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ABSTRACT

Discussions within the literature on education have presented conflicting definitions of the term *collaborative cultures*. Nonetheless, a general sanctioning of teacher collaboration has predominated. With the intent of evaluating that advocacy and developing a better understanding of the notion itself (collaboration), this study examines collaborative relationships in public schools. Specifically, an analysis of the literature has been undertaken to comprehend more fully collaborative associations between teachers, and teachers and administrators.

The many conceptual notions of collegiality and collaboration were considered when choosing a method of analysis, and an attempt was made to identify recurrent themes within the literature. The following were felt to be most prominent: cultural requirements of collegiality, structural requirements of collegiality, curriculum development and evaluation, instructional innovation, and conceptual models of teaching.

The frequency with which researchers have discussed collaborative teaching prompted a number of queries, including those concerning teacher development. This study set out to answer the following questions:

1. What behaviours define collaboration?
2. How do conceptions of collaboration found in the literature compare?
3. Is collaboration a behavioural goal (end) or a means to some other purpose(s), or, is it an indicator of the effectiveness of personnel practices?
4. Is collaboration a meaningless slogan, or, behaviour worth dedicating sparse educational resources towards?

The findings include those that indicate the term collaborative cultures is often employed as a catch phrase. However, they also show that teacher collaboration holds significant promise for educational practice. As well, collaboration may be a frequently ignored but valuable tool for educational reform.
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CHAPTER 1: COLLABORATIVE CULTURES IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Background Statement

During the period spanning the early 1980s to the early 1990s, educational resear­chers and reformers have called for the facilitation of collegial and collaborative oppor­tunities for teachers. To the extent that many have touted teacher collaboration as a panacea for a variety of problems in education, the debate has gained considerable attention and currency. In particular, collegiality has been linked with problems con­cerning teacher development and school reform. However, a wide range of interpreta­tions regarding both the meaning and purpose of collaboration clouds the discourse. In some cases very broad definitions are attached to the term, while others are more precise. Similarly, while some writers propose prescriptive conditions, others eschew them. The net result is an educational community undecided about how to facilitate collaboration, and unsure of where it should be pursued, if at all. Nonetheless, colla­borative action continues to be linked with teacher development and educational reform.

Collaboration vis-à-vis Teacher Development and Educational Reform

Educational reform has long been equated with teacher development. In turn, as Fullan and Stiegelbauer (1991), and Weissglass (1991) indicate, teacher develop­ment has remained a given feature of modern educational practice, the need for which has been justified both by changing social trends and the professional requirements of teachers.

Calls for teacher development and educational reform have been accompanied by recommendations for collegial practice (collaboration) amongst teachers. Zahorik
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(1987), for one, maintains that: "Collegial exchange is an essential aspect of any staff development program" (p. 394). In the hope of influencing the future directions of public education, many teachers have demanded a revitalization of their profession, a revitalization which will allow them to function collegially, and hence more directly in staff development (Fullan et al., 1991; Watson & Kilcher, 1990; Zahorik, 1987).

As distinct from an advisory or consultative model, Watson and Kilcher (1990) define collegiality simply as peers working interactively (p. 2). However, Grimmett and Crehan (1992) refer to collegial relations within a framework of instructional supervision between administrators and teachers. As such, the notion of collegiality is itself subject to some disagreement. As well, writers such as Hargreaves and Dawe (1990a) speak of both genuine and contrived cultures of collaboration.

The notion of a teacher culture has been explored by Cooper (1988), Grimmett and Crehan (1992), Hargreaves (1989), Lortie (1975), and Sergiovanni (1987), to name but a few. Within that rubric, researchers such as Hargreaves and Dawe (1990a), Hargreaves (1992a), and Hargreaves and Fullan (1992b) speak of teacher collaborative cultures. However, collaborative cultures are further distinguished as both "true" and "contrived" (Hargreaves et al., 1990a), as well as "administratively imposed" and "organizationally induced" (Grimmett & Crehan, 1992). Furthermore, while writers such as Showers (1983, 1985) and Watson and Kilcher (1990) prescribe collegiality via models of peer coaching, Hargreaves et al. (1990a, 1992a) and Cole (1991) object to such strategies as contraindicative of genuine collaboration. Similarly, while Showers (1983, 1985), and Goldman and Dunlap (1990) emphasize training of teachers for specific ends, Lieberman and Miller (1992b), and Hargreaves et al. (1990a, 1992a) stress the education of teachers--education intended to encourage teachers in the areas of curriculum writing and evaluation. Accordingly, a substantial body of work
has emerged to link teacher development with curriculum writing (Lieberman, 1988b, 1992a), instructional innovation (Grimmett & Crehan, 1989) and evaluational concerns (Little, 1987). As well, writers have directly linked these areas with the desire to enhance whatever influence teachers have within their own profession (Barth, 1990; Cole, 1991; Hargreaves, 1989, Hargreaves et al., 1990a, 1992a, 1992b; Little, 1987, 1992). Virtually all of the same writers link curriculum development, instructional innovation, and evaluation with collaborative culture, suggesting that collaboration may be an ideal route by which to involve teachers in these areas (e.g., Hargreaves 1989; Lieberman et al, 1992b). Furthermore, Grimmett and Crehan (1992) recommend teachers work collegially with administrators regarding instructional improvement.

Statement of Purpose

In consideration of the above discussion, and with attention paid to the notion of collaboration, as well as the organizational and cultural contexts within which it may operate, this inquiry will carry out an analysis of the term teacher collaborative culture. The review will attempt to answer the following questions:

1. What behaviours define collaboration?
2. How do conceptions of collaboration found in the literature compare?
3. Is collaboration a behavioural goal (end) or a means to some other purpose(s), or, is it an indicator of the effectiveness of personnel practices?
4. Is collaboration a meaningless slogan, or, behaviour worth dedicating sparse educational resources towards?
Background Literature

As explicated by Lortie (1975), Lieberman and Miller (1991, 1992b), and Little (1987), the existence of, and deleterious effects caused by, teacher isolationism have long been a feature of educational literature. Representative of current thinking, Hargreaves (1992a) proposes that while a majority of teachers have embraced isolationist culture, that action has carried a price: "If isolation purges the classroom of blame and criticism, it also shuts out possible sources of praise and support. Isolated teachers receive little adult feedback on their value, worth and competence" (p. 220).

In concert with such criticism has been the indictment of an apparent stultification of creative practice by an overly bureaucratic system (Wise & Darling-Hammond, 1984; Barth, 1990; Hargreaves & Dawe, 1990a; Hargreaves, 1989). Furthermore, in many instances, both the bureaucratization of education and its isolationist culture have been strongly linked. Fullan and Stiegelbauer (1991) articulate this connection and illustrate current thinking regarding both teacher and curriculum development:

"Intensification-type reforms focusing on narrowly defined and imposed curriculum and teacher competencies repel good people from entering and/or staying [in teaching]. Bureaucratic reforms may be able to guarantee minimal performance, but not excellence in teaching" (p. 332).

Hargreaves (1989), in describing trends in England, is even more specific regarding the same effect:

Tighter government control of expenditure on teachers' in-service development has virtually put an end to extended, award-bearing courses of in-service education where careful and systematic reflection of a critical and questioning kind is possible. . . . Even the vocabulary of professional development has changed--from in-service education to in-service training. Education is out. Coaching is in. (italics in original, p. 66)
Hargreaves (1989) and Schwartz (1992) indicate that the net outcome of such thinking has been a critical evaluation against bureaucratically derived staff development and the conditions of teaching itself. For example, in theorizing on the possible evolution of schools, Clark and Meloy (1989) indicate that bureaucratic systems, because of an apparent and inherent design to ensure "domination and control," can never allow for the "self-actualization" and the professionalization teachers apparently crave: "It [bureaucracy] does not fit the psychological and personal needs of the work force [teachers]" (p. 21). Similarly, Lieberman and Miller (1991) propose a staff development model which agrees with Clark and Meloy's position:

The challenge and opportunities for those who are involved in professional development in the next decade revolve around building a set of conditions for (a) developing a culture of support for teacher inquiry in schools, (b) considering the professional growth opportunities appropriate to particular school cultures, and (c) working through the inevitable problems and tensions raised as part of the change process. (p. 5)

It can be seen, then, that the above proposal for change is, in part, aimed at moving away from a strict system of bureaucratic control, and towards a teacher-determined method of staff development. As Hargreaves et al. (1990a) note regarding recent understandings about teacher development: "They [research findings] signal and justify a shift from working on teachers to working with them, from individual and personal forms of professional development to collaborative and collegial ones" (italics in original, p. 229).

However, the question might then be asked how these changes regarding staff development, and the conditions of teaching, may actually occur? Drew's (1989) annotated bibliography of literature on peer coaching cites the work of Little (1982), Mello (1984), Showers (1982), and Joyce and Showers (1982) regarding the issue of enhancing the working conditions and development of teachers via the cultivation of
colleagueship through coaching. The following notion of collegiality, as explicated by Little (1981), and cited by Barth (1990), is remarkably consistent throughout the literature:

Adults in schools talk about practice. Adults in schools observe each other engaged in the practice of teaching and administration. Adults engage together in work on curriculum by planning, designing, researching, and evaluating curriculum ... adults in schools teach each other what they know about teaching, learning and leading. Craft knowledge is revealed, articulated, and shared. (cited in Barth, 1990, p. 31)

Little is essentially describing practitioners communicating about teaching in order to facilitate teacher development. Lieberman and Miller (1991) point out that this notion has become embedded in conceptions of teacher culture itself: "... developing a culture of support for teacher inquiry in schools" (p. 5). In fact, the whole idea of developing collegiality has been given a cultural significance, whereby the inclination towards collaboration has been embraced into the imprimatur of good practice.

Many writers, then, have advocated the development of better collegial relations amongst teachers in the belief that teachers will enjoy both enhanced job satisfaction and efficacious professional development. Indeed, collegiality has been linked to a number of educational issues pertaining to such improvements. Barth (1990), Cole (1991), Schlechty (see Futrell, 1991), Huberman (1992), Lieberman et al. (1991), Caldwell (see Futrell, 1991), Keedy (1991), and Weissglass (1991) all connect the professionalization of teaching with the notion of teachers as leaders and change agents (collegial relations). Guerrero (1988), Irwin (1990), Keedy (1991), Munro and Elliot (1987) and Rude-Parkins (1987) all connect empowerment with peer coaching models and/or peer supervision. Similarly, teacher professionalism and empowerment is equated with the notion of teachers as experts (including colleagues and consultants as resources) by Glickman and Calhoun (see Futrell, 1991), Huberman (1992), Munro

Finally, teacher collegiality is linked by Little (1987) and Wolfle (1990) to positive effects on student learning. However, citing the problematic nature of much of the research (extraneous variables affecting outcomes), both Little (1987) and Drew (1989) cast some doubt on available evidence. By contrast, Goldman et al. (1990), Keedy (1991) and Munro et al. (1987) assume positive effects on student learning, while Barth, Costa, Weissglass, Schlechty, and Hixson (see Futrell et al., 1991) speak of the beneficial influence of collaborative action, but without provision of documentation.

By the above examination, it can be seen that the literature presents at least two consistencies: Firstly, the drive for educational reform is largely concerned with improved development practices and enhanced working conditions for teachers, and, secondly, with little exception, arguments for such outcomes are squarely based on the development of teacher collaboration. However, as Watson et al. (1990) point out, precious few examples of teacher collegiality can be found in the contemporary educational landscape, at least in Canada. Furthermore, whereas some writers contend collegiality exists, others do not.

For example, while Goldman et al. (1990), Keedy (1991), Little (1989), Munro et al. (1987) and Rude-Parkins (1987) speak of inducing collaboration through the dismantling of cultural obstacles using strategies that include peer coaching, Hargreaves et al. (1990a), Cole (1991) and Huberman (1992) maintain that the same (coaching) will
crush collaboration, and, in fact, result in what Hargreaves et al. (1990a) have termed "contrived collegiality." While some authors (Goldman & Dunlap, 1990; Keedy, 1991) speak at length regarding the importance of systematized and formalized models of collaborative action between teachers and administrators, others (e.g., Irwin, 1990) describe collaboration only in terms of the formal connection of schools with universities, businesses, and similar "storehouses" of knowledge. Therefore, while it remains that a substantial number of writers focus on the notion of collegiality and teacher collaboration as the zenith of teacher/school culture, there is by no means unanimity regarding the actual definition of, or route to, what Hargreaves et al. (1990a) have labelled true "collaborative culture" (p. 238).

Huberman (1992) and Little (1992) further complicate the debate by proposing that factors once thought of as cultural impediments (e.g., isolationist culture) may not function as such. Little (1992) also stresses that scant work has been devoted to reconceptualizing (if necessary) teacher collaboration in light of such revised thinking. Clearly then, endemic disagreement clouds the discourse on collaboration amongst teachers. Indeed, the literature would seem to indicate contradictory notions of what collaboration is, how it is achieved, and what benefits may accrue from its development. Furthermore, the term collaborative cultures may be a slogan to which no substantial definition can be attached.

In relation to an understanding of teacher collaboration, the above discussion of the literature reveals five themes: cultural requirements of collegiality, structural requirements of collegiality, curriculum development and evaluation, instructional innovation, and conceptual models of teaching.
Rationale

The lack of agreement regarding the term teacher collaborative culture, the ubiquity of the phrase within the literature on teacher development, and the importance many writers ascribe to the notion itself, suggest a full assessment of the meaning and application of the concept (teacher collaborative culture). While there appears to be some agreement regarding specific definitions of collaboration and culture, continuing differences indicate the need for further investigation. Using the identified themes, the features by which cultures can be dubbed genuinely collaborative may be explored. As well, distinguishing marks of efficacious collegial models, and the contextual limitations of recognizable collaborative strategies, can be uncovered. Perhaps the ultimate worth of pursuing collaborative models might then be assessed.

Cultural Requirements

Hargreaves and Dawe (1990a), Hargreaves (1992a), Cole (1991), Huberman (1992), Lieberman et al. (1991, 1992b), Little (1992), Barth (1990) and Schwartz (1992) all speak in terms of what can be described as a focus on cultural factors and conditions, which include: the function of "informal vs. formal relationships" (Cole, 1991); the notion of "loose coalitions" and "networks" (Lieberman et al., 1992b); considerations of cultural hegemony and reproduction (Hargreaves, 1989); and proposed arrangements for mentoring beginning teachers (Grossman, 1992). However, such differences notwithstanding, these notions all speak of grounding and defining models of collegiality and collaboration in cultural terms.

Structural Requirements

Many of the same writers who speak of cultural understandings also stress concerns regarding organizational conditions and factors, and how such forces impact on
both the establishment and conceptualization of teacher collaboration. For example, whereas Grimmett and Crehan (1992) speak of the possibilities for teacher development and growth through "instructional supervision," Barth (1990) speaks of "teaching pairs" as structural tools. Furthermore, while Hargreaves (1989) speaks of hegemony and cultural reproduction, Miller (1988) proposes that teacher collaboration begins not with individual practitioners, but via central office initiative.

Curriculum Development and Evaluation, and Instructional Innovation

Curriculum development and evaluation, as well as instructional improvement, are other commonalities in the debate. For instance, much deliberation revolves around whether curriculum reform may or may not be equated with teacher collaboration and development. While Hargreaves (1989) and Huberman (1992) draw direct and purposeful links between curriculum development and teacher collaboration, no such connections are proposed by Schwartz (1992) or Schlechty (1989), perhaps indicating the need for further investigation of such omissions. However, as mentioned above, some writers equate both teacher professionalism and collaboration with curriculum development.

Conceptual Models of Teaching

Evident throughout the literature is the attempt by many writers to describe the very nature of teaching itself. While certain authors (Hargreaves et al., 1990a; Huberman, 1992; Barth, 1990; etc.) refer to the craft model of role conceptualization, that same model may or may not be directly linked to teacher collaboration. For instance, while Huberman (1992) considers that "tinkering" (craft knowledge) with practice and the notion of collaboration might be incompatible, numerous writers think the opposite (e.g., McLaughlin & Yee, 1988; Clark & Meloy, 1989; Grossman, 1992). Nonetheless, the consideration of teacher role conception is made.
Terms and Definitions

The terms collaboration and collegiality are used interchangeably throughout the literature. Since this paper concerns collaborative cultures, use of the term collaboration will be emphasized. However, where discussion of the term collegial is indicated in the literature, a discussion of the comparative meanings of both terms (collaborative and collegial) will be employed to help define collaboration. As well, the terms professional and professionalization are freely used by virtually all of the authors studied. Both for reasons of expediency, and the fact that professionalism is not the focus of inquiry, this study accepts the notion of professionalism as indicative of teachers exerting increased control and influence over their vocation (Hargreaves et al., 1989, 1990a, 1992b; Lieberman et al., 1991, 1992b; Grimmett & Crehan, 1989, 1992). However, as with the terms collegiality and collaboration, particular examples are explicated as necessary.

Since five explicit themes can be isolated from the literature, they can be constructively and effectively used to study collaborative cultures. To be effective, those five themes must be related back to the everyday world of teaching, and the multitude of chores and decisions regularly faced by teachers.
CHAPTER TWO: APPROACH TO THE ANALYSIS

Methodological Considerations

Owing to the seminal nature of her work on collaboration, Little's (1981) description of collegial relations may serve as a central or core notion on which to anchor analysis: namely, the notion of teachers working together in a multiplicity of ways to improve both their own practice and working conditions (see p. 6). However, as discussed above, the ways in which collaboration has been defined are indeed diverse. Yet, emerging out of that diversity are some commonalities of discourse from which to approach the analysis. It is within these common themes of discourse that researchers have framed their inquiries to ask three specific questions: (a) to what ends and via what means can collaborative culture function? (b) are there means to replicate an agreed upon notion of collegiality? and (c) is the notion of collaborative culture something which teachers should adopt or dismiss? Therefore, while writers may agree with what Little (1981) set out as collegial behaviour, or with how that behaviour may become enculturated (Hargreaves et al., 1990a), there is disagreement as to whether such frameworks have become part of observable practice, and in ways which are both useful and efficacious.

In order to proceed, an examination of the literature was undertaken to determine what means particular authors have used to discuss and delineate the notion collaborative culture. This involved the writing of annotated bibliographies for twenty-four articles and books that discussed teacher collaboration and collegiality. Each title was evaluated for whether it was an opinion piece or research article, and with regard to the latter, whether sound methodological considerations were evident. In addition to an abstract and list of references, major and minor findings were given in summary
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form for each entry. The annotated bibliographies are listed in Appendix A.

Writings for this thesis were chosen according to the comprehensive nature of the arguments presented. Comprehensiveness was decided by judging whether each piece provided enough information and detail to conduct an analysis of collaborative culture. Consideration was also given to ensuring that this inquiry remain workable in both scope and complexity.

Analytical Themes

Cultural Requirements of Collegiality

Since the publication of Lortie's (1975) study *Schoolteacher*, the notion of an observable teacher culture has been referred to by many writers. With regard to the delineation and explication of apparent collaborative cultures, the significance of teacher cultures has been particularly stressed. Indeed, Grimmett and Crehan (1989, 1992) spend considerable time framing their discussion of "interdependent collegiality" around the consideration of cultural change amongst teachers. Similarly, Hargreaves (1989) strongly proclaims the need to address cultural considerations when understanding educational change and collaboration. Such considerations have encompassed the notions of cultural reproduction, cultural norms, and cultural obstacles or impediments: ". . . if we accept the general point that in cultural terms, teachers, like other workers, are creatures of their occupational situation, then we might do better to address ourselves to how the circumstances of the occupation might be modified so as to elect a different kind of cultural response" (p. 53). Similarly, Lieberman et al. (1991) directly link the building of collaboration between teachers with staff development, and "culture building": "Staff development is culture building" (p. 107). Therefore, examination of the theme *cultural requirements*, will consider those *cultural con-
ditions that are deemed necessary and sufficient for the development of collaborative culture. As well, this analysis will include a reevaluation of the supposed obstacles to a pervasive culture of privacy and isolation (Little, 1992).

**Structural Requirements of Collegiality**

Little (1987) points out that collegial relations amongst teachers are not likely to exist unless certain organizational conditions are present. A concern echoed by many writers, the structural organization of schools and school districts features prominently in the literature on collaboration: “Collaboration does not come as a natural consequence of working in a school. It must be taught, learned, nurtured, and supported until it replaces working privately” (Lieberman et al., 1988b).

Structural considerations refer to the operation of bureaucratic structures and systems vis-à-vis the working conditions of and collegial relations amongst teachers. The restructuring of the educational system currently being studied by many writers may also be considered. Examination of the theme *structural requirements* will therefore attempt to establish which organizational *conditions* are deemed necessary and sufficient for the establishment of a collaborative culture.

**Curriculum Development and Evaluation, Instructional Innovation, and Conceptual Models of Teaching**

The establishment of collegial relations is consistently linked with the act of curriculum design and evaluation, as well as instructional innovation: “As teachers become leaders, they come to view themselves as serious theoreticians as well as capable practitioners, as contributors to a collaborative process as well as individuals in classrooms, and as major decision makers in the educational process as well as implementors of programs... they transform the professional culture in which they work” (Miller, 1988, p. 172). This examination may also include the influence of educational goals and values in relation to teacher cooperation, and the function and determination of
leadership roles in the educational community. As well, and since the consideration of instructional innovation would likely include how teaching is conceptualized, conceptual models of teaching (e.g., teaching as a "craft") will also be considered under this theme.

**Procedure For Analysis: Analytic Model**

The literature on teacher development has long discussed curriculum and instruction not in isolation, but in context with the structural and cultural realities of teaching itself. As noted above, Lortie (1975), and others, have helped to define the structural and cultural influences at play in the school workplace. Researchers have come to realize that in order to understand the desires and needs of teachers, they must consider the conditions within which they work (Hargreaves, 1989). It may be argued that such conditions might provide a framework for analyzing a notion such as teacher collaboration. Therefore, an examination of those relationships which may influence this inquiry will precede the analysis itself.

The organizational structure of schools is cited by each of the writers surveyed as influential on teacher collaboration. Furthermore, each writer has discussed the same factor (organizational structure) as it relates to the curricular, instructional and evaluational responsibilities of teachers. Similarly, all writers have discussed the cultural conditions of schools and how that may impact on the establishment of collaboration. The effect of cultural conditions in schools has also been related to the curriculum, instructional and evaluational responsibilities of teachers. Figure 1 is intended to illustrate an inquiry into these relationships as proposed by this author.

Figure 1 illustrates the format for inquiry into the establishment of teacher collaboration regarding both the work teachers do (curriculum, instruction, and evaluation)
and the structural and cultural conditions of schools. The approach taken will be to determine from existing literature what conditions are considered necessary to establish, define, and implement teacher collaboration. Specifically, the establishment of collaboration will be examined as an inquiry into the effect teachers and administrators may have on the structural and cultural organization of schools, and the instructional responsibilities of teachers. It will then be asked which, if any, of those influences or combination of influences, may impact on or lead to the establishment of collaboration amongst teachers. It is hoped that by studying such conditions, a definitive picture regarding the nature of collaborative cultures will emerge.

**Organization**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRUCTURAL CONSIDERATIONS</th>
<th>CULTURAL CONSIDERATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRICULUM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTRUCTION</td>
<td>ROLES AND INFLUENCES OF TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVALUATION</td>
<td>ROLES AND INFLUENCES OF TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 1.* Analytic Model--Impact of the Organization of Schools and the Work of Teachers on the Establishment and Definition of Collaboration
Organization (Definitions)

Structural Considerations and Teaching

Grimmett and Crehan (1992, pp. 60-61) consider organizational structure within the context of school culture. Using the work of Cohen (1983), Weick (1982), and Cohen, March, and Olson (1972), they suggest that the organizational structures of schools can be thought of as either loosely or tightly coupled. While a loosely coupled structure is that which allows teachers room for experimentation and exploration within a shared framework of values and goals, a tightly coupled organizational structure depends on bureaucratic control to maintain institutional direction (Grimmett et al., 1992, p. 60). Similarly, a loosely coupled structure is that which contraindicates bureaucratic control over teacher practice, while a tightly coupled framework indicates the opposite. The authors contend that loosely coupled structures are most common, though not necessarily in ways conducive to teacher collaboration (Grimmett et al., 1992, pp. 62-64).

Hargreaves (1989, pp. 66-67) also concerns himself with the structural organization of schools, especially as it relates to the establishment of school culture and teacher reform. Integral to his concern is the "structural reinforcement" of a traditional curriculum, the resultant control over teachers, and a stifling of curricular and instructional innovation. As such, Hargreaves discriminates between a structural organization which allows for curriculum innovation by teachers, and that which holds teachers rigidly accountable to bureaucratically derived procedures.

In later writings (1990a, 1992a), Hargreaves et al. draw a strict line between a teacher collaborative culture built on trust and mutual interest, and that which has been administratively planned. Peer coaching is given as an example of the latter. Ha-
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greaves and his collaborators contend that teachers in England and North America are more and more having to cope with the strict bureaucratic control of education.

The implications for teacher development are quite clear. The consideration of how schools are organized is important to any discussion of teacher collaboration. The notion of organizational structure includes consideration of the freedom to participate in curriculum design (Hargreaves et al., 1989, 1990a, 1992a), the presence or absence of resources allowing teachers to observe colleagues and engage in instructional development (Cole, 1991), and the discussion of bureaucratically imposed procedures such as peer coaching (Hargreaves et al., 1992a; Grimmett & Crehan, 1992). For the purposes of this investigation, the notion of structural organization is congruent with the ideas just presented. Simply put, questions regarding structural organization are those addressing both the bureaucratic freedoms and constraints on teachers, and the ability of teachers to engage in activities which may be defined as collaborative. As such, the terms "tight" and "loose" must figure in the debate.

Figure 1 may suggest several relationships involving structural considerations. The availability of particular resources may influence whether teachers experiment with instructional techniques, including those judged to be collaborative. Similarly, it may be seen that establishing collaboration is problematic with regard to how it is defined. What is felt to be collaborative by an administration may not be shared by teachers, and vice versa. The net result may be the establishment of operating conditions which are incompatible with the overall culture of the school.

Cultural Considerations and Teaching

Lieberman et al. (1991) summarize their position regarding the role of school culture in terms of its overall significance, particularly to staff development: "Staff development is culture building" (p. 107). Such a position suggests the need to understand
the cultural realities of schools.

Culture and school culture is also discussed at length by Grimmett and Crehan (1992). Relying on the work of Greenfield (1984), Cooper (1989), Lieberman (1989), Selznick (1957), and Sergiovanni (1984), the authors outline a model which presents culture as the life-blood of an institution: “Culture is constructed reality. It is known by its representation. It consists of the beliefs, values, and norms which govern ‘what is of worth to this group and how the members should think, feel, and behave’ (Sergiovanni, 1984:9)” (p. 59). Grimmett and Crehan again quote Sergiovanni specifically regarding schools: “The more understood, accepted, and cohesive the culture of the school, the better able it [the school] is to move in concert toward ideals it holds and objectives it wishes to pursue (Sergiovanni, 1984:9)” (p. 59). Culture is represented as a driving force that embodies the central beliefs and ethos that underpin an institution. Furthermore, schools are as vulnerable to the effects of culture as any other institutional entity.

Relying on a similar view, Hargreaves (1989) also investigates what may be specifically examined to identify a recognizable teacher culture. In so doing, he identifies what is termed the “cultural reproduction of teaching” (p.54):

[teachers] . . . tend to avoid long-term planning and collaboration with their colleagues, and to resist involvement in whole school decision-making in favour of gaining marginal improvements in time and resources to make their own individual classroom work easier. (p. 54)

Add to this general orientation the necessities of coping daily with classroom constraints of low resources, poor buildings and large class sizes, along with the strains that arise from the conflict-based character of the teacher-pupil relationship, and one can understand why teachers become not just concerned with but also confined to classroom life and its problems. (p. 55)

Once in motion, the culture of teaching is reproductive and self-generating, but

---

1 This entry is listed in the reference section under M. Cooper (1988)--note date discrepancy.
2 This entry is listed in the reference section under A. Lieberman (1988a)--note date discrepancy.
only as long as the conditions of its existence—the isolation and constraints of the classroom, the limited opportunities for reflection, the minimal allocation of statutory time to non-classroom work—persist and continue to sustain it. (p. 56)

Hargreaves (1992a) also identifies what he terms “collaborative culture.” He reports collaborative cultures as most often operating at the elementary level, and consisting of “informal” systems of praise and gesture, sharing of personal lives within school contexts, staff celebrations, and encouragement and support. As such, it is usually based on a general agreement of educational values, but includes the toleration of and even encouragement for certain amounts of “disagreement.”

For the purposes of this exploration, the broad term “culture” will indicate those values and norms by which a group decides what is of value to it. Furthermore, the terms “teacher culture” and “collaborative culture” will be differentially employed to address the educational context of this inquiry. As well, both terms (teacher culture and collaborative culture) will be used in the forms explicated above.

How collaboration is established and defined may turn out to be influenced by a number of relationships that embrace cultural factors. Some of these may include the cultural hegemony of coalitions within schools. Others may revolve around cultural obstacles to change, including what may be required to establish collaboration.

**Collegiality and Teaching**

**Curriculum.** Curriculum is generally thought of as a specific or entire course of study (Webster’s, 1966) at an individual or group of educational institutions. Within the term lie distinctions that dictate the ends and means of curriculum study. For instance, McNeil (1990) identifies four main conceptualizations of curriculum practice: “... humanistic, social reconstructionist, technological, and academic” (p. 1). In each, curriculum includes what students learn and the context in which they learn it: “Proponents of each [each of the four conceptualizations] have different ideas about
what should be taught, to whom, when, and how” (McNeil, 1990, p. 1).

Whether following a humanistic, social reconstructionist, technological or academic curriculum, teachers are held responsible for teaching what may or may not be a set curriculum. For instance, Holmes (1992) argues that all curriculum should be set by the state, and worries that too much curriculum content is being determined by teachers. However, Barth (1990) indicates the need to have teachers participate in laying down curriculum content and instructional practice. Hargreaves (1989) believes that state control over curriculum effectively results in state control over teachers. Lieberman and Miller (1991) and Schwartz (1992) also believe that teachers should have a hand in determining what students learn, and in researching how that may best be accomplished.

For the purposes of this examination, the consideration of “curriculum” will concentrate on the question of who should determine curriculum content, and who shall write that curriculum? How those processes may take place will also be studied.

Instruction. How curriculum is presented and taught is defined through the study of instruction. Cole (1991) and Huberman (1992) both defend the notion of what they term “craft knowledge.” Both writers argue to give teachers the opportunity to develop their “craft” in ways unique to individual styles and interests. In fact, for Hargreaves et al. (1992b) and Lieberman (1988a), developing the craft of teaching is a primary reason for advocating teacher collaboration. However, discussing the authority for this function (instruction) takes precedence over the function itself. Since this investigation concerns teacher collaboration, rather than studying specific techniques, this study will concentrate on how and by whom instructional practice may be determined.

Evaluation. The concept of evaluation is crucial to discovering whether a particular program of instruction (curriculum), instructional technique (instruction), or cultural and
structural arrangement (collaboration) is successful (McNeil, 1990). Each conception of curriculum (humanistic, social reconstructionist, technological, and academic) will likely have its own formal procedures of evaluating students (McNeil, 1990), and as Little (1987, 1989) points out, that procedure must likely be extended to include the effects of practices such as collaboration. Furthermore, as discussed in Chapter 1, Little (1987, 1989) questions the existence of hard evidence demonstrating that collaboration amongst teachers may benefit student performance. This paper will consider who might determine curriculum evaluation, and how that determination may be handled.

Studying relationships between the organizational and cultural dynamics of schools, and the concerns of curriculum, instruction, and evaluation, may provide much information about collaborative cultures. At the very least, such an endeavour promises to highlight the complexities faced both by those who favour collaboration and those who oppose it.
CHAPTER THREE: THE ANALYSES

Structural Requirements of Collegiality

The need for specific organizational structures is cited throughout the literature on teacher collaboration. Amongst those suggestions are calls for decentralized authority and an overall reduction of bureaucratic control (Hargreaves et al. 1990a, Huberman, 1992; Grimmett & Crehan, 1992), the provision of sympathetic leadership (Cole, 1991; Hargreaves, 1989, 1992a; Lieberman et al. 1988b, Huberman, 1992), and an emphasis on school-centred as distinct from externally imposed innovation (Hargreaves et al. 1992a; Huberman, 1992). However, these goals may be seen as outcomes derived from addressing teacher collaboration in relation to curriculum, instruction, and evaluation. The approaches taken vary from that of bureaucratic formulas for developing collegiality to those that are non-bureaucratic. This analysis will begin with those that are decidedly prescriptive.

**Bureaucratic Approaches**

Studying “teacher-leaders” in schools that emphasize staff development practices, Lieberman, Saxl and Miles (1988b) describe collegial relations as a necessary prerequisite for “professional” practice. As such, “building colleagueship” becomes an end for employing specific strategies, strategies borrowed from the practices of the study groups (p. 152). That approach appears to be oriented from the top down:

---

3 "What we have then is a new leadership role that can help in the creation of new collaborative structures. It appears that a combination of these new roles and structures is necessary to professionalize the school culture and to bring a measure of recognition and respect to teachers--who may be, in the final analysis, the best teachers of teachers as well as children" (Lieberman, Saxl & Miles, 1988b, pp. 165-166). The professionalization of teaching is conceptualized by Lieberman, Saxl & Miles (1988b) as producing a culture of teachers who are self-directed towards teacher and curriculum development. However, the same authors did not mention the notion of autonomy per se.
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"Researchers have . . . documented that norms of collaboration are built through the interactions created by the principal's facilitation of collegial work" (p. 152).

These authors portray a system whereby collegiality is envisioned, planned for, and then consciously realized. Along with other supports covered later under the discussion on culture, bureaucratic structure is manipulated according to administrative goals that in time are meant to epitomize those (goals) of the entire institution—a professional culture of teachers.

Now organizational forms enabling people to work together are certainly necessary, but in order for them to be established, the teachers must be organized, mobilized, led, and nurtured, with the principal's support, participation, and concern, and the support and concern of all who share in the life of the school. (Lieberman, Saxl & Miles, 1988b, p. 151)

This study, while not emphasizing the elements of teaching per se, does focus on the continuous learning of teachers.

Miller (1988) outlines conditions for the establishment of collegiality which heavily depend on district administrative intervention. Holding that collegiality will likely not develop independently, Miller cites evidence on how collaboration can be nurtured, specifically via teacher involvement in the area of curriculum and instruction. She argues for a locus of change centred within a district's senior administration: "... the district central office—in particular, the office of curriculum and instruction—as an arena in which the transformation of the teacher culture can be initiated and encouraged" (p. 167). However, while the goal of a transformed teacher culture is referred to, the structural means are emphasized.

A cadre of central-office staff in the curriculum division found that by altering the way we function, we could affect the way teachers function and that, in so doing, we could lay the foundation for the development of a professional culture in the schools of our district. (Miller, 1988, p. 168)

Miller argues for active involvement by teachers in the areas of curriculum writing,
staff development, research, and overall coordination of activities involving collaboration. Falling back on her own experience with a primary writing project ("Primetime"), Miller cites stipends for curriculum writing which are approved by the teachers' association, as well as the explanation and introduction of new curriculum prior to the beginning of each school year. However, her experience specifies the final editing and approval of curriculum by central office staff. Nonetheless, full clerical and related services are assumed. Miller explains that "Primetime" offers many opportunities to teachers.

As teachers become leaders, they come to view themselves as serious theoreticians as well as capable practitioners, as contributors to a collaborative process as well as individuals in classrooms, and as major decision makers in the educational process as well as implementors of programs. . . they transform the professional culture in which they work. (p. 172)

Specific tools mentioned include a staff-development specialist chosen by central office personnel. The position is held on a rotational basis by a district teacher. “Since the teacher/consultant positions are designed to rotate every two years, people realize that access to these enriching professional opportunities remains open” (p. 181). As well, other considerations include a comprehensive evaluation study, peer observation, and research opportunities for teachers. The multi-faceted evaluation study included attention to student achievement:

1. What are teacher, principal, and parent perceptions of Primetime?
2. How are Primetime classes organized for instruction? What happens in a Primetime classroom?
3. What are the effects of Primetime on student achievement?
4. What are viewed as the major strengths and weaknesses of Primetime?

Peer observation is built into the process to allow for the building of shared instruc-
tional knowledge and practice. In fact, Miller states that instructional leadership should be the purview of teachers and that practitioners should provide role modelling, mentorship and support for each other.

Miller’s experiences with the above strategies are described as successful, and, in her view, coincide with Sergiovanni’s notion (1987, p. 121) regarding the need for administrators to reduce their authority. She quotes Sergiovanni (1987, p. 121) regarding the same: “‘Highly successful leaders practice the principle of power investment: They distribute power among others in an effort to get more power in return’” (Miller, 1988, p. 183). Indeed, Miller states that a school district’s central office ought to provide for the genesis and maintenance of teacher professionalization by encouraging collaboration. Furthermore, strategies should be those that address the areas of curriculum, instruction and evaluation. In fact, curriculum, instruction and evaluation provide the cornerstone on which those methods function:

1. Curriculum can and should be written by teachers under direct central office supervision.
2. To allow for instructional growth, teachers must be allocated the resources to engage in peer observation.
3. Evaluation of measurable student gains must be factored into the process
4. Points 1-3 should be facilitated both directly and indirectly via central office staff. While point 1 may serve as an example of direct involvement, the function of an appointed staff development person from the ranks of teachers may stand as an indirect influence.
5. While the intention of ever increasing teacher involvement is alluded to, the required imprimaturs of central office remains.
6. The genesis of teacher collaboration firmly rests with central office initiative.

(Miller, 1988)

Miller then draws a direct connection between the writing of curriculum and facilitation of instructional growth, and the institutionalization of collaboration via central office policy.

As noted in Chapter 2, Judith Warren Little's 1981 definition of collegiality has served a decade of debate (quoted in Barth, 1990, p. 31). As well, her 1987 framework for collaborative action offers similarities to that of Miller. Research is cited that points to conditions which are considered necessary and sufficient for collaborative culture to survive: (a) collaborative action is highly valued within the school culture (by fellow teachers and administrators), (b) collegial action exists as a function of school organization, (c) colleagues work on tasks which are "compelling" and "challenging", (d) adequate resources are available, and (e) recognition is accorded to individuals as well as groups (Little, 1987, p. 513). Therefore, where specific types of school organization exist, collaborative culture is constructed by those motivated to do so. As well, the inference can be made that if collaborative culture depends on specific bureaucratic or organizational circumstances, its inception requires the same. Therefore, the acceptance and promotion of collegiality via prescriptive measures (from central office staff) is indicated. Furthermore, such measures would include concerns of curriculum, instruction and evaluation.

Little's (1992) recent work offers new information. Investigating the likelihood of collaboration amongst high school teachers, she includes the variables of teacher individualism, student achievement, instructional assignment, occupational community, department status, subject specialization and teacher identity. She concludes that each factor encourages selective collaboration by teachers, which may or may not
encourage teachers to work collegially. Thus, it may be understood that administrative action need not be specifically designed to elicit collegial conduct, to have that effect. Similarly, however, that same action may serve to undermine conscious attempts to facilitate collaboration.


Grimmett and Crehan specify that both the nature of beliefs held by teachers about education, and the structures within which teachers work must be compatible for collegiality to exist. Specifically, teachers must fundamentally agree about educational values. At the same time, organizational structures should be loose enough to allow for experimentation, observation and conflict, as specified by what the authors term "strong interdependent collegiality."

When teachers are given to experimentation because of the beliefs and values that support such normative action, the organizational structure in which experimentation develops can be loose. In other words, the administration has no need to organize teachers for experimentation when they believe in and value risk-taking; rather it needs to reinforce the beliefs and values that sustain such a norm and facilitate teacher enactment by supporting the organizational conditions initiated by such keen professionals. Strong cultures in schools, then, are framed around tightly structured professionally oriented beliefs and values, which constitute the basis for normative action, within an appropriately loose bureaucratic structure. (emphasis in original--p. 64)

However, as the authors point out, regrettfully, interdependent collegiality rarely exists (p. 65). They conclude that a false superimposition of school cultures and organizational strategies are to blame: "... features of the typical culture found in schools
have been superimposed on innovative collegial practices to establish a culture of contrived collegiality” (p. 65). Therefore, it may be asked, what, if any, structural impediments stand before a successful implementation of collegiality? Besides the description of interdependent collegiality both observed and explicated by the authors, Grimmett and Crehan outline two other models: “administratively imposed collegiality”; and “organizationally induced collegiality” (p. 80).

Administratively imposed collegiality is indicated as that contrived to determine the behaviours of teachers towards a forced collegiality: “The administratively imposed type of contrived collegiality consists of ‘top-down’ attempts to manipulate directly the practices and behaviours of teachers as professional educators (p. 70).” Furthermore, the structure within which this type operates is significantly different from interdependent collegiality:

In the case of administratively imposed collegiality, it is not merely the beliefs, values, and norms that are tightly structured; rather, the nature of the very beliefs and values which constitute the normative basis for action is such that the organizational structure is also tight. (p. 72)

Organizationally induced collegiality is differentiated from that which is administratively imposed by what is manipulated and fashioned by administrations:

The organizationally-induced [sic] type of contrived collegiality is characterized by ‘top-down’ attempts at fostering ‘bottom-up’ problem-solving approaches to school improvement through careful manipulation, not of teachers’ practices and behaviours, but of the environment within which teachers live and work and have their professional being. (p. 70)

Therefore, according to the latter model (organizationally induced collegiality), administrations, through modified conditions and structures, may encourage teachers, subtly or otherwise, to engage in reflective transformation with peers. The model of organizationally induced collegiality is exemplified by the following author’s diagram (see Figure 2).
Figure 4.5: Exemplars of Beliefs, Values, and Norms Found in Organizationally Induced Collegiality

Exemplar 1

TIGHT
Belief: Teacher commitment to collaboration possible before and during activities structured for that purpose
Value: Intrinsic motivators
Norm: Fashioning of environment for collaboration

LOOSE
Organizational structure

Exemplar 2

TIGHT
Belief: Conflict a source of frustration and perplexity potentially capable of disrupting or transforming project's purposes
Value: Decisions made in accordance with project's purposes
Norm: Conflict seen as normal aspect of collaboration

LOOSE: Organizational structure

With regard to Figure 2, and as mentioned in the introduction to this chapter, "tight" and "loose" organizational structures refer to the degree of freedom which teachers have to act (e.g., experimentation with instruction). While a tight structure indicates a lack of freedom, a loose structure indicates the opposite.

When teachers are held accountable by tightly structured beliefs and values sustaining the norm of collegial interdependence, the organizational structure in which collegial conditions develop can be loose. In other words, the administrative hierarchy can invest in teachers the power required to make collegiality happen. (Grimmett & Crehan, 1992, p. 63)

Similarly, beliefs, values and norms that are determined to be "tight" are those felt to be both "professionally oriented" and shared by multiple members of a school staff. A professional orientation is described as the inclination to experiment in order to improve instruction and practice: "In other words, the administration has no need to
organize teachers for experimentation when they believe in and value risk-taking; rather, it needs to reinforce the enactment by supporting the organizational conditions initiated by such keen professionals” (Grimmett & Crehan, 1992, p. 64). The opposite, or “loose” configuration of beliefs, values and norms, indicates school conditions that “... could be characterized as having weak cultures” (Grimmett & Crehan, 1992, p. 60). With regard to “tight” structures, organizationally induced collegiality is described as that which is initiated by administrative action, but not subject to bureaucratic imposition:

Whereas administratively imposed collegiality has a ‘cult-like’ [tight organizational structure/tight beliefs, values and norms⁴] oppressiveness to it, organizationally induced collegiality is characterized by a more typical ‘tight-loose’ formulation of its culture. (emphasis in original—Grimmett & Crehan, 1992, p. 73)

But what ends do Grimmett and Crehan’s observations indicate? What results are implied by their model?

With a focus on clinical supervision, Grimmett and Crehan are concerned with the cooperation of principals and teachers for instructional development. The authors point out that the strengths of clinical supervision may lie in the very features of interdependent collegiality: “... clinical supervision draws its strength from the heterogeneity nurtured in the association of dissimilar and unequal competencies” (p. 69). As indicated above, and within the realm of similar values, disagreement, experimentation and observation are considered a constructive feature of interdependent collegiality. Therefore, the tenets of collegiality would seem suited to the goals of clinical supervision, if not as an end in itself, a useful tool. However, as also discussed, true interdependent collegiality is rare. Nonetheless, it has been implied that interdependent collegiality can be prompted by organizationally induced collegiality, which is

⁴ “... schools which have cultures framed around tightly coupled organizational structures appear to be cult-like” (Grimmett & Crehan, 1992, p. 60).
described by Grimmett and Crehan as pivotal and catalytic towards that end. This is expressed in the authors' diagram (see Figure 3).

Figure 4.6: The Pivotal Nature of Organizationally Induced Collegiality

Therefore, for the successful encouragement of clinical supervision, it is the belief of Grimmett and Crehan that organizational structures are needed to "induce" collegiality, a contention with which some writers take exception, including Hargreaves and Dawe (1990a). It may also be the case that clinical supervision is in itself a form of administrative inducement. That being said, Grimmett and Crehan's model for interdependent collegiality and how to obtain it are germane to this analysis of the structural requirements of teacher collaboration (see Figure 4).

Figure 4 illustrates what Grimmett and Crehan (1992) consider the essential characteristics of true teacher collaboration, or, interdependent collegiality. Beliefs, values and norms of practice all have what the authors consider to be a professional focus (see definitions re: Figure 2). Similarly, a coherent set of beliefs regarding educational practice, or "tight" orientation regarding beliefs, values and norms, is combined with a
"loose" organizational structure, or the ability to examine and independently experiment with practice (see definitions re: Figure 2).

Figure 4.2: Exemplars of Beliefs, Values, and Norms Found in a Strong Interdependent Collegiality

Exemplar 1

Belief: Talking about and observing teaching builds up shared referents adequate to the complexity of teaching

TIGHT
Value: Shared referents are preferred over idiosyncratic perceptions
Norm: Collegial interdependence

LOOSE
Organizational structure for how collegial conditions occur

Exemplar 2

Belief: Learning accrues from the active pursuit of the demonstration and risk taking that teaching provides

TIGHT
Value: Taking risks is preferred over the stagnation resulting from isolationist, avoidance tendencies
Norm: Experimentation

LOOSE
Organizational structure for how experimentation takes place

Figure 4. Schematic from Grimmett and Crehan (1992)--The Characteristics of "Strong Interdependent Collegiality"

Therefore, the pursuit of clinical supervision via teacher collaboration is seen to concern instructional improvement and perhaps curriculum development. However, evaluation has not been specifically mentioned.

Non-Bureaucratic Approaches

As Little (1981, 1987, 1992) has provided a definition of collegiality subscribed to by a decade of educational debate, Hargreaves et al. (1989, 1990a, 1992a) have differentiated between collegiality that is "interdependent" (Little, 1987), and that which is purportedly "contrived." Furthermore, Hargreaves and his associates have contributed
definitions of what is described as both acceptable and unacceptable structural prac-
tice.

In “Curriculum and Assessment Reform,” Hargreaves (1989) examines the English
school system of the 1980's for evidence of unsuccessful curriculum reform. He con-
cludes that the culture and conditions of teaching can be self-defeating, and that only
wholesale change in one can lead to reform in the other:

If substantial curriculum reform is to be developed and implemented effectively,
teachers, as a routine and scheduled part of their work, must therefore be allowed,
couraged, indeed required to move beyond their own classrooms into other
classrooms, into regular scheduled meetings with their colleagues, into other
schools, and into contexts where they consider and discuss educational theory.
(pp. 93-94)

It would appear, then, that Hargreaves has established a direct connection
between what teachers do and how they may do it collaboratively. He has concluded
that any hope for reform concerning what teachers do--curriculum, instruction and
evaluation--cannot take place without cultural changes amongst teachers themselves,
and structural changes in the environment in which they work. His propositions
include the following suggestions:

1. “Meaningful teacher development” and the generation of an “interest in learning”
amongst all students via the decentralization of curriculum development and
decision-making.

2. A reshaped teachers’ culture to that of collaboration--“Redefined conditions
of teachers’ work,” including “. . . more time away from the classroom.”

3. “. . . [a] set of centrally produced guidelines directing schools to provide a broad
and balanced curriculum in a way which recognizes and rewards, in reasonably
equal measure, a wide range of educational achievements and which does this
for all pupils, not just some.”
4. "More pupil-based assessment and recording procedures will lead to curriculum development which is more effectively geared to the needs of the individual pupil. However, these strategies (assessment) can thrive only with the increased opportunity for teachers to meet with pupils individually--time."

Hargreaves, then, does not attempt to understand teacher collaboration except within the structure and culture of teaching. Interestingly, in later works, Hargreaves et al. (1990a, 1992a, 1992b) appear to refute some of these same points.

Hargreaves and Dawe (1990a) examine collaboration via the technical model of peer coaching. Unlike those authors already reviewed, they believe that conditions for collaboration must progress through a cultural evolution towards collegial interaction. However, it is admitted that administrative action such as "coaching" might help, indeed be necessary, to begin the process (p. 239). In fact, Hargreaves and Dawe give specific recognition to the role of administrative leadership. However, that role is limited both in scope and practice:

We recognize too that administrative leadership and facilitation (though not supervision and intrusive control) are almost certainly needed to further the development of these relationships which bring together practically, collegiality and critical reflection in an innovatory mix. (Hargreaves et al., 1990a, p. 239)

The authors draw a strict line between a collaborative culture amongst teachers which is built on trust and mutual interest, and that which has been administratively planned. In their view, while the former must undergo a natural evolution, which may indeed benefit from executive assistance, the latter can by no means circumvent the former's developmental requirements: "Collaborative cultures may need administrative support and leadership to help them grow and to facilitate their development, but their evolution--depending as it does on vulnerable human qualities like trust and
sharing--will inevitably be slow" (p. 238).

Without specifying forms of administrative assistance beyond coaching, the overall requirements for collaboration are suggested as those goals and practices which have "evolved" in the educational community and to which teachers have become genuinely committed. Further, in cases of mandatory collegiality, whatever collaboration may be present can quickly disappear under the stress and burden of behavioural expectations. Finally, the authors firmly believe that such disappearances are not by nature arbitrary, but "integral" to what they feel is a bureaucratic tightening around instructional reform, curriculum design, and teacher development. They conclude by stating that the development of genuine collaborative culture amongst teachers is in fact being stultified by bureaucratic manipulation of peer coaching models (pp. 227-241).

Therefore, while Hargreaves et al., continue to draw strict connections between culture and structure, vis-à-vis curriculum and instruction, it is the structure within which teachers function that, in Hargreaves' et al. view, stultifies practice. Hargreaves and Fullan (1992b) echo these thoughts by examining teacher development under three headings:

Teacher Development as Knowledge and Skill Development
Teacher Development as Self-Understanding
Teacher Development as Ecological Change (p. 2)

Based on a review of his own research and that of others in "Cultures of Teaching: A Focus for Change," Hargreaves (1992a) evaluates collaborative cultures for whether they are, in his terminology, "bounded" (contrived) or "true." The author contends that although truly collaborative cultures appear to lead to innovative change, because the results are slowly realized and unpredictable, they are not favoured by administrators.
Similarly, research also indicates that in order for teachers to have something significant to collaborate about, collaborative effort demands a "devolution" of responsibility for curriculum development, which he again contends is not acceptable to educational authorities. Therefore, administrators often prefer that which is more in line with the bureaucratic aspirations of control ("bounded" or "contrived collegiality") and espoused primarily by male officials (especially with regard to male administrators and women elementary teachers). Hargreaves proposes then that developing collaboration becomes the process of shifting the responsibility for curriculum development to those who will deliver the curriculum, and from "... administrators to teachers and from men to women" (p. 235). Therefore, Hargreaves reasons, teacher development and curriculum development can be seen as inseparable, and collaboration is at the core of both.

Contrived collegiality describes the use of a formal and specific set of bureaucratic procedures to increase cooperative planning and consultation amongst teachers (e.g., "peer coaching," "mentor teaching," structured joint planning, specific job descriptions and consultancy training, etc.). However, while in Hargreaves' estimation contrived collegiality can at best act as a preliminary step towards genuine collaboration, it also is distinguished by specific problems: (a) it cannot guarantee the installation of a collaborative culture; (b) it may prove to be an impediment to true collegiality due to the bureaucratization of the process of change, and may offend the feelings of those teachers who already interact in a collegial fashion; (c) it may "undermine" the positive informal relations amongst teachers, including an overloading of teachers' time through meetings and the like; and (d) significantly, contrived collegiality may also be associated with intents contrary to those of true collaboration. While those intents (d) may indicate school-centered innovation (true collaboration--teacher professionalism),
they might also be associated with externally imposed implementation (contrived collegiality), possibly leading to the deprofessionalization of teachers via the uncritical implementation of the "ends of others" (pp. 230-231).

As referred to earlier, Hargreaves' ideas appear to have evolved, specifically from the encouragement of teacher participation in planning and peer observation (1989), towards an egalitarian evolution of those practices by teachers themselves (1990a, 1992a). As already noted, that encouragement will likely be manifested in some measure through administrative action. But does Hargreaves present a contradiction? Can collaboration evolve in a natural and unfettered way while simultaneously benefiting from administrative assistance? Hargreaves (1992a) addresses how executive leadership might play a role in the elementary setting; a role which again is described as limited and non-bureaucratic:

Leadership is especially important here--particularly leadership through example; through frequent praise; through helpful, personal notes placed in staff mailboxes; through principals or headteachers indulging their staffs with little treats like cakes or flowers which show caring and thoughtfulness; and through principals' having high visibility around the school, revealing an interest in what is going on there and pleasure in making contact with teachers and students alike. Dispersion of leadership and responsibility also helps, playing down formal differences of status and investing visible administrative trust in the skills, expertise and professional judgement of ordinary teachers. In the main, it is through such small, interpersonal details of elementary school life more than through its official business and procedures that a collaborative culture is sustained. (p. 226-227)

It can be seen, then, that while Hargreaves et al. support a specific executive function regarding collaboration, it is not a bureaucratic one per se. Indeed, specific administrative initiatives are discouraged, especially those that are in any way supervisory (1990a, p. 239). That being said, and notwithstanding the practicality of Hargreaves' notion, he and his collaborators have firmly connected the structure of collegiality with curriculum, instruction and evaluation (see Figure 5).
Figure 5 illustrates Hargreaves' apparent notion of the relationship between organizational structure and school culture in the establishment of teacher collaboration. While the function of teaching is simultaneously acted upon by both forces (cultural and organizational controls), each is acting upon and influencing the other.

Figure 5. Hargreaves—Influences Affecting the Institution of Teacher Collaboration

Hargreaves et al. (1990a) note that collaborative cultures are reported as most often operating at the elementary level, and consist of informal systems of praise and gesture, sharing of personal lives within school contexts, staff celebrations, and encouragement and support. It is usually based on a general agreement of educational values, but includes the toleration of, and encouragement for, certain amounts of disagreement.

Cole (1991) explores the defensibility of coaching teams known as “partnership programs.” Utilizing research on human development by Brim and Wheeler (1966), and Erickson (1963), Cole examines the psychosocial needs of novice teachers. The argument is then put forward and defended that “... self-socialization is a necessary part of a new teacher's transition to teaching and contributes in important ways to the psychosocial aspects of their development” (p. 9). Furthermore, it is contended that mandatory collegial relationships (partnership programs) do not satisfy those needs of
self-socialization, but that "caring and helping communities of learners" creating collaborative "settings" do (p. 25). Her conclusions are based on the observations of thirteen teachers from one school site (elementary) situated within a public school board in southwestern Ontario (data samples for the master study are taken from three elementary schools and one high school).

Utilizing the literature on both human development and teacher development, Cole formulates a number of questions designed to determine whether the needs outlined in the former are positively indicated in the latter, including: How and with whom do novice teachers develop relationships, both working and otherwise, in their new profession? What features describe these relationships, and for what purpose are they formed? Are some relationships valued more highly than others at different times? Do particular relationships hinder and/or contribute to teacher development? Is it possible to "contrive" assisting relationships? "Can contrived relationships be facilitating?" And lastly, how should "context" be mixed into the overall equation (pp. 4-5)? Examining the record of "mandated collegiality" (Quaglia & Rog, 1989), the author discovers that teachers have found such programs often unhelpful, instead preferring to build working relationships with colleagues of their choice. Indeed, teachers reported that they would set up a varied number of "colleagueships" to satisfy different needs. Cole contends that when assigned partnerships do enjoy some success (Huffman & Leak, 1986; Killion, 1990; Shulman & Colbert, 1988), that success remains limited by the extent to which they are "facilitative" and "significant" (Cole, 1991, pp. 5-8).

Collecting data from an apparently collegial school (Riverside Elementary), Cole discovers the same dynamics at play regarding assisting relationships. While a partnership program was attempted, an overwhelming majority of teachers chose instead...
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to develop a web of informal relationships. Furthermore, this network was as varied as the interests and needs of the individual participants. The author also contends that the teachers at Riverside only did what others would do had they the chance. Significantly, teachers at the site school were encouraged to pursue the collaborative action which suited them, and they did not choose the partnership program. As well, evidence existed (anecdotal) illustrating the benefits to the culture and running of the school as a whole. Such evidence leads the author to conclude that teachers desire the opportunity to develop "caring and sharing" working relationships with whom they will most benefit, but that bureaucratic strategies will likely not work to such an end (Cole, 1991, pp. 7, 23-26).

Both Cole and Hargreaves stress informal relationships between teachers. Furthermore, their observations lead them to eschew specific administrative planning. Instead, they wish culture to evolve and develop under its own Darwinian force. Interestingly, Lieberman and Miller (1991) echo these concerns. Lieberman and Miller cite both Huberman (1990) and Hargreaves (1990c) concerning the pitfalls of considering collegiality as a panacea. While Huberman sees teachers as independent artisans, Hargreaves "... reminds us that school reforms have to strike a balance between system-driven colleagueship and collaboration and the preservation of teacher individuality" (p. 105).

Holmes (1991) also expresses a distaste for engineered relations amongst teachers via his rejection of two principles subscribed to by many educators. He describes current change strategies in education as being dominated by the trends of technocracy and humanism. Holmes contends that teaching is deprofessionalized by these trends, and that neither influence accounts for the inherent value of an innovation or innovations. Rather, the author submits that ethical and professional considera-
tions are ignored in favour of the "processes" of schooling. As a result, experts not only attempt to determine what teachers should teach (instead of society as a whole), but instructors are no longer encouraged to take responsibility for the effectiveness, or lack thereof, of their teaching. In short, Holmes believes that education, and more specifically teachers, have become the prisoner of the "education as therapy" model (and to a lesser extent, technocracy), as determined by a group of "experts."

Holmes argues that society, not teachers, should have control over the goals of education. Similarly, the author believes that as practising professionals, teachers must implement society's goals by having control over teaching itself. He believes that current trends intervene. The so called "therapeutic" model based on the authority of experts, and in many cases aided by the tenets of technocracy, is one such tendency. Holmes describes therapy as a suspect route for education to adopt: "[the]... method by which individuals are changed, normally by some form of psychological pressure, nominally for their own good on the basis of alleged professional expertise" (p. 78). Holmes rails against this notion if for no other reason than the apparent lack of real evidence supporting proposed changes (Holmes cites O'Neill's 1988 review of research on instruction, and, Fullan, 1982 & 1985). However, the very idea of changing people instead of asking them to consider making changes is most disturbing to the author. "The idea of applying therapy (quite apart from encouraging them to apply therapy to children) runs fundamentally against the most basic principle of professionalism" (p. 79). Similarly, the author relates the therapeutic model to the repression of female elementary school teachers by male experts, and discusses the dogma of current change practice as examples of mass indoctrination or "group think" ("social-engineering"). In support of his criticisms, Holmes cites Fullan's (1982, 1985) recommendations for the "re-socialization" of teachers. The author (Holmes) accuses the
therapeutic community of "brainwashing" (p. 82).

Answering his own charges, Holmes proposes a model of change that places the burden of responsibility for achieving educational goals back on the teacher, and the task of determining those goals back to society. However, to the extent that teachers are responsible for student achievement, they are also given professional discretion over how those goals are to be met. In that way, teachers are professionalized instead of deprofessionalized, and "... the emphasis of professional activities would likely be more on education that on training or development" (p. 85). As they relate specifically to structure, Holmes's views appear to agree with those of Hargreaves and Cole (Holmes, 1991, p. 85).

Summary Statement

This section of Chapter Three has examined, under two categories, bureaucratic and non-bureaucratic structural considerations. Both have been identified as essential to a discussion of teacher collaboration. Within this organization have appeared a variety of viewpoints and findings. Perhaps the best summation of the information presented lies in a direct comparison of the work of Andy Hargreaves et al. (1989, 1990a, 1992a, 1992b) and Grimmett and Crehan (1989, 1992). As already noted, this inquiry has placed Grimmett and Crehan in the bureaucratic category, and Hargreaves and his collaborators in the non-bureaucratic category. Specifically, while Hargreaves acknowledges that bureaucratic strategies (e.g., coaching) may be employed to build teacher collaboration, he disputes their ultimate usefulness by questioning the final results and intents. Similarly, the functions attributed directly to administrators are limited and non-bureaucratic in nature. By contrast, while pointing to the almost total lack of teacher collaboration in Canadian schools, Grimmett and Crehan propose that bur-
eaucratic means are not only useful, but likely essential. The differences between these arguments appear clear, helping to define just what is meant by teacher collaboration.

Hargreaves contends that collaboration is most often an informal system of giving praise, sharing of both personal and professional lives, and encouragement and support. Furthermore, he indicates that collaboration most often exists at elementary schools. In spite of similarities regarding a conception of school culture, Grimmett and Crehan maintain that collaboration can successfully function as a formal structure, which, in their model, is the basis for instructional supervision. Hargreaves, while outlining structural requirements such as expanded material resources and decentralized authority for curriculum writing, contraindicates such a direct and prescribed role for school administrators and the establishment of teacher collaboration. In fact, his arguments would indicate a reluctance to describe instructional supervision as truly collaborative. Therefore, whether concerning implementation and/or outcomes, both models indicate different conceptions of teacher collaboration. As well, and as already shown, the views of Hargreaves et al. are reasonably congruent with those of Cole (1991), Holmes (1991), and, Lieberman and Miller (1991). In turn, the views of Grimmett and Crehan share significant similarities with Lieberman, Saxl and Miles (1988b), Miller (1988), and Little (1987, 1989, 1992).

Cultural Requirements of Collegiality

As already noted, the phenomenon of an observable teacher culture has been recognized at least since the publication of Lortie's *School Teacher* (1975). In turn, Hargreaves (1989) and Hargreaves et al. (1990a, 1992a) have come to understand teacher collaborative culture as an evolved pattern of functioning, which has also
become observable. As well, Hargreaves argues that teacher culture determines the extent to which change is perceived and accepted. Similarly, Cole (1991) subscribes to the notion of collaborative culture as both an observable and evolved pattern of functioning, while Lieberman et al. (1988b, 1991, 1992b) stress tools such as teacher centres for changing teacher culture. Schwartz (1992), while advising against imposed collegiality, also believes in the use of teacher centres, as do Grossman (1992) and Miller and O'Shea (1992). In turn, and via collegial structures based on improved principal/teacher relations, Barth (1990) proposes turning schools into communities of learners. With the goal of empowering teachers, Schlechty (1988, 1989) stresses the need for visionary and enabling leadership from school boards, and, at the building level, from principals. Similarly, while Little (1987, 1989) speaks of dismantling cultural obstacles, in subsequent writing (1992) she indicates the need to reassess the apparent negative effects of teacher individualism. Finally, Huberman (1992) emphasizes collaboration which is squarely based on a recognition of teacher craft knowledge and teaching as an art.

While the above writers may approach teacher collaboration in diverse ways, they are unanimous in regarding the observable and crucial role played by teacher culture in teacher development. As noted above, teacher collaboration has, in the minds of several writer/researchers, manifested itself as a cultural force and adjunct to teacher culture. Furthermore, as with the previous discussion on structure, writers can be understood as presenting views that promote bureaucratic or non-bureaucratic solutions.
Bureaucratic Approaches

Lieberman's (1988a) writings appear to draw a direct connection between teacher collaboration and what she terms professionalism: "... professionalizing teaching and building a more collaborative culture in schools can profoundly change the way both staff and students in schools grow and learn" (p. vii). To that end, and to improve both student and teacher achievement, Lieberman et al. (1988b) propose that, using teacher leaders, the building of professionalization and collaboration be deliberate and aimed towards goals addressing curricular, instructional and evaluational concerns:

What we have then is a new leadership role that can help in the creation of new collaborative structures. It appears that a combination of these new roles and structures is necessary to professionalize the school culture and to bring a measure of recognition and respect to teachers--who may be, in the final analysis, the best teachers of teachers as well as children. (pp. 165-166)

Lieberman et al. are suggesting, via the use of key positions, culture building; culture building which is heavily skewed towards a model which is labelled "professionalization." Similarly, Lieberman and Miller (1991) consider the construction of school culture with regard to policy and school context:

"... the social realities of teaching are not given but constructed--and capable of being reconstructed when the proper conditions are present" (p. 106).

"Learning and understanding new conceptions of practice are likely to come about through collaboration among those who observe schools and those who work within them" (p. 106).

"What is unique about the restructuring movement is its acknowledgement that teaching and learning are connected, that change in one requires change in the other" (p. 107).

---

5 Lieberman et al. (1988) loosely term teacher professionalism as teachers leading teachers both in the development of educational practice and overall conditions of the occupation itself (pp. 165-166). Similarly, the terms collaboration and collegiality are used interchangeably, indicating teachers working together, and with administrators, to develop practice (p. 156).
"In these schools, teachers are redefining and remaking their own professional lives; in so doing they are also redefining and remaking public schooling for the students in their charge" (p. 107).

While Lieberman and Miller quote the work of Little (1986) and Rosenholtz (1989) regarding the notion of teaching as "collaborative work," their (Lieberman & Miller) warning against an unreasonable belief in the effects of collaboration contradicts that premise (p. 105). As noted above (see p. 41), Lieberman and Miller (1991) cite Huberman (1990a) and Hargreaves (1990c) concerning the danger of considering collegiality to be a cultural panacea, and raise the need for recognition of teacher privacy and independence. Nonetheless, Lieberman and Miller (1992b) remain convinced that collaboration be derived essentially from the process of culture building. As well, such culture building is seen as embracing, if not revolving around, curriculum writing, instructional planning, and the evaluation of student progress:

1. "Staff development is culture building." Notions such as collaborative cultures need to be pursued: "... where teachers assume new roles in their own development and in the education of their students" (p. 107).

2. "Staff development is teacher inquiry into practice." "Reflective practice, disciplined inquiry and informal research"--"study groups, curriculum writing, action research, peer observation, case conferences, participation in outside events and organizations" (p. 107).

3. "Staff development is about human development and learning for both students and teachers." "Staff development must preserve the individuality of the teacher as an artisan or craftsperson" (p. 108).

4. "Teaching is a craft." "Staff development programs must maintain a fragile balance between building culture where collaboration and colleagueship are
promoted and where individual integrity and artistry are allowed to flourish”
(p. 108).

Inherent in this view is a large degree of importance placed on the role of the principal, and the relationship between principal and teacher. Lieberman et al. (1992b) stress that without the proactive efforts of administrators favourably disposed towards collaborative action, the efforts of teachers will likely fail. Their greatest concern is that “. . . of the unrealized potential of colleagueship, and of the power of a principal to make a school better or worse” (p. 15). Citing the work of Meyer (1975) and Deal and Celotti (1977) amongst others, they conclude: “The relationship between teacher and principal may be a more dominant feature of school life than the larger social issues in the newspapers and the recent research done on the processes of school change” (Lieberman et al., 1992, p. 28).

In “Developing an Ethos for Professional Growth: Politics and Programs,” Schwartz (1992) advocates the use of teacher centres to build “teacher leadership, collaboration and professional growth” (p. 187). Having studied what he describes as successful examples of the same strategy, Schwartz stresses a model similar to that outlined by Miller (1988). However, as with Lieberman (1988a) and Lieberman et al. (1988b), the onus is on culture building through the concept of ethos, or, teachers' development of attitudes conducive to collaboration. Furthermore, Schwartz emphasizes his encounter with “peer review,” “teacher research,” “a teacher mentor program,” and “teacher-administration collaboration” (pp. 188-192). In fact, with regard to the latter point, most programs are developed through joint interaction between teachers and administrators. The teachers in Schwartz’s (1992) study focus their efforts towards collaboration within the multiple concerns of curriculum, instruction and evaluation.

Through his work at the Harvard Principals’ Center, Barth (1990) concludes that
collegial relations between principals and teachers is key to successful school reform. As well, the author states his belief in research that shows collegial schools to have successful students and satisfied teachers. At the heart of these notions is the idea of "schools as communities of learners and leaders." To that effect, Barth ruminates on how the contemporary effective principal may have become more of a "successful coalition builder" than authority figure. As well, Barth outlines the advantages for teachers and principals who explore their anxieties and strengths through the medium of writing. Similarly, practitioners can spread the word about successes and strategies, and above all, teacher culture, through writing and publication. Teacher culture then, even as it is explicated by teachers themselves, is a product of teacher-principal collaboration and administrative leadership. Most important, however, is the realization that to be successful, all strategies must result in teachers and principals feeling able to develop and express their own visions of how schooling should occur. Strategies outlined include that of "teaching pairs." With each assignment, teachers are matched in pairs so as to collaborate on instructional and curriculum planning.

Utilizing the work of Cooper (1989)⁶ and Selznick (1957), Grimmett and Crehan (1992) point out that culture is the force which unites individuals regarding purpose and outcome. As mentioned above, Grimmett and Crehan (1992) have indicated a picture of traditional school culture that has enforced codes of individualism and isolation (see Figure 6).

According to the authors, self sufficiency and individualism amongst teachers will reduce the likelihood of "collegial discourse." As well, teachers themselves have mistakenly equated professional autonomy with "teacher seclusion and secrecy." They believe that both dynamics discourage collegial relations, if for no other reason that despite the sharing of beliefs, values, and norms, the *nature* of those values and

---

⁶ This entry is listed in the reference section under M. Cooper (1988)—note date discrepancy.
beliefs has not been attended to (p. 62). On the other hand, it is the professional focus of the beliefs, values, and norms that typify an interdependent collegiality.

Figure 4.1: Exemplars of Beliefs, Values and Norms Found in a Typical Culture of Schools

Exemplar 1

Belief: 'I must be able to cut the mustard'
Value: It is important to succeed without help
Norm: Self-sufficiency, individualism

Exemplar 2

Belief: 'I should not intrude into another teacher's classroom'
Value: Teachers' privacy is to be respected
Norm: Reticence, isolationism

Exemplar 3

Belief: 'Teachers' needs are practical, not theoretical; any abstractions are irrelevant'
Value: Knowledge/skills that are relevant and useful
Norm: Skepticism, potential resistance to externally-imposed innovation

(p. 61)

Figure 6. Schematic from Grimmett and Crehan (1992)--Picture of a Typical School Culture

Figure 7 illustrates Grimmett and Crehan's (1992) notion of a professional orientation. Teachers are willing to experiment with practice in order to improve it. A collegiality which will benefit teachers and, above all, students, will result from (a) sharing knowledge and beliefs, (b) developing commonalities by which to define, generate and justify those beliefs, and (c) construction of interdependent working relationships between educators. Furthermore, all of the above must take place in a bureaucratic environment which will allow such experimentation and development (Grimmett & Crehan, 1992, pp. 63-65).
Figure 4.2: Exemplars of Beliefs, Values, and Norms Found in a Strong Interdependent Collegiality

Exemplar 1
Belief: Talking about and observing teaching builds up shared referents adequate to the complexity of teaching
Value: Shared referents are preferred over idiosyncratic perceptions
Norm: Collegial interdependence

TIGHT
Value: Shared referents are preferred over idiosyncratic perceptions
Norm: Collegial interdependence

LOOSE
Organizational structure for how collegial conditions occur

Exemplar 2
Belief: Learning accrues from the active pursuit of the demonstration and risk taking that teaching provides

TIGHT
Value: Taking risks is preferred over the stagnation resulting from isolationist, avoidance tendencies
Norm: Experimentation

LOOSE
Organizational structure for how experimentation takes place (p. 64)

Figure 7. Schematic from Grimmett and Crehan (1992)—Concept of Interdependent Collegiality

Strong cultures in schools, then, are framed around tightly structured professionally oriented beliefs and values, which constitute the basis for normative action, within an appropriately loose bureaucratic structure. (emphasis in original--p. 64)

As previously mentioned, Grimmett and Crehan (1992) connect the principles and ends of interdependent collegiality with those of clinical supervision:

“... principals and teachers or teachers and teachers working together in clinical supervision can, theoretically, engage in talking about teaching, observing classroom practice, planning and preparing materials together, and generally teaching one another the practice of teaching.” (p. 69)

Grimmett and Crehan (1992) conclude that teacher collaboration is relatively rare due to the forcing of isolationism and individualism overtop of collegial values and beliefs. As a result, the “professional” nature of those beliefs is never fully or even partially embraced. Therefore, strategies such as organizationally induced collegiality
may have to be utilized in the hopes of effecting a cultural transformation. Administrators must work actively to dismantle the traditional culture. Grimmett and Crehan cite the willingness of educators to accept and enter into constructive debate (disagreement) as evidence of a successful transformation. Equally important, however, is the authors' notion of cultural change dictating that which is structural. A commitment to interdependent collegiality predetermines structural evolution. Structural evolution is conceptualized as a stage of cultural transformation.

Like many writers and theorists, Hargreaves' own work may indicate a conceptual shift regarding the nature and genesis of collegiality. In Curriculum and Assessment Reform (1989), Hargreaves points to failures in curriculum improvement in England. Amongst other causes, the author blames the inability of teachers to move beyond their own direct classroom and hence cultural experiences. For teachers, educational theory was not considered a legitimate factor for expediting change (pp. 34-35). Indeed, formal educational theory was deemed "culturally inadmissible" (p. 39). According to Hargreaves, such action resulted in aborted educational reform:

... it reinforced the capacity of senior management to set boundaries and limits to the curriculum agenda, to decide what the range of acceptable curricular practice was to be, to determine what was worthy of serious discussion and what was not.

... the experience-based character of teacher contributions helped to sustain a substantial measure of inconclusiveness in curricular discussions, which in turn created a pretext for managerial intervention. (p. 43)

Hargreaves (1989) also discusses how school officials define the boundaries of acceptable discussion and practice through the contrasting of policy opposites (e.g., a discourse comparing "free" schools with those of a military bearing). That which is allowable is defined by contrasting extremes of unacceptable policy; trivialized and stylized descriptions are employed. He concludes that the differential access of administrators to the workings of school systems allows them to speak of "educational
alternatives" in extreme ways, which nonetheless appear congruent with generally
held notions of teaching: "[ways] . . . that resonates suitably with teachers' own con-
ceptions of present practice and its enemies" (p. 50). This is termed "contrastive rhe-
toric" (p. 50). According to Hargreaves, it then follows that curriculum reform is stifled
by a combination of restrictive teacher culture and institutional restraints:

The maintenance of the boundaries of permissible practice is therefore achieved
through a combination of three things: head and deputy headteacher strategy in
the form of contrastive rhetoric, the cultural resources which teachers bring to the
interaction (these consist of professional experiences and shared interpretive
schemes), and the influences of the institutional distribution of power on the content
of those resources. (p. 50)

Furthermore, and as shown earlier, Hargreaves (1989) reduces this apparent dilemma
to facilitating the development of a modified teacher culture:

The failure of democratic staff involvement, due in part to the overemphasis on
personal classroom experience and the cultural exclusion of other kinds of
experience as a basis for collective curriculum planning, therefore created the very
circumstances that increased headteacher domination still further. (p. 52)

... [I]f we accept the general point that in cultural terms, teachers, like other
workers, are creatures of their occupational situation, then we might do better to
address ourselves to how the circumstances of the occupation might be modified
so as to elicit a different kind of cultural response. (p. 53)

However, what is noticeable in light of Hargreaves' later writings is how he intends
those changes to take place.

Like many writers, Hargreaves urges the breaking down of the doors of isolation
and seclusion. He describes two processes that he defines as "cultural interruption,"
which is simply put as redefining what teachers do: "[the] . . . process designed to
develop, refine and transform the language and categories in which teachers think
about their work . . . [through] new insights and understandings about the schooling
process" (p. 57). Hargreaves appears to promote the interruption of traditional teacher
culture in order that an altered culture may be substituted. By contrast to the old, the replacement culture is intended to encourage a "... more educationally worthwhile and enlightened culture of teaching" (p. 57). He describes two ways, both unsuccessful, in which this has been attempted:

1. The academic study of the "educational sciences": "sociology, psychology and philosophy, and more recently, of management theory" (p. 57). However, it is felt that this approach has not proven very successful against the rigours of teaching culture and the mundane demands of teaching.

2. School-centred reform which relies on collaboration between researcher and practitioner, and is built upon existing "craft knowledge": "... personal, practical knowledge of the classroom teacher" (p. 58). However, Hargreaves points out that research may be devoted only to those classroom concerns that presently occupy the time of teachers, making it hard to transform teacher culture by moving beyond what teachers "... already think and do" (p. 58-59). It is also necessary for academic researchers to evaluate teachers' language and thinking on its own merits and in terms of the practical contexts for which it is best suited (p. 60).

Hargreaves appears to be reasoning that since it is the context of teacher experience that has produced the language of teaching, then it is likely the context and conditions of teaching that need changing in order to initiate curriculum reform. In other words, in order to allow for a "reshaped culture of teaching," broad reforms ("school-wide," "state-wide" and "nation-wide") that structurally enable new ways of "thinking" and "doing" are probably necessary. Furthermore, such action will have to move beyond merely assisting teachers with common classroom problems: "[beyond]... helping teachers cope with their effects in the classroom" (p. 61).
With that in mind, Hargreaves describes the reinforcement of traditional curriculum as reinforcing traditional teacher culture: The development of and adherence to a national curriculum such as in England is an example: "[it]... is a strategy which is simultaneously fostering earlier educational differentiation on academic criteria and, by reinforcing the fragmented subject base of the existing culture of teaching, also defusing potential sources of opposition to that process" (p. 66). Thus, a national curriculum reinforces traditional forms of teacher culture, which, amongst other things, tends to be organized along subject lines. Hargreaves follows with the notion that the institution of teacher training programs, as distinct from educational programs (i.e., inservice), have also served to stifle critical reflection by teachers. An emphasis on training has come about in order to deliver prescribed programs in prescribed ways (p. 60).

According to Hargreaves (1989), the net result in Britain has been the "structural reinforcement of the [existing] culture of teaching," which may of course have been the political intention (p. 66-67). However, the sacrifice appears to be that while reforms which concur with existing culture may be successful, those that are not will likely fail. The inference is clear--structural changes to teaching culture are intimately tied to curriculum reform, and, teaching culture will determine the extent of teacher participation and/or resistance to change: "Once more we can see reinforcement rather than redefinition of the academic basis of the culture of the teaching" (p. 67). The culture of teaching is a response to conditions with which teachers have to live: "[the]... existing material structures of subject specialization, [and] inservice training" (p. 68). Therefore, a redefinition of the structural basis of the culture of teaching must be undertaken. Merely examining what teachers do in classrooms will not suffice.

From this, Hargreaves (1989) goes on to challenge the twin poles of reform, name-
ly, bottom-up and top-down approaches. He contends that while the former suffers from a myopic preoccupation with what teachers already know, the latter is likely to reinforce alignment along subject disciplines. Similarly, in as much as the unfocused debate of teachers leaves bottom-up reform susceptible to bureaucratic manipulation, the imposition of change from above is not likely to succeed any better due to the entrenchment of teacher culture along subject lines (pp. 92-94). What then is Hargreave's prescription? In fact, he proposes structural changes which are prescriptive and designed to mould and transform teacher culture:

\[ \ldots \text{one of the greatest obstacles to curriculum reform is therefore undoubtedly the culture of teaching and the work context in which it is embedded. (p. 93)} \]

If substantial curriculum reform is to be developed and implemented effectively, teachers, as a routine and scheduled part of their work, must therefore be allowed, encouraged, indeed required to move beyond their own classrooms into other classrooms, into regular scheduled meetings with their colleagues, into other schools, and into contexts where they consider and discuss educational theory.

(p. 93-94)

Regarding teacher reform, Hargreaves (1989) wishes to leave relatively little responsibility to teachers themselves. However, his notions for change do rest on a reshaped teachers' culture emphasizing collaboration. These include the decentralization of curriculum development and decision-making, the institution of curriculum guidelines which are common to all schools and which recognize and address the needs of all students, and improved "pupil-based assessment and recording procedures" (p. 166-169): "There is a desperate need for a coherent, alternate educational strategy which will tie together curriculum, assessment, teacher and pupil development in a persuasive reform programme which can promise and deliver greater educational equality and opportunity" (pp. 169-170). However, while many ideals remain the same, Hargreave's future writings appear to indicate a somewhat different
Hargreaves and Dawe (1990a) explore the differences between collaborative teacher cultures, and bureaucratically driven collegiality, dubbed "contrived collegiality." Using technical coaching as a subject for inquiry, the authors draw a strict line between a collaborative culture amongst teachers built on trust and mutual interest, and that which has been administratively planned. As mentioned above (see pp. 35-36), Hargreaves et al. (1990a) note that while collaborative culture must undergo a natural evolution which may benefit from executive assistance, administratively planned collegiality cannot effectively circumvent the developmental requirements of the first (collaborative culture). Such requirements are suggested as those goals and practices which have evolved in the educational community and to which teachers have become genuinely committed. Further, the authors suggest that in the cases of mandatory collegiality, whatever collaboration may be present can quickly disappear under the stress and burden of behavioural expectations, which, in turn, are linked to a bureaucratic tightening around instructional reform, curriculum design and teacher development.

Interestingly, then, the prescriptive nature of Hargreave’s (1989) writing is somewhat contradicted by his work with Dawe. While Hargreaves and Dawe (1990a) conclude that teacher collaboration may benefit from “administrative assistance,” they intimate that to be genuine, any such development must “evolve.” This appears to beg the question of whether a change can be considered genuine if those by whom the change will be felt most--i.e., teachers--do not suggest it? Hargreaves (1992a) goes on to reinforce the importance of considering administrative interference when ponder-
ing contrived or "bounded" collegiality, as distinct from that which is termed "true."

Based on a review of both his own research and that of Huberman (1990b), Hargreaves (1983), Ball (1981), Fieman-Nemser and Floden (1986), and Lortie (1975), Hargreaves evaluates collaborative cultures for whether they are, in his terminology, "bounded" or "true." As already stated, the author contends that although truly collaborative cultures appear to lead to innovative change, because the results are slowly realized and unpredictable, they are not favoured by administrators. Similarly, research also indicates that in order for teachers to have something significant to collaborate about, collaborative effort demands a "devolution" of responsibility for curriculum development. Again, this is not acceptable to educational authorities. The result is that administrators often prefer that which is more in line with the bureaucratic aspirations of control (bounded or contrived collegiality) espoused by primarily male officials (especially in regard to male administrators and women elementary teachers). Thus, Hargreaves proposes that building collaboration involves the shifting of curriculum development to those who will deliver the curriculum, especially "from administrators to teachers and from men to women" (p. 235). As such, teacher development and curriculum development can again be seen as inseparable.

As previously observed, Hargreaves (1992a) describes collaborative cultures as most often operating at the elementary level, and consisting of informal systems of praise and gesture, sharing of personal lives within school contexts, staff celebrations, and encouragement and support. Based on a general agreement of educational values, critical debate of those values is considered appropriate (see p. 39). By contrast, contrived collegiality is described as the use of formal and specific bureaucratic procedures to increase cooperative planning and consultation amongst teachers (see pp. 37-38). However, Hargreaves feels that while contrived collegiality can, at best,
act as a preliminary step towards genuine collaboration, it also is distinguished by specific problems (see pp. 37-38). Significantly, and according to the author, contrived collegiality may also be associated with different intents from those of true collaboration (Hargreaves, 1992a, p. 230-231). Therefore, as has been mentioned above, Hargreaves (1992a) argues for teachers' participation in curriculum design as well as implementation.

In *Relationships in the Workplace: Doing What Comes Naturally?*, Cole (1991) approaches many of the same questions dealt with by Hargreaves et al. Specifically, the author compares those elements of human development highlighted in the works of Brim et al. (1966) (self-socialization), and Erickson (1963) (psychosocial development), with the self-stated and observed needs of novice practitioners (self-socialization, colleagueship, community, and opportunity). It is then argued that teachers must be free to define working relationships for themselves and according to their needs: “. . . self-socialization is a necessary part of a new teacher's transition to teaching and contributes in important ways to the psychosocial aspects of their development” (p. 9). Furthermore, it is contended that mandatory collegial relationships (partnership programs) do not satisfy those needs of self-socialization, but that “caring and helping communities of learners” creating collaborative settings do (p. 25). When a partnership program was attempted, an overwhelming majority of teachers chose, instead, to develop a web of informal relationships. Furthermore, this network was as varied as the interests and needs of the individual participants. Significantly, faculty at the site school were encouraged to pursue the collaborative action which suited them, and they did not choose the partnership program.

Finally, evidence (anecdotal) is brought forward illustrating the benefits to the culture and running of the school as a whole (such evidence leads Cole, 1991, to con-
clude that teachers desire the opportunity to develop "caring" and "sharing" working relationships with whom they will most benefit).

It would seem then that Cole (1991) shares in common with Hargreaves a concern for an evolved culture of collaboration. Cole's subjects all indicated an appreciation for the opportunity to define collegial relationships with those whom they felt inclined. Cole also stresses that teachers were encouraged to participate in the collegial relationship of their choice, and that encouragement was forthcoming from the school administration. It is noted that the means for implementation are in no small part due to both administrative resources and attitude. Furthermore, that influence appears to be more direct than what is indicated by Hargreaves et al. (1990a, 1992a):

Because of its size, Riverside is the only elementary school in the Board with a full-time vice-principal (Fran) who does not have teaching responsibilities. Together with the school principal (Karen) they make up the only female administrative team in the Board. Two years ago they, too, were new to Riverside (though not new to administration). Karen and Fran described by several as "the best" are trusted, respected, and admired by all the new teachers (and presumably the others as well). One teacher told me [author] that Riverside School has "a reputation for getting along so well." Ask any teacher at Riverside how this has come about and chances are the response will point to the administration--"definitely, the administration." (Cole, 1991, p. 12)

Gender issues aside, it is clear that subjects of Cole's study point towards administrative involvement regarding the genesis of meaningful and successful collaboration in the study school.

Perhaps more so than Hargreaves, Little's writing shows both a change in, and development of, ideas. As noted in "Teachers as Colleagues," Little (1987) cites research highlighting certain conditions necessary for collaborative culture to survive: (a) collaborative action is highly valued within the school culture (by fellow teachers and administrators) (p. 508), (b) collegial action exists as a function of school organization (p. 509), (c) colleagues work on tasks which are "compelling" and "challenging"
(p. 510), (d) adequate resources are available (p. 512), and (e) recognition is accorded to individuals as well as groups (p. 512). Therefore, as distinct from any unique qualifications of ability and expertise, research shows collaborative cultures to be constructed by those who are both motivated and able to do so. However, collegial action is reported to still be very rare. Little expresses the belief that future educational gains will come via collaborative action amongst teachers, and between teachers and administrators.

In support of collegiality, Little (1987) cites the apparent correlation between student achievement and teacher collaboration (Bird & Little, 1985; Rutter, Maughan, Mortimore, Ouston & Smith, 1979; and Little, 1981). However, that connection is questioned in light of the many extraneous variables (including the exigencies of everyday classroom life) affecting research outcomes (Bredo, 1977), and she calls for additional investigation.

Similarly, the author asks what group or groups of teachers benefit from collaborative practice--novice, experienced, veteran, or all teachers? She concludes that because of the complexity of introducing new curricula and the pace of current educational change, such action will benefit all practitioners, but that conditions will have to match the particular needs of each subset. As such, Little reviews the relative strengths and differences of mentoring-protégé and collegial models. Evidence shows that cultures of isolation and non-intervention will likely make the former difficult to install. However, the attendant benefits of mentoring indicate it is worth considering. Nonetheless, Little notes that where collegial schools may offer specific advantages to teachers working in teams, novice teachers may find those structures initially intimidating.

However, in “Opening the Black Box of Professional Community,” Little (1992)
questions earlier assumptions regarding the negative effects of teacher isolation and seclusion. She quotes Huberman (1990a) regarding how teachers may be viewed as "independent artisan[s]," and how isolation is not necessarily an undeniably negative influence on them (Little, 1992, p. 159). In fact, given the apparent nature of teaching—teachers as artisans—such privacy may, according to Huberman, actually contribute to the practitioner's opportunity to experiment, or "tinker", and experience professional satisfaction. "... Huberman leaves policy makers with the challenge of making the best use of the inevitable independence of classroom teaching" (p. 159). However, as Little (1992) notes, Huberman's notions do not necessarily address what some see as the prime reason for schools: "[the]. . . civic purpose to which schools ultimately must respond" (p. 159).

Besides challenging the negative effects of privacy, Little (1992) also discusses criticisms of the unbridled optimism reserved for "collaborative cultures." These reservations concern both "pragmatic obstacles" and "fundamental conceptual inadequacies and ideological dilemmas" (p. 161). With regard to "organizational impediments," Little discusses Hargreaves' (1990b) notion of contrived collegiality. Similarly, Little discusses the ideas of Bellah, Madsen, Sullivan, Swidler and Tipton (1985) regarding the passion for individuality that marks American society, and how collaboration amongst teachers is out of step with the larger culture: "In a world in which individualism prevails and in which individuality is treasured, what are the obligations, opportunities, and rewards of community among teachers?" (p. 162). She also stresses that emphasis only on structured "occasions" of cooperation may prevent teachers from seeing the benefits of more complex dynamics: "... blind us to the more fluid, moment-by-moment interplay of self and society in schools" (p. 162). Little concludes that "community" amongst teachers may be found in many situations other that those speci-
fically designed to foster it; that failing to look beyond structured moments of so-called teacher collaboration might result in a restricted notion of what collegiality is:

[while it would seem that] . . . collective orientations and involvements in secondary schools are far overshadowed by individualistic pursuits, . . . certain between-school and within-school patterns deserve attention, showing the situationally variable ways in which teachers take one another into account in the ordinary fabric of school life. (Little, 1992, p. 163)

Reporting on a Swiss study on teacher development, satisfaction and effectiveness, Huberman (1992) indicates that the outcomes generally conform with findings from both previous research on teaching careers and the generic “life-cycle literature.” However, the research does prompt a number of questions, including what distinguishes teachers who finish their careers with a strong sense of satisfaction, and those who are bitter and resigned? Further, what do the results indicate regarding the paths to professional satisfaction, and how can those paths be influenced by teachers?

The evidence strongly implies that those who experimented with their own classroom innovations, were consistently happier and more satisfied with their careers than those who invested substantially in school and district sponsored reforms. Shifting roles in the classroom (changing the subject mix or grouping), and achieving satisfying instructional results were also predictors of satisfaction, though not necessarily at the end of one’s career (Huberman, 1992).

The results indicate that a number of conditions are probably necessary for satisfaction in teaching, especially at career end. These are: (a) having working conditions that are manageable, (b) the opportunity for experimentation without strong recrimination in the light of unsatisfactory results, (c) available changes in assignments, (d) availability of “collegial expertise,” (e) “external stimulation,” and (f) reasonable expectations of success with students.

However, the question is posed that if the above are indeed determinants of satis-
faction, which aspects of a teacher’s duties become most important and how are those duties mastered? As well, how do teachers cope with those aspects of teaching which are causing them difficulty?

Table 1 presents the results of investigating these questions.

Table 1. Factors Most Likely To Predict Teacher Career Satisfaction (as reported by Huberman, 1992)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of attempt</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
<th>Percentage of responses</th>
<th>Percentage of cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Little experiments - trial and error</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal research on one’s subject matter</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with a small group of colleagues</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inservice training</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work on one’s own personality or work habits</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recourse to specialists</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other attempts (miscellaneous)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Multiple responses (n = 143)

The greatest number of respondents (39%) reported achieving teacher satisfaction via experimentation with practice, including trial and error. The next largest group (22%) comprised those who indicated conducting research on personal areas of interest as
an indicator of career satisfaction.

The results show that the extent to which teachers determine career satisfaction through their own experimentation, and to a lesser extent personal research, has a much greater influence on teacher satisfaction and effectiveness than the effect of collegial activities and inservice training. Huberman (1992) states that a number of conclusions can be drawn from the evidence.

From the study results, Huberman deduces that the strongest evidence for teacher career satisfaction is indicated by a so-called “craft” model. That is, teachers who are given the reins to experiment as independent and individual practitioners are most likely to experience a rewarding career in teaching. As such, teachers function as “artisans.” Indeed, on those occasions when teachers interact with peers or consultants, the resultant knowledge is then converted into a more personal form of practice. It is also noted that, in the future, the decentralization of inservice might better reflect development needs at the school level. Finally, the study points to a cohort of teachers who respond to little, if any, strategy at all, literally “turning off” teaching after 10-15 years. Based on the overall evidence of the inquiry, Huberman (1992) suggests four approaches for teacher satisfaction:

1. Provide a greater number of better qualified “colleagues or experts” to whom teachers can turn while “tinkering” and “experimenting” (build a “network”).
2. “Decentralize” the system which supports and resources such a network.
3. While retaining the notion of individuals experimenting in the classroom, recruit disaffected teachers and provide assistance to the same through “peers,” “experts” and “consultants.”
4. Provide fertile conditions for the above through sympathetic leadership (“working conditions”) (pp. 136-139).
Huberman's report would seem to speak to many of the ideas and findings put forward by Hargreaves et al. and Little.

**Summary Statement**

This section of Chapter Three has dealt primarily with the cultural conditions necessary and sufficient for the establishment of teacher collaboration. Furthermore, and by way of both identifying those conditions and developing a picture of collaboration, the role of school and district administrators has figured prominently in the literature examined.

Lieberman (1988a) and Lieberman et al. (1988b) assign the role of administration (school and district levels) as primarily that of leadership. Considered crucial, administrators are seen as the driving force behind successful collaboration. Barth (1990) appears to agree, as does Schwartz (1992). As well, Barth (1990), Schwartz (1992) and Grimmett and Crehan (1992) envision administrators as collaborators at the operational level of day to day curricular, instructional and evaluational decision making. However, in a way distinct from other writer/researchers, Grimmett and Crehan (1992) place administrators in a framework, that, due to its supervisory nature, involves the evaluation of teachers not just for teaching expertise, but also their (teachers) ability to engage in a collaborative process with supervisors and presumably other colleagues. Grimmett and Crehan's model appears to fit Barth's dream of "schools as communities of learners and leaders" (Barth, 1990).

By contrast, Hargreaves (1989) and Hargreaves et al. (1990a, 1992a) do not ascribe a similar responsibility to educational administrators. In fact, it is the "devolution" of responsibilities for curriculum, instruction and evaluation away from school administrators that begins to define Hargreaves' et al. (1989, 1990a) notion of
teacher collaboration. As well, Hargreaves' model resides within a picture of teacher culture, which is characterized by its destructive disinclination towards self-examination, and xenophobic approach to educational theory and innovation. Since, in Hargreaves' view, traditional teacher culture may not support innovative practice, cultural renewal appears to indicate teachers redefining the mode and conditions under which they work. While material resources may come from sympathetic administrators, access to those needs will no longer be left in administrative hands.

For Hargreaves et al. (1989, 1992a, 1992b), teacher collaborative culture is primarily defined as the assumption of responsibilities by teachers for curriculum writing and instructional planning. Teaching colleagues would then have the opportunity of working together towards goals which address the needs of particular schools.

Interestingly, Grimmett and Crehan (1992) also express concerns about traditional teacher culture, describing it as seclusionary and unlikely to encourage teachers away from old cycles of "survival" and "competition." But, it is school administrations who are entrusted to dismantle that traditional culture. Unlike Hargreaves' notion, teachers are not expected to liberate themselves from administrative privilege and censure. With that in mind, Grimmett and Crehan also outline their conviction that cultural change dictates structural evolution, in turn enabling further cultural progression. That progression will lead towards what is termed a professionalization of teaching, which indicates that the beliefs, norms and values of a school are oriented towards enhancing the educational experience of teachers and, above all, students. As well, a collaborative focus indicates a cooperation between administrators and teachers to better understand and define classroom practice.

Hargreaves (1989, 1992a) emphasizes that teaching culture is a response to specific conditions such as material structures and inservice training, all of which must
change in order to facilitate a cultural evolution. Therefore, a structural evolution must always precede cultural change.

While Cole (1991) and Little (1992) agree with many aspects of Hargreaves’ et al. (1990a, 1992a) model, Cole extends greater credit to the value of administrative leadership. As well, Little raises the issue of evaluation, questioning whether enough evidence exists in favour of collaboration, or, for that matter, whether collegiality is wholly realistic in a society which celebrates individualism. However, Little also accedes to Hargreaves that formalized modes of teacher collaboration may obscure the benefit of informal and often unobtrusive collaborative efforts. However, Little (1992) by no means rejects her earlier vision (1981) of collaborative culture, which still appears to form the basis of those other writings surveyed here, and is worth restating.

Adults in schools talk about practice. Adults in schools observe each other engaged in the practice of teaching and administration. Adults engage together in work on curriculum by planning, designing, researching, and evaluating curriculum . . . adults in schools teach each other what they know about teaching, learning and leading. Craft knowledge is revealed, articulated, and shared.

(quoted in Barth, 1990, p. 31)

Finally, Huberman (1992) echoes Little’s concern for acknowledging craft knowledge and the notion of teachers as artisans. However, Huberman points out the benefits of having available collegial expertise, manageable conditions and sympathetic leadership. As well, like Hargreaves (1989) and Hargreaves et al. (1992a), Huberman (1992) advocates the decentralization of teacher supports and services.
Summary Analysis

Teaching and Collegiality

A Structural Perspective

The development and writing of curriculum by teachers. With an eye to improving the overall quality of education, and enabling teachers to work collaboratively, Hargreaves (1989) identifies curriculum reform as the most likely focus for altering teacher culture. Accordingly, he calls for teachers to research, write and test curriculum. By giving the opportunity to design what they teach, he is convinced that teachers will truly participate in educational change, rather than resisting it. While Holmes (1991) expresses that the determination of curriculum content is a public affair, he too believes teachers should have full responsibility for determining instructional techniques and procedures.

Lieberman, Saxl and Miles (1988b), and Little (1981, 1987, 1992), to name a few, emphasize the need for teachers to be more involved in determining the shape and direction of the profession in which they work, and curriculum writing is one answer to the question of how to do that. Collaboration would be part of that process.

The role of administrators. While, on the one hand, Hargreaves et al. (1989, 1990a, 1992a) acknowledge the potential contribution by administrators to establishing teachers as curriculum writers, researchers, and consultants, they also outline a number of problems with doing so. On the other hand, many writers, including Miller (1988), Schwartz (1992), and Barth (1990), indicate their conviction that administrative action is required to establish teacher action by those routes mentioned above (curriculum writing and evaluation). In this way, while Hargreaves et al. (1989, 1990a,
1992a, 1992b) may see administrative action in neutral, if not negative, terms, the aforementioned group of writers stress the need for administrative leadership that may include bureaucratic initiative. That being said, what structural changes are being referred to?

**Structural changes and cultural transformation.** Hargreaves (1992a) points out that because of the slow pace of change, truly collaborative cultures are not favoured by administrators. As well, the devolution of responsibility for curriculum development is also not generally acceptable to education authorities. Therefore, Hargreaves (1989) prescribes large structural changes.

Hargreaves et al. (1990a), while emphasizing collaboration as an informal system of praise and gestures and the sharing of personal lives, believe that time and resources should be made available to establish collaborative cultures. He (1989) also indicates the more formal activity of research and observation. These changes are intended to alter the nature of teacher culture so that change may become teacher driven and circumscribed.

Lieberman and Miller (1991), and Barth (1990) also acknowledge that structural adjustments are the required price for involving teachers in curriculum development and related activities. However, as indicated above, those changes are more likely to be prescribed by administrators than in Hargreaves' model.

All writers surveyed expressed a desire to expedite teacher curriculum leadership by having faculty work together. Little (1987) bluntly states that collegiality (working together) must be a function of school organization. As such, she stresses that material and organizational structures (e.g., time tabling) must be supplied--supplied so that teachers may have the opportunity to dialogue about, plan, research and evaluate curriculum.
Collaboration as structural change. Collaboration amongst teachers (i.e., teachers working together) can be seen as a response to demands asking for greater influence on the designing, writing and evaluating of curriculum. Indeed, it may be said that as a dynamic of educational reform, teacher collaboration is a structural change dictated by the desire for teacher involvement in curriculum design and evaluation. It is also possible that, while curriculum writing may be a logical choice, any other area of endeavour would suffice. The question remaining for most writers may be to what extent teachers should make curriculum decisions.

As a component of educational reform and despite disagreement regarding the role of administrators, teacher collaboration may itself represent a structural change to education. Indeed, a structural change which is manifested in a number of ways (organizational and material supports), allows teachers a greater role in curriculum planning, and thereby provides them with increased influence on the teaching vocation.

A Cultural Perspective

Traditional teacher and school cultures. Within the context of teacher development, Hargreaves (1989) recorded the apparently self-defeating characteristics of teacher culture. That is, Hargreaves (1989) found that when attempting educational reforms, teachers in England were unwilling to examine theory and observe practice. Simply put, they were unable to move beyond their own classroom experiences. At the same time, Hargreaves et al. (1989, 1990a) outlines a general bureaucratic tightening around teaching, especially in regards to instructional reform, curriculum design and teacher development.

Traditional teacher culture and the traditional curriculum. Hargreaves’ et al. (1989, 1990a) findings show that sustaining the traditional curriculum effectively bolsters tra-
ditional teacher culture. Therefore, in order to "elicit a different kind of cultural response" beyond every day problems of the classroom, Hargreaves (1989) calls for a changing of workplace conditions (p. 53). He wants to allow for the transformation of teacher culture. Similarly, Lieberman et al. (1988b, 1991) indicate that teacher development must be looked upon as culture building, culture building that will incline teachers to engage in the research, evaluation and writing of, amongst other things, curriculum. In fact, all writers speak of teacher development in terms of a cultural transformation and a required change in workplace conditions.

Collaboration and culture building. Miller (1988) and Schwartz (1992) stress the development of attitudes amongst teachers conducive to collaboration regarding curriculum design. In order for palpable teacher growth to occur, Barth (1990) maintains that schools must transform culturally to become communities of learners and leaders. However, while cultural transformation is in indeed topical, there are significant differences regarding the notion of a desirable teacher culture.

The nature of collaboration and the role of administrators. The notion of true collaboration is discussed by Hargreaves et al. (1990a) with regard to an "evolved" pattern of functioning. Such a pattern has teachers working together by choice in essentially informal ways, a model agreed to by Cole (1991). Lieberman et al. (1991) also see collaboration as informal cooperative relationships between teachers, but not restricted to that.

Lieberman et al. (1988b) stress that "reflective practice, disciplined inquiry and informal research . . . study groups, curriculum writing, action research, peer observation, case conferences, participation in outside events and organizations" all amount to collaborative action (p. 107). Maintaining a different focus, Hargreaves et al. (1990a, 1992a) have developed guidelines for what should not be considered genuine
Hargreaves (1992a) specifies that denying teachers the opportunity to engage in curriculum design and/or doing so under administratively imposed plans (e.g., peer coaching) is destructive to teacher culture and results in "contrived collegiality"; Cole (1991) agrees. However, Miller's (1988) notion of giving final authority for curriculum decisions to administrators would seem to contradict Hargreaves' position. In fact, Hargreaves et al. (1990a) maintain that administrative intervention can be destructive, and short circuit whatever collaboration may exist, or over burden teachers who are already very busy. However, describing them as coalition builders, Barth (1990) lays primary responsibility for culture building on the shoulders of principals, a role agreed on by Lieberman et al. (1991). Therefore, it can be seen that administrative influence is seen as both a hindrance and a catalyst.

Maintaining that collaborative action must be highly valued within a school staff for it to flourish, Little (1987) indicates the need for administrative involvement. However, by noting that teachers must have the opportunity to collaborate on tasks which are compelling, administrative influence is also effectively checked. Little also notes that teachers must receive recognition for work which they are motivated sufficiently enough to do. Lieberman et al. (1991), Little (1992) and Huberman (1991) indicate the notion of teaching as a craft, and note the need for preserving a balance between colleagueship (colleagues working together) and the individuality of the participants.

Collaboration as cultural change. While variations of opinion and findings have led a variety of writers to promote different change models, it can be seen from the evidence presented that a base commonality exists amongst the above researchers. As pointed out by Hargreaves (1989), changes to teacher culture are intimately tied to reforming the way in which curriculum is written and determined. As well, teacher cul-
ture will determine the extent of teacher participation and/or resistance to change and, most importantly, teacher culture must benefit from changes allowing faculty to work together, or, collaboratively. It can be said, then, that collaboration is in itself a manifestation of teacher culture, and, in most instances, will represent a change and/or evolution of that culture. Nonetheless, most writers indicate collaboration as a goal toward which teacher culture must evolve. Either way, perhaps the key to comprehending the arguments reviewed is to understand the importance placed on curriculum writing. Writing and designing curriculum is viewed as a tool for changing teacher culture. Furthermore, these changes are meant to allow teachers to enhance the influence they have on their chosen profession. Culture is transformed to allow for collaboration. However, since collaboration can be seen as the best route to transforming and designing curriculum, collaboration becomes a necessary adjunct to teacher culture and hence, in itself, necessitates a cultural transformation.

**Collegiality and Instructional Decisions**

A structural perspective--collaboration as an organizational tool. In support of instructional improvement, Hargreaves' (1989) argument for wholesale structural and cultural changes in education has been shown to include the provision of more time away from classrooms, as well as more time in the classrooms of fellow instructors (observation). Like Holmes (1991), Hargreaves et al. (1989, 1990a) indicate that teachers should have basic control over how curriculum is taught. Similarly, Grimmett and Crehan (1989, 1992) outline a method for instructional improvement which, while including the element of supervision, is solidly based on the thinking of Hargreaves et al. (1990a, 1992a) and Little (1981, 1987, 1992), amongst others.

Borrowing the notion of contrived collegiality from Hargreaves et al. (1990a), Grimmett and Crehan (1992) argue that collaboration is rarely found in Canadian
schools. This fact is attributed to the apparent superimposition of school cultures marked by "isolation" and "self-sufficiency," and what is termed innovative practice. It is argued that the former will stifle the latter. Such a merging results in what Grimmett and Crehan (1992) term an "administratively imposed" collegiality, the definition of which is very similar to Hargreaves' et al. (1990a) notion of contrived collegiality. By contrast, Grimmett and Crehan (1992) laud the possibilities of what is termed "strong interdependent collegiality." Showing firm ties to Hargreaves' et al. (1989, 1990a, 1992a) notion of true collaboration, Grimmett and Crehan describe a scenario distinguished by both a measure of bureaucratic freedom ("loose organizational structure"), and commonly held beliefs, values and purposes ("tight" value orientation). As well, a strong interdependent collegiality is intended to allow for instructional growth within a supervisory relationship between administrator and teacher. That is, within a relationship where both supervisor and supervisee challenge each other within a commonly held set of beliefs, both parties are expected to collaborate on solving instructional problems. Grimmett and Crehan maintain (1992) that such a strategy is not possible without the loosening of organizational structures so that experimentation and disagreement are both tolerated and encouraged.

In a related way, Miller (1988) indicates that instructional leadership becomes the mandate of teachers because of the initiative of senior administration and, in order to encourage shared instructional knowledge and practice, peer observation must be planned and budgeted for. Similarly, Lieberman et al. (1988b) indicate that to improve instructional practice, principal support in the encouragement of collaborative methods is essential.

Perhaps most removed from the ideas presented throughout the writings of Hargreaves and his collaborators are those presented by Schwartz (1992) and Barth
Advocating the strategies of teaching centres and teaching pairs respectively, both writers approach instructional improvement by way of administrative facilitation. What then is the overall function of collaboration within the context of instructional decision making?

Comparable to the findings regarding collegiality and curriculum decision making, collaboration appears to be less an end than a means. Indeed, it is a tool used to realize the goal of instructional improvement. As such, the fermentation of ideas through the collaborative process is held as a strategic goal. A goal quite different, however, from pursuing collaboration for its own sake, and one which defines collaboration as a structural instrument. As well, and while notions of collaboration vary, the conception of collaboration as a structural device appears consistently throughout the literature studied. So, not only do structural changes allowing for collaboration need to be enacted, but, as well, those changes can be seen as the bits and pieces of a global structural change typically labelled collaboration.

A cultural perspective—collaboration and the establishment of values. Grimmett and Crehan (1992) define culture as the force which unites individuals regarding purpose and outcome, educational or otherwise. As well, and within the context of educational improvement, the same authors maintain that the nature of teachers' beliefs must indicate a general agreement regarding educational values and a genuine interest in instructional improvement. However, Grimmett and Crehan (1992) also point out that advocates of school improvement may face a lack of consistency and/or interest regarding educational values. As such, Grimmett and Crehan favour a cultural shift towards shared values of instructional improvement and decision making, or, collaborative action. As well, the same authors, in spite of the supervisory nature of their proposed model, suggest an investment of power in teachers by administrators in
those working beneath them. Both Miller (1988) and Barth (1990) also advocate the investing of power by administrators.

Schwartz (1992) favours in teachers the development of attitudes conducive to collaboration regarding instructional concerns. Similarly, Lieberman et al. (1988b, 1991) advocate culture building that also concerns instructional issues.

As already stated, Grimmett and Crehan (1992) warn of the cultural forces of self-sufficiency and individualism (typical school cultures). They also point out that teachers have mistakenly equated professional autonomy with “teacher seclusion and secrecy.” They go on to explicate their notion of collaborative schools, which as indicated above, and with the exception of instructional supervision, bears a strong resemblance to that of Hargreaves et al. (1989, 1990a, 1992a) and Little (1981, 1987, 1992).

The following information is taken from Figure 4 (see p. 33):

Belief: Talking about and observing teaching builds up shared referents adequate to the complexity of teaching
Value: Shared referents are preferred over idiosyncratic perceptions
Norm: Collegial interdependence

Belief: Learning accrues from the active pursuit of the demonstration and risk taking that teaching provides
Value: Taking risks is preferred over the stagnation resulting from isolationist, avoidance tendencies
Norm: Experimentation

(Grimmett & Crehan, 1992, p. 64)


Huberman (1992) found that teachers experience greatest career satisfaction when their needs define the collaborative avenues available to them. However, practitioners may elect to experiment with techniques and approaches individually, a point
echoed by Little (1992). In fact, this latter issue is given significant weight by Little, prompting her to reevaluate the need for formal collaboration at all times.

Clearly, the notion of collegiality within the context of instructional decision making gives a focus to collaborative action, which may in fact justify its pursuit. However, it can also be seen, as shown by Grimmett and Crehan (1992), that a commitment to interdependent collegiality likely precedes any structural evolution. That is, prior to collaborative instructional decision making, a desire for collegial action must come before the necessary structural arrangements.

Finally, while writers such as Schwartz (1992), Barth (1990) and perhaps Lieberman et al. (1991) may accept instructional supervision as congruent with collegial action, Hargreaves et al. (1989, 1990a, 1992a), and Cole (1991) do not. In fact, the latter two writers are likely to disagree with the former group quite vehemently on that point.

**Collegiality and Evaluation Decisions**

A structural perspective. Hargreaves' (1989) notion of collegiality includes a commitment to materials and resources devoted to “pupil-based assessment and recording procedures . . . [leading] to curriculum development which is more effectively geared to the needs of the individual pupil” (p. 169). He calls for an increased time allotment for to teachers to accomplish this task.

Due to an apparent shortage of research and problems with existing studies, Little (1987) concludes that the connection between teacher collaboration and student achievement is unproven. Accordingly, she calls for additional investigation.

Miller (1988) specifies that any initiative towards teacher collaboration must include the resources to evaluate both the program as a whole, as well as student achievement. As such, evaluation of measurable student gains must be factored into
the process. Similarly, as with culture building, Lieberman et al. (1991) sees collaboration as centred on activities that must include the evaluation of student progress.

In that he is concerned with teachers developing attitudes conducive to evaluation (at teachers centres), Schwartz (1992) tends to focus the process of evaluation on teachers. Similarly, Grimmett and Crehan (1992) also indicate a focus on teachers, as implied by their concentration on instructional supervision. Presumably though, such action would also include developing better systems of evaluation for students.

It can be seen, then, that all of the above writers call for the committal of more resources to evaluation. However, where some emphasize evaluation of teachers, and others emphasize students, still others emphasize evaluation of both teachers and students.

A cultural perspective. Lieberman et al. (1988b, 1991) emphasize that culture building towards collaboration must include teachers dealing with evaluational concerns. Similarly, Schwartz (1992) stresses the cultural transformation teachers must undergo, and how that transformation should include concerns about evaluation, while Grimmett and Crehan (1992) speak of teachers accepting the need for evaluation via instructional supervision.

In summation, while Hargreaves (1989), Miller (1988), Little (1987) and Lieberman et al. (1988) specifically address the need for evaluating student achievement in terms of teacher collaboration, Grimmett and Crehan’s (1992) notion of instructional supervision implies a concern about student evaluation which should be addressed through instructional innovation. However, Little (1987), whose support for collaborative culture is clear, also warns that the benefits of collaboration for students may or may not be substantial.

Figures 8, 9, and 10 outline the overall findings of Chapter Three, and are orga-
nized according to the research themes: Figure 8 lists findings associated with the cultural requirements of collegiality; Figure 9 lists information concerned with the structural requirements of collegiality; and Figure 10 contains those results related to curriculum development and evaluation, as well as conceptual models of teaching. Together, the three figures make up a comprehensive list of the analysis results. Since findings are cross referenced by writer/researcher, both the frequency and source of each can be viewed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-defeating nature of traditional teacher culture (including the inability to move beyond classroom experiences):</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional curriculum reinforces traditional teacher culture:</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-defeating nature of traditional school culture (including self-sufficiency and individualism):</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural change must precede structural changes re: collaboration (cultural changes to include the sharing of values, norms and beliefs):</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genuine collaboration not favoured by administrators:</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct relationship between failed (contrived) collaboration and administrative action:</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration as an evolved pattern of informal relationships (but may include curriculum committees):</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration as a tool for cultural change:</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers enlarging their influence in education through collaborative action, curriculum development, and instructional improvement:</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers mistakenly equating professional autonomy with &quot;teacher seclusion and secrecy&quot;:</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration as an outcome of shared educational values:</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration as the catalyst for meaningful debate (debate as the indicator of true collaboration):</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration a result of culture building (cultural transformation):</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>(a) Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Barth (1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) Cole (1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d) Grimmett &amp; Crehan (1989, 1992)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e) Hargreaves et al. (1989, 1990a, 1992a, 1992b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(f) Huberman (1992)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(i) Miller (1988)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(j) Schwartz (1992)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(k) Holmes (1991)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 8.** Cross Sectional Comparison by Author of Findings of The Analyses regarding Cultural Requirements of Collaboration
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structural change must precede cultural changes re: collaboration (structural changes to include material and organizational considerations):</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decentralization of teacher supports and services:</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessity of administrative influence in establishing collaboration:</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessity of limited administrative influence in establishing collaboration:</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final authority of administration over collaborative action required:</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration as a system of formal relationships (including peer observation, curriculum committees and instructional supervision):</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration as a tool for structural change:</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators investing power in teachers through collaboration:</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers enlarging their influence in education through collaborative action and curriculum development and instructional improvement:</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration as an outcome of organizational flexibility:</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**

- Column (a) Findings
  - (b) Barth (1990)
  - (c) Cole (1991)
  - (d) Grimmett & Crehan (1989, 1992)
  - (e) Hargreaves et al. (1989, 1990a, 1992a, 1992b)
  - (f) Huberman (1992)
  - (i) Miller (1988)
  - (j) Schwartz (1992)
  - (k) Holmes (1991)

**Figure 9.** Cross Sectional Comparison by Author of Findings of the Analyses regarding Structural Requirements of Collaboration
Collaboration as the working together and cooperation of teachers on curriculum development, instructional improvement and evaluation:

Collaboration as the working together and cooperation of teachers and administrators on curriculum development, instructional improvement and evaluation:

The need for preserving a balance between collaboration and the individuality of the participant:

Unproven link between teacher collaboration and student achievement:

Assumption of student benefits via collaboration:

Present systems of evaluation considered discriminatory:

Student gains (collaborative system) require measuring:

Teacher as artisan or craft person:

Collaboration not a panacea for problems in education:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B C D E F G H I J K</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 10.** Cross Sectional Comparison by Author of Findings of the Analyses regarding Curriculum Development and Evaluation, Instructional Innovation, and Conceptual Models of Teaching
CHAPTER FOUR: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

With the intent of understanding both the nature and operation of teacher collaborative culture, the work of ten writer/researchers has been examined. Based on the evidence presented in Chapter 1, research has been conducted so as to answer the following questions (Chapter 1, p. 3):

1. What behaviours define collaboration?
2. How do conceptions of collaboration found in the literature compare?
3. Is collaboration a behavioural goal (end) or means to some other purpose(s), or, is it an indicator of the effectiveness of personnel practices?
4. Is collaboration a meaningless slogan, or, behaviour worth dedicating sparse educational resources towards?

While these questions are addressed throughout this chapter, they are revisited under the heading of General Conclusions.

The analysis itself was conducted according to the analytic model presented on p. 16 (Chapter 2), the intent of which was to compare both the structural and cultural organization of schools with the instructional responsibilities of teachers, and study how those elements might interact to affect the establishment and definition of collaboration. The elements were derived from the following themes identified from the literature: cultural requirements of collegiality, structural requirements of collegiality, curriculum development and evaluation, instructional innovation, and conceptual models of teaching. The analysis was broadly organized under two categories: bureaucratic and non-bureaucratic. This approach reflects the schism within the literature on the establishment of collaborative cultures. The findings are presented below.
The literature reviewed has indicated a variety of conceptions of teacher collaboration. Figure 11 illustrates the notion of teacher collaboration at the behavioural level, or, simply what it means to collaborate.

At the head of Figure 11 is a passage from Little (1981), who was amongst the first to study and publish on collegial planning. Her original observations on collaborative schools have, as explained in Chapter 1, formed a basis for subsequent debate. Columns A, B and C outline the three main operational variations of collaboration as discussed in Chapter 3. Each is placed after Little’s passage for reasons of chronology.

Consideration of how collaboration is established is not included in Figure 11. Only a general description of what it is to collaborate and with whom is given. One proponent of each variation is quoted within each column. As shown in Chapter 3, many variations exist regarding what activities are suggested by the notion of collaboration. However, each of the three columns can be seen to represent those activities which are suggested by several writers.

Figures 12 and 13 present an amalgamation of the central results of Chapter Three with regard to both the establishment and definition of collaboration. Outcomes regarding the roles and influences of both teachers and administrators on the establishment and definition of collaboration are considered for both Bureaucratic (Figure 12) and Non-bureaucratic (Figure 13) approaches. Both Figures (12 & 13) are themselves outcomes of the analytic model stated on p. 16 (Chapter 2).

Conflict between varying conceptions of collaboration is manifested by the four outcomes or findings. Interestingly, the outcomes can be seen to coincide, which may reinforce the realization that a majority of writers have striven for similar if not identical goals. Each outcome is numbered for reference purposes only (Figure 12, #1 & #2; Figure 13, #3 & #4).
Judith Warren Little (1981):

"Adults in schools talk about practice. Adults in schools observe each other engaged in the practice of teaching and administration. Adults engage together in work on curriculum by planning, designing, researching, and evaluating curriculum . . . adults in schools teach each other what they know about teaching, learning and leading. Craft knowledge is revealed, articulated, and shared." (cited in Barth, 1990, p. 31)

Informal systems of praise and gesture, sharing of personal lives within school contexts, staff celebrations, and encouragement and support. A general agreement of educational values exists, and critical debate of those values takes place.

Teachers engage with teachers in development activities such as curriculum writing, instructional observation and research.

Teachers pursue greater responsibility and usurp administrative influence for curriculum, instructional and evaluational decision making. (Hargreaves et al., 1990a)

Teachers work with teachers on curriculum and instructional activities under administrative direction and facilitation. Supervision is not included in the process.

Teachers experiment with and debate educational practice with other teachers.

". . . reflective practice, disciplined inquiry and informal research . . . study groups, curriculum writing, action research, peer observation, case conferences, participation in outside events and organizations" are all considerate collaborative activities. (Lieberman et al., 1988, p. 107)

Within a supervisory framework, teachers and administrators talk about and observe teaching; teachers and teachers, and teachers and administrators establish "shared referents" for professional practice.

Teachers engage with administrators in instructional improvement and innovation.

Teachers accept challenge of educational improvement while working "collegially" with administrative supervisor.

Experimentation and risk taking are both accepted and pursued. (Grimmett & Crehan, 1992, p. 64)

Figure 11. Collaboration at the behavioural level.
Collaborative Cultures / 87

Self-defeating nature of traditional teacher and school cultures

Administrative initiative and leadership re: instructional improvement, curriculum development and evaluation: e.g., instructional supervision, coaching, collaborative structures, structural changes

Dialogue, debate and experimentation (formal and informal); distillation and evolution of ideas and values

Establishment of shared professional values and beliefs within a collaborative framework

Lasting Cultural Change

Lasting Structural Change (material supports and flexible organizational structures) including those facilitating collaboration

(1) Entrenchment of educational changes including those favouring collaborative cultures. Lasting cultural change ("strong interdependent collegiality")

Administrative decree and obeisance ("administratively imposed collegiality")

Cultural stagnation and entrenchment

Ephemeral structural change

Collapse of change process

(2) Establishment of collaborative culture fails

Figure 12. Findings Regarding Bureaucratic Routes for the Establishment of Collaborative Cultures as Indicated by an Amalgamation of the Research Findings
Self-defeating nature of traditional teacher and school cultures

Natural development (evolution) of shared values and aspirations by teachers over long period of time. Potential but limited role for administrative leadership in establishing collaborative cultures.

Administrative decree and obeisance ("administratively imposed collegiality")

Identification of cultural values

Establishment by teachers of need for particular changes in education, some of which may contradict prevalent administrative practice.

Cultural stagnation and entrenchment

Ephemeral structural change

Urging by educators for devolution of structural constraints re: curriculum development, instructional practice, and evaluation; collaboration (more control for teachers)

Substantial structural changes. According to interest, teachers voluntarily engage in research and observation, curriculum development and instructional improvement (informally). Teachers contribute to the building of educational practice ("true collaboration")

Structural changes allow for continued cultural evolution and transformation via curriculum development and instructional innovation.

(3) Entrenchment of educational changes including those favouring collaborative cultures

Structural changes insufficient against cultural and bureaucratic inertia. Need for change no longer identified with personal transformation. Teachers continue to rely on past experience. Bureaucratic tightening on teaching continues. Influence of traditional curriculum ("contrived collegiality"). Cessation of cultural transformation.

(4) Relapse to dependence on traditional cultural values. Collapse of change process. Establishment of collaborative culture fails.

Figure 13. Findings Regarding Non-Bureaucratic Routes for the Establishment of Collaborative Cultures as Indicated by an Amalgamation of the Research Findings
The findings under the bureaucratic heading (Figure 12) have been gleaned from the writings of Barth (1990), Grimmett and Crehan (1987, 1992), Hargreaves (1989), Lieberman et al. (1991, 1992a, 1992b), Little (1981, 1987), Miller (1988), and Schwartz (1992). Those outcomes beneath the non-bureaucratic heading (Figure 13) have been derived from the writings of Hargreaves et al. (1989, 1990a, 1992a), Cole (1991), Holmes (1991), Huberman (1991), and Little (1987, 1992). Figures 12 and 13 have been constructed using the same organization of findings found in Figures 8, 9, and 10 (pages 81, 82, and 83 respectively).

Figure 12 and 13 each begin with the idea that traditional teacher and school cultures are self-defeating by nature, and harmful to the overall functioning of public education. This notion, as shown in Figure 8, is agreed upon by a majority of writers. Each of the findings is discussed below in detail.

Bureaucratic Initiative and the Successful Establishment of Collaborative Cultures
(Figure 12, Outcome #1)

A number of writers propose that collaboration can be encouraged by a process for which the genesis lies in administrative leadership and enterprise. Crucial to understanding the logical realization of this outcome is the establishment of shared values and beliefs within a collaborative framework. For example, central to Grimmett and Crehan’s (1992) thesis is the building of professional values. As discussed above, professional values are those that will ultimately benefit educational practice for both teachers and students (Grimmett & Crehan, 1992, pp. 63-65). The progression from administrative initiative to a collaboration similar to Grimmett and Crehan’s (1992) “strong interdependent collegiality” appears to require a professional orientation on the part of both teachers and administrators (p. 64). It is a professional orientation.

---

8 While no attempt has been made to correlate specific findings with particular writers in either Figure 12 or 13, author references can be made by examining Figures 8, 9, and 10.
which will foster debate and experimentation. If either party to such practice fails to develop a professional focus, then presumably the process will fail. The question then becomes which party is least likely to develop such a focus (professionalization).

Clearly, those supporting administrative leadership believe that administrators are more likely to be in a position to promote professional values, and for that reason alone, will likely do so. For example, teachers must often work within a prevailing culture prescribed by isolationist and seclusionist tendencies, especially regarding debate and experimentation. Furthermore, as Grimmett and Crehan (1992) and Hargreaves (1989) point out, the culture many teachers find themselves in will likely act to prevent cultural transformation. Simply put, the very traditions that fail to encourage professional practice also inhibit any movement towards the alteration of school and teaching cultures. Therefore, teachers may not always be capable of rising past their own cultural milieu, with the result that administrative action is required to achieve collaboration. Of course, that is not to say that administrators themselves may not be bound by inhibiting traditions.

Bureaucratic Initiative and the Failure to Establish Collaborative Cultures (Figure 12, Outcome #2)

The failure to establish a collaborative culture is described by what Grimmett and Crehan (1992) term “administratively imposed collegiality” (p. 73). While the idea of administratively imposed collegiality is very similar to Hargreaves’ et al. (1992a, p. 230-231) notion of “contrived collegiality,” Grimmett and Crehan have conceptualized a bureaucratic obstacle within a model that supports bureaucratic solutions. While Hargreaves concedes that administrative influence can contribute towards collaborative action, that assistance is always held in check.

Grimmett and Crehan (1992) are explicit that collaborative practice cannot be
installed by administrative decree or achieved as a byproduct of bureaucratic manipulation. Rather, an alignment of professional values and administrative practice is required to nurture collegiality.

Moreover, in the trend towards greater centralization of control over the curricular-instructional programme, school reformers have attempted to implement collegial practices without regard for the necessary beliefs, values, and norms which combine to sustain professional interdependence. As a consequence, features of the typical culture found in schools have been superimposed on the innovative collegial practices to establish a culture of contrived collegiality. (p. 65)

Similarly, Grimmett & Crehan (1992) also identify how school cultural values must become aligned with collaborative practice for a successful transformation from traditional to collaborative cultures: "Contrived collegiality can be characterized, then, as the overlay of a typical set of school cultural beliefs and values on the administratively required practices of interdependent collegiality" (p. 68).

A truly collaborative culture will not only thrive on the comparison of opposing views, experiences and competencies, but will demand it. However, whether or not educational values are shared (i.e., experimentation, argumentation etc.), if the organizational system will not carry those values via the type of supports specified by Little (1987, 1992)--structural and material inducements--collaboration will not occur.

Of the proponents supporting bureaucratic routes towards the establishment of collaborative cultures, Grimmett and Crehan (1992) are the only writers surveyed to warn of potential pitfalls. While Barth (1990), Miller (1988) and Schwartz (1992) speak without question of the need for administrative leadership, Grimmett and Crehan (1992) illustrate how that leadership must operate in particular ways to prove educationally defensible. On the one hand, Grimmett and Crehan (1992) argue for the notion of "organizationally induced collegiality" (p. 75). On the other hand, they warn that when both teachers and administrators are restricted by an oppressive organizational struc-
ture not conducive to experimentation and dissent, the opportunity of realizing educational innovation is unlikely.

Grimmett and Crehan (1992) agree with Watson and Kilcher (1990) that collaboration rarely exists in Canadian schools. The forcing of isolationism and individualism over top of collegial values and beliefs is blamed, with the net result a stifling of professional beliefs.

Non-Bureaucratic Initiative and the Successful Establishment of Collaborative Cultures (Figure 13, Outcome #3)

Perhaps the greatest proponent of this approach is Hargreaves et al. (1989, 1990a, 1992). Hargreaves’ contends that given the proper structural conditions, teachers will manage their own cultural transformation. As noted, those conditions may include the requirement that teachers engage in research and observe colleagues (Hargreaves, 1989, pp. 93-94). Therefore, significant structural changes are required which, in turn, will lead to cultural change.

Many writers support the thesis of preceding cultural change with structural alteration, including Cole (1991), Little (1987, 1992), Miller (1988) and Holmes (1991). However, while Miller clearly ascribes organizational changes to the influence of administrators, Cole and Little admit to a lesser, though still important, executive function. Hargreaves, while suggesting administrative help in establishing collaboration may be necessary, maintains it can be volatile and often more damaging than beneficial. Nonetheless, Hargreaves and Cole subscribe to a model of teacher-managed cultural change, cultural change accomplished primarily through the process of curriculum writing, which in turn is made possible through the breaking down of structural barriers. As Grimmett and Crehan (1992) emphasize the need for administrative leadership through their notion of “organizationally induced collegiality,” the expression
by teachers of the need for change remains a linchpin in the models of Hargreaves et al. (1990a, 1992) and Cole (1990). It is the need for change which drives teachers to surmount cultural obstacles. Therefore, the question must be asked whether a significant number of teachers will be sufficiently motivated to effect change.

In spite of his assertion that teachers hang on to destructive traditions (1989), Hargreaves et al. (1989, 1990a, 1992a, 1992b) contend that both the traditional public school curriculum (particularly in England), and a bureaucratic tightening around educational practice have forced teachers to work within a stifling cultural environment. It is contended that the need felt by teachers for cultural change results from these pressures. But, how consistently are these needs felt?

The experiences of several writers may help to determine how likely teachers are to pursue collaborative cultures. As discussed in Chapter 3, the writings of Miller (1988), Lieberman et al. (1991, 1992a, 1992b) and Barth (1990) all present evidence suggesting the survival of collaborative cultures requires more than just the “window of opportunity.” Cole (1990) herself maintains that teachers need the occasion to collaborate with colleagues, though in a manner prescribed by teachers, not administrators. Interestingly, as Huberman attests (1991), such a position may include not collaborating at all.

The evidence that collaborative cultures are rare in Canada must again also be considered (Grimmett & Crehan, 1992; Watson & Kilcher, 1990). The development of collaboration likely suffers, as Grimmett and Crehan point out, from the obstacles of isolation and seclusion, a circumstance noted by Hargreaves (1989).

Non-Bureaucratic Initiative and the Failure to Establish Collaborative Cultures (Figure 13, Outcome #4)

A renewed dependence on traditional cultural values, and the failure to establish a
collaborative culture outlines, among other things, the inability of teachers to embrace cultural change. Hargreaves (1989) specified the combination of increased bureaucratic control, influence of the traditional curriculum, and inability of teachers to see past their own classroom experiences as influences negatively affecting the institution of collaboration. In order to address the latter, Hargreaves suggests teachers be required to engage in a variety of activities that include curriculum writing. Therefore, curriculum writing is also meant to address the problems of excessive bureaucratic control and the traditional curriculum, both of which Hargreaves thoroughly documents. Curriculum writing becomes part of the structural change that precedes cultural change.

Two issues stand out from the literature regarding the establishment of collaboration: (a) the necessity of administrative leadership, and (b) the ability of teacher needs to sustain a cultural transformation. Simply stated, does the case for administrative leadership outweigh that specifying the curtailment of administrative influence, and the determination of collaborative relations by teachers? These issues are addressed in the following section.

Conclusions

Specific Conclusions

Cultural requirements of collaboration. The majority of those writers surveyed indicated that while collaboration indeed had cultural requirements, collaboration is itself a tool for cultural change. While most writers indicate collaboration as a goal towards which teacher cultures must evolve, it is evident that collaboration benefits processes such as curriculum writing and instructional innovation. Therefore, the establishment of collaboration must precede or coincide with curriculum and instructional work by
Collaboration is likely not something to be pursued for its own sake. As Little (1987, 1992) stresses, teachers must have something meaningful to collaborate about, with an end goal towards which to strive. When teachers are joined by like values, and when those values have a professional focus, it is likely that the realization of educational goals will be greater through collaborative action. Therefore, if teachers are interested in improving curriculum and practice, they may wish to make cultural changes to the extent of working collaboratively, so that they may then proceed in a collaborative manner onto strategies requiring collegial debate and research. The manipulation of culture in order to work collaboratively can be seen, in some ways, as confusing cause with effect. Collaboration is itself a route to cultural change.

Structural requirements of collaboration. Most writers have been of the opinion that large structural changes are essential for establishing collaborative cultures. However, and similarly to that discussed under the heading of culture, collaboration can also be seen as a structural change; collaboration is an organizational arrangement. Facilitating arrangements for collaboration allows collegial relations to become part of the structural organization of education.

While changes must be made in order to facilitate teachers and administrators working together, it can be seen that collaboration represents a manifestation of what is necessary to achieve innovation in the business of teaching. Collaboration may be the structural and organizational arrangement required to advance educational practice. Of course, how this realization is interpreted is crucial.

Hargreaves et al. (1990a, 1992a, 1992b) are adamant that certain strategies such as peer coaching lead to “contrived collegiality.” Indeed, there is ample evidence from Hargreaves and from Grimmett and Crehan (1992) that administrative imposition will
likely result in a pseudo form of collaboration. Perhaps structural changes must be determined by the intent of those modifications. Having people work together may be superficially collegial, but not collaborative. If the debate Grimmett and Crehan (1992) speak of is lacking, or the goal of enhancing educational practice for students and teachers ignored (Lieberman et al., 1991, 1992a, 1992b; Barth, 1990), Hargreaves’ caution regarding contrived collegiality is probably well founded. If the collegiality practised is not in Grimmett and Crehan’s (1992) terms “interdependent,” then what may be experienced is a collegiality more closely related to congeniality. As such, perhaps a real and definable distinction can be made between the terms collegiality, and both interdependent collegiality and collaboration. In that the latter two indicate shared professional values, it would seem that organizational planning must be guided by values which develop the overall educational enterprise. Furthermore, that development must take place in a way so as to become self-perpetuating.

**Collaboration and curriculum development and evaluation--collaboration and instructional innovation.** Writers such as Lieberman et al. (1991, 1992a, 1992b) and Miller (1988) have maintained that development in the areas of curriculum writing, evaluation, and instructional innovation is a means of establishing collaboration. However, writers such as Grimmett and Crehan (1992) show that instructional innovation may not happen at all when collaboration is absent. In essence, one does not need instructional innovation to establish collaboration, but must pursue collaboration in order to improve instructional practice. Whether teachers should be writing curriculum is probably, as Holmes (1991) contends, a political issue, but if it is to be done effectively, it should be done collaboratively.

**Collaboration and conceptual modes of teaching.** With agreement from Holmes (1991), Huberman (1992) trumpets the notion of teachers as craft persons. While
Huberman maintains teachers can benefit from collegiality, he also indicates they should be able to opt in and out of such relationships. In general, the notion of teacher as artisan/craft person is not disagreed with anywhere in the literature surveyed. However, the notion of teachers opting in and out of collaborative ventures at will is considerably more volatile.

The instructional supervision model of Grimmett and Crehan (1992) is a notable example of that which encourages the committed participation by teachers and administrators. Therefore, whether or not a person can refuse to work collaboratively becomes a means of defining collaboration. If instructors are not asked to work collaboratively, and are not motivated to do so, then it is unlikely they will. Collaboration then becomes a strategy which allows teachers to reject demanding, but potentially educative situations--a model which does not resemble Grimmett and Crehan's (1992) paradigm of "instructional supervision." Teaching faculty who are motivated, however, may choose the route of experiment and debate. Nonetheless, beyond the strictures of bureaucratic conformity, the notion of teachers as artisans and craft persons in no way guarantees that they (teachers) will desire to work collaboratively. Indeed, and according to Huberman (1992), it may mean a rejection of collegial practice on the part of some practitioners.

General Conclusions

Operation of collaborative culture. Perhaps the feature which most clearly separates the various conceptions of collaboration is needs and leadership. The literature is unquestionably divided on the necessity--and nature--of administrative leadership to both establish and maintain collaboration, and the establishment of collegiality by teachers who do so from their desire to reform educational practice. While the latter position would likely include some level of administrative assistance, that help is primarily
specified as the encouragement by and standing aside of administrators; Hargreaves' notion regarding the devolution of responsibilities for curriculum writing is a prime example of the latter. What has to be considered is whether it is realistically possible to achieve Hargreaves' model of devolution, and if accomplished, whether sufficient numbers of teachers will be motivated to engage in the collaborative process.

The majority of writers indicate that administrative assistance is needed beyond the gestures of standing aside and providing inspiration. As well, both the early ideas of Hargreaves (1989) and the model of Grimmett and Crehan appear to recognize the potential shortcomings of both teachers and administrators regarding the implementation of educational initiatives. However, in that they continue to uphold a strong administrative role, Grimmett and Crehan's conception appears to occupy the ground between that of Hargreaves' and the models of writers such as Lieberman et al. and Schwartz. Grimmett and Crehan also appear to agree with Little and Holmes—public education policy decisions prescribing what can and cannot be determined at the school and district levels will affect conceptions of collaboration. Indeed, the role of administrators, while open to debate, requires both thorough study and legislative change before it is relegated to that of "handing over" responsibility. Still, Barth's notion of administrators as coalition builders resonates with much of the research considered. His contention that the investment of authority and power in teachers by administrators will strengthen education is rarely questioned. However, that notion clearly retains final authority for the educational enterprise with those who are handing over authority, namely, administrators. While that fact may disturb those who wish to reduce administrative influence, it is a crucial factor when defining collaboration.

Collaborative culture defined. With some variation, and with attention to the most compelling models, the term collaborative culture appears to indicate a self-
perpetuating school culture oriented towards enhancing the educational experience of both students and teachers. As such, collaboration is a notion squarely based on the establishment of a shared system of professional values. Activities associated with collaboration may include instructional innovation and curriculum planning. Not surprisingly, researchers have identified severe problems with the engineering of collaboration, not the least of which has been labelled both as "contrived collegiality" and "administratively imposed collegiality."

Consideration of a general lack of collaboration has led some writers to propose collaborative strategies that satisfy responsibilities for instructional improvement (Grimmett and Crehan, 1992—"instructional supervision"). Inherent in such a view is the notion that unequal competencies and diverse areas of expertise allow for a positive generation of ideas and insights. As well, the component of supervision may add an urgency to the enterprise that might not otherwise exist.

Railing against the idea of administrators controlling collaborative relations, other writers have proposed a hands off policy, leaving teachers to collaborate in individual ways (Cole, 1990; Hargreaves et al., 1990a, 1992a, 1992b). However, evidence supporting the case for administrative leadership in light of entrenched traditional teacher and school cultures indicates the need for what has been termed "organizationally induced collegiality" (Grimmett & Crehan, 1992). That is, administrative assistance is indicated. Sufficient evidence also exists to conclude that establishing collaborative cultures rests on the sharing of educational values, and that until common values are established, it is unlikely that collaboration can be engineered, at least not without negative consequences (e.g., "contrived collegiality" and "administratively imposed collegiality"). Therefore, certain strategies such as coaching are likely contraindicated. The emphasis placed on values also appears to overshadow the dilemma of whether
to first institute cultural or structural changes (establishing collaboration). However, while researchers may emphasize one or the other, it is certainly clear that structural and cultural factors are profoundly interrelated.

Similarly, it also remains that no matter how compelling the arguments of writers such as Hargreaves (1989) and Cole (1990), teachers must themselves bear some responsibility for the cultural morass in which they apparently find themselves. Grimmett and Crehan’s (1992) observation that some educators mistakenly equate professional autonomy with teacher seclusion and secrecy would appear to support that notion.

Interestingly, Hargreaves appears to contradict himself regarding the same question. While, on one hand, he (Hargreaves, 1989) prescribes specific behaviours by which teachers may establish collaboration, on the other hand (1990a, 1992a, 1992b), he eschews any specific directive save giving teachers the freedom to solve their cultural predicament.

Evidence also supports the idea of collaboration as much more than pleasant or congenial relations. As specified above, a culture of collaboration virtually demands the challenging of traditional ideas and concepts—hardly a feature of congeniality. Furthermore, working cooperatively and attending to the regular business items of schools may not represent collaborative action, though it may demand it. In fact, collaboration may be identified as the best means to work out contentious problems and develop strategies for change. While virtually all authors used the terms collegiality and collaboration interchangeably, the latter may signify a cultural shift oriented well beyond the handling of system problems, but in fact towards changing the system. Indeed, Grimmett and Crehan’s (1992) label "strong interdependent collegiality" (p. 64) indicates operational relationships far beyond the notion of simply cooperative or
colllegial connections. Furthermore, and as noted above, these differences may prompt a differentiation between the terms collegial, and collaboration, though the notion of an interdependent collegiality would seem to refer to the latter (collaboration).

It might be said that a culture of collaboration not only represents cultural and structural change, but is based on both. Collaboration does not appear to be an end unto itself (or particular goal), but a cultural and structural tool for educational change, a tool which is based on the realization that interdependency amongst possibly diverse individuals will enhance educational practice.

This fact indicates that someone within the educational system must risk change prior to the renewal of teacher and school cultures. Whether teachers or administrators are seen as the catalysts for change, the notion of collaboration must find its genesis in visible and tangible leadership.

The debate on collaboration may also indicate a general challenging of administrative leadership within education. In fact, some discussions may reflect a cultural chauvinism oriented against administration of any kind. If this is the case, the full consideration of collaboration may prove difficult, and debate of the same (collaboration) a misplaced stage for dissent.

Summary of Conclusions

The following summary integrates information presented under the headings Specific Conclusions (p. 94) and General Conclusions (p. 97). An integrated approach has been employed in order to tie together all outcomes of this study. To provide the reader with practical knowledge, the following points have been arranged to begin with definitional conclusions, and end with those that concern the implementation and establishment of collaboration:
1. Collaboration is both a cultural and structural tool for effecting educational change. It is not indicated to be an educational goal or end to be achieved for its own sake.

2. Collaboration is an organizational arrangement which allows for and includes interdependent collegial relations. At the same time, the institution of collaboration is in itself a cultural change, which is only possible via an agreement of professional values.

3. The terms Interdependent Collegiality, and Collaboration, both indicate the sharing of professional values, as well as organizational planning aimed at improving the entire educational enterprise—educators working together to solve problems that have been defined via a common set of beliefs.

4. With consideration given to the nature of cultural and structural change, it is likely that such changes must be predetermined by the establishment of common values.

5. In addition to a foundation of common values, collaboration is based on the sharing of different abilities and varying areas of expertise.

6. Collaborative plans not based on common values may result in imposed views, which may in turn lead to contrived collegiality and/or administratively imposed collegiality. Consequently, the establishment of shared educational goals must precede the implementation of any collaborative arrangement.

7. In that collaboration is the method employed to sort out dilemmas and to effect change, it may be anything but a congenial process.

8. Administrative leadership is essential to the establishment of collaboration, otherwise teacher isolation and seclusion may prevail, with the outcome of little or no interdependent collegiality.
9. While instructional and curricular innovation will likely benefit from collaboration, it is incorrect to presume that collaboration will result from the act of curriculum writing.

10. Collaboration is a model that will likely not function effectively when teachers need not be committed to the practice (opting in and out). Not to commit and opt out, especially when faced with difficult issues, may be to sidestep the process at the point of greatest return.

11. Collaborative culture is generally described as the entrenchment of collegial practice oriented towards enhancing the educational experience of both students and teachers. As such, collaborative culture is seen as a self-perpetuating cultural entity.

12. The establishment of collaboration involves the factors of authority and influence. The roles of teacher culture (needs) and administrative leadership are central to the debate surrounding collaboration. The most compelling voices argue for a balance between these two poles, in effect creating a renewed partnership between administrative and non-administrative educators. This partnership would be bound by common values and goals for improving the educational enterprise.

13. Despite evidence supporting the need for executive leadership, many writers deny administrators a substantial role in the establishment of collaborative relationships. Therefore, the debate on and advocacy for collaboration may be as much a protest against school administrators as a call for collaborative relationships.

14. Since collaboration is an interdependency amongst diverse individuals, its establishment demands risk in the form of leadership. Who provides that leadership is perhaps not as much an issue as the fact that it is available. However, strong evidence exists that it is more likely to come from administrators, including that delivered in the form of instructional supervision.
Answering the original questions.

1. **What behaviours define collaborative cultures?** While this question has been addressed above, it bears repeating that collaborative cultures appear to support debate and experimentation. However, these activities or behaviours must take place within an environment of shared values and goals. Collaboration appears to be a strategy that has teachers, and teachers and administrators work interdependently to improve practice.

2. **How do conceptions of collaboration found in the literature compare?** While many differences have been discussed, the most notable dissimilarities may concern both the establishment of collaboration and the purposeful functioning of collaborative cultures. Arguments both for and against administrative leadership have highlighted concerns for the former, and the distinction between congenial relations and serious debate have marked the latter.

3. **Is collaboration a behavioural goal (end) or a means to some other purpose(s), or, is it an indicator of the effectiveness of personnel practices?** With some disagreement, the literature indicates that collaboration and the establishment of collaborative cultures is not necessarily an end, but a manifestation of cultural and structural change in order to achieve particular goals. Therefore, while an intent to work collaboratively *per se* may be difficult to justify—though by no means entirely questionable—facilitating instructional improvement via "interdependent collegiality" may warrant necessary and costly structural and cultural changes. As well, teacher collaborative culture is, in itself, both a structural and cultural change.

If collaboration is to be accepted as an indicator of personnel practices, then choices and development of both teachers and administrators will have to be judged, with a likely emphasis on executive leadership. However, establishing collaboration
may not only reflect how a district hires, but also indicate what measures against cultural stagnation are pursued. Most of all, when considering collaborative relations, the formation of comprehensive district management policies, which include the concerns of all parties, is implied.

4. Is collaboration a meaningless slogan, or behaviour worth dedicating sparse educational resources towards? Evidence indicates that as a goal unto itself, collaboration should likely be considered a meaningless slogan. Little (1992), Huberman (1991), and Hargreaves et al. (1990a, 1992a, 1992b) all indicate, despite the many and unbridled calls for its development, that collaboration is not a panacea for the problems of education. Furthermore, Little (1987, 1992), and Grimmett and Crehan (1992) underscore the necessity of directing the cultural and structural tools of collaborative relations towards useful and pressing goals. Little also emphasizes the necessity of ensuring that teachers are engaged in efforts that capture their interest. It can be concluded then that when teachers are engaged in pursuits which are both rewarding and will enhance educational practice, and those pursuits will benefit from collaboration, then collaboration will be worth investing in.

Implications for Theory, Research and Practice

Theory

The subject of this inquiry--teacher collaborative culture--appears from the literature as a strategy that may embrace many of the cultural and structural features of modern educational practice, including decentralization and the so-called professionalization of teachers. Since collaborative cultures might function positively to affect every corner of the educational enterprise, it must be fully appreciated for its potential; otherwise, educational reform may not benefit from a valuable cultural and structural
Similarly, educational theory must deal with collaborative cultures other than as a panacea (as some writers have indicated). A critical appreciation is required to prevent collaboration from being misunderstood and relegated to the status of slogan. That being said, it would appear from this study that as an end unto itself, collaboration is a false educational goal.

Research

As summarized in Figure 10 (p. 83), the real benefits of collaboration for students has received relatively little attention. Da Costa's (1993) study into the "teaching-learning relationship" is one of the very few to investigate this association. Furthermore, da Costa's research indicates a number of discrepancies between the expectations of the literature and his own empirical findings. Amongst other results, his work indicates that teachers who collaborate without observing each other tend to have lower "personal teaching efficacy," while those who collaborate and observe their partners tend to have higher "personal teaching efficacy" (p. 165). In order to understand more fully these relationships, as well as to address a number of concerns, da Costa calls for additional investigation. In particular, he asks for research that will replicate or refute his own findings (p. 172).

The direct influence of teacher collaborative cultures needs to be more fully explored. As mentioned, the immediate effect of collaboration on pupils has not been a feature of the debate, which since it (collaboration) has been described as a tool, must be considered a serious omission. If it is to be fully understood as a vehicle for change, it is necessary to understand the effect of collaboration on pupils.

By the evidence presented, the role of needs requires additional investigation. If teachers are indeed capable of cultural transformation based on the perception of
needs, the indication of that will have to be provided through empirical research. Collaboration is simply too rarely practised to base its advocacy on expectations and potential change.

Before the role of the school administrator is relegated to that of giving up authority, the function of the contemporary school executive requires additional consideration. Furthermore, precisely what responsibilities, if any, should be handed over, requires clarification. What legally can be relinquished must also be made explicit.

**Practice**

If, as the literature indicates, collaboration is the ideal route for harnessing the problem solving potential of administrators and teachers, the cultural and structural changes necessary for collaboration must be facilitated. It may also come about that collaborative practice will gradually seep into the system, incurring incremental costs over a long period of time. As well, and where supervision models have been established, the ideas of writers such as Grimmett and Crehan (1992) may not incur significant costs (in which case collaboration can be seen as a truly cultural phenomenon).

If the debate on collaboration accomplishes nothing else, it focuses on the fact that always working independently is open to question. However, the converse may also be true; perpetually working in collaborative situations may be equally inhibiting.

Educators must not view teacher collaborative culture as something which can be merely put into place when desired. Collaboration has been shown to be that which requires both a cultural progression and transformation. As distinct from a notion based solely on procedure, collaboration depends on the establishment of values and the pursuit of common professional goals. Collaboration is not an outcome; it is the tool by which professional goals are achieved.

Relations which are both congenial and collegial do not amount to collaboration.
The terms interdependent collegiality and collaboration both imply a deeper and riskier involvement in the solving of educational problems.
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**Abstract**

Barth's *opinion piece* (190 pages) explores how the visions of teachers, parents, and principals may ultimately produce lasting and meaningful change in public schools. The author stresses that it is up to those who inhabit schools to narrow the "gap" between how schools function and how school people want them to function. The desires of the public notwithstanding, Barth believes that school reform is contingent on whether the immediate players accept forthcoming change. He believes that prescriptive alterations ("lists" of descriptors from outside the practitioners' community) are always threatened by a rejection from those who teach. The author argues that just as it is difficult to remain enthusiastic about another person's ideas, it is hard to implement reforms that are externally generated. However, as Barth laments, it seems that educators are rarely listened to, and often shelve their own ideas. Nonetheless, the author proposes that unless they advocate their own notions for school improvement, educators will indeed be overtaken by outside reforms (e.g., propositions from legislators, special interest groups etc.).

Barth bases his thesis on the twin concepts of "communities of learners" and "communities of leaders." Schools are described as institutions that do not adequately model learning, and so a revised conceptual model for education is required. The teacher-principal relationship is blamed for this state of affairs. Research findings (primarily the author's own direct /anecdotal experience as director of the Harvard Principals Center) are quoted to show a causal link between how teachers and principals relate, and the establishment of both successful and unsuccessful schools. It is suggested that principals may do well to safeguard the interests of teachers, thereby freeing the creative and constructive capabilities of the latter. Instead however, Barth finds that principals are increasingly caught between listening to outside authorities, and the desires and wishes of teachers. Principals and teachers rarely communicate about educational issues and concerns. The author stresses that principals must acquaint themselves with what teachers can do and want to do. As well, it is expressed that teachers must take increased responsibility for their professional interests, including the success of the school itself. The notion of "communities of learners" and "leaders" is put forward as a foundation for meaningful change.

Collegial relations are at the heart of the author's notions. Barth cites Judith Warren Little (1981) regarding a conception of collegiality:

"Adults in schools talk about practice. Adults in schools observe each other
engaged in the practice of teaching and administration. Adults engage together in work on curriculum by planning, designing, researching, and evaluating curriculum. . . . adults in schools teach each other what they know about teaching, learning, and leading. Craft knowledge is revealed, articulated, and shared” (p. 31).

The author cites research that shows collegial schools to have successful students and satisfied practitioners. He concludes that the degree to which teachers make decisions and handle responsibility will determine the extent to which they (teachers) feel empowered and in control of their professional lives, and, feel “adult.” Therefore, Barth believes that educational reform must include the concept of the school as a community of learners and leaders. To this end, the author questions the use of descriptors for success developed outside of the educational community. Instead, he proposes that schools already contain the potential for change, including that which is available from students.

Crucial to Barth’s concept of collegiality is the notion of ownership. He stresses that both principals and teachers must become actively involved in the solving of school problems. Furthermore, such action will necessitate the handing down of direction from principals to teachers. In fact, and rather than serving as an authority figure, Barth ruminates on how the contemporary effective principal must become a “coalition builder.” As well, the author outlines the advantages for teachers and principals who explore their anxieties and strengths through the medium of writing. Similarly, practitioners can spread the word about successes and strategies, and above all, teacher culture, through writing and publication. Barth feels that it is incumbent on universities to expedite this process.

A fundamental component of Barth’s message is the notion that teachers and principals all learn in unique ways, and that all practitioners have some leadership abilities (Barth supports this contention primarily through the recollection of personal experience). The author states how principals can build leadership amongst teachers, even where very little if any delegation had previously existed. His methods include: “Articulating the Goal. . .Relinquishing Authority to Teachers. . .Involving Teachers Before Decisions Are Made. . .Shared Responsibility for Failure. . .Teachers Take Credit for Success. . .[striving for] Communities of Leaders” (pp. 133-146). However, and most importantly, all of the above strategies must result in teachers and principals feeling able to develop and express their own visions of how schooling should occur. Strategies outlined include that of “teaching pairs”: teachers are matched in pairs (for each assignment) in order to collaborate on instructional and curriculum planning.

While this book is primarily concerned with the author’s experiences and findings through the Harvard Principals Center, other references are made. These include mention of the work of: Adler (1982); Edmonds (1979); Elam (1989); Goodlad (1984); Levine, Barth, and Haskins, (1987); Little (1981); Lortie (1975); and Sizer (1984). As
well, the findings of the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy (1986), the Holmes Group (1986), and the Center for Policy and Analysis, National Governors' Association (1991) are mentioned. There is also some reference to the possible influence of the Paedia Proposal (Adler, 1982).

**Major Themes**

- crisis of confidence in American public schools; the deterioration of teacher/principal relationships; a lack of consultation with educators regarding proposals for school reform; collegiality between teachers, and teachers and principals (within which is considered the notion of teaching pairs); teachers and principals as both learners and leaders; schools as communities of learners and leaders, including parents and students; the need for school people to assert their vision of what they want schools to be; and the apparently positive effects of collegial schools on student's learning


**Abstract**

In this *opinion piece* Calderhead examines “reflective practice” within the context of teacher education. He investigates the specifics of “reflective practice,” as well as any conceptual difficulties that may exist. He eventually concludes that “reflective teaching” is presently no more than a “slogan.” However, he believes that it has the potential to become a “working principle” in teacher education.

Inherent in Calder’s view is the position that student teachers, let alone those with experience, must have a conceptual grasp of reflection. Such a clarification would not only guide practitioners about what to reflect upon, but also contextualize reflection with regard to their educational situations (practicums and lectures), and contribute towards the knowledge and skills required to interpret those observations. Calderhead cites writers who define reflection as an act of deliberation: Gauthier (1963), Polanyi (1967), Wiggins (1978), Van Manen (1977), and Schwab (1971). As such, reflection is viewed as both a “moral” and “rational” process for making decisions. However, it is indicated that educators influenced by the Frankfurt School of Social Research, and in particular Habermas (1974), subscribe to a different concept of reflection. This notion is labelled the “critical science” approach, and is based on the learning of specific scientific skills and understandings. It is also described as self-determining.

There is, then, considerable diversity regarding the “... process of reflection (e.g.,
reflection-in-action, curricular deliberation), the content of reflection (e.g., teachers' own values, societal context, educational theory), the preconditions of reflection (e.g., the attitudes for reflection, the tutorial context in which reflection occurs), and the product of reflection (e.g., effective teaching, emancipation, and understanding of the relationship between values and practice)" (p. 44). For instance, where Schon (1983, 1987) proposes a model of "reflection-in-action" dependent on a teacher/student teacher coaching relationship, critical science advocates have touted the opposite: namely, the avoidance of early exposure to schools and the learning of craft knowledge from the experienced teacher.

The author suggests that while useful research exists regarding the cognitive understandings of teachers and student teachers, knowledge of the practitioner, and the context of teacher training, more effort has to be made to place student teachers where reflection is truly possible. Calderhead stresses that without the essential knowledge, skills and dispositions, reflective practice may in fact be more destructive than instructive, if not plainly unworkable. Therefore, the author calls for empirical research into reflective practice for the student teacher.

Besides those writers already mentioned, this paper cites the work of: Borko, Livingston, McCaleb and Mauro (1988); Feiman-Nemser and Buchmann (1987); Calderhead (1987); Korthagen (1988); Russell (1988); Lacey (1977); Zeichner, Tabachnick and Densmore (1987); Clandinin (1986); Butt, Raymond, McCue and Yamagishi (1987); and Knowles (1987). There is an extensive list of references.

Major Themes

-the development of a clearly defined conceptual model of reflective teaching; the incompatibility of most teacher education programs with reflective practice by student teachers; the variations in approach to reflective practice, including coaching and non-coaching models; and the need for empirical research into teacher education programs which include reflective practice


Abstract

Using data from the first year of a two year qualitative study of "workplace relationships and teacher development," this 28 page research report concerns the defensibility of
"partnership programs" for new teachers. Specifically, the author compares those elements of human development highlighted in the works of Brim and Wheeler (1966) (self-socialization), and Erickson (1963) (psychosocial development), with the self-stated and observed needs of novice practitioners (self-socialization, colleagueship, community, and opportunity). The argument is then put forward and defended that "... self-socialization is a necessary part of a new teacher's transition to teaching and contributes in important ways to the psychosocial aspects of their development" (p. 9). Furthermore, it is contended that mandatory collegial relationships (partnership programs) do not satisfy those needs of self-socialization, but that "caring and helping communities of learners" creating collaborative settings do (p. 25). This paper draws on observations of thirteen teachers from one school site (elementary) situated within a public school board in southwestern Ontario (data samples for the master study were taken from 3 elementary schools and 1 high school).

Utilizing the literature on both human development and teacher development, the author formulates a number of questions designed to determine whether the needs outlined in the former are positively indicated in the latter. These include:

1. "With whom do beginning teachers form relationships in their new professional contexts?"
2. "What is the nature of these relationships?"
3. "What functions do they serve?"
4. "Are some relationships more important at some times than others?"
5. "How do certain relationships facilitate or constrain the various aspects of teacher development?"
6. "Can facilitating relationships be contrived?"
7. "Can contrived relationships be facilitating?"
8. "What role does context play in all of this?"

Examining the record of "mandated collegiality" (Quaglia & Rog, 1989), the author discovers that teachers have found such programs often unhelpful, with educators preferring to build working relationships with colleagues of their choice. Indeed, practitioners reported that they would set up a varied number of "collegueships" to satisfy a number of different needs. Cole contends that where assigned partnerships do enjoy some success (Huffman & Leak, 1986; Killion, 1990; Shulman & Colbert, 1988), that success remains limited by the extent to which they are "facilitative" and "significant."

Collecting data from a "collegial" school (Riverside Elementary), Cole discovers the same dynamics at play regarding assisting relationships. Where a partnership program was attempted, an overwhelming majority of teachers chose instead to develop a web of informal relationships. Furthermore, this network was as varied as the interests and needs of the individual participants. The author also stressed that the teachers at Riverside only did what other educators would do had they the chance. Significantly, educators at the site school were encouraged to pursue the collaborative action which
suited them, and they did not choose the partnership program. As well, evidence (anecdotal) is brought forward illustrating the benefits to the culture and running of the school as a whole. Such evidence leads the author to conclude that teachers desire the opportunity to develop “caring” and “sharing” working relationships with whom they will most benefit.

The project as a whole is described as being based on a “participatory planning model (Bach & Morley, 1987) of program development,” which reportedly places the subjects at the centre of inquiry (p. 10). As well, the study was conducted according to the tenets of “naturalistic inquiry.” As such, both “vignettes” and “pre-structured cases” were employed for data collection along with “... regular individual in-depth interviews and/or small group discussions with the project participants and more intensive observations at each school” (p. 11). The above stated questions guided the research throughout the process, and field notes and audio tapes were employed for recording observations.

Besides those references already mentioned, the author cites the following authors: Barth (1990), Cole (1990a, 1990b), Hargreaves (1990), Little (1990), Lortie (1975), Noddings (1986), Odell (1989), Sarason (1972), Thiessen (1991), and Veenman (1984).

**Major Themes**

- self-socialization and psychosocial development of teachers; ill effects of partnership programs (mandated collegiality); positive effects of open teacher collaborative relationships (“a helping an caring community of learners”--“participatory planning”); context of school and teacher development; teacher professionalism and professional growth (ownership); teacher empowerment; trial and error vs. participatory planning (group planning, interclass visitations, physical restructuring); craft knowledge (sharing of); and overall development of professional intimacy


**Abstract**

This research review (53 pages--56 annotated bibliographies) examines literature on peer coaching. The paper discusses the concept of peer coaching (Section 1), various models of “peer coaching programs” (Section 2), studies which report positive
findings (Section 3), and studies which report negative findings (Section 4). Drew explains that her desire to explore lasting and successful programs of teacher development sparked her interest in peer coaching.

Findings from the literature include that peer coaching is usually conceived of as a process, and that upon completion of training, allows peers to observe and give each other nonjudgmental feedback. As well, and despite a limited amount of literature, the very notion of peer coaching is shown to overlap the idea of collaboration and "educator effectiveness." Generally, however, the model is regarded by a majority of writers to hold promise for teachers, and by extension, students.

Limitations on inquiry mentioned by the author include the preponderance of "prescriptive" literature (as opposed to documented "research"). As well, what research is available is often problematic—either ecological conditions such as time are insufficient to provide conclusive findings, or instrumentation is not sufficient for "statistical analyses."

The author provides highlights from the literature, a selection of which is presented in the following points:

1. Training teachers to improve their instructional performance and that of their colleagues prompted the coining of the term "peer coaching" (Joyce, 1986).
4. Most conceptions of coaching make use of Joyce's five steps of "... theory, observation, practice, feedback, and coaching for application" (p. 37).
5. Besides improving instructional expertise, it is suggested coaching can also engender collegiality (Showers, 1984), and reduce teacher isolation (Rothberg, 1985).
6. Nonjudgmental feedback was advocated by Brophy (1979).
7. Peer collaboration via observation and feedback has also been advocated (Rorschach & Whitney, 1985).
8. Research has shown that high achieving schools practice the "concepts of peer coaching" (Little, 1982). Specifically, Sparks (1986) observed an increase in student achievement due to peer coaching (the transfer of positive effects from teachers to students).
9. Gilman (1988) noted that the enhancement of teacher effectiveness through peer coaching resulted in improved student attitudes.
10. Alfonso (1977) and Grimmert (1987) recognized the limitations of peer coaching where a lack of teacher and administrative cooperation conspired against collegial action.
11. Garmston (1987) stressed "teacher ownership" and "administrative involvement" for the successful implementation of the method.
The author concludes with a number of recommendations for research: (a) consideration of the effects of teacher personality on the implementation of peer coaching; (b) effects of peer coaching on student performance; (c) determination of which, if any, teaching strategies are particularly suited to peer coaching; (d) determination of whom should coach; and (e) the investigation of peer coaching and preservice training. As well, Drew recommends that administrators be properly trained as coaches prior to that type of service, and that teachers be offered specific incentives to train for peer coaching programs.

Major Themes

- peer coaching, teacher collaboration, coaching training, non-evaluative coaching, transfer of training for teachers, effect of peer coaching on student achievement (both positive and inconclusive correlations), lack of research, and problematic research


Abstract

As indicated by the title, this collection of opinion pieces features nine separately written outlooks on the future of staff development for the year 2000. Mary Hatwood Futrell begins the article with the declaration that a consensus has been struck regarding the staff development needs of the 21st Century. Central to that consensus is the apparent desire for teacher empowerment, which is described as the "... prime prerequisite for substantive and lasting reform" (p. 2). However, she asks whether “America’s teachers” are ready for the freedom and responsibility of autonomous practice--freedom from the "... era of managerial imperialism" (p. 2). It is her express opinion that teacher empowerment can and must be forged via the functioning of teachers as visionaries, agitators, change agents, and enemies of “stasis.” It is also her position that teachers must begin collaboration with the business community in ways that ensure academic independence from “corporate priorities.”

Phillip C. Schlechty delineates between three separate models of teaching: (a) teachers as performers (analogous to actors, musicians, artists etc.), (b) teaching as a service profession (equivalent to law and medicine), and (c) teaching as a leadership profession (where practitioners function similarly to business leaders). Schlechty is unequivocal in his belief in the third conception, that teachers must learn to function as educational leaders both for students and the profession as a whole. He feels that
empowering students should be the aim of education, and that "inducing" students to learn is empowering. As well, and as opposed to "performing," or the delivery of a "service," he states that such inducement is only possible through educational leadership. In short, teacher leadership both allows and forces students to take charge of their own learning. It is Schlechty's contention that once teachers see themselves as leaders, the determination of instructional practice and style will be made by the context of the educational situation. Thus, practitioners will no longer be searching for the "one best method."

As opposed to merely improving the existing system, Judson Hixson outlines a recent trend to restructure the educational sector. Positive implications regarding such a shift are listed as: (a) an emphasis on "human resource development" (borrowed from the private sector); (b) an expansion of research knowledge to benefit staff development; (c) the proliferation of new and helpful technologies; and (d) the enlarged understanding that staff development "... is a people, not a policy process..." (p. 4). However, the author points out that much effort is needed to "refocus" staff development effort towards the ever increasing numbers of vulnerable students. As such, Hixson feels that teachers must function as change agents, and work together both with colleagues and students in order to change school culture and enhance student learning.

With regard to staff development, Ann Lieberman and Lynne Miller stress the need for encouraging "teacher inquiry," promoting "professional growth opportunities" particular to certain "school cultures," and accepting and dealing with the "inevitable" difficulties associated with change. The authors feel that these goals can be achieved by developing "(a) norms of colleagueship, openness, and trust; (b) opportunities and time for disciplined inquiry; (c) teacher learning of content in context; (d) reconstruction of leadership roles; and, [sic] (e) networks, collaborations, and coalitions" (p. 5). However, citing Hargreaves (1990) and Huberman (1990), Lieberman and Miller point out that educators are still researching collaborative formats that "... engage teachers, without frustrating or inhibiting their need for autonomy with their students" (p. 5). The authors feel that "loose coalitions" and "networks" hold potential for enlisting teachers to think about teaching and how their own practice can be improved, while also providing an atmosphere conducive to experimentation and risk.

Arthur L. Costa believes that the goals for students of the 21st Century must include the "capacity" for continuous learning, teamwork, sophisticated communication skills, appreciation of differing value systems, and "... problem solving requiring creativity" (p. 6). He stresses, however, that if these and other goals are to be realized, staff developers must have the means and skills to facilitate "... the collaborative efforts of school staffs, community groups, administrators, legislators, and board members to ...": (a) see the potential for formulizing and realizing educational vision, (b) use "action research" for both students and teachers to evaluate their progress and "instructional decisions" respectively, (c) retire "obsolete" curriculum and practice, and (d) evaluate their own advancement regarding the educational goals of the
Carl D. Glickman and Emily F. Calhoun warn that many schools may not be ready for the decentralization sweeping many districts and schools—that a lack of hard knowledge on the part of many staff developers and teachers make them easy prey for high priced commercial consultants. Therefore, the authors present a number of recommendations for staff development: (a) instead of purchasing programs, rely on local teachers to assess local needs for the improvement of student achievement; (b) “gather information not answers”; (c) develop experts within immediate and district staff; and (d) utilize “outside consultants” conservatively for assistance and/or added interest. The authors stress that the goal of education must be enhanced student achievement through “...more purposeful, professional, and inquiry-oriented schools” (p. 7).

Sarah D. Caldwell agrees that measurable increases in student achievement as well as organizational changes in schools are necessary goals for education. Action research is advocated by the author as a route to achieving these goals. As well, a shift from central authority to school level decision making will, in the author’s view, necessitate the need for “collaborative relationships.” Furthermore, these collaborative relationships must focus on “long range planning” towards the fulfilment of goals common to staff and community alike (p. 8). The ultimate aim may well turn out to be the accommodation of both “...individual and group development...” (p. 8). As such, the further “professionalization” of teaching will be based on “...the development of teacher leadership, decision-making, and active participation in reshaping schools” (p. 8).

Susan S. Ellis also feels that teachers have to become both conversant with and adept at using information about educational change and innovation. Furthermore, she expects them to assist their colleagues (teachers and administrators) in the same. Ultimately, however, rather than relying on the results of outside research as “solutions,” the author recommends the designing of “action research projects” that utilize the investigations of others as “starting points.” As such, staff development for the 21st Century is described as teachers collaborating to improve practice. However, that practice must suit the needs of the school as well as reflect the findings of research.

Madelaine Hunter touts the notion of combining research based knowledge on teaching with a sense of artistry (teacher as artisan). The combined concepts are seen as both interacting and constantly growing through the continuous learning of the practitioner. She outlines three characteristics of such a model: (a) “preservice education will be the launching pad for a continuum of enhanced professional effectiveness and artistry”; (b) professional preparation will extend to six or seven years with an intensely supervised internship which parallels that of the profession of medicine”; and (c) “proficiency skills will reflect current educational research” (p. 9). Similarly, as school systems include time for educators to study research, districts will increase expecta-
-teacher empowerment, autonomous practice; teachers as change agents (school culture), teacher collaboration and colleagueship (with colleagues and business community, and community groups, administrators, legislators and trustees - networks), teaching as a leadership profession (leadership roles), student empowerment through teacher empowerment, the matching of content and context of teacher practice and learning, human resource development vs. policy development, inclusion of educational research with human resource development models, staff development for at-risk students, teacher and student action inquiry (action oriented schools), collaborative formats and teacher autonomy (loose coalitions and networks that allow for both), retiring of obsolete curriculum and practice, development of teachers as experts (conservative use of consultants for assistance or interest), school goals formulated for student achievement, long range goals (common to staff and community) facilitated via collaborative relationships, accommodation of individual and group development, action research tailored to particular school situations but based on previous research, combining of research knowledge and teaching artistry, extended teaching internships, and teacher professionalism and accountability.


Abstract

This research report (40 pages) details the results of a cooperative venture involving the University of North Carolina (Greensboro) School of Education and Camp Lejeune Dependent Schools (North Carolina). Responding to recent trends in educational reform, the project was commenced in order to "... reduce teacher isolation, increase collaboration and improve instruction" (p. 20). The School Improvement Groups Network (SIGN) was also intended to address North Carolina Senate Bill 2 (SB2), which essentially called for the installation of "site-based management" systems into North Carolina schools. The legislation (SB2) is reported to have addressed the perception that bureaucratic reforms ("top-down") had not lead to meaningful educational change in North Carolina, and that both "voluntary" and locally generated "reform" programs held greater promise.
The study method pivoted on the forming of "school improvement" (collaborative) groups of teachers (each including one administrator) at four school sites within Camp Lejeune, N.C. (operated by the U.S. Department of Defence and the United States Marine Corps). Each of the schools were entrusted with setting goals particular to their needs. Examples included the establishment of a professional library, programs to intervene on behalf of "at risk" students, enhancement of communication regarding learner outcomes and curriculum goals, introduction of a collaborative structure for school "planning" and "governance," and a five year plan for "school improvement." The latter project also embraced goals regarding collaborative planning and decision making at both the "school and system level."

Already encouraging teachers to participate in the "decision-making process" via "teaching teams," "teacher advisory groups" and "curriculum councils," the Camp Lejeune Dependents' Schools are described as having a tradition of recognized excellence. As well, additional ecological information such as school demographics are given. The project is stated as a quasi-experimental study using a "'one-shot' pre/post design and equivalent control or comparison groups" as specified by Campbell and Stanley design #3 (1963) (p. 5). While the methodology is stated as using both qualitative and quantitative techniques, a "case study design" was the prime method for data collection: it was felt to be the "best means for exploring a complex educational and social process" (p. 7). The paper includes a discussion of qualitative research in general, and the case study design in particular, and addresses the concerns of reliability, dependability, validity and generalizability. It is the contention of the study's authors that it is more useful to approach reliability in qualitative research via the pursuit of dependability. This has been done by addressing the following: "(1) assumptions and theories underlying the study; (2) procedures and social context of the study; and (3) multiple methods of data collection" (p. 11). Indeed, all points are given attention in the paper through a discussion of the literature, methods, and site description. The study is described as relying on "thick description" for "reader generalizability and the exploration of concrete universals" (p. 9).

The results of the project include those described as "paper products": "strategic plans," a "statement of student outcomes," and a "governance structure" proposal. Significantly, interviews (pre and post) highlighted positive feelings by participants regarding the inclusion of principals, enhancement of communications, collaboration, and "goal accomplishment." Evaluations also indicated that participants attributed a higher degree of collegiality, productivity and effectiveness to SIGN than traditional in-service, and applauded that projects struck by school based teams still received central office support. Opportunities to develop "experts" within "school groups" were highlighted.

Teachers also indicated their wish to remain involved with the projects beyond the initial term. Specifically, 21 participant/respondents reported "... that Sign had reduced isolation and increased collaboration to improve instruction" (p. 22). Eleven
participants expressed that "collegial/collaborative interaction" was the most impressive outcome of SIGN, and while nine teachers listed working together as the most significant result, eight mentioned "empowerment." As well, many teachers felt the results would be long lasting, and indeed several developments were adopted by the entire Camp Lejeune system of schools. "Observable changes" were reported as including dealing with "at-risk" students, "increased parent involvement," "student involvement in school improvement," and "more clearly stated exit skills by grade level..." (p. 19).

Problems of the study were also specified, including the expense and time constraints of case methodology, and the inability and/or lack of desire of some principals to fully participate. The entire study was funded by the North Carolina Small Grants School-Based Research Program, 1989-90. Data collecting forms and documents were appended in the report.

Reference citations include Achilles and DuVall (1989); Brubaker (1985); D'Amico (1989); Daresh (1987); Joyce, Murphy and Showers (1989); Keedy (1988, 1989); Marburger (1989); Merriam (1988); Timar (1989); and White (1989).

Major Themes

- teacher isolation (need to reduce); teacher collaboration (need to increase); instructional improvement (need for); effects of collegiality on teacher productivity and effectiveness (positive); teacher collaboration and empowerment (links between); central office support for teacher decision making; difficulty of some educators regarding the exercise of new influence; role of principals vis-a-vis teacher collegiality and teacher/principal collegiality; teachers as experts in their own schools; and the effect of teacher collaboration on student achievement (positive)


Abstract

In this research report (40 pages) Grimmett and Crehan explore conceptions of collegiality found within instructional supervision. In doing so, they ask how teachers develop through "reflective transformation" via instructional supervision. The authors present evidence for the existence of three models: administratively imposed collegiality, organizationally induced collegiality, and interdependent collegiality. Analyzing each
for evidence of reflective transformation, they conclude that only within the bounds of interdependent collegiality can such development occur. Utilizing the work of Schon (1983), the conception of a "reflective transformation of experience" is based on a teacher's ability and likelihood to experiment, explore, and "reconstruct" their "classroom practice": "Reflective transformation of experience can be said to have taken place when a teacher manifests evidence of naming the things to which he or she will attend and framing the context in which he or she will attend to them" (p. 7).

Analyzing two clinical supervision settings, the authors find evidence for the models of collegiality named above. In that a principal or other administrator acts as the source of leadership and expertise in a supervision model, administratively imposed collegiality is essentially a form of what Hargreaves (1989) apparently terms contrived collegiality. That is, the situation is constructed so that collegiality is subscribed to rather than believed in by both parties. The inability of this model to provide for teacher "reflective practice" is an interpretation of one subject's (Audrey) lack of "response" when supervisory criteria were solely established by the principal. Similar shortcomings were attributed to organizationally induced collegiality (also a subset of contrived collegiality), where one or both (in this case the principal) parties fail to transcend the conceptual limits of everyday language and understanding in order to develop new insights. Finally, when players can move beyond the limits of "rank and form," interdependent collegiality can become manifest, and allow reflective transformation and the development of new strategies (Barry). Specifically, and with the insight of his principal, Barry was able to self-diagnose instructional difficulties and search for solutions that were not bounded by his principal's separate agenda and perceptions. These observations lead the authors to conclude that where contrived collegiality perpetuates practice without "internalization of the beliefs and values" that form the basis of that practice, interdependent collegiality allows for the opposite: "... interdependent collegiality would seem to be less preoccupied with the artifacts, and more concerned with the essential philosophy behind collaboration" (p. 36). Finally, the authors conclude:

... teacher development through the reflective transformation of experience is more likely to occur when teachers work collaboratively with other teachers in a culture of interdependent collegiality rather than when they work with their principals in conditions of contrived collegiality under the aegis of instructional supervision. (p. 38)

Both sets of subjects (2 teacher/principal dyads) were scrutinized through two supervision cycles. In order to analyze the "classroom management practices" of the teacher, each cycle consisted of an observation and subsequent conference directed by the principal. Field notes were also gathered by two independent observers attending the lessons. Supervision conferences were video taped, and the results were shown separately to each participant "... for purposes of a stimulated recall interview" (p. 4). The principal sources of data for the paper were transcriptions of both the con-
ference dialogues and stimulated interviews, as well as the classroom field notes. The paper itself contains case studies of Audrey and Brian, “episodes” from each of the cases, and analyses of those episodes.


**Major Themes**

- compatibility of instructional supervision and reflective transformation; compatibility of contrived collegiality (administratively imposed, organizationally induced) and reflective transformation (negative); compatibility of interdependent collegiality and reflective transformation (positive); interdependent collegiality and teacher collaboration (positive correlation); and teacher ownership of educational change and transformation (teacher empowerment)


**Abstract**

This *research report* details how New York City School District #24 responded to a state wide assessment of public schools by introducing the Collaborative Consultation Support System Program into Public School 19. Identified as a school in need, the program was installed in P.S. 19 to raise levels of instructional knowledge and expertise amongst teachers, and to increase student academic achievement. The program consisted of eighteen teachers working in collegial "triad" groupings, with each member paired with an additional non-triad teacher. Each pair was comprised of an inexperienced and experienced teacher. Collegial coaching was chosen over "technical" and "challenge" coaching, since the former was understood to be the "... most effective for promoting self-initiation, autonomous teacher thought and improving school culture. . ." (p. 7). As well, instruction on collegial and peer coaching was given to par-
The one year trial program is reported as having beneficial effects for teachers and students alike. Generally, teachers felt that the opportunity to experiment with new methods "without fear of criticism" made the program worthwhile. As well, interviews and surveys indicated that probationary triad teachers progressed with regards to using curriculum guides, building a repertoire of instructional methods, "pacing lessons, and establishing rapport with students" (p. 4). Assessments from paired and experienced teachers were also reported as positive, but not specifically how. Complaints apparently included the pairings themselves, though again the details were not specified. The impact on students was determined through pre and post measurement using standardized tests. Again, the reported results are felt by the authors to justify the program. Where the students of triad teachers experienced a 3.6% increase in reading proficiency, students of teaching pairs experienced a 12.2% increase. Similarly, while the students of triads at 2.7% scored below the citywide increase of 4.9%, the student scores of pairs rose by 6.5%. Based on the initial results, the report arrived at three recommendations: (a) as opposed to "open-ended discussions," professional development workshops should be hands-on and content laden "training sessions"; (b) the organization and relationship of triad and paired teachers needs reworking; and (c) a decision has to be made whether the program should be voluntary or involuntary.

The article (26 pages) itself consists of the program report, proposal outline, collegial coaching training agenda from the cooperating university, and an article entitled "Empowerment: Engendering Collegial Environments for Teachers and Supervisors," by John E. Iorio. Details of procedure include some discussion of technical, challenge and collegial coaching. Where the technical model is described as best suited for "...transferring teacher training to classroom application," challenge coaching is described as "...effective in solving instructional problems..." (p. 7). In order to obtain the goals mentioned above, collegial coaching was described as requiring training, as well as non-evaluative peer coaching and observation. Administrative support was also outlined and specified, and included the need for demonstrating the value of coaching, supplying resource and structural needs, and providing incentives and training.

Testing instruments for student achievement are listed as the Metropolitan Achievement Test in Reading, the Degrees of Reading Power Test, the Pupil Evaluation Program Test (math), and the Metropolitan Achievement Test in Mathematics. Students receiving the program of instruction ranged grades 2 to 5. Other than they were members of P.S. 19, no indication was given as to how teachers were chosen for the study. A full description of the school is given, including information on socioeconomic and cultural factors: 1,687 students, of which 80% are Hispanic, 10% Asian, 4% Black, 6% non-minority, and 19% described as having limited proficiency in English. The catchment area is described as "high-density, low income housing, and retail/wholesale
While not containing a formal list of references, the report cites the following writer/researchers and reports. These citations specifically concern the initial program design and methodology: J. Bellon and E. Bellon (Classroom Supervision and Instructional Improvement: A Synergetic Process); Bruce Joyce and Beverly Showers; Robert J. Garmston; Thomas L. McGreal (Successful Teacher Evaluation, 1983); Florida Performance Measurement System; A. E. Wise, B. McLaughlin, and L. Darling-Hammond (Teacher Evaluation); Donald Schon (The Reflective Practitioner, 1983); and Thomas Sergiovanni (Understanding Reflective Practice, 1986).

Major Themes

- how to achieve improvement of student and teacher performance in low S.E.S. schools; collegiality (non-evaluative peer coaching and observation); effects of collegiality on student academic achievement (positive); effects of collegiality on inexperienced and experienced teachers (positive); administrative support; and empowering teachers (professionalism)


Abstract

In this opinion piece/research review Hargreaves evaluates collaborative cultures for whether they are in his terminology “bounded” or “true.” The author contends that although truly collaborative cultures appear to lead to innovative change, because the results are slowly realized and unpredictable, they are not favoured by administrators. Similarly, research also indicates that in order for teachers to have something significant to collaborate about, collaborative effort demands a “devolution” of responsibility for curriculum development—which is again not acceptable to educational authorities. Therefore, Hargreaves concludes that administrators often prefer collegial relationships which are more in line with the bureaucratic aspirations of control (bounded or “contrived collegiality”) espoused by primarily male officials (especially as regards male administrators and women elementary teachers). Consequently, and according to the author, the process for developing collaboration must change. Hargreaves calls for the shifting of responsibility for curriculum development to the those who will deliver the curriculum, and from “…administrators to teachers and from men to women” (p. 235). As such, the author concludes that teacher development and curriculum development are inseparable pursuits.
Hargreaves delineates between the "content" and "form" of teaching cultures. Where the former refers to the attitudes, values, beliefs, habits, and assumptions that may be shared by a group of teachers, the latter indicates the different ways that teachers associate and relate. The author believes the two views of culture are often confused, and argues that the "cultural form" substantively determines the evolution of content. Three such forms are identified and addressed:

**Individualism.** Using Lortie's research and terminology, three variations are identified:

1. **Presentism.** Reliance on short term planning only
2. **Conservatism.** So as to avoid direct experience of transition and/or scrutiny, the shunning of change
3. **Individualism.** Perhaps due to the fear of judgments and/or criticisms, the avoidance of collaboration with colleagues (Lortie's work is further cited regarding the evidence that teachers indeed do not often collaborate)

**Balkanization.** This form is described as when teachers associate in competing groups instead of with the staff as a whole. Balkanization can generate competition over resources such as "space," "time," and funding, and because of the subject orientation of upper grades can be an acute problem in high schools (the size of an institution can also be a factor). The status accorded certain subject areas is also cited as a cause, and balkanization can also be found in elementary schools where teachers rarely cooperate beyond their primary and intermediate groupings.

**Collaborative Culture.** Collaborative cultures are reported as most often operating at the elementary level, and consist of informal systems of praise and gesture, sharing of personal lives within school contexts, staff celebrations, and encouragement and support. It is usually based on a general agreement of educational values, but includes the toleration of and even encouragement for certain amounts of "disagreement."

Hargreave's thesis rests on the contention that while true collaboration is currently needed more than at any other time (re: increasing specialization and pressures in teaching), such needs run head long into the constraints prescribed by a lack of time and the mandated curriculum. Such constraints lead to what has been termed "bounded" collaboration, which is described as a superficial form, and is rarely concerned with deeper levels of curriculum planning (e.g., the planning of special events only). This leads the author to conclude that collaboration in its most frequent form (bounded) is not leading to wide spread and progressive educational change at all, but rather a perpetuation of "presentism" and "conservatism." "Contrived collegiality" is an example of bounded collaboration.

**Contrived Collegiality.** Contrived collegiality describes the use of a formal and specific set of bureaucratic procedures to increase cooperative planning and consultation
amongst teachers (e.g., “peer coaching,” “mentor teaching,” structured joint planning, specific job descriptions, and consultancy training etc.). However, while contrived collegiality can at best act as a preliminary step towards genuine collaboration, it also is distinguished by specific problems: (a) it cannot guarantee the installation of a collaborative culture; (b) it may prove to be an impediment against true collegiality due to the bureaucratization of the process of change, and may offend the feelings of those educators who already interact in a collegial fashion; and (c) it might “undermine” the positive informal relations amongst teachers, including an overloading of teachers’ time through meetings and the like. Significantly, and according to the author, contrived collegiality may also be associated with different intents from those of true collaboration:

1. **School-centered innovation** (true collaboration). Compatible with interests of teacher professionalism
2. **Externally imposed implementation** (contrived collegiality). Deprofessionalization of teachers via the uncritical implementation of the “ends of others”

Therefore, as mentioned above, Hargreaves argues for teachers to take part in curriculum design as well as implementation.

Hargreaves' paper contains numerous references, citing amongst others the work of: Huberman (1990); Waller (1932); Hargreaves (1983); Ball (1981); Feiman-Nemser and Floden (1986); Lortie (1975); Nias (1989); Pollard (1987); Schneider and Hochschild (1988); Zielinski (1983); Zahorik (1987); Fullan (1982); Little (1986); and, Fox and Sowton (1989).

**Major Themes**

- teacher cultures (content and form); collaborative teacher cultures; contrived collegiality vs. true collaborative culture; the connection between teacher development and curriculum development; gender equality; and, the professionalization and deprofessionalization of teachers


**Abstract**

Based on an examination of technical coaching (identified by the authors as the most prevalent model of teacher collaboration), this *opinion piece* (15 pages) examines the relationship between collaborative teacher cultures and bureaucratically driven collegiality (contrived collegiality). Described as a means by which new skills and strate-
gies are learned and transferred into existing "teacher repertoires," technical coaching is also specifically related to those forms of peer coaching apparently engineered by administrative and bureaucratic influence. As such, the authors draw a strict line between a collaborative culture amongst teachers built on trust and mutual interest, and that which has been administratively planned. It is expressed that while the former must undergo a natural evolution, which may indeed benefit from and/or require executive assistance, the latter can by no means circumvent the former's developmental needs. Such requirements are suggested as those goals and practices which have evolved in the educational community and to which teachers have become genuinely committed. Further, it is suggested that in the cases of mandatory collegiality, whatever collaboration may be present can quickly disappear under the stress and burden of behavioural expectations. Finally, the authors firmly believe that such "disappearances" are not by nature arbitrary, but "integral" to what they generally feel is a bureaucratic tightening around instructional reform, curriculum design and teacher development. They conclude by stating that the development of genuine collaborative culture amongst teachers is in fact being stultified by bureaucratic manipulation of peer coaching models.

The paper begins with a discussion of the link drawn by researchers between teacher isolation and failures in curriculum implementation. Both contemporary and dated research is quoted, including: Lortie (1975), Zielinski and Hoy (1983), Elklit and Friis (1979), Zahorik (1987), Flinders (1988), and Hargreaves (1989). It is considered that teacher isolation begets anxiety, which in turn hinders educators from desiring change, especially that which is evaluated. Therefore, it is reasoned that lowered isolation may sufficiently reduce anxiety to a level conducive to reform. Such research has apparently lead many administrators to exhort collegiality and in fact bureaucratically determine it. Many pitfalls to this approach are highlighted, including the narrowness and prescribed nature of legislated change. The authors stress that when teachers are intellectually involved in the process of change, professional development is more a process of working "with teachers" than of working "on teachers." The former is stressed as being more conducive to critical reflection, and therefore more likely to become enculturated by teachers. However, the authors contend that enculturation is unlikely with technical coaching due to a number of fundamental problem areas: "time," "scope," "balance," "ideological distortion," and "teacher resistance." The latter two concerns are identified as most crucial. Whereas the term "ideological distortion" indicates that teaching is reduced to means, techniques and procedures, "teacher resistance" is "... viewed as a personal and individual problem within the teacher, not as an indicator of problems within the system" (p. 237). Thus, teacher conformance is highly stressed in the technical model.

Major Themes

- comparison (negative) between collaborative teacher cultures and bureaucratically contrived collegiality; the effect of teacher isolation on educational change; the erosion
of collegiality under administrative expectations; and the effect of administrative budgetary restraint on instructional reform, curriculum design and teacher development


Abstract

This research summary is comprised of an edited volume of articles on teacher development (Editors: A. Hargreaves and M. G. Fullan), the organization of which illustrates the editorial focus:
- Teacher Development as Knowledge and Skill Development
- Teacher Development as Self-Understanding
- Teacher Development as Ecological Change.

Teacher Development as Knowledge and Skill Development
Articles in this section reflect the premise that an over-emphasis of skills and knowledge development places little or no value on the hard won practical knowledge of teachers. Similarly, it is contended that coaching and training strategies cannot mitigate the negative effects of “outside-in reform.” The authors maintain that the long standing reliance on positivistic research models masks an entire body of knowledge and vision available from educators. As well, it is felt that mainstream subjects receive preference over periphery courses with regard to pedagogical inquiry (e.g., social studies and math over art and music).

Teacher Development as Self-Understanding
It is stressed that neither the personal development of the teacher, nor notions of collegiality and professional autonomy, are usually considered in teacher development strategies. Furthermore, seeing teaching as an “art” is viewed as a window to the very “depths” of teaching, and allows a useful and indeed crucial perspective that is otherwise ignored. To this end, a “craft model” for teacher development is proposed, and methods such as workshops and peer coaching decried as too “codified and scripted.”

The reader is warned about the humanistic approach to teacher development and the spectre of imposed development. Specifically, Hargreaves and Fullan discuss the masking of de facto bureaucratic manipulation and the control of teachers. As well, the lack of replicability and cost of such research is brought forward. However, apparent benefits such as the development of “self-understanding” and solving of problems in particular contexts are recognized.
Teacher Development as Ecological Change
It is contended that appropriate attention to the conditions and contexts of teaching must be made if teacher development is to be effective—the "culture of teaching." Problems include a lack of resources, the misallocation of resources, and a dearth of supportive leadership. Similarly, excessive bureaucratic control is seen as destructive to creative change amongst teachers, especially as regards collaborative cultures. Finally, gender issues are seen as needing analysis regarding how they impact on teacher development issues. Hargreaves and Fullan conclude that teacher development should embrace the understanding and analysis of those considerations mentioned, but not the over-emphasis of any one or two.

Besides the work just described, the edited volume contains articles from the following authors: Apple and Jungck (1992); Robertson (1992); Jackson (1992); Clark (1992); Thiessen (1992); Goodson (1992), Huberman (1992); Raymond, Butt and Townsend (1992); Oberg and Underwood (1992); Louden (1992); and Hargreaves (1992).

Major Themes
Negative effects of positivistic research models (knowledge and skill development), ineffectiveness of imposed change, personal and professional considerations of teachers, teaching as an art and profound source of information on educational change, the craft model of teacher development, collaborative school cultures, ecological conditions of teaching, and contextualizing professional development by examining the culture of teaching.


Abstract
In this opinion piece/essay, Holmes states that current change strategies in education are dominated by two identifiable and, in his view, disturbing trends: technocracy and humanism. Holme's thesis—he describes his essay as being about "power"—asserts that teaching is deprofessionalized by these trends, and that neither influence accounts for the inherent value of an innovation or innovations. Instead, the author submits that ethical and professional considerations are ignored in favour of the "processes" of schooling. As a result, experts not only attempt to determine what teachers should teach (instead of society as a whole), but educators are no longer encouraged to take responsibility for the effectiveness, or ineffectiveness, of their teaching. In short, Holmes believes that education, and more specifically teachers,
have become the prisoner of the "education as therapy" model (and to a lesser extent, technocracy), as determined by a group of "experts."

As mentioned, Holmes argues that society, not teachers, should have control over the "goals" of education. However, the author feels that as practising professionals, teachers must implement society's goals by having control over teaching itself. However, current trends appear to intervene. The "therapeutic" model based on the authority of experts, and in many cases aided by the tenants of technocracy is one such tendency.

Holmes describes therapy as the "...method by which individuals are changed, normally by some form of psychological pressure, nominally for their own good on the basis of alleged professional expertise" (p. 78). Holmes rails against this notion if for no other reason than the apparent lack of real evidence supporting those changes (Holmes cites O'Neill's 1988 review of research on instruction, and Fullan, 1982 & 1985). However, the author is most disturbed by modifications which are both prescribed and predestined: "The idea of applying therapy (quite apart from encouraging them to apply therapy to children) runs fundamentally against the most basic principle of professionalism" (p. 79). Similarly, the author relates the therapeutic model to the repression of female elementary school teachers by male experts, and discusses the "dogma" of current change practice as mass indoctrination or "groupthink" ("social-engineering"). In support of his criticisms, Holmes cites Fullan's (1982, 1985) recommendations for the "re-socialization" of teachers. Holmes accuses the therapeutic community of "brainwashing."

Holmes concurs with Grant (1986) that the same mind frame that produces technology will assert itself through the use of that technology. The author argues that teachers will sometimes elect not to use certain technologies (e.g., computers), as they may not contribute to the reaching of particular goals (i.e., vis-à-vis professional discretion of teachers). However, Holmes believes educators are pressured into using technology despite its negative potential. As such, both the therapeutic model and technocracy are viewed as means of wresting pedagogical influence from teachers.

Answering his own charges, Holmes proposes a model of change that places the burden of responsibility for achieving educational goals back on the teacher, and the task of determining those goals back to society. However, if teachers are to become responsible for student achievement, they must also be given professional discretion over how those goals are to be met. In that way, teachers are professionalized instead of deprofessionalized, and "...the emphasis of professional activities would likely be more on education that on training or development" (p. 85).


Major Themes

- humanism and technocracy in educational change and the deprofessionalization of teachers ("socialization of teachers"), the devaluing of ethical and professional considerations in favour of processes (educational change), the determination of educational goals by society, the determination of instructional needs and means by educators (the professionalization of teachers), responsibility for student achievement given to the practitioner (professionalization), the lack of research evidence in support of therapeutic and technocratic models of change, gender equality (lack thereof), and the education of teachers as opposed to their training or development


Abstract

This research report begins with the observation that despite the prominence given to life-cycle research and its importance to teacher development, satisfaction and effectiveness, few investigative findings are available. The author reports on a Swiss study that focuses on the "career." Specifically, it asks how "instructional mastery" and developmental phase intersect to affect teacher performance and fulfillment. It is reported that empirical research has uncovered a variety of recurrent themes that may be applied to the career development of teachers:

1. "Survival and discovery." Young teachers surviving the initial rigours of teaching
2. "Stabilization." Commitment to and professional achievement in teaching
3. "Experimentation/activism." Concerns that include teacher burn-out and motivation
5. "Serenity." Transition from a rigorous devotion to work to a more accepting realization of what can reasonably be accomplished
6. "Conservatism." Dogmatism regarding change and innovation
7. "Disengagement." Together with an emphasis towards more reflective interests, the gradual removal of one's self from instrumental concerns and/or the system.

(pp. 123-126)
The study itself was conducted between 1982 and 1986 among 160 Swiss teachers. Run in Geneva and Vaud, the research populations were drawn from lower-secondary (2/3), and upper-secondary/preuniversity (1/3) groupings. All subject areas were represented "... in equivalent proportions to the referent population" (p. 128), and a random sample was chosen regarding years of experience (from four groups: 5 to 10 years, 11 to 19 years, 20 to 29 years, and 30 to 39 years), sex, and level. It is expressed that since interviews were approximately 4 hours in length (usually two sittings), the study has both clinical significance as well as the value of being inferentially generalizable to a larger population. The study was apparently replicated in Zurich with equivalent outcomes.

The results of the study are reported to generally conform with findings from both previous research on teaching careers and the generic "life-cycle literature." However, the research does prompt a number of questions, including what distinguishes teachers who finish their careers with a strong sense of satisfaction, and those who are bitter and resigned? Further, what do the results indicate regarding the paths to professional satisfaction, and how can those paths be influenced by educators? The evidence shown strongly infers (canonical r = 0.84, p < 0.001) that those who experimented with their own classroom innovations were consistently happier and more satisfied with their careers than those who invested substantially in school and district sponsored projects. Shifting roles in the classroom (changing the subject mix or grouping), and achieving satisfying results in the classroom were also predictors of satisfaction, though not necessarily at the end of one's career.

The findings indicated that a number of conditions are probably necessary for satisfaction in teaching, especially at career end: (a) the provision of manageable working conditions, (b) the opportunity for experimentation without strong recrimination in the light of unsatisfactory results, (c) option of assignment changes, (d) availability of "collegial expertise," (e) "external stimulation," and (f) reasonable expectations of success with students. However, the question is posed that if the above are indeed determinants of satisfaction, which aspects of a teacher's duties become most important, and how are those duties mastered? As well, how do teachers cope with those aspects of teaching which are causing them difficulty? The results are presented via the table reproduced on page 143 ("Table 8.3").

The extent then that teachers determine career satisfaction through their own experimentation, and to a lesser extent personal research, is much greater than the effect had by collegial activities and inservice training. The author emphasizes that a very large offering of professional development activities are available to teachers in both Geneva and Vaud. A number of conclusions are drawn from the findings.
Table 8.3 Attempts to achieve mastery of core facets of teaching (n = 93)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of attempt</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
<th>Percentage of responses</th>
<th>Percentage of cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Little experiments - trial and error</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal research on one's subject matter</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with a small group of colleagues</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inservice training</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work on one's own personality or work habits</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recourse to specialists</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other attempts (miscellaneous)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Multiple responses (n = 143)

It is deduced that the strongest evidence for teacher career satisfaction is indicated by the so-called “craft” model. That is, where teachers are given the reign to experiment as independent and individual practitioners, they are most likely to experience a rewarding career in teaching. As such, teachers function as “artisans.” Indeed, on those occasions when teachers interact with peers or consultants, the resultant knowledge is then converted into a more personal form of practice. It is also noted that the future of inservice might better reflect development needs at the school level by becoming decentralized. On the other hand, the study also points to a cohort of teachers who respond to little if any strategy, literally “turning off” teaching after 10-15 years. Based on the overall evidence of the inquiry, Huberman suggests four approaches to teacher satisfaction:

1. Provide a greater number of better qualified “colleagues or experts” to whom teachers can turn while “tinkering” and “experimenting.” Allow teachers to build a “network” of such people.
2. “Decentralize” the system which supports and resources such a network.
3. While retaining the notion of individual teachers experimenting in the classroom, recruit disaffected practitioners, and provide assistance to the same through “peers,”
4. Provide fertile conditions for the above through sympathetic leadership (working conditions).

As already indicated, the research cited in this chapter is effectively reported, and would appear to be well constructed (control techniques such as random sampling and sample size seem appropriate to the authors claim of generalizability). As well, considerable reference is made to the literature regarding teacher and adult life-cycle research, including: Erikson (1950), Baltes and Brim (1984), Neugarten and Datan (1974), Jung (1930), Hirsch and Ganguillet (1988), and Huberman (1988).

**Major Themes**

- adult and teacher life-cycle research and teacher development; teacher avoidance of school wide reforms; a craft/artisan conceptual model of teaching; instructional isolation; collegial expertise; colleagues and consultants as resources, not authorities; and decentralization of development resources

---


**Abstract**

In this *research review*, Irwin argues that while teacher empowerment is currently an issue with considerable momentum and legitimacy, research efforts “. . . appear to be thin, casual, and heavily reliant on qualitative data” (pp. 12-13). After reviewing the available research, the author calls for more quantitative studies and longitudinal investigations, especially as regards the apparent relationship connecting teacher empowerment with student learning: “Do students learn more effectively in the classrooms of empowered teachers? This critical question has yet to be answered” (p. 13).

Teacher empowerment is defined as the deliberate professionalization of teachers, and the encouragement of educational leadership and initiative by teachers. It is also associated with their increased status and active participation in school based decisions, as well as the notion of life-long learning for educators. Terms associated with teacher empowerment are discussed, and include:

1. **Collaboration.** The formal connection of schools with universities, businesses, and similar "storehouses of knowledge"--bringing teachers up to date with current practice
2. **Collegiality.** As opposed to focusing on complaints and points of dissatisfaction, cooperating with colleagues through the sharing of ideas and activities

The author outlines questions to be answered regarding how the concept of empowerment can be made "operational." As well, strengths and weaknesses of empowerment are also discussed, and include:

1. **Strengths.** "Teachers are given growth opportunities early in their careers, thus motivating them to stay in their profession."

   "In situations where empowerment works, the leadership of the principal is strengthened."

2. **Weaknesses.** "Careful structure is necessary so that teachers do not assume the functions of the principalship."

   "Weak leadership at the building level will give rise to chaos when teachers usurp the principal's responsibilities."

   "Accountability and teacher empowerment may come into conflict in regard to goals and objectives; these are best left to the school district."

   "Teacher empowerment does not necessarily produce better learning--there is little or no research to link student achievement to empowerment."

   (pp. 8-9)

Evaluation and research reports (8) related to teacher empowerment are listed. Recurrent themes include the "training" of teachers in order to take advantage of empowerment opportunities and strategies.

Finally, the technique of "portraiture" is touted as a new and useful tool for gathering information on teacher empowerment. Described as a "descriptive technique" employed to capture the culture of a district in a short period of time, "deliberation teams" are used to observe, collect anecdotal data, interview subjects, analyze journalistic accounts and diaries, and utilize other "artifacts" to "construct portraits." The apparent advantages are in the technique's ability to "reconstruct someone else's perception of what a person is about, and how this contributes to the larger canvas . . . . the school context" (ellipsis in original, p. 12). Portraiture is also considered to be time efficient.

The paper (16 pages) provides short summaries of the following research on teacher empowerment: Science Education (J. Myron Atkin, Sanford University, 1989), Classroom Research or Action Research (Christopher Day, Nottingham, England, 1988), Shared Governance (Vicki Karant, 1989), Teacher Empowerment and Teacher Education (Mary E. Diez, 1989), Principals' Perceptions of Teacher Empowerment (Paul V.

**Major Themes**

- teacher empowerment (defined); collaboration between teachers and multiple agencies (e.g., universities, businesses etc.); professionalization of teachers; training teachers for empowerment; loss of influence of the principal; lack of resources; complacency of teachers; conflict of teacher empowerment with accountability; research techniques (portraiture); lack of evidence linking student performance with teacher empowerment; and the need for "... quantitative and longitudinal studies to connect teacher empowerment to student progress and to the excellence of the school" (p. 16)


**Abstract**

In this opinion piece/research review (chapter), Little examines literature on collegial relations amongst public school teachers. While current research offers evidence both for and against collaborative action (the terms collaboration and colleagueship are used interchangeably), the author concludes in favour of collegial practice. Such practice is simply defined as those situations where "... teachers engage in the rigorous mutual examination of teaching and learning" (p. 513). Conditions which are considered necessary for the survival of collaborative culture are identified: (a) collaborative action is highly valued within the school culture (by fellow teachers and administrators), (b) collegial action exists as a function of school organization, (c) colleagues work on tasks which are "compelling" and "challenging," (d) adequate resources are available, and (e) recognition is accorded to individuals as well as groups. Therefore, as opposed to any unique qualifications of ability and expertise, research shows collaborative cultures to be constructed by those who are both motivated and able to do so. However, collegial action is reported to still be very rare. Little expresses the belief that future educational gains will come via collaborative action amongst teachers, and between teachers and administrators.

In support of collegiality, Little cites the apparent correlation between student achievement and teacher collaboration (Bird & Little, 1985; Rutter, Maughan, Mortimore, Ouston & Smith, 1979; and Little, 1981). However, that connection is questioned in
light of the many extraneous variables (including the exigencies of everyday classroom life) affecting research outcomes (Bredo, 1977), and she calls for additional investigation. Similarly, the author asks what group or groups of teachers benefit from collaborative practice--novice, experienced, veteran, or all teachers? She concludes that because of the complexity of introducing new curriculum and the pace of current educational change, such action will benefit all practitioners, but that conditions will have to match the particular needs of each subset (novice, experienced et al.). As such, Little reviews the relative strengths and differences of mentoring-protégé and collegial models. She discusses evidence that indicates where the former may be difficult to install due to cultures of isolation and non-intervention, the attendant benefits make mentoring worth consideration. On the other hand, where collegial schools may offer specific advantages to teachers working in teams, novice teachers may find those structures initially intimidating.

Citing the work of Etzioni (1969), professionalism and teacher collaboration are strongly linked by the author: "Members of a profession are colleagues not merely in name but also with regard to the core ideas, principles, and practices of their work" (p. 502). Little believes that the teaching culture of independence has stifled professionalism, a circumstance that can be ameliorated through collegial practice.

Little prefaces her discussion with a consideration of the stresses induced by teacher isolationism. Citing strictures on "reflection in action," and the attendant lack of professional growth, Little suggests a review of collaborative action.

This paper contains numerous references. Besides those writers already mentioned, citations include the following writers (writers whose names are underlined are linked to research conducted at Stanford University and often referred to by Little): Bird (1985, 1986), Bredo (1977), Feiman-Nemser and Buchmann (1985), Fuchs (1969), Goodman and Lieberman (1985), Johnson (1976), Lortie (1975), Lipsitz (1981), Mar-ram (1972), Molnar (1971), Showers (1985), and Wagner (1985).

**Major Themes**

- teacher isolation; reflection in action; collegiality defined; collegiality and teacher professionalism; impact of collegiality on student achievement; impact of collegiality on teachers; conditions necessary for collegiality; mentorship versus cooperative action; impact of collegiality on the school; and, collegiality and training

Abstract

This research report (17 pages) describes a year long peer coaching project com­menced in 1985 and conducted at Forest View High School in Arlington Heights, Illinois. The program was designed to promote “instructional goal achievement” for improved student performance. While all goals were correlated with those drawn from research on “effective teaching,” “instructional goals” were not predetermined for the coaching teams. As well, the program was entirely voluntary, and participants were free to choose coaching partners. The authors describe the lack of goal predetermination and the ability to choose coaching partners in a voluntary program as evidence of the uniqueness of the Forest View project.

The program is based on the notions of ownership for the professional growth of one­self and one’s colleagues, and the separation of peer coaching strategies from “contractual evaluation” (p. 6). As such, the project goals were to:

1. Enhance student achievement
2. “Facilitate” collegial sharing of instructional methods and materials, and build “team planning”
3. Provide regular and positive feedback on teacher classroom performance
4. Assist teachers to concentrate on “instructional goal achievement,” and formulate strategies for student achievement
5. Combat isolationism amongst teachers (pp. 4-5)

The study’s results were gleaned from the following:

1. “four case studies of participants”
2. “two questionnaires” completed by all participants (mid year and end of year)
3. interviews with division chairpersons and the principal (in addition to questionnaires) (pp. 6-7)

Furthermore, instructional goals were compared with those outlined through the research of Rosenshine (1983) and Brophy (1983). No statistical information is given regarding the study’s external validity (population and external), the ecological external validity of the questionnaires (quantitative inquiry), or the internal (many factors) and external validity (population and ecological) of the case studies (quantitative inquiry). However, the results are intriguing.

The outcomes are heavily weighted in favour of peer coaching. However, an impor­tant proviso, as stated by the authors, must be the untested assumption --“not empirically tested”--that “effective teaching strategies” would indeed benefit student achievement. That being said, support for peer coaching is very strong:

Mid year questionnaires:
Participants stating they were close to achieving goals 87%
Those who stated peer coaching contributed to goal achievement 93%
Teachers stating peer coaching was more effective regarding goal achievement than “direct classroom supervision” 94%

End of year questionnaires:

Instructional goals accomplished 97%

Teachers who felt peer coaching made a substantial contribution to “goal achievement” compared to “previous years” 88%

Instructors stating that peer coaching had been more facilitating in “achieving instructional goals” than “direct classroom supervision” 94%

(p. 11)

The results were explained as probably due to the increased number and consistency of observations teachers received. It was also reported through the case studies that since practitioners were always aware of impending observations (“stimulated growth”), peer coaching led to greater “on task” teacher practice. As well, teachers reported heightened awareness and self-evaluation through the observation process (reflection). Collegial support was also a highly touted benefit, as was the breaking down of isolation and the sharing of instructional methods (pp. 12-13).

A number of concerns emerged out of the exercise, including a lack of time, the problem of “conflicting schedules” and the desirability for additional skills regarding observation and feedback. Suggestions for subsequent projects included “cross-disciplinary” teaching teams and optional mid-year partner changes. However, most subjects reported a “rekindling of professionalism,” and 82% stated they would participate in similar projects again (pp. 13-15).


Major Themes

teacher effectiveness and student achievement (assumed positive correlation), motivating teachers to use effective teaching practices through peer coaching (positive correlation), benefits of peer coaching over traditional instructional supervision, developing instructional goals, needs and methods for reducing teacher isolation (peer coaching), voluntary peer coaching—choosing coaching partners, compatibility of peer coaching with notions of teacher accountability and evaluation, peer coaching and instructional standards, instructional improvement through consistent peer observation, professionalism and freedom to choose coaching partners, and cost effectiveness of peer coaching
Abstract

This research report touts the benefits of the practice termed "collaborative autobiography." Collaborative autobiography is described as a technique which provides the opportunity for "collegiality and collaborative teacher development," as well as the chance to focus on both the needs of the individual practitioner and the "collective project." Similarly, the authors contend that collegiality has an indisputable effect on teacher development, and while many teachers have had negative experiences with collaboration, such evidence is proof of the need to capitalize on the potentially constructive nature of collegial action. It is expressed that collaborative autobiography is just such a means.

As a tool for teacher development, autobiography is justified by data indicating teachers function better when they can contextualize change within the knowledge of their own "values," "predispositions," "evolving styles," and "biographical development" as persons and teachers. Indeed, where learning and instructional activities include a personal contextualization for teachers and students, there is reported evidence that both parties thrive. As such, the strategy is based on research indicating that teachers who successfully retain their personal identities in the profession are those who can effectively reinterpret the "external mandates" of educational change (i.e., from outside experts, provincial ministries, et al.).

The practice itself is described as a four phase process (for the changing teacher). The stages are: (a) the depiction of a teacher's working environment as experienced by the teacher, (b) description of the "pedagogy" and "practice" in use, (c) reflections on the subject's past personal and professional life, and (d) a projection of the preferred future professional directions. Collaborative autobiography is also described as taking place within voluntary groups that include at least one administrator. Due to the supportive collegial atmosphere of working groups, it is maintained that collaborative autobiographies are much easier to accomplish than those that are individual.

The benefits of a collaborative work culture serves as the premise for the autobiographical technique. These are listed as including both a collegial and individual responsibility for the expectations and demands of the mandated curriculum, as well as the necessity of dealing with systemic constraints. Furthermore, the authors cite research (their own and others), which indicates that collegiality and "experimentation" are more likely to occur when teachers and administrators can articulate, request, model, and create their own incentives for change. Volunteerism is also presented as a linchpin of success.
The research itself includes the direct comparison of three autobiographies (summaries of each are included), evidence from 80 case studies, and a review of the literature. The summarized autobiographies were derived from a long-term research project studying teachers' knowledge and development. The project aimed to move from a "descriptive" knowledge of how teachers develop, to the formation of "intentional" strategies for specific ends (change). An agreement between the literature and the study's findings is reported. However, while research evidence is generally well documented, there is little information regarding the direct benefits of collaborative culture (though assumptions appear to have been made). The literature consulted includes: Nias (1984), Lortie (1975), Hargreaves (1988), Denscombe (1980), Woods (1984), and Sarason (1982).

Major Themes

- Professional development as personal development (personal knowledge), the benefits for both teachers and students of contextualizing personal knowledge against learning and instruction, individualism and collegiality, collaborative culture, volunteerism and teacher development, and collaborative autobiography


Abstract

This project report (35 pages) describes a prescriptive plan for developing teacher collaborative working groups ("participative structures") in rural school districts. The actual process was undertaken in Louisville, Kentucky. A variety of models were employed along each stage of a process labelled the "strategic action plan." Justification for the project is given via a discussion of the difficulties concerning teacher development in rural districts.

Working towards the development of "peer coaching" and "school based trainer teams," an extensive examination of instructional models was undertaken by the host district. Specific models were chosen and are recommended, though it is stressed that schools/districts must choose structures appropriate to their needs. A strategy of implementing the "Effective Teaching" model by Madelaine Hunter (incomplete reference) via the skills based approaches of Joyce and Weil (Models of Teaching, 1986) was chosen. Those approaches include: "Teaching Skills," the "Behavioural Systems Family," and the "Basic Practice Model." Practitioners were then selected to become "experts" in the chosen models; these candidates then attended "national level training
sessions" (p. 8). Transferring their expertise via the writing and video taping of lessons, these teachers were also charged with instructing district resource people. The experts could then resume their school based roles, including that of resource personnel (peer coaching), while district consultants instructed throughout the system.

The philosophical underpinning of the plan is described as the empowerment of teachers. The specific aim of turning teachers into decision makers is also mentioned. Peer coaching is envisioned as an informal and equal partner relationship (non-supervisory). The process itself is based on three stages: “planning,” “observation,” and “feedback.” Following a “planning conference,” the players engage in a “preobservation conference,” as well as sessions for “goal setting” and “technique selection” (p. 6). The writing of a “coaching guide” which outlines the chosen teaching model is recommended. As well, gauging the impact of the program upon teaching effectiveness and student learning is considered essential. Evaluation and assessment must include both changes in teacher practice as well as student achievement. It is also recommended that besides using appropriate measurement instruments (e.g., “teaching and coaching logs,” “levels of use interviews,” etc.), student perceptions be considered. Finally, an explicit warning is given to dissuade teachers from perceiving data collection as a form of evaluation.

The report is appendixed with project forms (assessment and evaluation), goal structures and intended impacts, as well as participatory structure outlines. No attempt to measure statistically the success of this project is mentioned. The following references are cited: Hord, Rutherford, Huling-Austin and Hall (1987); Johnson, Johnson and Holubec (1986); Joyce and Showers (1988); Joyce and Weil (1986); Marzanno and Arredondo (1986); Naisbitt (1982); and Slavin (1987).

**Major Themes**

- obstacles to staff development in rural schools, change accomplished through participatory structures/peer coaching, generic teaching skills, collaborative action, teachers as experts, accountability of instruction (productivity and quality), teacher empowerment, transfer of training, and the effect of teacher collaboration on student achievement (untested)


**Abstract**

In this interview (opinion/research findings), Robert Garmston describes cognitive
coaching as applicable to both supervision and/or peer coaching, but does not advise doing so simultaneously. Cognitive coaching is meant to form the basis for a process of learning which is distinguished as "self-directed" and "self-motivated." The specific function of the coach is to "support" the observed teacher in what is called a "natural journey." Essentially, it is the process of teachers learning to cognitively reflect on their own practice through the assistance of another set of "eyes," and is based on three apparent assumptions: (a) all people are capable of cognitive growth, (b) teaching performance "... is based on decision-making skills--thought processes--that drive the overt skills," and (c) a knowledgeable and "enlightened colleague" can help facilitate the cognitive processes and hence the teaching effectiveness of another (p. 12).

Coaching itself can be supervisory where it is effected by an administrator, or purely collegial when conducted with another teacher. The actual technique of the practice is outlined through three stages: (a) "preconference," (b) "lesson observation," and (c) "postconference." Since it provides the opportunity for both parties to agree on the purpose and format of the observations, the preconference is highlighted as the most important stage. Developing images of student learning indicators and behaviours is recommended for the observed party at this juncture. To facilitate cognitive inquiry and eventual self-coaching, the postconference is characterized both by recall and Socratic questioning. "Cause-and-effect thinking" is encouraged.

As opposed to fixing currently used lessons, cognitive coaches are asked to concentrate on identified "long-range goals," and remain focused on the "relationship" between themselves and the observed teacher. Where the former consideration ("long-range goals") is felt to engender "cognitive autonomy," the latter ("relationship") is accomplished through the memorization of a "coaching map," and the unhindered application of coaching skills.

The benefits of cognitive coaching have been shown to increase with the number of observations to the point of reaching a "critical mass," upon which the process becomes self-perpetuating. Similarly, Garmston recommends that a critical mass is essential for policy change to occur; a policy change which will shift the emphasis of supervision from evaluation to coaching. Garmston believes that the benefits of cognitive coaching far outweigh a monolithic evaluative model (he equates the latter with quality control, and the former with teacher reflection).

Cognitive coaching is described as resulting from marrying the work of Art Costa and Robert Garmston. As such, the following readings are recommended: Costa and Garmston (1985); Costa, Garmston, and Lambert (1988); and Garmston (1987).

Major Themes

cognitive coaching both through supervision (principal coach) and peer colleague-ship (peer coach); cognitive coaching for self-reflection and self-coaching; teaching as an act of cognition; the cognitive growth potential of all teachers; cognitive autonomy;
coaching skills (observations); and the need to establish a "critical mass" of teacher practice and understanding in order to establish lasting policy change (change from purely evaluative supervision models to coaching supervision models)


Abstract

This research report (27 pages) discusses the initial implementation of the Indiana staff development project "Teachers Teaching Teachers." Conducted February, 1986, to May, 1987, observations were made on the effects of teachers from one school system training teachers from four other districts. The study's primary purpose was to compare traditional staff development (delivery by "experts") with that of peer instruction. Affective measurements were made in the following areas (little or no elaboration was given regarding the focus of each measure): (a) self concept, (b) perception of others, (c) total of a and b, (d) attitude toward teaching, (e) peer coaching, (f) administration, (g) perception of student attitude, (h) other teachers, and (i) differential staffing (p. 8). The actual content of development activities is not reported on, and no attempt was made to measure student outcomes as a result of those activities.

Results indicate a positive correlation between peer staff development and participant satisfaction. In particular, statistically significant gains were reported for (a) peer coaching (attitude towards), (b) acceptance of others, (c) the total of self-concept and perception of others, and (d) administration (attitude towards). In total, "significant gains" were made in 11 out of the 27 comparisons, while 4 comparisons resulted in "insignificant losses." Pure gains were reported in 23 of 27 categories. However, as noted, only 4 out of a total of 23 gains were considered to be "statistically significant."

Instrumentation: A t-Test comparing pretest and post-test means was implemented. Both the Likert Bipolar Attitude Inventory and Osgood's Semantic Differential Scale were employed, but for different measures. The report includes the three questionnaires administered to eighty-three participants before and after the development period (February, 1986, to May, 1987). The documentation also contains a consideration of factors regarding the lack of significance in some "gain" scores. Those include educators chosen for their expertise and dedication (statistical regression), a short project duration (small gains), the relative inexperience of teacher coaches, and a possible inconsistency of instrument application. It was noted that: "... all measures has [sic] yielded reliabilities above 90 in previous administration" (p. 8). Otherwise, little information was provided regarding extraneous variables, population external validity and
ecological external validity.

The study was mounted to confirm literature that pointed to the apparent ineffectiveness of traditional staff development practices. It was felt that the results of this study generally reflected that same literature. Cited sources include: Bouley (1986); Broyles and Tilman (1985); Joyce and Clift (1985); National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983); Pusch, McCabe and Pusch (1985); Showers (1985); and Tomlinson (1986).

Major Themes

- ineffectiveness of traditional professional development methods, peer instruction, cooperating teachers, interprofessional relations, teacher satisfaction, and teacher professionalism


Abstract

This research report examines the notion of peer coaching as a component of teacher development and one which is congruent with the concept of “teacher as life-long learner.” Specifically, research findings are cited which indicate that peer coaching established for its own sake is both ineffective and short lived. However, while coaching is described as one of many valid teacher development strategies, its employment is offered as a particularly effective means of building staff collegiality, as well as associated benefits (e.g., teacher satisfaction). Improved student performance is also cited, though with a weaker correlation than is attributed to teacher satisfaction.

Included in the report are sketches of six peer coaching programs implemented in Ontario. Research findings are compared with practices from those programs. The authors stress throughout their report that peer coaching can operate at both the individual and organizational levels, but for lasting change in either, it (peer coaching) must function as a “norm” in the workplace (as opposed to an add-on). The authors conclude that structural barriers (bureaucratic) pose the single greatest impediment to implementation of peer coaching.

Addressing conflicting definitions of peer coaching, the report outlines from the literature a process which includes colleagues working together, and although “advisory” approaches are cursorily discussed, the observation and discussion of practice with-
out evaluation. As opposed to informal practice, coaching is also defined as a process that receives explicit recognition from the "organization" (school).

The report is divided into eight chapters, an extensive list of references, and two appendices. Appendix A offers a "guide to the literature on coaching," while Appendix B serves as an "overview of studies on coaching." Contained in the main body of the report is a discussion of key issues. Examples of these include: "contrived collegiality," "process and models," "planning," "benchmarks of coaching," a variety of coaching models, and "factors affecting implementation of coaching." Administrative leadership is considered essential for the implementation of coaching programs.

Research topics are posed, and include the following: (a) the contextualization of coaching (i.e., the consideration of coaching with regard to teacher-teacher dynamics and teacher-institution dynamics); (b) the integration of coaching with broader educational goals, including "professional growth and school improvement"; and (c) the trivialization of coaching due to a lack of clarified purposes (unnecessary "innovation").

This report (69 pages) was studied because it was felt to contain a number of valuable components: (a) a coherent definition of peer coaching; (b) a solid research base, including consideration of general research (Grimmett, Moody & Balasubramaneam, 1986; Showers, 1983; Little, 1985; etc.), "theoretical/thought pieces" (Joyce & Showers 1981, 1982; Brandt, 1987a, 1987b; Hargreaves & Dawe, 1989; Fullan, 1990; etc.), coaching models (Joyce & Showers, 1982; Garmston, 1987, 1988; Goldsberry, 1986; etc.), "practical/applied research" (Showers, 1985; Garmston, 1987; Leithwood, 1989; etc.), "training programs" (Seller, 1987, 1988, 1989; etc.), and "program descriptions" (Graebner & Dodds, 1984; BCTF, 1988; Raney & Robbins, 1989; etc.); (c) an examination of practical applications (i.e., Ontario examples); (d) a discussion of current issues and research topics; (e) an overview of research studies; and (f) the consideration of obstacles to the implementation of effective coaching practices.

**Major Themes**

- peer coaching as an integral component of staff development; coaching as a process of observation and discussion, but not evaluation; coaching as a school norm; the necessity for research into the context of coaching (amongst other concerns); and the conditions necessary for coaching such as "time" and organizational factors (e.g., flexibility of time tabling)

Abstract

This opinion piece (12 pages) argues that while the future of educational reform lies in the hands of all stakeholders (teachers, students, parents and administrators), it especially resides with teachers. Wolfle's argument is based on the research and acceptance of two notions: (a) collegiality will allow teachers to collaborate, and thus learn from and help each other, and (b) teachers must "actively" take the burden of responsibility for change away from legislators and lawmakers. In short, "structure and regulations" must give way to cooperative examination by educators.

Decrying the top down approach of government educational strategies (accountability and bureaucratic manipulation), Wolfle cites research on the benefits of cooperative professionalism amongst all parties ("professional team") (Slavin, Sharan, Kagan, Hertz-Lazarowitz, Webb & Schmuck, 1985; Slavin, 1983; Little, 1982). However, she notes (same research) that teachers are cooperating with each other less than ever before. Wolfle draws a direct comparison between educators and the medical establishment, concluding that teachers are rejecting for themselves what they admire in doctors: namely, the willingness to consult with colleagues. As such, teachers are seen to be inhibiting themselves, especially as regards the "role model" function of teachers in our society. Therefore, she advocates that teachers begin dialoguing about educational issues, and sharing ideas and expertise. Citing examples of teachers taking control for curriculum design and implementation (Casner-Lotto, 1988; Sickler, 1988), Wolfle endorses the apparent efficacy of a grass roots approach to change.

Besides those sources already listed, Wolfle cites the following: Elam (1990); Lambert (1988); and the Public Broadcast Service (1990).

Major Themes

-teacher isolation, collegiality and collaborative action (dialogue), collegiality and professionalism (teacher empowerment), burden of responsibility for change on stakeholders (teachers, students, parents, and administrators), change through grass roots action, and the effect of teacher collaboration on student achievement


Abstract

In this opinion piece, the author submits a model for educational change that is based
on the assumption that teachers, in order to thrive, require both "personal transformation" and enhanced "collegial relationships." Weissglass maintains that only through the development of meaningful and effective interpersonal relationships amongst practitioners, can teachers successfully deal with educational reform in the face of typical school cultures—cultures which are distinguished by "... [a] personal resistance to change, [and a] lack of awareness of the need for change" (p. 32). As such, the author is vehement that the provision of "information" only is not sufficient for the purposes of staff development. Weissglass concludes that since the most important functions of classroom life are under the direct control and influence of teachers, and that teachers have dispositions about what they do as practitioners, change agents must recognize the sensitivities of educators. Specifically, it is unrealistic to attempt educational change without acknowledging the "feelings" educators have for education in general, and reform in particular.

Weissglass's proposed model for change is based on the satisfaction of four requisite conditions:

1. "Obtaining information": Teachers need the opportunity for and encouragement to become more familiar with educational research and their role in the educational environment.

2. "Reflecting and planning": Teachers need the opportunity to both plan and reflect on short and long term goals.

3. "Obtaining emotional support": Giving educators the opportunity of working together through unresolved feelings from the past is seen as a way of opening educators to change.

4. "Taking action": If change is ultimately going to benefit students, reform must include action on all fronts, including the role of and respect accorded to students.

Wiesglass's model has been constructed and tested through his own experiences, including work addressing gender and racial bias. The author has drawn from the work of Cobb (1986) in order to facilitate teachers adopting a "... constructivist approach in which learners construct their understanding through interaction with the environment" (p. 30). To accomplish this, Weissglass has teachers reflect off each other in collaborative groups (e.g., constructing instructional strategies). Weissglass also operates on the assumption that teachers have great leadership potential, and attempts to develop that potential through the use of teacher "dyads." By working in pairs, teachers can define and refine their visions about teaching in a supportive and constructive situation. The author completes her model with the following recommendations: (a) "incorporate activities that break down educators' isolation"; (b) "provide opportunities for educators to improve their listening skills"; (c) "provide opportunities for educators to express their feelings about changes being proposed, about issues in education, and about their own past experiences as learners"; (d) "address controversial issues on a personal as well as an intellectual level"; (e) "provide the opportunity whenever you present information for each person to reflect on its meaning and to
plan on how to use that information"; (f) "use staff development as an opportunity to establish and sustain mutual support networks"; and (g) "clarify for educators the difference between discussion groups, support groups, and action groups" (pp. 32-33).

References include: Cobb (1986); Cummins (1989); Fullan (1982); Hopfengardner and Leahy (1988); Kirk and Walter (1981); Leershen (1990); Montessori (1967); Rosenholtz (1985); Schon (1983); Spindler and Spindler (1982); Weissglass (1990); and, Weissglass and Liebscher Weissglass (1987).

Major Themes

-major impact of school cultures on educational reform, effect of teacher collaboration and “personal transformation” on school cultures (positive), effect of teacher collaboration on student achievement (undocumented), staff development as a process of collaboration and collegiality, teachers as students; teachers as reflective practitioners, emotional support for educational change, teachers acting as leaders, and staff development that addresses the needs of students


Abstract

This research study (10 pages) reports on an inquiry designed to “. . . describe collegiality among teachers in relation to classroom teaching” (p. 385). Three questions are posed:

1. “To what extent do. . .” teachers exchange assistance with each other?
2. “What types of classroom help do teachers . . .” help each other with?
3. How do factors of SES, school organization (e.g., teaming), and teacher experience affect the exchange of assistance?

The emphasis of the reported study was on how and if teacher collegiality took place under relatively natural circumstances (i.e., as opposed to formalized programs). This write-up includes a short literature review and rationale. It is reported that good teachers do not always stay in the system. This occurs for reasons that include the following: (a) teaching has few extrinsic rewards, (b) teacher salaries are low compared to other professions requiring similar levels of training, (c) demands on teacher preparation programs have increased, and (d) the educational community has experienced a decrease in prestige. Similarly, while the importance given to student achievement appears to be increasing, the "intrinsic" satisfaction may still be limited. As well, student achievement is difficult to gauge. With the goal of retaining quality edu-
cators in the profession, as well as improving their career satisfaction, the author cites "collegial interaction" as a way for improving teacher development.

The methodology is well documented, and described as a multi-case interview design sampling fifty-two teachers in eight elementary schools. A mixture of open and closed questions were used (interview questions are listed in the appendix), and address the type of help teachers both gave and received from colleagues. Statistical information is also listed, as are selection procedures and site descriptions. As well, controls for reliability and internal validity are briefly discussed.

The findings show that teachers do discuss teaching with their colleagues (on average 40 min./day). However, they usually restrict that discussion to the progress of students. Issues of teacher performance were described as, amongst other things, "less important," "personal and private," and "time consuming." The author interpreted these responses as indicators of entrenched teacher isolation. As well, the findings imply that feedback by peers on teacher effectiveness is too threatening (only one of the six schools featured frameworks for formal peer supervision). Additional findings indicate that teachers in schools with traditional arrangements get more help with discipline from other teachers, while those in schools having team structures receive greater assistance with materials. The findings also indicated that schools with formal structures of teacher interaction enjoyed higher levels of collegiality—a fact born out by the literature. Several questions are posed for further research, including what forms of collegiality occur in democratic schools as opposed to those with different organizational structures.

The author concludes that collegiality is essential to the success of staff development programs, and that in order to promote the same, schools must arrange suitable organizational conditions (e.g., time and grade level teams). As well, educators must be encouraged to favour openness and collegiality over privacy and isolation: "Teachers must come not to fear exposing their classroom practices" (p. 395).

References include: Alphonso and Goldsberry (1982); Eisner (1983); Feiman-Nemser and Floden (1986); Galvez-Hjornevik (1986); Kent (1985); Lieberman (1982); Little (1982); Lortie (1975); Sarason (1982); and Wise, Darling-Hammond, McLaughlin and Bernstein (1984).

**Major Themes**

- formal and informal structures of collegiality, the need for organizational structures that are congruent with collegial action, the effect of school SES on collegial relationships, the scarcity of collegial relations and resultant effect on staff development (negative), and the effects of entrenched teacher isolation on collegiality (negative)