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ABSTRACT

This research documents how a group of secondary English as a Second Language (ESL) teachers attempted to work collaboratively with their subject-specialist peers for the benefit of ESL students. Using qualitative methods consistent with the case study strategy (Yin, 1989), this study describes and analyzes how the ESL teachers created and managed their new roles as teacher-collaborators (TCs) and how their subject specialist (ST) colleagues responded.

In the process, the data also highlight seldom considered aspects of the medical model of consultation, upon which collaboration in schools is typically based. This research demonstrates that the medical model fails to capture important aspects of joint work within the educational context, including assumptions about who initiates and terminates contact, sets the agenda, and is responsible for implementing suggested or negotiated procedures.

In addition, joint work in schools is shown to be further complicated by the need to take into consideration the pre-existing hierarchy of authority structures in institutional settings, and how these structures influence collaborative efforts. The TCs in this study could not move directly to fulfill their joint work mandate but had first to construct and establish the prerequisite components that could subsequently lead to joint work with their ST colleagues.

This study has implications for both practitioners and researchers. Classroom teachers moving into joint work need to be given time and techniques to help them to develop an approach to such work which will allow them to continue to meet their
professional responsibilities as they see them, while creating a common platform for working with their colleagues. This process should include careful examination of the underlying assumptions that are part of any joint work effort, as well as the negotiation of how these assumptions will be reconciled with the complex demands of the daily teaching agenda.

Research needs to move beyond static models of joint work and develop dynamic models. These models will need to capture the processes by which the prerequisites for joint work are constructed through the use of institutional discourse within the context of the school.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Attractive concepts like collegiality and collaboration are often imbued with a global sense of virtue. Vagueness can be helpful at the beginning, as people attempt to sort out the various possibilities. But it can also presage later disillusionment and disappointment if the different hopes and meanings invested in it do not pan out, and the meaning and benefits become less clear. It is vital then that we understand the meaning of collaboration. (Fullan & Hargreaves, 1991:46)

Research into the parameters of school change focusses, to a large extent, on defining more clearly the elements of effective school improvement (for a review of this research see, for example, Fullan, 1991). Such research has repeatedly concluded that building collegiality among teachers is critical to effective and lasting change (Lieberman et al, 1988; Lieberman, 1992, 1986; Little, 1990b, 1984; Sizer, 1984). However, teaching practices and approaches to teacher training have generally served to isolate teachers, not foster joint work (Cohen, 1987; Feiman-Nemser & Floden, 1986; Lortie, 1975). In addition, there are multiple, and sometimes conflicting, definitions and prescriptions as to what collegiality and/or joint work should look like in day-to-day practice (Austin et al, 1992; Bird & Little, 1984; deBoer, 1986; Gray, 1989; Lieberman, 1986; Rosenholtz, 1987).

Given that traditionally isolating practices are the norm, and that there is a distinct lack of clarity and direction as to how to do
joint work and what it should look like on a day-to-day basis, how, then, do teachers work together and create a collegial environment? In particular, how do secondary English as a Second Language (ESL) teachers and their subject-area teaching colleagues work together for the educational benefit of ESL learners. That question forms the focus of this study.

RATIONALE

Teachers and schools are struggling to cope with the ever-increasing diversity of learners that attend schools in North America (see for example the extensive review of work in high schools in Louis & Miles, 1990). In particular, serious questions have been raised about both the kind and the length of support provided for English as a Second Language (ESL) learners in our schools. Research implies that teaching ESL in isolation is inefficient from both the perspective of the teacher and the learner (Bourne, 1989; Celce-Murcia, 1991; Collier, 1989; Crandall, 1987).

In addition, it is clear that several years beyond specific instruction in basic "survival" English (how to take the bus, shopping, banking, etc.) are required for ESL learners to reach full academic proficiency on a par with their English-speaking peers (Collier, 1987; Cummins, 1984). Therefore, since ESL learners cannot acquire such academic proficiency in a vacuum, rather than ESL teachers becoming pseudo-experts in the disciplines (Spack, 1988), joint work has been advocated.
This study documents the process by which ESL teachers and subject-area specialists come to terms with some measure of joint work in the interests of assisting ESL learners to acquire cognitive and academic proficiency in English. It is hoped that this study will contribute to the knowledge base about how joint work can occur and how it unfolds on a day-to-day basis within the constraints of large urban secondary schools.

This study also helps to illuminate and further current understandings about what collaborative work looks like, how teachers attempt to build bridges across the gulf of subject specialties and how ESL specialists, working as teacher-collaborators with subject teachers, attempt to re-create and re-define their roles within their schools.

In order to achieve all these ends, I have described and analyzed how a group of ESL teachers, who were given the new role of teacher-collaborators (TCs), have worked with their subject teacher colleagues (STs) to create challenging yet supportive learning environments for ESL learners.

As a case study of teacher collaboration, which will be called joint work in this study, this dissertation explores the experiences of the TCs as well as the meaning they, and those with whom they work, attach to those experiences. In other words, teachers' conceptualizations of what it means to do joint work and how to arrive at a joint work juncture with subject-area teachers is examined. In addition, this inquiry seeks to document the efforts of TCs to redefine their place and role within the school.
Based on the data from this study, I argue that to do joint work effectively requires consideration of a number of interrelated elements. On the practical side, clarification of what joint work looks like on a day-to-day basis is needed. In addition, adequate amounts of time to both do the work and to build a measure of trust between those collaborating, impact on joint work efforts. Joint work also demands high levels of flexibility and personal ego-strength based on both experience and appropriate interpersonal skills training.

Pivotal to any practical considerations, however, is the fact that the process of joint work necessitates a re-definition of the roles of those collaborating. In particular, when considered in light of the pre-existing hierarchical structures that are embedded in discourse in institutional consultative encounters (DICE), this becomes problematic.

Further, the model of joint work prevalent in today's schools, which is based on the medical model of consultation, also impacts on the joint work efforts in this study. The findings of this research will serve to illuminate the interplay of these various elements, link them to the research in the field and outline avenues of further considerations and potential future research.
STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM AND EXPLORATORY QUESTIONS

Background to the Problem

Research indicates that both teachers and students benefit from "strong collegial relationships" among and between teachers (Little, 1990b) (see also Glickman 1984/5; Lieberman, 1986, 1992; Little, 1982; Rosenholtz, 1989; Scott & Smith, 1987). Little (1990b) enumerates the benefits of such relationships for students in terms of improved achievement; for experienced teachers who stand to make significant gains in instructional range, depth and flexibility; for novice teachers who will be better able to risk asking for help from their experienced colleagues and learn from them in the process, and, finally, in terms of the benefits for the school as a whole, creating an organizational frame that will facilitate the implementation of change efforts.

Despite this litany of benefits, however, teachers have generally taken little advantage of opportunities provided (such as common preparation periods, resource materials, more flexible timetabling) that would lead to joint work (Johnston et al, 1988; Hargreaves, 1989). One significant reason for this reluctance is that joint work requires different and quite sophisticated skills and strategies both in terms of learning to plan and work together and in terms of interpersonal communication (for example, Alexander & George, 1981; deBoer, 1986).

Aside from the prerequisite skills to conduct oneself in a particular way, it must also be kept in mind that for teachers to work collaboratively, the assumption has to be made that teachers
are willing to work with and learn from their colleagues. This becomes a problematic assumption when coupled with the fact that, particularly in the secondary schools, collaborating teachers have trained in and been hired specifically for very different and distinct expertises. The issue is further complicated by the institutional constraints of DICE. In this study I attempt to shed some light on these issues by documenting how teachers trained to operate in isolation and for very specific subject areas come to work together.

This study examines these issues by posing the following question: How do teachers from different subject-area backgrounds work collaboratively for the benefit of ESL learners? This document describes and analyzes the joint work of teachers. Underlying this question is a quest for understanding of the issues surrounding the distinct lack of joint work even when opportunities have been provided (see above) as well as an attempt to document the reality of how teachers themselves view joint work and how they define their own roles within that process.
**Exploratory Questions**

The driving question, How do teachers from different subject-area backgrounds work collaboratively for the benefit of ESL learners?, suggests a number of closely connected additional questions:

1. What strategies and techniques do teachers use to "work collaboratively"?
2. Is there a common language that the collaborating teachers can use to help them bridge the gap between their very different expertises?
3. What role(s) do the collaborating teachers assume to facilitate their joint efforts?
4. How do the designated teacher-collaborators (ESL teachers) re-define and re-create their roles within the school and within the context of joint work?
5. What other factors at the school level influence opportunities for and the desirability of joint work?

Each of these questions is examined through analysis of data collected in the field over the course of two school years.
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS

This investigation was conducted using an in-depth case study design (Yin, 1984; 1989). Data collection was done through interviews at intervals throughout a two year period, document analysis and participant observation. The study focuses on ten teacher collaborators (TCs) in four urban high schools in southwestern British Columbia.

Yin (1984) articulates a case study research design as being an empirical enquiry that:

- investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context; when
- the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident; and in which
- multiple sources of evidence are used.

(p. 23)

He further points out that this design lends itself particularly well when asking how or why questions and when the investigator has little, if any, control over events. The day-to-day reality of the teacher-collaborators attempting to work with their subject-area colleagues is the focus of interest in this study. The case study research design assumes that by sharing the self-reflexive behaviour and individual reflections of the teacher-collaborators and those with whom they have interacted within the school, an in-depth account of the process, the how of learning to work collaboratively, will result.
Selection of Research Site

The teachers in this study work at four secondary schools which are part of a larger Pilot Project, involving both elementary and secondary schools. As Louis & Miles (1990) and others have pointed out: "Most of the studies of planned educational change have emphasized the elementary school. There is clear consensus in the literature that approaches that work in elementary schools may fail when transferred to the more complicated and turbulent environment of high schools." (p.4) For this reason this research concentrates on the secondary schools alone.

The objective of the Pilot Project in these schools was to integrate language and content teaching with a view to better serving the growing numbers of ESL learners in the school district. To facilitate this process a team of teachers, experienced in ESL pedagogy and practice, was created at each school. The four high schools applied to be part of the Pilot Project and specific departments agreed to try the approach, elements of which they would be taught via inservice sessions and through the chosen teacher collaborators. I met the ten teacher-collaborators (TCs) during inservice training sessions and they agreed to allow me to interview them over time as they learned and operated in their new roles.

Data Collection

The TCs allowed me to interview them, both formally and informally, individually and as school-based teams (of TCs) and supplied me with a list of subject-area teachers who were
potential "collaborators" for the duration of the Pilot Project. I interviewed a number of subject-area teachers as well as some of the administrators at the schools.

In addition, I examined copies of documents produced for the inservice programs as well as memos, newsletters, referral forms and other handouts produced by the TCs to advertise their roles and modes of possible assistance to staff members. Finally, I attended regular TC meetings of all four schools, obtained copies of materials produced collaboratively, and took many notes at inservice sessions and other, less formal, gatherings.

Delimitations of the Design

Since my focus was on how the teacher collaborators (TCs) created opportunities to work with their subject-area colleagues, I established a number of delimitations for this study. Focusing on so small a group, ten key informants, allows for an in-depth case study but does not allow more than very cautious generalization to a population (Yin, 1989). To facilitate this, I have attempted to create a detailed portrait of both the respondents and the approach taken. This should allow the reader to determine the applicability of the findings to their own contexts (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). It should be noted that this case study is limited to collaboration for the benefit of ESL learners. It does not compare or contrast this type of collaboration with collaboration for other purposes.

The scope of this study creates a second delimitation. In focusing primarily on the perspective of the TCs, documentation of
a host of other possible issues that may arise in joint work efforts from the perspective of others within the school context has been given little or no attention. Further while the effects of joint work on the students or the school as a whole are mentioned incidentally by the TCs, my focus remains limited to the joint work dynamics themselves.

Finally the methodology chosen, inductive, qualitative, case study research, creates its own delimitations. Specifically, I did not intervene, advise or suggest options, even when so requested, as to how to proceed with joint work efforts. Rather, I attempted to study what occurred and how the TCs themselves interpreted events and then acted upon them. Nonetheless, it is recognized that my mere presence may have influenced their efforts and interactions with colleagues. In addition, extensive personal contact over a two-year period - with all the attendant patience, empathy and sensitivity to issues that involves - is another delimitation of this type of research.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

Despite a current emphasis in the literature on the values of collaborative work (see above and Chapter 2) for purposes ranging from collaborative consultation (deBoer, 1986) for the integration of special needs learners in the mainstream, through interdisciplinary teaming (Erb, 1989; Idol et al, 1986; George et al, 1992) to curricular integration (Fogarty, 1991; Jacobs, 1989), a
large gap exists in the research regarding how this process works on a day-to-day basis for the individuals who participate in it. There is, moreover, little research that specifically considers ESL specialists working with their subject-area colleagues. (There are three recent M.A. Theses done in the same school district that have added to this sparse body of knowledge: Dempsey, 1995; Hurren, 1994; Minnes, 1991, although only the last of these deals with the issue at the secondary level.)

While there are guidelines, lists of definite do nots and even recipe-like prescriptions for facilitating a collaborative and/or consultative process (see for example deBoer, 1986; Friend & Cook, 1992a), there is a dearth of documented evidence as to what actually happens when teachers from disparate disciplines attempt to work together for whatever purposes.

The results of collaboration in terms of student achievement as well as benefits to the teacher are well documented (see above and Chapter 2), but how individual teachers struggle toward that achievement is not. Since, as Little (1990b) points out, such ongoing collegial relations, however they may be achieved, are "rare, fragile and hard to maintain", it is vital to document the process of creating such an environment, becoming teacher-collaborators, in order to inform future efforts in this direction.

It is of interest, and relevant to this discussion, that most of the teachers in the present study were previously part of another district wide project, The Funds For Excellence Project. This project had the same philosophical underpinnings as the Pilot Project in its attempts to provide classroom teachers with
strategies to better meet the needs of ESL learners in their classes. On a questionnaire about their tasks and roles, these 80 or so teachers were virtually unanimous in their voicing of one concern which is summarized in this teacher's comment: "How are we supposed to work collaboratively with other teachers? There's no time built in and besides, we don't even talk the same language."

Teachers do not feel they know how to work and plan together. Lacking a strong research base, theorists have relied on recipes and lists of tasks to complete, but are unable to help teachers deal with the complexity of their day-to-day reality. Pressured to work collaboratively, teachers need to clarify their own understandings about any form of joint work, a clarification that goes far beyond a list of tasks to do and who will do them, and when to schedule the next collaborative session.

The knowledge gains from this case study offer a starting point and from this a theoretical base, which can inform future research and future practice, may be built. This dissertation argues for a reconceptualization of what it means to work collaboratively. A simple list of tasks does not begin to address the complexity of the day-to-day reality of joint work. What is needed instead is a framework that allows for an ongoing process, a dialogue between and among subject specialists, rather than a demand for products and procedures. Such a process encourages joint work connections among teachers. It also offers ongoing professional development for teachers by providing opportunities to learn from those who best understand their contextual reality - their own colleagues.
At another level, documentation of attempts to do joint work, offers a window on the complexities of this process as well as the importance of the roles individuals play in doing joint work and their assumptions about how this work will proceed. The institutional constraints of DICE (see above and Chapter 2) also require examination if joint work is to become the norm in schools.

Since the research agrees that joint work is a key element in restructuring and change efforts in schools (Little, 1990b), and also agrees how fragile such efforts can be and are, the knowledge gains of this case study - documenting specific instances of joint work - will provide valuable data to help educators gain insights into how teachers, accustomed to working within the relative isolation and autonomy of the classroom, learn to function in a joint work endeavour.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Part of this dissertation considers the varying definitions of words and phrases that describe teachers working together in some fashion. Throughout this document I use the term joint work to refer to any form of joint effort on the part of teachers to take each other, their students and the curricula into account in their planning and teaching. This is done in order to avoid confusion among the various terms used in the literature. The reader is directed to the detailed outline of these various terms in Chapter 2.
OVERVIEW OF THE DISSERTATION

Chapter Two of this dissertation examines the literature related to this study. First, this chapter will set the context for this study by briefly reviewing the history of change efforts in schools and the current emphases of ongoing change efforts which directly impact on the project under study. Next, are outlined not only the current plethora of definitions of what joint work entails, but also the research done to date citing the benefits and value of such work. An attempt is made to both narrow and broaden the definition of joint work in order to set the context for the variety of approaches used by actual teacher-collaborators in the day-to-day reality of school life. The dominance of one model for doing joint work in schools is discussed next, together with the assumptions embedded in that model. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the institutional dynamics of discourse, and speculates on how these could impact on the joint work efforts of teachers.

Chapter Three outlines the research design and methodology for this study. This case study design is based on Yin (1984;1989) and involves what Erickson (1986) characterizes as fieldwork or interpretive research. In this chapter are included a complete list of data sources, methods of data collection, and a detailed explanation of how the data were analyzed.

Chapter Four describes, in some detail, the subjects of this study both as individuals and within their school contexts. An overview of data collected and preliminary coding is also presented.
Chapter Five focusses on the findings of this study by presenting a richly detailed picture of how the teacher collaborators (TCs) themselves see their roles develop and evolve, attempt to forestall possible complications or roadblocks, create a school image for their work and define their joint work efforts. Two issues found to be particularly problematic for joint work efforts, time and teacher professionalism, are also presented.

Chapter Six summarizes the findings in relation to the original research questions and discusses possible implications for both research and practice.

Appendix 1 presents the twenty-four code categories and how they are defined for the purposes of the data analyses.

Appendix 2 provides the key question areas for the five rounds of semi-structured interviews conducted.

A comprehensive bibliography completes this work.
CHAPTER TWO
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Much of the press toward collaboration has occurred in the context of reform movements or on behalf of specific organizational innovations. What is missing is what various parties bring to the exchange...

(Little 1990a: 524)

The body of literature underlying this study brings into focus a number of areas in educational theory and practice. Change efforts both locally and abroad have seen attempts to implement initiatives in curriculum and instruction. Some of these initiatives have had and are having a direct impact on and relationship to the current emphasis on joint work.

Joint work, what the literature variously calls collaboration, collegiality, collaborative consultation or collaborative problem solving, needs to be defined and its parameters outlined to set the context for the current research project. The impact joint work has on the roles of teachers and what dilemmas that poses, must also be considered. Finally, these new roles must be considered in light of what the research tells us about how the power and authority structures inherent in institutional contexts are likely to impact on joint work efforts.
Despite innumerable attempts to improve schools, curriculum, teaching and learning "educational improvements ... are hard to find. Much money, much time and much professional effort has left a very paltry legacy." (Rutherford, 1986). In this climate, the search for models of and approaches to successful educational change continues (Collins, 1992; Hargreaves, 1994; Holt, 1993). Historically, the particular innovation varies but the focus remains on the teacher to implement change efforts.

In the search for enhanced learning for students, the 1960s saw an explosion of new materials inundating the schools, especially in mathematics and science. It was assumed that simply their introduction and availability would lead to full implementation and change for the better in students' performance in those areas. This proved not to be the case.

By the 1970s the promoters of change in schools had realized that an infusion of materials, of whatever quality, did not equate with the hoped-for outcomes of enhanced learning and improved teaching. Two major studies in the United States during that decade demonstrated the need for considering more than just the excellence of materials.

While the DESSI studies (Huberman & Miles, 1982) did work with exemplary materials, they found that what was required in addition to these were benevolent strong-arm tactics from the administrators in place and considerable ongoing technical support for the teachers in the process of implementation.
The RAND Change Agent Study (McLaughlin & Marsh, 1978), on the other hand, pointed out that for change to be successfully implemented, the innovation must be adapted to the local setting (the school or district) where it is to be used, and the local setting must, in turn, adapt to the innovation. Their findings conclude that the actual materials were incidental to the change effort as they, too, would have to be adapted to suit local needs.

Two things are implicit in both sets of studies above: the recurrence of a "top down", outside expert approach to effecting change in schools and the perceived need to find ways to circumvent what has been called the "pocket veto" of teachers, whether by hovering and arm-twisting or by planning carefully for their "adaptation".

In the 1980s, however, the pivotal role of the teacher in any school change efforts was starting to be acknowledged. This has led to more extensive staff development programs, school-based staff development efforts and various "effective schools" movements (for example see Cohen, 1987; Little, 1984; Murphy et al, 1985; Tumposky, 1987).

Despite these many and varied efforts, Fullan (1991) still points out that "educational change depends on what teachers do and think - it's as simple and as complex as that." (p.117).

To this end, many have sought to itemize what teachers do and what the factors that contribute to teacher acceptance or rejection of change efforts are (Cohen, 1990; Doyle & Ponder, 1977; Hargreaves, 1984; Norris & Reigeluth, 1991; Webb & Ashton, 1987),
presumably in the hope that once itemized they could be dealt with, thus dissolving these barriers to change.

Teacher perspective on change specifically was considered by Hall & Hord (1987) as part of the Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM). This model examines the stages teachers pass through before implementation and change is complete. One component of the model sets out seven distinct Stages of Concern (SoC) about an innovation from awareness through basic management of use to involvement with the impact of the innovation. The other component of the model looks at Levels of Use (LoU) of an innovation, from awkward and incomplete use to sophisticated refinements on the change effort.

The rationale behind the model is that until we know at what stage a given teacher is operating, we cannot help her nor can we begin to address why that teacher is not moving toward the "desired" stage of implementation. However, if the SoC and LoU are known, appropriate intervention plans can be tailor-made to address the needs of teachers at various stages on these metaphorical ladders toward change.

In terms of teaching practices, the Madeline Hunter model, Instructional Theory Into Practice (ITIP), is only one example of formulaic programs that became widely popularized both in Canada and the United States as the answer concerning what teachers do and how they can do it better.

Worthy of note is that these kinds of innovations (presumably to improve schools, teaching and learning) take a behaviouristic approach, reminiscent of the traditional deficit view taken of
teachers. In fact, that teachers are lacking in something, whether materials, knowledge, skills, the right attitude or whatever, is still very much the focus of the change literature today. This is despite much recent work to look at what teachers already have and already know (see for example Clandinin, 1986; d'Andrea, 1986; Elbaz, 1983).

What is ironic in the discussion of the above efforts to change teachers is the fact that although we have long ago acknowledged the inadequacy of the tabula rasa model of student learning, it still tends to be applied to teachers, at least where change efforts are concerned.

What is clear from this brief review of change efforts to date is that teachers' knowledge, skills and roles have long been undervalued and this has been to the detriment of educational change efforts. A teacher interviewed by Fullan & Hargreaves (1991) perhaps sums it up best:

My wife and I were talking about the fact that we have collectively 45 years of teaching and experience and nobody - this time excepted - has ever asked us our opinions about anything, where it could actually be put into action. And yet I've got to have more experience ..... than a lot of the people who are telling what I should be doing .... I think I could help and I could bring a lot to it and nobody ever asks.... They just go ahead and proclaim and we have to follow. (p.1)
JOINT WORK

The next section of this review will focus on the current emphasis on teacher collaboration, or what will here be called joint work. Such collaborative efforts appear to be the fulcrum on which current change efforts rise and succeed or fall and fail: "In most effective schools -- schools where the learning of both teacher and students is greater -- teachers collaborate" (Rosenholtz & Kyle 1984:14). First, the benefits of joint work, touted throughout the recent change literature, will be outlined. Next, the myriad references in this literature to variations on joint work will be clarified and defined. Then, the prescriptions for doing joint work will be outlined, followed by a discussion of current models for doing joint work in educational settings. The chapter concludes with some dilemmas that joint work efforts pose for teachers and examines a number of assumptions and questions that need to be considered in relation to joint work efforts per se, and in the context of an institutional setting, in particular.

Joint Work - Benefits

As the benefits of joint work efforts are outlined, it should be kept in mind that this shift to collaborative work between and among teachers is contrary to the long-standing isolation and autonomy of teachers within their classrooms (Ashton & Webb, 1986; Goodlad, 1984; Lortie, 1975). (more on this dilemma later)
Nonetheless, what has become clear is the pivotal role of individuals in making change efforts work. Meaningful and lasting change in schools appears to require not only the support from outside, but also from inside the school, and a large measure of that support comes from the collaborative efforts of teachers (Little, 1990b). Or, as Fullan & Hargreaves (1991) so succinctly put it: "Educational change that doesn't involve and is not supported by the teacher usually ends up as change for the worse, or as no real change at all." (p.14)

Little's (1990b) review of studies of school improvement, teacher preparation and change implementation to date, confirms that strong collegial relationships among teachers and between teachers and administrators can ultimately make the critical difference between success and failure in terms of change and improvement efforts.

Little goes on to enumerate the benefits of such relationships:

Schools stand to benefit in three ways from promoting closer collegial ties among teachers. Schools benefit first by simply orchestrating the daily work of teaching across classrooms. Teachers, students, and parents all gain confidence in their knowledge of what is taught throughout the program and why. Teachers are better prepared to support one another's strengths and to accommodate weaknesses.

Second, schools that promote teacher-to-teacher work tend to be organized to examine and test new ideas, methods and materials. They are adaptable and self-reliant in the face of new demands; they have the necessary organization to attempt school or classroom innovations that would exhaust the energy, skill, or resources of an individual teacher.

Finally, schools that foster collegiality are plausibly organized to ease the strain of staff turnover, both by
providing systematic assistance to beginning teachers and by explicitly socializing all newcomers to staff values, traditions and resources. (p. 176)

Others speak to similar findings in their own research. Rosenholtz (1989), for example, in her exploration of the workplaces of teachers classified schools in her study as either collaborative or isolated. She notes that schools where collaborative work is the norm, generate "new ideas, fresh ways of looking at things, and a stock of collective knowledge that is more fruitful than any one person's working alone." (p. 41)

Louis (1992) reports on her examination of the "quality of work life" (QWL) in eight high schools. Based on a review of the organizational literature, she created a framework which included seven issues pertinent to teachers that are consistently expressed in the research on educational reform:

1. Respect from relevant adults;
2. Participation in decision making;
3. Frequent and stimulating professional interaction;
4. Frequent accurate feedback leading to a higher sense of efficacy.
5. Use of skills and knowledge.
6. Resources to carry out the job.
7. Goal congruence. (pp. 140-142)

Although the schools studied represented a wide range of community contexts, socioeconomic and racial mixes, and restructuring efforts or lack thereof, all seven issues were considered very important by teachers. Those issues relevant to collaborative work and feedback ranked highest. Subjects pointed
out that collaboration was neither easy nor simple to achieve but was invariably perceived as "enriching for both the teachers involved and for the student recipients of teacher effort." (p.149).

Fullan (1991) reports on a study conducted by King et al (1988). Five thousand high school teachers in Ontario reported on the most satisfying as well as the most stressful aspects of being a teacher. Highly ranked as satisfying was "interaction with/support from colleagues" and equally highly rated was the stress of poor collegial relationships. Fullan & Hargreaves (1991) report similar findings in their own research.

What this brief review of the many cited benefits of joint work highlights, in addition to the fact that there are many benefits, is that there exists a number of terms that appear to be linked with joint work. For example, what precisely might be meant by teachers when responding to the category "interaction with/support from colleagues" (above) ? It is the plethora of similar and sometimes confusing definitions of joint work that is addressed next.

**Joint Work - Definitions**

Collaboration in education can be defined simply as joint work. Little (1990a) uses the term to distinguish among types of collegiality or collaboration:

I reserve the term joint work for encounters among teachers that rest on shared responsibility for the work of teaching (interdependence), collective conceptions of autonomy, support for teachers' initiative and leadership with regard to professional practice, and group affiliations grounded in professional work. (p. 519)
Many other terms have a similar intent but the terminology varies. It is also often referred to with the equally vague label of collegiality, which Barth (1990) states "is difficult to spell, hard to pronounce, harder to define." (p.30). The links among these terms are outlined below and related back to the literature on school change efforts since it is these efforts that support the emphasis on collaborative work and these efforts that cite joint work as such a boon.

Lieberman (1986) states that collaborative efforts may be "small or large, heavily funded or not funded at all; organized within schools by a group of teachers or a principal or encouraged by someone from the district; or they may be organized by a business, foundation, university or professional association in collaboration with schools." (p.6).

Bird & Little (1984) see collaboration in team teaching as taking three possible forms: coordination, where "teachers separately orient their behaviour to some common framework or third party"; accommodation, where teachers "unilaterally . . . adjust their behaviour to take each other into account"; cooperation, involving "mutual face to face interaction among teachers which has the overt aim of achieving a joint product" (pp. 10-11). These three forms of collaboration are quite different. It is the virtues of the last version, however, that reflect what the literature has been discussing, although according to Bird & Little, all three variations are considered forms of collaboration.

Rosenholtz (1987) defines collaboration as "the extent to which teachers engage in help-related exchange". This definition is no
more precise than ones cited previously and does little to delimit the parameters of what collaboration entails. Other definitions also encompass a large variety of activities including joint action to plan and produce materials or effect specific school-based change, team teaching efforts (sometimes called team coaching), teachers coaching each other (peer coaching), and teachers cooperating with researchers or other institutions.

Friend & Cook (1992a) further complicate the matter of definitions. They maintain that "what the term collaboration conveys is how the activity is occurring, that is, the nature of the interpersonal relationship occurring during the collaboration." (p5)

Further, they argue that collaboration cannot exist in isolation, but rather is a style of interaction: "...in the same way that writers use various styles to convey information to readers, so, too, do individuals use interpersonal styles or approaches to their interactions with one another." (p.5)

For this reason, Friend & Cook warn, collaborative efforts should be initiated only with some very specific and concrete understandings of their complexities and inherent difficulties. This added dimension to the topic of joint work only reinforces the need to answer the key question of this research study, namely how teachers work collaboratively on a day-to-day basis.

Joint work, in its broadest definition, is the term of choice in this study in order to avoid confusion over the wide spectrum of terms often used interchangeably: collaboration, collegiality, collaborative consultation, collaborative problem solving, to name but a few. As stated in Chapter 1, throughout this document I use
the term joint work to refer to any form of joint effort on the part of teachers to take each other, their students and the curricula into account in their planning and teaching. Without compromising the intent of Little's (1990a) definition, cited above, this version allows room for inclusion of instances of joint work that might not meet all criteria of that definition.

Often considered together with the many definitions of joint work is a set of recipe-like procedures outlining how this or that version of joint work ought to proceed. An outline of some such prescriptions will be presented in the next section of this review.

**Joint Work - Prescriptions**

The research literature abounds with variations on definitions and also speaks volumes on recipe-like prescriptions for how to go about doing joint work and what its characteristic features include. It is important to enumerate some of these prescriptions for doing joint work to further clarify the need to learn more about how joint work actually proceeds on a day-to-day basis.

DeBoevoise (1986) notes that collaborative efforts must start with administrative support and should have realistic expectations. Little information is offered as to what constitutes support and, more importantly, what the actual process would look like.

DeBoer (1986), in her discussion of collaborative consultation, presents four principles for success: separate the people from the problem; focus on mutual interests; collaboratively generate several options; base final decisions on objective criteria. According to deBoer, to "listen for the message and not simply the
words" is the hallmark of successful collaborative problem solving (deBoer uses this term interchangeably with collaborative consultation).

While she speaks of working together to generate options and choose criteria, the message that someone, the expert, is in charge, is quite clear. De Boer outlines the next steps in the process somewhat as follows. The consultee will choose a preferred option from the list and attempt to implement it. The consultant will note this and check back in a few weeks to see what progress is being made. Finally, putting it all in writing is considered essential to a commitment to actually follow through.

Gray (1989), using negotiated order theory, sees collaboration as a process of negotiation among those who have a stake in the outcomes. He points out that the process is temporary and emergent in nature, differing in form and content from one group to the next depending on its purpose. There are five critical features of this type of collaboration: interdependence, solutions that consider differences among the stakeholders, joint ownership of decisions, joint responsibility for future directions, and recognition that collaboration is an emergent process.

Austin & Baldwin (1992), in discussing how to work collaboratively, suggest the way to combat minor conflicts and controversies that are sure to come up, is to choose colleagues/team members carefully, divide the work to be done fairly, establish work guidelines and, when completed, formally terminate the collaboration. In addition, they see collaboration as being either
complementary (working closely on all aspects) or supplementary (a simple division of labour).

Like de Boer (above), Friend & Cook (1992b) discuss the collaborative efforts between specialist teachers and classroom teachers - a situation very similar to the respondents in this research. They offer a list of tips to facilitate joint work, including careful planning and attention to details, a go-slow attitude, open discussion about personal teaching and learning philosophy and a willingness to talk through any disagreements. In addition, they suggest the classroom teacher make a special point of welcoming the specialist teacher into the classroom environment and caution the specialist teacher not to fall into the "paraprofessional trap".

What all these recipes, suggestions and warnings lack is a picture of what actually goes on day-to-day as teachers try to work together. Documented evidence of how joint work develops over time is needed to create the contextual reality of the plethora of definitions and outcomes available - whether to validate, enrich and augment, or contradict currently held beliefs and viewpoints.

A final point related to prescriptions concerns the unanimous call for careful training. Despite speaking of working as equals, virtually all the literature cited constantly refers to someone being the consultant rather than the consultee and receiving special training and inservice to facilitate this role. Several studies have described in detail the competencies the holder of such a role should have.

West & Cannon (1988), for example, list 47 competencies in eight categories, that both the consultant and the consultee should
have. A 100-member expert panel from across the United States identified these competencies, which they consider essential for effective joint work. The competencies receiving the highest rating include skills in interpersonal communication and problem solving. Rated equally high was the category of "personal characteristics" which includes a long list of not so much skills as attitudes and approaches to working with others.

Again we have recipes but no more than hints of how joint work is conducted on a day-to-day basis. It is rather like having a recipe for baking bread which fails to inform the reader how to combine the ingredients and how to handle the yeast so that it will not be exhausted before the bread is in the oven. Bread baked with exhausted yeast is better used as a hammer than to fill your stomach. Technically all the correct ingredients in the correct amounts are in the recipe but if prerequisite knowledge and understandings are assumed but not a fact, the result can be less than desirable.

In terms of the value of and need for joint work in schools, this is a crucial point: if the model of joint efforts that is assumed by these prescriptions does not appropriately characterize the process, it follows that the prescriptions for joint work, no matter how detailed and clear they may appear, will also need to be reconsidered and revised.
Conceptions of joint work usually assume some model of consultation. These models are borrowed and adapted from a number of areas including medicine, mental health, human relations and sports. Since the plethora of definitions and prescriptions are, at least in part, due to the varied models, it is useful to examine key models on which joint work efforts in education are based.

Of ten models described in some detail by West & Idol (1987), four will be presented below. They are particularly relevant because of their common use in educational contexts. It should be noted that while these models are in current use for a variety of purposes, they are all based on an expert/novice dyad.

The model of clinical or medical consultation (West & Idol, 1987), while having no specified theory for the consultative relationship, is familiar to all. It assumes a relationship like that of the doctor/patient dyad in psychiatry and typically leaves the power and responsibility for change in the hands of the "doctor" who will "examine" the "patient" and "prescribe" treatment based on her/his diagnosis.

In an educational context this approach to collaboration involves the expert, often in consultation with agents external to the school, in deciding what to prescribe, and it is the teachers who receive this prescription for improvement/change. Sarason (1982), and others, have pointed out, that this common model for effecting change has met with limited success and as Babcock & Pryzwansky's (1983) research confirms, this model of collaborative
activity is not well received by teachers because it virtually ignores their personal practical knowledge (Elbaz, 1983). Nevertheless, this model is pervasive in its use and, more importantly, its goals, stages and levels of responsibility underlie the other models (discussed below) that are common to educational contexts.

Underpinning much of the work with school-based staff improvement projects, is the human relations model based on organizational theory (Argyris, 1964). Here the focus is on incorporating into the change process all the individuals within the organization (the school, for our purposes). In this view, planned change will be brought about only by taking into account the attitudes and values of the individuals within the larger framework of the planned change.

In this way, it is argued, the participants develop a sense of ownership that is presumed to maintain a level of commitment concomitant with success. As in the medical model, the impetus for change efforts comes from outside the school. In many cases, someone external to the change site coordinates interventions and provides training for those being asked to change. The similarity to the expert/novice (doctor/patient) dyad of the medical model is also clear.

While the extensive writings about school based staff development speak of much success using a model of this nature, there is too often a lack of durability of the planned change. Little (1984), for instance, describes the relative persistence of change in two professional development programs. It was the program that
required teachers (and the principal) to become involved in all phases of the program from training through to implementation, and gave time for ongoing collaborative effort and reflection, that produced lasting rather than temporary and superficial change.

The lack of lasting change was attributed chiefly to the lack of collegiality and relative brevity of technical and moral support - using the medical doctor/patient metaphor, when the symptoms of "illness" disappear, the "patient" starts to forget that she had promised to stick to a new "regimen" that would see ongoing change and improvement.

Closely related and sometimes part of school-based improvement programs is peer coaching, which is modelled after sports coaching (Showers, 1985). Here again the medical model's expert/novice dyad is at the core of this coaching model. The expertise of an experienced and knowledgeable practitioner is provided for the novice or new-to-a-technique-or-strategy teacher in an intense one-to-one process where the expert models the desired technique/strategy and the novice practices it under the watchful eye of the coach. In this way the novice has the opportunity to practice and receive feedback in a continuous, supportive loop that will eventually lead to the acquisition and incorporation of the new strategy/technique.

Coaching has gained considerable popularity and one form or another is widely used today both in teacher training and school-based improvement efforts (see for example Bird & Little, 1983; Garmston, 1987; Showers, 1985; Wildman & Niles, 1987). Garmston
(1987) describes three models of coaching: technical, collegial and challenge. He suggests that which one is preferred depends on the context and the personnel who will be using it.

Technical coaching is based on Showers' model described above and aims to help teachers translate training received into classroom practice. One obvious application of this approach is for coaching student teachers.

For experienced peers, however, it is somewhat problematic. Though it encourages concentration on behaviour, not personality, technical coaching does require some form of evaluation and thus can have an inhibitory effect on the mutually satisfying working relationship considered the hallmark of collegiality in improvement efforts (Lieberman, 1986).

Collegial coaching attempts to help teachers refine their existing teaching skills. In this approach the observed teacher chooses what she wishes to have observed so that she can learn more about it. For example, she might ask her coach to note how many literal versus inferential questions she asks her students during one or a series of lessons. After observation, the coach helps the teacher observed to analyze the data acquired and encourages her to apply their mutual findings to her future teaching.

Again, this mutual talk is meant to deepen collegial relationships but can be problematic. What if, for instance, the observed teacher does not act on the analysis or what if no requests for reciprocal observation are made, or no requests for observation at all? It is difficult to imagine an administrator with school improvement in mind, and having spent valuable resources to train
individuals for collegial coaching, who will just let such a situation be. Conversely, a teacher wishing to work on collegial coaching efforts would find a work environment that does not readily foster such interaction both frustrating and disillusioning.

Finally, challenge coaching is described as a way to help teams of teachers resolve what is considered a "persistent" problem, whether in program design or delivery. Garmston (1987) points out that, to work at all, this approach requires well established norms of collegiality, trust and problem-solving behaviour in place. Based on how important to change efforts collegiality appears to be, it is probably safe to assume that most schools looking for ways to improve are not likely to have such norms already established.

While all three models stress peer coaching, rather than exposure to externally designed processes and strategies, the training for the coach is generally taken on by an outside expert. This can be seen to imply that teachers do not know, on their own, how to coach each other, or, by implication, collaborate effectively toward the improvement of teaching and learning.

The question has also been raised as to whether peer coaching is an example of "empowering teachers toward greater professional independence [or] incorporating them and their loyalties within purposes and structures bureaucratically determined elsewhere." (Hargreaves & Dawe, 1989:4).

The model that seems ideally suited to the call for collaboration between presumed equals, establishing a relationship of parity, equality and shared responsibility, is the collaborative consultation
model (Idol et al., 1986). Here two or more teachers, each with different areas of expertise, would join in generating "creative solutions to mutually defined problems. The outcome is enhanced, altered and produces solutions that are different from those that the individual team member would produce independently." (West & Idol, 1987:390). More recently collaborative problem solving has become synonymous with collaborative consultation (West & Cannon, 1988). Efforts using this model are not new but as yet little is known about what such collaboration looks like, how it is created and maintained, and how the process unfolds over time (Lieberman, 1986).

While the definition seems to make an equal relationship paramount, nonetheless the word consultation carries connotations of the expert/novice dyad of the medical model. While teachers may be collaborative in consultation, they return to the classroom to work as individuals. Therefore the model would proceed somewhat as follows: Teacher A consults with Teacher B, who has special expertise that may help with problem Y. They brainstorm possible actions or solutions, one is chosen as most likely to succeed and teacher A then implements the chosen approach. The label may be different but collaborative consultation/problem solving is, in effect, yet another cosmetically altered version of the medical model.

The foregoing discussion has commented briefly on how each of four models of joint work, used in educational contexts, might be perceived. There is a notable trend in the gradual movement from
the clinical/medical to the collaborative model in that the focus now seems to be more on working with teachers instead of working on them. Nonetheless all four models are clearly rooted in the medical model, complete with its inherent assumptions based on an expert/novice relationship.

In terms of a school setting all four models described have both advantages and disadvantages, depending on the change to be fostered and the circumstances and personnel of the setting. However none of them, or any other models available to date, address the original question posed here, namely how the process of joint work unfolds. While the literature has clearly defined and reached considerable consensus as to the critical elements fostering school improvement/change (including teacher joint work), there is little mention made of the ways in which teachers relate to and interact with their peers (Hargreaves, 1984).

Zahorik (1987) further points out that where a measure of joint work in the form of information exchange and mutual support does exist, it is generally confined to grade-level or subject-specialty counterparts and remains invariably at a shallow, non-threatening level. He concludes by urging change implementors to encourage teachers to be less private and more collegial but offers little in how this might be achieved.

In other words, how do teachers who have traditionally seldom discussed teaching strategies and processes with their peers (Lortie, 1975), are fearful of criticism (Sarason, 1982), and extremely sensitive to observation while actually teaching (Hargreaves, 1984), suddenly become effective collaborators?
In addition, as noted above, despite currently favoured labels, the form of joint work seen in the day-to-day life of schools is essentially some form of the medical model, an expert/novice dyad. Whether the purpose is to learn strategies for including a special needs learner in the life of the classroom, move toward resource-based learning with the aid of the teacher-librarian, or assist ESL learners in subject-area classes, someone is the "expert" on the topic at hand, and someone else is the "novice". Given the litany of problems with past change/improvement efforts, and the need for joint work embedded in them, the question could be raised as to whether the common use of this model of joint work is the most appropriate tool for these purposes.

As a final note on this topic, the table below offers a summary of what the roles and responsibilities embedded in the medical model would appear to be for teachers attempting day-to-day joint work, as in the present study. The reader is reminded that in this study, what are called teacher collaborators (TCs), with ESL teaching and learning expertise, are endeavouring to work together with subject teachers (STs), various subject-area specialists. Given this scenario, the "assumed" roles and responsibilities are briefly outlined as are the goals and contact procedures.
Figure 1:
ROLES/RESPONSIBILITIES FOR THE MEDICAL MODEL OF JOINT WORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROLE ASSUMED</th>
<th>CONTACT PROCEDURE</th>
<th>GOAL OF JOINT WORK</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TEACHER</td>
<td>available for consultation</td>
<td>advise; consult; diagnose; prescribe</td>
<td>ensure ST has a plan to implement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLABORATOR (TC)</td>
<td>expert/consultant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJECT</td>
<td>appointment or request for assistance</td>
<td>describe &quot;problem&quot;; request assistance</td>
<td>carry out agreed to plan / solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHER (ST)</td>
<td>novice/consultee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Joint Work - Dilemmas

As the previous discussions have indicated, joint work is offered as a multi-faceted panacea in the name of change/improvement efforts. However, from the teacher's viewpoint the push toward joint work efforts poses a number of dilemmas, conflicting desires and tendencies. Several of these dilemmas are worthy of discussion to help set the stage for the likelihood of corresponding dilemmas faced by the subjects in this study.

Teacher isolation, autonomy and individualism repeatedly surface in the literature in relation to change efforts. All three can act to inhibit such efforts or become stepping stones toward change; each involves both acquiring and giving up; all three are interrelated yet separate.
Since Lortie's (1975) seminal work documenting the isolation of teachers, efforts to "crack the walls of privatism" (Showers, 1985) and move to a more collaborative mode abound. In the work of Bird & Little (1986), the persistent dilemma of such joint work among teachers is pointed out.

Although isolation provides room for individual creativity and relieves teachers of some of the difficulties associated with shared work, it also deprives teachers of the stimulation of working with peers and the close support they need to improve throughout their careers. (p.495)

Little (1990a) points out that collaboration or collegiality does not automatically lead to change in schools. Rather, it often leads to change efforts that seem "contrived, inauthentic, grafted on, perched precariously (and often temporarily) on the margins of real work." (p.510) She also concludes that many forms of collegiality promote privacy and isolation rather than breaking it down.

It does not seem untoward then, that secondary school teachers who are already overwhelmed in a role characterized by a "rapid work pace, . . . impersonal student-teacher relations and much time spent doing 'necessary' clerking and managing tasks" (Bullough et al, 1984:346) may prefer to simply shut the door to the classroom and carry on in relative isolation.

Teacher autonomy is defined by Little (1992) as "freedom from scrutiny, the right to make professional judgments that fit personal preference, and the implicit obligation to solve one's own problems." (p.173) Autonomy, then, involves the power of individual latitude and personal preference. Professional autonomy brings the
personal into the public sphere. The dilemma this entails is outlined by Little (1990a). "Teachers open their intentions and practices to public examination, but in turn are credited for their knowledge, skill, and judgment." (p.521)

For a teacher such close scrutiny of one's practice will not easily be tolerated, and certainly not if the teacher in question has any doubt of her/his own or a colleague's competence and commitment - an assumption that cannot be made automatically. Collaboration, then, hinges on that balance.

Subsumed under the rubric of autonomy is the issue of ownership and control. This includes more than simply being a caring, nurturing and supportive teacher. It suggests that teachers take prime responsibility, almost to the point of feeling they "own" their classes and do not wish to relinquish that control and care for their charges - a necessary prerequisite to any form of collaborative work. If the sense of responsibility for the educational welfare of one's charges - I have to be there to see it is done right for my students. - cannot be mitigated by a sense that joint efforts will greatly benefit those same students, such collaboration will not occur.

Also forming part of the sense of autonomy is a personal sense of efficacy - the conviction that one's individual efforts can make a difference (Ashton & Webb, 1986; Bandura, 1977; Poole & Okeafor, 1989). There are two parts to efficacy. First is the individual teacher's sense that s/he can make a difference with the students in her/his class(es). Having the autonomy to act and conduct
learning as seems appropriate, described above, is an obvious prerequisite.

Second is what Bandura (1977) describes as self-efficacy or personal efficacy. Implied here is a teacher's sense of competence and ability to cope in a variety of situations. It should be noted that this sense varies from one context to the next - a teacher may feel quite competent to cope with quadratic equations but utterly incompetent when it comes to interpreting literature. Putting teachers from disparate disciplines together for joint work, then, has the potential to disrupt or seriously undermine this sense of efficacy. The question then becomes whether teachers are willing to put themselves in this position in order to gain some of the many benefits of joint work.

Hargreaves (1993) draws on the data from a qualitative interview-based study to argue for the positive side of what he calls individualism. He argues that "collaboration and collegiality have become powerful images of preferred aspiration; isolation and individualism equally powerful images of professional aversion." (p.229).

This study (reported in full in Hargreaves and Wignall, 1989) brought to light three main reasons for individualism. What Hargreaves calls constrained individualism is simply the administrative and situational constraints that are part of teachers' daily work, constraints over which they have little, if any, control. Examples include the physical space restrictions - the egg-crate classrooms and even portables, no common place to meet
and work, no teachers-on-call to free up teachers to plan with colleagues, etc.

Strategic individualism, Hargreaves argues, is a teacher-created coping mechanism that helps them deal with the day-to-day details of an increasingly complex work environment. The myriad details of day-to-day work with an increasingly complex clientele, the mounting pressures of accountability, the ever-growing list of content to cover within a shrinking time frame create the impetus for teachers to remain "highly classroom-centred in their pursuit of the impossibly high standards and endless work schedules they set for themselves and that others set for them." (p.236-7).

Elective individualism refers to ways of working that are based on personal as well as pedagogical grounds - the choice to work alone all or some of the time, even if opportunities to collaborate are available. This determinant of individualism is further broken down into at least three aspects - personal care, individuality and solitude.

Personal care reflects a concern with ownership and control over what happens in the classroom on a day-to-day basis - a similar concern to that expressed earlier as autonomy, ownership and control. Individuality is "the power to make independent judgments; to exercise personal discretion, initiative and creativity through their work." (p.241)

Finally, solitude is a simple reflection of the chaotic nature of today's schools. Having some time alone with oneself, rather than an avoidance of colleagues, can equally be seen as a chance to reflect, be alone with one's thoughts. Hargreaves points out that
this is an individual preference for some, not all, teachers. He further reminds us that so-called teacher isolation can be seen as either "a prison or a refuge", solitude should be seen as a necessary retreat - time to re-think, re-focus and reflect.

The dilemma which, in many instances, cuts across the dimensions of all those previously mentioned is the dilemma of time. It is a truism that joint activities require more time than simply completing the task alone. The dilemma time poses for teachers has been captured by Flinders (1988) this way:

More so than other occupations, teaching is an open-ended activity. If time and energy allowed, lesson plans could always be revised and improved, readings could always be reviewed again, and more text material could always be covered before the end of the term, students could always be given more individual attention, and homework could always be graded with greater care. (p. 23)

In this context, yet another demand on limited time - to work together with colleagues - may not be seen favourably. Fullan & Hargreaves (1991) also report this dilemma in their discussion of a study seeking to document how teachers have used additional preparation time allotments. Many chose to use the time in ways other than joint work with colleagues.

Related to the issue of time is what Doyle & Ponder (1977) describe as the practicality ethic in teaching. The term is "an expression of teacher perceptions of the potential consequences of attempting to implement a change proposal in the classroom." (p.6) In other words, if teachers cannot see the benefits - to themselves and, most of all, to their students - as opposed to the cost in time
and effort, the change effort, in this case joint work, will not be attempted.

Finally, it is important to consider the established parameters of the teacher's role. Bullough et al (1984) describe a teacher's role in this way:

The role of a teacher is a culturally and historically determined artifact decisively shaped by those embedded ideals of public service first distilled for us in Plato's *Republic*, and by the technological ideology that is endemic in Western civilization today. ...the constraints of role operate essentially unconsciously, as presuppositions that define the natural and the right..." p339

Teachers are enculturated into the role of teacher from the first day of teacher training, and, in addition, assume an occupational identity that reflects personal choice.

This is asserted in statements such as, "I'm a science teacher" as opposed to "I am a teacher". Where the dilemma arises is in the question of how this sense of who I am and what I do is to be changed or modified if collaboration involves working with a colleague from another discipline. As Langer & Applebee (1987) point out, there is a distinct reluctance among subject-area teachers to involve themselves in activities and approaches that could be perceived to be furthering the work of another discipline - for example that of the English teacher.
Joint Work - Assumptions and Questions

The final section of this chapter attempts to create a more holistic view of all the elements discussed above. What we have learned in this discussion about school change and improvement efforts is that joint work plays a key role in such efforts. In terms of joint work, we know much of definitions and prescriptions but little of how it is enacted on a day-to-day basis.

Further, while several models of joint work are common to the educational context, the assumptions common to them are rooted in the medical model, the doctor/patient or expert/novice relationship. In addition, it is clear that there are a number of dilemmas for teachers to come to terms with before they can consider involving themselves in joint work efforts.

The components and circumstances of joint work are all enacted within the context of secondary schools, institutions that have endured relatively unchanged; "hardy institutions, quite immune to the instructional reforms that have sporadically ricocheted harmlessly off their walls." (Cuban, 1982:118). It is also an institution that has a lengthy history of "how things are done around here".

While it is not the intention, and beyond the scope of this study, to do discourse analysis, the field offers some important insights into the complexity within which the respondents are working. Research in the field of discourse analysis has examined the conversations of interactions (such as joint work) in institutional situations such as education (Bonvillain, 1993; Fisher & Todd, 1986).
What this research has noted is that interaction in the areas of law, medicine and education is unique in that there exist prearranged, pre-determined authority and power structures for how such interaction will be conducted. This includes such issues as turn taking, who sets the topics and constrains their discussion, who assigns the rights to speak and who has the authority to advise, prescribe and recommend. Illuminating the interconnections between the language used in such a "consultation" process and the pre-established hierarchy of roles offers a lens through which to view the present research.

An additional part of this type of interaction is what Jurgen Habermas (1970), describes as "technocratic consciousness". He points to how this affects our way of thinking about interactions. Both the control over the conversation and the technical jargon that may or may not be understood is an expected part of the interaction. How we talk to and are spoken to by a doctor, then, becomes normal, natural and, therefore, legitimate.

Continuing with the doctor/patient example, what has been discovered is that in this relationship, while the contact may have been initiated by the patient, nonetheless it is the doctor who is, at all times, in control of the conversational agenda. The doctor listens to the initial complaint, asks pertinent questions, redirects any ventures off topic, makes a preliminary diagnosis, prescribes, and expects compliance.

Equally, the patient colludes in this scenario by accepting the authority of the doctor, being conscious of not wasting the busy doctor's time and trusting that any remedy prescribed is in her/his
own best interests. The impersonal, technocratic language used to analyze and prescribe effectively and efficiently only adds to the status that has been accorded the doctor. Both parties are reasonably satisfied with the relationship. In fact, if the doctor were too informal and spoke too much in lay person's language, the automatic status and authority given might well be undermined.

The structure of how this interaction is played out is an example of discourse in institutional consultation encounters (DICE) and so is relevant here as it provides the lens for examining how consultation encounters eventuate in this study. The doctor/patient example was deliberately chosen to focus the lens because it parallels, in many ways, the medical model of joint work used in educational institutions.

As discussed above, the medical model, and its various cognates in educational circles, have been the dominant model used for joint work purposes in schools. Although educational institutions are now moving toward models that intend equal relationships as opposed to the expert/novice, such models, for the most part, simply mask the underlying issues of power and authority structures that dictate how interaction will be conducted during joint work. In addition, the long history of and familiarity with the medical model will certainly influence the joint work efforts in an institutional setting such as schools.

To illustrate the issues, the example of the doctor/patient relationship will be continued. Everyone is familiar with the doctor/patient process: When a patient is sick, an appointment is made with the doctor, a treatment is recommended, which may or
may not involve a prescription. The patient follows the treatment regimen and soon feels better. The process is repeated as required.

Similarly, one could assume that in schools, when a teacher feels in need of assistance, s/he applies for such assistance. However, applying this process to the school situation is not as straightforward as some might be inclined to conclude. Conceptually, we understand that the day-to-day operation of schools cannot be considered equivalent to the doctor/patient situation. Empirically, there is much evidence that the educational equivalent of the medical model is neither working as effectively as one might wish, nor is it well received (see above). There are a number of reasons for this.

First, in the medical model there is absolutely no doubt as to who is the expert and the authority in the doctor/patient situation. However, the hierarchy of authority in schools traditionally lies with the administrators, not with teachers. Teachers are considered, and consider themselves, equal as colleagues, with perhaps some minor deferment to department heads in secondary schools. (Department heads have some status as leaders within the department, but the ultimate authority still lies with the administration.)

In this light, the disaffection with the expert/novice model may be better understood - how can a colleague suddenly claim expert status, imbued with the power to prescribe and recommend? In the situation described in this research, if anything, the subject teachers ought to be considered the experts, not the ESL specialists.
Since ESL has neither a specific curriculum nor an acknowledged body of knowledge to be transmitted to students, it is not easily able to claim equal status with traditional subject-area departments, let alone the status of a body of knowledge that should be seriously considered by subject-area specialists. In the end, it is the subject-area teacher who is accountable for what is learned and bears the ultimate responsibility for the learners on a day-to-day basis.

Second, if we assume for the moment that the ESL teachers are the experts (at least in linguistic matters), what allows us to then presume that the subject-area teachers will consent to play the role of novice, solicit and, indeed, take advice? Other, perhaps more realistic, possibilities include never asking for assistance or asking for assistance but, for a variety of reasons, not using what was suggested or prescribed. In other words, in the eyes of the subject specialist, how credible is an ESL expert who has little or no experience in the subject areas under discussion in such consultations?

Further, assuming this lack of credibility, how can the ESL teachers create credibility for themselves? Additionally, this scenario assumes that the subject-area teacher feels s/he, in fact, has a problem to begin with and that the ESL specialist can be of help in its solution. Is it, perhaps, more likely that the subject-area teacher will assume the problem belongs to the ESL specialist, whose mandate, after all, is to assist ESL learners in the achievement of success in English?
Third, this enterprise is fighting a long-standing tradition. Teaching evokes a vision of one teacher and a group of students. In fact, such relative autonomy is part of what is prized in the profession (see above discussion on autonomy). Of even more import is the fact that, historically, the only time another educator was found in the classroom with the teacher was during evaluation processes. Whether there is intent to pass judgment on colleagues' classroom activities or not, the subconscious concern that this will be precisely what occurs cannot help but be there - another reason for the subject-area teachers to simply not participate in the first place.

A final note of interest is the rapid growth of joint work in the corporate sector (see, for example Turner, 1993), another form of effecting change within an institutional context. Here the process is called a "project" and the position of the TCs in this study would be that of Project Manager. It is the Project Manager who has the responsibility of putting the "project plan" into action on a day-to-day basis. It is noteworthy that project managers have very limited power or sometimes no real power, similar to the situation of the TCs in this study.

The power resides with the "project executive" (in education this would be the school administrator or the administrator of a given project, if different). This person bears the ultimate responsibility for the completion of the projects within the constraints and parameters set out by the "project plan". This plan consists of a detailed outline of what is to be done by whom, under what time and cost constraints, and to what standard of quality. Where products
are part of the project, specifications on the number and quality of these products, within a given time frame, is also included.

Project management in the corporate sector, however, does not usually concern itself with the assumptions and issues outlined above because ultimately, employees in the business world expect to be told what to do. Further, they understand that compliance with a project, whether they personally agree with its precepts or not, is a given, a condition of employment. Anyone who seriously interferes with or impedes production and profit cannot expect to continue to be an employee of that organization.

Such is not the case in education as the litany of failed change efforts proves. Further, teachers are not held accountable for either the marks their students get or for the hours they put into any attempts to improve their teaching and learning. While teachers who spend serious amounts of extra time and effort to improve their teaching and their students' learning conditions are applauded and encouraged, they are also not in danger of losing their jobs if they choose not to participate in a given project within the school.

It is this unique context of the school, then, that raises the questions of assumptions and possible power and authority conflicts during a change effort in which individuals may be charged with attempting to affect change but are not given the authority to mandate such change. It is in this context that the respondents in this study relate and reflect on their attempts to do joint work.
This chapter has attempted to outline the complexity of the context in which this study takes place. The history of change/improvement efforts was briefly described as was its impact on current attempts. A clear message from the research indicates that some form of joint work is considered a crucial element in such change in schools. To this end, the benefits, as well as the drawbacks of joint work were outlined, together with current definitions of and prescriptions for such efforts. The perspective of teachers urged toward joint ventures was also considered. The roles and the dilemmas joint work present were articulated. The discussion concluded with an examination of the underlying assumptions that impact on joint work efforts of teachers within their school contexts.

Teachers are being asked to do the best possible job under less than ideal circumstances. As Winitzky et al (1991) put it: "All elements of our society demand that teachers respond to the complexity of the learner with a new and more sophisticated pedagogy." (p.6). The TCs in this study are being asked to implement a change effort within the complex context of the urban high school. Their ST colleagues are being asked to reframe how they "deliver" their curricula. Both groups want to see students succeed.

How a small group of teachers respond to the complexities of their own teaching situation and attempt to meet these demands on a day-to-day basis, is the subject of this research. Before examining the data, implications and conclusions, we turn to the methodology for this study. The how of conducting this case study research is the subject of the next chapter.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

As a research endeavour, the case study contributes uniquely to our knowledge of individual, organizational, social, and political phenomena. (Yin, 1984:14)

As indicated in Chapter Two, the purpose of this research is to gain understandings of the "lived experiences" (van Manen, 1990) of teachers by studying how they respond to the complexities of their day-to-day teaching situation within the parameters of new and complex roles. Their mandate is to do joint work with their colleagues. This relatively new innovation in schools involves English as a Second Language (ESL) specialists working collaboratively with their subject-area specialist colleagues in order to facilitate the academic success of ESL learners. The present study explores issues surrounding such a mandate and attempts to document the process of collaboration over a two-year period.

To examine the process and dynamics created by this mandate, a qualitative approach was chosen. According to Rist (1982:441), using qualitative methods is appropriate when a problem seeks "a holistic understanding of the event/situation/phenomenon", when "the task is to study the specific and build towards the general", and when the research is to be conducted in a natural setting, as opposed to one that is in any way contrived or artificial.
The purpose of this chapter is to outline, in some detail, the approach and theoretical assumptions used to conduct this study. However, it may be useful to first restate the research question. Then I will clarify issues of theory and method, including a) the selection of methodology, b) the researcher's role in the gathering of data, and c) the selection process for both site and subjects. Next, sources of data will be presented together with how stages of analysis proceeded. A detailed discussion of the collation and analysis of data is presented in Chapter Four, while the findings, implications and conclusions are the subjects of Chapter Five and Six.

RESTATEMENT OF THE QUESTION

In order to focus on teacher collaboration, the process of joint work between and among teaching colleagues, this study undertakes to explore the question: How do teachers from different subject-area backgrounds work collaboratively? Specifically, how do secondary ESL teachers work together with their subject-area colleagues? In order to answer this and related questions (see Chapter 1), a qualitative approach using interviews, document analysis and participant observation has been chosen. The following discussion relates to that methodological choice and the reasons for it.
METHODOLOGY

Methodology is the set of theoretical assumptions which are used in structuring research and generating appropriate methods. This study has been conceptualized and designed based on the assumption that individuals can reflect on their own actions and interactions with "consciousness" (Csikszentmihayli, 1993). Such consciousness allows for conscious choices and adjustments on an ongoing basis. Since the teachers in this study are embarking upon an unknown role, such self-reflective behaviour, recorded and reported, will be able to highlight the process of learning to do joint work, the focus of this research.

Quantitative/Qualitative

The traditional distinction between quantitative and qualitative research is based on a long-standing confrontation between two schools of social research (Maxwell et al, 1986). Those embracing quantitative research are concerned with "hard science". Empiricists advocate careful and systematic measurement, experimental and quasi-experimental methods and analysis rooted in statistics. Characteristic of quantitative research is a deliberate narrowing of reality, by isolating and controlling variables, in order to capture particular aspects of the issue chosen for investigation. Such selection is based on the assumption that the aspects of social phenomena so chosen are concrete and
measurable. As Peshkin (1988) puts it: "Thus are the gray and the ragged, the murky and the amorphous precluded." (p.417).

While both quantitative and qualitative research can be either deductive or inductive, quantitative research is usually deductive, statistical and taking place in a controlled setting. Qualitative research, on the other hand is usually inductive and the focus is on discovering the perceptions of the participants.

As a somewhat black and white example, then, in contrast to arriving with theory in hand (or, at the least, hypotheses) and measuring instruments prepared, the qualitative approach attempts to study phenomena in all their complexity with the primary instrument used being the researcher herself (Woods, 1986). The emphasis is on inductive analysis, detailed description of events and situations and a focus on the perceptions of the phenomenon from the perspectives of the participants themselves. Typical methods include close observation, interviewing and document analysis.

In summary, while quantitative research is theory-driven and the research setting is carefully controlled, qualitative research uses theoretical assumptions to discover "what is" in the natural, uncontrolled setting; the former wishes to objectively test a priori theories and hypotheses, the latter to create meanings and understandings based on a guiding, but not fixed, methodological framework. While there is no doubt that each mode of inquiry addresses questions of interest, they are different types of questions and different answers.
For this study, qualitative research was chosen, specifically the case study. Before outlining the rationale for this approach it is important to be clear where case study fits into the numerous and loosely connected varieties of qualitative research.

For qualitative research, generally, close-up, detailed observation of real world events is the norm (van Maanen et al, 1982). Case studies, in some cases, can actually be based on only quantitative evidence and can, in fact, be done without any direct or detailed observations taking place. An example would be a detailed examination of archival records in order to gather information on the incidence of a particular disease, for example, skin cancer.

As Yin (1984) puts it: "To this extent, the various strategies are not mutually exclusive. But we can also identify some situations in which a specific strategy has a distinct advantage." (p. 20)

Defining case study research more precisely and outlining the reasons for choosing it for the present study is the next topic of discussion.

**Case Study Research - Rationale**

According to Robert K. Yin (1984), the critical features of case study research, ones that distinguish case studies from other approaches to qualitative research, are as follows:

A case study is an empirical inquiry that:
- investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context; when
- the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident; and in which
- multiple sources of evidence are used. (p. 23)
Merriam (1985) notes that case study research has historically been used in such fields as anthropology, law, medicine, political science, psychology, and social work. More recently its use in education has grown as the advantages of an approach that assists in understanding the dynamics of certain aspects of practice, are recognized and noted.

Merriam further points out that "a case study differs from other research methods primarily in the nature of the product. The case study results in an intensive, holistic description and analysis of the phenomenon or social unit being studied." (p.206). In other words, rather than looking at a few variables across many cases, as in quantitative research, case study examines the interaction of many variables so as to provide as comprehensive an understanding of the phenomenon as possible.

While case study research shares philosophical assumptions with other qualitative research approaches, there are research topics for which case study is particularly suited and may, in fact, have a distinct advantage over other approaches. Yin (1984:20), suggests that where a "'how' or 'why' question is being asked about a contemporary set of events, over which the investigator has little or no control", case study research is particularly suitable. Since such is the case in the present study, which is aimed at examining how teachers learn to work collaboratively, a case study approach was considered the most suitable.
Preparation of the Researcher

According to Yin (1984) skills required of a researcher wishing to do case study research include the following:

- A person should be able to *ask good questions* - and to interpret the answers.
- A person should *be a good listener* and not be trapped by his or her own ideologies and preconceptions.
- A person should be *adaptive and flexible*, so that newly encountered situations can be seen as opportunities, not threats.
- A person must *have a firm grasp of the issues being studied*, whether this is a theoretical or policy orientation, even if in an exploratory mode.
- A person should be *unbiased by preconceived notions*, including those derived from theory... sensitive and responsive to contradictory evidence. (p.56-7)

Some measure of self-analysis and appropriate remediation is proposed to prepare oneself for this role.

In this regard, I tried to keep these criteria in mind as I proceeded. To assist with remaining sensitive to the issues, I drew on my extensive background as a classroom teacher and lecturer. It was also assumed that my extensive research into the topic would constitute additional appropriate background on the issues. Further, it was encouraging that a survey I had designed for a group of teachers similarly trying to work collaboratively, had brought to light their discomfort with this notion. Since there was minimal evidence in the literature of similar attempts to do joint work
across disciplines, discovering and documenting such a process seemed eminently suitable.

Being a good listener and understanding the interpersonal issues in collaboration is also considered important. In this regard, I had tried to prepare myself by including as part of my course work, a specific focus on interpersonal communication. As additional preparation, I attended a session series which would teach me the collaborative skills and strategies (including active listening and optimal questioning strategies) which were to be taught to the TCs. This training raised a number of possibilities as well as questions in my own mind as I tried to imagine myself applying the "recipes" for joint work to real school situations in which I had taught.

*Research Methods*

Qualitative research methods include procedures related to discovery, documentation, collation, analysis and presentation. As stated earlier, of the techniques available, I chose to focus on document analysis, participant observation and in-depth interviewing. This last allows the investigator to not only document the natural occurrence of events, but also provides a platform for illuminating the meanings attached to these events by the informants.
Interviewing

There are two aspects of interviewing - whether interviews are of individuals or groups and whether the interview format is structured or unstructured. In this research I have done both individual and group interviews. According to Fontana and Frey (1994) interviews may be structured, unstructured or semi-structured. It should be noted that this division is somewhat artificial, but serves the purpose of conceptual clarity.

Structured interviews, Fontana and Frey (1994) note are those where:

all respondents receive the same set of questions, asked in the same order or sequence, by an interviewer who has been trained to treat every interview situation in a like manner. There is very little flexibility in the way questions are asked or answered. . . (p.363)

The unstructured interview, on the other hand, seeks "to discover the informant's experience of a particular topic or situation" (Lofland & Lofland, 1985:12). This intensive interview seeks to elicit details of the real-life experiences of the interviewees. In this type of interview, no prescribed, previously listed set or sequence of questions is used.

However, in both unstructured and semi-structured interviews, a set of questions do exist, at least in the mind of the interviewer. These questions, or possible discussion points, while flexible in terms of order and specificity, reflect the focus of the research in an attempt to elicit particular types of information (Denzin, 1989).

In this study semi-structured interviews were the form used and were by far the largest source of data as this type of interview
allows for maximum flexibility to elicit information and follow-up on points raised. In general, possible discussion areas were noted in advance of the interviews, and again after initial reviewing of field notes and interview tapes.

**The Interviewing Process**

In depth interviews with the ten respondents were conducted four times over a period of two years. The majority were tape-recorded, with the permission of the respondents. Interviews lasted approximately one hour per session. Understanding the hesitancy to be tape recorded, the pause button on the tape recorder was always available to the interviewees if they chose to continue "off the record" at any point. Subsequently, respondents were offered a copy of the tape and invited to read the transcripts for their own information and to clarify any comments they felt were not expressed as clearly as they might have liked. As well as taping, I took notes in the field diary as the interview proceeded. These served chiefly as reminders to myself to refer back to a point made earlier or to note something worthy of further discussion or follow-up at a later date.

Similarly, fifteen subject-area teachers (STs) were also interviewed, most at length and a few informally over lunch or over the telephone. All these interviews took place in the second half of the second year of the Pilot Project. Specific coding of data was only done for twelve of these STs, where the interviews were formal and substantial. In addition, five administrative officers at
the schools were also interviewed informally. Again, their responses were not formally coded for similar reasons.

**Participant Observation and Documentary Analysis**

Documents collected included those produced by the subjects, both curriculum oriented as well as the variety of memos and mini-newsletters that served to advertise both the TC roles in the school and their availability for joint work. In addition, I collected minutes of relevant school-based committee meetings. All documents received were noted in my field diary and dated.

The field diary also served for participant observation notes, which were taken at any and all work-related events involving the TCs (and their colleagues, as applicable), including informal meetings among the TCs of all four schools. For example, when I visited the TC teams for the first time at the beginning of Year I, I noted such things as the layout of the room, the types of materials acquired, how seating was arranged and how the mechanics of timetabling worked.

All data collection was done with the full knowledge and consent of the participants. While meetings and inservice sessions varied in location, all interviews took place within the schools, often in a counselling room or other facility where the background noise level would be minimal. The exceptions were the TC Team interviews which took place in the space allocated to the TC team for preparation work and planning.
SITE SELECTION AND ENTRY

The selection of respondents came about primarily through prior contacts. A number of teachers had been involved in another district project and I had attended some of the meetings and workshop sessions given by members of the university community. As an interested graduate student and long-time teacher, conversations and friendships began.

Chapter Four outlines the details of this prior project and how, in fact, it led to the contemplation of the present research question as an avenue worthy of exploration. The fact that teachers from very different disciplines were being asked to work collaboratively and had acknowledged that they did not feel they knew how to do this, proved to be the prime motivation for the present study.

The research literature is clear on the value of "working collaboratively" and equally clear on the fragility of such relationships (see Chapter Two for an extensive review of these findings). In addition, the literature speaks infrequently of cross-discipline collaboration and hardly at all of the specific combination proposed in the Pilot Project discussed in this study - namely English as a Second Language (ESL) teachers working together with their subject-area colleagues.

Since the Pilot Project aimed to provide training, time and a setting wherein teachers could begin to work together, I asked my initial contacts, those who would be assuming the new Teacher Collaborator (TC) positions, if they would allow me to interview them over time and "play fly on the wall" at meetings, attend
workshop sessions with them, and gather documents as appropriate. They were willing and also introduced me to their colleagues across and within the four schools.

More formally, I made contact with the school administrators, over the telephone or in person at inservice sessions or in their schools. I informed them of my interest and that I was part of a larger project, a Social Sciences and Humanities Research Grant, led by Drs. Mohan and Early. Permission to be in and about the schools was immediately forthcoming. Support, in terms of release time for the teachers who had volunteered to be part of my research, was also available. In all, ten TCs became part of my research initially and some of their subject-area colleagues were interviewed toward the end of the two-year project.

COLLATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

While there is some variation on this issue, most researchers agree that data analysis for qualitative research in general, and case study research in particular, should be done while they are being collected (see for example Merriam, 1985). Glaser & Strauss (1967) call this theoretical sampling and consider its chief purpose to be a guide to the investigator for further data collection. This is important since qualitative research, in general, neither operates without a particular theory to prove or disprove, nor imposes pre-established categories onto the data (Burgess, 1984; Hammersley & Atkinson, 1983).
It should be noted, however, that this does not imply that the researcher enters the field *tabula rasa*. Rather the literature review for the study contains sensitizing issues and questions raised and only partially answered. Thus, data analysis is emergent, advocating for openness to possibilities and the reframing of questions as realities are discovered in the data.

My general procedures for analyzing data followed recommendations in the literature, particularly Yin (1984). My first code categories were based on frequently occurring and relevant words or phrases in the data. I used colored highlighter pens to mark longer passages in interview transcripts or wrote code names in margins of documents. For example, I would read through events of a day - field notes and documents received - and make a code name note in the margins as something that seemed relevant occurred. It should also be noted that code categories needed to be re-adjusted throughout the analysis as I employed the constant comparison method described by Glaser & Strauss (1967).

A common complaint about case studies is the sheer volume of data that are collected. Researchers are strongly advised to create and faithfully use a careful organizational system to help manage the volume of data. At the end of the first year of the Pilot Project, and this research study, I acquired a data organization software package, *HyperRESEARCH*, which allowed me to upload all interview data and then assign codes, do frequency counts and manipulate the data in a number of ways. Field notes and relevant passages from documents were also entered so that all the data could be manipulated jointly.
For the remainder of the research and for the purposes of data analysis at all stages of the research, this tool proved invaluable. Not only was it much easier to manage huge amounts of data but it was a simple matter of a few keystrokes to re-design categories and interaction sets and re-run the results for further analysis, or return to previous groupings and try them with new category clusters.

As indicated earlier, case study research lends itself to the use of both qualitative and quantitative data. Therefore, given the opportunity to "play" with the data to try out different possibilities and see what they brought to light, I did code frequency counts for all interview rounds, then searched the documents and field notes for confirming or contradictory evidence. The numerical counts, proved illuminating and provided a useful springboard for subsequent searches for themes and possible "answers" to my original questions. For the information of the reader, this tabulation has been included in Chapter Four.

In addition, the data were manipulated in a variety of permutations to see if new categories would come to light. For example, all references to a particular code from one TC were collated over the entire two year period to look for any changes or evolutions in the perspective initially expressed. Similarly the same code was then collated for all members of the school team and considered with respect to what the STs said about the same topic at the same school. Finally, comparisons across schools were done to look for yet other possibilities.
Ultimately, data analysis requires careful reading and re-reading. Re-reading of all the data collected leads to an attempt to identify core analytical categories through the coding process. The categories are intended to reflect both the sensitizing concepts gleaned from the literature on the topic and the observations made during the data gathering stages.

Throughout the analysis, aside from continued inquiry into "what seems to be happening here and how do the informants explain and interpret it?", the medical model of consultation - its educational version is called collaborative consultation - was used as a foil. This was because discussion of and reaction to this model was a constant undercurrent and foremost in the thoughts of the TCs as they attempted to avoid setting themselves up as the resident "experts", fearing this would undermine efforts at joint work before they even began.

Further, as variations of joint work multiplied, Little's (1990a) four categories of joint work - storytelling and scanning, sharing, aid and assistance, and joint work - became formative categories for the data. These were later expanded to include new categories and innovative alternatives to these four (see Chapter 5 for a fuller discussion of the major variations on joint work documented in this research).
VALIDITY

The pivotal place of meaning in qualitative research sets the conditions of validity. Therefore the emphasis has to be on designing a study that will be comprehensive enough to provide the findings with a range of support. In interpretive research the question is not whether or not another researcher would find similar "results". Rather, the question is whether another researcher would "discover" concepts/constructs that would either logically or empirically invalidate those of the original study (Schatzman & Strauss, 1973).

Validity is also strengthened by triangulation of the data - studying the phenomenon over time, space and person. Triangulation is intended not only within cases, for example the series of interviews with a single individual, but also across cases, through multiple sources of evidence such as other interviewees, documents produced and notes from participant observation (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1983). Such triangulation of data also allows the researcher to use a variety of methods, numerous sources of data, even different investigators within any study. In this way problems of bias are significantly reduced (Burgess, 1984).

Finally, without dismissing the importance of triangulation via a variety of strategies and data sources, perhaps an equally important criteria should be plausibility rather than validity. Mishler (1986) points out that the issue is not to point to one absolute "truth" but rather to the relative plausibility of the
interpretations presented when compared to other possible explanations.

External Validity

Yin (1989) points out that the findings of a case study are not generalizable in the quantitative sense of a statistically defined population. Rather, the findings are generalizable to theoretical propositions. Thus the generalizability of the results of a study - the external validity - rests to a large extent with the readers of the research. In addition, the readers must decide if the results presented, given details of the subjects and the methods used, are applicable to their own situations. The reader has to assess to what extent and what aspects of the research apply in her/his own context (Lincoln & Guba, 1990).

Reflexivity

As mentioned above, what Csikszentmihayli (1993) calls "consciousness" is of concern in any study where long term contact takes place. To reduce the effects my own developing ideas would have on the research situation, I monitored my reactions, looked for clues as to the individuals' responses to me as a person, spoke deliberately of perceptions I had about their participation at certain times, and asked for clarification of documents, as well as comments and situations that arose.

For example, the period leading up to a district wide job action was not a time period very conducive to relaxed and thoughtful
interaction. While, no one had suggested that we cancel a planned session, the nonverbal cues from the participants made it clear that there was an issue other than teacher collaboration to be dealt with.

Lincoln & Guba (1985) assert that the success of data gathering in general, and interviewing in particular, is greatly influenced by the trust and rapport established between researcher and respondents. Suggested ways of building trust and rapport include prolonged interactions on site, negotiation of consent with respondents, a familiarity with the language and culture of the setting and an honest and non-threatening presentation of oneself (Fontana & Frey, 1994).

My lengthy teaching experience as both a subject specialist and an ESL teacher helped me to empathize with and understand the concerns and viewpoints of the teachers. The drawback is the possibility that my own prior experiences would colour my expectations and flavour what I would "see". However, while having the advantage of being able to empathize, my own experiences had been in a sufficiently different setting and some years ago, that it was relatively easy to "make the familiar strange", which Erickson (1986) deems a critical element in conducting interpretive research.

Reciprocity

Reciprocity, simply put is "what is in this for me?" What will respondents gain through their willingness to participate? Bolster
(1983) points out that one form of reciprocity is the internal benefits teachers get from simply participating.

In addition, I considered it important to demonstrate some more practical ways to reciprocate. Among my strategies were assisting with the production of materials in areas where I had some expertise to contribute, being a sounding board "off the record" when serious difficulties arose, and showing my personal appreciation for their time by providing some delectable edibles for the intensive interview sessions.

ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Professional and ethical responsibilities to the individuals who participated and the academic community at large, were respected. While many of the documents subsequently collected were produced on an ongoing basis and were, for all intents and purposes, part of the public domain, individual interviews required more serious consideration.

To protect the identities of the respondents and their places of work was ensured by using codes (see Chapter 4) and/or by allowing the respondents to "withdraw" information provided, on the spot by using the "pause" button on the tape recorder, or at a later date, upon reading of the transcripts.

In all cases agreement was established, including clarification of roles and responsibilities on the part of both the respondents and the researcher herself. The respondents knew they could decline to
participate at any point, or choose to withdraw from the research completely. They were given a clear outline of how the information gathered would be used and reported. Using codes for both individuals and their schools ensures confidentiality and anonymity. On occasion, and only for purposes of relevance and clarity, a specific role such as "English teacher" is used in the presentation of findings.

To sum up, this chapter has outlined in some detail, the research perspective and approaches adopted for this study. In addition, a detailed explanation of the rationale for case study research and its attendant strategies was outlined. The issues of validity and ethical considerations in qualitative research were also addressed.

The next chapter presents further details of the subjects and their contexts, information on data gathering, and a sampling of analysis strategies.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESPONDENTS, SETTINGS AND PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS

This chapter introduces the respondents in this study, who they are and in what contexts they work. After setting the context for this research and outlining the preliminary work that led to the chosen focus, the 10 key respondents (known as teacher collaborators - TCs) and their subject teacher colleagues (STs) will be described, as will the school settings in which they work. An overview of the preliminary results of the data collation and analysis will conclude this chapter.

The findings of this study both at the descriptive and interpretive level form the focus of Chapter 5. Chapter 6 follows with a discussion of these findings, their implications and a consideration of avenues for future research.

SETTING THE CONTEXT

This research took place in a large urban school district in Western Canada. This district is one of several that has experienced rapid and continued growth in the numbers of English as a Second Language (ESL) learners in the schools, such that students for whom English is not the language of the home are rapidly becoming the majority.
In addition to the issues and concerns this raises for teachers trying to provide the best possible education for their learners, two other initiatives in this district and throughout the province are of relevance. For some years now the role of school teacher-librarians has been evolving to one of cooperative teaching and learning rather than the role of library technician (Austrom et al, 1986).

In terms of learners with special needs (not second language-related), the provincial mandate for "inclusive" education has seen the disappearance, with rare exception, of segregated classes even for severely disabled learners, and put an emphasis on collaborative planning and teaching to provide for these learners within the grade-level setting.

Both of these province-wide initiatives have served in some measure to open the door to a more collaborative approach to teaching. However, as outlined earlier and without malice aforethought, it has created a perception that this collaboration is almost by default an expert/novice relationship, where the specialist "expert" tells/teaches the classroom teacher "novice" how to deal with information gathering in the former case or the designated special learner in the latter case.
PRELIMINARY WORK

It is in this context that the present study and its antecedents went forward. Prior to the present study, the growing need for support for ESL learners and their grade-level teachers had been a district concern. As a result, a major project involving some 100 classroom teachers from a variety of subject areas and grade levels was implemented (for a description of this project see Early, Mohan & Hooper, 1989).

As these teachers strove for new strategies and techniques that would help them combine language and content teaching in their classrooms, cooperation and joint effort were encouraged. As a graduate student interested in issues around language and content learning I became an observer and participant in several of the inservice sessions offered as part of this project.

Eventually, a questionnaire/survey was designed that sought to clarify both accomplishments and concerns engendered by the project. While the results of this survey provided much useful data for the project coordinators, the comments and concerns around "collaboration" raised by the participants are of immediate relevance here.

What participants were reiterating again and again in their responses is twofold. At the secondary level, many respondents pointed out that with a faculty of 80 or more, two or three faculty lounges over a spread-out campus, and a staggering workload, the presumed collaborating teachers seldom even saw each other in the
course of a week, let alone on a daily basis. How, then, were they to "work collaboratively"?

At both the secondary and the elementary level, a much more fundamental cluster of questions was raised: "How do you work collaboratively? What does it look like on a day-to-day basis? Are we talking about planning together or actually teaching together? If the latter, who is 'in charge' and what gets taught - subject matter or linguistic conventions?"

In conversations with the teachers, other important and relevant issues were raised concerning personal style in both teaching and interacting with students, knowledge (or lack thereof) of the subject matter, time to plan together, ego strength and the lingering perception of feeling "judged" when another teacher is watching you "perform". The pivotal question, "How do you work collaboratively?", led to further investigation and a formal pilot study.

The purpose of the language and content project had been to provide strategies and techniques for teachers through the use of the Knowledge Framework (Mohan, 1986). The ideas and strategies embedded in this Framework have the potential to serve as a bridge, a common language across subject areas. Therefore, it seemed appropriate to examine the use of this "common language" by teachers across disciplines to see if it could both serve this function and, as an added bonus, provide a platform for collaborative work.

At this point, I was invited to attend a meeting of social studies and ESL teachers at the secondary level, teachers who had been
participating in the inservice sessions. The purpose of the meeting was to examine the social studies curriculum from grades 8-10 to see if key topics that were historically sequential and spanned across the three grade levels could be identified. It was the ESL teachers' intention to then help create materials that would lower the linguistic barriers for ESL learners to access those topics, while allowing for a grasp of the larger issues and their sequence in history.

Everyone would benefit as a result. Students would be able to enter senior social studies courses on a more equal footing with their English-speaking peers. Social studies teachers would benefit from an increase in enrollment in senior social studies courses and ESL teachers would see that their former students were able to perform better at academic and cognitive levels as measured by the provincial examinations that, at senior levels, awaited the students at course end.

While the fundamental purpose of the meeting was to determine which topics could reasonably be "skipped" in order to help ESL learners concentrate on getting the basic picture of the sequence of historical events, it soon became clear that the two groups of teachers, ESL and social studies, were not "speaking the same language".

These teachers were coming from different specialty areas with different agendas, even though they presumably had a common agenda to be in attendance. What was striking was their very different use of what one might assume were common terms. For
example, the word "text" (as in course textbook), did not imply the same thing to both groups of teachers.

ESL teachers saw text as a set of linguistic hurdles that students needed to overcome in order to succeed, whereas social studies teachers saw text as a body of knowledge, indeed the course itself. It goes without saying that to "skip" portions of the text, as was proposed, did not sit well with the social studies teachers who saw it as an integral part of the course itself and the body of knowledge of the discipline.

Eventually decisions were made and materials were created. The turning point in creating a common understanding was when participants began to use the common language and structures of the Knowledge Framework as a bridge between their different viewpoints as teachers of social studies or language.

This experience led me to consider further investigation of the obvious next step - a social studies teacher, expert in the content and in-depth knowledge of specific topics, would have to work collaboratively with an ESL teacher, expert in the linguistic aspects of language learning.

Teachers volunteered their time to create materials covering specific topics and loosely divided themselves into dyads for this purpose. One such pair agreed to let me interview them after the fact. In attempting to discuss their process of collaboration, particularly in terms of what common language they might have used, I was disappointed.

They did not sit down face to face to plan together because they saw that as far too time-consuming. Their concerns ranged from
simply having no in-school time to get together to learning how to work together without "stepping on each other's toes". As one of them put it: "Nobody has told us how to work collaboratively or teach collaboratively and - yes, we could learn but it would take so much of our time - we thought this was an easier way to do it." (conversation notes)

The type of collaboration they referred to was what Fullan & Hargreaves (1991) describe as "comfortable" collaboration. The social studies teacher set out a worksheet that outlined key topics in a unit of study and gave it to the ESL teacher to "fix it up". The ESL teacher in turn created more organizational structures for the topics, breaking down difficult linguistic sections into more manageable chunks.

The "revised" materials then went back to the social studies teacher to see that her intent and key focus for any given topic was still clear, made any necessary adjustments and then taught the content in the usual manner, but offered the newly created support materials to the ESL students.

Both teachers were quite satisfied with the results and felt that their collaboration had been fruitful in that it proved beneficial to the students and had taught them a bit about "working with someone else's agenda in mind". In fact, they were prepared to take on another project in a similar manner.

A number of issues surface from this brief description. Working collaboratively does not necessarily include face to face work. Teachers are disinclined to work, plan and teach together if they cannot see any obvious benefits (Ashton & Webb, 1986) and if they
are not provided with the extra time during their working day (Flinders, 1988; Hargreaves & Wignall, 1989) that they realize this process would take. Finally, the hesitation to embark on an in-depth joint effort reflects the project teachers' original question concerning how this actually might work.

It was clear that much more needed to be learned about how collaborative work of any variety plays itself out on a day-to-day basis - and how teachers could be trained to work in this way. Then, perhaps, a look at a common language might prove more fruitful than in this preliminary work. To illuminate the day-to-day process of working collaboratively is what the present study has endeavoured to do.

THE CONTEXT OF THE PRESENT STUDY

In September of 1990 a Pilot Project was launched in the school district. (Although the project involved both elementary and secondary schools, I will confine my remarks to the four secondary schools involved, where the respondents of this study were working.) In this district, at the secondary level, ESL learners can move from a sheltered, reception level program, through a transitional, subject-oriented program, to grade level classes where they are expected to perform on a par with their grade level peers.

This Project sought to expand the continuum of services for ESL learners by offering, in particular, more in-depth support for
learners once they were integrated into their age-appropriate grade levels. It was the intention of the project that part of this support would be available by having ESL specialist teachers work collaboratively with their classroom/subject teaching colleagues. To this end, what in this study are called the Teacher Collaborators (TCs), were given inservice training in approaches to collaborative work and urged, in addition, to create ways and means of working together as seemed appropriate for their particular contexts.

At the secondary level, four schools were involved, schools ranging in ESL population from less than 25% of total students enrolled to upwards of 80%. This wide range was chosen deliberately in the hope that a variety of contexts and issues would emerge to further inform ongoing work in this area. Each school was given a team of ESL specialists, who did not enrol students and therefore was available full time to work collaboratively with teachers.

As noted above, these specialists, here called the Teacher Collaborators (TCs), were concurrently participating in inservice sessions that provided information on the theory of and suggested practices for working collaboratively. To begin to lay some groundwork toward a common approach to helping ESL learners in the subject-areas, the entire staff, or those departments that had chosen to participate in the project, received training in the techniques and strategies of the Knowledge Framework Approach (Mohan, 1986).
THE SUBJECTS AND THEIR CONTEXTS

The Teacher Collaborators (TCs)

Although each school was allotted a minimum of two TCs, one school chose to use the staffing allotment in different ways such that only one full time TC coordinated collaborative efforts at that school. The other three schools had three TCs each. This group of ten constitute the primary respondents of this study over the two year period.

Eight TCs were trained ESL specialists who had also taught other secondary subject areas. All ten of them had previous teaching experience (this was not their first assignment), were familiar with the difficulties of teaching sophisticated subject matter to a mixed group of students, including ESL learners, and seven out of ten had taught previously in the school where they were now TCs.

The two non-ESL specialists had extensive teaching experience with ESL or EFL (English as a Foreign Language) learners, both in integrated classrooms and in special transitional programs for ESL students about to enter grade level. It is also of interest that one of the TCs is an ESL speaker, a fact that proved helpful in the process of assessing the difficulties ESL learners were having with some subject matter.
The Subject Teachers (STs)

Fifteen subject-area teachers (STs) from a variety of content-based teaching areas were interviewed. All had extensive teaching experience in their subject areas and all had been teaching at their particular schools for many years. Several were department heads and spoke at length of their concerns over the rapid change in student clientele, combined with the ongoing demands of their subject areas and the expectations of performance on both school level and provincial examinations.

Administrators from all four schools were interviewed informally. It was hoped that their whole-school perspective would add yet another dimension to collaborative efforts within the school. Their roles in the Pilot Project ranged from minimal (signing on the dotted line) to extensive (e.g. steering committee member, active advocate for the TCs and the Project in general, one-on-one encouragement of involvement). One of the administrators also taught part time in a subject area affected by the Pilot.

The School Settings

Three of the four schools in this study have a student population of approximately 1000, the fourth is close to 1500. All four schools continue to experience rapid growth in their ESL population and all provide a reception level, sheltered entry program for these learners. In terms of location, three schools (including the largest in population) are located in the working-class areas of the city,
while the fourth is in a part of town that predominantly houses well-to-do, upper income families.

All four schools provide other services to address the specialized needs of learners. The schools run programs that address the needs of First Nations learners, accelerated learners (both ESL and native-English-speakers), literacy students and the learning disabled. In this light, another new program of services is not particularly unusual to the day-to-day life in these schools.

PRELIMINARY DATA COLLATION AND ANALYSIS

The data from interviews, documents and participant observation were searched for emergent themes and categories in two ways. First a "paper" search using common theme names and highlighter pens was used. When a software program called HyperResearch became available, all data were typed and loaded into this database. The program allows for recursive and comparative examination of data using chosen codes and categories.

Because the interview transcripts formed by far the largest portion of the data that were collected, these data lent themselves to incident "counting". The sheer frequency of some categories thus became extremely obvious. This proved a valuable first step in further refining and interpreting the findings of this research. The
tables created with this "countable" agenda in mind, are presented in this chapter.

Information from documents and participant observations was subsequently used specifically to reinforce or disconfirm evidence presented in the interviews, a form of triangulation. Final analysis took all three sources of data into consideration.

Interviews proceeded in five rounds, two during the first year of the Pilot and three during the second. While coding information obtained in an interview is a subjective process, nonetheless the consistent recurrence of certain themes in conversation points out the pre-eminence of these topics in the minds of the speakers and allows for careful inference to be made. The tables below outline the key themes that emerged from each round of interviews. Further explanations of the meaning of these code categories can be found in Appendix 1. For the additional information of the reader, the general question areas explored during each round of interviews are listed in Appendix 2.

All respondents are coded for anonymity and confidentiality, a number for the school and a small letter for individuals. Therefore, 1a represents a TC at School 1, 1b another TC at School 1 and so on. (The reader is also reminded that one school, School 3, chose to have only one TC). The numbers in each category reflect clear incidents of discussion of the topic (see chapter 3 for further details about coding).
**Round I - Individual Interviews with TCs**

The first round of interviews included all ten Teacher Collaborators (TCs) and took place between October and December of Year I of the Pilot Project. In this initial round of interviews the main purpose was to paint a picture of the school settings as the respondents saw them and to establish a baseline of relevant issues that seemed common to all TCs within and across the four schools.

**TABLE 1 - Topic Frequency of Mention: Teacher Collaborators (TCs)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>1a</th>
<th>1b</th>
<th>1c</th>
<th>2a</th>
<th>2b</th>
<th>2c</th>
<th>3a</th>
<th>4a</th>
<th>4b</th>
<th>4c</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>collaborative efforts</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>first contacts</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ideal Pilot Project outcomes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>managing role perception</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative staff view of collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not enough time to</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peer help/clubs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal view of role</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positive staff reception</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positive staff view of collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provide time to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>purpose of Pilot</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>setting up shop</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>team cohesion</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Six categories, by their frequency of occurrence, dominated the conversation with all respondents. Everyone commented in the categories collaborative efforts, first contacts, managing role perceptions, personal view of role, setting up shop and team cohesion.

What is also clear, even at this early stage, is that the four schools are already showing signs of differing priorities and concerns. For example, the issue of time as coded in provide time to and not enough time to is a major category of discussion for School Three (see Chapter 5 for details on this) but mentioned far less frequently at the other schools.

While positive staff reception (of the Pilot Project in general) is mentioned at all schools, negative staff view of collaboration receives heavy mention at one school, brief mention at another and no mention at all at the other two schools. On the positive side, only one mention of positive staff view of collaboration was recorded for all four schools.

Round II- School Team Interviews

Interviews with each group of TCs, as a school team, were conducted during May and June, the end of Year I of the Pilot Project. The "Team" at School Three consisted of the one designated TC and two colleagues who worked closely with her and who were intimately aware of collaborative projects in progress and how the Pilot, in general, was being handled at the school.
TABLE 2 - Topic Frequency of Mention: School Teams of TCs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>School One</th>
<th>School Two</th>
<th>School Three</th>
<th>School Four</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>collaborative efforts</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>constraints</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ideal PP outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>managing role</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perception</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new job description</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>next efforts</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not enough time</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal view of role</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pos staff view collab</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provide time to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A major topic of discussion at this stage concerns *new job description*. To gain further insights as to how the role of TC had evolved over the period of one school year, everyone was asked to write or discuss a job description for themselves. Everyone found this an intriguing exercise and was only too willing to discuss, at length, what they had learned about themselves and their new roles over the course of one year - and what advice they would offer for someone new to take such a position.

Notable in their absence are categories that were of some significance in Round I, *first contacts, setting up shop, team cohesion, peer help/clubs, positive staff reception*, and *purpose of Pilot*. While little mention of the first three is logical - the setting up, team building and contact making is now well
established, the lack of mention in the remaining categories is less easy to explain.

On the other hand, not surprisingly, collaborative efforts continues to receive frequent mention as does managing role perception. Differences based on school are also noticeable. Several categories receive mention by only some of the schools. Most dramatic is the continued (from Round I) discussion around provide time to at one of the schools only.

New categories had to be created both to allow for new information and to accommodate the increasing differences among the four schools. Next efforts, what the team was thinking of and planning for in the second year of the Pilot, was much on everyone's mind. Constraints to implementing their plans and the aims of the Pilot also were of concern in this round of talks. However, school outcomes, a new category, was a major topic for one school and not mentioned at all by any of the others.

ROUND III - Individual Interviews with TCs

The third round of interviews with the TCs was conducted between February and May of Year II of the Pilot Project. One new TC was now in place, having taken on the position at the beginning of the second year. For the purposes of this round of interviews the responses of this new TC will be coded as with those who have been in the position from the beginning. Another new TC, from School 2, is not recorded as she was unavailable for an interview during this time period.
TABLE 3 - Topic Frequency of Mention: Teacher Collaborators (TCs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>1a</th>
<th>1b</th>
<th>1d*</th>
<th>2a</th>
<th>2c</th>
<th>3a</th>
<th>4a</th>
<th>4b</th>
<th>4c</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>collaborative efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>first contacts</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ideal PP outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>managing role percep.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new job description</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>next efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peer help/clubs</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal changes</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal view of role</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>√/problems</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>purpose of Pilot</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>setting up shop</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>solutions/supports</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>√/staff view + or -</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>-4 +11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>team cohesion</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>√/time (needed or provided)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* new TC
√ see Appendix I for changes in code names

Three categories, collaborative efforts, managing role perceptions and personal view of role continue to be a dominant topic of discussion in the interviews, although several new topics have now been raised. Three completely new codes have been created to accommodate the evolving discussions - personal
changes (specific change in approach or viewpoint) student outcomes and solutions/supports.

In addition, what was called constraints (issues that inhibited desired outcomes) in Round II has been collapsed into the new code of problems (difficulties for self and for learners). This last proved to be a category of much discussion in both this round of interviews and the concurrent ones that involved the Subject Teachers (STs) and administrators, respectively.

Finally, the four categories dealing with staff view/reception of the Pilot Project, in general, and working collaboratively, in particular, have been collapsed into staff view + or -. This was done to accommodate the number of incidents where it was unclear whether the comment made reference to the general or the specific case, but it was evident that the view was clearly biased toward either the negative or the positive.

Round IV - Individual Subject Teachers (STs)

Somewhat concurrently with the second round of individual interviews with the TCs, interviews with some of their subject teacher colleagues (STs) were conducted. These interviews took place between February and June of Year II of the Pilot Project. Twelve teachers who taught a wide range of subject areas (English, social studies, French, physical education, special education) agreed to be interviewed. Two were interviewed together and are designated as only one (2e/f) due to difficulties in attributing a comment or viewpoint specifically to only one of them. Three
others were interviewed very briefly and not tape recorded. These have not been coded in the table below.

The interviews of the twelve are coded, although two interviews were conducted over the telephone and face to face, without the convenience of a tape recorder. Based on notes taken, categories are indicated with an asterisk (*) to signify that they were a frequent topic of the conversation, even in the relatively shorter time frame.

As with the TCs, the STs have been coded, for anonymity and confidentiality, with the number of their school and a small letter (beginning with e). Therefore 3e would signify a subject-area teacher from School 3 as would 3f signify another subject teacher from the same school.
TABLE 4 - Frequency of Mention: Subject Teachers (STs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>1e</th>
<th>1f</th>
<th>1g</th>
<th>1h</th>
<th>2e/f</th>
<th>2g</th>
<th>2h</th>
<th>3e</th>
<th>3f</th>
<th>4e</th>
<th>4f</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>collaborative efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>first contacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ideal PP outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>managing role percep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>next efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal changes</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal view of role</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>problems</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>purpose of Pilot</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>setting up shop</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>solutions/supports</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staff view + or -</td>
<td></td>
<td>3+</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>5-</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2+</td>
<td>8+</td>
<td>3-</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time (needed or provided)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# total count not possible because of * (see above)

A number of topics seem of primary importance to the STs. Of particular note are the topics problems and solutions. STs spent considerable time giving examples of the problems they saw themselves and their students having and often offered parallel solutions they would like to see implemented.

They also presented their views of the role of the TCs (personal view of role), had much to say about collaborative efforts they had been involved with or seen proceed in their departments (collaborative efforts), and provided insights as to the view of the
staff concerning both the Pilot, in general, and collaboration as an approach, in particular (staff view + or -).

Round V - Interviews with Administrators

The "whole-school" perspective was sought to add yet another dimension to the present study. Therefore, five administrators, including representatives from all four schools, were interviewed informally during the last two months of Year II of the Pilot. While their responses were not recorded and are not tabulated, pertinent comments are included in the discussion of these findings.

This chapter has presented an overview of preliminary rounds of data analysis. This analysis was done by reading and re-reading the data, creating appropriate coding categories, then coding interview transcripts, documents and participant observation notes using these categories. As is typical in qualitative data analysis, as themes and categories emerged, adjustments and, sometimes, additions had to be made.

Interview transcripts, forming by far the largest portion of the data, were submitted, with the help of a computer software package, to a "counting" exercise. Because the frequency of categories proved an illuminating first step in further refinement and interpretation, these preliminary findings were presented. The next chapter, with the aid of many verbatim examples, examines more closely the findings of this study.
High schools as they are currently organized are hardy institutions, quite immune to the instructional reforms that have sporadically ricocheted harmlessly off their walls. (Cuban, 1982:118)

This research has sought to illuminate how a specific group of secondary teachers learn to work collaboratively on a day-to-day basis and what impact the process has on their roles within the school. While the literature abounds with recipes and prescriptions meant to streamline the collaborative process and serve as a record of procedures and products, the impact on the individuals involved, the assumptions inherent in the roles they play, and how they negotiate their way through a joint venture has not been well documented.

To examine the joint work between teacher collaborators (TCs) and subject teachers (STs) was the purpose of this study. However, before such joint work can take place, it is logical to assume that there must be some agreement between the TCs and STs as to the when, where and how of such joint efforts.

The construction of such agreement is neither automatic nor simply a given, yet such agreement is assumed by the dominant model of joint work used in schools, a model rooted in the expert/novice dyad of the doctor/patient relationship. Further, the work of discourse analysts points out that discourse in
institutional consultation encounters (DICE) such as education, medicine and law, is constrained by the pre-determined hierarchy of power and authority structures. This hierarchical structure will also impact on any form of joint work (see Chapter 2 for a fuller discussion of these issues).

The question arises, then, as to whether the medical model is appropriate for the espoused purposes of establishing joint work in schools. Further, how the unwritten rules of behaviour and communication that are part of DICE influence this process, also deserve examination. In other words, how will the TCs proceed in their attempts to not simply negotiate, but actually construct for themselves, the structures and relationships needed to accrue the right to have their ideas and suggestions listened to and followed?

In the Pilot Project in which the TCs participated, it was their mandate to act as change agents in assisting STs to adapt their teaching in ways that would benefit ESL learners' access to academic subject material. In addition, they were encouraged to explore alternate models of joint work that could facilitate their work at the school level. How the TCs attempted to work day-to-day in a context where the educational equivalent of the medical model of joint work was often the assumed default model, and where the constraints of DICE had not previously been considered, forms the focus of this chapter.

Chapter Four provided an overview of the initial tallies of categories that were created during the four rounds of interviews, part of the data collected over two years. The list of categories shrinks and expands over time and as priorities alter in response to
changes in circumstance and perception. Four clusters of these
categories dominated the data and were further scrutinized to
determine "what is really going on here" and what meaning can be
reasonably drawn from these events. These four clusters are
discussed in this chapter.

The role the TCs are given and/or aspire to is discussed first as
it has significant impact on all that is to follow. How the TC teams
set themselves up within the school defines the parameters of
their work and is outlined next. Third, the contacts made, both
formally and casually, are seen to lead logically to a variety of
ways of working collaboratively. Finally, further perceived and
reported problems with joint work are discussed. The chapter
concludes with a summary figure. Figure 2 summarizes the data by
providing outline profiles of the four schools, including the school
image that became associated with the TCs, as well as the
essential concerns and approaches of both the TCs and STs.

Throughout the presentation of this analysis, the medical
(expert/novice) model will be referred to as a foil to facilitate
understanding of the issues highlighted. The reader is also referred
to Figure 1 (in Chapter 2) for an outline of the underlying
assumptions upon which this model is based. In addition, elements
of the hidden assumptions outlined in DICE (above and in Chapter 2)
will be seen to form a backdrop to the issues as discussed by the
informants themselves.
ROLE

1) Personal View of Role

First and foremost, in discussions with the TCs, was talk centering on the role itself. The ten Teacher Collaborators (TCs) accepted their new positions with a scant job description and no functioning models of the roles they were to assume. Their assumptions and consequent actions reflect prior experiences, reflection and deliberate planning, and learning and adjustment over time. Though the role the TCs are to play in working collaboratively is an obvious concern for the TCs, noteworthy also are comments about what this role should be that came from the Subject Teachers (STs).

Each TC has entered into, and is trying to make sense of, a new role within the school, a role that, for all intents and purposes, has no historical precedent. It is a role that has a mandate of joint work, which also has few precedents and, in fact, has some local, not necessarily positive, history.

Marris (1975) hints at the difficulties:

Occupational identity represents the accumulated wisdom of how to handle the job, derived from their own experience and the experience of all who have had the same job before or share it with them. Change threatens to invalidate that experience ... (p.16)

Not only are the TCs in the midst of change, but also they have no model or basis of experience on which they can base their new
"occupational identity". The respondents themselves confirm their feelings of unease and concern over how they will function and how they will be perceived by their colleagues. They have not been given the power to mandate collaboration and therefore they made finding ways to "fit in" a high priority:

So that's been the difficult part . . . fitting us into their perception of the job description rather than fulfilling the job description. I think that we're doing it but we are doing it in many different ways. I think we have probably decided to mold ourselves to their need and you'll notice that just by the very different things that we're all doing with different teachers. But by the same token we have defined certain parameters or limits to that as well. (1b)

Moreover, they were extremely concerned about what perceptions their colleagues might have with regard to the medical model, the expert/novice dyad.

I found some parts of it intimidating ....in particular, were we supposed to model for people and the part that kind of assumed great expertise on my part. (1a)

I don't want to come in here as the expert. It really bothers me . . . I don't like to see myself as the expert. I don't feel it. I got lots of good intentions but that doesn't make me the expert. (2c)

Credibility of the worth of the roles they had assumed, therefore, also ranked high among the TCs' concerns. While their willingness to take on this new role, unproved and untested, speaks of their own sense of efficacy (Poole & Okeafor, 1989; Ashton &
Webb, 1986) and craftsmanship (Garmston & Wellman, 1994 draft), they still raised many concerns about how others might view what they were, or were not, doing.

I am very sensitive to the fact that I am seen working. I justify my existence in terms of being in several of these classrooms helping. If I'm not doing that then I don't think that I am working. Now I am working, absolutely, but I don't think that they think I'm working and I can't get over that. I mean, I believe them, not me. (4a)

If you have things organized, I think it appears that . . . If people come in to talk to you and you don't follow up, you're not in a good organizational situation. You don't know where you're going. It doesn't look good. It's just an aspect of credibility. (2c)

However, despite the trepidations about how these new roles could function and would be received, the TCs were unanimous in seeing it as an opportunity for growth, change and exciting new learning. This is what Garmston & Wellman (1994 draft) call craftsmanship: "They know they can continually perfect their work and are willing to pursue ongoing learning." (p5)

When I first saw the job description I found it very intriguing and interesting even though I wasn't exactly sure I understood it completely. But that didn't bother me 'cause the curiosity about doing something new and different overrode the part of me that was nervous about not understanding completely. (1a)

The thing that eventually determined me last year was my interest in being where the rubber hits the road, namely being in change . . . in it right here. (4a)
I think one of the reasons I took the job was because I wanted to know more on the district level. I knew lots about what's going on in the school and in the classroom at that point. I'd taught the courses in a variety of ways and a number of times, changing that, this, and everything each time as I learned new things. But I didn't know a lot of about what was going on at the district level. (2c)

Even at the earliest stages in the Pilot Project, and given the relative inexperience of the ten TCs in functioning in their new role, many expressed specifics in terms of their own agenda - their vision of the role's purpose over and above the written job description. What is of interest here is the often subtle, but sometimes blatant, contradiction to initial concerns not to be seen as the expert coming in to fix the teacher.

By playing this role [pretending I'm a student], underplaying my role . . then once I'm in the classroom I find then I can give the teacher suggestions. Once I'm in the classroom then I'm giving suggestions to the teachers, without them probably even knowing it. (4c)

Our primary focus now is getting to work with teachers and having them say to other teachers, "Yes we've done some work with .... and it was good. You know, you should give it a try... (1b)

My hidden agenda is the socializing aspect. I see myself as working on a collegial basis and all of us working together. (3a)
2) Managing Role Perception

Closely related to a personal view of the role being assumed is a more conscious effort on the part of the TCs to manage how this new role is perceived in the school, particularly in relation to what they, and the Pilot Project, did not consider part of their mandate. They found themselves having to sometimes take a hard line approach to avoid having their time and efforts co-opted in other directions.

At the beginning there were some certain difficulties; there were certain misconceptions about what we were to do. Some people in the ESL department felt that we were supposed to deal with their students - almost be helpers in their rooms. We had a request to take kids out to do some Round Robin Reading and things like that. And we also had some difficulty about us being almost assigned certain people, we had to straighten out those things . . that we in fact made those decisions and that we had ways of going about doing things and that we were separate from the ESL department. I wanted to avoid any idea that we were being shoved on to people, assigned to people or attached to people and snooping around people.(1a)

We don't want to be the good suitable substitute when the teacher is burnt out kind of thing. We're fairly flexible or willing to do whatever it takes to get involved with the classes on the one hand. On the other hand, I'm beginning to become very kind of militant that we do not become teachers' aides . . we do not become something that we are not supposed to be. (2c)

Beyond the school-wide perception, careful handling of actual interaction in the classroom with colleagues was seen as of paramount importance - another aspect of managing role perception and attempting to avoid the expert label.
The rule I have for myself is I never take up a pen 'cause I never want to feel that they feel I'm documenting what they are doing 'cause I'm not the administrator and the people would think that I'm writing reports on them. Actually I tend to try and look at who they know are the referred students. Quite often I'll look over officially, especially when they ask questions and I think they sense what I'm doing. As a result of doing that, and by doing that I think they feel that, yes, they really are monitoring the students. They are not looking at how we are teaching in the class although obviously we can be doing that, too. If I really think it's not a lesson that truly supports the language development of the kids, I certainly don't indicate that even though... It would be suicide to do anything like that. (2a)

There's a personality; there's a certain personality that you must maintain. (2c)

That (how I am perceived) has to be something... going into classes... to be really conscious of that 'cause it's really easy I think for teachers to think that there's one more person in my room evaluating me as a teacher, so everything - all my body English - and things that I say are aimed towards putting that teacher easy, making sure that they understand that I'm here to help Jane or Grace or whoever. (4b)

The discussion so far makes it clear that while no specific models were available for the TCs to follow, they all had some very definite ideas about how they thought things should proceed, much of it reflecting an intuitive knowledge of DICE. This self-reflective behaviour is defined by Csikszentmihayli (1993) as "consciousness", an awareness of thoughts, feelings, intentions, behaviours and the impact they may have on others. It is because of this consciousness that the TCs have worked in various ways to play down or
neutralize the often forgone conclusion that they will be taking the role of expert in any collaborative effort.

3) Subject Teachers' (STs) View of Role

From the beginning, there was some dissonance between what the TCs were trying to emphasize and what the general perception of the TCs role was among their colleagues. While the TCs received inservice emphasizing the need to work collaboratively and collegially as opposed to the roles embedded in the expert/novice dyad, some of the STs demonstrated their continued assumption that the latter was de facto the way things would operate.

... have the resource teacher come into the classroom and understand what we are doing in our classrooms and have that same resource person teach us about the language acquisition for the students (4e)

... she showed me how I could re-use them to make better .. to make them into key visuals, to tie them into some kind of thinking process .. (4e)

... I did feel uncomfortable because I knew he was much better in grammar ... But it is something to realize that your way of teaching something isn't the best way. (2g)

Despite expecting to be "told", STs were very much aware of the shortcomings of the medical, expert/novice model as it had traditionally been used in past years to provide support services. Some expressed the hope that the TC team would not make the same mistake as "those people" (referring to special needs integration
personnel), shutting themselves off from the mainstream of school life and its students.

While most of the STs who chose to participate assumed that no one would actually imply that their teaching was inappropriate or lacking in any way, they did recognize the subtle pressures to amend what they were currently doing. Reactions varied. Some welcomed the suggestions and acted upon them.

I've never made as many overheads or key visuals as I have made this year. I thought it was a joke at the beginning but now that I have used it and seen better results from this ... (3e)

Others were adamant in reminding the world at large that they were not language teachers, nor had they any wish to be. They had, in fact, spent considerable time learning to teach subject matter, because that is what they were most interested in. This comes across particularly pointedly when voiced by someone within the English department, where many of the other subject teachers assumed that language learning would and should be taking place.

Basically, my love is interpretive literary criticism and so, while academically or intellectually I certainly see the need to be an introducer of basic language, it is frustrating. It is not the thing that fascinates me in the way it would someone who has said, 'Look what I want to do is teach basic English to newcomers to the country.' I think it frustrates many teachers. (4f)
4) School Image

Over the two-year period the TCs continued to develop and manage their roles within the school. In the process, each school team began to be perceived in association with a particular image, created through quite deliberate action, though not necessarily in conscious intent. Though still individuals, their efforts to work as a school team helped to foster an image that would distinguish them and their work in the school. As can be expected, given the influence of the culture of the school, and considering the dynamics of DICE each team of TCs came to represent an image that fit both their context and their espoused working roles.

School One TCs became the Producers. Over the two-year period they created and assisted in the creation of enormous quantities of materials and resources which they consciously fed to the appropriate content teachers.

We came at it from the materials angle. When we looked at stuff we'd say - we need this, we need this, oh, we must use this, kids should see this, they must do this.... Then when we made contact ... I'd like to see the materials you've used, that would give me a good idea of what sort of things you've done with the kids. Then I would take the materials and then I would come back with some work I had done as well to show them. (1b)

In this regard they spent countless hours above and beyond school time because they saw their priority as collaboratively working in class, which quickly began to tie up large chunks of the timetable - leaving less time for materials preparation. Despite
working overtime to produce their best possible efforts - "if you're a real bozo in the classroom, if you come up with inappropriate materials, you won't wash" (1a) - they were also conscious of not making things too slick:

We might be able to prepare some wonderful visuals for the class but we can't assume that other teachers are equally going to prepare that sort of visual because they've got their other class load as well. So we have to be sensitive to that because if you show work you've done - expecting them to do similar - then you've got to be aware that you're going to get some responses from people who will say, "Well, of course you can do a really good job. You only have one class. What do you expect; you should be, you know." (1b)

The TC team at School Two, from the outset, was known for careful organization. Not only did the Organizers here produce specific forms and procedures for referring students for assistance, they prided themselves on following up any such referrals within 24-48 hours. The specific format and quick response was considered an important aspect of the team's credibility.

Once we get in a referral on individual students - they will tell us subject area, block, the teacher - then it's a matter of going to find the teacher during the teacher's spare and saying, "OK I have got your referral now. What's the best approach for you with this student. How should we work with this. (2b)

School Three worked hard to create an image of Professionals. Here the dominant theme focussed on the all-too-common reality of time pressures. Therefore, went the argument, since we are all
professionals who don't need to be told how to behave and to work with students, providing a block of time to work on a project of your own choosing, is obviously the best thing to do.

We've got really good teachers here. They've taught for a long time and there's expertise and you don't need to smack them over the head too many times... It's not for us to go in and teach necessarily. Teachers are sensitive, they're creative. Otherwise this wouldn't be the job they'd want. We don't need to tell them... (3a)

At School Four the TC Team chose the image they wanted to create from the outset. Taking off from the theme song and title of the movie, Ghost Busters, they became the Text-Busters, complete with chants and banners to announce the opening of their Homework Room where text-busting strategies would be taught to all comers.

In addition, as long-time colleagues at that school, they found invitations to come and see how the (ESL) students were coping easily forthcoming. Once problems were identified, the students were given both in-class support and urged to continue their strategic learning in the Homework Room. Samples of text-busting strategies, often focussing specifically on the underlying language patterns, were given to the ESL students and sometimes taken up by the subject-area teachers as a useful strategy for the entire class.

We went to all classes. We started off with the top students, the ones who are totally integrated, then the ones who are in transitional... So we went to those students first and then we got them (teachers) to participate... what problems are you having with the kids in class... and we told them what our job was.... and what we thought we could do for them and where we were located.... We went to the students and we got them
to write down their study skills ... and what problems they had with homework and things like that. (4c)

I'm telling the teacher - by the way the other kids want this (graphic/ handout created for ESL students) - and then she, like sees it and uses it for the whole class. (4c)

5) Role Development - Advice and Reflections

At the end of the first year of the Pilot Project, all TCs were interviewed with a view to reflecting on both the accomplishments and the possible areas for changes and/or improvements for the second year. The TCs were asked to reflect on what they had done over the year, how/if they might do it differently for the second year and what advice they would give to anyone about to step into a similar role. During these discussions, they re-affirmed some of their initial perceptions, expressed surprise at some of the expectations that had developed and had specific suggestions and plans for the second year.

Common to all TCs was the conviction that being flexible and supportive in whatever model of joint work seemed workable was key. (Models used will be discussed later in this chapter.) "They have to perceive you as being someone that they would be comfortable with as well as the type of person that's willing to be open." (2a)

Related to this comfort level is the issue of who is in charge when two teachers are in the classroom. Although the TCs assumed various roles in their joint work with teachers, they pointed out
that despite any temporary arrangements with the ST, it had to remain clear that the classroom teacher was in control; "Mr. and Mrs. are still the boss.... you must play second fiddle with words."

They also recognized they had been ascribed the roles of salespeople - leaders and advocates, who could not afford the luxury of sitting and waiting for customers to beat down their doors if they hoped to maintain the credibility in the schools for which they had all worked so hard. This created some difficulties for TCs who were less experienced and found doing such things as assertively seeking joint work opportunities and doing demonstration lessons for interested colleagues quite stressful.

You may be told that this (not sitting back and waiting for customers) is one thing that you should be doing and you can't seem to be able to do it . . . then it becomes kind of frustrating. (2b)

I've done a lot more model teaching than I ever expected to do - which is really quite scary. . . to walk into a classroom where you don't know the kids and you're expected to do. . . you've got to get their attention right away and . . . this person is watching you and assuming you're the expert. (2c)

The TCs were also unanimous in declaring that the job was or would be much easier if the TCs were "colleagues who had taken a different job in the school" rather than newcomers to the staff. At the one school where this was not the case much time was taken at the beginning of the pilot to "be incredibly present" and available much above and beyond the proverbial call of duty.

Another concern for the TCs at all schools was the all too common perception that since they were no longer carrying a
regular teaching load, they no longer understood the unique joys and frustrations of classroom teaching, years of experience immediately prior to this new position notwithstanding. In response, all had already or intended to take on at least one teaching block. Some felt quite strongly that was what should have been done from the outset. It was pointed out how much easier, for example, demonstration lessons would be if you "at least knew the kids".

Tied to being a fellow teacher of classes was the notion that subject-area expertise was highly regarded by their ST colleagues - more so than ESL experience and expertise. Therefore, all the TCs recommended that similar projects in the future see to it that people in similar positions, at the very least "must know what the curriculum is made up of (preferably in several subject areas) and understand [how] everything links in and see how concepts build on one another year after year".

A final point made by the TCs concerns the socio-political aspects of schools. They issued strong warnings to anyone who would take on a similar position. Their recommendations include being social only at officially social times (don't be caught in the coffee room after coffee break is long over), giving 150% in terms of finding and creating resources, being seen to be involved in extra-curricular clubs and programs, not starting anything you then find yourself unable to follow through on (a homework club that fell flat because the TCs in charge were overbooked with other commitments), and doing your utmost to stay neutral in the
political intrigues and partisanship that are part of every institution of any size.

With regard to this last point, attempting to not "belong" to any specific group, not some special part of the school, was advocated. Instead, being known as individuals with individual talents and strengths was considered superior.

This has been the typical problem of - I hate to say it - Special Ed. departments and ESL departments. You can ask people in the school and they don't even know the person's name and you can't be that way. (2c)

As already highlighted above, these insights and suggestions, while presented formally at the end of the first year of the Pilot Program, were in many ways already embedded in the thoughts, actions and approaches of the TCs. They helped to form part of the total action plan for setting up, making contact and moving into joint ventures. It is to the setting up that we turn next.

SET-UP

Aside from finding ways to fit into their new roles, the TCs were also embroiled in basic organization - setting up shop. This code category, together with how they chose to set themselves up as a team - team cohesion - again demonstrates much thought and prior knowledge of both their colleagues and the school situation. It is also at this juncture that the quite different approaches (above)
are taken, differences that have enormous implications for the eventual outcomes of the entire joint work agenda.

I knew we'd have to spend a lot of time establishing ourselves and establishing credibility or trust or whatever you want to call it. I did a lot of thinking at the beginning as opposed to doing, was constantly thinking out loud and talking about how it was going to be done. Things as simple as whether and what kind of form we should use to keep track of the people we deal with, how people should approach us, how we should divide up departments if we are going to do it that way, for instance. So in a way we are still at that kind of informal stage and we have rejected the idea of having a form for people to fill out when they want to see us. (1a)

We decided to make it less formal. My thinking was that paper might get in the way. (4b)

We thought to develop the student referral form and that's the key point. We have the system where a content teacher gets the referral to the counsellor, who can have any additional information about the student and then it comes to us for "round tabling". We generally agree through the nature of round tabling, who should go . . . where we are more qualified, so to speak. (2a)

How the team of TCs was to work together was also not predetermined and needed to be dealt with. Again notice the different tacks taken by the different schools.

We always know what each other is doing. That's different for me but I like it. I think it's really good. We have a lot of stopping and taking stock. I'm not used to working as a member of a team either. . . . We feel that since we are breaking new ground all the time, we always have to get feedback. (1b)

We all agreed that organization is really important and so we are talking about things like referral forms or
how we are going to keep track of kids. We have a list of things . . some readings we would do and stuff like that, really general but certainly we were very focused on the organizational aspect. (2c)

We put together problems regular teachers perceive kids having in the classroom, and then we circulated that to the ESL kids. We put our information out to the ESL classes and that was the team effort that . . three of us going into the class and saying, "We are the text-busters. This is where we can be found, and the homework room is here. This is what we do, here's the form to fill out on what problems you have in classes." (4a)

A final note on this topic is in order. The TCs quickly realized that their attempts to involve themselves fully, so they could feel, and be perceived as if, they were pulling their weight in the school, had an overwhelming side effect. Preparation for a regular teaching load was far different from the work they had now taken on, work that encompassed many more subject areas and that almost demanded the spectacular if their credibility and that of the entire Pilot were to remain high.

Another thing we started just two weeks ago was scheduling our blocks for certain things because we always scheduled them with teachers, but then there's other times when you are in here and you don't have a schedule, and we're so schedule-oriented being teachers we found we had actually to schedule time in the day where we do certain things that need to be done otherwise we'd find they all piled up at the end of the week (1b)

I must admit I worked my tail off to get that stuff done because I thought it's got to be good. If I have mucked it up and had given her a lot of rubbish . . I had to take what she had given me, take it and put some visuals on
that and it wasn't easy because I don't have the background in the subject either and I wanted it to be not so different from what she has given me that she thought, "Who the hell does she think she is?" (1b)

Also of note is the fact that School Three did not appear to go through a formal set-up stage. While a team existed on paper, the support offered was created and enacted almost completely via a unique timetable grid that plotted self-selected teachers into two-month slots.

During these time blocks, teachers were free to pursue their own pet projects, while someone from the TC team took their classes in one teaching block. During the first year of the Pilot Project at this school, only informal contact was made in this loosely structured support system. The TC leader sums it up as follows:

The two-month cycle seems to be just perfect because it gives us time (with the slight overlap) at each end for people to come and go out. . . I have to make sure I see them once at least and they see each other. . (3a)

Interestingly enough, the teachers themselves, while they enjoyed enormously having school time to work on a unit or some research they had been leaving undone due to time constraints, decided that they really needed something more formal to learn how to better serve the growing numbers of ESL students in their content classes.

When, in the second year of the Pilot, the TC leader taught one block, teachers began not only asking informally what to do about specific language or content-based issues but asked to watch this
"expert" in action dealing with the perceived issue or problem. Thus, despite efforts to remain "just one of the colleagues", the TC leader was being put in the position of expert she had tried so hard to avoid.

... the next block when we talked about what he was going to do, he wanted to use some of the strategies I had used . . . and he said, 'Can I watch you?' . . . and then he wanted me to watch him try ... he really wanted to work on process . . (3a)

The stage is now set and considerable thought and planning has gone into creating the roles and relationships that will determine how joint work will proceed at each school. While initial formal introductions have been made, individual contacts that will lead to collaborative work, remain to be established. How the TCs made contact and then proceeded to some collaborative enterprise is the topic of the next section.

CONTACT AND COLLABORATION

Contacts with teachers toward the aim of some kind of joint work and actual instances of such work were the prime directive of the TCs. With some sort of base of operation set up at each school, initial approaches were sometimes deliberately coordinated, other times simply coincidence.
1) Contact

All the TCs agreed that simply sitting back and waiting to be approached, with or without a formal process in place, would not be enough to garner the involvement they all desired.

The way I first did it was to be incredibly present and positive and to join as many things as I could and to make sure I sat with as many different people at coffee break as possible and I then talked to people about what I wanted to do as much as I could. It's usually through casual encounter and many of the exchanges, many of these things that's how it's been. I was waiting outside the racket ball court, for example, at 5 o'clock, waiting for my partner when the English teacher ran through on the way back from volleyball supervision, and we talked for 3 minutes and out of that we have this entire unit of Romeo and Juliet visuals. (1a)

He's in charge of the annual, and I have been reviewing the grad write-up for a number of years and those sort of things . . [those prior contacts ] are what lead to, "Come on to the classroom. So and so is having a problem and what can I do." (4b)

I'm trying to get into science and before I get into that I'm trying to develop some friendship with the science teacher. I volunteer my help once or twice a week with the team he is coaching. (1c)

The casual encounter also had the potential of creating the wrong impression. Very quickly many of the TCs found themselves incredibly busy and locked into certain timetable constraints in order to be available as these contacts developed into joint efforts. This sometimes proved to conflict with the schedules of other interested teachers.
The classroom teachers tended to see the "wide-open" schedule of the TCs - as non-enrolling teachers - as equivalent to absolutely limitless availability. At School Two it was reported that the subject teachers initially made jokes about "these Pilot people who had seven or eight spares". The STs were, therefore, not pleased when schedule constraints meant they did not have access to the TCs' expertise when they wanted it:

From speaking to him casually in the staff cafeteria about the project, I asked him if he was interested in doing some of this or had an interest in having me in the classroom. First he was a little bit - I'm not sure and I'm really busy myself, always on the go - but he said maybe see him later and he did mention that possibly I can go in and work with some Physics 11 students. I was involved in computer studies and wasn't able to get to him. I tried to keep the contact and mention that "you're on my list and I'm going to get to you I just haven't got there yet." He said, "Well by the time you get there maybe I'll have the language problems rectified myself." (2b)

More formal contacts were made, in a variety of ways, through the students because everyone agreed that "that's how the teachers buy in - through the kids."

Those contacts were made very specifically - this kind of salesmanship type thing we did. (2c)

We are trying to work it every way we can if it is giving them a break because when they know there is some advantages with being involved in this project... We wanted to get the formal objective testing so we gave them a GAP test. So we just sent the teacher off to have a spare. (2a)
I found myself totally ineffective, because I didn't know what kids were doing. I guess after a month and a half or so I sort of decided what I'm going to do. I'm going to go and take 4 blocks and I just go to every class for a month, I go into the classroom and be like a student and learn the subject. Then by doing that I can do the homework and the kids can come in here and I can help them with the homework or in the classroom I can help. (4c)

We went to all classes. We started it off with the top students, the ones who are integrated, then ones who are in transitional class and ELA class. (4c)

2) Collaboration

Whether the contact was formal, informal or a combination of both, the key was to establish some form of joint work. The TCs had received some formal training that suggested ways to work collaboratively, a model where responsibility is shared but, nonetheless, the TC was expected to take the role of consultant, somewhat the expert. They were to see to it that work at least progressed beyond brainstorming and talking about possibilities. In the process of establishing joint work with their colleagues, the TCs attempted to clarify and refine what they saw as the essence of such collaborative efforts and what forms of it seemed both acceptable and workable. The issue of definitions and variations on joint work will be discussed next.
a) Collaboration is . . .

As we have seen in Chapter 2, collaboration is defined in a variety of ways in the literature and much confusion exists when details of the day-to-day process are sought. In a more local context, teacher-librarians in the same school district as this study, trained to be "cooperative program planning and teaching resource teachers" (a program already in place for a number of years), were surveyed as to their reactions to and involvements with the Pilot Project. (Dunn, 1992) They pointed out that "cooperative" and "collaborative" were terms they used somewhat indiscriminately and several also stated that cooperation, to them, meant team teaching while collaboration meant team planning. With this further confusion of terminology in mind, let us turn to how the subjects in this study chose to view the joint work they were doing.

Both the TCs and the STs, also, had preconceived notions of what collaboration was - based on previous experiences at the school level, notably around the integration of special needs learners. Here again, the medical model becomes the fall-back position, where both the TCs and the subject teachers see the TCs' role, at least in part, as one of prescribing appropriate intervention in order to "fix" (depending on your viewpoint) either the students' problems or the approach used by the subject teacher.

On a strictly affective level, over the period of two years, both groups of teachers described and defined collaboration in a variety of ways: Collaboration is scary; show time; undefinable; more rapid change; exhilarating; the only way to go; working with, not for;
shared responsibility; fun; almost like detective work; a test of your flexibility.

One TC sums up the contrasts in some detail:

It's a very painful process. I think from the beginning, working collaboratively is very difficult because we're all - the people that have come in the program - we were all very successful as individuals . . . and individuals is the word. We followed our own ideas and then . . . it was very difficult to give up your individuality for something that at first you might have thought wasn't as good as your own ideas. . . and (in terms of the TC team) having three people was really a good balance because if there's three people, you know, that if you put something out and two people don't agree with you then maybe it's not the right one - and yet sometimes it's very hard to give that up. . . but once you sort of have worked collaboratively and then you see the results are better than what you did yourself. . . The more you do it, the more you see that the results, working things together, turns out better than what one person could do alone. (4c)

The subject teachers expressed their trepidations, too:

I made myself collaboratively teach with her. Initially it's like waltzing with somebody. When you first dance with them you're worried about stepping on toes. But it is something to be able to realize that your way of teaching something isn't the best way . . . (2g)

While the TCs were willing to accept a number of variations on what collaboration "should" be as an entry point, they had a definite vision in mind of how the ideal of joint work should look. They were both right and wrong. In their struggle to both fulfill their mandate and not "step on the toes" of colleagues, they learned that the ideal
according to Little (1990b), where parity, shared responsibility from inception to completion of a project is the norm, was often not only impossible but at times, not even desirable.

One TC describes her involvement with a project that included several classroom teachers and the teacher librarian. Initially, she was trying, over coffee, to diagnose just exactly how one teacher was trying to articulate that she needed assistance. The project snowballed and became a very successful theme study - one finally taught by the classroom teacher alone, for a number of reasons, including the impracticality of having five or six teachers rotate through one classroom over a relatively short period of time.

From the beginning, the teacher librarian assumed the expert role and the TC sat back in awe as a hodgepodge of materials and ideas took shape before her eyes. She confided that she was really glad she had not voiced her strong concerns over the number of people involved and the myriad spin-offs suggested, which she felt would destroy the cohesiveness needed to see a project to completion.

In the end she asked this "expert" colleague, "Now how did we get from point one - which was this teacher didn't know what he or she wanted to do - to 'we've got an outline and everybody's got a task.' ?" (1b) The response was an eloquent shrug and "I guess it's just practice and knowing the people."

The resulting theme study became a workshop showpiece and the TC involved struggled with how to describe what had happened in this collaborative venture - specifically defining what collaboration looks like, since she knew workshop attendees would
be looking for a recipe that might allow them to reproduce such a successful team effort.

I could hardly give that as a model of collaboration. What do you say? 'Oh, we started with coffee and we started thinking about ......' and now, having done this a number of times (since this specific project) - every time is completely different. It's not a defined set of rules for any one person . . . (1b)

b) Flexible Hats

The term "Flexible Hats" was coined by the TC above to describe her duties as a Teacher Collaborator as she joked about having to check her timetable to see which hat she had to wear next. This image for different variations of joint work with different teachers seems apt as the many variations reported indicate.

For example, while all TCs in their training had been encouraged to not simply be "an extra pair of hands" in the classroom, they all admitted to doing precisely that with a view to progressing to a more interactive role as some measure of rapport and trust developed between them and their subject-area colleagues.

In addition, the earlier discussion of the perceived role or roles they chose to assume for a specific purpose, provides further examples of wearing different hats in different circumstances. On a continuum from minimal interdependence to joint work where specific roles are indistinguishable, the TCs created, adopted and adapted as seemed appropriate.
Aside from being the extra pair of hands in the classroom, they describe working in isolation with a topic for which some materials were requested, sitting with a teacher to plan and create a unit of study and then handing it off for the teacher to do with as s/he chose or, more rarely, planning and implementing a theme study together with the classroom teacher. What the TCs ended up doing most frequently depended on circumstances, timetabling constraints, and the individuals involved. Some of the more common variations are discussed below.

1) Playing Student

Sitting in on content classes and playing student in order to analyze the difficulties students were having with the content matter and its linguistic hurdles proved to be a common technique often associated with an initial way to get the proverbial foot in the door.

So it's working with an individual student that's been recommended (for help) and through the class the teacher has seen the improvements. . . hey that really worked and I like that sheet you gave her and . . . would you like a copy . . . and it's into her hands and next thing the whole class is using it. (2a)

This type of contact was perceived as fairly low risk by the STs, and even welcomed.

At first I thought it would take her so long to learn the stuff that she would not be able to be helpful or beneficial . . . but what it did serve to do is . . . she was learning it from their perspective and she had more to relate to in terms of their inability to learn some of it
than I would, or a person who knew the content very well. (4e)

This role, however, had its detractors, too. Both STs and some TCs felt that it was an inexcusable and costly waste of time and expertise of highly trained individuals. One TC expressed his concerns as follows.

I don't know if it warrants the effort to sit through long, numerous classes when perhaps there's only a single student they want you to help them with. I think it would be more beneficial if someone that knew what was going on went in there, could assess the situation pretty quickly and be useful to that person - like immediately. (2a)

**ii) Expert/consultant**

As discussed earlier, the TCs understood that the role of expert was to some extent expected of them, although they were extremely conscious of the hazards of such a role - the negative stereotypes and fear of evaluation and judgments associated with it in the minds of teachers. Nonetheless, in order to begin to work toward a more collaborative model, they had to accept this role when it was thrust upon them - and it often was. This role is particularly reminiscent of the doctor asking leading questions to get at the "real" problem the patient is having.

Often I find that people have a great deal of difficulty explaining what exactly the problem is. They say, 'They're (the students) having trouble.' That doesn't really help me. Then I have to keep asking questions . . . Some just don't understand why they (the students) don't
get it. Others understand why they don't get it but they
don't know what to do about it. (2c)

It's difficult to know what they're getting at. They talk
almost cryptically. They don't know what they want. So
I'll say, 'I think maybe you're thinking of . . . and
sometimes they'll say, 'Yes, that's exactly ...' and other
times they're saying no they're not. . . (1b)

...we had teachers calling us to come in; teachers
approaching us with concerns about the kids in their
classes; teachers coming in here or in the hallway
stopping to say, 'This is what's happening. Can I get
some help?' (4b)

I went in and observed because he wondered how he
could help his ESL kids. (3a)

iii) Guest Teacher

Aside from being put in the position of expert who would fix the
problem, perhaps the most common hat the TCs wore was that of
guest teacher. Indeed, this role evolved, almost inevitably, from one
of the two above forms of collaboration - playing student or expert.

In discussion with the TCs, it was pointed out that going in to do
something that was specifically requested or that met a need that
had been voiced, was an excellent way to showcase the usefulness
of involvement with the Pilot Project in general and the TC team in
particular. School One was the first to pick up on an opportunity to
play guest teacher by teaching study skills to grade eight and nine
students.

The general idea was based on comments about kids
being weak in specific skills . . . .we were teaching
specific study skills that the teachers had requested
and were trying to direct it into whatever material they were using at that point in time. It put us in contact with tons of teachers in a most positive way because they had given us the idea - they'd selected those skills. (1a)

This project was so successful that the other schools worked to create similar opportunities.

Another form of guest teaching occurred when an ST decided to make use of the opportunity to be freed from a teaching block in order to plan or refine a topic of study s/he wanted to work on. During the planning with one member of the TC team, a second member would take over that block of teaching, usually 3 one-hour sessions per week for a period of two to four weeks.

This was another opportunity to demonstrate the quality of support that was available through the Pilot Project. The TCs also realized how important it was, in these instances, to be very clear as to the expectations of the ST involved.

We have to be really careful with that. We don't want it to be something where they come back and say, 'Oh well, of course in this time I would have covered so much more.' And the other thing is it has to be a finite unit. It can't be something which we open and then they close... That doesn't work very well because they have their own ways of approaching a unit. So we really need a time frame. (1b)

Realizing that despite relishing an opportunity to work on future teaching units during school time, the STs involved would still be concerned about how their classes were doing in their absence, the TCs also worked hard to reassure the STs involved.
I would always check in with him once a week just to let him know what we're up to, what's going on, which projects are taking place . . . and he, I think, came away feeling really good about his classes being left in sort of a comfortable situation . . . that they weren't falling behind in their work. They were doing what needed to be done. I took on the full role for that class from the marking to everything else. (2a)

iv) Turn-taking

Co-teaching, where the collaborating teachers planned and executed a topic of study together, was aspired to by all TCs. The reality was, in fact, what Fullan and Hargreaves (1991) consider, at best, comfortable collaboration. In simple terms, two teachers were present but only one was "teaching" at a time. While one presented an agreed upon section, the other either sat back and watched, circulated among students providing individual help, or left the classroom entirely. At some designated point the two would reverse roles. This "turn-taking" seemed to suit many teachers, both TCs and STs.

I sometimes teach with him - we divide the class in the sense that he would do the first 25 minutes or so and I'd do the last 25 minutes. (2a)

We took turns, though. I'd go up and then it would get to a point where I didn't even know quite what she wanted to do with the next section. So she'd do it. (1b)

If there's two teachers co-teaching then it's not so hard to say, 'OK I'm taking some time off to . . . you still have that class flow running because the two of you are together. (2e)
The last comment above offers a very different definition of co-teaching and also reflects the often mentioned convenience aspect of turn-taking as opposed to a more interactive model of co-teaching.

v) on the firing line

In the second year of this study, all TCs taught at least one block of grade level classes. Despite the need for more, not less, time to plan and work with colleagues, they all felt out of touch and less effective in their roles because they had not been "on the firing line", teaching their own classes for the last year. The STs agreed. Though the TCs had been successful teachers, in many cases in the same schools, as soon as they became TCs and non-enrolling, their credibility became questionable.

There's more trust now, in our abilities to help to pinpoint problems and they'll be much more forthcoming with information, I find. Whereas it was before, 'Well, you wouldn't understand because you're not teaching. Now that we're teaching, that has been a benefit. (1b)

I can just be someone else who's teaching that unit at the same time. She's going, 'What am I going to do with this unit I hate?' and you can just say, 'Well I've got some stuff, you know . . . ' (2c)
vi) Mentor/Model

Despite adamantly insisting that "I'm just one of the colleagues", many of the TCs found themselves taking on the role of expert. As a result of deliberately putting themselves back into the classroom part time, the TCs were able to use their teaching blocks as yet another way to forward the aims and specific strategies of the Pilot Project. Within a very short space of time, there was a growing demand for demonstration lessons and related forms of peer coaching and mentoring.

I didn't feel ill at ease teaching in front of him and obviously he didn't in front of me. And I think, had I gone in and sat at the back of the room or something like that, I don't think it would have worked as well . . . him trying some of the strategies I demonstrated. (3a)

They are in control of what problem or content or process they want to work on. . . in many cases they do know about ESL kids, even though they may not realize it at first. They do know some of the things they have to do. So it really is reassuring in that sense.(1a)

It offers the opportunity for people to come and see what we are doing. Rather than saying this is what you should be doing, we can say, 'Why not just come and see how I deal with this problem or situation?' (2c)
PROBLEMS/CONCERNS

While both TCs and STs waxed poetic about some of their successes using one form of joint work or another, all also articulated some concerns. Beyond the scope of this study are the litany of complaints about the perceived "lacks" of the students themselves. For example, many STs commented on the ESL students' lack of readiness for the demands of their subject areas as well as their inability to understand and follow the contextual or anecdotal backdrop to events under discussion.

Also of interest for more specific future research, and relevant to the present context, is the notion presented earlier about the differences of perception of what the "problem" really is. Like the example in Chapter 4, of how differently the two groups of teachers viewed the "text", what the key issues of the Pilot Project, and possible solutions were, was often distinctly different for the two groups.

The mandate of the Pilot Project was for the TCs to help STs deal with this increasing diversity, both linguistic and experiential, while teaching the content. How the TCs attempted to achieve this has been the subject of this chapter. The discussion makes it clear that the STs did not always agree with these "solutions".

What was also of concern to both TCs and STs were issues more directly related to their efforts to institute some form of joint work. As discussed above, the TCs saw a number of possible problems from the outset and worked to minimize them. However,
two key issues, time and teacher autonomy, remained and were repeatedly articulated throughout the term of the Pilot Project.

1) Time

Concerns over time were expressed by all participants. Despite the fact that there was now additional time to plan, organize and reflect by virtue of having extra teachers per school available to assist in almost any way requested, the STs still felt a chronic lack of time to "cover the curriculum", meet to plan with the TCs, or create and adapt materials that would assist the ESL learners in their classes.

One ST voiced her strong opinion (supported by others on staff) that "having the non-enrolling bodies who can relieve you in various ways doesn't seem to be the answer". She justified her conclusion based on two criteria. She pointed out that the offered "time-share", where a TC would take your class so you could plan with a second TC or work on your own project, was severely under-utilized in the school because people could not be creative on demand.

You have to have blocks of time and it has to be . . . I mean to be creative you can't be forced into it. You have to have your own time and be free of everything else. If you're sitting worried about what's going on in your class . . . I don't know, it just doesn't work. (2e)

Also hinted at in the above is the second concern, time spent away from "my class". In the earlier discussion of different models of joint work, TCs tried in various ways to support the strong sense of ownership and responsibility that the STs felt for their classes. However, this concern was obviously not completely dealt with.
Because you like to know where your own kids are. You don't want to leave them for two weeks or even longer... not as a professional, so that's not satisfactory. (2f)

In addition, voices of newer teachers argued that simply keeping up with the demands of the curriculum was about all they could handle on a day-to-day basis. To plan for time away also involved setting up a program to be followed during this absence and teachers, despite the fact that they could articulate the benefits of planning with a more experienced colleague, felt unable or unwilling to meet this additional demand on their time.

The fact that the TCs, also, felt always pressed for time and despite this gave up some of their time to teach one class (see above) further supports the importance of this concern.

2) *Teacher as Professional*

Equally difficult to reconcile within a collaborative framework is the issue of the teacher as a professional and an individual. The sense of responsibility for "delivering the curriculum" within a limited and set time frame is part and parcel of the sense of freedom teachers feel they need, to impose their individual styles and approaches on that teaching. Both TCs and STs saw this as an issue. One ST expressed it as follows:

You have different teaching styles, different ways of evaluating, different emphases, and for me that's my class in there and I want to be with them and do it my way. (2f)
In addition, many STs expressed a concern that their chosen specialty was in danger of being co-opted in favour of some perceived larger good.

I certainly see the need to be an introducer of basic language as frustrating. I think it frustrates many teachers... (4f) I agree totally. (1e)

Even if the need to work collaboratively in order to be more effective in the classroom is a given, STs saw time to talk, work and plan with those in their own departments as time better spent than the time to work collaboratively that was offered through the Pilot.

In my Utopia, keep them out of my classroom and give me the time to get together with fellow professionals. The only people that can possibly, in the context of school, work for me are the people I'm directly working with. (1h)

Again, the discussion above has pointed out that TCs were very sensitive to this perception and tried to accommodate by clarifying their own role, how it did not impinge on that of the STs, and how they proposed to step in and "cover the curriculum" in the ST's place as carefully and effectively as the ST would be doing.

A final note is in order. As mentioned earlier, specific departments signed up to participate in the Pilot Program. Given the frequent contact of this researcher, it was clear that participation was not always voluntary nor enthusiastic. Moreover, many teachers, even in the departments officially committed, chose not
to take advantage of any of the opportunities offered by the Pilot Project.

In such a situation, Anita de Boer has counselled those in roles similar to that of the TCs to recognize when to "stop watering rocks" ( workshop comment). This reality was recognized by all the TCs.

So many teachers are in their classrooms and they're happy the way things have gone. They're happy to continue that way and they don't want somebody else in the classroom. (2b)

The VSB Pilot Evaluation (Dunn, 1992) displays at some length other comments and concerns of teachers who chose not to participate more directly. Since this reaches beyond the mandate of this thesis, the reader is directed to that work for further details.

This chapter has outlined, in considerable detail, the roles and attendant responsibilities of the subjects of this research. The TCs have worked to create an appropriate image of themselves as helping individuals and as members of a school team. In addition, how they created and implemented instances of joint work is documented, as is the reaction of their ST colleagues. Finally, two key issues that create dissonance with the premises of joint work have been articulated in the words of the respondents.

To conclude this presentation of findings, the following summary figure provides an outline of many of the key elements presented in this chapter. Figure 2 summarizes the data by providing outline
profiles of the four schools, including the school image created by the TCs, and the essential concerns and approaches of both the TCs and STs.

Figure 2: School Profiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMAGE</th>
<th>SCHOOL #1</th>
<th>SCHOOL #2</th>
<th>SCHOOL #3</th>
<th>SCHOOL #4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TCs' APPROACH</td>
<td>informal; incredibly present</td>
<td>formal; referral of students</td>
<td>individual, self-directed; scheduled time</td>
<td>informal; blitz all departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STs' APPROACH</td>
<td>do this for me; work with these students/topics; let's ....</td>
<td>do this for me; let me work, don't bug me; just fix 'em</td>
<td>I want to do ...; what do you think about ...; can I try ...</td>
<td>do this for me; give me some time to ...; let's ....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCs' RATIONALE</td>
<td>we're here to work for you</td>
<td>we're on top of it and we can help</td>
<td>a gift of time honours your efforts</td>
<td>try it, you just might like it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCs' CHIEF CONCERN</td>
<td>establishing credibility</td>
<td>establishing credibility</td>
<td>non-interference</td>
<td>total school involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STs' CHIEF CONCERNS</td>
<td>resources that work</td>
<td>are you earning your keep?</td>
<td>specific topics and routines</td>
<td>students lack skills; is this worth the time?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCs' SOURCES OF CLIENTS</td>
<td>coincidence; solicitation</td>
<td>student referrals; drop-ins; coincidence</td>
<td>humanities teachers; self-selected</td>
<td>class lists; referrals; coincidence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the next chapter the key elements presented here will be reiterated in light of the original research questions, as will the implications of the use of the medical model of joint work in schools. The impact that DICE has on interactions such as joint work will also be discussed. Then, questions and implications for further research will be outlined and a summary of possible conclusions that can be drawn from this research will complete the chapter.
CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

... institutions affect our lives and through their hierarchical structure elicit characteristic kinds of behaviors within them. . . . Although people may not be consciously aware of hidden constraints, they nonetheless act in accordance with unstated rules of behaviour and communication. (Bonvillain, 1993:371)

This case study has described and analyzed how a group of Teacher Collaborators (TCs), specialists in English as a Second Language pedagogy and practice, attempted to and learned to work collaboratively with their subject-area specialist colleagues. The exploratory question of the study focussed on how this joint work might be constructed and enacted on a day-to-day basis within the context of secondary schools.

In addition, the de facto model of joint work typically used in schools, the medical model, was considered as a foil for highlighting the evolution of joint work in the present study. Finally, discourse in institutional consultation encounters (DICE), especially the pre-assigned rights and constraints inherent in these encounters, was used as a lens to help focus and fine-tune understanding of events and issues.

This final chapter summarizes the major findings of this study and discusses possible conclusions to be drawn from such findings. First, at the descriptive level, six key findings will be presented
and discussed. Limitations of these findings are also addressed. Then a careful look at the two frames of reference used throughout this research, DICE and the medical model, will consider the impact these may have had on what occurred. This helps to explain, at the interpretive level, why joint work eventuated as it did. The implications of the study for both theory and practice form the focus of the conclusion.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Six key findings are presented and discussed in light of brief examples. Further examples of each can also be found in the relevant sections of both Chapters 2 and 5. It should be kept in mind that what follows is a brief overview, many points of which will be re-visited later, in light of the implications of these findings.

1) Finding: In the view of the TCs, constructing the parameters of their new roles, was both the most difficult, and considered the most critical, aspect of joint work endeavours.

Discussion: Greenburg (1987), among others, makes it clear that role changes represent disruptions to the routines that are part of what is "comfortable and known". Woods (1983) further points out that roles are actively constructed in accordance with how individuals define their situation and are, therefore, dynamic and evolving. The ten TCs in this research set themselves the task of
not only creating their new roles but also of making both
themselves and their subject-area colleagues as comfortable as
possible within this new context.

From the first moment of accepting their new roles, the TCs
endeavoured to create for themselves and fit themselves into a
niche within the school. Their own prior experiences as classroom
teachers had not prepared them for these new roles, but these same
experiences appeared to help them intuit what roles and procedures
were likely to succeed within their school contexts.

To this end they sought, in particular, to be seen as supportive
and non-threatening. The terms and descriptors they used all
reflected the common message of "I'm here to help, not hinder."
They pointed out to their subject teacher colleagues (STs) that they
could act as supporters, liaisons, stress-relievers, extra pairs of
hands, encouragers, ones who follow through - the reliable ones,
and, simply, helpful colleagues.

It is important to note that this supportive role was, in reality,
only one aspect of the roles the TCs worked to establish for
themselves. Concurrently, they saw their roles in a more persuasive
mode, referring to their roles as managers, coordinators, SDAs
(Staff Development Associates), and coaches. This duality of role
was not lost on them or their subject-area colleagues, who, as
illustrated in Chapter 5, fully expected them to take the lead in
some cases. The critical factor for the TCs was knowing "when to
wear which hat". One TC expressed this for the group as follows:
I think most of the people . . . are interested in trying out new things but you've got to approach them in the right way. You just have to watch them and watch the whole situation and see how you can approach it in a positive way. (2c)

Further implications that the TCs cited include the need to "be willing to give up lots of time outside your schedule" and "work your tail off" to produce something agreed to before any pre-established deadlines.

What these findings suggest is that the recipes and prescriptions that abound in the literature for how to do joint work neither begin to address the interpersonal and intrapersonal aspects of creating and negotiating joint work, nor do they provide a template for stepping into and adjusting to a new role.

2) Finding: Credibility was a highly subjective but vital component of joint work.

Discussion: Fay (1992) in her case study on the nature of teacher leadership, points out how important it is for "lead teachers", roles closely resembling those of the TCs in the present study, to be perceived as having the appropriate expertise and common background - subject area, classroom experience and so on - to that of their peers, in order to be effective in these roles. She further notes that it is equally vital that the lead teachers continue to teach while in their new roles.

These findings are generally confirmed by the results of the present study. At the outset, the TCs worked to establish their
credibility in a variety of ways. They presented themselves and outlined their background and experience (even where they had been on staff previously), made themselves specifically available to both teachers and students, produced quality materials requested in very short order, created their own versions of official reporting and procedural forms, found and organized a collection of subject-specific material resources that were made available to teachers, and set up specific hours for teacher-referred students.

The TCs were enormously pleased to be part of a non-enrolling team because, as they saw it, this would provide them the opportunity to meet with STs during school time and give them the flexibility to adapt to the schedules of their colleagues, including acting as guest teacher while other team members planned with an ST colleague.

However, while they provided support and services far above and beyond their scheduled school hours, it quickly became apparent that their ST colleagues thought that a) TCs had "eight spares" to do as they chose and b) TCs couldn't possibly know what it was really like in the classroom if they were not teaching - guest spots notwithstanding.

This rather took the TCs aback, all of whom had been carrying a regular teaching load the previous semester. As a result, by the second year, all the TCs were teaching at least one class, and, even though this meant less time to support their ST colleagues, this was heartily endorsed by the latter as a "good move". STs continued and, in fact, increased their requests for model teaching lessons
that they could watch and from which they could "learn some strategies that work with the ESL kids".

While these findings confirm other findings in the field, it is important to note that this demand for establishing credibility has a cost - less time is available for TCs to work with their teaching colleagues (more on this dilemma later).

3) **Finding:** The sense of professional responsibility and accountability for "delivering the curriculum" was a mitigating factor in joint work efforts.

**Discussion:** Cohen (1990) discusses at length the reasons for a distinct lack of change in schools over the decades. One thing blamed for this is the continued tradition, especially at the secondary level, of using the transmission model of instruction.

What is repeatedly cited by subject-area teachers in this study as a reason not to engage in more joint work efforts is their concern that they meet their professional responsibilities, namely to "cover the curriculum". The responsibility they feel to deliver the curriculum as laid down - and examined - is often felt to preclude the time it would take to do joint work. This was an issue for the STs from two standpoints.

First, the reasoning went, since I only see this group of students for a very limited number of periods per term, I do not feel good about taking time and energy for other projects and ideas. Second, if I take time out to plan with you, while so-and-so takes my class, I'm worried that time will be wasted getting to know the kids and
materials instead of getting on with the topics that I would have covered in the same time frame.

Hargreaves (1994), calls this persecutory guilt. (This term was first coined by Alan Davies in his essay "The Politics of Guilt").

Persecutory guilt is the kind of guilt that leads many teachers to concentrate on covering the required content, rather than ignoring it or subverting it to develop more interesting materials and approaches of their own. (p.143)

In terms of using the transmission model of teaching, the STs in this study argued that they really have no other option, given the sheer volume of material to cover and the fact that, with upwards of 120 students seen per week, getting to know individual students' strengths and then moving then forward from there is "nothing but a pipe dream". As one ST put it, "That's all very well in theory but when you literally run through that many kids it's just not an option - if you want to have a life that is." (workshop conversation)

These findings confirm what research in the educational change literature has repeatedly noted, namely that the inertia of the known and routine can be a powerful inhibitory factor to change. In addition, a teacher's sense of efficacy can become a personal veto card for any proposed change effort that does not clearly demonstrate a minimal cost for maximum gain. (see Chapter 2 for details on these issues.)
4) Finding: The forms joint work took in this study appeared to be directly related to the roles assumed by the TCs.

Discussion: Bonvillain (1993) notes that individuals in institutional contexts behave and interact in particular ways based on not necessarily conscious awareness of hidden constraints, what has in this study been labelled DICE. This seems to be borne out by the actions and interactions of the respondents of the present research.

Joint work was originally defined for this study as any form of joint effort on the part of teachers to take each other, their students and their curricula into account in their planning and teaching. Chapter 5 outlines several versions of joint work as they manifested themselves in the day-to-day work of the TCs and their ST colleagues. While some form of joint work occurred in all four schools of this study, the specific forms taken varied significantly. The variations appear to be closely linked with the roles the TCs established for themselves.

For example, at School One, the TC team created for themselves the image of Producers. They created and collated extraordinary amounts of materials both for their own use in joint work ventures and as the "extra pair of hands" assisting ST colleagues. That this was seen as an important and worthwhile use of their time and talents, was expressed by both TCs, "time and a like-minded person promotes getting long-needed tasks done", and STs "the greatest convincer for the ordinary classroom teacher is to have resources that work well".
By comparison, School Three produced relatively little. Given the school image of Professionals, it is perhaps not surprising that much of the TC's time was spent on model teaching and mentoring or coaching activities. The TC leader at this school had expressed concern about joint work from the outset: "my personal style is not collaboration. So I asked myself, what can I give people . . . time . . . to think and do for themselves." (workshop conversation).

One administrator at the same school backs up this viewpoint: " . . . having the subject-area teachers watching ESL teachers [using these ideas and strategies] will assist them in understanding how they need to adapt for their integrated ESL learners." (staffroom conversation). An ST put it as follows: "Change is here. We should not be dinosaurs - we know what happened to them." (workshop conversation).

What these examples illustrate is borne out at the other two schools in this study (see also Figure 2, above, for an overview). In particular it is noted that the initial setting up of the TC roles appears to be directly related to the kinds of joint work and the attendant roles that the TCs were called upon to take.

What is less clear and a potential topic of great interest for future research in this area, is which came first - are the types of joint work requested and negotiated a result of the role parameters the TCs created for themselves, or were these parameters deliberately created as a reflection of the culture of the school combined with the intuitive knowledge of the TCs as to how the STs could be induced to "buy in"? The latter would support the body of research in institutional contexts which posits that the hidden
constraints of institutional hierarchy and power structures dictate how interactions are conducted.

While the information from this study is only a small sampling, preliminary speculation based on the data available would indicate it is probably a combination of both kinds of factors, such that role creation is a function of understanding what will work and the action and interaction within that role would be emergent and evolutionary rather than static and fixed.

5) Finding: Assumptions embedded in joint work processes both facilitated and inhibited joint work.

Discussion: Some of the assumptions about joint work include how it should proceed, what roles each party to the effort plays, who is "in charge" and how that power is shared, and where ultimate responsibility for the process and/or the product should lie. Another very basic assumption is that the participants in a joint work effort want to work together, which in turn implies that they feel they have something to learn from each other that would benefit their students and, possibly, their subject area.

Bryk et al (1990), among others, point out that a system of mass education such as the urban high schools in this study, complete with the inherent processes of subject specialization and bureaucratic centralization of power, create a work ethic characterized by "that's not my job".

This sentiment was frequently expressed by STs in this study, who felt that teaching ESL learners, was not their mandate. While
no one would argue that teaching ESL learners the English language per se is the domain of the ESL specialist teachers, the teaching of the "language" of specific subject areas is another matter. The STs in this study seemed to feel that this latter was not their responsibility either. In fact, the STs saw themselves not as teachers in the general sense, but labelled themselves as teachers of specific subject matter - "I'm a math teacher" rather than "I'm a teacher". One ST summed it up this way:

You're not going to have science teachers and social studies teachers having a real interest or a love for the language. That's not what their interest and love is. They assume, either that the kids already know that or they don't feel it's their job to do that. (2e/f)

Where STs thought that they owned "the problem", as opposed to vesting it in the ESL students (which tended to automatically make it the ESL teachers' problem), they were willing to learn from their ESL colleagues and in fact demanded lessons in language acquisition and strategies for helping the ESL learners acquire the subject matter.

What this finding points out is that the assumptions embedded in joint work efforts includes variables that are not necessarily predictable in advance - variables that form part of the culture of the school as well as the individual perspectives of the teachers involved. Since the research into joint work efforts has focussed primarily on recipes and prescriptions for executing the process, the area of prior assumptions before joint work efforts even begin requires much further study and research. (Prior assumptions also play a role in the model of joint work used - more on this later.)
6) Finding: The provision of time and human resources to do joint work created a dilemma for teachers.

Discussion: As Hargreaves and Dawe (1989) found in their extensive research, simply providing teachers with more time does not necessarily result in more joint work taking place. Much of the body of literature also points out that teaching is a never-ending task. It is perhaps no wonder then that teachers choose to devote extra time given to the myriad and mundane tasks that are part of teaching on a day-to-day basis.

In addition, as pointed out earlier in this discussion, the non-enrolling time-frame given to the TCs, was looked at askance by the STs, some of whom saw it as an endless continuum of "spares" to do with as desired. The TCs also felt the need to appear to be working and put in many extra hours to convince themselves, as well as their colleagues, that they were indeed working. Despite this, however, the TCs also felt it necessary to give up some of their time in order to gain increased credibility with their ST colleagues, as noted concerning the second finding above.

STs, too, faced the dilemma of time with regard to time off in one teaching block, offered to facilitate collaboration with the TCs. For example, at one school there was lengthy discussion among STs as to the pros and cons of taking the offered time block. On the plus side was in-school time to work on something that would likely have to be done at home or after hours otherwise.

However, the factors against taking that time often won out. These included, having to do some measure of preparation for
someone else to take over the class for that time period, concern that "all the right stuff" would be covered in their absence, concern over the already short time frame in which they had to get to know the students well enough to evaluate them appropriately, and the notion that "being creative on demand, at a particular time of the day, and turning it off when the bell goes" was not realistic.

What these findings indicate is that time continues to be a paradox for teachers: there is never enough but sometimes it must be given up for both professional and personal reasons.

LIMITATIONS OF THE FINDINGS

As indicated in Chapter 3, findings in case study research are not generalizable to a specific population. Instead such findings must be judged by the reader by looking for possible "fit" with, and transferability to, the context the reader has in mind. To this end, I have attempted to paint a clear and comprehensive picture of both the context and the events of this study.

In addition, the findings for this study relate specifically to ESL teachers working with their subject-area colleagues for the benefit of ESL learners. Hence generalizations to joint work efforts in other contexts must be considered with appropriate caution.

Relevant research for the findings cited has been reviewed extensively in the literature review of this dissertation, and
highlighted briefly during the above discussion. Beyond the six findings specific to this study, a number of both practical and theoretical issues and their implications are worthy of consideration. That is the topic of the next section.

THE MEDICAL MODEL OF COLLABORATION

The medical model was a constant component of the joint work efforts documented in this study. The reader is reminded that the medical model forms the basis for the type of joint work traditionally done in schools. All teachers had prior experience with this model, especially where the integration of learners with special needs is concerned. This type of joint work was, in response to the move toward inclusive education, often mandated without any prior preparation for the classroom teacher.

In both the literature review of this study and the outline of the findings, the dilemmas inherent in this expert/novice dyad, similar to the doctor/patient relationship, were highlighted. While the currently popular version (in education) of the medical model, collaborative consultation or collaborative problem solving, de-emphasizes the inequality of status inherent in the doctor/patient relationship, prior practical experiences of teachers seem to dictate otherwise. As illustrated clearly in the data, both the TCs and the STs saw the cosmetics of a changed label as no real change at all and acted accordingly.
The question then arises as to whether or not this model is appropriate for the promotion of joint work in schools, especially given the dismal record of joint work efforts documented in the body of research on such efforts. Perhaps the one size fits all approach to doing joint work in schools needs to be re-examined with a view to a more precisely tailored fit to reflect specific needs. The many and varied examples of how joint work emerged in this study seem to indicate this as a valuable avenue for further exploration.

One possible alternative approach that may have merit in institutional contexts is that proposed by Gray (1989). Using organizational theory, he has proposed four categories of what are called collaborative forms to create mutually acceptable versions of joint work. These forms are exploratory, advisory, confederate and contractual. He argues that they are hierarchically arranged and distinguished by their functions and corresponding outcomes. He further implies that all stages are necessary for optimal and lasting implementation of agreed upon change efforts.

In the present study, the purpose of collaboration included an increased appreciation and understanding of ESL issues. Therefore, according to Gray, the form of collaboration used should have, first and foremost, been exploratory in nature - both parties gaining a shared understanding and common problem definition, which would then lead to a refinement of the issues and consequent actions. Such seeking of common ground could also have led to concrete discussions of how the assumptions embedded in the medical model
of joint work would be dealt with in the reality of day-to-day efforts.

In contrast, what Gray calls the advisory category of collaboration was created. At this stage in the hierarchy, the exploratory findings should be analyzed, and agreed upon options implemented. In other words, the first step of creating a common basis upon which to build had been omitted and an expert/novice dyad was created.

This is reflected in the data of the present study. For example, a point frequently highlighted by the respondents was the lack of felt interdependence. The aims of the TCs were not seen as particularly important or valuable by the STs. Rather, the STs felt they were being asked to do yet one more add-on from which they did not necessarily see the benefits that might accrue, or at worst, they saw it as doing someone else's (the ESL teacher's) job. According to Gray, without a real awareness of interdependence the confederative stage, that of adoption and implementation of agreed upon strategies and solutions, is not easily reached.

Referring back to the doctor/patient analogy, the doctor (TC) told the patient (ST) what the correct prescription was and did not allow for any discussion of the pros and cons or even, whether the patient agreed with the diagnosis in the first place. While in actual fact no TC had the temerity to specifically tell STs what to do, the assumption that this would more or less be the format was embedded in the mandate of the project. The results varied from dutiful taking of the prescription (rarely) through a half-hearted
effort to comply, to complete dismissal of the diagnosis, prescription and all.

Gray's final category of collaborative forms is the contractual. At this stage collaboration could be institutionalized, similarly to the final stage of change implementation outlined by Fullan (1991). The results would include contracts enforceable by law or other forms of authority.

This alternate conception of joint work in institutional settings has merit in the present context and is offered as a possible starting point for further research. Together with Gray, however, I wish to caution the reader that this is not proposed as yet another prescription to follow: "Collaboration is essentially an emergent process, rather than a prescribed state of organization." (p.15) This raises the question of the forms that such an emergent process takes. One value of the present study is that it outlines some forms of that process.

DISCOURSE IN INSTITUTIONAL CONSULTATION ENCOUNTERS (DICE)

Throughout the presentation of this study, reference has been made to the importance of keeping in mind discourse in institutional consultation encounters (DICE) when considering the analysis of day-to-day joint work efforts. The impact the pre-existing structures of DICE have on what occurs during joint work efforts should not be underestimated. What DICE illuminates is how
the strict parameters of professional relationships are enacted in joint work contexts.

Fisher & Todd (1986) outline the differences. During ordinary conversation there is an expectation of turn taking, topic change and equal question and answer exchange. When moved to a professional relationship mode as in DICE, however, "status and power have been shown to wreak havoc with this symmetry. . . The structure of the institution is organized so as to lend those in power the authority to pursue defined goals." (p. ix)

In terms of the present study, the professional relationship between the TCs and STs was bounded by the dynamics of DICE. This manifested itself in a number of ways. First, since no direct power and authority was given to the TCs, it appears that they created a measure of power and authority for themselves by having control of both material and human resources. Acting as the gatekeepers for the use of time and newly created resources allowed the TCs to set, to some extent, the agenda for joint work efforts.

Second, technocracy, as used in DICE, can become a tool of control. Just like the technical wizards of this computer age dazzle and overwhelm those less literate in computer technology, the TCs were able, at times, to use their expertise in linguistics and language acquisition to demonstrate their ability to analyze content-area subject matter in a way the STs could barely fathom.

Third, the TCs, by virtue of their appointment as non-enrolling support personnel had accrued a measure of status and power within their schools. Unlike their enrolling colleagues, they were in control of their own schedules and could allot that most valuable of
resources, time, both to themselves and their ST colleagues, in varying ways. Such control, according to DICE, supports the right to determine to some extent the content and direction of both talk and resulting activity.

However, all was not as simple and straightforward as the foregoing would indicate. In terms of control over resources, the TCs found themselves having to use these same resources as the proverbial carrot to even begin a negotiation towards joint work. Sceptical and overworked, STs, for the most part, wanted ready-made materials that were relevant to their subject area and that worked without having to put in the time to create them, either alone or in collaboration with the TCs. If they heard through word of mouth that some materials created and offered appeared to work well, they were inclined to "give them a try" with no promise to participate in future joint work.

The technocracy of TC expertise was often dismissed out of hand. For example, the TCs set up a workshop session for science and social studies teachers to help them gain some measure of understanding of the linguistic demands of their subject areas. Through the use of model exam questions in both subject areas and the subsequent process of analyzing "How do I answer this question?", STs began to realize that there was a very specific language component to each subject area.

Some also realized that as the experts of a given area they found it more difficult to isolate the linguistic components of that area. It was suggested that this might be because they were too
conversant with the content. A science teacher summed it up this way:

I had trouble seeing it in science - isn't that funny - but it's easier if I don't know the material, like with the social studies question. It was obvious to me that it was a before and after situation. (workshop session)

While all agreed that this was indeed fascinating and interesting, when asked if they would now apply these new insights to their teaching, the answer was invariably in the negative, and the prevailing reason for this was that "this takes time from and has nothing to do with covering the content".

The third area of access to power and authority outlined above relates to the control TCs had over their own schedules. As indicated above and in Chapter 5, the STs were very ambivalent about availing themselves of opportunities to leave their classrooms in order to engage in joint work efforts. Such opportunities were almost seen as a dereliction of duty by some and, for one ST, the open-ended schedule of the TCs was seen as a waste of precious human resources that could be better used in other, more beneficial ways.

What all three manifestations of DICE point out is that status and authority in institutional settings are not impersonal factors of the setting. Instead, they are created by the people involved and valued according to unwritten perceptions and belief systems. What this research has done is, to some small extent, highlight what
people generally have arranged not to talk about because it is a given in institutional encounters.

Gray (1989) discusses this problem in terms of developing a theory of collaboration in organizational contexts. He points out that what is needed is threefold:

1) education about the advantages of and skills needed for collaboration,
2) guidelines for when and how collaboration can be deemed useful and
3) reward systems . . .

(p.254)

In my view, these three points are also of crucial importance in the present research. While some attempts were made in all three areas, both by the school district and the TCs, the foregoing discussion has amply illustrated that such efforts were not enough to bring about the desired level of involvement and understanding on the part of the STs.

Since the body of research on joint work efforts is rife with failed and less than stellar attempts to create and/or mandate joint work, it remains open to conjecture and further research as to exactly what processes and guidelines will bring a more consistent rate of success.
QUESTIONS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

1) Questions Related to the Medical Model and DICE

The summary, above, of the impact that both DICE and joint work rooted in the medical model have on how joint work efforts are enacted on a day-to-day basis, highlights the need for further exploration and research in several related areas.

First, there needs to be a heightened recognition and understanding of the preconditions to joint work. As has been repeatedly pointed out in the literature, it is not as simple as providing time and resources, nor can it be achieved by putting two teachers together in one room and telling them to work together. Individual personalities, past experiences, familiarity with joint work efforts and models, an appropriate working relationship and the hidden constraints of DICE, all need to be considered.

In other words, a way needs to be found for two professionals to negotiate their roles and responsibilities in such a way that they will be able to equitably share the "territory of the classroom" to their own and their students' benefit. It appears that the field of organizational theory as noted above, and the area of project management in the corporate world (see Chapter 2 and, for example, Frame, 1987) may be pointing the way toward new models and approaches that could be adapted for educational settings.

Second, in order to avoid the difficulties inherent in the medical model of joint work, alternatives may need to be constructed in order to begin to resolve some of the many dilemmas raised in the
present study. Gray's (1989) categories (above) have led him to propose a theory for dealing with inter-organizational conflict management and resolution. Further examination of this and other models may provide new and successful approaches that are applicable in education.

Third, since the majority of research in the field has pointed to the many benefits of joint work of whatever variety, this area seems a worthy avenue for further exploration. Reasons to do joint work range from improved school climate (Little, 1990b), through a way of sharing the collective knowledge and experience of teachers (Rosenholtz, 1989) to more practical concerns for the promotion of a particular discipline (Snow, 1994).

From a global perspective, our interdependence is a fact, not a piece of fiction. Individual teachers cannot hope to keep up with the explosion of knowledge in their respective fields of expertise, nor can teachers assume a homogeneous student body, mono-cultural and monolingual. Joint work with colleagues seems a useful way of sharing these increasing complexities of teaching. By combining expertises, teachers can assist learners to see how different bodies of knowledge connect and interrelate, as well as learning to understand and live in an increasingly multicultural and multilingual world.

As pointed out by Fisher & Todd (1986) the "unintended", both in actions and their consequences, are so pervasive in our personal and professional interactions that we hardly notice. They suggest that:
"collective work or the combination of studies across settings, perspectives and methodologies are required to create a broader vision than single efforts can provide. . . insights can be drawn from combining the work of disparate scholars [in different disciplines] to create a more complete collage than any one alone offers. (p. xiv)

Louis & Miles (1990) point out that any form of coordination of efforts - such as in the present study - "requires legitimacy, the right as well as the sheer time to take coordinative action." (p.265) Incidents in the present study saw TCs trying to gain access to this right with varying success. Much more research is needed into how such rights can be constructed and negotiated on a day-to-day basis.

Frame (1987) asserts that Project Managers, the equivalent of the TCs in this study (see Chapter 2) are something like politicians:

Typically, they are not inherently powerful, capable of imposing their will directly on their co-workers . . . Like politicians, if they are to get their way they have to exercise influence effectively over others. (p.43)

This importance of personality and personal style should not be underestimated and deserves much further examination as an important element of joint work efforts.

Fourth, another important element that interweaves DICE and the medical model is power. How it is derived, according to Wasley, (1992) depends on the relationships of the partners in joint work efforts. What her research indicates is that the power to effect
6. How significant a factor is personal autonomy in mitigating against joint work? There is no doubt that some autonomy must be sacrificed in the interests of pursuing joint endeavours, both in and out of the classroom. What the internal cost/benefit analysis may be that results in choosing to do joint work or not, would be extremely illuminating for researchers and practitioners alike.

7. One fundamental issue concerning what it means to be a teacher has been noted in this study. Specifically, is it a teacher's mandate to teach subject matter or to teach children what they need to learn? The answer to this question is fraught with political threat and possibility. For all intents and purposes, in the present context, the majority of secondary teachers would opt for being considered subject matter teachers, while teachers in the elementary grades would be inclined to speak of themselves as teachers of children, rather than subject matter.

Given that the enormous changes in student clientele have radically altered what secondary students are capable of in the English language, it is important to explore further what motivates, for example, science teachers to take some of their limited class time to specifically teach the language of science so that their ESL learners will better understand and comprehend both lectures and textbooks.

8. The issue above is also related to responsibility. How can the acceptance of responsibility for all learners in the classroom, ESL learners included, be facilitated? How can this be reconciled with the sense of responsibility for "delivering the curriculum" as commonly stated by secondary teachers?
9. While this research has illuminated one small piece of the picture that examines how joint work can be enacted on a day-to-day basis, much more research is needed to clarify its dynamics and parameters from the viewpoint of those most intimately involved, the teachers themselves. The endless recipes and prescriptions available in the body of research appear to break down the moment two people have to negotiate their roles and how they will work together in a face to face situation. Any efforts to gain further insights and understandings would benefit the educational community.

CONCLUSIONS

It is difficult to draw firm conclusions from the qualitative data presented here. What this study has done is to present an exploratory incursion into what is a complex area, one that holds the promise of much richly illuminating further research. It has documented the process of becoming teacher collaborators for the benefit of ESL students. As a result, these data suggest certain issues and offer some directions for further consideration and investigation.

According to Poole & Okeafor (1989), researchers and theorists describe educational change as a process of resocialization. This is particularly true when it comes to having teachers learn to work collaboratively, as in this study. Teachers themselves have
Joint work that empowers and enhances, managing to succeed despite the constraints of technocracy and tradition, is hard to achieve but appears worthy of the effort and is achievable, as the body of research in the field and the present study have documented. Practically put, Bullough et al (1984) point out, that while "the obstacles to altering teacher role are formidable" (p 356), the fact remains that teachers make dozens of decisions daily that tap their ability to deal with contrary values and balance contrasting needs. Joint work appears to be a necessity for the improvement in the academic education of ESL students and has been shown, by this study, as possible.

The present research has illuminated the process in all its complexity and demonstrated how a small group of teachers constructed and negotiated new roles for themselves in their efforts to do joint work. Their trials and their errors, their actions and reflections provide much food for thought, admiration and speculation. It is hoped that this small contribution can be built upon to further enhance and expand the promise and possibility of joint work in schools.

This research has also shown the inadequacies of the medical model of joint work. It has indicated that research needs to move beyond static models of joint work and develop dynamic models. These models will need to capture the processes by which the prerequisites for joint work are constructed through the use of institutional discourse within the context of the school.


APPENDIX 1: CODE CATEGORY DESCRIPTIONS

In total twenty-three code categories were used during the two years of this study. These codes were used in preliminary stages of data analysis and are used to demonstrate how the data were grouped during the analysis process. These codes refer specifically to the information presented in Chapter 4 of this dissertation. Each code and a brief explanation of its intended significance is listed below in alphabetical order. Codes later collapsed are marked with a check mark (√) and codes found most significant overall are marked with an asterisk (*).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE CATEGORY NAME</th>
<th>EXPLANATION OF CODE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* collaborative efforts</td>
<td>what does collaboration look like in action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>√ constraints</td>
<td>inhibiting factors toward working collaboratively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* first contacts</td>
<td>both planned and accidental contact with the aim of establishing collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* ideal Pilot Project outcomes</td>
<td>personal views of what the overall program should achieve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* managing role perception</td>
<td>deliberate but informal ways of establishing &quot;what we do, don't do and/or could do&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>√ negative staff reception</td>
<td>general view of programme vs specific objections to collaboration as an approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>√ negative view of collaboration</td>
<td>staff view of collaboration as reported by TCs and stated by STs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>new job description</strong></td>
<td>experience, personal characteristics, etc. deemed appropriate for this role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>next efforts</strong></td>
<td>what we need to work on next (end of Year I perceptions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>√ not enough time</strong></td>
<td>time is key factor in lack of ability to do, to teach, to plan, to make, to collaborate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>peer help / clubs</strong></td>
<td>elective club options for helping ESL learners (as opposed to in-class support)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>personal changes</strong></td>
<td>here is something I changed to support the Pilot's purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>√ personal view of role</strong></td>
<td>here is how I feel TCs should be, act, support, etc. - both TCs and STs viewpoints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>√ positive staff reception</strong></td>
<td>positive views of Pilot programme and the TCs new roles in the school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>√ positive staff view of collaboration</strong></td>
<td>positive views of collaboration per se</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>√ problems</strong></td>
<td>difficulties cited by TCs and STs in terms of difficulties for themselves and for ESL learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>√ provide time to</strong></td>
<td>provision of time to teachers to do, plan, research, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>√ purpose of Pilot Project</strong></td>
<td>staff mandate of espoused goals/aims and personal views expressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>√ school outcomes</strong></td>
<td>observed changes in school as a whole, reports of espoused aim to foster school changes - as opposed to <em>student outcomes</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>setting up shop</em></td>
<td>organizational and management efforts to get ready to offer services to the school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>solutions/ supports</td>
<td>material and other forms of support that address <em>problems</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>student outcomes</em></td>
<td>changes in student ability to cope, perform, etc. as opposed to <em>school outcomes</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>team cohesion</em></td>
<td>how the TCs present, view and organize themselves as a team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COLLAPSING OF CATEGORIES**

On reviewing incidences of some categories it became clear that there was enough overlap of implication to justify collapsing them. As a result the following categories have been combined.

**ORIGINALLY**

- Constraints problems
- negative staff reception
- negative view of collaboration
- positive staff reception
- positive staff view of collaboration
- not enough time to provide time to

**NEW CATEGORY**

- problems
- staff view + or -
- time (needed or provided)
Appendix 2: Question Areas for Interviews

Semi-structured interviews were conducted in five rounds over a period of two years. While an initial set of question areas were created, possible discussion areas were noted as issues of relevance arose. For each round, the general question areas that formed the focus of the interview, are listed below.

**Round I - Individual Interviews with Teacher Collaborators (TCs)**
1. Describe the school setting, atmosphere and other issues you see as relevant to your position here.
2. How do you see your new role in the Pilot Project in general, and in this school, in particular?
3. How do you plan to communicate this vision of your role to your colleagues?
4. What are your plans/strategies for getting started working with your subject-area colleagues? Describe what you have done or how things have eventuated already?
5. Describe how you have gone about "setting up shop".

**Round II - Interviews with TC Teams**
1. Spend a few minutes writing a job description for your present position, in terms of what you actually do and what the qualifications and requirements on a detailed job application would look like.
2. Talk about your new role based on its day-to-day reality. How is it the same as or different from what you were expecting when you applied for this position at the outset of the project?
3. If you could advise a person about to take a similar position in another school what "words of wisdom" would you offer?
4. How do you see the staff reacting to your position and to you as a team in terms of what you do and how they think you could help them?
5. Tell me about your thoughts and plans for the next school year - plans, things you will do more of/less of, new ideas, plans, etc.

Round III - Individual Interviews with TCs
1. How has your role evolved up to this date? Does it still fit the job description you wrote? If not, how is it different and why do you think that may be so?
2. Describe what working collaboratively is like for you. What does it look like from day to day, even hour to hour on your schedule? How is it the same or different depending on the people involved or the topics?
3. Please talk about any thoughts and reflections on your role, working collaboratively, or anything else you would like to comment on.
Round IV - Individual Interviews with Subject Teachers (STs)
1. Describe your role in the school and how you came to be involved with the Pilot Project.
2. Tell me about your experiences working with the TCs at your school: what worked, what could have been done differently, what you liked and what was not so great?
3. Please talk about any other thoughts and reflections that seem relevant to you.

Round V - Individual Interviews with Administrators
1. Describe your role in the school, specifically in terms of how you are involved with the Pilot Project.
2. As an administrator, tell me your thoughts on the impact of the Pilot Project on the school as a whole, as well as on individuals and/or departments as seems relevant to you.
3. Feel free to comment on anything else that you have seen working and/or you wish could have been done differently.