

Hallitzky, Maria; Kinoshita, Emi; Spendrin, Karla

Joint object – diverse perspectives. (Hidden) normativities in a dialogue between a teacher and researchers

Hallitzky, Maria [Hrsg.]; Mulhanga, Félix [Hrsg.]; Spendrin, Karla [Hrsg.]; Yoshida, Nariakira [Hrsg.]: Expanding horizons and local connectedness. Challenges for qualitative teaching research and development in intercultural contexts. Bad Heilbrunn : Verlag Julius Klinkhardt 2025, S. 243-265



Quellenangabe/ Reference:

Hallitzky, Maria; Kinoshita, Emi; Spendrin, Karla: Joint object – diverse perspectives. (Hidden) normativities in a dialogue between a teacher and researchers - In: Hallitzky, Maria [Hrsg.]; Mulhanga, Félix [Hrsg.]; Spendrin, Karla [Hrsg.]; Yoshida, Nariakira [Hrsg.]: Expanding horizons and local connectedness. Challenges for qualitative teaching research and development in intercultural contexts. Bad Heilbrunn : Verlag Julius Klinkhardt 2025, S. 243-265 - URN: urn:nbn:de:0111-pedocs-341971 - DOI: 10.25656/01:34197; 10.35468/6193-20

<https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0111-pedocs-341971>

<https://doi.org/10.25656/01:34197>

in Kooperation mit / in cooperation with:



<http://www.klinkhardt.de>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Dieses Dokument steht unter folgender Creative Commons-Lizenz: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nd/4.0/deed.de> - Sie dürfen das Werk bzw. den Inhalt vervielfältigen, verbreiten und öffentlich zugänglich machen, solange Sie den Namen des Autors/Rechteinhabers in der von ihm festgelegten Weise nennen und das Werk bzw. diesen Inhalt nicht bearbeiten, abwandeln oder in anderer Weise verändern.
Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

Terms of use

This document is published under following Creative Commons-License: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nd/4.0/deed.en> - You may copy, distribute and transmit, adapt or exhibit the work in the public as long as you attribute the work in the manner specified by the author or licensor. You are not allowed to alter or transform this work or its contents at all.

By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.



Kontakt / Contact:

peDOCS
DIPF | Leibniz-Institut für Bildungsforschung und Bildungsinformation
Informationszentrum (IZ) Bildung
E-Mail: pedocs@dipf.de
Internet: www.pedocs.de

Mitglied der:



Maria Hallitzky, Emi Kinoshita and Karla Spendrin

Joint Object – Diverse Perspectives: (Hidden) Normativities in a Dialogue between a Teacher and Researchers

Abstracts

EN

In the German context, teaching practice and teaching research are often organised differently in terms of personnel and structure. Although they share a common interest in improving teaching, the concrete (and necessarily normative) ideas of what is ‚better‘ can differ. In the analysis – focused on a lesson – of a cooperation between a teacher and a research team, the partly explicit, partly implicit normativities that emerge in the various phases of the dialogue about observations are detailed and discussed in their relationship to each other.

DE

Unterrichtspraxis und Unterrichtsforschung werden im deutschen Kontext oft personell getrennt und strukturell unterschiedlich organisiert. Sie teilen zwar das gemeinsame Interesse an einer Verbesserung des Unterrichts, wobei allerdings die konkreten (und notwendigerweise normativen) Vorstellungen des ‚Besseren‘ differieren können. In der Analyse einer – auf eine Unterrichtsstunde fokussierten – Kooperation von einer Lehrerin mit einem Forschungsteam werden die sich in den verschiedenen Phasen des Dialogs über Beobachtungen zeigenden, teilweise expliziten, teilweise impliziten Normativitäten herausgearbeitet und in ihrem Verhältnis zueinander diskutiert.

PT

No contexto alemão, a prática pedagógica e a investigação pedagógica estão frequentemente divididas em termos de pessoal e de estrutura. Mesmo partilhando o interesse comum de melhorar o ensino, as ideias concretas (e necessariamente normativas) do que é “melhor” podem ser diferentes. Na análise de uma cooperação – focada em uma aula – entre uma

professora e uma equipa de investigação, as normatividades parcialmente explícitas e parcialmente implícitas que emergem nas várias fases do diálogo sobre as observações são analisadas e discutidas na sua inter-relação.

JA

ドイツの文脈において、授業実践と授業研究は、それをだれが担当するのかという点で分け隔てられており、異なる構造のもとで組織・運営されている。授業実践と研究の両者は、授業を改善することに対して共通した関心をもっているが、「改善」についての具体的なイメージ(と、また当然のごとく避けがたい規範)は異なっている。ある女性教師が研究者のチームと共同で実施したひとつの授業時に焦点を当てたプロジェクトでは、観察についての対話のさまざまな段階にあらわれる、ときに明白でまたときに示唆的なさまざまな規範を検討し、その関連について議論をおこなった。

1 Introduction: Normativity in professional cultures

Both teaching and classroom research work on and engage with the same phenomenon: lessons that take place in everyday school practice. However, teaching and research on teaching are quite different activities: While teaching essentially co-constitutes lessons as a phenomenon, research constitutes a certain perception of lessons from a more observational position. Although both activities can be carried out by the same person (a teacher who observes and researches his or her teaching), in our (German) context, there is a tendency of a personnel distinction between teaching and classroom research. Hereby, teaching and conducting classroom research are considered as different professions.

These two professions are not only institutionalised differently¹, but also have developed specific professional cultures regarding goals, practices and activities². These professional cultures – among other aspects – (re-)produce the objectives relevant for the particular professional activity and thus constitute a specific normativity in regard to what is important and what is to be attained. In the following, we reflect on differences, commonalities and interactions between teaching practice and research on teaching, regarding how they

1 School teachers are bound to the local school administration, which is assigned to the so-called Ministry of Education. Researchers are usually localised at universities or other research institutes which are generally assigned to the Ministry of Science.

2 According to the understanding of practice theory (e.g., Reckwitz 2003: 285f.), we regard 'cultures' as sets of practices, patterns of understanding the world and dealing with it, which are formed by groups of interacting people and form these groups at the same time (Valsiner 2003; Spendrin & Hallitzky in this volume).

deal with normative orientations concerning teaching, observing a process of dialogical teaching research and development.

As a shared object between the two professions, the further development of teaching and lessons might be important for both teachers and educational researchers, nevertheless the concrete normative measures of this ‘improvement’ can be far from identical. With this shared aim, several approaches of development-oriented research and/or research-based lesson development have emerged, which place the two professional cultures in relation to each other and are based on the specific relationships between the two groups of actors³ at the same time. In this article, we will briefly sketch some of those approaches of interprofessional collaboration in Germany (part 2). This overview will focus on the position of these approaches in regard to the different normativities suggested by the respective reference systems *science* and *school practice*. In the main part of this article, we will show in more detail how we deal with a lesson in an interprofessional dialogue: In the portrayed project, we developed a specific form of communication between the two reference systems, aimed less at interfering with each other’s practice, but rather at mutual observation at the border of different normativities and professional cultures (part 3). Assuming that (professional) cultures are neither homogeneous nor essential, we expect them to change when situations are established in which they come into interaction (Fuchs 2001: 80–83). The final considerations of this article are therefore aimed at reflecting on the question of what happens to the different normativities in the interprofessional dialogue (part 4).

2 Types of development-oriented teaching research in Germany

When describing approaches of development-oriented research and/or research-based lesson development that have emerged in Germany over the last decades, there is, as always, “no position above all positions” (Fuchs 2001: 83) from which we could give a ‘neutral’ description. Furthermore, as researchers (in our current positions), we are bound to describe these approaches from a researcher’s perspective. Therefore, we refrain from discussing the *general*

3 Besides differing normative measures in particular professional cultures, several (partly not immediately obvious) institutional differences complicate the relation between research and practice: Teachers and researchers are bound to different working conditions and frameworks that might impede the cooperation: Teachers tend to be ‘lone fighting’ in the classroom while researchers often work in teams; teachers often seek for (fast) solutions for special problems while researchers aim at generalisable findings; teachers strive for appreciative teacher-student relationship and students’ successful learning in daily ‘face-to-face’ encounters while researchers find or position themselves in a relatively distant scientific community and so on.

perspective of school practice or general normativities of every school practice. However, when introducing our own work and a specific interprofessional dialogue in part 3, we will report our observations of *concrete* normativity in specific school practice.

The constitutive characteristic of the approaches to be described here is that they relate to two reference systems – school practice on the one hand and scientific research on the other (Einsiedler 2010: 60f.). Especially in German educational studies, difficulties in connecting theory (or research, respectively) to school practice are traditionally emphasised and widely discussed (Horstkemper 2013; Stark 2004). However, behind the complaint about these difficulties stands a double demand that has been raised for scientific research in general (at least, in the German discussion): to meet certain within-science-criteria of ‘objective’ knowledge generation (Daston & Galison 2007: 34) as well as to be relevant and instructive for the development of the examined outside-science-practice (Meseth 2016: 474f.).

Pedagogical normativities have traditionally been placed in a contrast to the scientific criteria of knowledge generation, resulting in a dichotomous notion of normativity and empirical research, which assumes that normative positions exclude an empirical description, and that an empirical description must refrain from normative positions (Balzer & Bellmann 2019: 24-27). In contrast, we have shown that normativity in empirical research on teaching is inescapable (Hallitzky et al. 2014), and that pedagogical normativities have specific valences⁴ for and in empirical research, simultaneously enabling and limiting scientific observation (Hallitzky et al. 2018; Herfter et al. 2019). Furthermore, when not only referring to inner-scientific aims of generating knowledge, but also to the aim of ‘improving’ or ‘developing’ teaching, the reference to specific pedagogical normativities is already inherent in this endeavour. In approaches of development-oriented research or research-based lesson development, the tensions and contortions involved in being a ‘servant of two masters’ (Meseth 2016: 487f.) thus become clearly visible.

In the past, a one-sided directional relationship from scientific theory and empirical research to practical action has been assumed and a rationality gap between research and practice has been associated with it (Wolff 2008: 234f.). However, recent positions emphasise that social sciences do not provide a

4 We understand (research-related) valences as the implications that certain research decisions (e.g., the selection of a research question, a theory, a case, etc., in this case especially: pedagogical normativities that frame research) have for other research decisions. In qualitative research in particular, we assume that valences cannot be used to describe linear-deductive derivations, but rather continuous adjustments (Strübing et al. 2018: 86) of various necessary decisions within research processes.

principally better, but rather a different kind of knowledge compared to the already existing knowledge in society (ibid.: 236).

Systematising Lesson Study in German-speaking countries (Hallitzky et al. 2021), we used the relation of particular projects to the different reference systems (science and school practice) as an essential differentiating criterion to describe these approaches. We could find projects that direct their interest mostly to the reference system of school practice, for example Lesson Study-projects concerned with school-based development of single lessons (e.g., Isak 2016; Kullmann & Friedli 2012) or focused on the further education of the participant teachers (e.g., Gervé 2007; Gruber 2019). On the other hand, there are projects that are mostly oriented towards the reference system of science and thus focus on the description of classroom-interactions (e.g., Kuhn et al. 2011) or on examining effects of research-based lesson development (e.g., Rzejak 2019).

In the current context, however, we would like to focus on those projects that are not primarily oriented towards one reference system, but rather refer to objectives from both reference systems. These projects aim to combine instrumental (school practice oriented) and conceptual (scientific knowledge oriented) benefits. Using the categorisation introduced by Beywl et al. (2015: 141f.; see also Hahn et al. 2016), these projects could be located in between the polarities of instrumental and conceptional benefit. In such projects that try to balance objectives of both reference systems, we distinguish two ways of dealing with these demands, involving different structural arrangements of communication⁵: ‘joint lesson development’ on the one hand, and ‘observing each other’s practice in dialogue’ on the other hand.

In projects that conduct ‘joint lesson development’, both teachers and scientists are involved in the lesson planning to varying degrees. In some cases, lesson concepts are designed by scientists and only implemented by teachers. Projects of these kind refer to the concept of Lesson Study (e.g., Hofmeister et al. 2019) as well as to the approach of “didactical development research/didaktische Entwicklungsforschung” (e.g., Einsiedler 2010) which connects itself to the international discussion on Design Based Research. In these projects, the balance of influence between teachers and researchers seems very asymmetrical as both lesson development and research on these lessons are in the hands of researchers and are thus conducted in a rather exclusive mode (Beywl et al. 2015: 143f.). On the other hand, there is a long tradition of pro-

5 This distinction between arrangements of communications and/or roles can be regarded as somehow similar to the dimension “social production mode” in Beywl et al. (2015) systematic. Yet, whereas these authors are referring to the arrangement of roles and participation in the research process only, we have focused on differences in the participation in both lesson development and research.

jects in which teachers and scientists develop and plan the lessons together (e.g., Klafki et al. 1982; Svoboda 2019; Wallner 2019). In these projects, both researchers and teachers are involved in the scientific as well as in the practical field, which places high demands on the design of the cooperation processes. These demands have been reflected most extensively in the presentation of experiences of the 'Marburg Primary School Project' (Klafki et al. 1982). Concerning the role of different normativities, the specific aims of the respective lessons – e.g., knowledge about sights in London (Svoboda 2019) or students' abilities to communicate effectively in partner dialogues in a foreign language (Wallner 2019) – tend to become core constructs of scientific observation. Projects with the arrangement of 'observing each other's practice in dialogue', which include our own project, do not involve the joint development of lessons, but rather the mutual observation and the discussion about the different perspectives on situations in lessons. Thus, we aim less at creating a joint practice of lesson development and/or research than at describing the different practices (Hallitzky et al. 2021: 161f.). In insisting on different practices as delimitable areas, borders between the familiar and the unfamiliar (Cappai 2010) in professional cultures are maintained rather than dissolved (Spendrin, Mbaye & Hallitzky 2023). Following Schäffter (1997), diffusion of contexts is not what has to be attained in interculturality: In facing borders and in making them perceptible, experiences of difference can be gained and used as learning opportunities, and crossing these borders enables reflective access to the own practice in passing its internal horizon by adopting an external perspective (Schäffter 1997: 30). Thus, in our project, teaching and learning are observed from an external perspective, from the reference system of science. The teacher in turn observes this external perspective. In this dialogue, the possible difference of normativities in the respective reference systems is not easily resolved, but brought into a discussion in which researchers as well as teachers gain access to a reflective external perspective. Even though observations are communicated as observations from a particular perspective (and not for example as facts, suggestions or advice for improving teaching or research respectively), tensions stemming from established social hierarchies and/or long-established misunderstandings between scientific research and school practice (Wolff 2008: 234-237) might be implicitly powerful. Observing the practice of the interprofessional dialogue might therefore reveal, in which way different professional cultures and their inherent normativities are related to each other in the process of constructing meaning about lessons and their development.

3 Different normativities of teacher and researcher perspectives: A dialogue about a lesson

In this part, we present an example of an interprofessional dialogue from our project “Talking about Lessons” as a series of encounters of different professional normativities in the (first-order) observation of teaching in the different professional practices and (second-order) observations on these observations. Therefore, it is critical for our project to remain sensitive to, and to respect, each other’s profession-related normativities, taking an observational attitude inquisitive about what will be unveiled about the normativities of teachers and researchers. In the following, we focus on the process of a dialogue on an exemplary lesson with a female teacher (Ms. Kieres) who held the lesson. Thus, both the teacher and we as researchers are seen as protagonists of the dialogue.

The initial focus for the collaboration was a certain compatibility of the thematic interests. The teacher was interested in how to promote students’ participation and their contribution of their own perspectives in discussions on literature. This interest proved to be not identical, but compatible with our (more general) research interest in processes of individualisation and collectivisation in classroom interactions.

Starting from this point, we videotaped and transcribed some lessons of German Literature held by Ms. Kieres. Concerning a chosen lesson, we exchanged interpretations and reflections on the interpretations several times (for details see Hallitzky et al. 2022). Ms. Kieres’ first contribution to the dialogue was a systematic description of the lesson plan and its didactical concept (see below, 3.1; Kieres 2022a). After we provided her with the video records of the whole lesson and chose some sequences for further discussion, she added a reflection on how the lesson had proceeded (see below, 3.2; Kieres 2022b). We then provided a detailed scientific interpretation (see below, 3.3; Spendrin et al. 2022), on which she commented again (see below, 3.4; Kieres 2022c). As part of a (preliminary) final discussion, she contributed with a reflection on the whole process (Herfter et al. 2022).

In the centre of the teacher’s reflection, concepts of ‘successful teaching’ are repeatedly raised (Kieres 2022a: 38; Kieres 2022b: 46f.; Kieres 2022c: 89f.). In the different stages of the dialogue, she refers to her aims in the lesson and to ideals of teaching, thus pointing to specific normativities. Therefore, we trace the reflection process of both the teacher, and us as researchers, in order to analyse which understandings of a ‘successful lesson’ are shown. In this way, (potentially) different normativities in teaching and research are reconstructed.

3.1 The teacher's lesson concept and structure: "The discussion of the three characters is based on the objective..."

The teacher begins her lesson concept with the description of *institutional settings*: subject, grade, type of the course as advanced, school type, and material as predestined by the state ministry and curriculum (Kieres 2022a: 37), basing her lesson planning upon these institutional conditions and organisational norms for her practice. Further on, she refers to literary and didactical characteristics of the classical drama to be addressed in the lesson, which are also determined in the institutional setting. This is shown in her description of the lesson aims: "Using the tragedy 'Mary Stuart' [...] as an example, the students are supposed to understand the classical conception of the human being" (Kieres 2022a: 37)⁶. Until this point, she positions herself in a functionary role responsible to the institution, to which she must obey. This functionary role is also suggested by the dominance of the passive construction in the description. Additionally, she describes her analysis on the material "Mary Stuart", examining *the literary as well as didactical meaning and aims for the students* in more detail. These cultural assets frame a fundament of her lesson conception. What and how to teach follows the literary order, for example: "With the aim [...] the tragic potential also needed to be explored in connection with the drama's second main character" (Kieres 2022a: 38). Based on a literary explanation by Dahnke and Leistner (1985) she continues showing her conceptual lesson preparation including more concrete aims to be achieved by the students in each part of the lesson. She focuses on three advisors of Queen Elizabeth I. and their positions on the execution of Maria Stuart: "The examination of the three characters followed the aim of making Elisabeth's conflict imaginable" (Kieres 2022a: 38). Articulating the aims of the unit in this way, she follows classical procedures of school pedagogy (e.g., Meyer 2020) and literature didactics (Leubner, Saupe & Richter 2016). Thereby, she presents herself as a subject teacher and as an expert in the scientific field and the school subject of literature.

Thus, different normative orientations show in the lesson concept, such as institutional, subject- and literature-related, and didactical norms.

As mentioned above, the text on the lesson concept is dominantly written in the passive construction. Ms. Kieres' personality as a teacher is not revealed in it, rather she presents herself as responsible for an educational mandate specified in the curriculum of literature. Characteristics of the students or the

6 All citations from the book "Unterrichtsforschung und Unterrichtspraxis im Gespräch" (Hallitzky et al. 2022), in which some aspects of the dialogue between the teacher and our research group have been originally published, were translated by the authors.

class are still not taken into account in her planning and concept at this moment.

In the second part of the chapter, methodical decisions and settings are concretised in detail based on the objectives of the lesson: the framework of the lesson, learning and teaching materials as well as tasks along the lesson process. Ms. Kieres arranges them around her general aim “to further develop students’ competence in evaluating actions, behaviour and motives of literary characters” (Kieres 2022a: 39). To achieve this aim, she plans interactional methods along the lesson process, especially a group work for 20 minutes. Each small group consists of three to four students with different abilities concerning discussion, sum-up, and literary competence. The expected role-taking was intended to promote a result-oriented work and to provide support for pupils who struggle to engage independently with a literary text. Finally, each student should be able to present the results to the class (ibid.: 39f.). This means that every student has to achieve the common aim of the lesson by taking different ways. In this context, she leaves institutional settings, but rather orients her pedagogical concept to foster individual and joint learning processes. The normativity articulated in that part of her planning is not primarily based on institutional or literary-scientific norms, but more on her specific didactical or pedagogical goals and principles.

After the recording of the lesson, we invited Ms. Kieres to promote our inter-professional dialogue on the lesson in an intercultural context⁷. We shared some materials such as the recorded video, a rough transcript of the whole lesson process and detailed transcripts of three selected scenes⁸. Now our dialogue begins.

3.2 The teacher’s reflection on the lesson: “The anticipated path of cognition is therefore the teacher’s, not the students’ one”

In the reflection on the lesson (Kieres 2022b), the teacher traces its process, setting her focus on two main aspects: Firstly, the results of the lesson in com-

7 Cooperating with Hiroshima University, we were trying to contrast German and Japanese perspectives on the lesson and observe each other’s observations (see Hallitzky et al. 2022).

8 As an orientation to the reader, it is necessary to give a brief overview on the lesson process: The lesson was separated into eight phases in the rough transcript: (1) introduction, in which the students discussed the constellation of the characters based on an chart presented with the OHP, (2) preliminary discussion to characterisation of three advisors, writing one word for each advisor on the blackboard, (3) assignment to the group work for the characterisation of the advisors, (4) conducting the group work, (5) group presentation and discussion of group results, (6) dilemma discussion that evolved out of the characterisation of Shrewsbury, (7) concluding discussion on the characterisation of the three advisors, changing some of the words that were found in phase 2 and (8) final part of the lesson with transition to the break time (Hallitzky et al. 2022: 121f.).

parison to the aims that she had set, and secondly on the activation and participation of the students in terms of individual engagement with the literature (Kieres 2022b: 43), relating both aspects to her own didactical means, e.g., her assignments. She discusses these two main normativities – the focus on content-related aims (see part 3.1) and the students' participation – with regard to their (non-)achievement across the different phases of the lesson.

Starting from the opening discussion, the teacher expresses her dissatisfaction with low student participation (Kieres 2022b: 43). Even though she acknowledges that the participating students express complex ideas as well as individual and unexpected interpretations, she is concerned with the inactivity of many students (Kieres 2022b: 43f.) and feels responsible for the students' inactivity. She identifies the reason for the low participation in her inaccurate or missing clear task instruction and its intransparency, which consequently excluded the students "from the anticipated mental order that I had created in the planning" (Kieres 2022b: 44). The teacher recognises that the prepared tasks had not been made accessible for the students:

"On the one hand, the task did not communicate the purpose of dealing with the schematic representation of the figure constellation, and on the other hand, no criteria were negotiated according to which the validity of the given presentation could be examined. [...] The inactive group of students may have found themselves in the situation of not knowing what was required of them due to the lack of clarity of purpose or goal" (ibid.).

Concerning the normativities, both in terms of intended results and students' participation, she concludes deficits that relate to an 'unclear task'.

This pattern applies not only to her analysis concerning the introductory phase of the lesson, but also, for example, to the second phase, in which the students were asked to describe the three advisors with one word each:

"At this point, it must be noted that it is again not made transparent to the students why the classification should be carried out. The anticipated path of cognition is therefore the teacher's and not the students' one" (Kieres 2022b: 44).

Again, she expressed dissatisfaction with the actual results of this phase of the lesson (ibid.: 45) as well as with only half of the students actively participating, attributing this problem to the missing clarity of the assignment (ibid.).

In regard to the group work, she assesses the results in a mixed way: Although some students were able to come up with individual and autonomous interpretations, their contributions deviated to a great extent from the lesson objectives, by not relating the characterisation to Queen Elizabeth's decision-making, but rather to the character of Mary Stuart. Again, the lack of explanation of the aim and meaning of the task is considered as the reason for this:

“It was not made sufficiently clear that the examination of the three characters served the goal of showing which concepts in the person of the advisors influence Queen Elizabeth’s decision and on whose dependence she finds herself” (Kieres 2022b: 46).

In terms of participation and results of different students, she acknowledges that “the quality of results showed significant differences. This suggests that the quality of the work process also varied and that some of the students were not involved in analysing the text actively enough” (ibid.: 45). She attributes this not only to an insufficient supervision of the group work by the teacher (ibid.), but also to the fact that she had not made her considerations on organising the groups according to the different abilities of the individual students transparent by clearly assigning tasks (ibid.). At this point, she also articulates some alternative decisions that could have solved the identified problems.

In the conclusion of her reflection regarding the literature-related objectives, the teacher acknowledges that the students were finally able to develop a common position concerning the values and principles represented by each of the three figures – nevertheless, the connection to Queen Elizabeth and her decision-making was not established, so that the results of this lesson could not be connected to the process of exploring the piece of literature as a whole (Kieres 2022b: 46f.). In terms of participation, she recognises that

“in principle, the students were given various incentives for individual discussion [...]. However, it must be noted that for quite a number of students these incentives were not sufficient to really activate them, neither in the plenary discussions nor during the work in small groups” (ibid.: 47).

In this reflection, different norms become apparent: In some points, the (methodical) lesson plan itself is regarded as a norm, e.g., when Ms. Kieres refers to phases in the lesson that took much more time than planned. However, this argument is never justified by referring to the lesson plan in itself, which in turn is not set as an unquestioned or unquestionable orientation. Rather, references to the lesson plan are always connected to the normativities of the (didactical and subject-related) aims of the lesson. Furthermore, the norm of involving all students in the discussion process and therefore providing incentives for individual engagement with the figures to all students, is strongly and repeatedly articulated in this chapter. This norm is also connected to the subject-related goals of the lesson, e.g., when the teacher discusses the disparities in the quality of group results: In this way, she shows her normative point of view to a successful lesson, in which every student has to fulfil the common goal of the lesson despite different competencies identified already in the lesson planning.

In attributing the different problems to her assignments, the clarity of assignments advances to a (secondary) normativity, which in her perspective seems to be an indispensable condition for the quality of the lesson process seen in the normative light of subject-related aims and students' participation. This (secondary) norm of clarity, however, can be specified in more detail: Firstly, it contains the demand to relate the task to the didactic aims and objectives that it is intended to serve, explicating the intended insights to the students. This does not only refer to the single lesson, but also to the thematic context of the lesson, and might involve the need to make reasons for methodical decisions transparent. Secondly, clarity refers to providing (and advance thinking of) criteria for the intended results of a certain assignment.

In lesson planning and reflection, the teacher shows at least two different forms of role-taking as a teacher, an institutionally formal, which subjects herself to social and administrative goals, and an individual pedagogical or didactical position, which claims pedagogical responsibility for the students' participation and engagement in the learning process. In her planning and reflecting, she relates institutional, scientific and didactical general norms to her own observation of the students in the class. The latter perspective implies her pedagogical norm in a specific class situation, expressing a common aim for all students while the way to reach it could be optimised for each student. The participation of all the students in the classroom discussion can be seen both as a prerequisite and as an indication of achieving this goal and thus as a self-stitched norm to be fulfilled by the teacher.

3.3 The researchers' analysis: Uncovering a huge effort to simulate an open discussion

Our, the researchers', interpretation of the lesson focused on processes of individualisation and collectivisation⁹ as well as on the interactive constitution of the lesson content. Starting from a praxeological perspective (e.g., Reckwitz 2003, or more related to teaching: Reh, Rabenstein & Idel 2011), we aimed at reconstructing the lesson interaction and the process of sensemaking. Hence, we took a descriptive stance, which is normally connected to the (scientific) norm of avoiding (didactical, pedagogical or other lesson related) normativities. Yet, we are aware that focusing on individualisation and collectivisation sets a specific value on the question of the formation of persons and groups in lessons. In the same way, looking at the interactive construction of the lesson content valorises the (possible) object(s) of teaching and learning (in contrast to, for example, observing the interaction in terms of social order). Never-

⁹ For a further explanation on our understanding of these concepts, see Spendrin & Hallitzky in this volume.

theless, in our research we try not to be prescriptive in relation to the forms, methods or concrete aims of teaching and learning.

In relation to Mrs. Kieres' lesson, we firstly did a segmentation analysis (Dinkelaker & Herrle 2009: 54-64, see also Leicht in this volume) in order to choose some scenes to be interpreted in more detail. As the international cooperation project, in which the analysis was included, addressed 'teacher questions' as the object of research, we identified scenes in which these questions seemed specifically interesting and prevalent (see below). Using an adapted version of the method of addressation analysis (Rose & Ricken 2018), we interpreted the interaction in the selected scenes on a turn-by-turn basis, using heuristic questions that enabled us to elaborate on the interactive positioning of persons as well as on the interactive construction and framing of the lesson content (see Spendrin & Hallitzky in this volume).

The first segment we chose was a part of the preliminary characterisation of the three advisors, in which the students were asked to find one describing word for each character. Our main point in the interpretation of the segment was the balancing of the interaction between an openness of the discussion (results) and a subtle steering towards a result previously known by the teacher, as she was trying to lead the students to focusing on the value systems of the advisors (Spendrin et al. 2022: 56f.). In this balancing, the teacher was described as taking an ambivalent and therefore fragile position:

"The students should become aware of something already definite, which is why the discussion must be steered (by the teacher) – at the same time, they should come to this awareness by themselves, which is why the steering must not be obvious and a certain openness to results must be maintained in the discussion. For this reason, the teacher on the one hand positions herself within the discussion, for example through contributions framed as her individual interpretations [...]. On the other hand, by factually directing the discussion, determining the legitimate space for results and maintaining sovereignty over the results to be noted [on the blackboard], the teacher also assumes a position as a steering authority outside the discussion community" (ibid.: 58).

Regarding the second segment – a part of the discussion of the group result on the characterisation of 'Burleigh' – we further described the ambiguity and fragility of the teachers' position. In this discussion, the teacher needed to refer to (her) historical knowledge in order to explain Burleigh's ideal of political leadership, facing the problem that the students "do not come up with the solution (as if it were) by themselves" (Spendrin et al. 2022: 62). In this moment, an impulse by the teacher ends up becoming an elaborated 'lecture', a repetition or further elaboration of which is then even requested by a student (ibid.: 61f.). The established relation between openness and steering of the

discussion becomes unbalanced, making it clear that there had not been a 'real' openness of the discussion beforehand either:

"In order for a certain literature-related knowledge to be acquired, that would enable the students to expand their previous understanding, no actual 'open-ended' discussion could be held, but it was necessary to create this openness 'fictitiously'" (ibid.: 62).

Thereby, it became clear that students should not only adopt given knowledge, but also develop the ability to participate in literature-related discussions: "Only this objective explains the interactional 'effort' with which the openness of the discussion is repeatedly tried to be maintained in the necessarily orchestrated teaching arrangement" (ibid.: 64).

Finally, in the conclusion of our interpretation, we connected these considerations with theoretical concepts of education:

"The ambiguity and instability of the teaching mode thus reveals, theoretically reformulated, a specific constitution of autonomy-oriented pedagogical practice: the dialectical relationship between the structural asymmetry of knowledge and the objective of independent thinking is actualised here in a teaching and learning process *arranged* as an *independent* discussion process of the group" (Spendrin et al. 2022: 64).

In terms of normativities, we refer to the orientation to autonomy and independent thinking on the one hand. On the other hand, in trying to describe the fragility of the teaching and learning mode, we implicitly seem to refer to norms of stability, order or clarity that appear as the implicit counter-horizon, as characteristics of the interaction that appear jeopardised, but (therefore?) important. However, in relating our description to theory and (their) normativities, we focus on general or structural phenomena, not so much on the individual teaching process or practices, which are here treated as an actualisation of general dialectic relations.

After we had written down a (preliminary) version of our interpretation text, we handed it over to Mrs. Kieres, along with the question: "What do the interpretations mean to you? Do they have any relevance for you?"

3.4 Teacher: "... the uncovering of an essential role conflict of teachers"

In her reflection after reading our interpretation, Ms. Kieres begins with a preliminary remark, in which she emphasises that it was "immensely beneficial to be able to observe my own lesson virtually under the microscope and in slow motion through videography and transcription" (Kieres 2022c: 87). In

her view, this microscopic perspective differs substantially from ‘usual’ ways of reflecting teaching on a day-to-day basis, enabling her to capture unexpected processes in the lesson and their reasons, as well as to gain a lasting future perspective on her own teaching (ibid.).

Concerning our interpretation, Ms. Kieres recognises that we uncovered an inevitable role conflict of teachers, which she has especially experienced in teaching literature (Kieres 2022c: 89): The conflict between the aim of fostering individual (and therefore: different and subjective) interpretations of literature on the one hand, and needing to subject these interpretations to an objective assessment (using standardised criteria) on the other hand (ibid.). This reflection of the role conflict is interestingly attributed to teachers in general, therefore acknowledging our focus on structural relations and dilemmas in autonomy-oriented teaching. Turning to her own teaching, she recognises that it had been her aim in the analysed lesson, that the students felt taken seriously as readers and saw the teacher as one reader amongst others, enabling an “authentic engagement with literature” (ibid.). This marks a clear decision in terms of normativity, prioritising pedagogical norms (individual thinking) over institutional structures (need for assessment). However, she still positions herself (as before) inside the norms of the educational system, as she explicitly refers to a passage in the curriculum which underlines her pedagogical norm (of enabling individual interpretations) and thus supports her decision. What we observe here, is that the teacher needs to position herself in relation to different institutional normativities, which happen to become contradictory in her day-to-day practice: On the one hand, the curriculum sets the pedagogical objective of an authentic engagement with literature, which on the other hand is systematically hindered by the need for objective assessment.

Yet, in reading the interpretation, the teacher becomes aware that despite of her decision and aim to foster individual thinking and to take students seriously as readers, that “this endeavour is ‘undermined’ by myself, [...] but not primarily through actions and statements [...] that overtly postulate authority” (Kieres 2022c, 89), but rather that she subtly gives up (or is forced to give up) the desired role as a reader amongst others.

Already in the interpretation of the beginning stage of the lesson, she recognises the inner tension of her double roles and her attempts “to wriggle out of this tension and make progress by taking sneaky routes” (Kieres 2022c: 90). Comparing our interpretation to her own reflection, she recognises that not only the missing clarity of the assignment (see above) was a problem, but that “additionally, my intrapersonal meandering course attributed to the lengthiness of the discussion” (ibid.).

Concerning our interpretation of the second segment, when the relation between openness and steering gets out of balance and she positions herself

– and is positioned by a student – more as a lecturer than a fellow reader, she states that in this interpretation she is confronted with a “clear offender profile” (Kieres 2022: 91). In spite of our framing that as a structural problem of the dialectics of knowledge asymmetry and the aim of fostering independent thinking, she attributes her lecturing as “an uncontrolled moment of self-presentation” (ibid.): “Obviously, here it was more important to me to ‘solitarily’ elaborate knowledge than to maintain the discussion community” (ibid.). She articulates the need to control these impulses considering the question “how many students drop out of the process of gaining insights in such moments” (ibid.: 92). In terms of normativity, she clearly prioritises the relation between teacher and students, not as an end in itself, but as a necessary precondition for the students’ cognitive activation and their construction of knowledge. The (acknowledged) necessity and responsibility for knowledge elaboration is assigned a somewhat smaller priority (ibid.: 91f.).

Departing from that reflection and some other details of our interpretation, the teacher also discusses some alternatives for teaching, such as primarily asking the students in an open manner on their opinion to the characters instead of trying to find specific words (Kieres 2022c: 92f.).

We observe here, that the teacher’s modus of reading our interpretation differs substantially from our modus of elaborating it: While we had – in a modus which is discharged from the necessity of subsequent action – moved from the microscopic understanding of concrete teaching practices towards understanding them as specific realisations of general or structural phenomena, the teacher re-reads these interpretations in the light of her professional interest – to develop and conduct future lessons (see also Spendrin, Mbaye & Hallitzky 2023: 117).

Nevertheless, she not only relates the interpretations to her own concrete actions in this specific lesson, but also adopts a meta-perspective on the structural problem as a general condition of classroom interaction and asks herself what fundamental consequences this has for teaching. In her conclusion, she considers the above-described general dilemma again, taking up the question on what to do with the knowledge gained out of our interpretation:

“However, this soberly formulated realisation opens up the possibility of detaching oneself from the stressful feeling of a dilemma and instead recognising what has been described as a fact in order to explore the scope for action within this framework” (Kieres 2022c: 93).

Furthermore, she states some questions she would like to explore:

"What effect does this ambiguity have on students? Do they reflect on this role conflict of teachers? Is it at all useful for the learning process when the teacher tries to be part of the learning community? Doesn't this tend to confuse the students?" (ibid.),

concluding that it would be necessary to include the students' view into the systematic reflection of teaching and learning.

In reflecting our interpretations, thus, the normativities articulated by the teacher do not undergo substantive changes – still, the teacher moves amid institutional, subject specific, and student-related perspectives. However, we observe a gradual, but distinctive transformation to a greater valuation of the focus on students' learning processes and their ability to keep up with the process of constructing knowledge in the classroom. Even though (or because?) we had highlighted the – structural, fundamentally not avoidable – normatively dilemmatic character of teaching with the aim of fostering autonomous thinking, the teacher does not end up in accepting an equivalence of the normativities that constitute this dilemma. Rather, she apparently reaches a clearer decision to put (even) more force and focus on possible ways to foster what is in her view hindered by structural institutional requirements, despite being considered an official institutional aim.

4 Conclusions: Normativities on teaching and cooperation between teachers and researchers

In collaborations of researchers and school practitioners, potentially different normative orientations are brought together, both in terms of teaching itself and the form of cooperation. Reflecting the encounter and interprofessional exchange with a teacher, we identified how normative positionings were set and/or emerged in the mutual observation of each other's (more or less) unfamiliar reference systems. Eventually we noticed how these normatives were (at least slightly) reshaped in the reflexive examination of the respective other position.

The teacher's reflection on her own lesson planning and organisation reveals the complex demands of her work in between administrative, pedagogical-didactic and literary-scientific responsibilities to which she feels committed (3.1). In her critical examination of her own lesson, she focuses on the one hand on the content-related objectives and tasks, which demonstrate her orientation towards the curriculum guidelines and scientific literary concepts. On the other hand, the pedagogical norm of student participation emerges, which is also a prerequisite for the fulfilment of the content objectives (3.2). The focus on perceived deficits and the search for someone to blame for the

supposed failure (possibly herself) also points to the systematic requirement on practitioners to improve future action.

The researchers' view of the lesson (3.3), on the other hand, is not centred around the achievement of objectives or a judgement on the success of the lesson. By focusing on the teacher-student-interaction and the constitution of the subject matter, we identified a fragile balance between openness to individual interpretations and guidance to scientifically proven statements about the literary figures. Although we decidedly distance ourselves from formulating normative statements for the respective other profession (see part 2), one can question the extent to which the concept of 'fragility' contains a norm of stability that was applied here without the research team being aware of this before considering the joint dialogue. Taking into account the possibility of own subtle normative orientations, the question arises, what form of stability we implicitly refer to. Is it for example the balance of openness and guidance we are aiming at and which teaching ideals and implicit ideas of success are possibly linked to this (hidden) aim?

This also raises the question of how the teacher relates to this normativity of a balance between openness and guidance. In the teaching alternatives that she offers in the reflection of our observations (3.4), normatives become recognisable that initially seem to orientate the relationship between openness and control towards granting more openness, for example in expressing the need to control her impetus of self-expression. However, she also questions the potentially confusing effect of these open forms on the students. Reflecting this specific situation, there are also indications that she transcends the perspective of individual responsibility for the success of the lesson: she interprets the ultimately irresolvable contradiction between institutional and pedagogical norms and the associated "ambiguity and instability" (Kieres 2022, p. 93) as a structurally determined inner role conflict, thus adopting our interpretation in this point. Again, in taking over the practitioner role, she sees this 'dilemma' of teaching not as a problem to be solved, but as a fact, in order to "explore the scope for action" within the structural ambiguity of teaching (ibid. 93). In contrast to Design Based Research, where the researchers' normative ideas lead to the further development of teaching concepts (see part 2), the teacher's concrete intentions concerning the shaping of this range of action are not available to us.

Considering both the teacher's and the researchers' normative orientations, the normativities of the teacher stay independent from the ones of the researchers in the whole reflection process. Yet, they communicate at the core of the findings in so far as the teacher refers to the observations made by the researchers and in doing so, she slightly aligns to our (implicitly perceived, potentially insinuated) norms on teaching. This relative independence of per-

spectives is based on the conception of our co-operation as a work at the boundary between the professions, a boundary which we have set as not to be crossed but rather used as a point of observation. This conceptual premise of our collaboration – not to intervene normatively in the other person's field of reference and, in particular, not to formulate any suggestions for action beyond one's own field of action – implies that we see ourselves as partners in a symmetrical dialogue. Finally, the extent to which this normative of symmetry could be maintained in the encounter between the actors involved will be discussed.

For the researchers, the normative of symmetrical communication seems to be particularly evident in the fact that they try to refrain from action-guiding normatives or prescriptions and focus their description of the microstructure of teaching on general and not individual challenges. Nevertheless, the researchers' observations initially seem to give the teacher some reason for critical self-reflection. This can either be interpreted as an indication of an (unintended) reference to a traditional hierarchy between researchers and school practitioners, according to which researchers have knowledge that teachers have yet to acquire, or as a typical habitus of teachers who perceive the exploration of their own teaching first and foremost as an individual development task.

In any case, Ms. Kieres emphasises the benefits she has gained from the dialogue several times, underlining the extended time and the multiple perspectives on the realised lesson as a chance of professional development. Interdisciplinary collegial lesson observations do not seem to be everyday experiences. Furthermore, she appreciates the microscopic view beyond the subject-didactical horizon, confronting her with more 'fundamental characteristics' of lessons. It is not the acquisition of generalised, scientific knowledge, but the detailed examination of the microscopically observed interactions that attracts her attention. In this confrontation with micro-analytical interpretations of teaching, she sees a lasting chance for reflecting one's own teaching and an effective opportunity to further develop professional attitudes and skills (3.3). This interpretation of micro-analytical interpretations as an opportunity to examine one's own teaching, to explore areas for action and potentially to develop new perspectives corresponds to the conceptual approach of our cooperation: not to intervene in the other person's field of action, but to productively perceive mutual perspectives.

Nevertheless, the teacher's discussion of alternatives to her lesson planning reveals a cautious desire for cooperation that is more oriented towards joint planning. The continuation of our cooperative work, including cooperations with other teachers, reinforces this impression of a shift in our joint work towards a joint planning (see also Herfter et al. forthcoming). The norm of

symmetry of the dialogue that we have set is thus relativised insofar as the researchers' norm-setting is actively carried into the field of practice by transcending the descriptive perspectives of teaching. In contrast, the research remains (at least initially) related to the field of teaching and is not itself examined as a practice in the sense that the teachers reflect on the research process, its possibilities and limits of gaining knowledge or actively intervene in the field of research. This leaves a certain asymmetry at the level of cooperation, which however can be faded out in a communication of mutual respect.

References

- Balzer, Nicole; Bellmann, Johannes (2019): Die Erziehung der Theaterperspektive. Zur Kritik der Dichotomisierung von Pädagogik und Erziehungswissenschaft. In: Meseth, Wolfgang; Casale, Rita; Tervooren, Anja (Eds.): Normativität in der Erziehungswissenschaft. Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedien, pp. 21–47.
- Beywl, Wolfgang; Künzli David, Christine; Messmer, Roland; Streit, Christine (2015): Forschungsverständnis pädagogischer Hochschulen. Ein Diskussionsbeitrag. In: Beiträge zur Lehrerinnen- und Lehrerbildung. Zeitschrift zu Theorie und Praxis der Aus- und Weiterbildung von Lehrerinnen und Lehrern. 33 (1), pp. 135–151.
- Cappai, Gabriele (2010): Kultur und Methode – Über die Relevanz rekonstruktiver Verfahren für die Erforschung fremdkultureller Lagen. In: Cappai, Gabriele; Shimada, Shingo; Straub, Jürgen (Eds.). Interpretative Sozialforschung und Kulturanalyse. Bielefeld: transkript, pp. 129–155.
- Dahnke, Hans-Dietrich; Leistner, Bernd (Eds.) (1982): Schiller, das dramatische Werk in Einzelinterpretationen. Leipzig: Reclam.
- Daston, Lorraine; Galison, Peter (2007): Objectivity. New York: Zone Books.
- Dinkelaker, Jörg; Herrle, Matthias (2009): Erziehungswissenschaftliche Videographie. Eine Einführung. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Einsiedler, Wolfgang (2010): Didaktische Entwicklungsforschung als Transferförderung. In: Zeitschrift für Erziehungswissenschaft 13 (1), pp. 59–81.
- Fuchs, Stephan (2001): Against Essentialism. A Theory of Culture and Society. Cambridge, Massachusetts, London: Harvard University Press.
- Gervé, Friedrich (2007). Lesson Study als Modell für die schulpraktischen Studien. In Flammeyer, Doris; Rotermund, Manfred (Eds.): Mehr Praxis in der Lehrerbildung – aber wie? Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag, pp. 115–130.
- Gruber, Hubert (2019): Einsichten zu Lehren und Lernen durch Bachelorarbeiten mit Lesson Study. In: Mewald, Claudia; Rauscher, Erwin (Eds.): Lesson Study. Das Handbuch für kollaborative Unterrichtsentwicklung und Lernforschung. Innsbruck: Studien Verlag, pp. 123–137.
- Hahn, Stefan; Hallitzky, Maria; Hempel, Christopher; Künzli David, Christine; Streit, Christine (2018): Blaukittel und Weißkittel – (Methodologische) Reflexionen zum Verhältnis bildungswissenschaftlicher Forschung und Schulpraxis. In: Schwab, Susanne; Tafner, Georg; Luttenberger, Silke; Knauder, Hannelore; Reisinger, Monika (Eds.): Von der Wissenschaft in die Praxis? Zum Verhältnis von Forschung und Praxis in der Bildungsforschung. Münster, New York, pp. 30–38.
- Hallitzky, Maria; Heinze, Franziska; Herfter, Christian; Spendrin, Karla (2018): Potenziale der normativen Valenz allgemeindidaktischer Theorien für die Bildungsforschung. In: Erziehungswissenschaft 29 (56), pp. 87–95.
- Hallitzky, Maria; Herfter, Christian; Kinoshita, Emi; Leicht, Johanna; Mbaye, Mamadou; Spendrin, Karla (2021): Lesson Study in German-speaking countries. Between classroom research and

- teacher education. In: Jongsung Kim, Nariakira Yoshida, Shotaro Iwata und Hiromi Kawaguchi (Eds.): *Lesson Study-based Teacher Education. The Potential of the Japanese Approach in Global Settings*. London, New York: Routledge, pp. 155–170.
- Hallitzky, Maria; Kieres, Christine; Kinoshita, Emi; Yoshida, Nariakira (Eds.) (2022): *Unterrichtsforschung und Unterrichtspraxis im Gespräch. Interkulturelle und interprofessionelle Perspektiven auf eine Unterrichtsstunde*. Bad Heilbrunn: Verlag Julius Klinkhardt.
- Hallitzky, Maria; Marchand, Silke; Müller, Karla; Schneider, Dirk (2014): *Hermeneutische Konzepte empirisch erschließen: eine Herausforderung für die Allgemeine Didaktik*. In: Patrick Blumschein (Eds.): *Lernaufgaben – Didaktische Forschungsperspektiven*. Bad Heilbrunn: Verlag Julius Klinkhardt, pp. 65–77.
- Herfter, Christian; Kieres, Christine; Leicht, Johanna; Matsuda, Mitsuru; Miyamoto, Yuichi; Yoshida, Nariakira (2022): *Potenziale und Grenzen einer forschungsbasierten, interprofessionellen Unterrichtsentwicklung*. In: Hallitzky, Maria; Kieres, Christine; Kinoshita, Emi; Yoshida, Nariakira (Eds.): *Unterrichtsforschung und Unterrichtspraxis im Gespräch. Interkulturelle und interprofessionelle Perspektiven auf eine Unterrichtsstunde*. Bad Heilbrunn: Verlag Julius Klinkhardt, pp. 99–119.
- Herfter, Christian; Schweder, Charlotte; Spendrin, Karla; Kinoshita, Emi (forthcoming): *Unterrichtsentwicklung im Dialog: Selbstbeobachtungen der Praxis kommunikativer Wissensproduktion in der Begegnung von Unterrichtspraxis und -forschung*. In: Buchborn, Thade; Hallitzky, Maria; Hinzke, Jan-Hendrik; Martens, Matthias; Spendrin, Karla (Eds.): *Schule – Entwickeln – Erforschen*. Bad Heilbrunn: Verlag Julius Klinkhardt.
- Herfter, Christian; Spendrin, Karla; Heinze, Franziska; Leicht, Johanna; Kinoshita, Emi (2019): *Sehen, was sein soll? Zur normativen Valenz allgemeindidaktischer Theorien für die qualitative Unterrichtsforschung*. In: ZQF Zeitschrift für Qualitative Forschung 20 (2), pp. 253–269.
- Hofmeister, Ulrike, Juritsch, Friederike; Kreis, Isolde; Witschel, Elfriede (2019): „Das Lesen war sehr cool in der Gruppe“ – Wie Reziprokes Lesen Lesekompetenz in allen Fächern fördern kann. In: *Erziehung & Unterricht* 2019 (1–2), pp. 134–142.
- Horstkemper, Marianne (2013): *Freut sich Praxis auf Theorie? Dilemmata der Lehrerforschung im Spannungsfeld von Erkenntnisproduktion, Praxisentwicklung und Professionalisierung*. In: Hellmer, Julia; Wittek, Doris (Eds.): *Schule im Umbruch begleiten*. Opladen/Berlin/Toronto: Budrich, pp. 251–265.
- Isak, Gabriele (2016): *Lesson Study als Modell professioneller Reflexion am Schulstandort*. In: *Journal für Schulentwicklung*, 20 (4), pp. 27–36.
- Kieres, Christine (2022a): „Die drei Männer“ – Beschreibung einer Unterrichtseinheit als gemeinsamer Analyse- und Reflexionsfokus. In: Hallitzky, Maria; Kieres, Christine; Kinoshita, Emi; Yoshida, Nariakira (Eds.): *Unterrichtsforschung und Unterrichtspraxis im Gespräch. Interkulturelle und interprofessionelle Perspektiven auf eine Unterrichtsstunde*. Bad Heilbrunn: Verlag Julius Klinkhardt, pp. 37–42.
- Kieres, Christine (2022b): *Analyse der unterrichtenden Lehrperson bezogen auf die eigene Unterrichtsstunde*. In: Hallitzky, Maria; Kieres, Christine; Kinoshita, Emi; Yoshida, Nariakira (Eds.): *Unterrichtsforschung und Unterrichtspraxis im Gespräch. Interkulturelle und interprofessionelle Perspektiven auf eine Unterrichtsstunde*. Bad Heilbrunn: Verlag Julius Klinkhardt, pp. 43–47.
- Kieres, Christine (2022c): *Theorie trifft Praxis? Die Forschungsergebnisse aus unterrichtspraktischer Sicht*. In: Hallitzky, Maria; Kieres, Christine; Kinoshita, Emi; Yoshida, Nariakira (Eds.): *Unterrichtsforschung und Unterrichtspraxis im Gespräch. Interkulturelle und interprofessionelle Perspektiven auf eine Unterrichtsstunde*. Bad Heilbrunn: Verlag Julius Klinkhardt, pp. 87–96.
- Klafki, Wolfgang; Scheffer, Ursula; Koch-Priewe, Barbara; Stöcker, Hermann; Huschke, Peter; Stang, Henner (Eds.) (1982): *Schulnahe Curriculumentwicklung und Handlungsforschung. Forschungsbericht des Marburger Grundschulprojekts*. Weinheim, Basel: Beltz.

- Kuhn, Hans-Werner; Mayer, Oliver; Kuno, Hiroyuki; Gervé, Friedrich (2011): Versuch einer interkulturellen Unterrichtsanalyse. „Reklame in unserem Leben“ aus der 5. Klasse der Horikawa-Grundschule als ein Beispiel des integrierten Lernens in Japan. Seikataka und Sogogakushuu Kenkyuu (Zeitschrift für Sachunterricht und fächerübergreifenden Unterricht) 9, pp. 29-54.
- Kullmann, Harry; Friedli, Reto (2012): Lesson Study. Eine Methode zur symbiotischen Entwicklung von Unterricht und Lehrerprofessionalität durch Praxisforschung in der dritten Phase der Lehrerbildung. In: Freitag, Christine, & von Barga, Imke (Eds.): Praxisforschung in der Lehrerbildung. 16. Jahrestagung des Nordverbands Schulbegleitforschung am 15./16. September 2011 an der Universität Paderborn. Berlin: Lit Verlag, pp. 133-144.
- Leubner, Martin; Saupé, Anja; Richter, Matthias (2016): Literaturdidaktik. 3., überarbeitete und ergänzte Auflage. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Meseth, Wolfgang (2016): Zwischen Selbst- und Fremdreferenz. Systemtheoretische Perspektiven auf die Erzeugung erziehungswissenschaftlichen Wissens. In: Zeitschrift für Pädagogik, 62 (4), pp. 474-493.
- Meyer, Hilbert (2020): Leitfaden Unterrichtsvorbereitung. 10. Auflage. Berlin: Cornelsen.
- Reckwitz, Andreas (2003): Grundelemente einer Theorie sozialer Praktiken. Eine sozialtheoretische Perspektive. In: Zeitschrift für Soziologie, 32 (4), pp. 282-301.
- Reh, Sabine; Rabenstein, Kerstin; Idel, Till-Sebastian (2011): Unterricht als pädagogische Ordnung. Eine praxistheoretische Perspektive. In: Meseth, Wolfgang; Proske, Matthias; Radtke, Frank-Olaf (Eds.): Unterrichtstheorien in Forschung und Lehre. Bad Heilbrunn: Verlag Julius Klinkhardt, pp. 209-222.
- Rose, Nadine; Ricken, Norbert (2018): Interaktionsanalyse als Adressierungsanalyse – eine Perspektive der Subjektivationsforschung. In: Heinrich, Martin; Wernet, Andreas (Eds.): Rekonstruktive Bildungsforschung. Zugänge und Methoden. Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedien, pp. 159-175.
- Rzejak, Daniela (2019): Zur Wirksamkeit von Lesson Study. Ein systematisches Review empirischer Studien. In: Mewald, Claudia; Rauscher, Erwin (Eds.): Lesson Study. Das Handbuch für kollaborative Unterrichtsentwicklung und Lernforschung. Innsbruck: Studien Verlag, pp. 97-111.
- Schäffter, Ortfried (1997): Das Fremde als Lernanlaß. Interkulturelle Kompetenz und die Angst vor Identitätsverlust. In: Brödel, Rainer (Ed.): Erwachsenenbildung in der Moderne. Opladen: Leske und Budrich, pp. 91-129.
- Spendrin, Karla; Mbaye, Mamadou; Hallitzky, Maria (2023): Grenzbearbeitungen von Schulpraxis und qualitativ-rekonstruktiver Unterrichtsforschung im Dialog über Lehrer*innenfragen. In: Frank; Magnus; Geier, Thomas; Hornberg, Sabine; Machold, Claudia; Otterspeer, Lukas; Singer-Brodowski, Mandy; Stošić, Petra (Eds.): Grenzen auflösen – Grenzen ziehen. Grenzbearbeitungen zwischen Erziehungswissenschaft, Politik und Gesellschaft. Opladen, Berlin & Toronto: Verlag Barbara Budrich, pp. 103-122.
- Spendrin, Karla; Kinoshita, Emi; Herfter, Christian; Leicht, Johanna; Hallitzky, Maria (2022): Individualisierung und Vergemeinschaftung in der Unterrichtsinteraktion. Diskussionsgemeinschaft zwischen Offenheit und Lenkung. In: Hallitzky, Maria; Kieres, Christine; Kinoshita, Emi; Yoshida, Yoshida (Eds.): Unterrichtsforschung und Unterrichtspraxis im Gespräch. Interkulturelle und interprofessionelle Perspektiven auf eine Unterrichtsstunde. Bad Heilbrunn: Verlag Julius Klinkhardt, pp. 48-66.
- Stark, Robin (2004): Eine integrative Forschungsstrategie zur anwendungsbezogenen Generierung relevanten wissenschaftlichen Wissens in der Lehr-Lern-Forschung. In: Unterrichtswissenschaft, 33 (1), pp. 52-69.
- Strübing, Jörg; Hirschauer, Stefan; Ayaß, Ruth; Krähnke, Uwe; Scheffer, Thomas (2018): Gütekriterien qualitativer Sozialforschung. Ein Diskussionsanstoß. In: Zeitschrift für Soziologie, 47 (2), pp. 83-100.

- Svoboda, Stefanie (2019): Primar Web Quests im Englischunterricht. In: Mewald, Claudia; Rauscher, Erwin (Eds.): *Lesson Study. Das Handbuch für kollaborative Unterrichtsentwicklung und Lernforschung*. Innsbruck: Studien Verlag, pp. 149-160.
- Valsiner, Jaan (2003). Culture and its Transfer: Ways of Creating General Knowledge Through the Study of Cultural Particulars. In: *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, 2(1), <https://doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.1013>.
- Wallner, Sabine (2019): Turn Taking: Dialogisches Sprechen im Englischunterricht. In: Mewald, Claudia; Rauscher, Erwin (Eds.): *Lesson Study. Das Handbuch für kollaborative Unterrichtsentwicklung und Lernforschung*. Innsbruck: Studien Verlag, pp. 175-193.
- Wolff, Stephan (2008): Wie kommt die Praxis zu ihrer Theorie? Über einige Merkmale praxisensibler Sozialforschung. In: Kalthoff, Herbert; Hirschauer, Stefan; Lindemann, Gesa (Eds.): *Theoretische Empirie. Zur Relevanz qualitativer Forschung*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, pp. 234-259.

The authors

Hallitzky, Maria, Prof. Dr. is Professor for General Didactics and School Pedagogy for Secondary Schools at Leipzig University, Germany. Her particular research interest lies in the area of research into individualisation and communitisation in the classroom in a national and international context and aspects of steering and opening up teaching with a view to learning democracy in the classroom. Methodologically, she is orientated towards methods of videography-based, qualitative-reconstructive research. She also examines the methodological significance of normativity in methodological procedures. ORCID: 0000-0002-0867-112X

Kinoshita, Emi, Dr. is a Lecturer at the Chair of General Didactics and School Pedagogy in Secondary Schools at Leipzig University, Germany. Since her early academic career in Japan, she has majored in comparative education, history of educational thought of teachers and educators, as well as qualitative research methods from the transcultural perspectives. She is now especially engaged in intercultural projects on qualitative-reconstructive classroom research and lesson development in Leipzig. ORCID: 0000-0001-6512-4563

Spendrin, Karla, Dr. is a lecturer at the Chair of General Didactics and School Pedagogy in Secondary Schools at Leipzig University, Germany. After a PhD on didactic competencies for E-Learning and Blended Learning, she focuses on teaching research especially with videographic reconstructive methods. In this field, she works on methodological questions, such as the possibilities and challenges of teaching research in different cultural contexts and the role of normativity for teaching research. ORCID: 0000-0001-6101-6020