strong theoretical foundation for this practice. Although introduced to describe the multi-voicedness of novels, these terms have been adopted widely to account for the ways in which all speech is necessarily emergent from prior speech and exists in relation to the social conditions in which it is produced. Heteroglossia "insures the primacy of context over text" (Holzman, 1981, p. 428). Speech is characterized by "a

multiplicity of social voices and a wide variety of their links and interrelationships" (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 263). In other words, all speech includes echoes of prior speech and is implicated in speech that follows. It is thus dialogic:

Everything means, is understood, as a part of a greater whole; there is a constant interaction between meanings, all of which have the potential of conditioning others. Which will affect the other, how it will do so and in what degree is what is actually settled at the moment of utterance. This *dialogic imperative*, mandated by the pre-existence of the language world relative to any of its current inhabitants, insures that there can be no actual monologue. (Holzman, p. 426; emphasis added).

Recognition of the dialogic nature of utterance, however, has not extended entirely to issues of authorship. Frye (1957; reported in Wertsch, 1998) has argued that the glorification of individual creativity coincided with the evolution of the copyright age, which values and rewards those who claim an idea and discourages the acknowledgment of contributions made by others to the development of a new product, which for our concerns includes scholarly writing. The copyright age encourages artists to obscure, rather than acknowledge, their indebtedness to others and to secure full rights to the patent on an idea. Through this focus on individual production, says Wertsch, "we often lose perspective about the centrality of convention in the creative process, and we view the individual artist as the main, if not sole, source of a text or other aesthetic object" (p. 18). This notion of copyright—the need

and right to claim an idea as one's own in order to secure the intellectual capital that follows from it—contributes to the academy's emphasis on sole-authorship. If, however, Bakhtin and others are right in their contention that all thought is necessarily socially mediated and therefore collaborative, then the heavy value placed on sole-authorship rests on tenuous grounds.

We think that the grounds are especially tenuous in research conducted in close conjunction with a teacher in a single classroom. We credit our attention to this issue to *RTE* editorial board member Karen Gallas, a primary school teacher in Brookline, Massachusetts for many years, a researcher of considerable accomplishment (see, e.g., Gallas, 1994, 1995, 1998), and now both the principal of and a primary teacher at the Bellevue-Santa Fe Charter School in San Luis Obispo, California. Gallas pointed out to us that in her reading of educational research, she was disturbed that university researchers often spend many hours in a particular teacher's classroom, borrow extensively from the teacher's resources and knowledge, describe innovative instruction, quote lengthy interview responses or classroom interactions, and then publish articles in which the teacher receives a note of thanks but no credit for being a partner in the research. She argued instead that under such circumstances, teachers are very much co-authors of the research because their teaching, as much as the researcher's observation, is the centerpiece of the publication and because during ethnographic studies a

teacher's insights about the classroom often become incorporated into the observer's analysis. Gallas persuasively argued that under such circumstances a teacher deserves credit as co-author even if her work conditions mitigate the opportunities she has to engage in formal analysis and writing.

We find her point to be very compelling. We see then, in addition to Bakhtin's (1981) dialogic imperative, an *ethical imperative* to be addressed when university researchers work closely in reciprocal relationships with teachers and publish scholarship based on their experiences together. In this issue of *RTE*, we would like to share Gallas's challenge with our readers and, we hope, begin a serious professional conversation about who counts as an author in certain types of classroom research.

This issue features two studies in which university teachers worked closely with classroom teachers in conducting research in the teaching of English. In each case the original manuscript was submitted under the university researcher's name only. Based on our consideration of Gallas's concern, we asked each author to think about the role of the teacher in the production of the article and to consider whether or not the teacher should be included as a co-author. In each case the university researcher, after consulting with the collaborating teacher, was delighted to submit the final version of the article as a co-authored piece.

The articles reveal different ways in which such collaborations may unfold. Suzanne M. Miller and Sharon Legge

look at changes in Sharon's students' learning about literature that coincided with changes Sharon made in her own conception of how to make meaning. Sharon's epistemological beliefs at the beginning of her career were similar to those that are reified in most classroom discussion of literature: The teacher's role is authoritative, attention to the literary text mitigates the importance of personal and idiosyncratic readings, conventions of New Criticism yield more legitimate readings than do readings produced from other sets of conventions, and analysis of the text is the most legitimate mode of school response. Following a turning point she had when she participated in a writing workshop, Sharon altered her teaching with both successful and less-successful students to enable greater opportunities for more open-ended discussion and writing while at the same time providing the scaffolding the students needed to have meaningful transactions with the texts that they read together. In their article she and Suzanne reflect on the consequences of Sharon's attempt to teach two very different groups of students in accordance with her emerging constructivist beliefs about reading literature.

Lesley A. Rex and David McEachen also report on efforts to establish a classroom culture that allows for the inclusion of diverse students. In contrast to Miller's descriptive-narrative approach, Lesley employed domain and semantic analyses of what class members said, how they acted, and what they produced to understand both how David engaged students in understand-

ing the kind of reading and thinking practices that counted in his classroom and how he provided opportunities for students to take up those practices. David's efforts were complicated by the fact that his students came from different academic tracks and consequently had had very different experiences reading and talking about texts. Lesley's analysis of eight telling cases in the critical first three weeks of David's teaching demonstrates how he renegotiated local academic literacy and students' identities. David's teaching, they argue, provides an example of how inclusion is a tenuous cultural norm that is realized in and through classroom interaction.

Our third article raises another set of ethical issues and is the result of another kind of collaboration. Before we turn to it, we'd like to stress two points. The first concerns how reified the idea of sole-authorship is. As Wertsch (1991) argues, people tend to forget that the dominant patterns of action are the results of conscious choices and instead begin to accept them as natural or inevitable. He notes further, that "it is often only when confronted with a comparative example that one becomes aware of an imaginable alternative" (p. 126). We hope that these two articles will provide that alternative. But we want to stress also that we not instituting a new policy on authorship. Instead we hope our discussion suggests the need for researchers and teachers to negotiate questions of authorship much as they negotiate other aspects of the conduct of research, taking into account the kinds of contributions each makes as part of the collaboration.

But teachers are not the only participants in educational research whose contributions could be highlighted when considering questions of authorship. Are the students in a classroom authors? Does their claim to authorship depend on their age or the roles that they take in the analysis of data? Is the research assistant who collects or analyzes data a co-author? How about the students in graduate classes who do legwork or participate in discussions that contribute to a professor's production of an article? The field appears to be acknowledging the complicated question of whose interpretation counts in research practices through increasing reliance on procedures such as member checks. Yet this recognition rarely extends to the authorship of an article.

Shelby Wolf, Darcy Ballentine, and Lisa Hill provide an alternative to the standard practice of claiming sole-authorship for work done in collaboration with students. In their article they report a study in Shelby's university children's literature class of conceptual changes experienced by her students. She invited all of her students to participate in the study not only as traditional participants but also as co-authors. Darcy and Lisa accepted her invitation. Their article considers the problematic nature of both the course content—the question of who has the right to write about a particular cultural group's experiences—and the ways in which Shelby's students grappled with that issue through their course

reading and discussions. As part of their consideration of research method, the authors reflect on difficult questions of relationship in student-teacher collaborations. In particular, the authors needed to consider how such collaborations are negotiated amidst the web of other relationships that exist, particularly advisement and grading authority that could cause students to temper their contributions to suit the teacher's agenda. Their article therefore provides both a rigorously conducted analysis of important questions facing teacher educators—how multicultural education involves awareness of issues of representation and authenticity and how education classrooms can promote that awareness—and attention to questions of how teachers and students can collabo-

rate on such an inquiry in ways that are ethical and responsible.

All three articles illustrate how the field of literacy studies can respond to both the dialogic and ethical imperatives in considering the collaborative, dialogic, interrelated nature of producing scholarship. In writing this editorial and presenting these articles, we hope to open to the field a set of questions to consider when making claims about the ownership of intellectual products and capital: Whose ideas are these? Whose name becomes associated with this work? At what point does the participant become contributor and owner? What do we stand to gain and lose with different stances toward authorship?

P. S.   M. W. S.

References

BAKHTIN, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays by M. M. Bakhtin.* (M. Holquist, Ed.; C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

FRYE, N. (1957). *Anatomy of criticism: Four essays.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

GALLAS, K. (1994). *The languages of learning: How children talk, write, dance, draw, and sing their understanding of the world.* New York: Teachers College Press.

GALLAS, K. (1995). *Talking their way into science: Hearing children's questions and theories, responding with curricula.* New York: Teachers College Press.

GALLAS, K. (1998). *Sometimes I can be anything: Power, gender, and identity in a primary classroom.* New York: Teachers College Press.

HOLQUIST, M. (1981). Glossary. In M. Holquist (Ed.), *The dialogic imagination: Four essays by M. M. Bakhtin.* Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

MERTON, R. K. (1965). *On the shoulders of giants.* New York: Free Press.

SHULMAN, L. (1997). Disciplines of inquiry for education. In R. M. Jaeger (Ed.), *Complementary methods for research in education (2nd ed.)* (pp. 3-29). Washington, D. C.: American Educational Research Association.

WERTSCH, J. V. (1991). *Voices of the mind: A sociocultural approach to mediated action.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

WERTSCH, J. V. (1998). Mind as action. New York: Oxford University Press.