■

SOCIAL CONSTRUCTIONISM, ADVENTURE EDUCATION, AND THE ROLE OF FACILITATOR IN COLLABORATIVE LEARNING

Carl Yost
Messiah College

Collaborative learning has often been held as the silver bullet to all educational ills-by simply forcing students to work together in teams, pupils will become more motivated, self-determinant, and knowledgeable, while teachers will find their jobs simultaneously both easier and more rewarding. Because social constructionism holds that knowledge derives from the dialogic interactions of peers, placing people in dialogue with each other cannot help but lead them to a greater understanding of their world. Never mind the large number of students who would rather die than work together with their peers or the number of apathetic students who relish the chance to coast along at the overachieving heels of "the smart kid" or the frustration often encountered by students who just don't understand their assignments. Clearly, we are faced with a disconnect between the ideal of collaborative learning and the discouraging reality within which many students and teachers conduct their education. Fortunately, however, another form of group education exists, which participants have found to be an overwhelming success: adventure education. I intend to bring these two fields-social constructionist theory, particularly in its applications to collabora-

tive learning, and adventure education-in dialogue with each other. My goal is to enhance writing theory, especially current theories of collaborative learning, by comparing them to experience-based learning.

Before starting, however, I offer a word of background on these two fields. Essentially, social constructionist theory holds that knowledge develops as a group of people interact in meaningful and original discussion on a topic. The pedagogical tool of collaborative learning involves the practical application that arises from social constructionist theory and theories of knowledge as a social construct. Kenneth Bruffee, one of the most notable names in the field, especially in its beginnings in the 1980s, summarizes collaborative learning by saying that it "provides the kind of social context, the kind of community, in which normal discourse occurs: a community of knowledgeable peers" (394). This dense statement contains three key concepts-normal discourse, community, and knowledgeable peers. *Normal discourse* may be best understood as dialogue, whether academic or simple daily conversation, that adheres to certain conventions to make it acceptable to the values of a particular audience. In contrast, *abnormal discourse* refers to academic conversations and dialogue that occur between separate communities, such as writing theory and adventure education. *Community* generally represents a group of people with a common purpose (Harris 12-15), though the term "discourse community" is typically used when this group is epistemological or academic in nature

Bruffee appeals to Thomas Kuhn and Richard Rorty to assert that knowledge is a byproduct of constantly reorganizing beliefs in the context of relationships between peers or practitioners of a particular discipline (399). Therefore, this understanding of knowledge is consistent with social constructionist theory, which says that knowledge develops as a group of people interact in meaning-

ful and original discussion on a topic. Collaborative learning, particularly where value-specific dialogue (normal discourse) seeks to enlighten a group of people with a common epistemological goal (discourse community), is a practical means of obtaining the desired knowledge and making it appropriate for comparison to a different sort of practical application.

My focus now turns to *adventure* education. The term adventure encompasses a vast array of outdoor activities-rock climbing, high and low ropes courses, group games and initiatives, open-sea sailing, caving, canoeing or rafting expeditions, wilderness backpacking, and many others. As my most relevant experience has been with wilderness backpacking, most of my examples will relate to this activity. In wilderness backpacking, a group of approximately twelve people spend days or weeks hiking in the wilderness with all necessary provisions on their backs, for the purpose of challenging the program's participants-physically, mentally, and emotionally-to come to a greater understanding of their own potential, of the need for community, of spiritual truth, of the value of the environment, or of whatever else the program leaders deem important.

I have accrued approximately 19 in-field days and 70 miles of experience as a participant on such expeditions, and in excess of 30 days and 60 miles of experience while serving in some sort of leadership capacity, in such diverse locales as Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Utah, and Hawaii, as well as on countless personal and recreational hiking trips. Furthermore, I have also accumulated over 500 hours of ropes course, rock climbing, games and initiatives, caving, and whitewater facilitation through two summer tours on adventure staff at Ligonier Camp and Conference Center in Ligonier, Pennsylvania and through various leadership activities at Messiah College. As a result, I feel that I have experience to speak with authority about adventure activities, and I am familiar

enough with the conventions of the field to invoke them in light of rhetorical thought.

The educational component of adventure education is summarized well by experiential educators, Jim Schoel, Dick Prouty, and Paul Radcliff. Though they focus primarily on applications for troubled and at-risk youth, in their seminal book on adventure education, *Islands of Healing*, Schoel, Prouty, and Radcliff list the following important goals of adventure education: trust building, goal setting, challenge and stress, humor and fun, peak experiences, and problem solving (37). Furthermore, the educators recognize the inherent potential of adventure education to improve more academic and intellectual spheres:

> Academic Education [can utilize] the process of Adventure to promote a more active and involving academic curriculum for school programs. Team building for the purpose of small groups solving real life problems is an example of this strategy. The Alternative Program or Alternative School is an example of Adventure Education, as is the use of Adventure in the teaching of traditional science, English, history, etc., classes. (38-39)

School, Prouty, and Radcliff are not the only one to propose this sort of integration. Over the last few years, Dr. Helen Walker, assistant professor at Messiah College, has also conducted interesting experiments that incorporate these two fields, including a ten-day wilderness backpacking excursion as an experiential foundation for a first-year seminar on writing-as-a-journey (a heavily process-model approach) and first-year seminars on writing-as-a-risk-filled-activity, in which the students participated in high-ropes activities as a physical metaphor for the emotional risks inherent in sharing writing with peers.

This paper seeks to explore justifications for such an approach and to develop a theoretical basis for juxtaposing these two fields

in order to understand and improve writing theory. Consequently, this paper will analyze the similarities between adventure education and collaborative theories of composition, paying particular attention to the role of facilitator, in order to suggest methods of improving collaborative learning practices.

Structure and Process

Adventure education resembles theories of collaborative learning in its structure and process, as well as in its goals and results. The most obvious intersection between these fields is the heavy reliance upon group work, especially where wilderness trips are concerned. A wilderness leader will often divide a group of backpackers into a number of smaller (approximately) four-member units, known as "cook groups," each of which is responsible for carrying its own food, cooking equipment, water, and even shelter. Each cook group divides up its gear among members to ensure equitable weight distribution, and all meals are prepared as a group, providing abundant time for interpersonal interaction and relationship development in the forms of idle conversation, discussion and debate, humor, and even conflict. In addition, cook groups are responsible for their own management of the functional aspects of life in the wilderness, such as rationing, pace-setting, monitoring safety, conflict resolution, engaging members with lower participation levels, and ensuring the physical and emotional well-being of all participants.

In collaborative learning, group work is no less crucial an element than it is in the wilderness, and very rarely can a pedagogy without it be even remotely considered collaborative. Despite the vastly different arena, collaborative groups perform many of the same tasks as the backpacking cook group. For example, functioning in Bruffee's "knowledgeable community of peers" includes "making and following an agenda, keeping on task, completing

tasks on a deadline, showing empathy with the needs and problems of fellow group members" (Bosworth 28) as well as "giving support and reinforcement, . . . providing carrying energy[,] and bringing out low participators" (Finkel and Monk 56). These descriptions of scholarly collaboration describe the functions of adventure education as well-the only differences lie in the nature of the tasks to complete and the environment in which the groups operate.

An important and much overlooked factor in the writing environment, however, is that groups need a clear framework in which to operate that will manage members' expectations and guide their work together. Too often, a teacher will simply allow the classroom setting to provide the context for collaborative learning in group work, which unfortunately results most often in student expectations that conform to a traditional learning format (by "traditional" I mean those models of education that have come under fire for operating under hierarchical principles, in which all knowledge development is seen as a one-way transfer from the mind of the teacher to the minds of students and in which knowledge transfer is typically presented in a lecture format). Educators Donald Finkel and Stephen Monk acknowledge the inhibitory tendency of teachers to place the weight of the entire learning experience on their own shoulders, a mindset they refer to as the "Atlas Complex," but also realize that students have now come to expect that particular model of education. Consequently, they advocate an organic process of making small adjustments and continually reorienting expectations to achieve the full benefits of collaborative learning:

> Most teachers start with a small change, which enables them to experience their teaching in a different way and enriches their view of their course as a social system containing diverse teaching functions. This step leads to alterations in their own and their student's expectations of themselves, which deepen and expand their sense of further possible steps for change in

the course. Each further step alters both their experience of teaching and their sense of what is possible. (58)

This process often occurs in adventure education as well, as participants typically come to the experience with the impression that the leader will be showing them how to successfully complete the tasks at hand. There is truth underlying this mindset at first, as there are obviously relevant instructions and safety concerns that the leader explains at the outset: while backpacking, there is a seemingly unending stream of minutiae about wilderness living-how to cook, hike, set up a tent, go to the bathroom, read a map, read the weather, estimate trail time, etc.-with which the instructor is certainly the most familiar. Once the participants have begun to grasp such practicalities, however, the instructor steps back and gives them room to experience the trip on their own terms (within reasonable limits, of course), realizing that an overly directive leadership style is one of the greatest impediments to an enlightening and personally relevant adventure experience.

For these reasons, the notions of contract and covenant can serve an important role in expectation management. Adventure activities, especially those conducted at Ligonier Camp and Conference Center, at which I worked for two summers, often use a convention known as the Full Value Contract to regulate a group by "establishing a positive standard of behavior" (*LCCC* 10), requiring all participants in an activity to agree to uphold three basic principles-working towards individual and community goals as a group, adhering to safety and behavior guidelines, and agreeing to give both constructive and critical feedback to promote positive change (Schoel, Prouty, and Radcliff 95), often summarized as teamwork, safety, and communication. For longer experiences, the group is typically given a great deal of freedom to draft the particulars of their own contract, as long as it holds roughly to the guidelines given above. Some of the primary benefits of contract-

ing as outlined by Schoel, Prouty, and Radcliff include clarified goal-setting, group cohesion, and a rational purpose for the work expected from the group (94-95), with a physically and emotionally safe environment in which participants can feel comfortable pursuing growth the eventual goal.

Ultimately, classroom educators would like to see their students comfortably pursuing academic learning as well, and here the idea of contract may serve most usefully. Joseph Harris has noted that many conceptions of the academic discourse community have failed to "state *the operating rules or boundaries of these communities* [resulting in] a view of 'normal discourse' in the university that is *oddly lacking in conflict or change*" (12, emphases added). Because teachers have failed to manage student expectations as they seek to pursue collaborative paradigms of education, the "change" and self-improvement so desperately sought by the very notion of education has repeatedly fallen short. However, if the adventure education model of contracting is any indication, were the teacher to explicitly state expectations at the outset and grant students some authority in drafting the rules and conventions of the class, traditionally-minded students would adjust to a collaborative context in a much shorter period of time required for the continual restructuring of expectations advocated above by Finkel and Monk.

The lines between collaborative classroom teacher and adventure education leader blur even further when considering the application of debriefing. Kathleen Booher uses nomenclature identical to adventure professionals when she describes the role of the teacher as "a facilitator," leading the processing and debriefing of a group's recently-completed writing assignment; she even goes so far as to suggest a list of questions to initiate group discussion, a list that resembles questions used in adventure education debriefing (Booher 43, 45-46; *LCCC* 12-15). Professor of Education Kris Bosworth rightly points out that the debriefing session is designed

to allow the students or participants to "[discuss] feelings about the group and the process" (Bosworth 28) and share the insights and the lessons they learned with each other (*LCCC* 11).

The adventure leader's duty to the group requires that she make her best effort to elicit dialogue about the group's interactions during their adventure activity, be it a ropes course experience, a group initiative, or a day on the trail, in the hope that the group will come to a greater understanding of such issues as compromise, what it means to live in community, progress toward personal goals, overcoming challenges, or caring for other people. Furthermore, the leader will typically have an idea of what a group can learn from a particular experience and will "ask leading questions to get the participants to realize their own lessons" (12).

While such a tactic may initially sound manipulative, it really serves a rather necessary purpose, not only in adventure education, but also in collaborative learning. The facilitator-whether a classroom teacher or a backpacking guide-is the authority in his particular situation and possesses the expertise for which the student participants are present, and for this reason, is entitled to guide them to a greater understanding of the subject matter. Schoel, Prouty, and Radcliff acknowledge the position of the adventure leader as one that does have many of the "answers," but tempers that with a willingness to gently and surreptitiously direct the group members to their own understanding (169). Likewise, Bruffee promotes facilitator control of the debriefing dialogue, saying that the collaborative learning teacher

> must involve engaging students in conversation among themselves at as many points in both the writing and the reading process as possible, and that we should contrive to ensure that students' conversation about what they read and write is similar in as many ways as possible to the way we would like them eventually to read and write. The way they talk with each other

determines the way they will think and the way they will write. (400)

Both Schoel, Prouty, and Radcliff and Bruffee emphasize not only the role of the facilitator, but also the need for directive leadership.

Goals and Results

Inhabiting the gray area between structure and process on the one hand, and goals and results on the other, one may discern conflict. Conflict is often a welcome aspect of an adventure program, but only for its usefulness in producing growth and, when managed properly, in turning potential disaster in the life of a group into success (Schoel, Prouty, and Radcliff 157). Conflict is a natural part of the group process and group members must learn to constructively resolve such differences of opinion in order to succeed (Bosworth 28).

However, though conflict is certainly a reality of group interactions, my experiences in adventure education encourage a more productive outlook that would see conflict not as the unavoidable nuisance that Bosworth and others make it out to be, but as an actual goal of the collaborative process. Allow me to mention two examples. As a participant on a 19-day, 70-mile backpacking trip on Kauai Island, Hawaii, I was a member of a college-age group that interacted well throughout the first week. I noted a little more tension than what would normally occur between ten individuals spending every waking moment together and can say with relative certainty that everyone was enjoying the status quo. However, after a particularly grueling 13-mile hiking day, one participant confronted the group and charged other group members with self-centeredness, initiating a lengthy discussion on group cohesion and the negative consequences of relentless individualism. While the conversation itself was not particularly pleasant, the group became

more closely-knit as a result of dealing with the issues raised by the confrontation, and the group members conducted the remainder of the trip at a much higher level of interaction and relationship.

The second example occurred while I was leading a group of ten high-school students on a week-long backpacking trip in West Virginia. This group had been experiencing similar issues of selfishness, whining, and a lack of empathy for others; however, as teenagers, they differed from the college-age students in that they didn't particularly care about their behaviors' impact on everyone else. But during a rock climbing experience towards the end of the week, a sudden thunderstorm arose while we were exposed at the top of the cliff face, threatening serious damage to our equipment and, possibly severe personal injury. Suddenly, this group of ten self-concerned high-school students became responsive, obedient, efficient, and responsible, working together to ensure the security of our gear and the physical safety of all participants, including my co-leader and me.

Without the common goal provided by the thunderstorm or the reality check inspired by the post-hike confrontation, these two groups would have never performed at their full potential. Thus conflict may serve as an aspiration of adventure education and collaborative learning. Though this may seem an unusual goal to pursue, such a concept is not without precedent in the world of composition theory. Recognizing this inherent ability of disagreement to improve collaborative learning, Harris advocates the creation of discourse communities that embrace conflict as a means of growth and as a central tenet of their existence (20; see also, Trimbur). Indeed, Bruffee's very notion of abnormal discourse requires conflict and confrontation as it "sniffs out stale, unproductive knowledge and challenges its authority" (407). Conflict may also serve as a means of rooting out the natural tendency to preserve a faulty status quo, for revealing hidden agendas, and for creating change

in the world at large (Wolf 92). Regardless of its eventual results, conflict, when managed properly by an effective facilitator, can be the most useful means of learning available in a collaborative learning context.

Thia Wolf reveals that one of the most valuable forms of conflict occurs in the tension produced when an individual confronts a new experience and interacts with conventions that fail to support it. Both she and English professor John Trimbur in particular envision students continually critiquing and reevaluating the hierarchical nature of didactic authority in traditional education. Trimbur offers an exercise for students to identify and deconstruct the classroom structure and resultant segregation implicit in definitions of literature (452-53). His strategies parallel adventure education's ability to deconstruct such issues as cultural expectations and peer-imposed social roles through participation in experiential activities. Backpacking excursions in particular lend themselves nicely to such ideological subversion, as participants find themselves removed from both the comforts and pressures of civilization, where cultural definitions of beauty, gender stereotypes, personality expectations, and intellectual demands no longer hold sway. Participants then have the opportunity to break free of the segregations promoted by such institutions and instead construct their own personal definitions of identity. The classroom setting suggests a number of parallel projects of such reinterpretation-the inclusion of extracanonical works into the curriculum, student lectures on (relevant) topics of personal interest, the creation of a new grading model that has more applicability to a particular class context, or even student development of class assignments-all of which would occur as the result of constructive conflict between previously unreconciled perspectives.

Having established a more complicated identity, the student participant is now prepared to return to the communities from

which she came. Wilderness experiences are designed to induce growth so that the participant will return home with a greater understanding of how to be a member of the communities in which she already plays a role. Summer camp experiences operate under this same principle, particularly church camps-the child comes to camp, becomes a Christian, and then goes home as a sort of young missionary, sharing his spiritual experience; though proselytizing is the goal of neither writing groups nor adventure education as a whole, the idea of personal change effecting change in others does appear in both disciplines. In an academic setting, the teacher operating under this mindset realizes that his task is not to encourage students to

> leave one community in order to enter another, but to reposition themselves in relation to several continuous and conflicting discourses. Similarly, our goals as teachers need not be to initiate our students into the values and practices of some new community, but to offer them the chance to reflect critically on those discourses-of home, school, work, the media, and the like-to which they already belong. (Harris 19)

The collaborative learning context is a valuable one, but only insofar as it changes students into more educated participants in the worlds they inhabit.

The Role of Facilitator

Thus far, we have seen many instances of the facilitator, in both an adventure and a classroom context (see especially, Booher; Flannery). The labels *teacher, lecturer, instructor*, and (to a much lesser extent) *leader* carry connotations of unremitting directive leadership, of one person standing before the students and imparting his objective, infallible knowledge for them to simply copy down and memorize, the precise traditional connotations against which collaborative learning is a reaction. The *facilitator*, on the

other hand, serves as more of a manager or mentor, guiding and assisting (but never dominating) three key relationships-those between student and student, between student and facilitator, and between the student and experience.

I advocate this more managerial role of the teacher and wish to diminish the distance between adventure facilitator and classroom instructor, which I believe is what collaborative learning seeks to accomplish; however, I also believe that some conceptions of the collaborative classroom are too soft on the sometimes (perhaps oftentimes) directive nature of the facilitator's leadership. As a result, I will now devote a portion of this discussion to the role of the facilitator in the classroom, pointing out why the facilitator must intervene strongly in order to ensure learning takes place in the classroom, rather than gently allowing the students to direct their own learning.

The facilitation of the student-to-student relationship differs from traditional educational models in nearly every way. Whereas the traditional classroom teacher needed only to keep her students silent and attentive so that they could receive her knowledge, the facilitator now must involve herself much more actively in every aspect of the group process, from conception to maintenance to dissolution. Initiation is the most critical time in the group process and the time when facilitator involvement is most crucial. Researchers Fiechtner and Davis have noted that groups tend to fail when they are too large, when they are too small, when students choose their groups themselves, when the facilitator fails to group students with a purpose in mind, or when the facilitator continually shuffles group members (61). Theoretically, collaborative learning should just happen, but if students are given excessive leeway in structuring their own community, productive conflicts such as personality clashes, imbalances between strengths and weaknesses, and ulterior social motives may overwhelm the learning

process. While group dissolution due to some of these negative consequences can be avoided by careful group selection, conflict is still unavoidable (and as seen earlier, desirable) and necessitates facilitator intervention to ensure that it has productive results on group interaction (for a discussion of interdisciplinary collaboration at Worcester Polytechnic, see Miller, Trimbur, and Wilkes 42-43). Even during an absence of conflict, however, the facilitator must still remain involved by clarifying assignments, refocusing student attention, answering questions, or even submitting some of her own knowledge to the group's processing.

Furthermore, as the teacher's presence in the classroom invariably makes him or her a part of the collaboration, the students will perceive the instructor in relationship to everyone else is the classroom, requiring intentionality in the structuring of that relationship. First of all, the students will likely come to a class expecting to encounter the traditional model of education, forcing the teacher to "call attention to own role in the classroom and how it differs from traditional classroom teaching in order to help students redefine their relationship to the teacher's authority" (Miller, Trimbur and Wilkes 42), which revisits issues of contracting and expectation management. However, as postmodernity grants no one absolute authority, the facilitator is also responsible for learning *with* the students, bringing his or her own experience to the group's discourse and allowing it to interact with the experiences of the students, so that he or she becomes with his or her pupils a co-creator of the knowledge that their conversation creates (Sperling 243).

This brings us to the relationship between a student and experience. Personal experience is arguably the most valuable element of collaborative learning because, without it, there would be no foundation upon which to base group discussion, student reflections on the issue at hand, and the subsequent development of knowledge (Fishman and McCarthy 654-59), and it is for this reason that the

bulk of the facilitator's responsibility lies in managing student interactions with experience. In an academic setting, the facilitator promotes thoughtful reflection and encourages students along some of the following experience-to-text processes:

> [analyze] real-world experience and ... render it in the text world; analyze that experience as it was (or might have been) rendered in the student's text; negotiate between real-world experience and text rendition; generalize from the specifics of experience, both real-world and text-rendered, into more universal truths; generalize from the specifics of the student's writing experience to more universal truths about the student's own writing process; and negotiate between teacher's and student's points of view, thus switching and comparing perspectives and attempting to find a creditable balance. (Sperling 243)

In this sense, the facilitator helps the student to devise meaning from personal experience, thus achieving the elusive "knowledge" that is the goal of collaborative learning. Adventure education utilizes this technique regularly by debriefing, or "the process of taking lessons from the experience and 'reapplying them (those lessons) to other situations'" (John Rhoades, qtd. in Schoel, Prouty, and Radcliff 179); this is primarily done in the context of group discussions, but journaling about an experience afterward accomplishes the same purpose of solidifying in the participant's mind the lessons learned, echoing the experience-to-text concept outlined above. Regardless of the method, reflecting upon an experience, whether writing- or adventure-related, is the key to fully utilizing the promise of collaborative learning in generating knowledge, and the only way to prevent the lament of T.S. Eliot in his *Four Quartets*: "we had the experience, but missed the meaning" (2.45).

Conclusions

This overall comparison leaves us with three needs that the already-effective model of collaborative learning can incorporate to become even more useful: productive conflict, an explicit, contract-negotiated framework particular to each classroom or group, and occasional directive leadership. The first of these, conflict, I have addressed in sufficient detail to warrant only a brief revisiting here. Conflict is essential for growth. If we want learning to take place, we must embrace it instead of viewing it as an unwelcome byproduct of group interaction. And we must manage it in effective and case-specific ways, granting the students autonomy to solve their own problems where possible, but unafraid to step in when authority is necessary.

For the idea of contracting, a personal example will serve. In my studies at Messiah College, I enrolled in an advanced writing class that generally utilized adventure principles rather well, to the point where the first class period was spent devising a list of what made "good" writing-purpose, voice, thesis, consistency, creativity, etc. Consequently, as we addressed our group assignments throughout the semester, we had a clear idea of what was expected from us and directed our writing accordingly. Just as an adventure contract provides an understanding of how group members will interact with each other, this list gave the entire class a clear indication of its goals and what the groups were expected to produce, giving a direction and purpose that made the experience a far more productive one than a class lacking such an apparent and self-generated framework. Though this example demonstrates one such method of integrating contracting and expectations management into a classroom, there are certainly as many ways to do so properly as there are collaborative groups in educational institutions across the country.

Last, I turn to the need for directive leadership in collaborative

learning. In maintaining that "knowledge is an artifact created by a community of knowledgeable peers" (405) without addressing the role of the facilitator in that creation, Bruffee reveals the greatest fallacy inherent in many forms of social constructionist theory-that knowledge can be spontaneously created, ex nihilo, by interactions among individuals. This is true, but only when a facilitator or teacher is present, someone who already possesses knowledge of the subject, and who is able to direct the pupils toward a greater understanding of the issue at hand. Just as a group of college freshmen, cast adrift in the woods with all supplies necessary for survival but lacking in camping savoir-faire, would find themselves dead within a week without a knowledgeable guide to initiate them into the discourse of wilderness survival, so a group of students would be unable to devise any relevant knowledge if their teacher were to hand them copies of *Anna Karenina* and walk out the door, leaving them to compose some meaning on their own. In order for any meaningful development of knowledge to take place, "an authoritative instructional presence" (Flannery 22) must steer the students in their dialogic interactions, allowing them to develop their own understanding of a text or a writing assignment within their own particular culture (which, owing to age differences, is likely different from that of the teacher), but also steering them in the correct direction when their interactions become harmful to group members or simply fruitless.

Although many of the guides for practical application of social theory to the classroom have acknowledged this fact, a discontinuity still exists between the application and most statements of theory. For this reason, adventure models of education have the potential to elaborate upon our current notions of collaborative learning. Experience may have indicated the lack of effectiveness exhibited by traditional models of education, but that does not allow the teacher to throw a group of individuals together and expect them to

carry out their education in a meaningful manner; the teacher is never absolved of the responsibility for learning in the classroom, regardless of what model she decides to use. Indeed, training to fulfill the role of facilitator may prove far more difficult than simply developing and delivering a lecture, and it is for this reason that we must fully consider the implications of, and the best methods for implementing, collaborative theories of learning.

Works Cited

Booher, E. Kathleen. "A Writing Teacher's Guide to Processing Small-Group Work." *Focus on Collaborative Learning: Classroom Practices in Teaching English*, 1988. Ed. Jeff Golub and the Committee on Classroom Practices. Urbana: NCTE, 1988. 43-46.

Bosworth, Kris. "Developing Collaborative Skills in College Students." *New Directions for Teaching and Learning* 59 (Fall 1994): 25-31.

Bruffee, Kenneth A. "Collaborative Learning and the 'Conversation of Mankind.'" Villanueva 393-414.

Eliot, T.S. "The Dry Salvages." *The Complete Poems and Plays*, 1909-1950. New York: Harcourt Brace & World, 1971. 130-37.

Harris, Joseph. "The Idea of Community in the Study of Writing." *CCC* 40 (1989): 11-22.

Fiechtner, Susan Brown and Elaine Actis Davis. "Why Some Groups Fail: A Survey of Students' Experiences with Learning Groups." Goodsell, et al. 59-67.

Finkel, Donald L. and Stephen Monk. "Teachers and Learning Groups: Dissolution of the Atlas Complex." Goodsell, et al. 50-58.

Fishman, Stephen M. and Lucille Parkinson McCarthy. "Is Expressivism Dead? Reconsidering Its Romantic Roots and Its Relation to Social Constructionism." *College English* 54 (1992): 647-61.

Flannery, James L. "Teacher as Co-conspirator: Knowledge and Authority in Collaborative Learning." *New Directions for Teaching and Learning* 59 (1994): 15-23.

Goodsell, Anne S., et al., eds. *Collaborative Learning: A Sourcebook for Higher Education*. University Park: National Center on Postsecondary Teaching, Learning, and Assessment, 1992.

Ligonier Camp and Conference Center (LCCC) Ropes Course Instructor's Manual. Ligonier, PA: LCCC, 2002.

Miller, Judith E., John Trimbur, and John M. Wilkes. "Group Dynamics: Understanding Group Success and Failure in Collaborative Learning." *New Directions for Teaching and Learning* 59 (1994): 33-44.

Reagan, Sally Barr, Thomas Fox, and David Bleich, eds. *Writing With: New Directions in Collaborative Teaching, Learning*, and Research. Albany: SUNY P, 1994.

Schoel, Jim, Dick Prouty, and Paul Radcliffe. *Islands of Healing: A Guide to Adventure Based Counseling*. Hamilton, MA: Project Adventure, 1988.

Sperling, Melanie. "Speaking of Writing: When Teacher and Student Collaborate." Reagan, Fox, and Bleich 227-245.

Trimbur, John. "Consensus and Difference in Collaborative Learning." Villanueva 439-56.

Villanueva, Victor, Jr., ed. *Cross Talk in Composition: A Reader*. Urbana: NCTE, 1997.

Wolf, Thia. "Conflict as Opportunity in Collaborative Praxis." Reagan, Fox, and Bleich 91-110.