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Abstract

This study examined experiences of teachers working in extended physical spaces (those added to an existing school building such as built additions or modular classrooms) in the case of a growing British Columbia elementary school in which there was a perceived lack of physical space. Specifically, I looked at the intersections of spatiality, teacher constructions of collegiality, and power relations with regards to working in extended spaces, and how these concepts affected teacher work lives and professional interactions. In this study, spatiality refers to human constructions of space and place that occur through our social interactions with others within the physical environment, and collegiality is defined as teachers’ involvement with peers on a variety of levels. Through use of a critical symbolic interactionist lens and a conceptualization of power from a feminist empowerment (power-with) model, I sought to understand how these teachers interpreted symbols representing organizational values and norms within the broad school culture, the meanings they derived from the extended physical spaces, and how socio-spatial relations were produced.

Data obtained through observation, document analysis, and interviews suggested teachers derive meaning from extended physical spaces based upon how their workspace allows them to carry out their work role. These spaces were symbolized as being separate from the original building. Generally, teachers believed inhabiting extended physical spaces had the potential to contribute to a lessening quality and quantity of interactions with other teachers, and to make resources less accessible. Teachers constructed six broad categories of collegial interactions which were largely based upon their ability to interact with colleagues through space and took the form of socio-spatial enactments that were reflections of negotiated organizational culture. Findings indicated teachers inhabiting extended physical spaces had the potential to feel tension as they attempted to enact the organizational values that characterized the school while simultaneously experiencing a new spatiality. However, through strategies of empowerment and a distributed-leadership model, teachers and administrators were able to mitigate much of the potential disadvantage that could occur through inhabiting extended spaces, thereby producing new, inclusive spatialities and opportunities for socio-spatial dialogue and community growth.
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Chapter 1: Introduction and Research Questions

A school is a complex organization, one that invokes many images, perhaps of classrooms and desks, or of gymnasiums and playgrounds. These images may be of teachers in front of chalkboards and computers, parents conversing with one another, or of the principal making a speech at a graduation ceremony. Whether one thinks of a large, multi-department secondary, or of a small community elementary, a school building holds significance to the stakeholders who work and learn within its walls. Teachers and administrators conduct the majority of their work within a school building, and conversations about the use of space in the school are likely to produce much discussion. The nature of school spaces have a relationship with efficacy of teaching, and an impact on student learning (Clark, 2002; Dixon, 2004). Yet, little research has focussed directly on the experiences of school personnel as they negotiate the realm of the space in which they work.

This study looks at Parkdale Elementary (a pseudonym), the school in which I currently work (as a teacher), and how it has undergone a transformation in its physical design. Changes in neighbourhood demographics have led to a doubling of the student population, and consequently, a corresponding increase in staff numbers. Over the years, rooms have been reallocated for multiple purposes, the general use of school spaces has evolved (including staff feeling as though there is a lack of space), modular classrooms have been added on-site, and most recently an addition designed and constructed. Space has become an important issue here. I have observed much discussion about the allocation of classrooms and other workspaces, an apparent lack of storage, and a language that appears to differentiate certain parts of the school building from others. Staff have worked together, and at times struggled to find ways to engage in their daily work while trying to negotiate systems in place to manage both temporary and permanent movement between workspaces, and allocation of these classrooms and other work zones. For example, the process by which teachers are chosen (or volunteer) to relocate to various workspaces has, historically, been a contentious issue, with attempts (over the past five years) by teacher groups and administration to find effective and equitable solutions. Most recently, approximately one year ago an additional wing was substantially completed, with teachers moving into its
classroom spaces. Decisions about which teachers would work in the new classrooms were made through a variety of channels.1

I have, over the past few years, heard discussion and language suggesting a general sense amongst staff that extended physical spaces (those added or constructed subsequent to the construction and occupation of the original school building, and take the form of built additions and modular classrooms) may be perceived differently than the original building itself. Language patterns have included words and phrases that suggest that the modular classrooms (I will herein refer to these as portables, the common term for them amongst Parkdale staff) are less desirable than classrooms in the original building, and language that suggests that there is a perceived separation between the original building and the addition. While in these spaces for work and social purposes, I have tended to see less social interaction in these areas. I hear the word space (and its various synonyms and representations) referred to frequently throughout the school – in fact, it seems, I see consistent concerns regarding space affecting school affairs. Such observation of language and behaviour patterns by teachers and administrators with regards to both the portable and additional-wing classrooms had led me to wonder if the existence of these extended physical spaces has had an effect on professional and social interactions between staff within these physical areas of the school, and how the extended physical spaces intersect with organizational values.

Parkdale teachers are interested in physical space and how it impacts their work, largely by virtue of it becoming a necessary point of discussion and decision-making. This is particularly evident through discussions of its extended physical spaces. It is not uncommon for similar stories to appear in media; one can find numerous articles outlining the struggles

1 For the purpose of this study, while terms such as occupy and use may refer to one being in a space, I will use the term inhabit, as was initially used by a participant during and interview, to refer to a space one predominantly works in. The term inhabit suggests a sense of permanence, as opposed to occupy, which I believe signifies a more fleeting or less permanent experience. I will use the term occupy to denote a more temporary arrangement or placement in space).
that school districts and school users are facing in British Columbia (and elsewhere) as they build new schools, expand old schools, incorporate modular classrooms into existing school design, and generally strategize how to cope with buildings that need to be larger. This study offers teachers and administrators who are grappling with such questions a look at how extended physical spaces (and social space in general) impacts the work lives of teachers. It seeks to provide educators with the knowledge necessary to change the way space is conceived and experienced so as to improve working and learning conditions in schools.

School leaders generally value and seek to improve student learning and to enhance the ways in which teachers work together (Leithwood & Reihl, 2003; Donaldson, 2001), and to understand the intricacies of the organizational culture present in their buildings (Peterson, 2002). Educational leaders who recognize the significance of physical space to the overall function of a school are in a position to better enact positive change and to enter into discussions about spatiality (Fisher, 2004). Space can become an opportunity for dialogue and for staff and community growth (Horne, 2004).

Teachers (alongside administrators, support staff, students, and parents) are continuously interacting with and within a school’s built spaces. Through this study, I examined various aspects of spatiality at Parkdale, specifically those related to spaces that were planned and either constructed or added due to growing student and staff populations. In other words, I looked at extended physical spaces, those which were physically added onto an existing school building. The school had an existing staff body and organizational culture prior to the conception of these extended physical spaces. I sought to learn how teachers perceived, symbolized, made meaning from, and socially produced/reproduced extended physical and social spaces. I was interested in how collegiality was constructed amid spatiality and how power relations intersected with the experience of inhabiting an extended physical space. To accomplish this general goal, I addressed the following research questions:

1. What do extended physical spaces mean to teachers within a school building?
2. How do teachers inhabiting the extended physical spaces interact with one another and with other teachers in the original school building?
3. How do teachers inhabiting extended physical spaces perceive and characterize collegiality within the school?
4. In what way does inhabiting extended physical spaces intersect with perceived collegiality?
5. In what ways do power relations intersect with spatiality and collegiality among teachers inhabiting extended physical spaces?

These questions helped me to unpack how the extended physical and social spaces at Parkdale are significant to the interactions of teachers and administrators who do their daily work as members of the school organization. I employed a case study research design and linked spatiality to (constructions of) collegial relations, teacher interaction tendencies and power dynamics. My goal was to provide organizational members with insight into how the physical spaces of the school are related to their daily work as a part of their overall organizational roles, and to provide information through which other schools and school districts can be better equipped to examine their own spatial challenges and their impact on professional lives. Collegiality and power relationships, through interaction, are ever-present in intricate and changing school environments. While academics differ greatly on how they view and conceptually define power (Allen, 2005), I will be primarily employing a lens of empowerment, suggesting organizational members can (and do) work together in a manner that incorporates shared decision-making (Townsend, 1999). At times I will contrast this notion with the conceptualization of power as a capacity, and at times, a form of domination of one over another (Lukes, 2005), as will be discussed in Chapter II. A general lack of knowledge about the integral nature of how spatiality in schools is socially produced, and its intersections with collegial constructions, power, and organizational values may create or perpetuate tension and power imbalance within the workplace. My research may bridge these topics of discussion and provide a clearer understanding of the significance of these spaces to the teachers and administrators who use them, both in the school of study, as well as within the broader educational community. The more that school personnel are empowered to understand the connections between the spatial, social, and professional aspects of their work lives, the better they may be able to make informed decisions within a changing building, engage in collegial relations through the power dynamics, and to see beyond the notion of a building as simply a configuration of walls in which they work.
Chapter 2: Review of Relevant Literature

2.1 The significance of space in the school context

Through my career as an educator working in a variety of school buildings, most recently at Parkdale, it has become clear to me that the concept of space, and the many ways teachers tend to describe it, discuss it, and work within it, is one of the predominant topics of conversation in schools. School spaces are significant to the people who inhabit and use them (Armstrong & Bray, 1997) and the manner in which a building’s physical spaces are laid out and constructed is important to the daily affairs of a school. McGregor (2004a) refers to space as being a “physical container for social life” that has an effect on the nature of interactions that occur within it, and is produced through human interaction. Schools are indeed social spaces. I would argue that interaction, be it verbal, written, gestural or communication through symbols or other means, is the mainstay of a school’s operation. Schools are, as I have discussed, complex organizations with many members and many interactive and communicative permutations. Be it teachers working with students, parents commiserating with one another, or an administrator speaking at a staff meeting, communication is continually occurring through some form of interaction.

When one considers the majority of these interactions occur within a school building, and that space is integral to the construction of the relations between organizational members (Massey, 2004), it makes sense that the spaces in which teachers work have a relationship with their work role, how they interact with others, and how they interpret and make meaning from organizational symbols. Surprisingly, there is little research directly examining the relationship between a school’s physical environment and the social interactions therein (McGregor, 2004a). Though existing surveys of teachers suggest the importance of space as it pertains to one’s general working conditions, research has not tended to look at how organizational symbols (defined by Rafaeli and Worline (1999) as “visible, physical manifestations of organizational life” (p. 73)), such as the placement of classrooms, the nature of common workspaces, and various visual spatial factors, and their subsequent interpretation relate to one’s collegial experience through time and space. I have briefly described the significance of one’s interactions within the school environment, and
have made a general connection between the spatial and one’s interactions with others. This study, and consequently this literature review, will focus largely on the experiences of teachers as organizational members (the school being the organization). The review will further discuss the significance of spatiality on human interaction in a schools context, organizational theory related to space, teacher collegiality (as constructions based largely upon interactions with others in space), and how power plays an important role in spatial experiences.

2.2 Space and human interaction: spatiality

Many tend to view buildings as passive structures in which people engage in their daily affairs. They may think of a building and its rooms, corridors, and other spaces, as a rigid structure that rarely constitutes conversational significance pertaining to social relations (that occur within it). In the context of a school one might think its physical structure remains the same from moment to moment, over time. One might think that space itself does not change, that it is a physical form that remains static. As we will discuss, this notion of space as static has evolved to an understanding that space is far more than just a backdrop. Researchers have, over the past fifty or so years, proposed a variety of theories related to space and human interaction. Goffman (1963) referred to buildings and the spaces within as “props”, in and through which behaviour occurs, but which do not define or create behaviour directly. In contrast, Fitch (1965) describes the many aspects of architecture that are meaningful to people and influence their behaviour, referring to biological, psychological and cultural needs that are satisfied by built spaces. Gutman (1966) suggests that buildings influence values, norms, and social roles, and that these elements in turn regulate and determine behaviour patterns. In other words buildings influence the behaviour of occupants in that people interact while moving through fixed spaces. For Goffman, a building is simply a structure that contains interaction but does not effect human interaction and behaviour. Gutman’s opposing theory describes buildings as having direct influence over the behaviour of those within. Fitch’s view is closer to that of Gutman in that he sees buildings as influencing human behaviour, though he believes this occurs because buildings are constructed to satisfy various human needs (shelter, to house an organization, for political reasons, etc.). Gutman takes the concept of a building’s influence a step further. For him, a built space does not simply satisfy a need (thereby affecting our behaviour), but influences
the beliefs, norms, and values of those within. Because human behaviour is heavily influenced by cultural, organizational, and societal norms, the buildings that people and groups inhabit become influential in shaping such behaviour.

Contemporary environmental sociologists have looked at the role a space has on those who use it from several differing perspectives. Fisher (2004) suggests space is not a neutral thing, but rather has a *performative impact* on its occupants, one that commands and locates people, encourages or discourages social interaction, and can contain social sources of power. The manner in which a physical space is organized produces particular social relations and interactions (McGregor, 2004a). It is a socially produced construction that exists by virtue of people, objects, and their interrelations (Mulcahy, 2007). Massey (1999) uses the term *space-time* to suggest that there are dynamic and ever-changing interrelations that comprise the notion of space. Space itself is constantly changing, as opposed to being rigid and static. A school staffroom, for example, takes on a much different character when a group of teachers is engaged in a structured and formalized staff meeting debate about a pedagogical concern than if it is being used as a social space through which teachers are drinking a coffee and discussing personal matters during a recess break. While the physical boundaries, furniture, and appearance of the space may not have physically changed (though the seemingly simple manoeuvre of moving a chair or table, for example, may have spatial, interactional, and power-related implications) the function and character can be quite different from one moment to the next. Space-time is “a moment in the intersection of configured social relations” (Massey, 1994, p. 265). McGregor (2003, p. 354) connects Massey’s work to the school context. She describes schools as organizations with “particular configurations of social-spatial relations” that contain physical, organizational, and power structures. A hallway leading to groupings of classrooms, for example, may serve as a physical configuration that encourages or discourages communication between students or between teachers through the physical ease with which they engage socially with one another, and perhaps by timetable constraints, administrative rules and expectations, and an overall culture that leans towards (or away from) social interaction. That said, a space that encourages or discourages communication is produced through interaction. It becomes, for teachers, a construction of how they define it through interactive behaviour and organizational values. I will examine similar aspects of spatial configuration at Parkdale.
Annesley, Horne, and Cottam (2002) state: “buildings affect people – the way they feel, experience, learn, work and relate. Buildings support particular organizational forms and operational models. They communicate messages to the people who use them and to the people who look in from outside.” (p. 25). When one considers that personal agency affects our behaviour, I suggest thinking about a bi-directional process in which buildings affect people, and people make characterizations and re-production of the space itself. People derive meaning from physical space, and simultaneously give meaning to the space. Physical spaces are often used for a multitude of purposes. At the same time they contain symbols of organizational values and members derive meaning from these spaces. *Spatiality*, as we have discussed, refers to how space is socially produced and the meanings derived from it (McGregor, 2004a). It is often used synonymously with or is connected to Massey’s concept of *space-time*. Since much of the world is constructed through social relationships, the physical and the social are embedded into one another. Outcomes are not determined but open to change as individuals and groups use the space to exert or express opinions, negotiate power, and transmit and reinforce (or refute) social and cultural norms. McGregor further describes spatiality as “the relationship between different kinds of space and place, including the network space of relations and objects” and the production of space through social interaction. *Network space* refers to the linkages between spaces (for example, a classroom is a space, yet there are many diverse objects and spaces within it that constitute the classroom, such as a teacher work area, a reading area, a cloakroom, and so forth) and objects (such as furniture, technology, etc.). The objects become a part of the physical and social space, and often become symbols that attribute meaning to that space. A chalk- or white-board on a wall may be an object that denotes the space as a classroom. Within that classroom a teacher’s desk may suggest a social-space that is adult- or teacher-oriented, while a bookshelf with picture books and a carpet may suggest a space in which children may read. *Relations* can refer to social interaction or intersections between spaces. McGregor explains that spatiality involves the “recursive interplay between the spatial and the social [and is] the product of complex ongoing social relations” (McGregor, 2003, p. 363). Space is a social construction that locates people and, in tandem, people continually produce (and reproduce) through their interactions. It is everywhere and exists, through interaction, in a diversity of forms. Oultram (2012), describing how spaces and human
interaction are intertwined, states: “Space cannot…be understood without examining the interactions of networks of actors (human and non-human). So networks become the focus of spatiality, but networks themselves are ephemeral rather than static.” (p. 239) McGregor (2004b) also refers to networks of interaction that are both located in space, and simultaneously produce the space itself.

Spatiality is a cornerstone of this study. Within a school organization, interactions occurring frequently and are a necessary part of teacher work roles. In an organization whose building has extended physical spaces (like Parkdale’s portables and addition), it can be assumed that interactions generally occur throughout all spaces. However, if extended physical spaces are characterized differently by teachers (compared to characterizations of the original building), it is wholly possible that spatiality in these extended physical spaces may look quite different.

Massey and McGregor suggest that one is continuously interacting with space, thereby continuously redefining and reproducing it. In other words, we interact with each other within a physical space, and are continuously changing the meaning of that space through the nature of our interactions within it (such as the nature of a school staffroom, as previously discussed). This may be particularly salient for extended physical spaces – if either the portables or the addition are produced by staff as different (and perhaps symbolically imbued as less desirable than original building spaces), I would suggest implications for, and differences in, the manner in which teachers and administrators interact within that space, and the meaning they derive with and from it. A teacher’s experience with and interpretation of organizational values within an extended space may be different than a similar experience they have had when located in the original building. They experience a different spatiality. McGregor suggests a relationship between spatial location and meaning: “A topological approach to the school as a workplace for teachers must consider patterned forms and locations of association and the meanings these have for people, and also the way in which the workplace is linked with complex interconnections across space and through time, or rather space-time” (McGregor, 2003, p. 355). McGregor believes that specific spaces in school buildings create, for its members, associations and meanings derived through social-spatial interactions. Teachers, for example, have a relationship with the spaces in which they work, and thereby derive meaning from them. Humans interact with
the spaces that they occupy thereby constructing and reconstructing what the physical and social space means to them. These interpretations of meaning may vary over time. A space may be constructed on one way, and then reconstructed differently at a different time, through changing social interactions. The nature of one’s interactions as related to the space one occupies and inhabits is an ongoing conversation amongst organizational theorists.

2.3 Organizational theory and physical space

Organizational theories examining the use of space within buildings have been employed in various areas, particularly in work that looks at institutions. A variety of paradigms have been used for studies in disciplines such as architecture, management, health care, and housing. Modernist approaches, critical and conflict theories, phenomenological concepts, and symbolic interactionist study have all played a role, largely dependent on the orientations and goals of the researcher.

In a study incorporating aspects of socio-spatial relations, constructions of collegiality, and power relations, each concept includes social elements; human interaction becomes the centre of all constructions. Interactions within the organization occur between members within spaces and, as I have discussed, between members and the spaces themselves. Both members and the building itself are a part of the overall organization, and share (to varying degrees) the organization’s values and norms. Teachers possess an organizational identity, which Hatch (2006) refers to as organizational members’ beliefs about and their specific experiences within, of which there may be many personal interpretations. While I am not specifically interrogating Parkdale Teachers’ organizational identities per se, I believe that aspects of their beliefs and experiences as organizational members will have some bearing on how they construct collegiality, socio-spatial relations, and navigate power relations. It is important to look at one’s personal experience as an organizational member as we examine these concepts, hence this brief discussion of organizational identity. Whetten (2003) sees claims made by the organization itself as moulding organizational identity – these institutional claims, to which all members are privy, encompass primary, long-lasting, and distinctive values and systems. In other words, it is systematic symbols and structures within the organization that lead an employee (a teacher, for example) to develop an organizational identity. Whetten’s viewpoint contrasts with the notion of organizational identity as being a product of common beliefs and shared
understandings about central and enduring symbols, structures and features of the organization (Gioia, Schultz, & Corley, 2000). They see identity as being a part of the “means by which people act on behalf of their organization [that are] infused with motivation and feeling”. These motivations and feelings about one’s perceived role within the organization “explain the direction and persistence of individual and collective behaviours” (Albert, Ashford, & Dutton, 2000, p. 13). It is evident that definitions of organizational identity are highly nuanced, encapsulating a wide variety of definitions and conflicting interpretations. Albert et al. (2000) point to the many dialogues of organizational identity: as personal, interpersonal and collective; as negotiated and socially constructed; as dynamic and multiple in nature; as political arenas involving justice; as spontaneous and emergent; as “flashpoints for psychodynamic process”; as enduring; and so on and so forth. Despite differences in how theorists define one’s organizational identity, it is clear that teachers are members of a school organization and contribute to and are influenced by to some degree, its values, norms and overall culture.

Symbolic interactionist theory has become popular in the study of organizations, including with inquiries into organizational spaces. According to Hatch (2006), an interactionist paradigm would seek to uncover and to describe meaning associated with a workspace or building’s physical features, as connected to the values, status, and identities of those occupying its spaces. Symbolic interactionism developed into a significant sociological theory through the 20th century. George Herbert Mead was one of the first theorists to identify and coin terms for two levels of social interaction: a conversation of gestures and significant symbols (Mead, 1934). The conversation of gestures refers to the physical gestures, words, tone, proxemics and so forth that characterize aspects of human communication. Significant symbols refer to the potential for meanings that can be derived from aspects of the gestures. Herbert Blumer, considered to be a founding symbolic interactionist theorist, builds upon Mead’s ideas. He writes that symbolic interactionism is built upon three premises: 1. Humans “act towards things on the basis of the meanings that things hold for them”; 2. The “meanings of such things are derived from or arise out of social interaction” with others; and 3. These meanings are “handled in and modified through, an interpretive process used by the person in dealing with things he encounters” (Blumer, 1969, p. 2).
Stryker (1980) criticized symbolic interactionist theory as ignoring any notion of power dynamics and processes. This was disputed by Dennis and Martin (2005) who argue that the very nature of situations in which symbolic interactionism is used as a lens of study must contain elements of power. Baker (2010) points out that while this may be true, traditional interactionist methods omit the generation of theory or findings that encourage organizational betterment and change. Sandstrom and Fine (2003) proposed the term critical interactionism to signify a blending of the micro-concepts of symbolic interactionism (such as looking at specific interactions, organizational symbols and meanings, and so forth) and the predominately macro-concept of critical theory (oppression, hegemonic tendencies, power imbalances, and marginalization). I will be approaching this study from a critical symbolic interactionist perspective. It suggests that forms of power are embedded in all interpretations of symbols, and in all representations that we make through our interactions. Carspecken (1996, p. 9) further describes the importance of adding a critical layer to interactionist theory: “The symbolic representations of events is never just a matter of symbols corresponding to objective reality, because social relations involving forms of power are always entailed in any representation.”

For the purpose of this study, I suggest organizational identity be viewed as socially constructed, and to look at it from the lens of how an organizational member interprets his or her work role within the context of organizational values which implicitly involve forms of power. Buildings are a representation of the organization that occupies them and effectively aid people in constructing their feelings and thoughts of and towards the organization as a whole. Interactionism views movement within the space as essential because people will make associations between spaces and experiences, thereby deriving meaning. The physical spaces experienced become symbols entrenched in organizational and social meaning and can highlight aspects of social relationships.

School buildings contain a multitude of symbols through which interpretation can be acquired through interaction with other people in those spaces, and with the physical space itself. Both the individuals and the physical environment are entrenched in organizational and social meaning. It is organizational members who create (and re-create) the spaces, infusing such spaces with symbols of organizational culture. The critical symbolic interactionist paradigm views movement of people within a space as essential because, as
people engage in activities within the space (with or without others) they will begin to attach meaning to that space by making associations between physical spaces and social experiences. A teacher who spends a lot of time in a particular classroom, for example, may derive from the space a sense of his or her professional identity as a member of the school organization (and its values and norms). Depending upon one’s experience in that space with other people, the teacher may feel that the space supports organizational values or is, to some degree, in conflict with said values. For example, if frequent interaction with colleagues during the teaching day is an organizational value, working in a space located away from other teachers may reduce capacity for interactions with others, creating tension between one’s experience and the values of the organization. In the context of this study, extended physical spaces have significant social and organizational implications for teachers who work in them.

Discussions of human agency are of value when looking at one’s spatial experience. Agency can be defined as an individual’s capacity to make choices independently and to act freely (Bandura, 2001). Theorists have debated how to account for agency as it relates to spatiality. Sociologist Anthony Giddens (1987) proposed a structuration theory suggesting that physical structures and agency operate in a bi-directional manner. The structure is reproduced through human agency in a continuously changing manner, second by second. A space or “location” is only socially relevant when it is interpreted by people (Giddens, 1979). Several organizational theorists have criticized Giddens’ work as minimalizing the importance that physical structure has on human interaction (Gieryn, 2002; Hannah & Strohmeyer, 1991; Storper, 1985). As discussed, for McGregor (2004a), space is socially produced. People derive meaning from the spaces with which they interact, and, in process, attribute meaning to those spaces (such as the reinforcement of organizational beliefs or values). One’s agency is significantly influenced by group or organizational behaviour, including spaces which are a physical part of the organization. For Bourdieu (1981), spaces tend to influence human behaviour in that buildings reinforce the norms and values that are held by those in power (we will further discuss this concept in the power section of this review). For Bourdieu, buildings influence behaviour. Giddens tends to view spatiality and agency as having bidirectional influence on one another; spaces and agency affect one another. Gieryn and Storper characterize physical structure itself as essentially socially
constructed and existing through, and because of, our experiences. Bourdieu, Gieryn, Giddens, and Storper have debated the question of whether physical spaces are primarily an expression of the human experience or are structures that influence our behaviour, or through which we interact. This is an interesting debate that, depending on one’s theoretical orientation, can be interpreted in many ways.

Gieryn (2002), in his examination of the construction and post-construction phases of a university building, concluded that human agency was a significant force in the phases of building design and construction, while the post-construction phase (when the building becomes occupied by people), is characterized by the physical spaces defining the behaviours of the occupants. Initially the people within change their behaviours and activities because of the space’s defining characteristics. In time, however, occupants begin to regain their agency, and in turn re-define and reinterpret the physical spaces (Gieryn, 2002). Perhaps the occupants initially feel that the space has been designed for a purpose, and they espouse (produce the space to uphold) this purpose. In time, through the ease of growing ownership and identity with the space, the occupants become more comfortable and apt to re-conceptualize the spaces within the building through their interpretations and meanings derived within. Gieryn, in challenging Giddens work, asks an important question: Do buildings affect human interaction or is it human interaction and agency that defines purpose and interpretation of what constitutes a building? Gieryn states that Giddens is “reluctant to ascribe autonomous agency (the idea that buildings themselves have implicit physical structures that affect, if not guide, human interaction) to built environments and instead makes them dependent upon interpretations and uses by knowledgeable humans” (Gieryn, 2002).

A potential flaw with Gieryn’s statement resides in Massey’s definition of space-time: a “moment in the intersection of configured social relations” (Massey, 1994, p. 265) and McGregor’s use of the term spatiality. According to McGregor (who cites Massey’s work), space is “neither a fixed container for action, nor … the pre-given social, political, or organizational context. Rather than being an arena in which social relations take place, space is constituted through the social. Space is thus itself enacted” (McGregor, 2003, p. 46). Gieryn criticized Giddens’ suggestion that there is a bidirectional influence between buildings and one’s agency because Giddens is “reluctant to ascribe autonomous agency and
makes them dependent upon interpretations…”. However, Gieryn fails to acknowledge McGregor’s theory that space is constituted through the social. Giddens’ view of spaces and occupants as continually influencing one another parallels McGregor’s definition of spatiality. Gieryn, on the other hand, believes that people influence buildings at one moment in time, and at another moment in time, it is the buildings that influence people, and so on and so forth. It is, however, challenging to imagine physical spaces as influencing human interaction, or human interaction influencing spatial production in uni-directional manner. It is more plausible that a bidirectional relationship exists; intricately connected socio-spatial patterns and networks of human interaction (see McGregor, 2004b), organizational culture, and embedded power dynamics in all interaction. McGregor and Massey are in line with Giddens in suggesting a bidirectional nature of the spatial: people interact with space – the space affects various aspects of an individual’s behaviour, while that behaviour (and one’s own agency) interacts with and continuously changes the meaning, purpose, and character of the space.

Gieryn feels a comprehensive sociology of physical spaces and buildings needs to include elements of both Bourdieu’s and Giddens’ viewpoints. A complete analysis would require one to “respect the double reality of buildings”, with the physical structuring individual agency, and with the potential of the spaces themselves becoming restructured by the agents (Gieryn, 2002). Interestingly, some of Gieryn’s work does appear to parallel that of McGregor, Massey, and Giddens. Gieryn looks to research on the social construction of technological systems to provide understanding that buildings are “simultaneously shaped and shaping”. Because buildings are made with materials created or derived through technology, “buildings, as any other machine or tool, are simultaneously the consequence and structural cause of social practices” (Gieryn, 2002, p. 41). This statement appears to be in line with the notion that human agency (and group interaction) influences and produces space, and space simultaneously influences human agency and locates people. While I believe Gieryn’s suggestion that space sometimes influences people, and people, in turn, sometimes influence space (there are shifts over time) fails to acknowledge that people are continually interacting within organizational spaces, thereby deriving meaning from and continually reproducing space, aspects of his research may have some bearing when studying
*extended* physical spaces. Gieryn looked specifically at the construction and occupation of space.

Gieryn’s three important phases or *moments* (in the aforementioned university building construction and move-in), despite not fully taking into account the concept of network space, do help to understand the effects buildings have on human agency and vice-versa. His research does provide a look at human behaviour that may occur during the construction and habitation process (salient to those inhabiting a school’s extended physical spaces). *Moment one* refers to the design and construction of the building, in which human agency is paramount, as it is the collaboration (to some degree) of organizational members, personal creativity, and human negotiation that informs the design. The *second moment* encapsulates the initial occupation of the structure and its internal spaces, in which people conform behaviours to the set spaces, often as purposed by designers. The building’s physical structure guides human behaviour and interaction. The *third* and final *moment* refers to the occupation (inhabiting the spaces) of people and groups once the initial newness of the building has passed. People in this stage begin and continue to narrate and reinterpret the physical spaces. The building is “made anew” through discourse and the return of agency. As time passes, Gieryn sees buildings as evoking changing narratives as the relationships, symbols, and meaning interpreted by the people within (who may or may not remain within the building over time, and whose own agentic experience may be constantly evolving) change through time and space. Perhaps this process is re-enacted as spaces are physically altered through the movement of physical features, renovation, or the building of an addition. At Parkdale, joint distributed decision-making processes were used in both the design of the new addition, as well as decisions about who would occupy the portable classrooms and the addition, the duration of occupancy, and a multitude of other matters such as overall room design, furniture choices, policy toward special accommodations for those who volunteered to move to a portable, and so forth. Administrators and teachers were involved on committees that provided input. Collegiality was at play in attempting to craft some notion of spatiality for those who would eventually inhabit the spaces, and a multitude of symbols, values, and meanings would have influenced human interactions within these processes.
In sum, human use of space, the organization of the space, and imagination all work together to create a space that is simultaneously social and material (McGregor, 2004a). Space, because it is a product of relations and human interaction, is constantly being created and remade (Massey et al., 1999). Durkeim (1964, p. 362) states "structure itself is encountered in becoming, and one cannot illustrate it except by pursuing this process of becoming. It forms and dissolves continually; it is life arrived at a certain measure of consolidation.” This occurs in the context of the whole organization, and in the context of embedded power relationships. “The symbolic conditioning of people’s behaviour, spatial elements (buildings, furniture, colour scheme), and spatial relations within a building or interior space (geography, layout, design, and décor) play a significant role in producing and shaping individual, group, and organizational identities” (Hatch, 2006, p. 241). Because this study aims to uncover a deeper understanding of how the spatial intersects with the social through an examination of individual agency and organizational participation, as it relates to extended physical and social spaces, one needs to understand how power may be conceptualized in an organizational context.

2.4 Power-over and power-with: a way to look at power relations

Critical symbolic interactionism assumes that power is embedded within our interactions with one another and through our interpretation of organizational symbols and phenomena. One can not effectively engage in analysis of organizational values, school spaces, and collegial constructions without investigating the role of power relationships within the organization. Sociologist Amy Allen (2005) states: “Although we use the term ‘power’ frequently in our everyday lives and seem to have little trouble understanding what is meant by it, the concept has sparked widespread and seemingly intractable disagreements amongst those philosophers and social and political theorists who have devoted their careers to analyzing and conceptualizing it.” In the interest of brevity, I will provide a succinct and focussed discussion of power as it pertains to the organization and to the theoretical lenses that will be employed in this study, a model that incorporates a critically-oriented look at power from an empowerment perspective.

Power has traditionally and most often been associated with a dominance model, assuming that, through a variety of means, one attempts to exert power over another (Lukes, 2005). While theorists from a diversity of perspectives would define this in many different
ways, generally the exertion of power over another may occur through varying degrees of force, through dominant cultural hegemonies, or potentially through the definition of knowledge itself. Foucault “proposed a deep and intimate connection between power and knowledge” (Lukes, 2005, p. 12). Some feminist theorists refer to such manifestations as power-over (Allen, 2011), suggesting that individuals and groups may attempt to exert a form of power over another. Power-over can be found within many organizations. Bourdieu (1981, p. 313) refers to institutional power, describing workers within institutions (forms of organizations) as engaging in the role that is expected of them, an effect of “regulations” and “directives”, essentially bowing to the power of those above as “consecrat[ed] agents who give everything to the institution”. Social forces are at work, sometimes masked as bureaucratic processes of societal control that even those in charge may not recognize as forms of power. Through a series of often-invisible processes and procedures, those of a dominant class or role exert force over the less dominant, who in turn engage in a role characterized by top-down expectation and surveillance.

Foucault acknowledges that power can be used as a control mechanism, but offers a more complex view. He addresses the organization and its internal processes. Foucault seeks to develop a notion of power beyond a dominant-subordinate dichotomy: “Power is not something that is acquired, seized, or shared, something someone holds or allows to slip away. Nor is power grounded in a group of institutions or mechanisms…nor a system of domination” (Foucault, 1990, p. 94 as cited in Able, 2005). Bevir (1999), who discusses a Foucauldian view of the organization, sees power as created, sustained, modified and subsequently recreated, and as being in flux. In terms of stating Foucault’s precise theory of power, Gallagher (2008) states that it is “pointless to demand a coherent general theory of power from Foucault, since he explicitly refuses to offer one.” (p. 396). Foucault tends to view power as diffuse, and embedded in social relations. Foucault writes “the exercise of power is not simply a relationship between partners, individual or collective; it is a way in which certain actions modify others. Which is to say, of course, that something called Power, with or without a capital letter, which is assumed to exist universally in a concentrated or diffused form, does not exist. Power exists only when it is put into action” (Foucault, 1982, p. 788). Foucault’s version of power supports the critical interactionist theory applied in this study, suggesting that power is embedded in all interaction. “Power relations,” Foucault
writes “are rooted deeply in the social nexus…a society without such power relations can only be an abstraction” (Foucault, 1982, p. 791). Foucault’s work, alongside others, has produced and encouraged alternative ways to look at power.

Able (2005) describes Foucault’s work as moving beyond what he refers to as “the dark side of the organization” (the notion that one attempts to dominate the other, while the other may attempt to resist, as described by Bourdieu). For Able, “meaning, identity, power, and goals are all contingent, provisional, [and are] always in process. They are not a given or an essential component of the organization’s structure, processes or norms. Neither do they follow upon the leadership ability of its managers nor the indoctrination of its employees” (p. 511). Gallagher (2008) suggests “it is helpful not to think of power as a ‘thing’ but as a general term for certain kinds of actions. Looked upon this way, power will appear as both diverse and dispersed, rather than concentrated in the hands of certain classes of people. Instead, power can be seen as distributed throughout society, exercised via a multitude of small-scale, local practices” (p. 402-403). Allen (2009), discussing Foucault’s notions of power, refers to a two-sided process of subjectification: “the process of being subjected to power relations constitutes one as the subject, but one is simultaneously enabled to be a subject in and through this process…power is omnipresent in all social relations” (p. 22). In other words, power affects an individual (power locates someone by virtue of his or her history, place in society, and the nature of how knowledge is produced). The individual is, at the same time, empowered through his or her history, social experience, and knowledge.

Though the conceptions of power that I have described have not been engaged through a lengthy and detailed philosophical discussion, it is clear that there are various ways to interpret what constitutes power. Generally-speaking, the theorists cited agree that power is, to some degree, a part of our daily relations with one another, and is both transferred and present in all social interaction. In this sense, power is infused into an organization. It is useful to look at feminist conceptualizations of power, which, I believe, are present in Parkdale’s leadership structure. While feminist theory sometimes looks at power from the oppressor-oppressed perspective, new forms have emerged in which theorists have suggested a version of shared-power that allows for women (and I suggest extending this to include all organizational members) to become empowered. Allen (2005) discusses the evolution of the empowerment concept, referring to it as power-with, the idea that power can be shared
among members of a group to further a mutual benefit. Power-with suggests that when women, through exercising strength and mutual support, share power, they can rise above an existing male hegemony that seeks to subdue and marginalize them (Lorde, 1984). Power-with is sometimes referred to as transformational power; this is the capacity, through working together, to transform and empower both oneself and others (Held, 1993). Allen describes empowerment as stemming, at least in part, from Mary Parker Follet’s (1942) description of power-with as a collective ability that occurs through relationships of reciprocity between group members. She also discusses Hannah Arendt’s conception of power as a general rejection of a dominance model but rather “the human ability not just to act, but to act in concert” (Arendt, 1970, p. 44). She connects this to Hartsock’s (1983) focus on community as the potential for a collective empowerment. This is not incommensurate with Foucault’s descriptions of power, in that he recognizes that power can be used over an individual (through hegemonic structures, for example), but that it is also distributed throughout a society, and is not fixed. In this sense, a group that might find themselves marginalized in some way has the ability to change the way they use power in a manner that promotes a joint-understanding and a common good.

Tett (2005) looks at power-with in community partnerships. She suggests that community members working together through struggle can “provide an arena for people to exercise their citizenship and learn…as a process this can both strengthen excluded communities and, through collective action, promote citizenship of individuals within those communities” (p. 6). The power-with lens of power relations “builds organization, solidarity, and cooperation” (Townsend, Zapata, Rowlands, Alberti, & Mercado, 1999, p. 102). Townsend et al. also note the transformational opportunity members of an organization have when adopting a power-with orientation: they can learn from one another and create new ways of looking at knowledge. Again we see a parallel with Foucault’s work. For example, Lukes (2005) suggests Foucault emphasizes that while power relations can take the form of transformation of dominant norms and ideas, they can also provide new opportunities for transformation and creation of new forms of culture. Lukes writes “power is a capacity, not the exercise of that capacity (it may never be, and may never need to be, exercised); and you can be powerful by satisfying and advancing others’ interests” (p. 12).
I have offered a variety of ways that theorists have conceptualized power; Foucault’s notions of power as being embedded within the structures of an organization, Lukes’ theory that power is a capacity that may or may not be exercised, and Allen’s suggestion that power can be exercised by individuals and collectives in the form of power-over and power-with, are pertinent examples. The conceptualization of power-over and power-with as prevalent within organizations has implications to educational leadership practice. It addresses an opportunity to engage in the ethical distribution of power through a community-based decision-making empowerment model, one that is significant to the Parkdale leadership context. For the purpose of this thesis, I suggest that analysis of power relations among organizational members in schools can be examined using both power-over and power-with conceptualizations through an assumption that power relations are implicit in all organizational structures, through knowledge and being, and through one’s interpretation of meaning during interaction with both space and other organizational members. Individuals experience power relations through interactions with others in socially produced space. This production of power, which is also derived from organizational structures (such as policy and cultural norms) can be exercised over or with others depending upon an individual’s or group’s orientation within the organization. There exists a degree of choice in how power is produced and experienced.

2.5 Collegiality as a product of interaction and an opportunity to engage in power-with

When thinking about school spaces it is important to learn how they are relevant to organizational members. I have proposed, through a discussion of spatial literature, that spaces in schools are significant those who inhabit them. These spaces form the backdrop of teacher and administrator daily work (Fisher, 2004). Interactions occur in school spaces and are a part of a teacher’s work role and organizational experience. Said interactions also support and transmit organizational culture, norms and values. As I will describe, teacher interactions form the basis of collegiality. Notions of collegiality, as constructed by teachers, are to a degree a reflection of organizational values. In this section I will discuss the importance of the collegial when looking at spatiality and how power relations, which are embedded in constructions and practices of collegiality, can incorporate both a power-over or power-with experience for organizational members. It is important to remember that all interactions occur in time and space, thereby reproducing space. Collegial constructions,
therefore, are a representation of organizational values through socio-spatial relations. Little (1982, p. 338) connects the collegial and the spatial experience. “Expectations for shared discussions and shared work distinguish one building from another; some buildings are reportedly (and observably) more ‘collegial’ than others”, she writes, suggesting that the spatial feel of a building is intricately related to (if not determined by) collegial interactive relations.

Teacher collegiality is a component of teacher social communication (Little, 1999). Collegiality, then, is present in all social interactions between teachers. It has an effect on organization function because “the prevailing pattern of interactions and interpretations in each building demonstrably creates certain possibilities and sets certain limits” (Little, 1982, p. 338). Space (in and through which teacher interactions with one another occur) is viewed by some theorists as an opportunity to engage in positive interactions with others. For McGregor (2004a), school buildings can become “spaces of dialogue” creating opportunities to transform the relationships of the people within. A school’s physical structure can become a point of collaborative discourse and discussion, which of course, is a product of teacher interaction. Herein lies the significance of Townsend et al.’s suggestion that organizational members can employ power-with models of distributed leadership and decision-making in a process that transforms the organization in a positive manner, through the encouragement of joint discussion, dialogue, and cooperation. The extended physical spaces at Parkdale have become a point of much joint discussion. Such social elements of a teacher’s job are connected to space: spatiality is the “recursive interplay between the spatial and the social [and is] the product of complex ongoing social relations” (McGregor, 2003, p. 363). These relations are embedded with power which can be expressed in a diversity of forms (such as power-over and power-with). Teachers and educational leaders experience some form of collegiality through interaction, and engage in power relations within and related to space. Parkdale’s extended physical spaces, and teacher experiences with collegiality and power within and around these spaces will allow for such an examination of these principles.

Little (1982) engaged in a study looking at teacher professional development that offered a new look a teacher relationships and sparked an interest in the collegial experience; she found that engaging in shared work became not just an expectation for educators, but could be defined as norm of true collegiality. In other words, shared work (which, she noted,
was defined and experienced in many different ways) is a symbol for collegial depth. Building upon her initial findings, Little (1990) offered a typology that characterized elements of teacher collegiality as having particular depths. These characterizations included (from a relatively surface-level collegial experience to a more depth-oriented collegiality) storytelling, aiding and assisting other teachers, sharing (ideas, materials, knowledge etc.) and engaging in joint work (teachers collaborating with one another). Little considers *telling stories* about one’s experience in the classroom as having a low collegial depth because, as a process, it communicates information but does not serve to shape or transform one’s practice or create the opportunity for new knowledge and an enhanced teaching experience as would deeper levels of collegiality. Collegial experiences with greater depth serve to create a *shared responsibility*, which may serve to strengthen teachers’ professional and personal relationships and contribute to the development of a shared school culture, through discussion and negotiation. Hargreaves and Dawe (1990) support Little’s suggestion that joint work, and refer to it as collaboration. “Collaborative cultures,” they write “comprise evolutionary relationships of openness, trust, and support among teachers where they define and develop their own purposes as a community” (p. 227). True collaboration, then, serves to transform knowledge, practice, and organizational culture in a positive, interactive manner. They juxtapose this against their definition of contrived collegiality that “consists of administratively contrived interactions among teachers where they meet and work to implement the curricula and instructional strategies developed by others” and serves as a means of administrative control (p. 227).

Jarzabkowski (2002) provides a somewhat broader conception of collegiality than that of Little and Hargreaves and Dawe. She defines teacher collegiality as teachers’ involvement with peers on intellectual, moral, political, social, and emotional levels, through participation in organizational culture. Her work does not attempt to mitigate notions that joint work (teacher-driven collaboration) are collegial in nature, but states her concern that many researcher descriptions of collegiality tend to minimize the general importance of social communication between teachers (that may occur within, or outside of, joint work). She does not necessarily feel that joint work is not important, nor does she reject the notion that collaboration has a relatively strong collegial depth. Rather, she outlines the significance of all social interactions between teachers as being part of the collegial, which
Little tends not to address to the same degree. My assumption throughout this research is that teacher constructions of collegiality are present in socio-spatial interactions with one another; it is essentially through space and interaction that collegiality occurs. Collegiality therefore is a significant element of teacher social relationships. Teachers experience some form of collegiality in their day-to-day work. This being the case, collegiality plays a significant role in one’s experience with extended physical spaces because the very notion of spatiality involves the social, and collegiality is ever-present in teacher’s professional lives.

Collegiality has long been viewed as an important aspect in the professional lives of school staff, and some research has looked directly at teachers’ collegial experience. Little (1982), examining teacher experiences in six school and using the continuum of collegiality that I discussed, found that some staffs were more successful in the collegial endeavour, while others were considered to be less successful. Numeroff (2005) studied collegial relationships amongst teachers in three different high schools. Findings indicated that the nature of collegial relationships between groups of teachers directly impacted their work lives. When collegial interactions, based upon values that teachers held as important, were frequent and positive in nature, teachers reported enjoying their jobs and being more effective in their roles. Uncertainty and stress was reduced, staff members felt supported by colleagues, and a distributed leadership process increased trust between teachers, and between teachers and administration.

There is a relationship between teacher collegiality and school administration, though this relationship may manifest itself in different ways depending on organizational values and how the particular staff group exercises power relations. When administrators engage in a process of encouraging dialogue amongst teachers, and a distributed decision-making model, for example, collegiality and the creation of what teachers view as a positive organizational culture is enhanced. In this case, an educational leader is working with teachers, and teachers are working together to incorporate a transformative power-with model, presumably in a manner that they hope will ameliorate staff relations and the production of distributed power-sharing and activation of voice in making decisions that affect the organization and each other. In a study examining collegiality, collaboration, and increasing demands on schools and teachers by the UK Ministry of Education, Webb & Vulliamy (1996) described how administrators in nine participant schools worked to create
opportunities for teachers to work together. Through increasing opportunities for teacher interaction during the school day, school culture was enhanced. However, in many schools teachers felt that less opportunity to be collegial (in this case due to government-imposed increasing teaching demands and time in the classroom) resulted in a weaker school culture. Teachers had less opportunity for collegial engagement, which affected how teachers were able to partake in and apply what they perceived as organizational values to their daily work. While teachers may have attempted to engage in a power-with model of collegiality, there was a clash with power-over (dominant) objectives and structures set by the government. Teachers potentially struggled to incorporate a power-with culture into their interactions. Hargreaves (1994) suggests that truly effective collegiality (which he ties to opportunities for teachers to collaborate with each other on their own terms) involves teacher and administrator interactions that are spontaneous, voluntary, and which essentially promote community and positive school culture. Hargreaves links collegiality and staff interaction, essentially proposing a power-with orientation. Datnow (2011) concluded that collaboration (a part of collegiality) is effective as long as teachers are supported by the values of the administration and of the organization. Dialogue and discourse should involve a power-with oriented structure of cooperation and community mindfulness. Koehler (1996) advocates that any sort of collegial endeavour must be developed with and by teachers themselves from start to finish, if it is to have success.

Juxtaposing the work of Hargreaves, Datnow, and Koehler with that of Donaldson and Numeroff, it becomes clear that staff bodies in different schools have varying experiences with (and interpretations of) collegiality. This makes an examination of how Parkdale teachers construct and interpret collegiality of great importance. While studies provide us with insight into teacher experiences with collegiality, none of these (or others) have looked directly at collegiality and the spatial. In making connections between collegiality and spatiality, it would be useful to talk to teachers themselves. In discussing collegiality and space in terms of experiences and the interpretation of organizational symbols through which meaning is derived, it is important to understand how teachers and administrators interpret their own work-roles in the school. MacDonald (2003) provides a link between collegiality, one’s work role and organizational decision-making (a structure that encourages shared power). She researched the case of a Scottish school identified by
teachers and the administrator as being collegial, in which staff enjoyed working, and tended to remain in teaching positions for long periods of time (as opposed to other regional schools, where the tendency was towards high rates of staff turnover). While teachers responded collegially to one another, they tended to see the administrator as an *other*, and had difficulty engaging collegially with him, despite their acknowledgement of mechanisms in place to encourage such interaction. It appeared to be the teachers themselves that had difficulty engaging collegially with the principal, presumably because of traditions and the ways in which they themselves viewed the role of a teacher and the role of an administrator. This extended to a reluctance on their part to engage in collaborative decision-making.

MacDonald’s work illustrates the importance of how individual teachers construct principles of collegiality, and the role of agency. The Scottish teachers had a specific interpretation of their professional identity and that interpretation affected collegial relations; for them, a teacher is attributed specific roles, an administrator possesses specific and separate roles, and they had difficulty, if not complete reluctance, to integrate the two. They found it challenging to engage in a joint decision-making process and shared power with the principal. This demonstrates the importance of how one perceives power relationships within the organization and connects these with perceptions and enactments of collegiality.

Teachers may not have understood the collective significance of a power-with model, or were so entrenched in a hegemonic social order and institutional structure privileging a power-over orientation that even the principal attempting to create new structures to encourage power-with could not engage staff in dialogue and shared power.

I have described how critical symbolic interactionism assumes that power is embedded within our interactions with one another and through our interpretation of organizational symbols and phenomena. I have also discussed varying conceptions of power. Theorists and researchers have proposed individual ways of looking at collegiality (as a product of interaction), spatiality and power through which common themes can be applied and linked together. It is necessary to reflect somewhat on both power-with and power-over conceptions to see how collegiality may be produced within and regarding school spaces. Foucault, for example, looks at the potential for power play in school design. Schools organize physical spaces and timetables in a particular manner, encouraging activities and interactions (or lack thereof) which change human behaviour, by distributing individuals
within the organized space and subjecting them to forms of classification and surveillance (Foucault, 1977). Shilling (1991) asserts that teachers determine or negotiate rules and routines that view children as subordinate to adults. Such controls of student movement, noise, behaviour, and access to materials through the creation of furniture layouts and corresponding rules related to the space have an impact on student behaviour and learning. Certain behaviours, attitudes, and values are encouraged, while others are suppressed through an almost invisible display of teacher expectations and the reinforcement of adult control of knowledge (Coffey & Delamont, 2000). While these studies looked at the power teachers hold over students, in space, they address embedded forms of power within spatial configurations that promote a power-over model of dominance. Constructions of collegiality may occur through such a model.

Bourdieu (1981) theorized a description of physical buildings as “systems of classification, hierarchies and oppositions inscribed in the durability of wood, mud and brick” (p. 305). He tends to see buildings as objectified histories, systems of classification with hierarchies inscribed within. The physical spaces that people occupy and their arrangements express symbolic oppositions and social hierarchies. Bourdieu proposes notions tied to conflict theory: buildings are essentially tools of power, built and administrated by those who seek to maintain power systems or a hegemonic system of hierarchy (such as rich over poor, male over female, and so forth). I believe Bourdieu identifies some salient themes related to power relationships and extended physical spaces. Such spaces physically created and then built by someone, or some group of people. These people presumably have some goal in mind, be it producing spaces that promote certain educational paradigms (and not others), that may be of better or worse quality than an existing building, and that may be driven by economic or political factors (that privilege some and marginalize others). As well, forms of leadership at the school or district level may seek to dominate through a top-down (power-over) model of employee and student suppression. That being said, teachers and educational leaders do have an opportunity to engage in shared power through spatiality.

Spatiality, comprised of ongoing connections between physical spaces and social interactions, involves the production and interpretation of meaning that is derived by those who inhabit space and one’s interactions with and within the physical and social space itself.
Community, professional relationships, and group values are terms often discussed amongst staff in schools. So, too, is space, most particularly in how it ought to be used or in many cases, how there just never seems to be enough. “If only we had more room” and “we need another space for x, y, or z” are frequent statements in many schools, Parkdale being an evident example. Donaldson (2001) suggests the need for administrators as school leaders to encourage both informal and formal interactions between staff members to assist in combating the potential isolation and stressful demands of the classroom. It is possible that isolation and stress may exist for those working on the physical fringes of a building, and this may be the case in many schools.

Spatial configurations, by their nature as imbued with symbols of power, become an opportunity for educators, through collegiality, to exercise power-with. They can also become symbols for conflict, dominance and power-over. The places in which teachers and school staff sit in a staffroom, for example, can reflect power relations and hierarchies within the staff organization of the school (O’Boyle, 2001). Relationships involving power status, social status, and curriculum are manifested through how the space is used and interpreted by teachers. The work of Fisher (2004) and Paetcher (2004) may have implications for those inhabiting extended physical spaces. Teachers whose workspaces are on the physical fringes of the building (as is the case with the Parkdale addition and portables) may face a sense of physical marginalization, with the distance and differing physical and visual nature of these building sections potentially contributing to feelings of isolation. This could reinforce an environment privileging power-over one another, in which spaces are symbolized as having status or a lack of status. I propose that a staff’s orientation of power has salient effects on how collegiality and one’s experience with space is enacted and experienced. Organizational values would look quite different depending on how power is interpreted and exercised. This would affect social relationships between teachers.

Bissell (2004) suggests that many interior school spaces such as mailbox areas, staffrooms, and copy rooms, as both designed and located, may actually inhibit the building of professional and social relationships with colleagues that are based on mutual respect, cooperation, and trust. For example, in a school where certain teachers’ classrooms are more centrally located to common areas, administrative offices and so forth, staff members who inhabit spaces at a greater proximity (or away from the main building) may feel isolated, or
even marginalized or disenfranchised, and may begin to grow resentment knowing others have more ready access to common areas. These feelings would likely have an effect on both teacher collegiality and the manner in which those teachers view themselves professionally. This may be particularly evident when the frequenting of these areas becomes an organizational ritual (an event that occurs regularly and predictably and around which organizational members form expectations of themselves and others, (Smith & Stewart, 2011)) and, such as in the staffroom, negotiate one’s status amongst the peer group (Kainan, 1994). Proximity and accessibility of the shared workspaces to the teachers’ classrooms are critical factors that predict whether teachers will use collaborative shared workspaces at all (Bissell, 2004). Politics and power are at play in decisions related to who occupies classrooms that have a greater proximity to common spaces, and which are less accessible. The very nature of such a layout may produce a power imbalance; some teachers have an opportunity to more frequently or more easily engage in interaction, collegiality, and the participation of group organizational values than others. That being said, these researchers do not explicitly examine the potential for a power-with orientation in regards to collegiality and the spatial experience. It is possible that teachers in the aforementioned studies felt dominated or perhaps were not open to, or knowledgeable about, empowerment. Conversely, it is possible that those researchers approached their settings with a dominance (power-over) conceptualization.

Other researchers have looked at collaborative and collegial processes for power sharing with regards to spatiality. For Wright (2004), a school is not just a building, but more importantly, it is a community where individuals should be able to learn, feel safe and included, share a common vision for learning, and be respected. These principles may be reflected in teacher constructions of the collegial. The notion of a building as being an element of community implies that social (and collegial) forces are at play within a power-with framework. One may ask whether the community simply resides within the building, or whether it is the building’s physical structures that create the community’s form, hence its movement and pattern of individual and group interactions through time and space. Massey’s space-time concept, the bidirectional interplay of space and social interaction at a given moment in time, has implications for how community is constructed in schools, specifically as it relates to collegial relations among educators. The physical design and
layout of a school’s spaces have both the potential to enhance educational experience and social cohesion, as well as the potential to undermine the learning process through the inhibition of effective teaching and learning, thereby perpetuating an environment that is detrimental to staff and student well-being (Wright, 2004). Conversely, the physical design may have equally positive effects. The development of shared values and beliefs, connectedness, and a positive cultural environment is crucial to the development of healthy local communities. Schools and the spaces within have an ability to welcome and promote diversity, create an arena for positive dialogue, and to build relationships between people, thereby overcoming a trend towards isolation and individualism (Horne, 2004). Parents need to meet other parents, students meet students, teachers meet teachers, parents meet teachers, and so forth. It is the nature in which spaces in schools are designed and allocated that can aid in determining the nature of such interactions, and ultimately, a school’s functioning as a healthy community.

2.6 Connecting the spatial, the collegial, and power experiences in schools: where we are and where we are going

This study has implications for both the Parkdale school community, educational leaders and teachers in general. Where are we now in terms of our understanding of how spatiality, collegiality and power relations intersect? While the majority of studies that have looked at school design and human interaction have focussed on student learning and child development, it is clear that school building design influences the overall effectiveness of a school, in particular student and staff behaviour, the performance of teachers, the recruitment and retention of personnel, and how the local community interacts with school personnel and students (Wright, 2004). Collegiality and power relations are central to this experience. Many studies have attempted to quantitatively track the effects of school and classroom architecture and physical elements on student learning and test scores, however few have looked at the perceptions of their physical spaces by teachers and students (Fisher, 2004). According to Siegel (1999, p.4), the way school spaces are arranged have significant effects on the ability of teachers and school staff to accomplish their work goals, form social and professional relationships, and to share information and knowledge. The architecture of a school and its classrooms contains and represents specific ideologies of education and values through its physical arrangements and interaction with the social space (McGregor, 2004a).
For Nespor (1997), a school can be seen as not a pre-determined, physical “place”, but as a grouping of ongoing relations and every day materially-embedded and intertwined practices. Jacklin (2000) concurs, noting that the physical form of built spaces expresses and affects social arrangements, as well as the predisposition towards certain practices that reinforce such arrangements. While a full-scale investigation into spatiality and school buildings might seek to incorporate the experiences of all persons engaging within the space, I have focussed on the professional work of teachers. Teachers come to their workspaces with varying notions of spatiality, organizational values, collegial constructions, and experiences with power relations. Many teachers have had a history working in different spaces, and sometimes within different organizational environments (different schools, school districts and so forth) and different physical designs. Research has failed to examine the experiences of school organizations with extended physical spaces, how those spaces are characterized, and the overall implications for collegiality and power in discussions of socio-spatial patterns.

The ability teachers have to effectively carry out their work role is often made more challenging by a school’s architectural design (Bissell, 2004). A study by Fielding (2000) looked at a classroom shared by various teachers separately, at different times. Observations indicated that while the furniture and physical structure remained unchanged (visually), the movement and interactions of bodies within the room, as well as the style of pedagogy, varied greatly from teacher to teacher. While teachers often report feeling as though they work in isolation, effective collaboration and interaction is a common goal in the teaching profession.

Fisher (2004) refers to schools as being “carceral and egg-crate like”, a notion that is reinforced by the societal view of how schools are physically represented. Despite this bleak image and the possibility that many schools’ designs encourage isolation, Giddens’ notion of bidirectional interpretations and constant redefinition of school spaces between the physical environment and the teachers within suggests that schools do not have to feel “carceral”. Classrooms, common rooms, offices, foyers, and even the hallways interact with, and affect human behaviour because they locate people and provide function, and are simultaneously created by people, in this manner. This occurs because the spaces have been socially produced and given meaning. For example, a teacher may, upon realizing it is break time,
navigate a particular path to access the staffroom because she knows she can interact with other teachers, or perhaps because it is an organizational ritual, a spatial navigation that has occurred many times before. The staffroom has been constructed to be a place where teachers meet at break times. The space, consequently, has affected her behaviour (how she got there, why she is there, the nature of her interactions within, and so forth). Paetcher (2004) notes the importance of the staffroom, because it is the space in which teachers often congregate for spatial interaction, meetings, and to work. The staffroom, Paetcher points out, is a space in which professional culture, social interactions, and power relations occur on a daily basis.

Some research has looked specifically at the classroom as a physical space, and the relationships produced and defined within it. Nespor (2002) sees classrooms as permeable spatial forms, despite an initial visual appearance of permanence and rigidity. Shields (1997) refers to the school and the classroom as a location that stands for the social, economic and political processes and organization that constitute said classroom. McGregor (2004a) employs this notion in conceptualizing physical school spaces as “hybrid, provisional, and porous” as opposed to “pre-existing and bounded” physical boundaries. Markus (1993) reminds us that the creation of the school building with separate, containerized classrooms and connected hallways has significant social effects on occupants. Through the creation of individualized cellular classrooms around central corridors, classrooms have tended to be produced as private spaces, away from peers. Extended physical spaces such as built additions and portable classrooms, which may or may not be attached to an existing corridor, have implications for the nature of teacher interactions and engagement with collegiality. Teachers may view these spaces as a form of freedom or as a form of isolation.

Bissell (2004) sees the physical classroom as the basic tool of an educator’s daily work activities and interaction. Bissell suggests that many teachers feel the physical structure of the classroom (and of other work areas) constrains their ability to create effective workspaces. In response to this idea of teaching being an isolating profession, and to encourage a more collaborative approach, designers and school staff alike have worked to build and encourage opportunities for social and professional connection through physical spatial arrangements. In this study, we will look at what teachers working in extended physical spaces define as spaces in which staff members tend to congregate, and how these
form a part of their interactional and collegial experience. McGregor (2004a) profiles a case study of a secondary school where staff attempted to encourage professional collaboration and cohesion through the use of shared common spaces such as “resource areas” housing computers, where staff and students alike were encouraged to visit, collaborate, and share. Staff noted that these spaces were specifically allocated for interactions outside the regular classroom. In this case, teachers felt that such allocation of space encouraged staff collaboration and made their work more productive and enjoyable.

In Bissell’s case study, teacher proximity to common areas in which staff social interactions occurred determined how frequently they used those collaborative spaces. Teachers whose classrooms were farther away from common spaces, such as the central staff room, tended to work alone or in isolation more frequently than teachers whose classrooms or personal workspaces were located closer to the work rooms. In these common areas, staff members were observed engaging in both social and professional conversation, and in professional collaboration and collegial relations. In another school, Bissell noted that teachers rarely used common workspaces that were intended to be collaborative in nature. These spaces contained data ports for computers, shelving, desk and table tops, other materials, and were located on the periphery of each wing of classrooms. It appeared these spaces were built and furnished with the intention of producing collaboration and work zones outside of the classroom. Yet, teachers were observed planning and grading primarily in their own (private) classrooms. The juxtaposition of teacher behaviour seen in both Bissell’s and McGregor’s case studies suggests, as I have previously discussed, the importance of a teacher’s agency when analyzing interactions within physical space. In Bissell’s study, spaces were designed in a manner to encourage teachers meeting one another, presumably with positive results. Yet it was the teachers’ own orientations to collaboration, and perhaps the overall organizational culture of the school staff and experience with power relations that may have determined whether school spaces were or were not used for the purpose of interaction and collegial relations. Paetcher (2004) suggests that teachers in many schools tend to segregate the physical spaces they occupy for social and professional discussion, based upon grade levels, subject areas, and specializations taught (the perceived work role). Perhaps it is the nature of social groupings and teacher perceptions of which group they are a part that play a role in determining how they use their physical environment and produce
space. There are clear intersections between spatial proximity and collegiality. The suggestion that physical proximity to collective spaces has a direct effect on collegial relations has significant implications for those working in extended physical spaces, and for administrators who are likely responsible (at least in part) for room and workspace allocation in schools.

The design and placement of Parkdale’s addition and portable classrooms, as well as the guidelines for processes through which staff would become occupants of those spaces, were established with joint teacher and administrator input, suggesting a power-with orientation. This study will include a look at the process of inhabiting a particular building design that incorporates extended physical spaces (portables and an addition) and the collegiality and power experienced in workspace allocation. The physical environment of a classroom (and other school spaces) can be manipulated, through design, to encourage social values and norms, such as sharing, and cooperative learning. The arrangement of a physical space, be it furniture in a classroom, posters on bulletin board in a corridor, or tables and chair in a common staffroom, provides information about teacher and administrator professional identity and organizational goals, values, and member roles and expectations.

One may now ask where we are going in terms of our understanding of spatiality, collegiality and power. Over the last twenty years or so, organizational leaders have realized the importance of physical space and how it interacts with members’ perceptions, interpretations of the organizational culture, and the social nature of space. A general trend in architectural design is to involve the current and future users of that space in determining how physical structures should be designed. Some researchers have begun to look at teacher input in building design and how, through using such input, these stakeholders have influenced the design of their buildings.

In the UK, a government agency has been created to encourage collaboration between school designers and school users, with a particular emphasis on teachers communicating their physical environmental needs. It takes the position that school design has tended largely to be outsourced to architects and designers with little collaboration with stakeholders, and that they must take into account the voices of those who work in schools (power-with, versus power-over). Schools need to be “strong clients articulating their needs” with “a clear vision of what sort of school [they] want it to be” (Wright, 2004).
All new school design certainly does not effectively take user input into account through decision-making models incorporate a power-with orientation with regards to spatiality. Architects and school district personnel who design school buildings tend to make decisions without meaningful community or educator consultation, and in a manner that fails to link educational policy and the built school environment (Fisher, 2000). This is unfortunate considering the participation of stakeholders who use spaces in the redesign and building or rebuilding of school can become a catalyst for positive educational change that includes the voices of all stakeholders (School Works Project, 2004). It is in schools themselves where dialogue through the involvement of those who use the school buildings (parents, students, staff, administrators etc.) and planning meaningfully through discourse (power with), would enhance creating effective and democratic building spaces (Morgan, 2000; Fisher, 2002).

Other researchers looking at the design of school buildings have made parallels with McGregor’s assertion that school spaces are continuously being interpreted and reinterpreted, that there is a bidirectional effect on and with users. Learning spaces can only become real and active venues (as opposed to passively experienced containers) if they are influenced by the people who subsequently inhabit those spaces (Fisher, 2004). Wright (2004) suggests that the participation of teachers, school staff, students, and the local community in designing school buildings and spaces can both create efficient and effective design, but also act as a “catalyst for change” within the school, encouraging collaboration, innovation, and the improved learning for all stakeholders. The involvement of these stakeholders in designing buildings creates environments in which they are more satisfied and increases communal ownership of those spaces (Dudek, 2000). While some studies have examined collaborative processes of school design, a paucity of educational research has looked at how actual workspaces are allocated, and the meanings interpreted of these spaces. This is vital for educational leaders who wish to understand how spatiality, collegiality and power relations come together to produce school culture and what teachers identify as an effective working and learning environment.

In sum, researchers and theorists have examined the human experience in relation to built spaces in several ways. They have tussled with questions of effect: Do spaces affect occupants? Does agency define the nature of spaces? Do people produce and construct
notions of space or does space guide or produce patterns of human interaction? Others are interested in interrogating how space produces, maintains, or is involved in the perpetuation of power. It is clear that physical space is important, because it is a part of the human experience. From an educational perspective, the school building is significant because it is forms the backdrop for the school organization. The organization’s affairs occur within (and sometimes outside of) the building, and its spaces are a salient part of a teacher’s daily work life. Teachers, as members of the organization, work within school spaces. The spatial experience refers to the manner in which people interact with space. So, school spaces affect various aspects of individual and group behaviour, which in turn interacts with and continuously changes the meaning and purpose of the space. Social interactions are produced in space, and space is continually in the process of being defined by organizational members.

Spatiality in schools has implications on teacher interactions with one another. Collegiality, which encompasses all forms of interaction amongst teachers, is constructed by teachers who are organizational members. These teachers possess a degree of negotiated group norms, beliefs and values that influence their interactions with others, in space, and how they construct collegiality. Critical symbolic interactionism assumes forms of power are embedded in all interpretations of symbols, and in all representations that we make through our interactions. It is, therefore, important to look at power relations within an organization in which one intends to examine conceptions of spatiality and collegial constructions. There is currently a lack of research that addresses intersections of spatiality, collegiality, and power within schools. We do know, however, that forms of power are embedded in all interpretations of organizational symbols and representations we make through our interactions. I would therefore surmise that interactions that occur in and regarding extended physical spaces may produce power imbalances in the case that original and extended physical spaces are viewed differently by teachers. Many schools are currently struggling with spatial issues, particularly related to growth and what the community perceives to be an overall lack of space. This has necessitated a variety of correctional measures, including the extension of existing buildings, and the addition of modular classrooms to school sites. Despite the construction of extended physical spaces, we know very little about how spaces added to an existing building affect or change the organization.
Existing literature fails to address the experiences of teachers who move into, and subsequently perform work duties in extended physical spaces. At Parkdale, for example, such extended physical spaces have been a challenge for organizational members as they attempt to engage in collegiality while negotiating or renegotiating a changing spatiality. Without research that provides insight into this tension, teachers face the potential of trying to understand a changing collegial experience thereby feeling isolated or disenfranchised. This could negatively impact one’s work-life, essentially creating the possibility for a power differential between teachers working in an original building and those working in extended physical spaces. This study aims to provide knowledge about the intersection of spatiality, collegiality, and power relationships amongst teachers working in the reality of extended physical and social spaces. This knowledge is aimed to empower educators to reduce tension, and ultimately power imbalance and marginalization that can, and does, occur in schools with extended physical spaces.
Chapter 3: Research Methods

3.1 Research background and summary

Despite growing interest in the field of environmental sociology, there have been few studies that have focused directly on the interplay of social behaviour and physical space within buildings (Glazer, 2009). This study is both descriptive and explanatory in nature and is somewhat ambitious. It examines and connects teacher experiences with and perceptions of the spatial, the construction of the collegial, and power relationships within the context of being members of a complex organizational group through a critical symbolic interactionist lens. I have addressed a number of concepts that are intricately interrelated and significant to the teacher-participants involved, and the school community in general. This research was designed with an overall intent to provide explanation and description related to the ways in which teachers symbolize and make meaning from the extended physical spaces in which they work, while simultaneously participating in the social construction of organizational culture and values. Such examination involves probing how they perceive their work roles, how they interact with others, the manner in which they construct collegiality, and the process used for decision-making within the organization with regards to spatiality.

3.2 Research design

I made use of a qualitative case study approach throughout the development of this project. A case study, though sometimes defined differently from researcher to researcher, is a method that entails gathering enough information about a person, social setting, or group to permit the researcher to understand how it operates or functions (Berg, 2007). It examines individual and group phenomena and uses a variety of data collection techniques that meaningfully contribute to the researcher’s application of, and contribution to, theory (Yin, 2003). This study’s in-depth, descriptive nature of largely unexamined phenomena lends itself to the use of ethnographic tools, though I hesitate to call it an ethnography due to my relatively short data collection period. However, the five years with which I have been a part of the school staff, my participation in all aspects of the organization, and the necessary richness of detail required, also justifies the use of ethnographic tools and a case-study approach. I felt the use of various data collection techniques, including the gathering of
organizational documents, informal and formal observations, and interviews, and subsequent in-depth analysis would yield thorough descriptions and interpretations of organizational phenomena (as related to spatiality) that are both accessible and helpful to school members, and offer intellectual quality and validity. As discussed in the literature review, this study approaches the case from the lens of critical symbolic interactionist theory which suggests that forms of power are embedded in all interpretations of symbols, and in all representations that we make through our interactions (see pages 12-14).

Hammersley and Atkinson (2007) suggest an ethnographic researcher approach the site with general ideas and research questions and, as the research process unfolds, develop new frameworks and categories of study. Using observations of layout and staff interactions, engaging in conversations, reviewing documents, and through direct interviews, I was able to identify key themes, develop a series of pertinent categorically-organized codes, and organize the data according to these codes. Through grouping and re-grouping both common and outlying themes into theoretical constructs (Silverman, 2005), I was able to see both common patterns as well as contrasting constructs contained in the data. The use of various data collection techniques involving a variety of teacher-participants allowed me to triangulate results for a more accurate analysis.

3.3 Site and access

Research was conducted at a British Columbia elementary school (certain details have been omitted to ensure the privacy and confidentiality of participants). I determined that the school would be a good case in which to engage in this research because of its struggle with space (against a growing student and staff population), and its use of modular classrooms and a built addition. As well, all teachers working in extended physical spaces have also worked in spaces within the original building. This is significant because these teachers have experienced the reality of varying spatialities, and can (and, in some cases, do) reference the representations of and feelings created through their experiences with spatialities in both the original building and with extended physical spaces. The school is located in an urban school district. It serves a relatively large population, with approximately 550 students, and offers educational programs in both English and French. Many students speak English as their second or third language, and there are a number of students identified as having special needs. The school has over 30 teachers, the majority of whom work full-
time at the school, with others working part-time, and several working between schools. Teacher experience in the profession as well as at the school varies; professional experience ranges from several months to over 30 years, and some teachers are new to the school (but not to the profession) while others have worked at the school since it was constructed. The majority of teachers who have worked at the school beyond three years have worked in a variety of workspaces.

3.4 Recruitment and Characteristics of Participants

Participants were recruited from Parkdale Elementary. At a staff meeting attended by all teachers, I formally discussed the nature of the project, what participation would involve, the measures in place that protect confidentiality, and I answered questions. I then distributed recruitment letters and consent forms to all attendees at the meeting. Extra forms were placed in a specified location in the school. Teachers were invited to return consent forms to either a secured box in the school office, or to me directly. While I asked teachers to indicate their willingness or non-willingness to participate in the research on the consent form and to return the forms, I noted that not returning the consent form would also indicate a decision to decline to participate in observations. I included this statement to ensure that teachers would be able to decline without having to write one’s name on a form.

Criteria for participation was based on two layers. First, for observations, all teachers were invited to participate, provided they were permanent members of the school staff. The principal and vice-principal were invited to participate. Second, for interviews, teachers whose primary workspaces were currently in an extended physical space (modular classrooms or newly-constructed addition) or those who had previously worked in one of these extended physical spaces in the past, were invited to participate. Seventy-nine percent of eligible teachers in the school consented to participate in observations, and six teachers consented to be interviewed (six interviews were required as part of my research design). Teacher names were changed to pseudonyms to enhance confidentiality. Maria, Stephanie, Ming, Jane, Julia, and Tamara are Parkdale teachers with varying years of teaching experience. They have all worked in an extended physical space. All are women (all but several of the school’s teaching staff are female, and no male teachers had worked within an extended physical space). Further details (such as grade levels taught, subject areas, language) will not be disclosed in this document to enhance confidentiality.
3.5 Data collection

To best address my research questions I employed a number of data collection techniques including gathering organizational documents, conducting informal and formal observations and conducting individual interviews.

Document Collection: I collected a variety of pertinent documents. These included school maps and plans, blueprints and documents related to construction of the addition, minutes and written releases by relevant teacher committees and other meetings, and internal memos pertaining to modular classrooms and the addition (such as staff meeting minutes). As well, I collected school mission statements, matrices outlining organizational values, and organizational school floor plans. These documents provided insight into the processes through which extended physical spaces were designed, how occupancy of these spaces was allocated, and how collegiality played a role.

Informal Observation: The goal of my informal observations was to create concrete descriptions of how teachers use and interact within extended physical spaces and to accrue knowledge about organizational symbols and meanings derived by members as related to spatiality and collegiality. I took notes on conversations with teachers, on formal and informal meetings, and through interactions observed. I observed how teachers use school spaces and the frequency and nature of collegial and professional interactions within these spaces, and within the original building. Informal observations occurred in functional spaces within the school in which staff tend to congregate, including the staffroom, office, the workroom, library, and other common meeting areas. I took care to ensure that I did not include any content in my notes related to staff members who did not sign a consent form.

During informal observations I did, at times, engage in conversation with various staff members, as these observations tended to occur throughout the course of the work day, as opposed to during defined periods of time.

Formal Observation: I conducted twelve formal observations. These were scheduled and time-limited observational periods (in twenty minute durations) of specific spaces. During observations I made detailed notes on interactions, including language used and gestures employed during conversations by teachers as pertaining to my research questions. These observations occurred in spaces where teachers tend to congregate formally (such as during meetings) and informally (such as during break times or conversations while preparing
materials in common work rooms, etc.). During formal observations I did not interact verbally with any participants, with a few exceptions in which a staff member asked me a question unrelated to this research. I felt that I could not record rich and accurate descriptions of observed phenomena if I was engaging in conversation. Anything observed of teachers who did not give consent to participate in the study was not recorded.

Reasons for formally observing the staffroom and workroom were twofold: first, teachers who inhabit the portables and the addition sometimes congregated and interacted with colleagues who inhabit the main school building, in these spaces. The staffroom and workroom are meeting points where many teachers congregate during non-instructional times, particularly at recess and after school; second, as central meeting points, I assumed that interactions would occur in these locales, and these interactions may provide insight into how teachers perceive collegiality, whom they interact with, and a sense of power relations that may be implicit or explicit through seating arrangements/composition at tables, conversation topics/language used, gestures, and the presence or absence of staff members. Listening to conversations provided insight into the topic of space as it arises during and through social interactions. As well, I was able to keep track of who used congregational spaces at various times and whether they work primarily in the main building or in the additional spaces. These patterns allowed me to examine whether proximity to the original building (and presumably where the majority of teachers are at a given moment in time) affects social interactions (hence, collegiality and power relationships) of teachers whose primary work occurs in the additional spaces and whether this has an effect on how these teachers self-identify as professionals in the organization compared to those who work primarily in the original building.

I engaged in twelve formal observations, each 20 minutes in duration. These occurred over a period of two months. I made observations on different days of the week to avoid drawing overall conclusions based upon an activity that may happen only on a particular day. Six observations occurred in the staffroom (three during morning recess break, and three during the lunch break). Six observations were during other times when groups of teachers came together, and took place in the staffroom, the library, a meeting room, the foyer, and the copier room.
Teacher-participant interviews: Through the use of interviews, I obtained data that helped to further my understanding of knowledge garnered through the collection of documents and through observations. This included insight into organizational values and beliefs, teacher perceptions of spatiality, and notions of constructed collegiality and power. I interviewed six teachers who currently worked in extended physical spaces, or who had worked in an extended physical space at the school in the past two years. Interview questions (see Appendix A) were designed to elicit responses related to the research questions. Questions posed were designed to attain description and perceptions related to the characteristics of and meanings derived from various spaces in the school, the nature of interactions in the building related to its spaces, participants’ constructions of collegiality and the nature of power relationships within the organization. I used the process of photo elicitation during interviews. Photos of Parkdale school spaces (classrooms in the addition, the exterior and interior of a portable classroom, the additions common space, the staffroom, and the school foyer) were shown to participants during interviews to elicit rich descriptions of their perceptions of these spaces and to provide a greater depth and richness of description.

Interviews occurred in quiet settings that were chosen by the participants (wherever they felt most comfortable), all of which occurred in empty rooms and offices within the school, during the school day or before or after teaching hours. I made use of a semi-structured interview protocol, consisting of open-ended questions that allowed me, as interviewer, and the participant, as interviewee, to explore themes related to power, spatiality, collegiality in the school, and their roles as teachers (see List of Interview Questions, Appendix A). Interview participants approached me after my initial presentation to staff to say they were interested in participating and I made appointments to meet with them. At the interview, I explained to interviewees what would be expected of them, the UBC policies related to confidentiality, and how transcripts and recordings would be used and stored. Interviews lasted in duration between 40 and 75 minutes. I presented participants with a $5 Starbucks Coffee gift card as a gesture of appreciation for their time. I interviewed each participant once. Interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed. After transcription, I approached interviewees as needed for clarification on responses to ensure I had fully captured and correctly interpreted details contained within their responses.
3.6 Ethical issues

A number of safeguards were employed in the field and throughout this study to enhance, to the highest possible degree, both the transparency of research intentions and the confidentiality and privacy of research participants and of staff within the school. Approval to conduct the research was first given by the UBC Behavioural Research Ethics Boards for scrutiny of ethical procedures and research design, then by the school district and the school principal. All staff members were informed that I would do my utmost to protect the privacy of individuals by reporting data from anonymous sources; pseudonyms were used for participants and identifying information was removed from data and, in some cases, altered to protect identities. It is possible that staff members could have felt compelled to participate in this research as they may have wanted to support my academic work and because they felt some sense of obligation as a colleague. I realize that I could not fully ensure that some teachers did feel pressure in this way, however I took steps to remediate these potential feelings. In addition to the statement in the initial contact and consent that participation was fully voluntary and without prejudice, I stated this clearly in the initial staff meeting (as well as during individual conversations about my research), that I would in no way hold this against anyone who did not wish to participate and I made it clear that in such studies it is normal to have some staff participate and others choose not to. As well I made it clear that I would not ask any questions involving one's decision not participate. I reiterated that all data collected, including the identities of those who did and did not wish to participate (including their participation/non-participation status) was completely confidential. Finally, I ensured staff were aware that any interviews would be conducted in a private location of the participant's choosing, and that all formal observations would be made without interaction with those who are being observed, making it less visible or obvious who had or had not chosen to participate. In addition to the meeting and individual conversations, I posted a recruitment letter and consent form explaining the research study and process at several key locations in the school (staffroom, office, and teacher work area) as well as electronically on the discussion and information board used by all staff members through the school's email system. Teachers were asked to sign and return a consent form to me via a sealed envelope on which no self-identifying information appears. All teachers working in the school were
able to participate in observations or interviews without the need for special assistance. Each of them is an adult professional fluent in English.

Written informed consent was obtained from all who agreed to be a part of observations and/or agreed to be interviewed, at least 24 hours prior to any observation or interview time. All teachers were informed that they might opt out of the study by checking off the appropriate section of the consent form (or by not returning the consent form).

Identification of participants was perhaps the primary potential risk associated with participation in the study. Because I interviewed a relatively small sample size of teachers who work in extended physical spaces, I have planned the selection process to potentially involve any or all of the teachers who work and have worked in these spaces. This diffused the potential for identification of individual participants. Pseudonyms were used for all participants and all information that could potentially identify individuals was removed or masked through techniques such as slightly altering phrases (without changing meaning) that could identify the participant and other information that might serve to identify a particular participant (such as their specific teaching role, years working at the school, and so forth). It was occasionally necessary to paraphrase certain comments and unique language used by interviewees that might be used to identify them.

Notes related to observations were taken on stenopads or on a computer. These were locked in a secure filing cabinet when not being used, and computer files were encrypted and stored on a personal computer that was also locked in a cabinet when not in use. Interviews were recorded on a computer voice recorder. These files were pass-coded and the computer kept in a locked cabinet when not in my personal use. On interview protocols and observation files and notes, pseudonyms were used to replace individuals' names; these pseudonyms were used in all on-site recording of a participant's name. The key to these codes is stored in the locked cabinet. My thesis supervisor and myself have been and will be the only people who have access to the data. We are both aware of UBC ethical guidelines concerning privacy and confidentiality issues. All data (raw/paper and digital) will be stored in a locked cabinet in the alarm-protected office of the PI on the UBC campus for five years.

3.7 Data Analysis

School documents, observation field notes, and transcribed interviews were used as raw data for analysis. I followed the approach suggested by Miles and Huberman (1994),
guiding my processes of reducing data, displaying the data, and drawing conclusions based on the data. As part of the reduction process, I became familiar with my raw data (thinking about potential themes contained therein) by reading hard copies of all transcript protocols, documents and notes and making my own notes and memos when necessary. I then developed an initial list of codes using a process described by Zhang and Wildemuth (2009): I looked for units of text that could be analysed based upon what appeared to be common themes (words, sentences, etc.) and developed categories and a subsequent initial coding scheme. I based codes upon individual acts I observed, activities of participants, apparent meanings participants offered through language related to my research questions, a look at relationships between organizational members and by thinking about context of setting (Loftland et al., 2006). I tested my initial coding scheme on the text of one interview, and further refined the codes used. I then began coding the data using my fairly substantial list of approximately 40 codes. I found the need (suggested by Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003) to continually be thinking about the codes and revising the list by grouping and regrouping codes related to common themes.

Throughout the coding process, I reflected upon questions that Charmaz (2003, p. 94-95) recommends a researcher ask him- or herself: What is going on? What are people doing? What is the person saying? What do these actions and statements take for granted? How do structure and context serve to support, maintain, impede, or change these actions and statements? I found this form of questioning to be helpful in linking data together and making connections within and between my research questions. The specific manner in which I engaged in coding was inspired by the recommendations of Auerbach and Silverstein (2003). Using my coding list (which I revised throughout the process as connections became more apparent and I learned more about my data) I began searching for repeating ideas both within protocols and across protocols. As I became more involved with my data, I was able to put repeating ideas together into themes. These themes were used to continue to refine and reduce my list of codes and to develop theoretical constructs, described by Auerbach and Silverstein (p. 39) as “the organization of themes into larger, more abstract ideas”.

I initially coded the observations and interview transcripts by hand, writing codes and memos (about themes) in the margins of the printed documents. After developing theoretical constructs, I engaged in what Miles and Huberman refer to as displaying data (displaying, in
some way, an organized and reduced quantity of data). I did this in two steps, which spanned the coding and display processes. First, I essentially re-coded the data, grouping it into a reduced set of themes (and beginning theoretical constructs). I created a word document that contained bolded headings (the themes that emerged from my initial paper-and-pen coding of all protocols) further grouped into topics addressing my research questions (organizational values, interactions with others, meanings derived from extended physical spaces, notions of collegiality, power). Using my hand-coded data and computer copies of the original, pre-coded transcripts, I used Auerbach & Silverstein’s method of copying and pasting selections of text under common thematic headings (and what became the beginnings of my theoretical constructs). At the end of this process, I had approximately 65 pages of raw data (response, observation and text from documents) grouped into common themes, further grouped (loosely) into beginning constructs related to my research questions (such as: how collegiality is constructed, and common spaces as places of interactions). I printed these pages as hard copies. Auerbach and Silverstein suggest various ways to organize themes into more abstract constructs such as visually arranging the data, and Miles and Huberman describe how displaying data (as a means to describe it) in the initial phases of analysis can lead to better interpretations through the conclusion process.

I used my re-organized thematic raw data in this manner. To visually see connections between data, I used a series of large sheets of paper, each of which I labelled with one of my broad research questions (meanings from extended physical spaces, collegiality, etc.). I physically cut up the 65 pages of reorganized themes and began to further organize the data under the broad research topics (while simultaneously re-creating new thematic headings and regrouping themes). I was able to physically manipulate headings, recreate themes, include memos, and move around the raw data. At the end of this process I had further organized the majority of my data into common themes on these large pieces of paper, and was able to see emerging thematic constructs. I was then able to develop the theoretical constructs that follow in my findings. Miles and Huberman (1994) and Hammersley and Atkinson (2007) note the importance of verifying one’s conclusions through the various processes including looking for competing themes, outliers, and triangulation. I engaged in this process as described both in my analysis of findings and in the reflexivity/trustworthiness, and limitations sections of the thesis. I attempted to triangulate data by using a variety of sources.
and different data collection techniques, and by examining the theoretical constructs I developed across the data, as well as by reflecting upon my experience in the school as both researcher and practitioner (having worked there for the past five years).

3.8 Trustworthiness of Research Findings

Shenton (2004), building upon the work of Lincoln and Guba (1985), provides the researcher with design suggestions to enhance the overall trustworthiness of the findings that are applicable to my study. These fall under four specific areas (credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability). I will discuss each of these four areas, and the measures I have taken to incorporate them into my research design. Credibility refers to the congruence of findings to reality (Shenton, 2004). This can be assessed, Shenton explains, through a number of measures including: employing methods that have been used and validated by other researchers; a general familiarity with the research setting prior to beginning data collection; use of different data collection strategies; drawing attention in analysis to inconsistencies; frequent check-backs/debriefing sessions/scrutiny with and by other researchers; and through member checking, which involves showing data to the participant to ensure meanings derived by the researcher are congruous with meanings intended.

I drew upon Shenton’s suggestions to ensure a degree of credibility in this study. The use of ethnographic tools for data collection and techniques like photo elicitation have proven successful in numerous other research studies of this nature and are considered to be valid methods of data collection. I triangulated my data through the use of different data collection techniques, including the use of organizational documents, informal and formal observations of several settings and timeframes, and the use of interviews. I was fortunate to have, prior to engaging in the research, an in-depth familiarity with the school. Through the analysis that follows, I have made an effort to note any inconsistencies or outliers in the data. Throughout the research process I engaged in regular check-backs and debriefing with my supervisor, and also engaged in member-checking in which I asked participants (particularly in the case of my interviews) to verify meaning that I derived from the transcripts. Shenton also recommends the researcher incorporate some degree of reflective commentary, in which he or she discussed openly the experience in the field and success or challenges encountered with the methodology employed. Such a discussion is engaged in the Researcher Reflections section of Chapter 5.
Shenton (2004) refers to transferability as how well the research findings apply to other settings. He acknowledges the difficulty in transferring a multivariable context to another location. In fact he notes “since the findings of a qualitative project are specific to a small number of particular environments and individuals, it is impossible to demonstrate that the findings and conclusions are applicable to other situations and populations.” (p. 69). However he recommends that the researcher make explicitly clear in the findings certain important details about the study. These include location, number of and nature of participants, the data collection methods, and the number of data collection sessions and timeframes involved.

While the transferability of findings in a study such as this is precarious at best (considering the multitude of specific variables, interpretations, and subjectivities of experience of both researcher and participant), Shenton does suggest that incorporating the aforementioned details will allow the reader to make his or her decisions about transferability; it is up to the reader to determine if sufficient transferability exists to another setting to effectively use the findings. The methods chapter of this study, as well as significant details about the participants and the case school in the findings chapter, have been included for reader perusal. The reader must become aware that details that would enhance transferability (such as certain specific characteristics of the school, teacher roles and personal details and so forth) have not been incorporated to enhance privacy and confidentiality of participants.

Shenton refers to dependability as being able, to the best of one’s ability considering the continually changing social phenomena and context of a qualitative research case, to replicate the research study in a similar context. Dependability had been addressed when “the processes within the study [have been] reported in detail, thereby enabling a future researcher to repeat the work, if not necessarily to gain the same results” (Shenton, 2004, p. 71). In addressing dependability, Shenton recommends including a clear description of research design, details about what actually occurred in the field, and an evaluation of the effectiveness of inquiry and methodology after the research is complete. This study incorporates a clear and detailed methodological design, incorporating a qualitative case-study approach using ethnographic research tools. Further specifics are located within the methods chapter. Details about what occurred in the field (which may by incongruous with
the methodology I have described) and a description of the effectiveness of inquiry and methodology of the study has been included in the Reflections section.

Finally, Shenton draws attention to confirmability, which he refers to as a qualitative researcher’s “comparable concern to objectivity” (Shenton, 2004, p. 72). “Here,” he continues, “steps must be taken to help ensure as far as possible that the work’s findings are the result of the experiences and ideas of the informants, rather than the characteristics and preferences of the researcher.” He highlights the importance of using triangulation of data during this progress. Miles and Huberman (1994) remind the researcher that dependability is best achieved through being transparent about one’s beliefs and pre-dispositions in all aspects of the research, from explaining why certain methods were used (as opposed to others) and to openly discussing why one may choose a methodology or theoretical lens over another.

All sociological research must assume that findings are subjective and (to be confirmable) require the researcher to engage in reflexive thought and disclosure. This is where an overlap occurs between incorporating measures of trustworthiness in research design and being reflexive as a researcher. My location, in terms of choosing a methodology, a theoretical lens, and a topic for study (among other things pertinent to this research) is a part of a personal world-view based upon the larger context of my beliefs, values, and organizational experiences. I will discuss this further in the reflexivity section that follows.

3.9 Reflexivity

Having worked at Parkdale for five years, and having professional relationships with all teachers, I recognize that I have developed ideas about how spaces are used in the building, many of which were formed prior to engaging in this research. I am, of course, a member of the Parkdale organization and have interacted with the teacher-participants long before the conception of this project. This intimate relationship with the organization and fellow members has been both an opportunity and a challenge; while I have insight into the organization well beyond (and prior to) my two months of data collection, I am analyzing various organizational structures of which I have inherently become a part.

Reflexive thought is required, as is the awareness that, as an organizational member myself, that I have contributed to and participated in many aspects of organizational
environment. By virtue of this participation, I have created personal interpretations of its organizational symbols, values, and structures and continue to be a part of their creation and re-creation. For example, I played a role in the collaborative process used to create the school’s mission statement and values matrix, documents I subsequently used in this study to unpack Parkdale’s organizational values. In a sense, I contributed to creating the values-system I later described.

Banks (1998) recommends that researchers make their values or orientations apparent in discussions of the research itself. It is necessary to reflect on how these values may influence research design, data collection, analysis, and the report of findings. I continue to interrogate and develop an awareness of data I chose to include and what I chose to leave out, and the overall validity of my thought processes both within and outside of the field. I created this project with specific notions about the organization: I see teacher collaboration as a desirable value, the promotion of collegial relationships between teachers and between teachers and administration as necessary to promote an effective community and working/learning environment, and I believe that effective school leadership promotes distributed decision-making tied to a strong collaborative and interactive processes. These beliefs about the organization subsequently become a part of my analysis.

My research at Parkdale has yielded opportunities and challenges. Recording observations was a challenge in that I had to decide what was significant and what was significant to both focus on and to record. For example, when I chose a location in the staffroom in which to sit, I used my judgement as to what would be the best spot to sit as to not be obtrusive, but also to be able to hear and record snippets of conversations, and to describe physical phenomena that I deemed as relevant. I knew it was not possible to locate myself in a way that I could legitimately hear and record everything, so I had to make choices. This included who I was to observe. When large numbers of people were in a setting, all engaging in conversation, I could not have my attention on everyone. Similar challenges presented in the selection of appropriate documents. Due to a vast number of documents available for use, I had to make choices as to which I thought would be the most salient for analysis. During analysis of documents, observations, and interview protocols, I created a list of codes that I felt represented participant experience based upon my research questions. I coded, and re-coded data, organizing it in themes and thematic constructs.
While I used primary data, it was my intuition (based upon my methodology) and experience that determined what to include, what not to include, and the significant categories through which to organize and present the data. Throughout these processes choices had to be made, essentially privileging some responses and observations over others. I also had to assume that what I chose to include within my observations, and the information garnered through questions asked was representative of the theoretical constructs that I eventually developed. I can not beyond a reasonable doubt (nor can any researcher conducting research) guarantee or state outright that nothing was missed, and that descriptions, themes, and eventual finding are completely representative of participant experience. Much is left to the interpretation of the researcher.

Challenges aside, engaging in a qualitative case-study as a researcher-practitioner affords opportunities as well. Banks (1998) offers recommendations for educational researchers who may find themselves as either insiders or outsiders within the community they study. These positions present both challenges and opportunities. An indigenous insider, for example, is an individual who tends to “endorse the unique values, perspectives, behaviours, beliefs, and knowledge within his or her indigenous community and is perceived by people within the community as a legitimate community member who can speak with authority about it” (Banks, 1998, p. 8). One can argue an insider does not necessarily endorse these values, perspectives and so forth, but certainly possesses access to, and an understanding of, these concepts. I consider myself to be an insider at Parkdale. The opportunity here is that I have (based on my own interpretations and values) an intimate knowledge of my school organization, a sense of its organizational values, a sense of how spatiality plays out, a sense of how collegiality is constructed, and some experience with on-site power relationships. Though I consider myself an insider, some teacher-participants may have viewed me as a partial-outsider, possessing a lesser degree of legitimacy as one who speaks for the Parkdale community. This may be possible due to my relationship with UBC (the outside community) and my requirement and desire to bring knowledge about the organization to those who are not members.

In qualitative research designs, it is important to consider the construction of emic and etic knowledge (Lett, 1996) as it relates to the insider-outsider continuum. Emic constructs refer to the various accounts, descriptions, and other derived knowledge.
considered to be appropriate and meaningful to the participants of a particular culture, in this case, the Parkdale teacher-participants. As an *insider*, I share in Parkdale’s emic constructs: certain values, buy-in to social structures and written/unwritten rules, and the concept of school, pedagogy, what defines a *school space*, and so forth. In contrast, etic constructs are the accounts, descriptions, and other derived knowledge as it pertains to an outside community. The etic in my study involves deriving theory and research knowledge of interest to organizational researchers (at UBC, for example) and educators in general (such as school district upper administration). An effective method of qualitative design incorporates aspects of both emic and etic epistemologies in research design to incorporate a diversity of thought and to increase the usability (for both the community studied as well as the greater society) and overall reliability of the findings (Lett, 1996; Morris et al., 1999). I have made attempts at including both concepts in this study.

Bourdieu’s *participant objectivation* (Bourdieu, 2003) offers the researcher an opportunity to practice reflexive sociology. He suggests that a researcher’s “most decisive scientific choices (of topic, method, theory, etc.) depend closely on the location she (or he) occupies within her (or his) professional universe” (Bourdieu, 2003, p. 283). He goes on to enumerate various perspectives a researcher may bring to the research table, including those embedded in the organizational, cultural and social structures of the discipline, as well as factors such as dominant paradigms, history, and personal experiences. In terms of this research, Bourdieu’s work suggests my life-history as well as my work-history as a teacher over the past twelve years, alongside my position within the Parkdale organization, contributes to the subjective nature of my research orientation. As I created my research design, interacted with teacher-participants and collected data, analyzed the data, and reported findings, I have reflected upon my experiences as a member of the organization. The reader of this research should bear in mind the following points: I have worked on numerous Parkdale committees including the council which engages in joint-decision making, a social responsibility group, and various other school committees; I have worked extensively with groups of teachers and the administration to enhance school culture in various ways; as a teacher-leader I have in-depth experience working alongside Parkdale administration; this thesis forms part of a graduate degree in educational leadership; and I am likely going to pursue a career in educational administration. The subjective has already
influenced this study in that the ideas and values I possess as a member of the organization (in addition to my orientations as a teacher, my general life experiences, my cultural and sociological values, and so forth) have collaborated to drive the very research questions and overall design of this thesis. For example, I have chosen to use a symbolic interactionist approach because I feel that it provides for a degree and depth of description that will offer a rich analysis that will be deemed relatable by, and useable for, the educators and leaders who read this study who may be seeking solutions to spatial issues. My choice to use feminist empowerment theory is related to a belief that power-with orientations promote power-sharing, and community-building (which I see as beneficial to schools and teachers).

The very research questions posed are the products of my subjective experience. As a teacher with an interest in, and who is considered by staff to engage in, educational leadership by virtue of my role in the school, I have particular educational values and a view of what constitutes an effective school. The fact that I included collegiality, for example, as a part of my research questions is a based upon a judgement of what is important in relation to the spatial. My notions of what constitutes organizational culture affected what I recorded as observations. They affected the questions I asked and how deeply I probed for information, and how I subsequently classified and sorted data. These examples are but a few of a multitude of interconnected and embedded subjectivities already present within my (and all) sociological research. To engage in legitimate reflexivity, the researcher must “systematically explore the ‘unthought categories of thought which delimit the thinkable and predetermine the thought’” (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 40). They suggest researchers look at their own social origins and to dig deep into one’s epistemological orientation. In reflecting upon these suggestions and attempting to connect these to my research design, unthought categories of thought that come to mind include aspects of my educational background and academic experience. For example, I completed my K-12 education in the Canadian public education system. Without going into an over-detailed personal narrative about public education (and the many nuances of my own educational history), I can say with certainty that I have a particular view of (and values related to) Canadian democratic western society, of a social-welfare capitalist state system of government, and a value towards intellectual pursuit in a university environment, and grew up in what many define as a middle-class household in which the language spoken was English. These values contribute
to my world-view that may privilege the pursuit of knowledge and a particular system of governance (among a multitude of other, interconnected variables), and become infused in my research.

It is also necessary to reflect upon the “social and intellectual unconscious embedded in analytic tools and operations” (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 36). Here, it is suggested that the very methodological tools used in a research study are infused with particular values. For example, as a student at the University of British Columbia, in the Department of Educational Studies, the courses I have taken and professors from whom I have learned have chosen to present knowledge, be it theory or methods (etcetera) that are either aligned with their orientations toward research (there exists even in the academy a multitude of approaches and viewpoints) or those of particular research traditions. The references used throughout this thesis were carefully chosen (over others) to illustrate particular points and constructions of knowledge. One could argue these I privileged these choices over others. While one cannot choose research traditions, methods, theories, or fields of interest without privileging something over another, I have at the very least acknowledged this fact and moved forward.

3.10 Limitations of the study

This study is ambitious in that it has examined aspects of a school’s physical structure and examined relationships within areas of significant complexity. The complex nature of human interaction with one another, with constructing organizational meaning and values, and power relationships within an organization suggests a need to look at this thesis’ limitations. As a masters thesis, time and resources available for data collection were limited. While six interviews and twelve sessions of formal observation provided a significant quantity of data, I made connections based largely upon interviews with only some of the teachers working in extended physical spaces. Others could have been consulted. Including maps of the school layout and specific teacher-participant profiles (examining work roles) would have aided the reader in further understanding the findings, by providing more detail. Similarly, photos of Parkdale’s physical spaces (particularly those used during photo elicitation) may have aided the reader to better understand (and personally apply to one’s own setting) written descriptions and analysis of said locales. However I feel that the inclusion of this data too readily identifies the school and potential research
participants all too ready, particularly because schools are public spaces, and much of this information can be searched online (school maps with teacher names attached to classrooms, for example). I examined collegial constructions and organizational values based upon observation throughout the school, and by the experiences of these six teachers. While they form approximately 20% of the teaching staff, more time would allow for interviews with teachers who do not work in extended physical spaces to provide their thought on collegiality, spatiality, and interaction.

There is a nuance in ascertaining the degree to which the spatial relates to the collegial when compared to other factors such as individual agency/personal propensity to engage in collegial relations and whether the composition of staff members working together affects collegiality (grade-levels/subject areas, whether staff like each other personally, life situations etc.). It should be noted that this study occurred during a time of teacher union job action in which I observed conflict between both the union and district administration, between the union and government, and between individual teachers over issues related to this job action. Because the job action is not a usual occurrence, it is difficult to know to what degree its presence affected research findings. The findings contained herein represent my own interpretations of teacher responses, particularly in the case of observations, in which a full and complete context may not be apparent. While I did take on measures to triangulate themes based upon multiple respondents and data sources, it would be challenging to get a clear view of organizational values and culture without consulting all members. While my status within the school as an insider may have assisted in better understanding aspects of the organizational culture and spatiality that might not have been available to an outsider, such a role is not without its limitations. While staff may have been more comfortable and apt to provide depth and accuracy of response (less inhibition than with an outside interviewer), conversely it is possible that staff members may have been less comfortable speaking about power relationships and potentially discursive topics with an insider, with whom they work every day.
Chapter 4: Research Findings & Discussion

My goal throughout this discussion is to bring to life the voices and perspectives of Parkdale staff pertaining to spatial, collegial and power-related issues and systematic analyses of their relationships. While conducting observations at Parkdale, a teacher-participant approached me to ask for clarification on why I was interested in studying school spaces. After a brief discussion, she said emphatically “as a school, I don’t think we understand at all how important the spaces in this building are to us!” She summed up the primary objective of this study. Its purpose was to examine a large and growing school in which space was, and is, an ongoing issue and to learn about how space, teacher interaction, collegiality, and power relationships come together as influences in the working lives of educators. Through this analysis it is hoped that schools struggling with similar spatial issues can find solutions or avenues towards solutions that will better the working and learning environment.

Prior to an examination of findings based upon my research questions, I will briefly discuss a relationship that I discovered between teacher conceptions of spatiality and organizational culture. Next, I will address research findings in two parts, both of which are based upon my research questions. First, I will discuss how teachers characterize school spaces. I will begin by discussing the ways in which they ascribe meanings to spaces in the original building, and I will then examine how they ascribe meaning to extended physical spaces. Second, I will examine the nature of teacher interactions (particularly by those working in extended physical spaces) and teacher constructions of collegiality at Parkdale. I will address the intersections of spatiality, collegiality, and power relationships throughout the discussion.

Through observation and inference I have attempted to see and to understand how power, which in present in all social relationships (Sandstrom & Fine, 2003), relates to spatiality, one’s interactions with other within space and one’s ascribing meaning to, and deriving meaning from, the space itself, thereby producing and reproducing it (McGregor, 2003). I asked teacher-participants specific questions designed to elicit their experience and perceptions of how power plays a role in their work lives. These included questions related
to perceived social-status hierarchy of teachers within the school, a question about the process through which spaces are allocated to teachers, and questions involving how interviewees defined workplace politics in general and at the school, in terms of the allocation of or experience working in, extended physical spaces. Because power is an implicit part of all social interaction and permeates all facets of an organization (Reynolds & Herman-Kinney, 2003), to reduce the concept of power into themes is challenging at best. For this reason, my findings related to power relationships at Parkdale will permeate all discussions of space, interactions, and collegiality.

Spatiality and organizational culture: Through both observation and interviews, teacher-participants frequently cited what they viewed as important aspects of the school, concepts I would describe as symbols of organizational beliefs, values, and culture. Data contained numerous references that could be triangulated with documents pertaining to the culture and the overall structure of the school organization. For example, teachers observed and interviewed made frequent references to Parkdale’s foyer as reflecting, to a significant degree, its organizational values because it is the teachers and administration (with input from students and the community) who, through collaboration, discourse, and negotiation, worked to craft this space into one that they feel represents the school. The foyer (as I will later discuss) contains symbolic representations of documents such as mission statements and matrices representing social responsibility values. As a result of this emerging theme, I believe it would not be possible to provide a fair and effective analysis of how teachers make meaning of spaces, or of their interactions with one another, without incorporating into the discussion some examination of teachers’ espoused organizational values. It is important to understand organizational symbols (values, beliefs, and so forth) in order to provide a thorough and informed discussion of organizational culture (Meyer, 1995). Through the photo elicitation process, for example, many teachers spoke directly and openly about Parkdale’s organizational culture. I will speak to themes related to organizational culture throughout the following discussion, as it pertains to the intersection of the spatial with the collegial and forms of power. It is important to note that an entire organizational structure is embedded with power dynamics (Boonstra & Bennebroek-Gravenhorst, 1998). A school’s organization and its culture is created (and is continually in the process of being redefined) amid power relationships: power is involved in the adherence to policy based on particular
cultural and social viewpoints and hegemonies, constructions of collegiality derived from social and group norms (that may privilege orientations of the majority over those of the minority), and tensions related to how each of us interpret and judges the behaviour of others.

While I will, throughout this analysis, discuss the school’s organizational beliefs and values, it is important not to assume that all teachers share equally in these organizational beliefs and values. While many of the documents and other symbols that demonstrate these values were created, to some degree, by all teachers, this was achieved through discourse and negotiation. In other words, compromise did occur in such discussions and there are probably varying degrees of support and internalization of these values. There are also potential outliers – teachers who did not agree with outcomes. That being said, power-sharing does have significance in teachers’ characterizations of spatiality and of collegial constructions.

Words and phrases like “respect for others”, “building community”, “we not me” and so forth have, according to the teacher-participants I interviewed and through observed conversation, actively become a part of the language used by teachers, in discussions of school culture, professional relationships, and in direct teaching for students. These espoused values are also found throughout written documents – the mission statement (created by a groups of teachers through full staff consultation and consensus alongside the values matrix) appears on the school website, school documents, and newsletters. The eagle mascots values matrix appears in most classrooms, and agreements have been made amongst teachers to actively use this language with students both in formal lessons and on a day to day basis. I can surmise, through regular written and verbal use of terms like community, respect, accepting diversity, being safe, and welcoming others, that Parkdale’s teachers, at least on the surface, aspire to create and continually re-create notions of an organization in which members work together towards a goal of having an environment in which members feel safe, respected, welcomed and a part of a common vision. This is consistent with the theory that organizational members tend to create an organizational identity that encourages the development of common ideas and shared understandings of symbols and structures within the organization (Gioia et al, 2000). This apparent desire for common vision suggests a general desire amongst teachers to promote the citizenship of organizational members.
within the community through an attempt at power-sharing (see Tett, 2005). Through my experience prior to engaging in this study, I can accurately state that all teachers claim to teach some aspects of these values to students. Teachers have a series of lessons that they enact in September and a common school language used throughout the year based upon the social responsibility matrix (though teachers say that they teach these lessons, I can not confirm that this is or is not done in actual practice). However, the appearance of acceptance of this curriculum suggests that teachers (again to some degree) believe these values to be worthy of parting to those in their charge, whether that be to teach a value-base they deem worthy, or to orient/control behaviour and philosophy within the organization (see Hoy & Woolfolk, 1990, for an expanded discussion of this idea). I can surmise from statements like “I think of students because I see student artwork” [Stephanie], “children are a part of creating the tone” [Tamara], “it’s important that we model our values for students” [Maria], and “student learning should be at the centre of what we do” [an observed teacher] that student learning and participation in school life is also a salient value. In fact, all teacher-participants interviewed and many who were observed discussed the importance of the student as learner. This is a frequent topic of conversation at staff meetings (along with discussions of how to improve the process of student learning). The school’s mission statement (also created through full-staff collaboration and negotiation) refers to “the joy of teaching and learning”. This reference to the value of teaching as joy, coupled with ongoing professional developments and conversations I have observed related to what staff perceive as effective teaching and improving learning for students, I would surmise that the professional goal of being effective in one’s work role is a significant Parkdale value.

“There is a professional respect between people at the school,” Jane tells me. She later states, referring to teachers, “there are some people [who] have very different political views, having to work together in the same environment, with a common vision and a common goal but with an underlying political bend that is going to change how they teach and [create] conflict”. She infers that while there may be apparent organizational beliefs and values at Parkdale, not everyone necessarily shares in those to the same degree. This is consistent with the idea that organizational beliefs and values are negotiated by members and may not be espoused by all to the same degree (Amis, 2002; Whetten, 2003). She alludes to teachers as not always agreeing with one another in terms of how they make meaning of the
organizational ideals that I have described, and a tension that exists within. Ming has a similar sense: “I think obviously there are some people who have different viewpoints than others, which is completely normal, and I feel that there are some underlying issues”. Tamara has, at times felt “caught” between “different perspectives”. Jane, Ming and Tamara provide a glimpse into the complexity of organizational values at Parkdale. Members have differing interpretations of symbols, and conflict sometimes arises. Not all teachers necessarily have shared views of organizational culture. I will further discuss these tensions throughout the findings presentation. That being said, I would characterize Parkdale’s overall culture as one that strives for members to feel part of a community. Staff value a problem-solving and discussion-oriented approach to decision-making, a school tone that appears welcoming, kind and friendly, and a general feeling that they are respected by one another. These values appear to be communicated and lived largely through staff interaction (and, as we will discuss, constructions of collegiality). The tension between a desire by some members to satisfy individual (over group) needs suggests, to some degree, that teachers locate themselves (as a group) on a continuum of power experience, fluidly exploring power-over and power-with. That said, this phenomenon may be more complex, in that teachers may locate themselves along a changing power continuum; depending on a particular issue and one’s personal or group orientation around it, a teacher, group, or leader may use differing degrees of power-with or power-over behaviours and decision-making structures. In sum, Parkdale’s matrix provides a set of values that adequately reflect an overall culture through which many reflective symbols can be found: having a positive community-oriented attitude/interacting positively with others, solving problems collaboratively and peacefully, taking ownership of one’s choices, having respect for others, engaging in community-oriented behaviours/welcoming others and being effective in one’s work role.

4.1 How teachers ascribe meanings to spaces in the school

Physical spaces are significant to the work that teachers do in schools and have an effect on teachers’ capacity to engage in teaching (Armstrong & Bray, 1997). The classroom, for example, is (in most schools) the locale in which most teaching and learning takes place. In addition to classrooms, teachers have a relationship with many different spaces within the school building. Movement and interaction within space “causes humans to associate certain experiences with particular places, which, in turn, allows physical
structures to evoke meaning for their occupants” (Hatch, 2006, p. 222). The previous discussion listed the ways that organizational members negotiate and espouse aspects of group culture, through the meaning made from representations of symbols, beliefs and values. The discussion that follows provides an examination of how Parkdale teachers ascribe meanings to the spaces in the school. Spaces in the original building are presented first, and extended physical spaces second. Aspects of power are discussed throughout.

4.1.1 Spaces in the original building

In examining how teachers ascribe meaning to spaces in the original building, it is important to remember that all teachers participating in this study, whether interviewees or observed participants, either have at one point, or currently do, work in the school’s original building. Not only is this physical portion of the school that which contains the greatest number of classrooms and offices, it is the main point of entry for the school, as well as a significant locale of social spaces, as I will describe. I will describe aspects of the original building layout and features that Parkdale teachers tended to deem as significant to their work and professional lives.

The original building’s layout (see figure 1) is essentially divided into two wings which extend east and west from what one could refer to as a central core. The primary entrance of the school opens to a reasonably spacious foyer. Adjoining the foyer are entrances into each of the two wings, as well as to the main office, the library, a multipurpose room and the gymnasium, and the only staff washrooms. Through the photo elicitation process, all interviewees, when shown photos of the Parkdale foyer, described it in positive terms. Each participant was shown a photo of the foyer from the perspective of entering the school and asked to tell me what comes to mind as she looked at the photo. The teacher-participants (all of whom currently work in extended physical spaces) referred to elements of the school foyer as capturing what they believe to be organizational values. Julia refers to the “evolution of our school” as being evident in visual imagery throughout. Observational data supported this claim. During many instances teachers referred to the foyer in a positive manner, and discussed visual aspects in a manner that suggested a representation of their values. The foyer’s visual imagery takes the form of posters, artwork, and other written messages, created by students and teachers, that communicate themes related to school values. A paper eagle with outstretched wings is seen hanging from the ceiling. There are
pictures of the school mascots (student-created figures who are a part of the school’s social responsibility expectation matrix) and written copies of the matrix itself. The foyer contains a variety of large work tables, chairs, and student artwork on the walls. The ceilings are vaulted with skylights above, from which stream natural light. A walk through the school’s foyer offers clues about espoused group values: the school’s mission statement, mascots, a matrix describing respectful attitudes and practices for students and staff, as well as an array of student work adorn the walls, display cabinets, and general décor. Tables are often active with students working on common projects, sofas are occupied by parents talking with one another, and students sometimes line the walls reading together.

“It’s what we stand for,” Julia says, in describing what the foyer means to her. “What we find important at Parkdale. Respect, attitude…I think what hits me foremost when I walk in now is I see what’s really important here…What’s important is how we conduct ourselves
and move around our building”. She describes the mascots and the social responsibility goals and expectations as representing the school culture. These include having a positive community-oriented attitude, solving problems peacefully, taking ownership of one’s choices, having respect for others and participating enthusiastically in ways that demonstrate school values. During several formal and a number of informal observations I heard staff members speak about the school foyer. “The eagle looks wonderful. It’s an amazing way of building community” a teacher said to another during one such observation. The table group she was sitting at all appeared to agree rather emphatically. This matrix will become important throughout the analysis as I believe its content (related to the aforementioned values) has become for staff a symbol of both organizational values and collegiality. It was created jointly, initially by groups of teachers and administrators, and then crafted by groups comprised of staff (as well as other community stakeholders), all of whom had the opportunity for input in its design and content. It has become a shared object (and concept) that actively helps teachers to “define their work and identity, and are…spatially constituted” (see McGregor, 2003, p. 349). It is also symbolic of a desire to engage in community and joint power-sharing.

Jane also refers to visual symbols when discussing Parkdale’s culture. “Social responsibility comes to mind” she tells me, pointing out that the mascots, animals whose names form an acronym for the values found within the matrix, are symbols with meaning that is easily recognizable by staff, students, and the community at large. Tamara feels entering the school is “…very welcoming. There’s a clear message because what’s posted is the mascot … and the matrix… it looks like children are a part of creating the tone”. Jane feels that “community comes to mind” in describing the foyer. “It’s very welcoming” Stephanie says. Words referring to the feeling of welcome were abundant throughout school documents as well spoken of in reference to the foyer, as well as to a staff desire for this general feeling during some of my observations, particularly during a table talk at one of the staff meetings, and during a meeting of teachers discussing union issues. In each case the foyer (and a general desire for an overall tone) of being welcomed were observed, connecting with the organizational value of engaging in community-oriented behaviours and welcoming others.
Other spaces within the original building formed a part of both interviews and observations. Teacher-participants spoke frequently about what I refer to as *common spaces*. These are spaces in which interactions between staff members frequently and regularly occur. It is in these common spaces where teachers, who work in all parts of the school, can be observed gathering for either social or work-related purposes. These spaces include Parkdale’s staffroom, copier room, library, office, and several meeting rooms. All of these spaces are located in the center part of the original building. During photo elicitation, a picture of the staffroom was shown to interviewees, and the teachers were asked what comes to mind as they looked at the photo of the staffroom. I added that these feelings could be in a state of being empty, or in a state of being full of people. Participants all spoke in-depth about their feelings toward, and the meaning they ascribe from this room. It is located in the centre of the original building, slightly west of the foyer, and across from the office. It contains a kitchen, seven round tables surrounded by chairs (and additional chairs stacked along the walls), a window, a computer work station, and a closet. It is irregularly pentagonal in shape, and has a small couch on one wall, which I have rarely seen used. Based upon my experience at Parkdale, the room is primarily used by staff for breaks (usually recess and lunch), for some staff meetings, and occasionally, as a workspace.

I observed on many occasions teachers congregating in the staffroom engaging in interaction. It appears to provide a space for teachers to interact with one another, which, as teacher-participants have identified through interviews and was triangulated through my observation of where teachers gather, may not be available to the same degree within their primary workspaces. The staffroom is also significant to teachers because they use it (through social interactions with colleagues) as a way to affirm their role as a teacher in the face of colleagues, and to gain or maintain social status amongst other teachers (Kainan, 1994). It is also a place where teachers feel camaraderie and support from one another through storytelling and other forms of interaction (Kainan, 1995). A dual-purpose of interaction may be to feel this camaraderie and also to create and sustain networks of power-sharing. When looking at photos of the staffroom, teacher-participants interviewed all frequented it on what they identified as a fairly regular basis. Half of my formal observations and many informal observations occurred within this space. I observed, during break times, teachers from all parts of the school gathering in this room. I noted some
teachers in this space during each of my observations, and others coming to the space less frequently, though every teacher who gave consent to participate in the study was observed in the staffroom at least twice during break times. All teachers were observed in the space during the staff meeting. McGregor (2004b) refers to areas in which teachers tend to congregate for interactive purposes as “a dynamic enterprise…manifested through a network of formal and informal relations, which [are] a locus of wider socio-spatial flows” (p. 364).

In effect, teachers are producing the social nature of this space, and essentially creating a space in which to socialize. There is an interesting conflict between intention and outcome, because, while significant numbers of teachers choose to attend the staff room and interact with one another, they do so with a degree of discomfort. Interviewees generally described the space as busy, overcrowded, and noisy. Each respondent felt that it was difficult to hear others thereby making interaction more challenging. “It’s not a calming space,” Julia tells me. “…it used to be four or five of us at a table, now it’s eight, sometimes ten. The table is only so big and it feels like we are competing with each other”.

I have both observed and experienced the crowded nature of this room. At times during my formal observations, I saw as many as 30 staff members using the space at once. The staffroom was almost empty prior to recess quickly becoming crowded. When teachers entered, they tended to sit at a table one by one, until all the chairs (about six per table) were full. I noted teachers usually filled one or two tables at a time. When a table became (at what was likely perceived by teachers to be at capacity - as Julia alluded to, often ten teachers would be sitting further back from the table, to allow for greater numbers to fit around it), staff members entering the room would begin sitting at a new table. Sometimes two tables would become occupied at once, but almost always two or three tables would remain vacant. Teachers arriving in the staffroom were observed scanning the room and either joining a table in which they could fit, sitting at a table by themselves (rarely observed) or congregating in the kitchen area.

Julia noted a sense of competition for air time during interactions. Ming sees the layout of the space as impeding interaction: “It feels a little crowded. A little bit loud sometimes. It’s not a bad thing…but I think for the amount of people we have in here, it’s not…designed in a way to accommodate them.” Through my formal and informal observations of the space, I attempted to note the frequency with which certain teachers sat at
the same tables, looking for common patterns. Interestingly, during each observation, the tables were mixed by grade-level/teaching role, seniority, and parts of the school in which teacher workspaces are found. Teachers tended to sit with different teachers from day to day. Who sat with whom tended to be based more upon when a teacher entered the staffroom and which table had space, rather than a pre-determined pattern or pecking order. This is contrary to the work of O’Boyle (2001) and Paetcher (2004) who suggest that school staffrooms contain a visible seating hierarchy. Tamara and Ming both noted that teachers at Parkdale do not sit in cliques or homogenous groupings from day to day. That said, all teacher-participants interviewed alluded to feeling uncomfortable at times in the staffroom, during times when teachers were congregating and interacting with one another. While I did not see a particular seating hierarchy, it is possible that those who work in extended physical spaces (a further distance to the staffroom than the majority of other classrooms) could be at a disadvantage in having less choice where to sit, or perhaps more likely to feel uncomfortable negotiating seating in a crowded room, or, worse, feeling relegated to an empty (and potentially lonely) table due to the crowded-nature of the room. In other words, in a first-come, first-served seating arrangement, assuming all teachers left their classroom for the staff room at the same time, teachers working in the extended physical spaces would arrive last to the staffroom, and have a greater likelihood of facing a group of fully-occupied tables. Those at a further proximity to a staffroom are also less likely to use it, resulting in a reduced frequency of interaction with colleagues (Bissell, 2004). In this sense, teachers working in extended physical spaces may feel at a disadvantage compared to those working in the original building, highlighting a key power differential, and may, in fact, produce some form of hierarchy (of which teachers may not be aware), as suggested by O’Boyle (2001) and Paetcher (2004) based upon one’s advantage in choosing where and with whom to sit. As well, the frequent and predictable nature of staffroom attendance during recess break times suggests this time for interaction has become somewhat of an organizational ritual (Smith & Stuart, 2011). Organizational members are often expected to attend such rituals. Those who do not feel comfortable in the staffroom or who are at a disadvantage in proximity to it (hence spending less time there) may be seen as, or feel they are perceived as, not participating in ritualized behaviour, thereby producing in-group versus out-group power dynamics and status.
When looking at photos of the staffroom, all interviewees identified the furniture as being problematic. Specifically, the respondents felt that the round tables made the environment uncomfortable for interactions with large numbers of people. For Jane, small round tables signify “cliquiness and exclusivity, the opposite of inclusivity”. She recounted: It’s a very threatening arrangement of tables for me. To me it’s not welcoming. I have many times, going into a staffroom with round tables, left because I didn’t know which table I was supposed to sit at, or if it was an empty table, it was pretty lonely.

I later asked Jane whether she felt an existing social hierarchy prevented her from choosing a table. She told me that she doesn’t feel that there is a social hierarchy in the staffroom at Parkdale, but rather was worried how teachers would perceive her if she did not sit at their table. She said her perceptions were likely related to negative experiences as a substitute teacher at other schools and not wanting to relive those experiences at Parkdale. Paetcher (2004) identifies substitute teachers as often being left out of interaction in the staffroom, or not fully accepted by regular teachers, even if they are in the school frequently. Interestingly I observed both frequent and new substitute teachers engaging in interactions alongside the faculty, appearing somewhat contrary to Paetcher’s suggestion. However, other teacher-participants confirmed the “separate, individual” nature [Ming, Maria, and Stephanie] of the small round tables and the general noise in the room. “When it’s busy and noisy, I’ll tend to avoid [the staffroom]” Stephanie states. In my observations, I did see teachers enter the room (when tables were full), scan the room, and leave (often with a beverage or food in hand, implying they had probably come in to stay and to interact). Noisy environments tend to decrease one’s comfort in that environment and can lead to stress responses (Schulte-Fortkamp, 2002). From a power perspective, those who are more tolerant to noise have a greater likelihood of engaging in interaction comfortably, while those with a lower noise tolerance, and who feel physical stress in this environment may frequent the environment less often, putting them at a disadvantage in terms of being able to interact socially with colleagues. However, another way of looking at staff experience in the staff room, as I have alluded to, is from a power-sharing perspective. Townsend et al. (1999) suggest women (I extend this to include all teachers), through interaction, build social networks of support. This is congruous with Parkdale’s organizational values and social spaces produced through
teacher interactions. Though teachers working in extended physical spaces may feel it more challenging to attend the staffroom, for the most part they do. All teachers, despite the noise and some communication challenges, at some point engage in interaction in this space. This suggests that Parkdale’s teachers are indeed attempting to build power-with social networks and to produce a space that is social and positive, despite some of the spatial challenges related to numbers of people and spatial aspects that make interaction more difficult.

While all interviewees viewed the staffroom as a spatial symbol of being emotionally uncomfortable and incongruent to communication with colleagues, I did not pick up on such feelings during observations. During all formal and informal observations of the staffroom I noted staff members to be interacting with one another in a manner in which everyone appeared, by virtue of gestures, body language, and facial expressions, to be interactive and quite comfortable in their surroundings. This includes those who were interviewed. However, as Kainan (1994) explains, teachers use a staffroom in a manner that both reinforces their role as teachers, and to produce social status amongst the peer group. It is possible that while teachers appear to be happy and engaged, they may feel aspects of physical or emotional stress, but attempt to appear engaged to both uphold espoused organizational values as well as social status. This would account for a discrepancy between teacher behaviours in the staff rooms and how they characterize the space.

The problematic, uncomfortable nature of the staffroom, for teachers working in extended physical spaces, may come from a tension between organizational values and the reality of interactions in this space, though Parkdale teachers appear to attempt to work together to mitigate this tension. Collegiality, which is produced by teacher interactions (Carspecken, 1996), a sense of community, and the feeling of a respectful, inclusive nature, may be put to the test in this common space. A room that teachers may ordinarily see as a symbol of organizational values may not provide for having a positive, community-oriented attitude/being part of the community, having respect for others, and engaging in community-oriented behaviours/welcoming others. While teachers appear to “do their best” to accommodate other colleagues, to the point of sitting at loud overcrowded tables, the nature of the space inhibits social interaction – the loud volume (created by many people attempting to interact), feelings of competition for airtime, and the cramped environment contribute to lessening the quantity and quality of interactions. This would be especially difficult for
teachers working in extended physical spaces, who feel overall that the frequency and quality of interactions with colleagues not working in extended physical spaces is already at a disadvantage, as Bissell (2004) notes of teachers working at a farther proximity from common spaces. However, congruous with a problem-solving oriented power—with philosophy of creating community and social networks, participants provided some potential solutions to the tension produced by the crowded nature of the common space.

Ming, and Maria suggested the use of a long, rectangular table that includes everyone: “a big long table, I want to say a knights of the round table kind of a thing, where everyone can fit around [Ming].” There is a clear desire for furniture that better conveys, for these teachers, the values of community and inclusiveness that are salient among members. Of course, a long table could have its own challenges, as it may be difficult to communicate with those at further points along it, and it likely would not reduce the noise level. Either way, teachers working in extended physical spaces feel a degree of separation and a challenge to effectively interact with others in the staffroom, which simultaneously reduces what they perceive to be an already reduced frequency/quality of interaction with colleagues. While they may appear to be content and happy in this space (such as during observations), in reality they have attached generally disparate meanings to this room. While some of these teachers choose to sit with colleagues in the staffroom regularly, despite these feelings of tension, some choose to avoid it altogether, at least at times, suggesting the space for them has become one that isolates and excludes. Though Parkdale teachers generally attempt to produce a common space that supports the building of networks and power-sharing, the space does not adequately support this for all members. It appears that teachers are, at least to some degree, thinking about how to mitigate these challenges.

Parkdale’s copier room, library, and central office are other areas where staff, during informal observations, were noted as tending to gather to engage in interaction. Based upon my previous experience at the school, I would suggest that these spaces are used more as professional (as opposed to social) spaces with staff members tending to congregate to achieve a specific job purpose as described by Bissell (2004). For example, the library is sometimes used as a meeting space; in the office teachers are frequently consulting with the clerical staff or school based administration and accessing files and information, and are either making photocopies or checking their mailboxes in the copier room. In either case,
small groups of teachers were observed interacting within these spaces on a regular basis, and consequently have produced social spaces for interaction. I did not show interviewees photos of these spaces, but I did conduct a formal observation in each of the library and the copier room. The library contains, along with shelves of books, five round tables. During a meeting, teachers pulled together the tables to form one long table. A teacher chaired the meeting, and other teachers raised their hand to respond during a discussion. Another teacher kept a speaker’s list in which she noted speakers in the order in which they raised their hands. During the meeting teachers appeared comfortable where they were sitting and appeared engaged and friendly with one another. I later asked a teacher why they moved the small tables to form one long table, and she said (as confirmed by my previous experiences) that they wanted to “create an environment where everyone felt welcomed and had a voice”. This is a solid example of teachers producing a social space in which to engage in the production and organizing of a network (see McGregor, 2004b, p. 362) through which they could engage in joint-discussion towards power-sharing and joint decision-making.

The copy room is the third space in which teachers tended to gather and interact both formally and informally, and I would define it as one of Parkdale’s common spaces in which socio-spatial relations are produced. It is a small room, with mailboxes lining two walls, paper storage cabinets against the third wall, and a large copy machine against the fourth. I engaged in one formal, and several informal observations in this space. A photo of this space was not shown during the interviews, however Jane, Maria, and Stephanie and Ming all identified it as a space in which staff members tend to gather and engage in interactions. During observations, the room became quite crowded. Staff members appeared to come into the room with a purpose, generally to use the mailboxes or the copy. However teachers engaged in a range of interactions, from professional talk to discussions of a personal nature. This was particularly salient as teachers were waiting in line to use the copier. Teachers sometimes had to walk around each other in what appeared to be an awkward manner, sometimes bumping into one another due to lack of space in the room. I did not witness apparent negative interactions, though I did see one or two of the teachers enter, quickly scan the room, and subsequently depart without acknowledging their colleagues. For the most part, teachers (of various different roles, and from all areas of the school, including the extended physical spaces) appeared to speak to one another in a friendly, polite, and
sometimes jovial manner. They asked one another about their day, sometimes about aspects of each other’s personal lives, and in many cases discussed their daily work. I could surmise through examining the topics of conversation, tone of voice and words engaged, gestures used, and patterns of teachers entering and exiting the room that staff generally perceive this room as a positive space in which to engage with colleagues and to complete a work task. This was not discussed directly in any interviews. The fact that some teachers entered and immediately left (when the room was crowded) could indicate a desire not to socialize, the feeling by that teacher that he or she has less status than the others, uncomfortable emotions associated with a crowded space, or a hierarchy of job tasks one feels need to be completed, perhaps privileged over social interaction. Alternatively, the space may be seen by some as a social place, and by others, less so. The friendly nature of interactions observed suggests that the space produces or facilitates a degree of interaction and networking, however, the small size of the room may symbolize (particularly when crowded) a limit on numbers able to interact comfortably. I cannot similarly discount the possibility that teachers chose not to enter the room when crowded because they had several tasks on the go, or other responsibilities that dissuaded them from waiting for the copier equipment.

Outside of the centre portions of the main building, an east and a west wing lead to a series of classrooms. The majority of classrooms are entered from a significant widening of the hallway, which teachers refer to as pods. These are open spaces lined with bulletin boards and tables and chairs that are often used by small groups of students working. Sometimes the pods are used for full group lessons and activities. Each classroom has a door and, next to it, a reasonably large window from which a teacher can see into the pod, or from the pod into the classroom. It is easy to see into other classrooms from adjacent rooms. Several classrooms are not in the actual pod, but rather in a more narrow hallway. In these cases, each classroom has a relatively large window in which one could easily see into the hall, and into the adjacent classrooms. On numerous occasions during informal observations I saw teachers conversing with each other in classrooms or outside their doors, both in the pod and the narrower hallways. Classrooms doors were sometimes left open and were sometimes closed. No classrooms had window coverings blocking the interior windows adjoining the pods and hallways.
4.1.2 Meanings ascribed to extended physical spaces

The presence of extended spaces (physical spaces that were conceived and added onto an original building at a date after the construction and occupation of that building) is both an old and a new phenomena at Parkdale. The modular classrooms were erected onsite approximately ten years ago, and the addition was conceived and constructed within the last two years, with teachers moving into that space less than one year from the report of these findings. As I describe how teacher-participants symbolize these extended physical spaces and construct meaning from them, bear in mind that I approach this topic from the theory that a physically extended space, upon becoming a part of an existing building (the original building, Parkdale Elementary in this case) also becomes an extension of the organization, occupied by organizational members who are a part of the culture and values of that organization. Though organizational culture is in a process of being continuously reconstructed and redefined (Albert et al., 2000), based upon our continuous interaction with the space as organizational members (McGregor, 2004), members working in the space are party to a spatiality and culture that exists in the original building, whether or not it is experienced in the same manner in an extended physical space. Analysis of teacher-participant interviews and observation yields a variety of ways that teachers construct meaning from Parkdale’s extended physical spaces. Teachers offer a diversity of characterizations of these spaces. I have organized these meanings into three categories or salient themes that I will discuss: Proximity to people and to resources; Appearance of extended physical spaces; and Functionality of extended physical spaces in terms of one’s work role. Throughout this discussion I propose several power-related themes that are characteristic of teacher-participants’ experiences working in Parkdale’s extended physical spaces.

Proximity to people and to resources: Teacher-participants interviewed identified proximity to people and to the resources they feel they need to effectively do their jobs as significant to the extended physical spaces in which they work. Most teachers spend the majority of their day working with students in a particular assigned space, usually working alone. The themes that emerged from discussing accessibility revealed these concepts: Physical separation from facilities and resources, and Social/Emotional isolation as well as
the concept accessing resources to do one’s job effectively. I will discuss each of these concepts in terms of working in extended physical spaces.

The notion of feeling separate from facilities and resources refers to the physical accessibility of what teachers view as the school, the representation of the organization (and corresponding values system) to which they belong. Teacher-participants alluded to extended physical spaces as feeling physically separate or not a part of the school and identified a number of reasons for this. Bissell (2004) found that those whose workspaces were at a farther proximity to resources felt they were disadvantaged compared to those working closer, in terms of effectively engaging in their work. The addition is generally viewed as less separate than the modular classrooms, but still distinct in nature. Stephanie describes the addition as being “down at the far end….It’s sort of on its own, but it’s still connected to the rest of the school”. Referring to layout, she views the addition as feeling separate from the original building and the teachers within by virtue of it having been built on the physical end of an existing hallway. “You’re still a part of the school,” she adds, “as opposed to the portable which is less accessible”. She makes a distinction between the addition, which feels less separate than a modular classroom, because it is still physically attached to the original building.

Maria refers to the addition as “not as central” as the original building, and described having worked in the original building as “…the middle zone [where] I just felt more a part of things”. On the addition, Julia states: “I feel like you’re away from the others…there is a real separation here”. This is paralleled by Ming: “the biggest thing for me is the feeling that you’re away from things [in the addition]”. Later clarification from Ming revealed that her statement of being “away from things” referred to “being away from colleagues”, which is supported by Maria’s statement: “I have heard people say…the new wing [is] a little bit far away” and the finding that where one’s workspace is located can have a significant impact on social relationships (Jacklin, 2000). During several conversations (recorded as part of my formal observations) teachers working in the original building used the term “new wing” to describe the addition. One of these teachers referred to the addition as being “far” and said “I never really get down there”. Several colleagues (sitting together) agreed, and a teacher working in an extended physical space appeared to sigh and said “I love it when people come down to our wing”. It is notable that teachers appear to define the addition as a supplemental
or third wing of the school, despite that fact that it is actually an addition to the west wing. By extending the wing, it is perceived by teachers to be (and in actuality is) farther than other classrooms to the center of the school, containing facilities like staff washrooms, the library, staff room, supply storage rooms, the office and copy room. The teacher-participants view the addition as a symbol for distant proximity to other staff members.

The addition is physically located on the edge of the building, and therefore, by virtue of its distance from what I presume to be the primary common spaces of the original building (its physical center), which creates a feeling of being separate, in line with the work of Jacklin (2000). This is reinforced by regular use of the words main building/old building and either new addition or new wing, language that all teacher-participants interviewed used, and which I observed frequently amongst other teachers at Parkdale. The words old and new have become symbols of this separation: both physical spaces are part of the same organization but a distinction exists between them. Feelings of separation are contrary to organizational values, particularly those related to engaging in community and conflict with an apparent desire by teachers to produce spaces that are interactive and embedded with the potential for shared-power.

Stephanie previously described the addition as being less separate from the main building than the portables. This view was paralleled by the other teacher-participants interviewed. “Working in a portable, you’re separate from the school body,” Jane states. “It feels different because you’re physically removed from the building”. During an observation, a teacher-participant referred to modular classrooms as being islands and the original building as the mainland. Maria refers to the modular classrooms as being “very separated from everybody else” while Tamara characterizes them as “little islands unto themselves”. Similar to the addition, it appears that staff view the portables as less accessible to colleagues than classrooms in the original building. The portables, for teachers working both in the original building and within extended physical spaces, is viewed as particularly separate and of a farther proximity to the centrally-located original building facilities (the staffroom, office, copy room, staff washrooms and other facilities, as I have described). Again we see a tension between how one experiences the portables as an extended physical space, and a tension with organizational values, particularly with engaging in community-oriented behaviours because when teachers feel separate, it may be more
difficult to engage with colleagues. This separation puts these teachers at a social disadvantage to those who work in closer proximity to colleagues, producing emotional responses suggesting a feeling of isolation.

Another theme emerging from teacher-participants’ notions of accessibility involved the ease with which they could access resources that they perceived as important to conduct their role as teachers. Firestone and Pennell (1993) found that access to resources contributed to both teacher commitment to the profession and to the improvement of quality teaching and student learning. When teachers deem there is adequate accessibility of resources and that a space is conducive to student learning, teaching becomes more effective (Oblinger, 2006; Clark, 2002). In general, teacher-participants felt resources were generally accessible in both the addition and in the portable classrooms. In both cases, some teacher-participants referred to the spaces as being far from the photocopier and the supply rooms, which were identified as important resources, similar to teacher identification of important aspects of the job, by Bissell (2004). Julia felt the portable classroom was both far from these resources by virtue of having to walk outside, often through the rain, but spoke about the temporal aspect of having to “lock the door, come into the school, go back to the portable, unlock the door. It’s time-consuming”. She implies that the time it takes to access resources competes with other aspects of working effectively. Portable classrooms, which are seen by some as “having less status” [Jane, Tamara, Ming, and Julia], have an intrinsic separation from and greater proximity to common spaces and resources within the original building. They may produce other power imbalances based upon one’s experience, such as “walking through the outdoor elements in a rainy climate” [Jane] and the “time you lose from your recess going to and from the school” [Ming] by having to lock and unlock a door and walk a longer distance. An imbalance lies in one’s personal experience with the space: some Parkdale teachers must carry their supplies, often through rain, puddles, and wind, on a day-to-day basis while those working elsewhere in the school do not share this experience. The process of accessing the portable classrooms takes more time than accessing interior classrooms, as does finding keys, locking doors, and so forth. While these may not appear as “a big deal” on the surface, they involve some of Parkdale’s teachers experiencing a situation with, as they have described, an element of adversity that other teachers do not experience. This adversity becomes a part of some teachers’ lived experience, and may be absent from
that of others. It is through this unbalanced lived experience where a power imbalance occurs by virtue of one’s interactions with the extended physical space.

Jane sees the portable classrooms as being less accessible to resources: “what I find frustrating is…supplies. When I’m out of scissors or I’m out of glue, it’s like a done deal. It’s too bad, so sad”. She refers to it being difficult to access the supply rooms because she is not comfortable leaving the students or sending a student runner “that far”. Ming felt that in some ways, the portable classrooms are closer to desirable resources. “The TV is nice. You can hook up your computer and that is phenomenal”. The school administrators fitted each portable classroom with televisions and DVD players because the technology carts in the original building could not be wheeled outside and up the portable steps. During an informal observation, I heard a teacher comment on the difficulty of having to travel between the portable and the original building with a large class and the challenge faced in finding a large, empty space for her class to work in during times when she wished to use a mobile laptop computer cart, which also could not be safely transported outside through the elements. Stephanie characterized the addition as being “close to the resources I need”, but, she added, “not quite as close as in my old room [in the original building].” During informal observations, I asked several teachers working in the original building “how they would like to work in the portable”. In all cases, these teachers indicated that they prefer their classrooms in the original building because they feel close to the staffroom, copy room, and storage areas. While there are mixed views on the accessibility of resources from the portable, it appears that resources are perceived to be somewhat less accessible to these spaces, again due to proximity to the center of the building. The ability (or in particular the inability) to access resources with ease may produce feelings amongst teachers that they may be challenged in being effective in their work role, an apparent organizational value of some teachers.

A second theme that emerged through my data analysis involved feelings of isolation by those working in extended physical spaces. Research suggests that teachers already have a propensity to feel isolated at work (Huffman & Kalnin, 2003). Annesley et al. (2002) confirm that spatial configurations and where one works in a building affect the feelings, hence the emotional experience, of teachers. With teachers already fighting a propensity to be isolated (I have heard teachers allude to this tendency several times during informal
observations), further isolation by virtue of one’s workspace produces an inherent inequity compared to those in locations that may be less isolating. “Being in that little corner [the addition], it is isolating,” Ming said. Maria feels working in the addition to be “a bit isolating because you can’t get out that much”. Julia sees the addition as a bit more “lonely than the main building”. Similar to the feelings that the addition is somewhat separate from the original building, these teacher-participants view the addition as isolated from colleagues in the original building as opposed to feeling a sense of togetherness. This in itself appears to contrast with the organizational value of having a positive community-oriented attitude/interacting positively with others and engaging in community-oriented behaviours. However, teachers working in the addition did not necessarily feel isolated from each other. “You definitely get to know the teachers [in the addition],” Stephanie says, of working in that space. On many occasions, I observed teachers in the addition interacting with each other, be it in the small hallways connecting the classrooms or in the classrooms themselves. While I have described in detail how teachers working in the addition feel somewhat isolated from those in other parts of the school, it is important to think about how these teachers interact within the addition. Despite this space producing feelings of isolation from the original building, teachers working in the addition have produced a social space in itself. In this sense, these teachers have empowered themselves (as a group) to build a community and to produce a social space.

Teacher-participants applied this theme (feeling isolated) to the portables as well, implying feeling separate. While the addition represented a degree of isolation from the building, teachers working in the portable classrooms appear to feel that much more isolated from staff in the original building, likely by virtue of the physical separation from the main building:

“I found it very easy for me to be isolated” [Tamara]
“It’s loneliness a little bit, it’s isolated from other people” [Julia]
“You’re isolated sometimes, from others” [Stephanie]
“I didn’t feel part of the school” [Maria]

Each of these teacher-participants identified feeling apart from other people when working in the portables. Throughout both informal and formal observations, I routinely heard language that denoted the portables as isolating. The were described during
conversations by those observed as “far away”, “not a part of the school”, “not where I’d want to be”, and “way out there” by some teachers working in the original building. I observed teachers working in the original building (and the addition) refer to “feeling sorry for” those who “had to work in the portables”. It is important to recognize that privilege and disadvantage is involved with working in extended physical spaces. This is true because, while these spaces are a part of the school organization, and therefore initially become extensions (and are involved in a reconceptualization) of the Parkdale organizational values, they are, in essence, different. School layout plays an important role in this difference.

Teacher-participants identified the propensity to feel isolated when working in the addition and in the portable classrooms. They identified feelings of separation and the need to go to common spaces to partake in interaction that is as rich as when they worked in the original building.

While teachers in the addition tended to interact with one another, Julia alluded to the same tendency experienced working in a portable: “there were advantages too, you felt like a community with the other portable classes”. Tamara mentioned speaking with “fellow portable teachers” and Jane reported regularly borrowing resources from a teacher in the nearby portable classroom. Though generally feeling isolated from the majority of teachers at Parkdale, those working in the modular classrooms did have some interactions with teachers nearby (this will be further discussed in the Interactions section of the thesis).

Power relations are imbued in all conceptions of spatiality – even the notion of forming a community experience with some (and not others) by virtue of space produces privilege for certain organizational members that may not experienced by others. The nature of the school layout itself produces privilege for some and disadvantage for others – those working around open areas, along central hallways, and nearer to common spaces have more opportunity to interact with others, and to access central resources than do those working in the extended physical spaces. This difference in opportunity creates a power imbalance. However, teachers at Parkdale who do not have these same opportunities for interaction produce their own social spaces (in between classrooms, and in their classrooms) as well as attending other social spaces in the school. Drawing on my observations and experiences at the school prior to engaging in this study, I have on many occasions seen teachers who inhabit classrooms in the original building invite those with portable classrooms to use their rooms for various
activities, suggest use of the common spaces and pods as workspaces, and invite these teachers to the staffroom during break times. While spaces with a greater proximity to areas where staff tend to congregate may have an inherent tendency to isolate, Parkdale teachers, through a desire to share power and equalize opportunity, make a concerted effort to lessen potentially isolating effects.

Appearance of extended physical spaces: Teacher-participants expressed emotional impact when talking about spaces within the school. Workspaces produce emotional responses (Annseley et al., 2002). Through both observation and in particular questions asked during the photo-elicitation process, teacher-participants and interviewees identified a variety of feelings produced by either their experiences within the space, or by the spaces themselves. These feelings related to the manner in which they perceived the physical experience of the extended physical spaces. Teachers at Parkdale tend to place value on a sense of feeling welcomed or invited into a space. The feeling of being welcomed in a space (by virtue of its physical characteristics) was spoken of during staff meetings, during conversations between colleagues, and during interviews. The idea of physical spaces producing emotional responses by virtue of their appearance connects with one of Parkdale’s organizational value of engaging in community-oriented behaviours and feeling welcomed. Whether discussing the extended physical spaces themselves, or other spaces within the school, all teacher-participants interviewed, and some of those observed, used the terms welcoming and inviting when describing spaces they liked. Such descriptions were accompanied by a positive tone, smiles, or comments linking the spaces to being perceived as desirable. The foyer, for example, was seen as welcoming and inviting for a number of reasons:

“[there is a] clear message…the wings of the eagle are spread out like an embrace” [Tamara]
“Well right away I think of students, because I see student artwork” [Stephanie]
“There are tables…there’s a couch…there’s space for people” [Maria]
“The wood, the vaulted ceilings, the openness…it feels open” [Jane]
“I love how open it is and how students work in there a lot…it’s welcoming” [participant during and observation]
Symbols of welcome/being inviting as identified include visual elements created by staff and students (tied to organizational values), the placement of furniture with the purpose to encourage interaction and for one to remain in the space for a period of time, a connection to nature (materials used such as wood, sunlight entering through skylights, placement of plants) and a large open space. Students and staff have, through discussion and discourse, produced what they define as a welcoming space. Similar symbols of welcome/invitation were identified in questions about the addition and portables. The addition was described as “sterile and unwelcoming” by Ming, because of its modern look.

Intersecting with the production of emotional meaning by teacher-participants was an aesthetic reaction to spatial appearances. In other words, participants used descriptions relating to whether they liked the appearance of physical aspects of the extended physical spaces. Referring to the use of metal (as opposed to wood) on the exterior of the addition and to the colours (that she felt were pale as opposed to bright or colourful), Ming felt that the addition was generally unattractive. Julia referred to the wood beams in the addition’s classrooms as being natural, and welcoming. There is a degree of connection between emotional and aesthetic responses to spatial appearance. Stephanie, in contrast, liked the “modern” aspects of the addition. Similarly, several teachers working in the original building mentioned, with a favourable tone of voice, the modern feeling in the additional classrooms. She had a slightly different interpretation of modern, referring to the wood beams (joists across the ceiling) as “more modern [than] a plain white ceiling and fluorescent lights” as found in original building classrooms. She also equated the many windows with making the room feel open and inviting. While definitions of modern vary, natural elements are valued.

When shown a picture of the exterior of the portables, teacher-participants unanimously identified the structures in a negative manner. Aesthetic responses described it as “a very contained, closed” [Stephanie], “it’s blah. It’s kind of uninspired I guess” [Ming], “drab, not too exciting” [Jane], and “they make me wonder if it’s really a place kids should be” [Tamara]. Reasons for these responses included the visual presence of electrical wires making the portables appear “industrial-looking” [Stephanie], the “dull brown colour”, the “block-like shape”, the fact they look “low to the ground”, and the lack of natural elements and large windows.
While teacher-participants did not in all cases agree on whether they felt particular spaces had a more positive or less positive emotional or aesthetic impact, several common themes emerged on what makes a space welcoming and inviting:

**Elements of a space interpreted as welcoming/inviting and aesthetically pleasing**

- Organic/natural elements used in construction (such as wood, stone)
- Organic/natural elements placed in the space (such as plants)
- Large spaces that feel “open”
- High ceilings
- Furniture perceived as inviting interaction (tables, chairs, sofas)
- Large/many windows allowing for natural light
- Bright colours
- Visual elements conveying organizational values (e.g.: children’s work, mascots, documents created by teacher groups, parent information etc.)
- Ability to easily manoeuvre through the space (space does not feel crowded)

The welcoming/inviting (as opposed to unwelcoming or not inviting) and aesthetic nature of the spaces at Parkdale were often described dichotomously in both my observations and in language used during interviews: open vs. closed; bright vs. dark; high vs. low; and organic vs. fabricated/industrial. The terms open, bright, high, and organic are seen as welcoming/inviting (conveying organizational values), and coincide with what most interviewees referred to as aesthetically pleasing whereas the terms closed, dark, low, and fabricated/industrial represent a non-welcoming and not inviting space (one that does not convey organization values, particularly that of community and interacting positively with others) and were described as not being aesthetically pleasing. The use of such dichotomized themes is salient through many aspects of spatiality, collegiality and power at Parkdale.

Teacher-participants had poignant emotional and aesthetic reactions to extended physical spaces based on other physical characteristics. In particular, aspects of the addition conjured up responses related to its physical appearance and condition of repair. Particularly noteworthy was a visual sense of separation, perceived by all respondents, of the addition from the original building. I heard similar expressions by other members of staff during my observations. “I didn’t feel they worked very hard to match [the addition and original
building]…there’s a very clear distinction between the older part of the school and the newer part of the school,” Ming explains. While the two sections of building are physically connected through a central pod, the materials used for the additional space were completely different. Stone walls meet wood panels, one style of terrazzo floor meets vinyl strips of a different colour, and the ceiling is much lower in the additional part of the building. “I thought it was odd,” a participant was observed saying to a colleague, of the visual transition. “I don’t know if mismatched is the appropriate word”, Ming explains. “I know where the wings are supposed to meet, but the floors are inconsistent and the walls are different colours. It’s clearly something that’s not flowing”. Jane thinks the addition “feels separate” because of the flooring transition, and Julia refers to the two portions of building as “a mismatch” in terms of colour and material. During observations, I heard many comments referring to the aesthetic differences between the original building and the addition, particularly in the manner in which the two spaces meet. Observed teachers clearly described the addition as having a dissonant appearance from the original building and noted the many deficiencies visible in the addition, in particular the flooring and ceilings.

From the lens of my theory, which proposes that an extended physical space becomes, for organizational members, an extension of their culture and values (this can lead to a reconceptualization of espoused organizational culture over time), I suggest that these teacher-participants are expressing tension between the physical and the spatial meaning they derive. The extended physical spaces have a different appearance from the original building, whether considered to be aesthetically pleasing or not. Spaces that teachers feel are separate from the original building and look different (especially when considered to be less aesthetically attractive than the original building) are also perceived to be less welcoming and less inviting than spaces in the original building, through which frequent interaction over time has created and re-created Parkdale’s organizational values. Spaces that teachers view as aesthetically distinct from one another (such as a significant transition between materials, colours, and openness) may appear to members as less apt to support said organizational values. Teachers feel an emotional response that conveys being separate from others which may produce feelings of isolation or marginalization. This feeling of tension is experienced by those working in extended physical spaces because they feel somewhat separate from the organizational values to which they have become accustomed and find themselves in a
process of recreating a new set of organizational experiences and values as they adapt to a new spatiality. This separation produces disadvantage amongst those working in extended physical spaces, who do not share in what has become the privilege of working in a space where symbols of separation may not be apparent. This may give teachers the impression that the extended physical spaces are less desirable, and that those working in them have less organizational status. Such feelings may have implications for the school’s organizational culture. For example, if teachers feel less connected to the social network than they once were, there is the potential to enact those feelings by physically withdrawing from others. This could affect the entire network through changing interactional patterns, and perhaps, through the appearance of non-collegiality, slowly reconstitute the school culture in a negative way. As well this could have health detriments for teachers affected, which, again, affects the network. However, teachers at Parkdale have attempted to mitigate the production of such feelings and potential negative consequences. Despite disjuncture in physical appearance, they continue to work together to create and recreate a social space that encourages interaction and positive feeling. They invite each other into social spaces and into conversations, and teachers working in the original building do come to the addition and the portables at times. Structures are in place that give all teachers voice. Teacher-participant-responses and observations regarding positive interaction with these spaces suggests they are on the road to producing positive socio-spatial relationships that are congruous with those found in the original building.

**Functionality of extended physical spaces:** Though representing a variety of teaching assignments, each teacher-participant interviewed discussed the importance of the functionality of their workspace in being best able to complete their daily tasks, the most important of which was effectively teaching their students. Bissell (2004) writes about the value teachers place on a functional workspace. This relates closely to engaging in the organizational value of being effective in one’s work role. Aspects of workspaces that they saw as most saliently related to effective completion of their daily tasks included the condition and repair of the workspace, the size of the workspace and the ease of flow of people within the workspace, and the ability to manipulate and personalize the space, and the capacity for storage within the workspace. While each teacher may personally define his or her work role in different terms, the teacher-participants felt the workspace should allow
them the capacity to teach effectively. “I think for the nature of the job,” Maria explains, “the space needs to be conducive to what you are trying to do.” Each spatial aspect was indicated to be significant by some or all of the teacher-participants and warrants a brief discussion.

The condition and repair of the extended physical spaces have created some tension for teacher-participants. Henke (1999) suggests that the repair of a workspace is an act that maintains social order in that environment. I would suggest, then, that an environment not in what is perceived to be good repair also creates social tension for workspace occupants. Apart from the physical separation and aesthetic appearance of the portable classrooms, teacher-participants who worked in these spaces reported them to be in good repair. Historically, however, this has not always been the case. Julia explains how the portable classroom has, in recent years, become a more pleasant place to work:

    it is better than when I inhabited it…the portables were painted, and are nice now. When I was out there, they weren’t fresh. There was a nice clean up. Some got new carpeting and new roofs. Things became better maintained…TVs and telephones and internet were added…to me this meant a lot, to see that the space was more valued.

Julia referred to the school-based administration, alongside teachers, as pushing for the school district to improve the condition and repair of the modular structures.

Ongoing repairs have been a reality in the addition. Though it is newly-constructed, respondents expressed a sense of anxiety and sometimes frustration at continued construction and the need for regular repair of deficiencies. According to Maria “it was challenging, because there were many interruptions during teaching.” These interruptions were often to fix deficient systems that needed repair, or to add elements to the rooms that had not yet been installed, even though teachers had already moved in. “They were still doing construction after we moved in,” Maria added. For Julia, installation of fixtures occurred after initial occupation of the classroom: “other classes [in the original building] had bulletin boards and cupboards, shelves…our rooms were bare”. Ming shared such an experience: “you know the shelves weren’t installed yet… it felt blank”. Julia, too, used the word blank several times to describe her classroom prior to the installation of all the fixtures.

Teacher-participants noted inhabiting the space while floors were repaired, ceilings were lowered, cupboards installed, pipes fixed, re-painting occurred and exterior deficiencies
checked. Jane feels the school-based administration was instrumental in “push[ing] hard to fix any deficiencies” and in “supporting us teachers with adding materials that were missing”. Nevertheless, teacher-participants who moved into the addition used terms such as difficult, frustrating, needing to be flexible, needing to be patient, overwhelming, and challenging to describe their feelings over a period of months throughout the process. These words suggest tension as they work to carry out the demands of their work role, personalize the space, while attempting to define and re-define their personal and organizational values within the space. This intersects with Henke’s (1999) suggestion that spaces in disrepair represent a lack of social order. In this sense, it appears difficult to be in communion with organizational values related to inviting and welcoming spaces, and being effective in one’s work role. In addition to this tension, those working in what they perceive to be unfinished spaces or those requiring repair may perceive a further emotional separation from the spaces in the original building, which were intact and not undergoing repairs. The addition (and in a sense, the portables) thereby could become a symbol of separation, dysfunction, and adversity. That said, Tett (2005) refers to change (using power-with) as requiring resources, time, and partnerships toward improvement and common goals. I see the administration and teachers working together to provide both attention and resources to improve these workspaces as salient socio-spatial articulations. It demonstrates a commitment by both Parkdale leaders and teachers to engage in the improvement of community relations by recreating spaces in a manner that makes them more liveable and desirable (and potentially more socially oriented). This power-with endeavour indicates that Parkdale staff are engaged in a process of organizational change to improve their spatial situation for mutual benefit.

Some teacher-participants identified flow, which I define as the effective and efficient movement of people through a space, as a critical element of spatial functionality. Several interviewees believed that, as a space, the classrooms in the addition are too crowded, be it with bodies or with furniture, thereby reducing one’s effectiveness to effectively engage in one’s work task. Flow appears to be closely linked to both the size of the space and the ability to manipulate aspects of the space. In effect, the space produces flow, which is itself produced by the social. All teacher-participants who have worked in the portable classrooms reported them as being ample in size to complete their tasks. “It’s a generous space.”
according to Tamara. The portable classrooms are larger than the classrooms in both the addition and the original building. They have separate cloakrooms (other classrooms have an area of hooks within the main room and storage shelves above these hooks). Opinions on the size of the addition classrooms, in relation to effectiveness of doing one’s job, varied:

“the actual space is too small, and poorly designed” [Jane]
“it could be bigger, logistically, otherwise it’s comfortable,” [Maria]
“it’s a smaller room to begin with…it feels small” [Julia]
“it’s a cozy feeling, I like it” [Stephanie]
“the addition is too small” [observed teacher-participant]

When asked what makes a workspace desirable Jane replied, “how big it is”. Other respondents did not mention size when asked about a classroom’s desirability. I would suggest, based upon comments heard in observations (referring to the desire for bigger classrooms in general), that the majority of teachers value larger classrooms, but few expressed an outright dissatisfaction with what they perceived to be a smaller space. Interestingly, my sense at Parkdale is that classrooms in the original building are also perceived to be small in nature, and teachers regularly comment on this. It should be noted that the square footage of the classrooms in the addition is almost identical to that of classrooms in the original building. Perhaps, though small, such spaces still offer the option for inhabitants to engage in personalization of the space.

Tamara explains how the square and open nature of the portable classroom allowed for easy manipulation of the furniture, thereby allowing for more efficient movement of people: “I just find it easy to work in…the student desks can be grouped in a way that creates…aisles [that are] easy to move in…so to me it looks manageable to work in with organized materials and children”. Conversely, teacher-participants consider it more challenging to manipulate spaces in the addition. In particular, teachers took issue with the carpet (on which students often sit during lessons) being physically affixed to the floor. “The carpet is static, glued down. I really had to think about how I was going to set up the room and where the children would sit. I’ve really had a challenging time” [Julia]. She notes that because the carpet is placed directly in front of the board, students must have desks on the periphery of the classroom, making it challenging for some to see and hear. Ming’s room in the addition is overcrowded. She says that she has difficulty accessing some students due to
the design of furniture and the difficulty manipulating it: “just trying to get around the tables to support someone on [the other] side, it’s just a little bit awkward”.

All teacher-participants valued being able to create organization within the spaces in which they work. Through observation of their spaces, it is clear that each teacher has a different notion of what an organized space entails. However, I surmise that the capacity to organize and manipulate one’s workspace is seen as desirable and important to overall functionality. Ming agrees with Julia that the affixed carpets in the addition make teaching more difficult. Many of the classroom resources in the addition’s spaces, such as bins for student manipulatives, filing cabinets, chart boards, and student book shelves are not affixed to the walls or floor, contain wheels and are moveable. While Julia identified the “floating furniture” as “difficult to allocate [where to place it]” because of the small room size, Stephanie reported the furniture on wheels quite positively, as “allowing me to change things around as I need to”. During formal observations, I heard one teacher-participant working in the original building describe the floating furniture as “cheap and awful”, whereas another teacher, also working in the original building described the same furniture as desirable and said “I’d like to have that in my own room”. In a subsequent conversation with Julia, she acknowledged that her negative perceptions of the rolling furniture changed once more affixed storage options were in place, namely several wall-mounted cabinets and shelves. She later appreciated being able to move the other objects. Meanings derived from the space (floating furniture as positive or negative) change as the space itself changes.

Jane spoke of the importance of a teacher being able to manipulate his or her space, making reference to her experience in the portable:

When I first moved in, the first couple of weeks, it seemed empty and it seemed not my space. I didn’t feel like it was mine. But now I absolutely love it. I feel like it’s my home…I can make the space any way I want. I would love to have a teapot, and a kettle out there too [laughs].

Ming also said her space in the addition felt “bare” when she first moved into it, but that it is “my responsibility to change that”. While the teacher-respondents had different ideas of what the final product of space manipulation might look like, they value the ability to personalize their space. These teachers appear to ascribe a degree of emotional meaning to how their space is organized and in its general appearance. Spaces that appear to be
unfinished, or which have not been personalized, may create feelings of emotional distress and potential anxiety while personalized spaces may have a calming, more positive emotional effect. This would suggest value in being able to choose the general layout, manipulate furniture and fixtures in a manner that each teacher feels best suits the ability to teach effectively, and add personal elements (such as a teapot) to the space. Teachers appear to see the size and furniture within the portables as allowing for manipulation of the space; while views on the addition are mixed, I would surmise that, other than the carpets, teachers view the moveable furniture as allowing for some personalization of the classroom. Such personalization may allow teachers to establish within the space a feeling of the extension of organizational culture while better able to be effective in one’s work role through solving problems and re-creating the space, and to feel emotionally comfortable and at ease within the space. As well, opportunity for personalization and manipulation of the spaces could give teachers feelings of self-empowerment, that they have an opportunity to produce the space itself. Though use of the term being allowed to manipulate the space conjures images of power-over dominance, it should be noted that the school and district administration (the district does own the school and its classrooms) does not have restrictions on how teachers manipulate or create the classrooms spaces. This lack of apparent surveillance or power-over model likely contributes to this sense of personal empowerment.

All teacher-participants interviewed, and many of those observed said that capacity for storage at Parkdale was a significant concern for staff. The ability for teachers to access adequate storage (and easily access materials) is a significant consideration in teacher work roles (McGregor, 2004b). Teachers possess a large quantity of physical materials that are used in the educational process, and, as they often change teaching roles/grade levels and general learning objectives and themes, they value keeping a variety of materials at the school. I can attest through my own experience working at the school that teachers feel there is an overall lack of storage space, both in original building and addition classrooms, and throughout the building in general. This is particularly true of the classrooms in the addition:

“There’s a lack of storage” [Julia]

“There’s just no storage. Even under the sink they put slanted boards instead of opening it up for storage” [Jane]

“They’ve had limited storage. They aren’t functional in that sense” [Ming]
“Storage is a definite issue in here” [Maria]

A number of comments were heard during my observations that indicated some teachers feel classrooms in the original building also lack enough effective storage space. The portable classrooms, which contain a separate cloakroom with large spaces for boxes and shelves (separated from the teaching space), have what is viewed as ample storage capacity: “I love that you have so much storage” [Ming]. Jane and Tamara also noted the plentiful storage in the portable classrooms, as did other teacher-participants through my observations. I would suggest that the addition’s classrooms are perceived as being storage-poor, and the portable classrooms as being storage-rich. That said, during data collection more storage cupboards and shelves were being added to the addition’s classrooms, highlighting the school leadership’s desire to produce spaces consistent across the school, in which teachers feel they can better engage in the work role. Functional storage appears to be defined as having enough space (as in the addition) and possibly as being separate from what teachers use as the teaching area of the classroom. It is connected closely with one’s ability to effectively engage in their work role and to personalize their space. While emotional attributes may be present with regards to one’s storage space, I did not specifically hear language during interviews or observations that linked particular emotional responses to the quality or quantity of one’s storage capacity.

The presence of extended classroom spaces that teachers may deem to be less functional than those classrooms in the original building tends to produce a differential in equity (one teacher has a more functional space, while another teacher has a less functional space). In the case of Parkdale’s extension, power-related factors outside of the school organizational played a role in producing a differential in accessibility of the school’s classroom spaces. The provincial government (to a greater degree) and school districts (to a lesser degree) hold power in the manner in which extended physical spaces come to fruition. The government brokers power in the manner with which classroom spaces are designed. In this sense, dominant power-over forces challenge schools such as Parkdale to create a social-spatiality that promotes their values. Teacher-participants spoke of small, awkward spaces and a lack of storage as affecting their work roles. They also spoke of ongoing deficiencies and subsequent repairs as affecting their jobs. Design decisions (made with some teacher consultation, but largely by architects and building managers) were driven by limited
budgets. Money was allocated by the province, and all public buildings must adhere to stringent guidelines specifying the size and general design of spaces. A limited budget forces architects and construction managers to conform to certain material quality and furniture/storage choices that may not coincide with what teachers feel they need to meet the demands of the job and the values of the organization. Hence we see spaces that have issues of quality, size, storage, and functionality. External power sources made decisions that affect the work of teachers, and essentially the spatial, collegial and organizational relationship within the school, over time. Despite fixed or semi-fixed spatial configurations challenging Parkdale teachers in many ways, school leadership and teachers alike have been working together using power-with strategies to engage in dialogue regarding spatial improvements and are on a path towards both the production of social spaces that better align with group values, and to seek strategies to reconceptualize spatial experiences and lessen potential inequity. I will continue to analyze such spatial conceptions as I examine teacher interactions, collegiality, and further intersections of power relationships, and further develop the notion of external sources of power having influence on spatiality at the school.

4.2 Teacher interactions, constructions of collegiality, and extended physical spaces

I have discussed how teachers at Parkdale derive meaning from spaces in both the original building and the extended spaces. As well I have discussed Parkdale’s organizational culture, and provided some insight into what spatiality looks like at the school, and how power relationships become interwoven in teachers’ experiences with the spatial. This section examines the nature of teacher interactions at the school, and makes a case for interactions as forming the basis of how teachers construct collegiality. The first sub-section will discuss teacher interactions, the second will look at collegiality, and a short third will specifically interrogate power related to decision-making, collegiality, and the allocation of extended physical spaces. Discussions about power will be interspersed throughout all sub-sections.

4.2.1 The nature of teacher interactions (of those working in extended physical spaces) at Parkdale

The opportunity to interview teachers working in extended spaces, to observe teachers (who work in all parts of the school) interacting in a variety of spaces, and my past
experience as a teacher at Parkdale have contributed to an understanding of how working in extended physical spaces intersects with one’s interactions with colleagues both in and outside of those spaces. Through discussions with teacher-participants and through observation, it became apparent that many factors influenced interactions by those working within extended physical spaces. While the term interaction can refer to many modes of communication (verbal, non-verbal, written etc.), teachers identified interactions as being face-to-face verbal contact with a colleague, and, to a lesser degree, gestures that convey a message. Teacher-participants discussed frequency of verbal communication, as well as the time spent interacting with a colleague. For the purposes of this analysis, the term interaction will refer to power-imbued verbal messages and to non-verbal visual cues, and will involve both frequency of, and time spent engaged in, interaction with another person or people. Through analysis of discussion and observing key spaces throughout the school, I have identified two broad categories that characterize these themes: factors that promote interaction with colleagues and factors that impede interaction with colleagues. In most cases here, the factors that promote or impede interaction by those in extended physical spaces have a dichotomous relationship with one another. I have also identified factors that promote and impede interaction with colleagues into two aspects: aspects of building layout (spatial) and aspects of the individual. Aspects of the building layout have a spatial characterization, in other words one’s interactions with the space characterize one’s overall experience in that space. Aspects of the individual refer to internal or personality characteristics that, though they are involved in how one interprets spatial phenomena, are likely to maintain themselves from setting to setting.

Interview and observational data suggest five factors that promote interactions between teachers working primarily in extended physical spaces with each other and with colleagues who do not primarily work in extended physical spaces. The term working primarily in refers to a teacher’s classroom, or space in which the majority of their teaching role occurs. These factors include: close working proximity to others; the presence of open areas and hallways; working in a space that is physically attached to the original building; the nature of common spaces; shared role and/or grade level; and externalized personality/one’s agency. I would characterize each of these factors as an aspect of building layout, with the exception of the last factor, an externalized personality/one’s agency can be
described as an aspect of the individual. Factors that impede interactions between teachers working in extended physical spaces with each other and with colleagues not working in extended physical spaces, and which form inverse relationships with factors promoting interactions include: farther working proximity to others; the absence of open areas and hallways; working in a space that is not physically attached to the original building; and an internalized personality/one’s agency. I suggest that each of these factors (with the exception of the last) are aspects of building layout, while an internalized personality/one’s agency is an aspect of the individual. The presence of official teacher union job action, which is not a typical occurrence but was underway during my data collection, is a seventh factor that was described to affect a teacher’s interactions with colleagues. Each set of factors as identified by teacher-participants and as observed will be discussed within the sections that follow.

Close working proximity to others vs. more distant working proximity to others: All teacher-participants working in either the portable or the addition reported those spaces as feeling “farther away” from others not working in the same area of the school, and having fewer overall interactions with those not working within what they defined as close proximity. “I didn’t get to visit with teachers that were on the opposite end or other side of the school, facing away from the portable, because I never walked through their rooms,” Tamara told me. Julia made a similar expression: “I get the same feeling I have in the new wing as I did in the portable. I don’t have the same ease of seeing people and getting together with people as I did in the old building”. Jane says that working in the portable has “decreased my frequency of interaction with [others]” while Maria refers to it “being difficult to connect with people who work on the other side of the school”. Stephanie sees teachers in the original building “very briefly” because “other teachers are farther away”. Essentially teachers feel working in an extended physical space decreases their overall interaction with teachers who work in the original building. These feelings are supported by the work of Horne (2004) who suggests that teachers tend to become isolated from others in the spaces in which they work.

Conversely, these teachers suggest that working in close proximity to others within the extended physical space itself lends to what they define as easier and more readily available interactions with those colleagues: “I think it’s easier to connect with [those also
working in the addition] because of its proximity...I’ll see [a colleague] because she is right next to me. I’ve definitely had more interactions with [the teachers] in this area,” Ming says, in reference to working in the addition. Jane tells me, of the portable, “it’s easy to walk next door. I think it’s easier to connect [with other teachers working in the portables] because of proximity...when I’m in the portable, it’s those also in the portables [with whom] I have more interactions.” Maria says that she got to know those working in the addition better, because of her close proximity to them. During informal observations I many times noted teachers interacting within the open spaces between classrooms. Bissell (2004) states that physical school structures often tend to inhibit interactions with others, but the creation of opportunities for interaction is possible. Close proximity of workspaces, according to these teachers, provides the opportunity for more interaction with colleagues. The challenge for teachers at Parkdale remains how to cope with these differences in proximity to common spaces and groups of teachers. In power terms, despite power-with mechanisms that are in place to promote equity of space allocations (such as a volunteer process in which all classrooms in the addition were allocated to those volunteering), an embedded power imbalance may exist in the unequal opportunity to access common spaces in which interactions tend to occur. Teachers and the administration continue to engage in conversation and discourse on this topic, and seek ways to ensure organizational equity aligned with group values.

The presence (vs. the absence) of open areas and hallways: Several of the teacher-participants identified working in a classroom whose door adjoined an open area (pod), or having one’s classroom door open to a hallway that leads to the centre of the school, as increasing the quantity and duration of their interactions with others. Fisher (2004) advocates for the construction of school buildings that have spaces which encourage frequent interaction, as Parkdale’s open-area pods appear to do. All classrooms in the original building either open into an open area or into a hallway that connects the open area with the centre of the school, hallways which tend to see heavy traffic as people walk between the centre of the school and each wing. The classrooms in the addition open into a small hallway that runs perpendicular to a common pod but do not open into it, and the portables are physically separated from the main building with doors that open to the playground (see Appendix A). Markus (1993) suggests that containerized classrooms connected by hallways
produce a sense of isolation. This appears to be a common experience by teachers working in extended physical spaces, particularly in the portables.

“I think definitely the frequency [of interaction in the portable is less] because there are just more opportunities when you’re amongst other people in the building to be outside your classroom” [Tamara]. She suggests that a classroom opening into a common space towards other classrooms encourages teachers to interact with those also adjacent to that space. “Teachers like to talk in central areas and hallways,” she adds. Julia identifies the capacity to physically see another teacher’s classroom from one’s door as salient in encouraging increased interaction:

In the other rooms [in the original building] we all faced each other … so we could see one another and it pushed you a bit to say ‘oh what are you working on?’ or ‘oh can we join you with pastels?’. There was more interaction and a nicer flow of socialization [than in the addition].

Through my observations, I noted the common spaces were often used by the classroom teachers that surrounded them as spaces for groups of students to work, and at times, for class lessons. I observed on many occasions teachers whose classrooms faced these spaces talking with one another. This is also congruous with Markus’ (1993) suggestion that separate classrooms along hallways produced feelings of individualization and separation. The open areas appear to lessen this tendency towards isolation. Stephanie said she appreciated working in a classroom facing an open space because of the ease through which she could ask another teacher for supplies or resources, whereas these interactions are “less easy” in the addition. Maria notes that “no one has any reason to come through [the addition hallways]” and Julia says her classroom door faces a “blank wall” with “no one passing by”.

During my formal and informal observations, I often saw teachers talking to one another in the pods, during the school day, while teaching students. In some cases teachers appeared to be sharing resources and ideas, sometimes I saw them looking at the work of students, and sometimes they appeared to be socializing. In these instances, teachers would either be in the doorway of their classroom or in a position in which they could see (and perhaps hear) their students from the hallway, open area, or an adjacent classroom. Teachers appeared to use their open doors and the adjoining windows to monitor their classes. This is significant in that, while they appeared to value easy interactions with colleagues, they also
valued the ability to monitor their students, essentially continuing their teaching role, even when interacting with another teacher. While Shilling (1991) and Coffey and Delamont (2000) suggest that teacher behaviours and attitudes (such as the need for monitoring) are power-oriented in nature and serve to control children, others see the need for teachers to be with their classes (as a part of the delivery of strong lessons) as important components of good teaching (Beishuizen et al., 2001; Muijs & Reynolds, 2010). The belief amongst teachers that being present in the classroom (or in view of students) is a component of quality instruction could also explain research that suggests that teachers in classrooms tend to feel isolated from colleagues. While teachers likely feel the need to be in and near their classes for reasons of effective teaching and safety of students, I would suggest that the presence of open areas (and the ability to interact during teaching time) represents for teachers the ability to engage with the organizational value of *interacting positively with others* and *engaging in community-oriented behaviours* because regular interaction and the open areas are seen as symbols representing the values. Teachers have produced these social spaces to be reflections of community, through which they can interact and share in collective empowerment. The apparent need to monitor their class (which I have observed during the study and throughout my experience at Parkdale) is related to the organizational value of *being effective in one’s work role*. Parkdale teachers have found ways to interact with one another at the same time that they teach, effectively lessening the sense of isolation that teachers often feel being alone in their classrooms. This is achieved through a spatial configuration that allows the expression of several different organizational values and reconceptualising the classroom space to privilege and create community.

Perhaps the addition, whose classrooms are not centered around a common pod or in a hallway that connects to the school centre, and the portables which do not connect to any common space, do not have an open feeling, do not allow for easy access to colleagues while still being able to monitor one’s classroom, and hence do not allow for the aforementioned interaction-oriented symbols representing organizational values. Coffey and Delamont (2000) allude to school buildings as encouraging certain values and behaviours and dissuading others. Interestingly, the varied layout at Parkdale (such as the presence or absence of open areas accessible to one’s workspace) may dissuade some from engaging in interaction, while others have a clear advantage. It is possible that these missed opportunities
for interaction have negative emotional affects on teachers working in extended physical spaces, and may result in those teachers feeling like they have less status than others. However, as I have described, teachers have sought ways to combat this through the recreation of the addition of a social space. I observed these teachers engaging in the small hallway and going in and out of one another’s classrooms. Though the fixed spatial structure may not promote easy interaction, teachers are finding ways to socially redefine the spaces.

Working in a space attached (or not attached) to the original building: Similar to the addition classrooms not opening into a common pod or central hallway, the portables are not physically attached to the original building, and their doors open onto the playground rather than into an interior common space or central hallway. This does not facilitate easy interaction with others and may also represent for teachers a tension with the symbols of community that teachers ascribe to central pods and hallways. “The only visitor was the custodian,” Tamara says of her portable classroom. In contrast, she says, of working in the main building (with a classroom next to an open area) “I often have people coming by, popping their head in and sometimes stopping for conversation”. She refers to the portable classrooms as “not being amongst other people”. A similar view is paralleled by other interviewees and through conversations observed by various school staff. Ming describes less interactions in general due to working in the portables because, by virtue of the increased distance it takes to walk to common areas of interaction, such as the staffroom, she finds she has less overall interaction time with colleagues. She suggests working in an extended physical space may not only decrease one’s interactions with other while working in that space, but also decrease one’s interactions with others throughout the school during other opportunities for social engagement outside of her workspace. During formal observations, a number of times I heard portables referred to as lonely, far away, and as islands (or other language denoting separation). The portables are indeed physically separate from the school, and teachers appear to view them as having less status and desirability than other classrooms. For McGregor (2004a), certain school buildings represent, through physical arrangements, specific values. I can surmise that the portables are representations of separation (a value that is inconsistent with espoused organizational culture). Teachers inhabiting the portables frequent the staffroom during social interaction and networking times, and, as I have described, come into (and are invited into) the original school building for social and work
purposes. This is an example of these teachers (alongside some of those inhabiting the original building) to build networks encouraging the interaction and power-sharing of all teachers, and the promotion of equity of status. Though the portables are separate, original building spaces have become active components of socialization that includes those teachers working in extended physical spaces.

_Shared (vs. differing) teaching assignments/grade level:_ Throughout my observations, I kept track of the roles that teachers have in the school (such as various grade levels, whether part of the French Immersion or English teaching programs, resource and non-enrolling teachers or those with enrolling classrooms, committee roles etc.) to see whether teachers tended to interact more (or less) with those possessing similar teaching assignments and grade levels to themselves. One might predict those with similar teaching assignments may interact more with one another, supported by the findings of Paetcher (2004) and Kainan (1995). At Parkdale, this does appear to be the case when teachers wish to share resources, knowledge, and for the purpose of collaborative planning but does not appear to be significant during social times (when they are not discussing professional topics directly related to their teaching programs). My observations occurred over time and space, in various common spaces. During break times in staffroom and during formal meetings that occurred in both the staffroom and the library, teachers sat in mixed groupings. I did not see any patterns related to teachers of similar teaching assignments sitting with one another. Table groups tended to be mixed and changing from time to time and space to space. This tendency, over time, while contrary to suggestions by Paetcher (2004) and Kainan (1994; 1995) that teachers often segregate themselves by interacting with those possessing similar roles, is more in keeping with the work of Acker (1995), Hargreaves (1994), and Ewing and Smith (2003) who suggest that teachers (particularly in the staffroom) often find camaraderie by discussing positives and negatives of the profession (as opposed to interacting in groups based upon teaching assignment or other role). During several informal observations, I did note one exception. At times when teachers appeared to be collaborating over curriculum, they tended to sit with those possessing the same or similar teaching assignments and grade levels. This was confirmed by interviewees. Julia “plans and does a lot of activities” with another teacher who teaches the same grade level and language program. Tamara and
Stephanie offered parallel viewpoints. They said it “makes one’s job easier when I can work with a same-grade partner” [Tamara].

Maria, Jane and Ming alluded to teachers in general working more closely with those teaching in the same language: “between French and English, if they have something in common, you might have more conversations” [Ming]. Maria and Ming suggested this tendency is of a practical nature: “I seek the support of [those with the same teaching role] so I may talk with them more than others” [Maria]. She suggests that for many teachers increased interaction based upon role is mainly a function of how teachers attempt to make their role simpler or to engage in the collegial notion of *working together towards common goals* (delivering a shared curriculum). Jane feels somewhat differently: “with [teachers teaching in the other language], there is no contact. So the French-English division has a lot to do with it”. I later asked Jane to tell me why she has no contact with those teaching in the other language. She said that she does not feel unwelcome by teachers who work in the other language (and in fact that Parkdale teachers all tend to speak English socially), but that her job assignment did not require interacting with them, and that she is too busy to do so. Her teaching role, and what she perceives to be the demands of it, prevented interactions with these teachers outside of that which occurs in spaces where teachers tend to congregate. It appears teachers at Parkdale do tend to interact more frequently with those possessing similar roles for purposes of collaboration, planning, and resource sharing. Socially, teacher role does not seem to be a salient determinant of whom they interact with. While power is embedded in all forms of interaction (Snyder & Kivinieri, 2001; Reynolds & Herman-Kinney, 2003), it does not appear that there are outright hierarchies perceived by teachers based upon teaching assignment. This is congruous with my observations and with an orientation towards structures of shared power.

One’s agency and personality factors: Sociologically-speaking, while organizational norms and group behaviours tend to have a significant effect on one’s own behaviour, an individual’s agency also plays a role in their behaviour (Bandura, 2001). Teacher-participants suggested one’s agency, including factors related to personality, has an effect on one’s interactions with colleagues. For Jane it is “personality-specific to whom I interact with most in the portables”. Tamara identifies herself as having a more introverted personality: “I’m comfortable being on my own…I don’t tend to seek out the social piece”
though, despite a comfort in solitude, she referred to it “being easy to become isolated” when working in an extended physical space. Julia parallels this notion through her own observation: “If you’re someone who is quite introverted, and likes to keep to yourself, you could probably do that and not socialize [in an extended physical space]. Myself, I’m pretty extroverted.” Maria also speaks of “liking the energy [of interaction]” and “being a part of things….it’s really [dependent upon] who you are”.

For teachers working in extended physical spaces, quality and quantity of interaction is already affected by a further proximity to congregational spaces in the center of the original building and by not being connected directly to an open area. The extended physical spaces also lack the same visual factors, like being able to see colleagues through an open door or interior window, which teachers feel increase the likelihood of interaction and the reinforcement of community values, such as inclusivity. I believe factors related to one’s personality are equally salient. It appears that teachers who have less externalized personalities or who, through personal agency, feel less compelled to leave the extended physical space to interact with others, may find themselves in a pattern of reduced interaction, which may affect how they are perceived by others collegially, and subsequently create personal feelings of tension, that they are not participating in organizational and group values to the same degree as others or to the degree to which they aspire, despite an open invitation (and sometimes outright encouragement) by others (and by the space itself, being socially produced as interactive) to spend time there.

Data suggested a connection between some teachers attempting to assert power over others through personality factors. Teacher-participants identified instances where they felt colleagues had attempted to use behaviours or interactional styles to hold power over another. I have observed similar instances related to discussions around and policy regarding allocations of extended physical spaces, and issues regarding space in general. This may occur through teachers being more vocal than others in an attempt to have decisions made that align with their particular viewpoints or opinions. Ming refers to sometimes feeling that “the squeaky wheel has gotten the grease before…and people who aren’t as political feel they may not be getting heard”. I asked her if she thought that those who are particularly vocal usually “got their way”. She said she did not feel that that was a common occurrence now, but felt it was a number of years ago, but that the “effort is still there at times.” Tamara
paraphrases a similar feeling and adds an extra layer of complexity: “Some people feel they know best, and they should be the ones to make the decisions and they are perhaps loud enough...they can intimidate others”. She demonstrates attempts for power over decision-making using behavioural tactics contrary to organizational values. Julia says situations have arisen where a teacher may try to “dictate what others should and should not do”. Using tone, volume, or other behaviours as tools of power to gain resources, access, or privilege through intimidation or other means are contrary to Parkdale’s organizational values of problem-solving through respectful discussion (solving problems collaboratively and peacefully), having respect for others, and an orientation towards engaging in community-oriented behaviours and welcoming others, thereby creating tension between individual behaviour and organizational norms. This tension is exacerbated as teachers explore power-with structures in an environment in which a few are attempting to express power-over orientations. When domination-oriented, power-over behaviour is exhibited and force exerted within school spaces that have been produced as community-oriented (imbued by the above-noted organizational values) a clash occurs as a new spatiality is produced. This conflict manifests itself as discomfort and tension amongst teachers. It is noteworthy that the majority of teachers tend to value power-with strategies, and I think that this, in general, produces a socio-spatial experience more in line with organizational values.

4.2.2 Teacher constructions of collegiality and extended physical spaces

Jarzabkowski (2002) characterizes teacher collegiality as being comprised of the various interactions that teachers engage in with one another through enactment of organizational culture. While Little (1982; 1990), Hargreaves and Dawe (1990), and Hargreaves (1994) suggest that teacher joint work (collaboration) is a benchmark of relatively deep collegiality, I will be using Jarzabkowski’s definition of collegiality for the purpose of a general analysis because a significant aspect of this study is to determine how Parkdale teachers, specifically, define and construct the organizational experience. These researchers have made, between them, slightly differing propositions as to what collegiality entails, as derived from their research data from a variety of school settings. Knowing that organizational experiences, including the overall culture of an organization, differ from site to site and are constructed by organizational members, I believe it to be important to consider each of these researchers’ definitions of collegiality, but to openly consider that Parkdale
teachers may construct collegiality in a different manner. That said, the depth-oriented constructions proposed by the aforementioned researchers will play a role in locating constructions made by Parkdale teachers working in extended physical spaces within widely-accepted field literature. I have gained insight into how teachers in extended physical spaces perceive and characterize collegiality at the school. These interactions occur within space and spatial elements, such as proximity, visual factors and so forth, have an effect on the users of those spaces. At the same time, space users create the spaces through interaction, and attribute and imbue meaning with regards to the space. This occurs through power dynamics (Carspecken, 1996; Reynolds & Herman-Kinney, 2003). The production of spatial configurations through social means, and the simultaneous ordering of interaction by space and time is intricately related to expressions of collegiality in a school. Because space is produced by and ultimately locates our interactions with one another, collegiality (comprised of teacher interactions) is very much a spatial concept. I will build this argument as I describe how teachers construct collegiality (in the presence of extended physical spaces).

Collegiality plays an important role amongst school faculty (McGregor, 2004; Jacklin, 1999; Jarzabkowski, 2002). Vulliamy and Webb (1996) and Little (1990) link teachers’ positive perceptions of collegiality with the nature of school culture. Teacher-participants had a lot to say about the collegial nature of the school. Questions were designed to determine how teachers characterize both collegiality and non-collegiality at the school, and to elicit their overall interpretations of what constitutes collegiality (or non-collegiality) at play amongst organizational members. When initially asked to describe what collegiality within the organization looks like, interviewees offered responses that connected directly to organizational values. These included “getting along” [Jane], “having a positive, respectful environment” [Ming and Maria], and “being part of a community” [all teacher-participants interviewed]. During observations, I heard statements such as and similar to “getting along is important to me”, “being respectful of other teachers’ styles”, “having professional respect to one another” and the term colleague used frequently. Responses offered and language used tended to make statements related to what they perceived as collegial or non-collegial. This language is significant to an analysis of the spatial because this language has been chosen by teachers who inhabit extended physical spaces, and who are a part of the socio-spatial configurations of said spaces, as well as those existing in the
original building. Generally responses suggested a direct linkage between collegiality and power expressed through power-with conceptions.

Based upon interview responses and group observation, I have organized teacher participants’ characterizations of collegiality into two areas: **behavioural orientations**, and **values-based orientations**. The behavioural realm refers specifically to verbal or non-verbal cues through which teachers derive meaning that appear to have a degree of depth or longevity, involving a degree of time and effort (see Figure 2). The values-based realm
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refers to behaviours or activities that also emphasize a degree of effort and longevity. The constructions that intersect each of these categories (those which are both behaviour-based and values-oriented) tend to indicate a greater depth (and presumably longevity) of collegiality than constructions found in each single realm. This is because teachers tend to both internalize, to some degree, the Parkdale organizational values, and also enact these
values through their behavioural interactions with one another. While the terms for these constructions differ somewhat from Little’s typology of collegial depth (because I organized data into themes that were derived directly from said data), I will note some of the salient connections between her work and my findings, in the paragraphs addressing collegiality that follow, within this section. MacDonald (2003) links teacher and school values with how they view their work role, which can become an internalized part of one’s professional identity (Hatch, 2006). I created the construction categories through aggregating common themes found in both interview and observational data. I believe it is important to understand how teachers construct collegiality (as an expression of their interactions and group values) in order to provide a clear linkage to spatial articulations. McGregor (2004b) refers to “communities in schools [as] more than bounded…local groups in face-to-face contact…but can be seen as networks of relations extending through space and time” (p. 361). She explains this point referring to Massey (1993), describing “face-to-face relations as ‘articulated moments in networks of social relations and understandings [that are] constructed on a far larger scale then we describe as the place itself’” (Massey, as quoted in McGregor, 2004b, p. 361). The implication as I see it is that collegiality is a construction that encompassed face-to-face (and other) relations and is a part of the organizational social network that produces the space in which it is expressed. It is also affected by space (which, through my reading of Massey, appears to encompass the overall organization, as opposed to any particular space). I suspect that behaviour-based collegiality has more localized spatial-oriented articulations (for example, passing a colleague in a narrow hallway may produce a nod, that is then interpreted to be collegial interaction). Values-based collegiality, though occurring in and because of the spatial, and indeed producing spatial articulations, is more spatially encompassing. By the nature of its internalization, it represents a values base that has been constructed by teachers through a multitude of spaces, and over time. For example, teachers working together towards common goals (also an organizational value) has implications for the production of space, however spatial configurations may be more pliable. Teachers seeking to work on common projects may transcend the bounds of individual spaces by finding alternative spaces or reconfiguring spaces to engage in such social networking.
Behavioural-based collegial constructions that teachers identified include *engaging in moment-to-moment behaviours that convey a sense of congeniality, and making an effort to interact positively with a colleague*. Constructions that have both behavioural- and values-based elements include *offering support to a colleague, working together towards a common goal, and being respectful towards the views of a colleague/looking for the best in others*. A fourth apparent values-based construction is *internalizing organizational and group values*. I will explain the distinctions between these categories and discuss how each construction forms an overall characterization of the collegiality at Parkdale. At the end of this section, I will explain how the allocation of extended physical spaces to teachers, which occurs through organizational structures that incorporate aspects of collegiality, employs a power-with model of decision-making.

*Engaging in moment-to-moment behaviours that convey a sense of congeniality:* 
**Congeniality** refers to behaving in a manner that is interpreted by others as being friendly and pleasing in nature. Teacher-participants identified, through interview responses, and displayed, through my observations, a series of such behaviours. The term *moment-moment behaviour* refers to an action that has an observable beginning and an observable end, or one that occurs in a moment in time (though effects may or may not have lasting implications on members). Examples of such behaviours at Parkdale include: greeting or saying goodbye to a colleague, using polite language/tone of voice, appearing to actively listen to others as they speak, and leaving one’s classroom door open. While Little’s collegial typology model tends to view congenial behaviours as superficial and outside the collegial realm (though they may occur in storytelling, aiding others, sharing, and engaging in joint work), Jarzabkowski does perceive behavioural interactions as potentially collegial in nature, as did the teacher-participants, and such congenial (or non-congenial) behaviours have spatial implications.

The general goal of such behaviours is aimed at creating or continuously re-creating an environment that feels friendly and welcoming. In other words, through these behaviours teachers produce a social space that supports the enactment of collegial behaviour. This is closely associated with Parkdale’s organizational values, particularly with *engaging in community-oriented behaviours/welcoming others, having a community-oriented attitude/interacting positively with others, and having respect for others*. For Julia, it is “warming when people…say hello”. Tamara wants “to be near people who I can be friendly
with and feel that they are friendly back”. She also believes “leaving one’s classroom door open, literally, makes the space welcoming [and produces] a collegial spirit”. It is not surprising that teacher participants responded this way because staff members tend to be happier in what they perceive to be friendly workplace (Rubin & Brody, 2011). The example of leaving one’s classroom door open demonstrates how this measure of collegiality is a socio-spatial articulation. The ability to open or close a door (in a part of the building that has been defined spatially as being a place where interaction may occur) changes the space. An open door creates, for teachers, feelings of collegiality and produces a temporal social space. A closed door has the opposite effect. For Ming, “working with the door closed” is non-collegial. Tamara identifies a “snippy tone” as being “uncooperative and not collegial”. During my formal observations of group interaction, I noted teachers tended to respond in a more reciprocal manner to those who appeared to be actively listening (making eye contact, nodding, and responding at appropriate moments) than those who did not display such behaviours, particularly during staff meetings and other social interactions. Teachers tended not to engage as much or positively with those who did not appear to be actively listening. Space that has been produced by teachers as interactive and supporting collegiality also serves to frame incongruous behaviour. For example, a teacher not socializing in a social space may be perceived as engaging in non-collegial behaviour.

Making an effort to interact positively with a colleague: Making an effort to interact with a colleague refers to a teacher either initiating, or responding to an interaction with another teacher. Julia referred to “doing things with colleagues”, “having a cup of coffee at recess” and “sharing stories with other teachers” as examples of collegiality. For Jane, it was “connecting with other people outside one’s sphere” and making “choices” to engage collegially with others. Tamara referred to “talking with others and sharing interests”. Each participant has identified an aspect of making an effort to interact with other teachers. Spatially, each respondent has identified teacher choices that produce and are influenced by place. Generally, teachers need to be in the vicinity of one another to engage collegially. Jane’s comment “outside one’s sphere” may be interpreted in several ways, but suggests a need for teachers, to engage in this collegial construction, to seek out those who inhabit spaces that may not be in close proximity, or to meet in spaces that promote social relations. While having a “cup of coffee” could conceivably occur anywhere, if the staffroom is seen as
the coffee space in which conversations occur, teachers remaining in their own classrooms for any variety of reasons spend a break-time in a space that does not produce drive to engage with colleagues, affecting one’s experience, at that moment in time, with collegiality. Stephanie defined “gossip” as non-collegial while Maria described “conflicts that become little conversations” as counter-collegial. Both gossip and private conversations (talking about others) in essence exclude other members from interacting, and are counter to the concept of making an effort to interact positively. Julia affirms “not sharing social times” and “not coming to the staffroom to avoid others” as non-collegial as is “doing one’s own thing”. Again, common spaces at Parkdale have been created as predominant places of social networking with staff who may not inhabit spaces near one another. Those who do not frequent those spaces miss the opportunity to be a part of that spatial-collegial experience. Aspects of layout are important – if a teacher who, for example, spent several minutes of a recess assisting a student in the classroom, he or she may judge that there is not enough time to navigate the school’s corridors to reach the staffroom in time to engage socially. While his or her intention may not have been to avoid a collegial experience, the spatial location of that classroom may influence his or her moment-moment experience with collegiality. This is important because teacher responses highlighting the positive nature of teacher collegial interaction are congruent with the findings of Numeroff (2005) who suggests that frequent and positive collegial experiences lead to increased job satisfaction amongst teachers. During formal observations I looked for staff behaviours that were characteristic of what the interviewees identified as collegial (in terms of interacting positively with a colleague) and I noted frequent examples, particularly in the staffroom during social times and in open areas between classrooms. Little (1999) refers to the close relationship between collegiality and teacher interaction. These teachers appear to connect making an effort to engage in positive relations to imbued organizational beliefs and values. While positive interactions are not a direct component of Hargreaves’ (1994) or Little’s (1990; 1999) collaboration-oriented collegiality, they may be a prelude to teachers feeling comfortable to engage with one another (including joint work) and the creation of a spatial culture that promotes and supports collaborative practice. This is particularly salient to aspects of organizational culture related to having respect for others, engaging in community-oriented attitudes and behaviours, welcoming/inviting others, and solving problems peacefully, all of which occur through time.
and space. It appeared, through analysis of interview data, that congenial behaviours were valued alongside collegial constructions that Little (1990) would define as having a greater depth, and Parkdale teachers generally identified forms of congeniality as enhancing school culture, teachers did not directly suggest that congenial behaviours were a precursor to other forms of collegiality.

Offering support to a colleague: I consider offering to support a colleague to be both behavioural (as it can be a momentary action in space and time, such as sharing a resource) and values-oriented (because it can be part of a deeper, long lasting relationship over time and space, such as helping a colleague emotionally through difficult times). Datnow (2011) alludes to the notion of collegiality as successful when colleagues feel supported by one another (as well as by school administration). Julia, Jane, Stephanie, and Maria all refer to the importance of sharing materials, resources and ideas. McGregor (2004b) refers to physical resources and shared objects as mediated between people. In this sense, the physicality of sharing (be it a physical object as part of space or a space itself) is located in space. For Julia, a collegial environment is one in which “I can call people when I need help”. She further explains that collegiality is “supporting one another through fun times and hard times”. Ming uses the descriptors “being willing to reach out, to offer guidance” and “regularly checking in” as indicating collegiality, while non-collegiality is “feeling like you don’t have the support professionally or personally”. Stephanie refers to the non-collegial as “unsupportiveness [sic] and a sense of competition.” Several participants identified feelings of competition for interaction time produced by tight table spaces in the staffroom. Perhaps shared resources such as the copier have an ability to create spatial competition – who may or may not use it at a given time, who can get to that space the quickest or at a time when it is free, and so forth.

Supporting a colleague can be a momentary offer of assistance or potentially longer-lasting and having more depth, such as helping someone in a variety of ways through a long-term issue or problem. These elements are incorporated within the assisting others and mutual sharing located along Little’s collegiality typology. Findings are consistent in terms of collegial depth, because offering support to a colleague can itself have a varying degree of time and depth, depending on the nature of the interaction, suggesting a continuum of depth of collegial experience within this Parkdale collegial construction. As an example of relative
depth of support, during my data collection the school district announced a series of layoffs that would affect many teachers, and essentially change social-spatial and collegial articulations. Little was known about what was to come in the future, and I observed teachers offering support in the way of conversation, listening, and offering advice for re-gaining a position to colleagues who were to receive lay-off notices through empowerment and socio-spatial networks of support. Teacher collegial interactions characterized as support were likely of a greater depth and, perhaps, importance than, say, suggesting or lending a resource, because the problem (teacher layoffs) were related to the organization as a whole, and would have collegial-spatial effects. Such support was timely and culturally appropriate knowing that a change in personnel (a change to the organizational member structure) would have farther reaching organizational and interactional effects than the sharing of resources during a given moment. That said, the sharing of resources as a general theme is likely to have a significant impact on the collegial experience.

Working together towards a common goal: Teachers at Parkdale collaborate frequently and for many purposes. This ranges from working together on committees and discussing issues and seeking solutions to problems during table talks at staff meetings, to creating and supervising extra-curricular activities and working together to design learning opportunities and lessons for students. As an organizational insider, I can attest to both observing, as well as participating in, a multitude of such experiences. Teacher-participants identified working together as a vital part of a collegial environment. Working together towards a common goal refers to teachers collaborating in a group of two or more toward some common end, be it creating an event, determining a solution to a school-wide problem/challenge, or towards furthering group knowledge or effective practice. This is consistent with Little’s construction of engaging in joint work. I have designated it as both behavioural (because it is a choice one can make in the moment) but also as values-based (because it can be long term and go into great depth), depending on the nature of the collaboration. Hargreaves (1994) believes that effective collegiality is that which promotes common goals that are driven by teachers themselves. McGregor (2004b) refers to school departments as both situated in space and as producing and organizing patterns and networks of interaction. While Parkdale is not departmentalized in the sense of a secondary school, it contains groups of teachers working together. Such a pattern (in which teachers work in
collaborative groups) locates teachers in different spaces, and produces a spatiality within those locations.

“Collegiality [involves] working together to reach a common goal,” Maria tells me. For Tamara, it includes “having a conversation around curriculum…or exploring the ethics of teaching”. During several meetings I observed teachers speak about the importance of working together, particularly in the face of teacher union job action. Teachers around the room appeared to be generally in agreement. Teacher views on coming together to create and work on common goals is in line with Hargreaves’ work. These are further examples of the organizational values of engaging in community-oriented attitudes and behaviours, solving problems peacefully, and having a positive community-oriented attitude/being a part of the community.

Collaborating on curriculum and assessment was also seen as collegial: “working with my [grade-level] partner” [Tamara]; “There’s a close collegiality within the team” [Jane]; “coming together to create lessons with other teachers” [Julia]. Bringing classes together for common learning time and team-teaching was identified by Tamara, Julia, and Stephanie as being collegial in nature. These appeared to be, as Hargreaves and Dawe (1990) and Little (1999) deem to be significant, teacher initiated and oriented. In spatial terms, teachers work in spaces that they deem as collaboration-oriented, such as a classroom. Which classroom they chose may affect the nature of their interactions. In bringing groups of students together, teachers are at an advantage when the configuration of a classroom or common space, such as a pod learning area, supports the number of students, volume, and so forth. This has an effect on the collegial experience – if teachers bring classes together in a common space, it produces an interactional reaction from other teachers working around the pod. They may wish to interact with their colleagues in a positive manner and perhaps engage in collaboration or they may close their door because they find the social environment too noisy, or perhaps become critical of a colleague’s teaching style or spatial choices. A very different collegial experience from one scenario to the next (with respect to working together in space and time) is produced with potential positive or negative effects.

Julia believes it is necessary to create goals that involve the whole school community: “collegiality to me means working on a project together whether it’s all the way from kindergarten to grade seven, no matter what”. Her comments suggest a certain perseverance
on the part of teachers, despite challenges that may arise. For Tamara, an example of collegiality is “when you come together [and are] all involved in a similar purpose”. She provides an example of a group of teachers who have recently begun working on a school-wide plan for curriculum that would benefit the community as a whole. Koehler (1996) advocates for teachers coming together to work on school-wide goals, suggesting that goals development by teachers is an expression of true collegiality. These collegial endeavours, to collaborate with another, appear to be interpreted by these teachers as a symbol for the organizational value of having a positive community-oriented attitude/being a part of the community, and making efforts towards being effective in one’s work role.

Being respectful towards the views of a colleague/looking for the best in others: A feeling of respect, both environmental (the school feeling like it has a culture of respect) and such emotions produced through one’s interactions with another, is related to Parkdale’s organizational values, specifically having respect for others. The word respect (as a linguistic symbol representing this value) is found explicitly throughout school documents, posted visually in various forms throughout the building, and can be seen in other school symbols, such as the mascots and mission statement. These spatial artefacts represent group discussion and discourse through empowerment because they were created by Parkdale teachers working together, through a number of small- and full-group sessions, over time. Symbols of common organizational goals were constructed through empowerment principles. I have observed the word respect used by teachers in a variety of contexts. Teacher-participants described behaviours symbolizing respect as part of their constructions of collegiality. This was accomplished through descriptions of how behaviours either tied into the concept of being respectful towards the views of a colleague/looking for the best in others, or described behaviours that were deemed to be disrespectful, or not engaging in the collegial value. I developed this category based on observed and recounted behaviours that appear to be linked to what teachers perceive as a respectful environment (collegiality practiced in space, while respectful spaces are thereby enacted), a symbol also tied to organizational value of having a positive community-oriented attitude/interacting positively with others and engaging in community-oriented behaviours/welcoming others in addition to having respect for others. The term looking for the best in people refers to my interpretation that teachers value, though views may differ, one staff member approaching another with
good intentions. Wright (2004) supports the notion that, in order to maintain a collegial and healthy school environment, teachers must feel respected by one another. The environment is the interaction of collegial construction and space. These behaviours could be occur in moment-to-moment interactions in space, but also could be part of one’s underlying and long-standing personal or interpreted organizational values-base that occurs in space-time. In a study on teachers new to the profession, Ewing and Smith (2003) identified feelings of respect and being positive in interactions with colleagues (as opposed to negative talk about other teachers and the profession) as a catalyst to decrease stress and to increase teachers’ happiness at work. I believe this is an important point in that teachers often have a tendency to engage in negative talk about the profession and other teachers (Ewing & Smith, 2003; Hammersley, 1980; Kainan, 1994) in a manner that is contrary to collegiality. This behaviour produces spaces that are imbued with negativity, essentially producing what is often referred to as a **negative environment**, or a **negative school culture**. While Little (1982; 1990) does not include respectful behaviour in her typology of collegial constructions, she does suggest that culture is produced through joint work and the production of mutual responsibility. I would argue that, for Parkdale teachers, notions of respectful behaviour occur through feeling that one is respected as a colleague, and that teachers have one another’s best interests at heart, as alluded to by teachers working in extended physical spaces.

Jane describes collegiality as encouraging “a professional respect between people despite differences that might be political or academic”. For Maria, non-collegiality is where “people…pick on those differences or disagreements you might have and use that as a focal point of their interaction with you”. Tamara describes a collegial relationship where teachers have “a cooperative tone” and “won’t get offended” by differences of teaching style or classroom management philosophy that may permeate spaces that are seen as a particular teacher’s, such as working in a pod outside a classroom, or noise made by students in the hallway or entering the building from a portable (that may be seen or heard through a window, for example). Open doors, visually being able to see others and other spaces through a window, or passing through another’s classroom are examples of this. These teachers suggest that, for a collegial environment to be present, one does not necessarily need to subscribe to the same viewpoints or work styles, for example, but conceptually accept that
others may be different, while still behaviourally engaging with others in a positive manner. One must accept, then, that spatial articulations and experiences (such as one’s own classroom) may change because of the behaviour of others who may not be, at that moment, in the classroom itself (an example of this could be a teacher making a public address announcement, an auditory interaction that permeates another teacher’s classroom). Julia describes a non-collegial situation as one “where people are really passionate about the job [but] another body is dictating what they can and can’t do”. She later told me another body referred to teachers with particular views being critical of colleagues who did not “do things their way”. For Julia “being outspoken when it comes to politics” in a manner that overtly criticizes the practice or decisions of another is non-collegial. Through my observations of meetings, I heard conversations related to “teachers need[ing] to be patient with one another”, “respecting” each others’ autonomy, and as Maria states, “working together and trying to see the best in people”. In one meeting, I observed two teachers with very different viewpoints discuss their perspectives and come to a consensus through negotiation while maintaining what appeared to be a positive tone that did not appear to attempt to privilege one viewpoint over the other. At the end of the discussion, one of the two teachers commented “it’s nice to be able to discuss things knowing we respect one another and want what is best for kids”. Those teachers have created a spatial configuration during that timeframe that supports a collegial experience.

*Internalizing organizational and group values*: During conversations about collegiality, teacher-participants spoke intently about community, mutual respect, and creating a welcoming environment in which organizational members feel safe. While some of these themes closely relate to other collegial constructs I have proposed (such as being respectful towards the views of a colleague and working together towards a common goal), I suggest a sixth collegial construct that concerns a deeper, more global character: internalizing organizational and group values. While a teacher may display collegial behaviour that is characteristic of organizational norms and values (but not necessarily internalize such norms and values implicitly), this category details teacher-described and observed behaviours that may indicate one, to some visible or assumed degree, internalizes or believes in the values that have been negotiated and created through group behaviour and participation over time and through space (see Hatch, 2006), with a goal to reinforce and, as
a group, re-create such values. Internalizing group values is intricately related to the spaces in which these values are displayed. It is through time-space that values become internalized, because of interactions that have occurred in space. Consequently space itself becomes reconstituted within the organization. “I feel it’s possible,” Tamara says “to have very rich collegial conversations”. She suggests that “the form for collegial conversations is always having to be re-created”. In other words, teachers need to be aware of how they construct collegiality and work to perpetuate it over time. Discourse about the nature of collegiality in terms of reinforcing organizational values was apparent through observation in specific spaces (particularly the library and staffroom) during meetings and social times. This construct, internalizing organizational and group values, is not described directly by Little’s collegial continuum, however joint work (which she describes as at the deepest level of collegiality) has become a part of Parkdale’s organizational and collegial culture. A teacher may view what she or he perceives as a colleague’s choice to internalize (or not to internalize) collegial values, such as meaningful collaboration, as a conduit through which interaction (including collaboration) occurs. In other words, a teacher who works collaboratively with others, may simultaneously be seen as internalizing such a group value, by virtue of engaging in said joint work. I believe this is a salient collegial factor, because a teacher’s attitude towards collaborating with (and, in general, interacting with) another appears to be closely tied to how she or he views someone else as an organizational member (and as a part of Parkdale’s organizational culture). Interviewees provided examples of this.

Teacher-participants offered examples of what participating in organizational and group values looks like. For Julia, this involves creating an environment that “feels like a family…bonding over anything, a partnership”. We have discussed the implications of a positive spatiality (a positive environment). The community value is apparent. For Ming, “a positive work environment where people get along and offer a balance between that person and a professional feeling of belonging” is collegial. Jane describes a “cliquiness or exclusivity” amongst staff as being non-collegial, similar to Tamara’s description of “people feeling they know best and that they should be the ones to make the decision”. The community-oriented notion of dialogue and collaborative decision-making and mutual discourse is valued by members and is supported by socio-spatial relations. All teacher-participants interviewed spoke in a positive manner of the decision-making structure adopted
by school-based administration which involves use of dialogue, consulting the voices of the
teaching staff, valuing consensus, and making decisions based upon “what is best for kids
and for teachers” [Tamara]. She feels “it is possible at [Parkdale] to have rich, collegial
conversations”. Spatial articulations have enabled this possibility, as teachers have created,
together, opportunities for such collegial conversations in shared spaces. Julia speaks of a
culture that makes one feel “welcome coming back into the school”, and Ming and Stephanie
both use the word “family” to describe the culture. It appears teachers see engaging in organizational and group values as a significant construct that is closely aligned with
Parkdale’s broad organizational norms and values.

Collegiality is important to Parkdale teachers. It is based upon interaction with others
at various depths, and it becomes a symbol of, and allows members to demonstrate (through
expressions of both behavioural-based and values based forms of collegiality) a relationship
with organizational culture, values, and norms. Those working in extended physical spaces,
who may have less opportunity to interact with colleagues due to proximity or physical
orientation of the space, may be perceived as having less opportunity to engage in what they
define as collegial constructions and may perceive themselves to be less a part of or on the
periphery of the values that characterize the organization. Others may perceive this of them
as well, creating a marginalizing effect: they are members of an organization but essentially,
through spatial features, find themselves on the fringe. However, the mutual creation of
social spaces of dialogue (in the form of both formal and informal structures) has enabled
teachers working on the physical fringes of the building to, themselves, engage in the
collegial experience.

4.2.3 Power related to decision-making, collegiality, and the allocation of extended physical
spaces

In the province of British Columbia, legislation gives principals and upper school
district administration the authority to make decisions related to matters pertaining to the
operation of a school. This structure implicitly gives administrators levels of power that
teachers do not have (potential for power-over). That being said, decision-making models
vary greatly from school to school. The allocation of spaces is challenging in that teachers
do not always share the same views about space, making consensus at times, difficult. At
Parkdale, administrators and teachers tend to work together in a process of distributed
leadership and decision-making that generally includes a degree of dialogue when looking to allocate extended physical spaces, knowing that these spaces (the portables, specifically) are considered less desirable than other classrooms. The act of teachers working together alongside a supportive administration lends itself to enhanced collegiality and a stronger school culture (Wright, 2004) and a positive working environment for teaching staff (Numeroff, 2005). Despite the prevalence of power-over structures in organizations (Tett, 2005), Parkdale administrators and teachers employ a power-with approach of discussion and mutual problem-solving toward the betterment of the organization and the collective experience of members. At this point, Parkdale staff can not conceivably decide not to use the portables because of a lack of space within the school. Nor can another addition be immediately funded and constructed. “We try and find a fair process,” Tamara says. “I don’t think there has been any directive from above”. What she describes as a fair process has involved lengthy discussions between members of the Staff Council (and the formation of policy and recommendations), similar discussions between all organizational members at meetings, and attempts at problem-solving and reaching some form of consensus through negotiation.

The Staff Council is a committee that each school in the district is required to establish as a part of the teacher-employer contractual agreement. This committee is comprised of teachers, who are elected or acclaimed, and who represent a variety of teaching roles in the school, as well as the school-based administration. The committee’s primary function is to discuss initiative, policy, and problems that arise over the course of the year and to find solutions or discuss policy and goals that affect the whole staff. Consensus on such issues is considered to be an ideal, and recommendations to staff are voted upon, delivered to all teaching staff, and again, voted on. The structure of this committee is congruous with the notion that collegiality is most fully achieved when teachers are working together to negotiate and achieve common goals that are supported by school administration (Hargreaves, 1994; Datnow, 2011). My participation on and observation of this committee suggests both its process for discussion and the outcomes of such discussions are thought to be representative of the common good, what best benefits both the teaching community as a whole, and students. This is indicative of a structure aimed at sharing power. Committee members reinforce with each other collegial expectations for conduct (reflective of the
constructs discussed here thus far) and frequent reference to our values as educators, respect for colleagues, and maintaining a safe workspace are frequent themes, which can be linked to organizational values: being part of the community, solving problems collaboratively and peacefully, and engaging in community-oriented behaviours. I have observed similar language in other meetings, committee-work, and social occasions. Such processes appear to be in line with organizational values that privilege having a community-oriented attitude/interacting with others, engaging in community oriented behaviours, and, in particular, solving problems collaboratively and peacefully. These conversations and eventual decisions engage a process that involves interaction between teachers (and with administration) in spaces that support a power-with model. In terms of deciding on spatial allocations, decisions are made that will essentially affect the spatial experience throughout the organization. Ponic, Reid and Frisby (2010) in work with feminist participatory action research, suggest that, when partnerships are formed to engage in joint-decision making and dialogue, “it is necessary to generate power-with strategies to harness each partner’s resources, skills, and knowledge” (p. 330). The Staff Council (and how it operates at Parkdale) is a structure that seeks to honour the resources, skills, and knowledge of each organizational member in that each teacher and administrator has the opportunity for voice and participation. Socio-spatial interaction between teachers forms the basis of collegiality and such conversations related to space occur not just through teachers dialoguing and negotiating, but through a collegial experience (such as the council). For example, discussions between teachers about who will inhabit which classroom (conversations on spatiality) are characterized by the identified collegial constructions, such as working towards a common goal.

Allocation of classrooms in the addition was a relatively simple process [Stephanie, Julia]. “It seemed quite equitable to me,” Tamara says. “It seems whoever wanted to go in there, went in there”. Conversations and allocations occurred prior to my engaging in research, however I was party to the process at the time it unfolded. When the addition was nearing completion, at a time when staff tended to enter into discussions about changing primary workspaces, a Staff Council meeting was called. An administrator presented the topic of space allocations to the council. Through discussion, teachers and the administration decided to speak to the full staff at a common meeting to begin a full-staff dialogue on the
process. There were five classrooms, and soon after the meeting five teachers volunteered to move into them (as opposed to other classrooms in the school, or to staying in their current workspace). While it is possible that power-over dynamics may have been involved (for example, if these teachers stated they would like to move, and another teacher who felt they had less status also wanted to move, he or she might not have made the desire to move known), I did not see observable evidence of this, nor did teacher-participants allude to this in interviews or during conversations and interactions observed. This indicates the successful negotiation of power through an empowerment model.

Conversations regarding the allocation of portable classrooms to teachers occur on an annual basis. Again, these conversations can be tied to the collegial construct *working together towards a common goal*. A teacher, during a meeting I formally observed, referred to the portable classroom allocation as “a potentially divisive issue that we shouldn’t let affect us like it has in the past”. The portables are viewed by some teachers as having “less status” [Stephanie] than other spaces in the school. If classrooms in the original building are seen as having a greater status than the portables, the modular classrooms then become symbols of a lesser status, hence teachers inhabiting them as having less power than other teachers, and subsequently subjected to domination. Also, these feelings may produce tension created by a perceived unequal opportunity to engage in interaction time (which allows for expression of collegial constructions) and organizational values that are salient at the school (such as interacting positively with others and engaging in community-oriented behaviours). Teachers may feel less a part of the community, and that power relations are characterized by power-over interactions. For them, their classroom spaces are produced through negative interactions and inequity. Parkdale teachers have struggled, over time, thinking about a difficult question: with a shortage of up to five classrooms in the original building (thus requiring the use of modular classrooms), who is going to work in the *less desirable* rooms (which, by virtue of staff perceptions, have become symbols of a lesser status)? Sometimes teachers do not volunteer to inhabit the portable classrooms. Simply the notion of four or five teachers not having a space in the permanent structure brings up questions of equity; such questions involve power structures outside of the Parkdale organization itself. These power structures are responsible, to a degree, for producing collegial and power-related spatial tensions at the school.
In British Columbia, funds and approval for the construction of school extensions come from the provincial government. Initially, despite the required use of five modular classrooms, government funding schemes for schools construction were not available for an extension at the school. Allocation of the portable classrooms is accompanied by a sense of power inequity for a variety of reasons, as discussed earlier, and they are in place because of decisions related to money and how to expand space in a growing school. The district chose to place modular classrooms on-site essentially because it was not given funds (or funding was not available) to build onto the existing building. At Parkdale, though the addition was eventually approved and funded, it did not solve the need for modular classrooms due to the continual growth of the school. The funds received by the district allowed for the construction of an extension that would avoid the need to bring in more portable classrooms, but which was never intended to render the modular structures unnecessary. The addition was built but the portables were still required. In this sense, it is government choices that affect which schools and districts get (and do not get) funding and approval for an adequate extension that has continued to create and re-create this inequity. This process may be steeped in any number of equitably questionable (power-over) decisions based upon a multitude of possible power factors. In any case, over time decisions have had to be (and will continue to need to be) made as to who will and will not move into the portables.

For many years, staff have attempted to mitigate a power-over mentality through discussion of equitable ways of allocating teachers to the portable classrooms. “Right now,” Tamara explains “there is a list we go through to see who is next to go into the portable”. Julia refers to the “two-year period we agreed to.” In a sense, because of the time implication and knowledge that the portable experience is a temporary one, the portables become shared objects (see McGregor, 2004b, p.349), spaces that are rotated, thereby imbuing them with a heightened sense of equity. “We try to take teachers’ voices into consideration,” according to Stephanie. “We try to be fair,” she says. Parkdale teachers and administration, working together collegially, have developed an empowerment-oriented policy that provides a formula for how portable classrooms are to be allocated. Tamara, Ming, and Julia all referred to a “lottery system”. Essentially teachers names are drawn, and an ordered list is made based upon order chosen randomly through the draw. A teacher will work in the portable for a period of two years, and then return to the original building (or
extension) at their option, and the next teacher on the list will move to a portable. I can ascertain through observing many discussions related to the process during both professional and social times that teachers are both aware of the process, and that it is a topic that invokes discussion and emotion. All interviewees referred to this system as being “fair” and “equitable”, derived through power-with discussions promoting community values. During formal observations I heard several teachers working in the original building as referring to the process as equitable. The policy itself was created through a collaborative decision-making model created by teachers and the administration together. It was initially crafted through conversation, discourse, and negotiation during Staff Council meetings and was voted-in by staff members (documents suggest that 100% of Parkdale teachers voted in favour of the policy). In essence, the policy was created through a process reflecting constructions of teacher collegiality (working together towards a common goal, participating in organizational and group values, and so forth), using aspects of the school organizational value system. In a sense, the policy has become a symbol of these values.

While many teachers at Parkdale appear to feel that the mutually-created portable policy has evened-out inequities, conflicts and power-related issues do still occur. One such imbalance, identified by the teacher-participants I interviewed, involved who was eligible for the portable list. Tamara states it “irks [her] personally” that some teachers are exempt from the draw. These exemptions are related to grade levels taught and to medical issues. Teachers of students in kindergarten and grade one are exempt from working in a portable classroom because these structures do not have washrooms and because it is considered a safety risk for children of this age to walk across the school grounds (which are not fenced-in) throughout the day, unsupervised. While this exemption creates a power imbalance in that some teachers are exempt from allocations to portables and others or not, this was agreed-upon by teachers for practical reasons related to student safety through a distributed decision-making model (power-with).

The presence of medical exemptions has also caused conflict. Such medical issues are diverse and may involve severe allergies, reduced mobility, and other health concerns such as breathing or hearing issues. It is thought in some cases that being closer to the office is desirable in the event of, say, anaphylaxis. While Tamara is “irked” by these exemptions and thinks everyone should “have their fair share” of working in a portable classroom, Ming
has a differing viewpoint: “I can understand completely why they shouldn’t be out there…it seems fair.” Questions may arise into definitions of medical concerns, which would create conflict. Teachers are deemed to have a medical exemption by the administrator only upon receipt of a doctor’s documentation. During an informal observation I heard one conversation regarding medical exemptions. It was between two teachers (both working in the original building) who said that they agreed with the policy in principle, but did comment that it significantly reduced the number of teachers eligible for the draw for portable classrooms. A further challenge of this situation involves teachers interrogating the legitimacy of a medical condition that another teacher may have. This not only creates conflict and is counter to the organizational and collegial values (such as having a positive community-oriented attitude and interacting positively with others, being respectful towards the views of a colleague and looking for the best in others and offering support to a colleague). On the other hand, in the view of some, these teachers may have a power advantage because they are able to remain in what is perceived to be a space with higher status. Stephanie notes the “divisionary effects” that the portable policy (and the need for teachers to work in what is perceived as a less-desirable space) can have. While staff appear to want to accommodate each other’s needs (however these may be defined), at times the perceived negatives of an extended physical space, and the subsequent tension created by the spatial inequity of how one experiences collegiality and organizational values and culture is apparent. Despite this tendency, teachers and administrators have clearly worked together through power-sharing and open communication to mitigate the experience of inequity with regards to inhabiting extended physical spaces. This has been achieved through the creation of a rotational system that changes one’s spatial experience (the potential that inhabiting these spaces is not a fixed permanence) and through attempts to increase accessibility of resources (such as installing televisions in portable classrooms), a series of building upgrades, and the creation of a spatiality in the original building that includes those working in extended physical spaces. Original building spaces have become symbols of inclusivity and opportunity in an interactional sense, and extended physical spaces are progressively being re-created as viable spaces in which to engage in collegial interaction and shared power.
4.3 Extended physical spaces as both extensions of the organization and as producing a new spatiality: tying it all together

I have engaged in an in-depth analysis of how one school strives to make sense of its extended physical spaces in relation to how collegiality is constructed by teachers working in these spaces and the nature of their interactions with one another and with other colleagues in the school through power relations. This examination has produced new knowledge about how the presence of extended physical spaces affects a school at which they are present. For teachers and administrators to have the background necessary to begin discussing these concepts in an informed manner, they must understand how they relate to one another.

There is a reciprocal nature spaces have on our interactions and our perceptions of those interactions. We interact with other organizational members within space, and we also interact with the space as we strive to carry out our role within the organization while simultaneously producing the space that we experience. It is the space that is a significant element of one’s role as a teacher, whether one feels he or she is manipulating it or that it is manipulating his or her behaviours and interactions. Essentially a bidirectional relationship exists. Space is produced by our interactions through time, and it configures teacher interactions as expressions of constructed collegiality. Collegiality is not just something teachers (for the most part) aspire to have, but is based largely upon behaviours and some degree of internalized organizational values that teachers experience in their day to day interactions with one another in time-space. The communities in schools are networks and patterns of socio-spatial relations (McGregor, 2004b). I suggest that collegiality is, to a degree, a representation of organizational values expressed through these networks. Behaviours associated with collegiality essentially become symbols of the organizational values and norms held by members, expressed through interactions, within space. Power relationships infuse the organization – influential power dynamics can be found both externally (such as national or local policy and societal norms) and throughout all aspects of the organization (our very role as teachers imply an adherence to hegemonic and cultural values). Critical symbolic interactionist theory proposes that power is embedded in all meanings one derives from representations that one makes through interaction. This is true of one’s interactions with others in the production of space. Power in schools can be conceptualized and expressed in several ways, such as by dominant (power-over) means, or
through an empowerment (power-with) orientation that privileges mutual benefit, dialogue, and distributed leadership.

How do these relationships that I have described account for the addition of extended physical spaces to an original school building? I suggest that, when an original building, which is characterized by an existing spatiality/spatialities and collegiality through organizational values, is physically extended, some sense of the organization’s existing spatiality/spatialities, collegiality and organizational values is extended to these new spaces. Because organizational members who have inhabited spaces in the original building move to inhabit the extended physical spaces, and these spaces become a part of the organization, organizational characteristics thereby extend to the space. As new spaces become integrated with an existing spatiality/spatialities under the umbrella of the school organization, teachers reconstitute their social network through the changing spatial experience. While this phenomena might initially appear as a more visible manifestation within the extended physical spaces themselves (those teachers essentially must recreate their socio-spatial interactions), over time changing patterns of socio-spatial interaction occur throughout the original building itself. I argue that this occurs, in some ways, through the very conception of extended physical spaces (discussions related to a proposal to construct an addition, for example, may change the way space is experienced) but it is a more visible manifestation after extended physical spaces are inhabited. Symbolic interactionism maintains that we make meaning based upon the phenomena of which we are a part and an interactionist organizational theoretical perspective suggests that the interpretive associations of spaces by organizational members become symbols that give significance to social interaction (Hatch, 2006). I would argue that initially (perhaps after a teacher who has worked in a space in the original building and then moves into an extended physical space), teachers attempt to attribute the organizational beliefs and values and constructions of collegiality that they possess, to their relationship with the extended physical space. They may feel tension or anxiety because they perceive that the new spatiality does not support these expressions, whether that be through their interactions with the space, or through their interactions with others in the space. Because of spatial attributes such as proximity and accessibility, their interactions with the extended physical spaces may have effects that are seen in the nature of
their interactions and collegial expressions with teachers outside of the extended physical space, such as in the original building.

The existence of extended physical spaces produces a fluctuating power dynamic: working in the space may involve changes in the nature of teacher interactions with one another, a perception of the extended physical spaces as visually and functionally incongruous (from the original building), and a sense of power imbalance (power-over). These divergences form what teachers may feel as tension. They may feel it challenging to interact with others (hence the enactment of constructions of collegiality as connected to organizational values) the way they once did when they worked in the original building. They may also be concerned that teachers working in the original building may also perceive these changes, and could attribute this to any number of factors. On the other hand, teachers and leaders have an opportunity to engage in power-with strategies that may enhance the socio-spatial experience of working with extended physical spaces and through working together to build solidarity, organization, and cooperation with one another, through a strength-based system of belief that inspires growth (see Townsend et al., 1999, p. 103). While the extended physical spaces represent an extension of collegial experience and organizational values, I would suggest that they serve to re-create organizational culture as well. Because teacher interaction, structures related to or experiences with collegiality, and power relationships are involved to some degree in the conception and allocation of spaces, and because teachers move in and out of those spaces, the extensions become a part of the manner in which organizational members symbolize and thereby derive meaning from the school’s physical structure. Essentially spatiality has changed and continues to change as teachers create and re-create meaning derived from the space, while they enact constructions of collegiality through interaction, and negotiate power dynamics embedded within the organization. Through a knowledge of how spatiality intersects with teacher interactions and collegial constructions, power relationships, and, effectively, organizational culture, school personnel are empowered to both interrogate the manner in which they interact with one another in the presence of extended physical spaces, to negotiate the ways in which extended physical spaces are allocated and to design new spaces in a manner that is consistent with group values and individual equity.
Chapter 5: Discussion and Implications

5.1 Revisiting theory in relation to the study’s findings

This study examined the experience of teachers working in spaces that were conceived and constructed (an attached addition and unattached modular classrooms) as extensions of an original school building. It looked at the ways in which those teachers characterized and derived meaning from the extended physical spaces, how organizational members interpreted symbols of organizational culture (such as values and norms), how these extended physical spaces intersected with collegiality and power relations, and the nature of said interactions within and outside of those spaces. Parkdale Elementary School’s organizational values were represented as symbolic concepts that “explain the direction and persistence of individual and collective behaviours” (Albert et al., 2000, p. 13). These cultural values included having a positive community-oriented attitude, solving problems peacefully, taking ownership of one’s choices, having respect for others and participating enthusiastically in school values. Teacher-participants demonstrated various ways that these values were created, transmitted, and subsequently reproduced. This is in keeping with the theory that organizational identity and culture are a product of common beliefs and (generally) shared (and negotiated) understandings about organizational symbols, features, and structures (Gioia et al., 2000).

Physical spaces within the original building, in particular those deemed to be social spaces (the foyer, staffroom, common pods, copy room, office, and library), were generally thought to be welcoming, and encouraging teacher interaction and collegial experiences, somewhat contrary to Bissell (2004). They were intricately tied to the school’s organizational culture and values, as both identified by participants, and through the variety of culturally-oriented visual artefacts present in the spaces. This is supported by McGregor (2004a), who suggests that a school’s architecture and physical arrangement represents specific ideological and educational values that develop through interaction. Furthermore, the physical form of built spaces both affects and expresses social arrangements and practices (Jacklin, 2000) which in turn produces such space. Teachers deemed the social
spaces to be representative of the organizational culture of the school. Aspects of that culture are created through interactions within social spaces, and the spaces, in turn, reinforce teachers’ tendency to interact collegially within them. Interestingly, the manner in which teachers interacted within the staffroom (including seating arrangements and interactional patterns) did not appear to construct hierarchical social relations, contrary to the research of Kainan (1994; 1995) and Paetcher (2004) who suggest that school staffrooms tend to have a rigid, hierarchical character based upon various power factors.

Extended physical spaces were characterized by teachers into four broad categories: accessibility, emotional impact of the space, functionality of the space to complete one’s work-role, and the ability to manipulate and personalize the space. These categories were further broken down into more descriptive meanings. In general, the addition was categorized as feeling modern, somewhat isolated from common spaces, and somewhat accessible to resources. Opinions varied on the addition’s overall functionality. Storage was considered to be lacking. It was perceived to feel separate from the original school building, but less separate and isolating than the portable classrooms. The portables were characterized as industrial-feeling, less accessible to resources, but with a greater ability to manipulate interior spaces and had better storage than the addition. It is not surprising that functionality of the space and accessibility to resources was deemed by teachers to be significant because the arrangement of physical spaces affect teachers’ abilities to accomplish work goals and to share information, knowledge, and teaching resources (Siegel, 1999). Accessibility, emotional impact of the space, functionality of the space to complete one’s work-role, and the ability to manipulate and personalize the space are spatial elements that are intimately related to a teacher’s job, and the physical classroom is considered to be the basic tool of a teacher’s daily work activities (Bissell, 2004). Teachers derived meaning (including whether they viewed the space as having generally positive or negative attributes) partially based upon the capacity they felt they had within the physical space to engage in effective teaching. The ability to personalize one’s workspace is important because variations of pedagogical style and interactional patterns occur between teachers within a given space (Fielding, 2000) and slight changes in spatial forms, such as furniture and carpets, can affect a teacher’s capacity to work effectively because classrooms are permeable spatial forms (Nespor, 2002).
Collegiality, which has been defined in various ways, but includes a degree of social interaction (Little, 1999; Jarzabkowski, 2002) was experienced through socio-spatial networks and articulations. Teacher-participants working in the extended physical spaces identified factors that promoted and impeded interaction with colleagues. Factors included: proximity to others, being near open areas and hallways, whether a space is physically attached to the original building, a shared role/grade level, visual factors related to the space, the nature of common spaces, and one’s agency. It was generally perceived that working in extended physical spaces reduced a teacher’s frequency and quality of interactions with colleagues not working in extended physical spaces. Classrooms in the addition (and the portables), by virtue of not opening into a common pod/social space tended to be, as Wright (2004) describes classrooms along a corridor (as opposed to a social space) as “carceral and egg crate-like”, which in turn reduces one’s prospects for interaction, thereby increasing feelings of isolation. This was experienced to a greater degree in the portable classrooms than in the addition, though such experiences were felt in the addition as well. Teacher constructions of collegiality were closely related to Parkdale’s organizational culture, which is encompassed by common (though negotiated) beliefs, shared understandings, and a degree of imbued organizational systems and features (Gioia et al., 2000). Collegiality at Parkdale, in essence, is an interactive expression of organizational culture, which is experienced somewhat differently from teacher to teacher. Teacher-participants described six broad collegial constructions: engaging in moment-moment behaviours that convey a sense of congeniality, making an effort to interact with a colleague, offering support to a colleague, working together towards a common goal, being respectful towards the views of a colleague and looking for the best in others, and participating in organizational and group values. These collegial constructions were based largely upon some degree of interaction (supporting the work of Jarzabkowski, 2002), and contained elements of Little (1990’s) collegial typology, suggesting that there are depths of collegial experience, including (from lesser depth to greater depth) storytelling, assisting others, sharing, and engaging in joint work. The Parkdale teachers’ constructions of collegiality included elements not found in Little’s work, such as quick congenial interactions, being respectful towards one another’s viewpoints, looking for the best in others, and participating in organizational values. I see these collegial experiences as extending Little’s typology.
because each construction, besides being identified by teachers itself as a collegial
endeavour, supports a particular interactive and values-based character that promotes and
supports a particular environmental feeling. This extends Little’s work to include spatial
elements. Each collegial construction had socio-spatial implications; each was affected by
space and space was simultaneously produced through collegial and non-collegial
interactions, creating a particular environment and feeling that either supported or did not
support said collegial constructions.

All aspects of a school (as an organization) are entrenched in the organizational
values and norms through which members are a part, and in which symbols become
representations of the organization, both as physical manifestations and as socially produced
and transmitted (Hatch, 2006). Teachers construct notions of collegiality related to the broad
organizational values of the school. Collegiality occurs through interactions by teachers with
one another within space and produce a particular environmental feeling and form that
extends and influences the overall organizational culture. Simultaneously, teachers’
interactions with one another and with space itself produces said space and spatial
conceptions (McGregor, 2003; McGregor, 2004b), which themselves contain a multitude of
organizational symbols.

Power is ever-present by virtue of it being embedded in many forms through an
organization and one’s interactions and interpretations of organizational phenomena
(Carspecken, 1996). It can take the form of privilege, disadvantage, and domination (power-
over) or be an exercise in joint decision-making, the development of common goals and
understandings, and community-building (power-with) (Allen, 2005; Tett, 2005). Through a
lack of collective decision-making regarding all aspects of a space (including allocation of
teachers to work in those spaces), exemptions from working in an extended physical space,
insufficient budgets to adequately equip extended physical spaces with resources and quality
finishing, and through an organizational lack of knowledge and discussion about how to
increase interaction with and amongst those working in extended physical spaces, teachers
who inhabit such spaces find themselves at a disadvantage and have a higher likelihood of
feeling separate, isolated, and marginalized (see Fisher, 2004). However, through power-
with oriented joint decision-making models, the production of social spaces through
empowerment, adequate funds to equip extended spaces with adequate resources and quality
materials, and the creation of organizational structures that encourage increased interactions and an enhanced opportunity for a collegial experience, these spaces become symbols for empowerment, dialogue, interaction, and community (see Townshend et al., 1999).

When an original school building is physically extended and teachers inhabit these new spaces, new socio-spatial networks are produced. For those teachers (and others), the extended physical spaces initially feel different than previously inhabited spaces in the original building (a new spatiality is created and experienced) and inhabitants may feel tension between their present and past experience with organizational values. This may manifest because of a changing nature (such as a reduction in frequency or quality) of interactions with others. The new spatiality may feel incongruous with past collegial interactive experiences through changing patterns of interaction. For these teachers, the spaces may also feel less personalized and separate from others. This may result in feelings of marginalization, disadvantage, and inequity. A power-over decision-making model may accentuate this.

Through time, however, teachers inhabiting extended physical spaces tend to feel an ease of tension as the new spatial experience becomes more familiar. The extended physical spaces become a part of a new, school-wide spatiality. Collegial interactions are reconstructed by virtue of changing interaction patterns. Physical spaces within the extended spaces feel more personalized as teachers manipulate network objects such as furniture and the spaces are improved in anumber of ways. At Parkdale, this ease of tension occurred largely through a power-with model of joint decision making and dialogue regarding the spatial experience. Communities began to form amongst those working in extended spaces. This was more salient in extended physical spaces physically attached to the original building than those not attached.

It appears that negative feelings and fractured collegial experiences can be mitigated through an understanding of spatial principles and through dialogue and shared understanding and through the development of a language of empowerment to reduce potential feelings of isolation. A reconstituting of old symbols and meanings, and a creation of new symbols and representations occurs through the establishment of new (and possibly quite different) patterns of socio-spatial interactions through time, thereby recreating and renegotiating organizational culture. This is key in the creation of school spaces that Wright
(2004) refers to as supporting a community. In this manner, school spaces can become arenas for positive dialogue, the promotion of diversity, and symbols for inclusion as opposed to isolation and individualism (Horne, 2004). Extended physical spaces can become part of a new spatiality within the school organization, thereby strengthening collegial interactive experiences through shared power and community-building.

5.2 Implications for schools and for educational leaders

The findings of this study will be shared with the Parkdale teachers and other staff members, and with school- and district-based administration. I intend to present the findings in a professional-development seminar format in which the presentation will be followed by a question period and the opportunity for small group discussion, reflection, and share out. A number of Parkdale staff members have already (at the point of writing) been asking questions about the research findings and are keenly interested in learning more about the spatial experience. Though the school administration clearly promotes structures for engaging in power-with, I hope that a discussion about empowerment alongside socio-spatial relations will encourage all teachers to talk about these issues, to engage in discourse and goal-setting with regards to how they conceptualize their spaces and support fellow teachers through interaction. I believe that this will further encourage and reinforce community-building, cooperation, and the promotion of a growth-based, mutually derived mentality that supports positive socio-spatial networks and the creation of spaces for dialogue and support. I am committed to supporting the staff through this process of discovery and exploration through he undertaking of a leadership-oriented, problem solving role.

I see the findings of this research to be of significance to the working lives and experiences of teachers because aspects of spatiality are present in every aspect of school life, affecting decision-making, staff health and happiness, school culture, and student learning (McGregor, 2004b). School leaders often seek to improve school culture, conditions for learning, and teacher capacity to effectively provide the best possible learning opportunities for students. Aspects of this research are designed to provide strategies for initiating conversations about spatiality in their schools through a distributed (power-with) decision-making structure. This would be particularly salient for school leaders grappling with issues surrounding extended physical spaces. Through conversations around how space is interpreted and produced, school personnel will become more apt and able to re-
conceptualize extended physical spaces and to produce positive, strength-based and community-oriented spatialities.

In schools with extended physical spaces, group dialogue (supported by leaders) produced around an examination of the nature of power relationships imbued in the socio-spatial, would serve as a springboard for potentially changing the way in which teachers create and use language that aids in space production and symbolization. When they realize the isolating effects that certain spatial articulations can produce (often language used by staff members that ascribes meanings to these spaces that suggest an air of disadvantage and lesser status), educational leaders and teachers may redefine their conceptions of these spaces. The development of a new spatial language of empowerment may assist in reducing the potential for isolation. Leaders can examine the physical and social aspects of these spaces that are challenging for teachers, and make changes within those spaces (such as physical re-arrangement, outfitting of new resources, changing aesthetic materials, the addition windows and so forth) and within the original building (such as relocating key spaces or the establishment of extra common spaces) that make sense to organizational members in the context of that particular school. Educational leaders may wish to examine how these (and all) spaces in the school are allocated and find the most equitable (power-with) manner of accomplishing this. Educators have an opportunity to examine the nature of common spaces, such as staffrooms, and to interrogate which spaces in a school produce positive emotional responses from members and which spaces are seen negatively, or not as conducive to collegial relations and positive interactions, and look at changes related to furniture, schedules, or perhaps entering into dialogue about changing the purpose of the space. Staff can take clues from spaces to which they ascribe positive traits and seek to incorporate these traits into other spaces, thereby re-constituting less desirable spaces. A knowledge of how organizational members interact and construct collegiality, and the character of embedded power relationships, provides an invitation for the members to investigate how they construct this knowledge. This may equip them to find ways, through the changing of existing or creation of new organizational structures, adapting the manner staff interact with each other, or through providing different opportunities to disadvantaged members. For example, if teachers feel isolated working in certain spaces (not facing onto
an open area or not attached to the main building), perhaps greater opportunities for interaction with colleagues can be created.

Finally, teacher-participants described the benefits that could come from school designers collaborating actively and legitimately with organizational members who will eventually inhabit the spaces (in addition to becoming intimately familiar with organizational values) to ensure that positive and effective spatial configurations in an original building are paralleled in extended physical spaces. Wright (2004) suggests the participation of all school stakeholders in the design of new buildings (and, I argue, extensions). Researchers suggest that the use of a thorough conception and design process for new spaces in which the space-users and members of the organization for whom the building is being constructed have an active role in deciding all aspects of design (Fisher, 2002; Morgan, 2000). School leaders have an opportunity to bridge the gap between planners and inhabitants by creating power-with structures for school design. While schools that currently have extended physical spaces may need to think creatively and openly about their lived spatial realities, educational leaders who are either conceiving extended physical spaces at existing schools, or who are planning the construction of new schools, have an opportunity to reflect upon how they encourage meaningful community participation in the design process.

5.3 Implications for future research

I believe the findings of this study give the educational and research communities respective springboards through which they might further our knowledge about how an extended physical space affects the community that lives within (and outside of) the walls of a building. I would suggest further research exploring how extended physical spaces interplay with teacher interactions. More can be known about how teachers construct collegiality and how it relates to a school’s organizational values. One could further explore how power plays a role in the conception, allocation, and occupation of extended physical spaces. I would recommend future researchers to examine:

- How socio-spatial interaction, teacher collegiality, and organizational values intersect from the perspective of teachers working in an original building (which may or may not have extended physical spaces, but which may have a layout with extremities and a central core).
• The manner that different styles of architecture and layout (such as school with open areas vs. those without) interplay with notions of interaction, power, and collegiality.
• The experiences of teachers working in extended physical spaces (in particular, modular classrooms) with regards to the potential for liminality.
• The process of building an extended physical space within an existing school organizational structure, analyzing how collegiality and power plays a role in the initial design, construction, and occupation over time (similar to Gieryn’s work on the moments of design, construction and occupation a university building).
• Similar concepts contained in this study, applied to a diversity of community spaces (elementary schools of different sizes and composition of staff roles, high schools, and other institutions) and to the construction and occupation of new schools.
• Examine the effects of a power-with versus a power-over decision making processes through which extended physical spaces and new schools are designed.

5.4 Researcher reflections

Engaging in this study has allowed me to step away, to a degree, from my role as a teacher within a large school that struggles with its understanding of spatiality (particularly as it pertains to extended physical spaces) and to see the intricacies of how we (as teachers) use space, make meaning from space, and interact with and within space. I am amazed at the complexities involved within these interrelations, and the challenge one faces in separating, at least for the case of analysis and discussion, such intertwined concepts. I am excited to bring forward the knowledge constructed through this thesis to the Parkdale School community, in hopes that it will allow them, too, to engage in fruitful and productive dialogue regarding their own spatialities, interactions, and collegial experiences. I learned quite a bit about conceptions of power. Amy Allen (2005) suggests that theorists have spent entire careers attempting to define power. Working in and observing the field first-hand, and reflecting upon leadership practices in other schools in which I have worked has allowed me to see the many ways in which power can be exercised in the school environment. I now have a better understanding of how joint-power interacts with distributed leadership, and the potential results of power-with and power-over models of leadership. I also have learned a great deal about how power and space interplays with collegiality and organizational values,
specifically how intertwined and complicated these relationships are. As a new school-based administrator, this knowledge will help me greatly in the definition of my own leadership style and subsequent decisions that affect both students and staff members, personally and professionally.

While I feel I have a lot to share with my colleagues, this research has not been without its challenges. In my reflexivity and ethics sections, I spoke about the need to acknowledge the subjective in all research, and of the complexities involved with being an insider, researching one’s own community. I did find it challenging to balance my role as researcher and my role as Parkdale teacher, particularly as someone who engages in a leadership-oriented role within the school. I realized quickly how my views about collegiality and power, for example, were *embedded* in my philosophy of teaching and of organizations. Being directly involved in the negotiation and creation of what have become symbols of organizational culture, it is all too easy to identify these as salient, and I found myself having to be careful to present what I *observed* and *heard* at Parkdale, as opposed to what I *believed* or *thought*.

As an insider in the field, I wondered (and wonder still) about the replication of my methods, within the same environment, by a researcher with outsider status. While I believe my insider status allowed me an advantage in that I could draw from previous experience and have, what I felt to be, a presence that I was received by participants positively and with a sense of trust, it too brought challenges. For example, during interviews I do wonder if teachers might have had the propensity to hold back on more politically-charged topics and avoid issues that could have been seen as unprofessional or unethical. When people are speaking about their values and beliefs, it is a challenge to ascertain to what degree these are internalized, and whether corresponding behaviour is practised in actuality, over time, or whether teachers describe an ideal to which they aspire. Despite one’s best efforts through methodology to ensure a degree of validity, I found, despite using what I believe to be sound procedures, it easy to wonder to what degree the data is valid, over time, and from context to context. I would have liked to have accessed many more interviews and many more observations to really see what everyone had to say on the topic, but of course time and scope of research only allows for so much. Having worked within the organization for a number of years, and in many teacher-leadership-based capacities, as a member of the staff
community, I have been directly involved in creating and re-creating the organizational culture at the school. I came to the research with existing views and interpretations of organizational symbols and power relationships at Parkdale, in addition to my own interpretations of staff behaviour and a pre-existing values-base, making it impossible (as it would be for any researcher) to approach analysis without bias.

Another challenge that I discovered in the field was the presence, at the time of data collection, of British Columbia Teachers Federation job action. Teachers were between contracts and embroiled in what I would describe as a tense and embittered battle with the British Columbia Public School Employers Association, an organization created by the provincial government to represent school trustees in provincial contract negotiations. The job action entailed several days of striking, and a work-to-rule campaign that suspended much of the typical communication with school and district administration, as well as with parents. Teachers were, at least by union decree, not meeting with administrators, and not engaging in many of the activities they normally do together, including most committee work. During this period I observed tension not only between teachers and the government, but between teachers as they tried to negotiate their job role and behaviour throughout this period of time. I do not know how this precarious position (with many teachers feeling powerless and frustrated, and some feeling they could not speak with administration about daily professional and social affairs) affected the data collected. This political climate may have had an effect on behaviour and interactions observed and interview responses, or it may not have.

On a final note, I want to express my belief that this research has made me both a better researcher and a better teacher-leader. This is invaluable for several reasons. I view educational research to be what drives our profession forward. We become better teachers and consequently create better schools when we use research and its techniques and findings to enhance our collegial work. I think that learning the capacity to research opens one’s mind to new ideas, and to a diversity of voices and perspectives that enrich the school environment. The opportunity to explore other researchers’ findings on a diversity of themes and the process of designing, conducting, and analyzing my own data related to these concepts has equipped me with a knowledge base that will help to improve the working lives of teachers, provide school administrators with knowledge that will help to improve school
culture and, consequently, student learning, and to remind us how some important aspects of our daily interactions that we take for granted (spatiality) play an integral role in our personal and professional lives as educators.
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Appendix A: Interview Questions

The following is a list of proposed questions that will be asked of participants who provide written consent to be interviewed.

**Participant’s Role at the School:**

Please tell me a bit about your history at the school (e.g., how long have you been here; what positions have you held; what roles have you played?)

**Allocation of additional spaces:**

- What different spaces have you worked in within this school?
- Tell me about how you came to be working in your current space?
- What are your observations and experiences related to the process of allocating rooms to teachers now and in the past? I am particularly interested in how rooms are allocated within the portable classrooms and within the addition.

**Perceptions of working in an additional space:**

- How did you feel about working in this space when you first moved in? How do you feel now? [Ask first question, wait for a response, then ask the second, wait for a response]
- (show photo of space in which the teacher currently works: new addition pod/classroom/portable classroom; staff room; main building) Can you say a few words that come to mind as you look at this photo? Why did you choose (word or phrase x, y, z) and what do they mean to you?
- (show photo of space in which the teacher does not currently work, but in which others currently work that is not an extended physical space: original building’s
pod/classroom staff room; other areas) Can you say a few words that come to mind as you look at this photo? Why did you choose (word or phrase x, y, z) and what do they mean to you?

**Staff Interactions/Collegiality:**

- In what areas of the school do staff members tend to congregate most frequently? How often do you go to these places on an average day? [Ask first question, wait for a response, then ask the other]
- Do you feel that working in the addition (portable) is different than working in the original school building? How is it (is it not) different? [Ask first question, wait for a response, then ask the other]
- What are the advantages of working in the addition (portable)? What are the disadvantages? [Ask first question, wait for a response, then ask the other]
- Have you noticed any language that you or other teachers/administrators use to describe the addition or portable classrooms?
- Describe in general terms the nature of relationships between teachers at the school.
- What does collegiality mean to you? What does non-collegiality mean to you? Please tell me about collegiality at the school. Have you noticed any patterns related to collegiality or non-collegiality at the school? What has been your personal experience related to collegiality or non-collegiality? Can you describe one or more experiences that stand out in your mind? [Ask first question, wait for a response, then ask the second, wait for a response, ask the third, and so forth]
- Do you feel that working in the addition (portable) has affected the frequency or quality of your interactions with other teachers/administration? If so, in what ways and why? [Ask first question, wait for a response, then ask the other]
- Please tell me about your interactions with teachers in the (portable/addition). Tell me about your interactions with teachers outside of the portable/addition. [Ask first question, wait for a response, then ask the other]
• How has collegiality (or non-collegiality) played a role in the allocation of the classrooms in the addition or portables to teachers?

**Power Relations:**

• What makes a working space in this school more desirable or less desirable (to work in?)
• Do particular working spaces relate to the social status hierarchy within the school? If so, in what ways? Describe your personal experiences or give examples of others’ experiences you have observed. [Ask first question, wait for a response, then ask the second, wait for a response, ask the third, and so forth]
• We often talk about politics in the workplace. What do workplace politics mean to you? Can you provide any examples of workplace politics at the school? [Ask first question, wait for a response, then ask the second, wait for a response, ask the third, and so forth]
• How have school politics influenced how teachers view or use the portables and addition? Have you noticed politics at play within the (portable/addition)? [Ask first question, wait for a response, then ask the second and wait for a response]

**Additional Thoughts:**

• Do you have anything else you would like to share with me that might help me better understand the relationship between particular spaces in the school (portables, addition, and original building) and collegiality among teachers)?
Appendix B: Recruitment Letter

Invitation to Participate in a Research Study

Researcher: Douglas Roch, MA Student, Faculty of Education, (604) 992-5392, dougroch@shaw.ca; droch@sd38.bc.ca

Research Supervisor: Dr. Wendy Poole, Associate Professor, Faculty of Education, 604-822-5462; wendy.poole@ubc.ca.

Dear Teacher:

You know me as a teacher and colleague at Anderson School. I am currently completing an MA degree at UBC and I will be conducting a study entitled: Working in Extended Spaces: Intersections of the Spatial and Teacher Collegiality. My study is being supervised by Dr. Wendy Poole, Associate Professor.

The purpose of the study is to look at the experiences of teachers who work in portions of a school building that are extended (such as portable/modular
classrooms and constructed additions). It seeks to learn how these teachers interact with others who work both inside and outside of these spaces. It looks at how working in extended spaces impacts collegiality, and how the presence of extended spaces affects teacher interactions.

I invite you to participate in the study. Participation will involve agreeing to be included in general observations. General observations refer to being observed in formal and informal daily professional interactions. Teachers who work in an extended space (the new addition or portable classrooms) are asked to further participate in an interview.

Please see the attached consent form for more detailed information about the study, the study procedures, and the rights of study participants. I thank you in advance for considering to be part of this study.

Sincerely,

Douglas Roch
Appendix C: Consent Form

Consent

Project: Working in Extended Spaces: Intersections of the Spatial and Teacher Collegiality

Researcher: Douglas Roch, MA Student, Faculty of Education, (604) 992-5392, dougroch@shaw.ca; droch@sd38.bc.ca

Research Supervisor: Dr. Wendy Poole, Associate Professor, Faculty of Education, 604-822-5462; wendy.poole@ubc.ca.

All Teachers in the School:

If you agree to participate in general observations in various spaces within the school, please record your name and signature in the appropriate section of this consent form. General observations refer to being observed in regular formal and informal daily professional interactions.

Teachers Working in Extended Spaces (portable classrooms and new
addition):

In addition to observations (see previous section), the research will involve interviews. If you work in an extended space and agree to participate in an interview, please record your name and sign the appropriate section at the bottom of this consent form.

In accepting to participate in this research project it must be stressed that:

1. Anonymity of participants will be maintained using pseudonyms, paraphrasing, and masking of gender, grades levels, or subjects taught; all data tapes and files will be erased at the completion of the study;

2. You may refuse to participate or may withdraw at any time from the research project without prejudice, even if you sign this letter of consent. You may withdraw particular responses to interview questions if you desire;

3. At any stage of your involvement you may request clarification on any issue regarding the project;

4. There are no known risks associated with participation in this study. Please sign the form below and return it to the researcher prior to the interview;

5. Observations will be conducted in common spaces at the school (e.g., the staff room, hallways, and meetings) during normal daily activities of teachers, including formal and informal interactions; and
6. Interviews will be conducted at a time and location that is convenient for each participant who consents to be interviewed. A copy of the interview questions will be sent to the participant prior to the interview. Interviews will be approximately 60-90 minutes in length and they will be audio recorded and transcribed verbatim. A copy of the interview transcript will be provided to the interviewee who will have an opportunity to correct any inaccuracies.

**All Teachers Working in the School:**

I, (PRINT) .........................................................., have read this Recruitment Letter and Consent Form and have had the opportunity to discuss in full any questions I have related to this project.

I give / do not give (circle as applicable) my consent to participate in observations for this project and acknowledge receipt of a copy of this consent form.

....................................................  ........................................

Signed  Dated

**Teachers Working in Extended Spaces (Portable classrooms and new addition):**

I, (PRINT) .........................................................., have read this Recruitment Letter and Consent Form and have had the opportunity to discuss in full the
nature of this project. I understand that this research component will be completed as unobtrusively as possible and in consultation with me.

I give / do not give (circle as applicable) my consent to participate in an interview for this project and acknowledge receipt of a copy of this consent form.

....................................................  ..........................................

Signed   Date