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ABSTRACT

This qualitative study aims to describe the collaborative planning process between a classroom teacher and an English as a Second Language (ESL) specialist. In addition, it examines the tasks planned in order to provide a description of integrated language and content (ILC) instruction. The case study approach selected is supportive of an investigation of planning and instruction which focuses on process rather than product. Early (1990) comments that we "lack a clear understanding of the kinds of learning tasks that simultaneously foster the acquisition of language and content knowledge; we also lack a clear explanation of how to construct and implement such tasks." (p.10) It is hoped that this study will contribute to this "lack".

An examination of the data collected around collaborative planning for integrated language and content instruction reveals that the planning teachers shared a common set of goals for the improvement of instruction in the classroom. A relationship of trust was developed between the two teachers as they gradually shared control of their areas of expertise. Particular information is provided on the role that Mohan's Knowledge Framework, Task Design and Key Visuals played in the planning and instruction. In addition, sequential processes for planning and instruction are described as the means for developing and presenting lessons. The teachers share their interpretations of the costs and benefits inherent in these processes. Preliminary conclusions are offered based on the data collected.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Over fifty percent of the students attending Vancouver schools speak English as a second language (ESL). These ESL students can take an average of five to eight years to achieve to their academic potential in their second language (Collier, 1987; Cummins, 1984). Because of the extended period of time needed to learn English, traditional teaching methods which emphasize language instruction prior to content instruction are no longer considered to be practical or effective. As stated in the External Review of ESL programs (Ashworth, Cummins, & Handscombe, 1989) commissioned by the Vancouver School Board, it is necessary for all teachers to plan for the language and academic needs of ESL students. This requires a change in theory and practice for many ESL and content teachers.

In recent years, literature in the field of educational change has highlighted the role of teacher collaboration in supporting meaningful school change (Fullan, 1991; Lieberman, 1988; Little, 1987; Zahorik, 1987). Increasingly, ESL and classroom teachers are being asked to work together to plan instruction for ESL students. This collaborative planning is one means by which ESL specialists and classroom teachers can share their expertise. However, little has been written about collaboration between teachers to meet the needs of ESL students (Hurren, 1993; Minnes, 1991). Research on teacher planning has required teachers to reflect on their planning process.
artificially, either retroactively or by thinking aloud while planning (Shavelson & Stern, 1981; Borko et al, 1979). Collaborative planning necessitates communication between teachers in order to clarify ideas and goals. This natural communication provides a forum for a better understanding of the planning process.

Research also tells us that true collaboration where teachers are involved in planning on a continuing basis is rare, due to a variety of school conditions which are not conducive to collaborative consultation between and among teachers (Little, 1987; Goodlad, 1984; Sarason, 1982; Lortie, 1975). Chief among these obstacles is the typical state of teacher isolation which exists in most schools. While it is important to examine those obstacles, this study will focus on a setting which has successfully supported a system for ongoing collaboration between ESL and classroom teachers. It is not the purpose of this study to identify the reasons for that success (see Early, 1993) but to document what successful collaboration looks like and how it translates into classroom instruction.

Current methodology in ESL teaching is supportive of an integrated language and content (ILC) approach to teaching. (Crandall & Tucker, 1989; Snow, Met & Genesee, 1989; Mohan, 1986). Central to this method of teaching is the concept of academic content providing the medium for instruction in language use. Mohan advocates a method for ILC instruction which focuses on the development of classroom tasks planned using the Knowledge
Collaboration and ILC Instruction

Framework; an organizational tool which links knowledge structures, language and key visuals. This particular method has been used successfully in the site selected for this research.

Within the context of the school, the central concern of planning and teaching is the development of students' tasks. There has been much discussion in the literature in regard to the actual components of a task or activity (Long & Crookes, 1992; Horowitz, 1986; Doyle & Carter, 1984). From a sociocultural viewpoint (Ochs, 1988; Halliday, 1985), tasks can be viewed as having both theoretical and practical components. This combination of theory and practice is reflected both in planning of tasks and instructional tasks based on Mohan's model.

In summary, this thesis assumes a form of collaborative planning between an ESL teacher and a classroom teacher where the individuals meet to specifically plan a unit of study in order to address both the content and language needs of the students. In addition, it recognizes that the particular type of ILC instruction used by the participants is based on the theoretical model developed by Mohan. In his review of ILC, Mohan (1991) makes the following statement:

The integration of language and content can be broadly defined as mutual support and cooperation between language teachers and content teachers for the educational benefit of LEP (Limited English Proficiency) students. Language development and content development are not regarded in isolation from each other and there is a focus on the intersection of language, content and thinking skills. (p.113)

This study intends to focus on the teachers' collaborative
planning of student tasks and the resulting instruction related to the planned tasks.

**Purpose of the Study**

This study will focus on a classroom teacher and a district ESL specialist who were involved in collaboratively planning and teaching a novel study based on *The Lion the Witch and the Wardrobe* (Lewis, 1950). The purpose of the collaborative planning process was to develop a unit of study which addressed both content and language goals. The examination of tasks as the common element of both planning and instruction provides a foundation for discussion.

The main research problem is: "How do an ESL specialist and a classroom teacher collaboratively plan instruction which integrates language and content demands of tasks?". In other words, the purpose of the study is determine what collaborative planning of tasks in this situation "looks like" and what the resulting ILC tasks "look like". The general problem can be broken down into two main areas of emphasis - planning and instruction. Specific research questions can be posed under each category as follows:

1) What does collaborative planning look like?
2) What does ILC instruction look like?

The significance of this study lies in its effort to identify specific features of collaborative planning and ILC instruction. Early (1990) states:
Researchers and teachers working in the field of second language learning lack a clear understanding of the kinds of learning tasks that simultaneously foster the acquisition of language and content knowledge; we also lack a clear explanation of how to construct and implement such tasks. (p.10)

By providing a rich description of the process followed by two successful teachers, it is hoped that others may be able to more easily apply the theoretical concepts underlying Mohan's model for ILC instruction.

The thesis is divided into five chapters along the following lines:

Chapter 2 a critical review of current literature which applies generally to the ideas of teacher planning and instruction and specifically to collaborative planning and integrated language and content instruction.

Chapter 3 a description of the methods used to gather and analyze data

Chapter 4 a discussion of the research findings

Chapter 5 a summary of the conclusions followed by implications and directions for future study

Background to the Study

In September of 1987, a number of Vancouver schools (6 elementary, 4 secondary) began a three year long project funded by the Ministry of Education - Funds for Excellence. Led by Dr. B. Mohan, University of British Columbia (UBC); Dr. M. Early, UBC and Mr. H. Hooper, Vancouver School Board (VSB), the participating
schools received background information about the theories of Dr. Mohan on ILC instruction through a series of workshops. As a result of this project, teachers began to apply the ideas to their classrooms and produce materials for student instruction.

Subsequent to the Funds for Excellence project, the VSB began a two year pilot project in September, 1989. The goal of this pilot project was to support classroom teachers in their efforts to provide integrated language and content instruction for mainstreamed ESL students. Teachers in pilot schools participated in a comprehensive staff development program consisting of a minimum of six days training in Mohan's Knowledge Framework approach. At the same time, ESL specialists hired for each of the pilot schools began to work with classroom/content teachers to plan ILC instruction. Results of the pilot project evaluation indicated that collaboration between ESL and content area teachers was highly recommended (Vancouver School Board, 1992). On a survey of participating teachers, over 84% of the teachers indicated that collaboration improved the learning environment for ESL students. In addition, approximately 91% of teachers rated Mohan's Knowledge Framework approach as effective in linking language and content.

In particular, one elementary school involved in the pilot project appeared to have considerable success with collaborative planning and ILC instruction. Further research has been undertaken at this site as part of a research grant from The Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC).
The following excerpt from the SSHRC research proposal describes the main focus of the project.

The general objectives of this research program are: to document and assess the feasibility and effectiveness of a teaching intervention designed specifically to help teachers and ESL students achieve a better understanding of how knowledge is shaped in the social context of the classroom and how it is realized in texts and in graphics within a particular content domain; and to assess the effect that different types of tasks have on ESL students' acquisition of academic discourse. (Early & Mohan, 1990 - Summary of Research Program for SSHRC Research Proposal)

Both quantitative and qualitative research related to the above theme has been completed or is planned for the selected site.

The elementary school selected for this study has a population of 497 students of whom 372 (74.85%) speak ESL (Sept. 1991). These students come from a variety of backgrounds originating in more than 29 different countries. There are over 20 first languages spoken, the most prominent being Chinese (and dialects). The majority of the students are in regular class programs. There are, however, two district classes (one intermediate and one primary) enrolling 20 and 15 students respectively. Three non-enrolling teachers are involved, on either a full or part time basis, in providing support for mainstreamed ESL learners. The following excerpt from the Special Alternative Instructional Program (SAIP) site description protocol describes the school and its community.

...students come from families with a wide range of educational backgrounds and income levels. However, the majority of families are working class, with a small presence of middle class families. In most cases, both parents are employed, many in low paying jobs.
Some parents are illiterate in English (their L1), while others are illiterate in both English and the L1. Other parents hold university degrees from their home countries, but because these degrees are not always recognized in Canada, many are forced into low paying jobs. Only a few parents are practicing professionals.

The school is in a relatively stable neighbourhood, with most families remaining in this catchment area for extended periods of time. The student transfer rate is <10%. The single parent population is small (<10%), and until very recently was almost non-existent. Family break-ups are beginning to occur in a variety of cultural backgrounds, and child custody ramifications at the school level are a recent phenomenon. A few families in this area have entered Canada as refugees. (p.3)

The participating classroom teacher is a white male in his early thirties. He has been teaching for four years in the Vancouver school system, all of them at this site. This is his second year with an enrolling class position.

The grade six class taught by the selected teacher enrols 21 students (12 female, 9 male). A class with so few students is unusual at the intermediate level, the average being closer to 28 students. However, the enrolling classroom teacher is also the computer specialist and the staff had decided to give him a smaller group in order to compensate for his increased responsibilities in the computer lab. Of the 21 students, 14 spoke another language before learning English. The amount of experience with English ranged from 1 year to 7 years.

**Justification for a case study approach**

There are specific features of a case study approach which need to be considered when interpreting and applying the data from this study.
1. This study focuses on a single successful school without examining the reasons why it is successful. The components which contributed to its success will be described briefly in chapter 3 and in more detail in other theses currently underway as part of the larger SSHRC research project. Therefore, this study does not serve as a tool for developing a school culture conducive to collaborative planning between ESL and classroom teachers.

2. This study is based on planning and teaching between a single pair of teachers within a particular subject area (Language Arts). This focus allows for a rich description of both the process and the product. It is hoped that this type of descriptive study will inform other's efforts to work together. However, no claims will be made about direct applicability to other teachers or subject areas.

**Key Terms**

**Collaboration:** A process for planning which includes both formal and informal discussions between two teachers aimed at planning and presenting a unit of study.

**Integrated Language and Content:** A method of instruction which combines both language and content goals within a unit of study. Both the language and content demands of tasks are emphasized and discussed with students.

**ESL specialist:** A teacher with specific university training in ESL teaching methodology and experience working with ESL students at a variety of levels.
Classroom teacher: An elementary teacher who enrols a group of students and is responsible for providing them with an educational program within a regular classroom setting.

ESL students: Students who speak a language other than English which may interfere with their academic success at school (regardless of amount of time in the country)

Knowledge Framework: An instructional planning tool which divides knowledge into six categories.

Insert Figure 1-1 about here

The top three boxes focus on theoretical knowledge divided into three groups - classification, principles, and evaluation. The bottom three boxes are based on practical knowledge, also divided into three groups - description, sequence and choice. The model emphasizes the connections between knowledge structures both vertically and horizontally within the framework. In addition, it links these same knowledge structures to language demands and graphic representations (Key Visuals) as shown in figures 1-2 and 1-3.

Insert Figures 1-2 and 1-3 about here

Key Visuals: Graphic representations of knowledge in which the content is organized for conceptual understanding while the language component is reduced.
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This review draws together research on teacher planning and instruction. The development of and connection between the ideas can be represented graphically as shown in figure 2-1. The literature is arranged sequentially beginning with general research about teacher planning and thinking followed by specific information about collaborative planning. Next, research focussing on teacher practice and instruction is outlined as a background to information on the process of ILC instruction. A study of tasks as defined and described in research concludes the review. The literature has been organized in this manner to facilitate a description of the planning and instruction undertaken in the study. However, it is important to note that the topics covered under each heading do not stand alone and are usually interwoven as part of the process.

Teacher planning and thinking

Teachers are individuals who develop their plans for instruction based on a variety of factors. Clark and Yinger (1979) state that "what teachers do is affected by what they think". This may seem to be a simplistic statement but the idea of exploring teachers' thinking as a way of understanding the planning process is a fairly recent phenomenon. The first
recognized studies of human decision making related to teacher thinking were done in the 1970's (Peterson, Marx & Clark, 1978; Shulman & Elstein, 1975; Shavelson, 1973; Zahorik, 1970). These studies used a variety of methods to understand and record teachers' thinking processes.

Shavelson & Stern (1981) describe five different models for collecting information about teacher thinking. In the first case, teachers worked with hypothetical situations. In other words, the participating teachers were presented with a particular scenario and were asked to make decisions about planning related to the situation. This model is called a policy-capturing study since it looks at identifying the policies that teachers use to judge the needs of students. Another method for describing teacher thinking is the lens modeling study where "three pieces of information are required: (a) a criterion measure of the event being judged (b) a list of cues predictive of the criterion measure and (c) teachers' judgements of students' preferences" (p.458). Teachers' judgements on the cues are examined in order to identify policies. Both of these methods are removed from a natural teaching situation and therefore are subject to criticism in regard to generalizability.

A third model for analyzing teacher thinking is described as a "process tracing" study. In this model, participants are asked to "'think aloud' while performing a task, solving a problem, or reaching a decision." (p.458) In situations where it is not practical to use the think aloud approach, a fourth model called
the "simulated recall" approach can be used. Teachers are asked to recall what they were thinking as they review their lessons on audio or video tape. Both of these strategies for accessing teacher thought are weakened by the unnatural way in which teachers are asked to verbalize their thought processes for the purpose of study.

The final model outlined by Shavelson and Stern rests on understanding of teacher decisions within the context of a case study. This type of model recognizes the social nature of teaching and emphasizes that "in order to understand teaching, teachers' goals, judgements and decisions must be understood, especially in relation to teachers' behavior and the classroom context." (p.459) This last type of model seems the most natural in terms of identifying teachers' thinking processes. However, it is more easily used when examining instructional practice where teachers decisions are demonstrated by their overt behavior rather than teacher planning which may or may not involve observable behavior. The model for gathering information about teacher thinking most similar to the method used in this study is the case study approach since the data gathered about teacher's decisions will be recorded in the context of the natural planning process.

In spite of the weaknesses of these models for identifying teachers' thinking while planning, there is some information to be gained from looking at the results of the studies. Early work in curriculum planning (Popham & Baker, 1970; Tyler, 1950) posits that there are "four essential steps for effective planning:
specify objectives, select learning activities, organize learning activities and specify evaluation procedures." (Clark & Yinger, 1979, p.233) Accordingly, much of the preservice training that teachers receive focuses on this highly organized, sequential process for curriculum design. However, in reality, the above methods of examining teacher thinking uncovered that teachers seldom follow this type of linear model. Instead, MacDonald (1965) and Eisner (1967) propose that teachers focus on "activities" as the central concern of planning, after which objectives and evaluation procedures are built around this block of planned activities. Along the same lines, Goodlad et al (1970) found that teachers spend the bulk of their planning time dealing with the content needs, followed by strategies for instruction with objectives coming a distant third. The idea of activities or tasks as the central focus of instructional planning will examined in more detail in the final section of this review.

Borko et al (1979) link the idea of tasks to two other components of preinstructional planning. Figure 2-2 shows the

Insert figure 2-2 about here

collection between these ideas. Shavelson and Stern have developed a model somewhat similar to the Borko model which adds dimensions of "teacher cognitive processes". (p.461) As shown in
figure 2-3, the models have common features with the latter being more detailed. The main difference in the two models is the cyclical nature of the Shavelson and Stern model which emphasizes the teacher's ability to evaluate his/her judgements and make changes to the instructional process as a result of that evaluation.

The general categories described above form a useful tool for evaluating the planning process of the teachers involved with the research project. It will be interesting to examine the process followed by the two teachers in this study in order to compare and contrast it to these models. Unlike the research on individual teacher planning, the collaborative planning process followed in this study provides a natural setting for examining the thoughts and beliefs of the participating teachers as they attempt to combine their expertise to develop a unit of study. The conversations which occur as part of the clarification process needed to plan effectively together can inform the process of identifying the sequence for instructional planning. Budd and Wright (1992) state that "Collaboration affords the opportunity to overtly discuss and reflect upon a wide range of teaching and learning processes and activities." (p.225) As such, collaborative planning, as a model for instructional planning, is an ideal venue for this investigation.
Collaborative planning

Lieberman (1986) states that "the forms of collaborative activity are as varied as the numbers and kinds of people involved." (p.6) Similarly, the process of teachers working together to plan and/or teach has been defined in many ways and called many things such as collaborative consultation, collegiality, teamwork, team teaching and cooperative planning (Brumby & Wada, 1990; Rosenholtz, 1987; Idol, Paolucci-Whitcomb & Nevin, 1986; Little & Bird, 1984; Little, 1982). The actual definition for the form of collaboration used in this study will emerge from the data collected in observations and interviews with the participant. However, it is possible to identify a preliminary definition from the literature.

In this case, a classroom teacher and an ESL specialist are working together to plan and teach a unit of study. This type of collaboration is best described by Idol, Paolucci-Whitcomb & Nevin (1986) in the following way:

Collaborative consultation is an interactive process that enables people with diverse expertise to generate creative solutions to mutually defined problems. This outcome is enhanced, altered, and produces solutions that are different from those the individual team members would produce independently. (p.1)

The key components of the collaboration process have also been described in various ways. Little (1987) discusses three critical collegial practices identified in successful schools. She recommends organization of time to ensure "opportunity for shared work and shared study" (p.516). In addition, she suggests
that topics/tasks selected for collaboration be "compelling" and "complex" enough to warrant the combined efforts of two or more teachers (p.510). Finally, Little emphasizes that provision of material resources and human assistance are essential for improving teaching and learning (p.513). In a more detailed manner, Lieberman (1986) has developed guidelines for successful collaborative work which include:

(1) some type of organizational structure
(2) a small core of people actually work on the collaboration
(3) time for collaboration needs to be allotted
(4) skillful people working together enhance collaborative work
(5) activities propel collaboration not goals (p.7)

In a rare look at collaboration related to language teaching, Bailey, Dale and Squire (1992) listed 3 components for successful teacher-to-teacher collaboration. They are: (1) "focus on goals rather than personalities"; (2) "recognize one another's contributions" and (3) "set aside specific time for planning on a regular basis" (p.174). Although it is not the intention of this study to examine the school-based conditions which contributed to the success of the collaborative experience, it is possible to identify and take note of the existence or non-existence of the above components as part of the description of the process.

In addition to the idea that certain components or practices contribute to the success of collaboration, Babcock and Pryzwansky (1983) describe a process by which collaboration typically occurs. This process includes: (1) "problem identification" where the collaborators jointly identify the problem to be solved; (2)
"intervention recommendations" where possible strategies for
dealing with the problem are discussed; (3) "implementation
recommendations" where the collaborators each implement some of
the proposed solutions; and (4) "nature and extent of follow-up"
which includes continuous communication and modification of the
problem-solving process (p.360)

Much of the research that has been done on collaboration
between teachers and consultants is based in the field of special
education. The "problem solving model" described in relation to
dealing with special needs students bears many similarities to the
way in which teachers work together to meet the needs of ESL
students. However, an important difference is that teachers
meeting to plan for ESL students seldom present a problem to be
solved. Instead, they work with the ESL specialist to develop
strategies for instruction which focus on integrating language and
content goals (Dempsey, 1994). Rather than focusing on
interventions that look at the deficit which exists in a
particular student, the teachers aim to develop a program which
will meet the needs of all learners. Gibson’s (1990) tripartite
classification of models for planning collaboratively for special
needs students includes; (1) The Restorative Model where "the
focus of the consultative support is the student's deficit"; (2)
The Minority Rights Model where "the student is labeled according
to an identified exceptionality" and (3) The Environmental Model
which "involved looking at the student in the context of the
educational community and identifying ways in which it is failing
to meet his or her needs." (p.7) In the final model, the focus is not on the deficit that the student possesses but rather on the ways in which the classroom program can be organized to meet the needs of a variety of learners. This particular model seems most like the type of collaboration which occurs to meet the needs of ESL learners.

Teachers who collaborate together to meet the needs of students usually have goals for the process. The goals of the teachers involved in this study are connected to the need for integrated language and content instruction. However, on a more general level, Champion, Kiel and McLendon (1990) identify two types of goals for collaborative planning. They are: (1) "the need for results" such as improvements in the program or performance of the students and (2) "the need for growth" including "increased capacity to perform new functions or behaviors on a continuing basis." (p.66) This relates back to the idea that the collaboration must be seen to accomplish something that neither teacher could accomplish as individuals.

Bravi (1986) describes the roles which two individuals usually play in their interaction. These relationship roles fall into several categories. In the first type of communication, the consultant teacher has full control of the collaboration session and the classroom teacher plays an inactive role. This type of relationship usually results in few changes in practice. Often the classroom teacher feels inadequate and judged by the consultant teacher. This way of operating is called the
"expert/client" model. Conversely, in the "extra pair of hands' model, the classroom teacher has full control and the consultant teacher acts as an aide. The teachers engage in limited two-way communication which seldom results in positive change. Finally, in the true "collaboration" model, the teachers enjoy an interactive form of communication which emphasizes shared responsibility for the planning and teaching process. This type of model fosters effective planning and mutual respect between the participants.

More recently, Champion, Kiel and McLendon (1990) described nine possible roles taken by consultants in their collaborative planning with classroom teachers. Similar to Bravi's categories, Champion, Kiel and McLendon relate the roles to the consultant's responsibility for the project's success. An additional factor included by these authors, however, is the idea of responsibility for the classroom teacher's "growth" in developing teaching strategies related to the consultant's area of expertise. The role which combines a high level of responsibility for both teacher growth and project success is the "partner" role which:

...assumes that both the client (teacher) and the consultant have the capacity to successfully perform aspects of the task and that both will share responsibility for the results. (p.67)

Similarly, the "modeler" role implies the same level of joint responsibility for project success but takes a different view of teacher growth in that:

...the consultant is highly responsible for results in the current project, but also that there is some value in the
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client system (teacher) building its own capacity. The modeler carries out the task for the client system (teacher), but does so in a way that makes his or her approaches and techniques apparent. ... The implication is that sometime in the future the client (teacher) may carry out the task. (p.67)

Although the research reviewed above paints a very positive picture of the collaboration process, there are some potential pitfalls. Some teachers are highly uncomfortable giving up complete control of their isolated classrooms (Hargreaves & Woods, 1984; Lortie, 1975). Bailey, Dale and Squire (1992) list a variety of possible problems for collaborating teachers. They emphasize the importance of self selection and willingness to work together as a team. The researcher and the teacher in this study are both willing participants, so the issue of control is somewhat reduced. Bailey, Dale and Squire also warn that "shared responsibility can result in no one taking full responsibility" (p.173) The likelihood of this happening increases in a situation where the participating teachers have an equal partnership rather than where one teacher is designated the leader. It is possible that problems will occur in any collaborative relationship as individuals learn to work together and these problems should be part of the description provided in the study.

The description of the collaboration process followed by the teachers involved with this study will include information about the key components, processes, goals, roles and problems encountered as outlined in this review. Reigeluth (1983) describes the difference between planning as outlined in the first
section of this review and instruction which follows, stating:

...the primary difference between curriculum (planning) and instruction as areas of inquiry is that curriculum is concerned primarily with what to teach, whereas instruction is concerned primarily with how to teach it. (p.6)

The description of the collaborative planning process will provide information on the "what" of instructional design whereas the section on the ILC instruction will provide us with a description of the "how". Theoretical information on instructional practice in both general education and ESL provides a comparative framework for the discussion of the ILC instruction which follows.

**Instructional Practice**

Teaching is variously defined as a science, a technology, a craft, or an art. Each of these characterizations carries with it defined orientations towards what teaching is, what essential skills it involves, and what teachers must know. (Freeman & Richards, 1993. p.193)

In the field of general education, Zahorik (1986) proposes three categories of general conceptions of teaching - science/research conceptions, theory/philosophy conceptions and art/craft conceptions. Zahorik suggests that the conceptions held by teachers dictate how they deliver instruction in the classroom setting. In other words, the instructional theories that teachers embrace inform their practice in the classroom. Therefore, a study of instructional practice which focuses solely on the observable behaviors in the classroom, without linking them to the thinking which underlies the behavior, is incomplete. Zahorik's conceptional models can be summarized as shown in Figure 2-4.
These models can provide a tool for analyzing classroom instruction which links theory and practice.

More recently, in a study of ESL teaching, Freeman & Richards (1993) present:

a framework for analyzing second language teaching which will shift the focus of discussions on teaching from behavior and activity to the thinking and reasoning which organizes and motivates these external practices. (p.193)

In the past, research on ESL teaching has focussed on observable behaviors rather than on the teacher thinking which underlies those behaviors. Building on the work of Zahorik, Freeman and Richards discuss the application of the three conceptions of teaching described in figure 2-4 to ESL teaching methodologies. Many of the main practices in second language instruction can be categorized using Zahorik's conceptions. However, Freeman and Richards suggest that teachers as individuals are products of their experiences and training and therefore may base their teaching on that background knowledge. They also hypothesize that teachers may move through the three conceptions in a developmental fashion, beginning with the Science/Research model which is most prescriptive and ending with the Art/Craft model which is most creative. There is no conclusive evidence to back up this claim as yet. The most important conclusion which can be reached through this analysis of teaching is the need to link classroom
instructional behaviors to their underlying conceptions. A discussion of those behaviors which typically occur in classrooms follows.

There are certain key features of instructional practice which have developed through studies of classrooms (Anderson, Spiro & Anderson, 1978; Hunter, 1976). Reigeluth (1983) describes instructional design as:

...the process of deciding what methods of instruction are best for bringing about desired changes in student knowledge and skills for a specific course content and a specific student population. (p.7)

The skilled teacher has a variety of instructional models and strategies from which to choose. The choices that teachers make can be categorized in order to make identification easier.

For example, Hunter (1976) breaks down the "elements of instruction" into four categories including:

(1) set - an opening section which labels the learning for the students;
(2) instruction - which includes 3 parts,
   • input of new information
   • monitoring student progress and adjusting instruction accordingly (checking for understanding)
   • guided practice to demonstrate understanding of new information
(3) closure - a restatement of the learning
(4) independent practice using new information

This model is widely used by teachers in a variety of forms. It
is based on a scientific model of instruction which emphasizes the idea of input, practice and output. This type of instruction assumes that students are empty vessels waiting to be filled with the knowledge the teacher has to impart.

An alternate view is represented in the "Task Design for Teaching and Learning" model developed by Early and Hooper (1988). This three step model, which originates in content area reading research (Morris and Stewart-Dore, 1984) looks at (1) Building Background Knowledge; (2) Thinking through Reading, Writing and Viewing and (3) Reconstructing Knowledge. It can be represented as shown in Figure 2-5. This model acknowledges that each learning task assumes an understanding of background knowledge. Therefore, the first step in the learning process is two-fold. It is important to find out what the students already know about the topic, as well as providing the necessary missing background knowledge before introducing the new information. Borich (1988) recommends the use of an advance organizer (Luiten, Ames, Aerson, 1980) which "gives the learner a conceptual preview of what is to come and helps prepare the learner to store, label and package the content for retention and later use." (p.171) The use of an advance organizer can also serve as a link between the current lesson and information which has been learned previously, "preventing every lesson from being seen as something entirely new
and integrating related concepts into larger and larger patterns and abstractions that later become unit outcomes." (p.171) The second step of this model refers to the teaching strategies used by the teacher to direct the learning such as a reading guide or focus questions for viewing a video. The final step entails the organization and presentation of the new information learned in a way which demonstrates understanding. This may take the form of a written essay, an oral presentation or many other possibilities.

Each classroom has its typical sequence for instruction. However, decisions about each of these are often made as a result of the teacher's style. There are two basic teaching styles which are often compared in the literature - teacher-centred (directive) and learner-centred (non-directive). In a summary of 32 studies of teacher style related to student learning, Anderson (1979) stated:

...Teacher-centred and learner-centred methods have been repetitiously investigated not because they were well conceived ideas as to how one would lead to superior learning, but merely to find out if one style was superior to the other. We were not fortunate enough to find that one method is consistently better than or even consistently different from the other...(p.57)

It is likely that the teachers involved with integrated language and content instruction will impose their own styles on the instructional program. Although the research does not show a clear preference of one style over another, identification of teaching style in the study is an important component of the description. In order to identify the prominent style used by the teachers in this study, it is useful to define the difference
between direct and indirect instruction. Rosenshine (1979) describes direct instruction in the following way:

...direct instruction refers to academically focused, teacher-directed classrooms using sequenced and structured materials. It refers to teaching activities where goals are clear to students, time allocated for instruction is sufficient and continuous, coverage of content is extensive, the performance of students is monitored, questions are at a low cognitive level so that students can produce many correct responses and feedback to student is immediate and academically oriented. In direct instruction, the teacher controls instructional goals, chooses materials appropriate for the student's ability, and paces the instructional episode....The goal is to move the students through a sequenced set of materials or tasks. (p.38)

In contrast, the B.C. Ministry Primary Program Foundation document (1990) describes student-centred or non-directive learning as an environment where the teacher acts as a guide for the learning rather than as the all-knowing presenter of knowledge. In this style, the students are given more choices in directing their learning and the teacher responds to those choices by providing support in investigating new ideas. It is not the intention of student-centred learning that the teacher give up planning and setting goals, but that the path which the students follow in order to achieve those goals is more flexible and student guided in contrast to the structured step by step presentation of knowledge which is the mainstay of direct instruction. It is likely that the participating teachers will apply strategies from both the directive and non-directive styles of teaching.

Instructional practice is a extensive topic which is not limited to the discussion undertaken in this review. However, the key issues listed here, including instructional sequence and
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teacher style, can serve as a starting point for description of the observed instruction.

Integrated Language and Content Instruction

The linking of language and content learning is supported in much of the recent literature on second language acquisition. (Crandall, 1993; Crandall & Tucker, 1989; Snow, Met & Genesee, 1989; Mohan, 1986) Brinton, Snow & Wesche (1989) have described three different models for linking language and content goals. They call the first model, "sheltered content instruction" which "consists of content courses taught in the second language to a segregated group of learners by a content area specialist" (p.15). This approach is similar to the immersion approach applied to the teaching of elementary and secondary students. The second model is called "adjunct language instruction" where "students are enrolled in two linked courses - a language course and a content course - with the idea being that the two courses share the content base and complement each other in terms of mutually coordinated assignments" (p.16). In the third model, "theme-based language instruction", "the language class is structured around topics or themes, with the topics forming the backbone of the course curriculum" (p.14). Of these three models, the theme-based approach seems most similar to the model instituted by the participating teachers in this study. Its strongest feature is its integrated nature, in that there is no segregation of ESL students and there is no segregation between language and content goals. Both language and content are essential components of the
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classroom instruction.

The development of ILC can be traced to three theoretical perspectives on second language acquisition - Krashen's (1985) Monitor Model, Cummins'(1991) Language Proficiency Model and the Language Socialization Perspective. Krashen's model is based on the idea of "comprehensible input" as the main component of language development. This was a move forward in language instruction in that teachers began to select content for their lessons which was meaningful rather than depending on isolated language drills. However, Krashen's model focusses solely on the development of language with the input (content) having no value other than as a vehicle for language practice.

Cummins' model adds to this work by introducing the idea that communicative tasks take place in a context and make cognitive demands on the students. Therefore, tasks increase in difficulty from context embedded to context reduced and from cognitively undemanding to cognitively demanding. This recognition of different levels of difficulty in communication led to the identification of two categories of language use - basic communicative language and cognitive academic language. Although some researchers have criticized this system of differentiation as being over-simplified (Edelsky, 1986; Rivera, 1984), its emphasis on the role of context and cognition is an important aspect of growth in language teaching methodology.

Language socialization theory differs from Krashen's and Cummins' work in that it is not a model for instruction as much as
it is a philosophy or an approach. Both Krashen and Cummins focus on language acquisition whereas "language socialization aims at the understanding of how persons become competent members of social groups and what role language plays in this process." (Mohan, 1991, p.118) In other words, a language socialization approach emphasizes the use of language for authentic communication in real life, relevant situations. Schieffelin and Ochs (1986) describe the language socialization approach as "devoted to understanding the interdependence of language and sociocultural structures and processes." (p.163) They believe that language is a medium for making meaning of the world around us. This is superior to a language acquisition perspective, as represented by the work of Krashen, where language is a goal unto itself separate from a sociocultural context or purpose.

Given the goal of tying together the language and content demands of tasks, the next step is to determine how that is accomplished. Mohan (1991) describes two ways in which this goal can be met. He advocates the use of the Knowledge Framework and Key Visuals as two strategies for linking language and content goals. They can be described as follows.

Building on the research of anthropologist, B. Malinowski (1935), and work done in the field of cognitive psychology (Abelson & Black, 1986), Mohan has developed the idea of knowledge structures as "ways of organizing experience through which we, as human beings, give a coherent structure to experience." (p.119)
He has organized these knowledge structures into 6 boxes (The Knowledge Framework) as shown in figure 1-1. The strength of this particular model is in the way that knowledge in each of the boxes is interrelated. The Knowledge Framework serves as an organizational tool for planning instruction which allows the planning teachers to examine their topic and link the content to thinking skills and language. In addition, the relationship between the theoretical components or background knowledge associated with tasks and their practical counterparts is emphasized. The Knowledge Framework can be used to plan an entire unit of study or to provide direction for a single task.

The second strategy for linking language and content is the use of Key Visuals. Key Visuals are graphic representations of content information which illustrate the relationships between ideas while reducing the language required for understanding. Key Visuals allow students with limited English to access ideas at their appropriate conceptual level. As shown in figure 1-2, there are particular Key Visuals which relate to each of the 6 boxes of the Knowledge Framework.

Finally, the use of the Knowledge Framework and Key Visuals combine to form a platform for functional language use.

This model of ILC represents a conception of teaching which falls in to Zahorik's category of theory and values. In this case the participating teachers have an understanding of the underlying theory of Mohan's methodology and are attempting to put this methodology into practice. There is no pre-set instructional
model which can be applied to the classroom. In fact, a goal of this particular study is to provide one example of what that instruction might look like, the end result being the description of an ILC model which could serve as a starting point for teachers who have little or no experience with the ideas.

The introduction of a methodology which links language and content demands of tasks has provided a bridge between classroom teachers and ESL teachers. In the past, while language teachers have focussed on the linguistic demands of classroom tasks, content teachers have targeted their instruction on content goals. However, content teachers have begun to recognize that they need specific help in order to plan instruction which integrates language and content goals for tasks. Langer and Applebee (1987) found that content teachers are reluctant to devote time to writing activities in the content classroom unless they promote learning of the content. In addition, Penfield (1987) surveyed content teachers and discovered that a large majority perceived a need for training on "how to" teach content to ESL students. Swain (1988) points out that content teaching needs to include design features of good language lessons in order to support understanding of the link between language form and meaning in subject area material. It is clear from this research that many teachers want help with the challenging task of integrating language and content demands of instruction in an educationally sound manner. Mohan (1990) recommends that:
...cooperating language teachers and content teachers should:
(1) agree on target tasks which can be both language and content goals. These will often be tasks essential to content classrooms.
(2) develop language sensitive ways to support LEP (limited English proficiency) students work on content tasks. (p.59)

The ILC approach developed by Mohan provides the a way to support ESL students and the collaborative planning models provides an opportunity for teachers to work together. The development of student tasks both from a planning and teaching point of view is central to the application of Mohan's methods. The final section of this review defines tasks as a central component of planning and instruction.

**Focus on Tasks**

Tasks can be viewed from either a psycholinguistic or a sociocultural point of view. The former has its roots in formal linguistics where the emphasis is on acquisition of the language system while the latter stems from functional linguistics where tasks are seen as an action (practice) of an agent who actively assigns meaning (theory) to it. A main difference between these two viewpoints lies in their interpretation of this dichotomy between theory and practice. The former focuses solely on practice (Prabhu, 1987) while the latter combines theory and practice. Therefore, socioculturalists propose a balance in writing tasks between the actual writing process and the underlying understanding of genre (Horowitz, 1986). Similarly, Ochs (1988) examines activities in light of both process and behavior. Just as the theory or conception of teaching informs the
instructional practice of teachers, the underlying theory of a task informs its practice. This relationship between theory and practice is a fundamental component of tasks within integrated language and content instruction.

The practical components of tasks or activities have been described in a variety of ways. The following graphic summarizes some common features. For the purpose of examination in this thesis, tasks will be described in the following manner:

1) TASK:
2) CONTENT / LANGUAGE GOALS:
3) RESOURCES:
6) FORM OF PRESENTATION:

This review of literature aims to draw together relevant research in the areas of teacher planning and instruction. In particular, it provides a summary of research in the areas of collaborative planning and ILC instruction. It concludes with a definition of tasks as a central component for examining the planning and instruction in the novel study unit. Throughout the review, the point is made that examination of tasks is not limited to the practical or observable behaviors of the participants but that these behaviors must be linked to their underlying theory. The balance between theory and practice is fundamental to Mohan's Knowledge Framework Approach in the same way that this balance
needs to be examined in the study undertaken by the researcher. Chapter Three describes how the data was collected and analyzed in order to support the discussion of findings in Chapter Four.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the role of the researcher and the methods of case selection, data collection and analysis. As stated in chapter one, the purpose of this study is to describe both collaborative planning and ILC instruction involving a classroom teacher and an ESL specialist. In particular, it aims to identify the specific features of collaborative planning and ILC instruction by comparing and contrasting these two components with more traditional planning and instruction. The focus of the inquiry will be on the development of student tasks.

Role of the Researcher

For the most part, I took on the role of participant observer (Spradley, 1980) in this study. The planning duo for the collaboration consisted of the classroom teacher and the researcher as the ESL specialist. In fact, as the research proceeded the relationship between the participating teacher and the researcher became more similar to a co-researcher partnership as the teacher took an interest in all aspects of data collection and analysis. This additional set of eyes in the research setting was an important asset which added to the validity of the data. Overall, the relationship was an enjoyable and effective one which resulted in many occasions of cooperation and collaboration.

Before I began the research, I had already established a relationship with the staff as a whole. Because I had been involved at the school as a presenter and coordinator for staff
development during the ESL Pilot Project, I had gained some measure of acceptance. Through the sponsorship of my teaching partner and the school ESL Resource teacher, I found myself in the centre of both social and professional discussions at recess and lunch. I knew I had really been accepted by the staff when I was invited to the staff Christmas party because I was, afterall, "a part of the staff". Even the students grew to accept me as part of the school as evidenced by one of the students who was wandering the halls looking for my office! I found that this level of acceptance contributed to the success of my planning and teaching experience at the school.

**Case Selection**

My selection of a research site was not an issue for this study as the site was already selected under the auspices of the larger research project funded by SSHRC. The proposal submitted for that project describes the purposeful selection of this site because of its characterization by both school and district staff as a highly "successful" school. A series of in-depth interviews (Early, 1993) conducted with all staff members at the selected site, including both teachers and administrators, revealed that this school characterized many of the components of successful implementation of an innovation (based on Fullan, 1991) including:

1) **CLARITY OF GOALS:**

The teachers felt they understood the changes they had to make in order to improve their teaching practice. This resulted in a low level of anxiety and stress related to the innovation.
2) COMPLEXITY:
The teachers acknowledged that the innovation required a certain extent of difficulty in understanding the concepts but found the ideas to be complimentary to their beliefs and values.

3) QUALITY OF MATERIALS:
There was general concensus that the innovation had value and teachers were highly impressed with the improvements in student achievement which resulted.

4) THE ADOPTION PROCESS:
A school Steering Committee in consultation with the District Office helped to guide the direction of the innovation. Teachers commented that they felt involved in the decision making process.

5) STAFF DEVELOPMENT AND PARTICIPATION:
Staff members felt that the inservice provided both by the district office and the on-site personnel was of a consistently high quality and was provided on an on-going basis as teachers continued to develop their understanding of the innovation.

6) TIME LINE AND INFORMATION SYSTEM:
Teachers were satisfied that the timeline for implementing the innovation was reasonable and that they received information about progress in their own and other sites throughout the process.

7) ROLE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR:
Both the principal and the vice principal took an active part in the staff development program. The teachers recognized that the administrative team valued and supported the innovation. They recognized that there was a high level of expectation that all
staff members would take part in the collaborative planning sessions. In order to facilitate this planning the principal provided teachers with valuable release time to work together.

8) TEACHER - TEACHER RELATIONSHIPS:
Prior to the introduction of the innovation, many teachers experienced a good working relationship with their colleagues. However, the innovation was viewed by teachers as strengthening that link resulting in a commitment to the idea of working together to improve instruction.

9) TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS AND ORIENTATIONS:
This category more than any other characterizes what is meant by a successful school as teachers in interviews described the following:

- a well developed sense of efficacy;
- an open dialogue with peers about teaching practices related to the innovation;
- a productive and active relationship between and among teachers and administrators aimed at mutual support and learning.

Therefore, for all of the above reasons, this school can be described as having successfully implemented the innovation.

The selection of the classroom teacher for this study was determined through a combination of purposeful/judgement sampling and opportunity sampling (Burgess, 1984). When it became known that I would be working in the school as both a participant and an observer, there was much enthusiasm for the opportunity to work on
this project. I conferred with the SSHRC research directors, Dr. B. Mohan and Dr. M. Early and the school-based ESL Resource Teacher to select an appropriate participant from those that had volunteered to take part in the study. Several criteria were considered in making the selection including:

1) Grade level - I have more experience working with intermediate students and felt I had more to offer at this level.

2) Level of interest in research - Two of the interested teachers are currently working on their masters' programs and could be seen more as co-researchers. This was considered to be a positive attribute.

3) Subject area for study - Each of the teachers had suggested a subject area they would like to work on. Possibilities for the different topics and their suitability were discussed.

4) Personal style of the teacher - It was considered important that the participating teacher be open minded and flexible about planning and scheduling in order to accommodate the needs of the researcher.

With each of these criteria in mind, the selection team met and selected an individual to participate in the project.

The participant was a grade 6 teacher who had expressed an interest in working on a novel study unit based on The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe (Lewis, 1950). He was eager to work with me in order to develop materials and to learn more about classroom-based research. He is currently studying ESL methodology and plans to do his master's work sometime in the near future.
Data Collection

Having selected a classroom setting and a participating teacher, I began to collect data both informally and formally through a variety of means. I had some background knowledge about planning and instruction based on the literature reviewed in Chapter two which served to guide the initial observations both in the classroom and in the planning sessions.

I expected to find both similarities and differences between standard practice and what we were attempting to do in the classroom and I did find them. The differences in particular were helpful in guiding further observations and reflections. I also interviewed my teacher partner to find out more about his interpretations of what was happening in his classroom that was "different". Together the observations and interviews provided a detailed picture of planning and instruction.

Prior to entering the site, I began a field diary where I could record my impressions, reflections and selected observations on a daily basis. As much as possible, entries were made immediately following teaching sessions. However, I frequently had to record my thoughts in the evening after the work day had concluded. This diary became an important source of data and provided me with a running account of the entire project. Unlike the more limited forms of information gained by other means of observation, the field diary allowed me to weave my own interpretations, trepidations and exhilarations into a narrative text. It was my most private form of data collection where I was
able to reflect on unformed, unresolved matters before sharing or discussing them with my teaching partner.

In addition to this field diary, I also kept an account during my qualitative methods course where I related the concepts discussed in class to my experience "in the field". This second field diary was less emotion laden, providing a theoretical perspective to my work which allowed me to reflect within in the context of learning more about ethnographic research.

Because I had enjoyed an extended period of informal observation during the two years I worked with the staff as a district consultant, I was able to begin working with my teacher partner immediately after confirming his willingness to participate in the project. We began our work together with a half day planning session on November 15th. As with all of our planning sessions, we audio-taped this initial contact.

Throughout the unit of study these planning sessions seemed to fulfill several needs. First of all, we were able to direct the instruction. Secondly, we worked out the logistics of how to present the content and who should present the content. Then we talked about how to include the language components of each task and finally, we reviewed the lessons and the students' progress in an ongoing fashion.

We began teaching the unit on Tuesday, November 16th. Over the next six weeks, I continued to audio tape planning sessions and make daily entries in my field diary. Early in January, my teaching partner became ill and had to stay at home for five
weeks. The novel study unit was put on hold midway through the story until we were able to restart in the middle of February. The teacher who replaced my partner planned and taught a series of lessons on an unrelated topic and made no attempt to build on what we had started. (T) and I decided that we preferred that she not coordinate her instruction with our project as neither one of us would be there to record any relevant data.

When my partner returned, I began a series of informal and formal class observations. This was initially difficult as the students had trouble accepting me as a strict observer in the classroom but they soon grew used to my presence and stopped asking for assistance on the days that I was "observing". I completed three informal and one formal observation of class lessons. This information was invaluable as a record of student and teacher activity as I observed and recorded much information that I had missed when I was in my participant role. In particular, I was able to more closely note students' efforts to deal with the assigned tasks. I also became aware of their personal preferences for grouping when given the opportunity to choose their learning groups. The teacher and I read over the observations and discussed the implications of some points during our planning time. As a result of these discussions, we made some changes in the seating plan to reflect students' needs.

After completing these observations, I constructed a two part interview. The first part of the interview consisted of open-ended guiding questions related to the collaborative planning
process. The second part of the interview was based on guiding questions which focused on ILC instruction. I audio-taped the interview with my teaching partner which lasted about 55 minutes and made additional notes on my interview sheet. Up until this point in the data collection, I had neither seen nor heard anything which I found to be terribly surprising. Given my experience with both collaborative planning and ILC instruction, I thought I had a pretty good idea going into this research project about the processes. However, the interview helped me to realize how egocentric I was being in assuming "my" experience was similar to others. I discovered that my partner and I viewed many of the experiences of planning and instruction in radically different ways. These new understandings helped to inform the direction of my comments in the field diary and my analysis of the collected data.

Towards the end of the unit of study, I had an opportunity to borrow a video camera. My partner and I took turns video taping the last two tasks undertaken by the class. Together we watched the resulting video tape and labelled the parts of the tasks viewed. The video tape provides valuable information about all components of the teaching experience. In particular, it documents the types of specific teaching techniques used to include the language components of the assigned tasks.

**Analysis**

A review of the field notes and the collaboration session tapes for the first six weeks of the project suggested the
presence of certain features of the observed planning and instruction. From this initial analysis of data collected from strictly a participant observer point of view, I was able to develop preliminary categories which served to focus the formal and informal class observations which followed.

After completing the formal and informal observations in the classroom in my role as complete observer (Spradley, 1980), I began to code the collected data based on the preliminary categories I had identified. There was some overlap of categories between the coding of the collaborative planning and the ILC instruction. However, there were some categories which applied strictly to one or the other of these components. This type of descriptive analysis allowed me to begin to consider the relationships between the categories.

The completion of the interview with my teaching partner introduced several new components to my data analysis. I refined several categories based on his responses and recoded the collected data to include his ideas. The inclusion of these categories did not radically alter the existing categories that I had developed. However, as I began my interpretive analysis of the data, they had a profound effect on the relationships between categories and the discussion of the underlying teacher thinking which informed the planning and instruction.

Chapter four presents the descriptive and interpretive findings divided into five sections - 1) Goals; 2) Roles; 3) Knowledge Framework, Task Design & Key Visuals; 4) Processes; and
5) Costs and Benefits. Supporting comments and ideas from the collected data are referenced using the following code:

- **Field Diary**: FD - pg# - line#
- **Field Diary (Class Reflections)**: FD2 - pg# - line#
- **Audio Tapes**: AT - tape# - counter#
- **Informal Observation**: IO - pg# - line#
- **Formal Observation**: FO - pg# - line#
- **Interview**: I - pg# - line#
- **Videotape**: VT - counter#
CHAPTER FOUR

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

Based on data collected through classroom observations, teacher interviews, audio-taped planning sessions, video-taped lessons and field diary records, this chapter describes and analyses the process of collaborative planning between a classroom teacher and an ESL specialist leading to ILC instruction. Prior to introducing the findings of this study, a brief commentary on the validity and trustworthiness of the findings will be offered. Figure #4-1 outlines the other main components of this chapter.

The first section of this chapter paints a picture of the goals and roles revealed by the teacher interaction during planning and instruction. The second part looks at how the three key components of Mohan's ILC model were integrated into the planning and instruction. Section three focuses on the sequence of steps taken during collaboration and ILC instruction. Finally, a preliminary evaluation of sections one to three is presented. This evaluation will focus on the costs and benefits of the collaborative planning and ILC instruction as expressed by the planning teachers and as supported by the collected data. Each of these four sections will include:

1) information about expectations prior to data collection (sensitizing concepts),
2) emerging themes during data collection
3) analysis of data and supporting evidence from various sources
   (including methodological triangulation)
4) connections to research as stated in the literature review
   (including theory linkage and triangulation)

Validity, Triangulation and Trustworthiness

There are a number of ways to judge the validity or trustworthiness of qualitative research. Of primary importance is to recognize the role that reflexivity plays in support of validity of findings. Hammersley and Atkinson (1983) stress the importance of recognizing "the reflexive character of social research: that is to recognize that we are part of the social work we study." (p.14) The nature of this study is such that there is a single researcher in a single setting over an extended period of time. The research undertaken is involved with the development and testing of a theory or values based conception of teaching. In this case, reflexivity is a fundamental part of the analysis of the data in this social setting. As such, reflexivity is provided by a methodology which focusses on continual checking and analysis of data. This analysis occurs between the researcher, the collected data and the social context of the research setting. Comments will be made about this process as part of the discussion of findings.

Triangulation can serve as one tool to support reflexivity in data analysis. Hammersley and Atkinson (1983) state that:
the multi-stranded character of ethnography provides the basis for triangulation in which data of different kinds can be systematically compared. (p.24)

Given the nature of this study (single setting, single case, single researcher) some forms of triangulation are not feasible (data triangulation, investigator triangulation). However, it is possible to establish theory triangulation and methodological triangulation.

First of all, theory triangulation exists between "effective" teacher research and "language and content" research as demonstrated in the discussion of the models and their connection to concepts discussed in the literature review. This is significant as some teachers are reluctant to attempt ILC instruction because they think it would mean extensive changes in their current practice. The data indicates that there are particular components which can be added to existing classroom programs (e.g. graphics, specific language teaching) in order to successfully integrate language and content.

Also methodological triangulation is supportive of most of the data categories. Many of the coded concepts are equally distributed across the data collected from observation, interviews, audio tapes, video tapes and the field diary. An example of a concept which can be coded in observations, an interview and the field diary is "statement of task" as in the following examples:

Field Diary Write a five line poem about the change from Winter to Spring. (FD-pg.1-#24)
Informal Observation  Sort and Defend activity (P1-pg.1-#20)

Formal Observation  creating a map of Narnia (P2-pg.2-#5)

Interview  children have rewritten the main ideas and taken that and put it into a paragraph of their own (P3-pg.15-#24)

The reflexive manner in which the researcher collects and analyses the data allows for the development of theory based on the findings. In turn, both reflexivity and triangulation as methods of analysis increase the validity of the developing theory.

Another way of judging the findings of this study is by using "parallel criteria" as described by Guba & Lincoln (1989). In particular, they suggest that "trustworthiness" can be judged using six criteria. Each of the six suggested criteria is listed below as it relates to this study.

1) **Prolonged engagement**: The researcher spent over 3 months in the site as a participant observer. This extended period of observation is supportive of the collection of quality data which accurately represents the social setting. It provides a broad scope for viewing the site.

2) **Persistent observation**: The researcher was present in the site an average of 3-4 times per week. This frequent observation adds depth to the scope of the data collection.

3) **Peer debriefing**: As part of her role as a teacher consultant, the researcher had the opportunity to share results of the research with uninvolved teachers from other sites. These teachers had no vested interest in the results of the
research and consistently commented that the findings seemed to "make sense".

4) **Negative case analysis**: Collected data was analyzed for negative cases and very few exceptions to the emergent patterns could be identified. Those that were identified were judged to be insignificant or of insufficient importance / frequency to modify the findings.

5) **Progressive subjectivity**: By continually acknowledging and discussing the sensitizing concepts which the researcher held prior to the analysis of data, it was possible to identify prejudices and biases which may have existed. In fact, there were several instances where beliefs held by the researcher were challenged by the collected data. The resolution of these challenges changed the shape of the findings.

6) **Member Check**: Upon completion of Chapter four the researcher presented the participating teacher with the manuscript and asked him to read it. A meeting was arranged one week later where (T) commented on his reaction to the findings. Aside from some questions regarding the terms used, (T) wholeheartedly supported the findings as presented.

The application of Guba and Lincoln's (1989) criteria for trustworthiness combined with the reflexive approach to data analysis described above present a strong case for both the validity and trustworthiness of the findings presented in this chapter. The resulting significance of the findings will be discussed in further detail in chapter five.
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Goals

As outlined in the literature review, teachers who collaborate together generally have goals for the process which are related to "the need for results" and "the need for growth" (Champion, Kiel & McLendon, 1990). Prior to beginning my research, I believed that given the nature of our rationale for working together, the goals of our collaborative planning would be directly related to the need for both language and content components in tasks. Also, in my own teaching experience I had used advance organizers for unit planning and therefore I anticipated using this method in our collaboration sessions. The data collected was supportive of these two assumptions and served to expand my understanding of how the development of language and content goals can be supported by the use of an advance organizer. I was not prepared, however, for the extent to which the advance organizer served as the central planning structure. In addition, I found it interesting that the reflections expressed by my teaching partner related not only to goals for students (e.g. Students will present evidence from the story to support their opinions (figure 4-5)) but to goals for the overall quality of the unit (e.g. a more comprehensive well-planned scoped unit timewise (I-pg.7-#25-27)). Therefore this section will describe in detail the discussion of goals regarding improvements in both the novel study unit and the students' performance on assigned tasks.

From the beginning of the collaboration process through to the classroom instruction, I was impressed by the clear and
consistent manner in which goals were established in collaboration and pursued in instruction. We began by discussing our goals in the first collaboration session. For example:

R: Is there one particular area of novel study that you want to focus on, characterization as you seem to in the other ones or... I know you did plot, you did characters...

T: I think that this particular story or chronicle lends itself well to two things - One, good vs evil and that's a theme I'd really like to stress in the class and two, it does lend itself to characterization. (AT 1-#235-245)

As time progressed, we developed an advance organizer which served as an anchor for our planning. The first draft of this simple graphic as shown in figure 4-2 was fundamental to our planning process for a couple of reasons. First of all, we examined each proposed task in light of the content goals outlined in the advance organizer as shown in the following typical statements made during planning sessions:

T: I wonder if since our theme is good vs evil, we should present Jadis as evil, Peter as good and Edmund between them. (AT 4-#254-260)

R: I think we might want to take this opportunity to focus on good vs evil which is what we wanted to focus on - so we could do a T-chart and decide what characteristics were good/evil. (AT 3-#192-195)

In addition, the structure of the advance organizer helped us to balance the instruction / tasks among the areas of plot, characters and setting. My partner's previous work on this novel
had focussed primarily on characters. With the help of the advance organizer we were able to reduce the number of tasks dealing with characters and increase the activities related to plot and setting as shown in the following comment:

T: ... getting back to our advance organizer. We talked about setting. The scenery is changing.
R: The end of chapter 11 works well with this. It would be great for poetry or something.
(AT 7-#32-36)

R: We've done a lot on characters, but not plot, setting and theme.
(AT 5-#036-038)

Figure 4-3 shows the balance of tasks planned for the unit.

Insert Figure 4-3 about here

Our initial draft of the advance organizer showed plot, characters, setting and theme as separate but equal parts of our novel study. After working with the advance organizer for several planning sessions, we decided to revise it to more clearly reflect the relationship between the ideas we were planning to emphasize with the students. In the planning session, I said to my teacher partner:

T: I put a box around theme because the others (plot, characters, and setting) feed into that main one.
(AT 3-#43-45)

Figure 4-4 shows the adapted advance organizer which reflects the

Insert Figure 4-4 about here
relationship between the content areas more accurately. It allowed us to see clearly that the tasks we were planning regarding plot, characters and setting formed the basis for the final task which required students to summarize the theme. This adaptation of the advance organizer reinforces the idea that it continued to be an important tool for relating new activities to our content goals. The planning talk supports this fundamental role for the advance organizer as shown by this quote from a planning session which occurred approximately six weeks into the unit:

R: We need to set aside some reflection time to talk about how activities, Key Visuals are matching up with our advance organizer. (AT 6-#185-187)

When we were nearing the end of the unit, the advance organizer became a summary tool, both for us in planning and for the students when they wrote their final piece of writing. My partner and I reviewed where we were in the advance organizer and then used it to introduce the summary writing paragraph for students. The following excerpt from a lesson introduced by my partner illustrates this point:

T: As you can remember from last week, we had gone over our advance organizer. We had gone over all of the key points, looking at what we had covered and where we are going next. (F0-pg.1-#5-8)

To conclude, although I had hoped to use an advance organizer as part of our unit planning process, I was surprised by the extent to which it became a common discussion point, continually focussing our planning of content.
In addition to content goals, it became increasingly clear as we worked together to plan tasks, that language goals had equal importance. My teaching partner described this dual focus in the following way:

T: There's just two things they're really focussing on. It's the language that you're giving them for a type of writing or thinking process and the content itself, the main ideas that come out of what you're teaching. (I-pg.22-#4-7).

Throughout the planning process we continued to plan tasks which combined expectations for language and content. Figure 4-5 gives a detailed outline of the content and language goals for each of the ten major tasks undertaken in this novel study unit. Our consistent focus on goals differs somewhat from the research presented in the literature review which claims that teachers generally begin by planning tasks or activities (Goodlad, 1970; Eisner, 1967; MacDonald, 1965) We definitely set general content goals prior to selecting activities and teaching strategies. After setting those goals we continued to discuss each selected activity in light of the language and content goals to be addressed.

The discussion of goals to this point has focussed on the task-related goals set by the planning teachers. However, upon reflecting on the process of planning together, my teacher partner described how he saw the collaborative planning process
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contributing to the overall quality of the unit. The following are some comments regarding the unit as a whole:

T: ...a thoroughly organized and structured unit. (I-pg.3-#2-3)

T: ...plan better ... and teach more efficiently (I-pg.9-#13-14)

These goals, as expressed by the classroom teacher, are the reasons why collaborative planning was the preferred model for teachers to follow.

In conclusion, I found that my teacher partner and I shared our content and language goals consistently during the planning process. We were able to articulate these goals clearly and discuss how they could be realized in tasks. In addition, my partner had distinct goals for working collaboratively and upon concluding the novel study unit, we both felt that we had produced something which was superior to what we could have done as individuals. On the other hand, I discovered during our interview that we viewed the purpose of collaboration quite differently. I made the following notes in my field diary:

R: I found that we view the collaboration process very differently. I find it very comforting in that I have someone else to share the load with, some one to confide in, discuss issues and concerns about the work and the students. (T) on the other hand seems to feel that collaboration provides pressure to excel and to stretch yourself in order to be an equal partner in the collaboration process. (FD2-pg.21-#3-10)

The ease with which the negotiation of content and language goals took place may not be typical for all teacher partnerships (Bailey, Dale & Squire, 1992; Hargreaves & Woods, 1984). Our
success with collaboration and ILC instruction could be due to a variety of factors. Some of these factors will be discussed in the next section on roles. In particular, it would seem that our shared conviction that each task should have both content and language goals was supportive of our planning together. Given that the very nature of the collaborative planning process is such that teachers are required to "overtly discuss and reflect" (Budd and Wright, 1992. p.225), this conviction is one which both of us have had a chance to develop through our experiences working with an ILC model. In this case, the planning process that we experienced is entirely supportive of the research done by Bailey, Dale and Squire (1992) which suggests that for successful collaboration, teachers should "focus on goals rather than personalities." However, as with all occasions where people work together, the personalities and experiences which the individuals bring to the process have an effect on the way in which they work together. The next section on roles will examine the interaction between these two planning teachers.

Roles

In this situation, the term "roles" refers to the relationship between the two planning teachers during collaborative planning and teaching. The literature review has already outlined a variety of possible roles which are typically taken on during collaborative planning. Prior to beginning my research, I expected us to follow a "true collaborative" approach (Bravi, 1986) where the teaching and planning responsibilities
would be shared equally between us. I, perhaps naively, assumed that we would be "partners" (Champion, Kiel & McLendon, 1990), each with an area of expertise to offer. To a certain extent we did work as partners and in fact, we developed a fairly collaborative approach over time. However, while we both did have areas of expertise, I found that my role began more as a "modeler" where I provided many of the skills and strategies for presenting information to students. As the collaboration progressed our relationship evolved, as will be shown in the discussion of data, to the point where we were more equal. This progression was not immediately apparent to me during the collaboration sessions and it was only after rereading my field notes and reviewing our planning sessions that I became fully aware of how unequal our relationship was initially and how that changed during our time together. In my field diary I commented:

It gives me the strangest feeling of power in this "partnership". In spite of the fact that I've tried to establish a relationship of equality between us, (T) obviously considers my opinions to be "the word". I guess it's natural due to the difference in our teaching experience both in time and position.

(FD-pg.10-11-#20-01)

In fact, it was likely our differences in teaching positions which led to the roles we chose to play. Goffman (1959) maintains that during field research, people do not reveal their true personalities but rather they play the role that they think is expected of them. In this case, (T) and I naturally brought our roles of classroom teacher and district consultant respectively to the collaboration process. This had an observable impact on our
interaction with each other.

Throughout our planning sessions, there are examples of occasions where my teacher partner defers to my suggestions. The following quotes are just a small representation of this pattern:

T: You're the expert.
R: If that's what you want.
(AT 2 - #265-266)

R: Do you want me to set up a co-op learning activity?
T: You know more about that.
(AT 3 - #68-71)

T: Whatever you want, really!
(AT 3 - #273)

In addition, compliments seemed to play an interesting role in continuing this unequal relationship. The following is a typical compliment made by my teacher partner:

T: Lovely idea, you come through at the last minute as usual.
(AT 5-#195-196)

After reviewing my audiotapes, I made the following comments about compliments in my field diary:

R: In several places (T) compliments me on the work I've done and so finally I assured him that I thought we worked as a team and that he had a lot to contribute to the partnership too. It struck me that perhaps he didn't realize that I felt that way. He seemed very pleased to have that confirmed and was more relaxed. I wonder if perhaps this has something to do with the artificial heirarchy which might exist between us. I am a more experienced teacher in a district "consultant" position compared to (T) who has only been teaching for a few years. I like to think I have treated him as an equal and I do consider him to be an equal partner in this collaboration but perhaps I need to be more overt and confirm for him that I felt that way.
(FD2-pg.21-#15-28)

It might appear from these interactions that I had complete control over our planning sessions and ultimately, control over
the tasks that were planned. Fortunately that was not really the case. In spite of my teacher partner's initial willingness that I have control over most aspects of the planning, he was comfortable with his areas of expertise including: 1) knowledge of the novel and its story; and 2) background knowledge on the experiences and abilities of his students. The following examples illustrate these two areas:

R: I don't have a clear idea of the "layout" of the setting ...In this case, (T) is definitely the "expert".  
(FD-pg.12-#7-8)

T: They have done description writing before.  
(AT 3-#354)

This relationship where my partner shared his knowledge about the novel and the students while I shared my knowledge about the ILC model and different teaching strategies was established early on in our planning and was even acknowledged by us in the following way:

T: You are the Guru of the Framework
R: If I am the Guru of the Framework, then you are the Guru of Narnia (the novel).  
(AT 1-#320-322)

During the first six weeks, our planning sessions went very smoothly; we agreed on most things and when we didn't agree, my partner usually followed my recommendations. Then, the planning of task #7 (Winter/Spring poems), provided an interesting conflict. When I initially suggested that we try to do some poetry writing with the students, my partner seemed somewhat reluctant but as usual suggested that if I wanted to try it, that he would agree. I went ahead with the poetry lesson and it was
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not very successful. The following excerpt from our planning session describes how we debriefed this lesson:

R: Let's start off by reviewing yesterday's activity because it didn't go very well.
T: It bombed miserably. I'm sorry.
R: I think I forgot to tell them they had to have opposite but parallel forms.
T: Poetry is not a very exciting thing for me. Let's kill it off today.
R: I'd like to talk to them about being parallel but opposite.
T: (changes subject talks about collages)
R: So maybe this morning I'll try to light a fire under them re: poems- maybe I'll reintroduce it.
T: Yeah- I guess it wouldn't hurt to reintroduce it.

(AT 7-#5-20)

I believe that my partner felt as though his initial reluctance to support the poetry writing activity had been justified. However, I persevered and reintroduced the poetry lesson to the students. I had determined that the content was well thought out and so I focussed my lesson on developing an understanding of the language component of the activity. The results were very gratifying. But most interesting of all was my partner's reaction. I made the following notes in my field diary:

R: Hallelujah! This was a great lesson. Because the students had a good handle on the content and had a starting piece of writing, they were able to quickly implement the ideas modelled re: form and elaboration. They worked with partners to improve their writing and most of the students made incredible improvements. (T) was so surprised. He was very pleased with the improved writing. He even took some samples to other teachers and bragged about what (R) and the kids did.... (T) says I can put together a bulletin board display in the hall to show the finished work.

(FD-pg.3-#4-19)

The result of this interaction could have been a strengthening of my role as the expert. Interestingly, the opposite seemed to be
true. Our discussion of this task was the first instance where (T) expressed a strong differing opinion from mine. After the successful completion of the task, he seemed to be more willing to offer other opinions on task selection and presentation.

For example, he said:

T: I don't think you'll get that answer with your question. You'll get something like ...
R: OK, I agree, so what can we say?
T: (gives several examples)

(At 11-#236-240)

In our informal discussions, he continuously commented on how, in the past, he had hated teaching poetry to his class and that our experience made him feel that he could teach poetry more easily in the future. I believe that this conflict helped my partner see that he did not have to passively listen to my ideas and accept them, but that he could challenge my ideas and we could both learn from the resolution of that conflict. If I had chosen to "kill off" the poems as he had suggested, neither one of us would have learned as much.

In addition, I discovered when I interviewed (T), that the conflict that arose over the poetry unit was something he considered to be an important part of the collaboration relationship. He said:

T: Other people often have very strong suggestions or ideas. It forces you as a teacher to look at it.

(I-pg.3-#13-14)

In fact, he went on to describe the change in our relationship saying:
T: I feel myself rise to a new level just discussing things.  
(I-pg.10-#7-8)

Having commented previously on how compliments seemed to play a role in maintaining the inequality of initial planning sessions, it is interesting to note that as time progressed, compliments between the two of us decreased in frequency. It is possible that because of the developing trust relationship between us, we no longer felt the need to compliment each other on every contribution. This was likely because it became more difficult to identify any one task as being solely one person's contribution due to the increased discussion which went into its formulation. The other change which occurred with the decreased frequency of compliments was what I would call an increase in "sincerity". When compliments were given they recognized more extraordinary effort than they had in the past. For that reason, they were more meaningful because they had been earned. This change in frequency and "sincerity" of compliments mirrors the developing nature of our collaborative relationship.

There are at least two ways in which this change of relationship can be represented graphically. Figure 4-6 presents the shift in relationships from the viewpoint of expert/novice.

Insert Figure 4-6 about here

Our reason for planning together initially had a lot to do with the fact that each of us was going to be an expert in "our" area.
As time progressed, the distinction became less precise and we felt quite comfortable working in the other's area of expertise. Another way of viewing the change in our relationship is shown in Figure 4-7.

Insert Figure 4-7 about here

In the beginning, the communication between us could be viewed as one-way if you consider that my partner and I shared information only from our areas of expertise to plan tasks for the students. After the conflict over task #7, we developed a pattern of two-way communication where we could discuss each other's area of expertise before planning tasks. The classroom observations are a good example of a time when I was able to comment on my partner's domain. After completing several hours of both formal and informal observations, I made the following remarks in my field diary:

R: (D) is the other student who stood out. I noticed that he never chose to work with anyone in his table group. He only has girls in his group and he always wanted to work with a boy or boys.... I asked (T) about it and he said that (D) wasn't doing work in the other group and so he purposely moved him into a group with some hard working girls. He said he would think about moving him. (FD-pg.10-11-#25-6)

The success of this collaboration experience was not just dependent on the expertise that we brought to the planning and teaching experience. We were lucky in that our personalities, philosophies and goals were a good match. (T) described his
opinion of this match in the following way:

T: ...you're going to plan better and collaborate and team teach more efficiently and with a better feeling with some people than with others and that's just a human dynamic, a component that comes into it. ...I think that this almost is removed from a job class hierarchy and it's brought more into a personal level and it's your own inhibitions and insecurities and securities, that you feel good working with a person. It's like when you meet someone on the sideline at a soccer game and you strike up a conversation. You either find that person interesting and want to continue it or it remains superficial and it's not continued. You see someone teach. You plan with somebody. You feed on their ideas and if you are in synch and see where they're coming from you take those and wow ... I find it stimulating. Whereas the opposite of that would be if you're in a situation where someone is non-receptive to ideas or not willing to give ideas... where you find it almost a dead end. It's not stimulating. You don't see the discussions going anywhere. You're not sure you like the way they're teaching, presenting things to children. There perhaps is a different philosophy, a different point of view. You may not agree with information they're presenting. They may discuss something with you in the planning process but teach something different and I think there's all kinds of possibilities that could arise to turn you off. So, I think to sum it up, what makes someone feel secure and successful and want to plan with somebody is this.. just a feeling you get through the process and the teaching on a personal level, as well as in a professional sense.

In summary, there appear to be a number of things which contributed to the development of our collaborative planning process. On the one hand, we shared a common goal of developing a novel study based on an ILC approach which would provide an improved learning opportunity for the students in the grade 6 class. However, on the other hand, it would seem that shared educational goals are not sufficient. As my partner describes above, it is the developing relationship of trust which occurs during collaboration when partners with similar philosophies share
ideas and communicate openly and honestly with each other that is supportive of a collaborative planning model.

Also, I consider the development of friendships between collaborating teachers to be one of the most positive aspects of collaborative planning. In a profession which is typically an isolated and lonely job (Minnes, 1990; Lortie, 1975), it is important for us to examine planning structures which provide positive growth experiences for teachers. Upon completion of my research at this school, I was very sorry to be leaving the school and the students. However, during the following weeks, the one thing that I missed most was the regular contact with my teaching partner. This was a feeling which we shared. When I spoke with (T) on the phone, he stated that he found it really depressing going back to teaching alone again. We still keep in touch regularly and I believe that we value each other as friends. However, the pleasure and satisfaction which we experienced when planning and teaching together can not be recaptured unless I have the opportunity to collaborate with him again in the future. In our interview, my partner stated:

T: This collaboration process has been very fun. I've enjoyed it immensely. Once you're exposed to it, once you try it... I mean you wonder how you could get along without it.
(I-pg.22-23-#26-6)

Our collaborative teaching experience has acted like a double-edged sword in the sense that I feel that I did some of my best teaching in that class, at the same time that I feel frustration that we can not continue to work together.
The Knowledge Framework, Task Design and Key Visuals

As my partner and I prepared to begin our planning sessions, we were both highly aware that we would be focussing on planning tasks using the Knowledge Framework, Task Design and Key Visuals as defined in the introduction of this thesis under key terms. As such, we intended to use these tools consciously and conscientiously during our planning. I anticipated that we would develop a Knowledge Framework early in our planning sessions and would then use that as a guide for planning and structuring tasks. I would also have predicted that we would apply the task design model to each of the tasks selected for the students. Finally, I knew that Key Visuals would play an important role as a strategy for instruction in the class. The reality of our planning sessions was somewhat different from what I had expected. I will comment separately on how each of these three components was included in our planning and instruction.

1) Knowledge Framework

It is important to stress that the use of the Knowledge Framework was not new for my teaching partner. He had already done a lot of work with the students related to using knowledge structures for learning. In fact, when I observed the classroom prior to beginning my research, I made the following notes in my field diary:

R: Displayed on this bulletin board are six boxes reflecting the Knowledge Framework, a theoretical focus for the classroom programs.
(10-pg.2-#19-22)
In the teacher interview, I asked my partner how he got involved with working with the Knowledge Framework approach. He said:

T: I was a new classroom teacher ... and I hadn't developed any set way or strategies or methodologies or pedagogy. ... I was searching for an opening to help. This new framework approach seemed like a very good way because it was being supported by people I respected.

(I-pg.13-#13-22)

Clearly, my assumption that we would use the Knowledge Framework in our planning was shared by my partner.

However, the reality of our use of the Knowledge Framework was somewhat different from what I had anticipated. I did approach my partner early on in our planning sessions about developing a Knowledge Framework as follows:

R: Have you put together a framework on this?
(AT 1-#286-287)

T: We're going to work in all the boxes. Let's do the framework together.
(AT 1-#308-312)

At this point, in the early stages of planning, I showed my partner a "generic" short story Knowledge Framework. This short story Framework is shown in Figure 4-8. We discussed this informally in the classroom and agreed that it would serve as a good guideline for our planning. We made the following comments about a short story framework:

R: Major characters and setting go down here in description. Types of stories go in classification you know "genres". Up here goes good vs evil - the theme of any novel goes in principles. The timeline or sequence of events down here.
Evaluating and predicting outcomes goes here (in evaluation) and choices of endings and character's choices goes here in choice.
(AT 2-#177-195)

Time passed and about 7 weeks into our novel study unit, I said:

R: We still need to do a Framework.
(AT 8-#40-41)

We again agreed that this was important but went on with the more urgent need to continue to plan tasks for the students. In fact, it was not until the end of our novel study unit that we actually sat down and developed a Knowledge Framework specifically for *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe* (Lewis, 1950) as shown in figure 4-9.

---

Insert Figure 4-9 about here

---

Our use of a generic Knowledge Framework for the larger part of our planning leading to the development of a specific Knowledge Framework is shown graphically in figure 4-10.

---

Insert Figure 4-10 about here

---

I was quite disturbed that we hadn't found it important to complete a specific Knowledge Framework sooner until I examined the tapes from our planning sessions more closely. I discovered then, that although we hadn't formally written down the knowledge structures to be included in our unit, we had used the Knowledge Framework approach in another way.
One of the benefits of using the Knowledge Framework is that once a knowledge structure is identified, it serves as a reference point for selecting Key Visuals and language. In spite of our lack of a Knowledge Framework for the novel, we both continuously used our awareness of knowledge structures to do just that, as the following examples show:

R: So the language we will focus on is the language of classification, description and principles - also evaluation and choice.
(AT 1-#282-284)

R: This is an evaluation and choice activity. They need to give reasons for their decision. Let's use a T-chart.
(AT 4-#420-422)

T: Right, what kind of language do we want? Do we want opinion, do we want summary language or sequence?
(AT 11-#040-046)

R: I think they definitely need compare/contrast language.
T: Yes, I agree they need compare/contrast. They would say stuff like; (gives examples).
(AT 11-#055-060)

I believe that the most powerful use of the Knowledge Framework was as a tool in the continuing development of tasks. Given this focus, it suddenly made sense that (T) and I would rather develop our specific Knowledge Framework at the end of our novel study because we were constantly selecting and labelling our tasks as we planned.

When I asked (T) about the role of the Knowledge Framework in his program, he responded:

T: Everything is taught through the Framework, whether it's thinking and organizational skills, or it's mapping out where we're going with this, or it's a Key Visual that elicits information from text, or that children have rewritten the main ideas and taken that and put it into a paragraph of
their own, whether it's a character chart which brainstorms words to describe a character and they've written about that character, or the relationship between two characters... it's everywhere. 
(I-pg.15-16-#20-2)

The data supports that this is the way that my partner and I worked with the Knowledge Framework. It was an integral part of the planning process, not something which could be completed prior to planning.

2) Task Design

I expected there to be more evidence of the three steps of this model for each task, when in fact what I found was that the Task Design Model applied more to the whole unit. Therefore, the progression of lessons in this unit reflects the Task Design model, beginning with a task where students are given an opportunity to demonstrate and build their background knowledge followed by tasks which required students to think while reading the book and viewing the video tape and concluding with a task which required the students to restructure what they had learned into a graphic and a piece of summary writing. This overall structure is shown graphically in figure 4-10.

When planning tasks we discussed overtly the need for supporting students at each of the three stages. In particular, we spent a lot of time before beginning the unit talking about ways to build background knowledge as the following examples show:

R: It (the book) assumes a common background which is not there. 
(AT 1-#273-274)
As part of our plan to build background knowledge, we showed the students a war film and accessed information on the CD-Rom system in the school Resource Centre to set the stage for the first scene in the book where the children are evacuated from London during WWII. In addition, we planned task #1 specifically to build background knowledge by introducing students to key vocabulary related to the important themes of the book.

At this point we moved to a series of tasks (#2-7) which were designed to help students make meaning of what they were hearing, reading and viewing. Since we presented the novel in these three ways, it was important that we give students the support they needed to understand the story. The primary tool we used to accomplish this was Key Visuals. This will be discussed in more detail in the next section.

Finally, the last three tasks (#8-10) were planned to help students present information they had learned in another form. Tasks were structured to allow the learners to demonstrate their understanding after completing the novel.

3) Key Visuals

As was the case with the Knowledge Framework, my teaching partner was already using some Key Visuals in his classroom. I commented on this in both my informal observation and my field diary as shown below:

R: The extensive display of visuals, both student work and resources for classroom study, indicates an emphasis on
visual presentations...
(IO-pg.4-#20-24)

R: This classroom is so packed full of graphics and displays. It is definitely representative of the language and content model. It's interesting that the work that is displayed is mostly not for decoration. Many of the charts and graphics serve as resources for the students when they are working on class assignments.
(FD-pg.8-#154-21)

This bountiful display of Key Visuals implied a strong foundation of understanding both by the teacher and the students prior to the beginning of our novel study.

I was pleased to find that my expectation that Key Visuals would be used extensively was fulfilled to the point where virtually every task involved the use of a Key Visual. I then focussed my attention on the actual use of the Key Visuals. I examined how Key Visuals supported learning during the novel study and found that they were used primarily in three ways as follows:

1) graphics for teaching:

   R: He goes through the steps for completing the task in order using the actual worksheet (Key Visual) as a prop to support the oral instructions.
   (IO-pg.5-#21-23)

2) graphics for learning:

   R: This could be an opportunity to do our first piece of writing. The students can fill out character charts and do good or evil writing supported by those charts.
   (AT -#215-218)

and 3) graphics for presenting:

   R: I used the model "Four Step summary". It's very simple and seemed to work well. The students were asked to develop a visual to show their key points and use it to do an oral presentation for the class. They had some trouble with selecting an appropriate graphic, but we worked together to
I have supplied different examples for each of the three categories but it was often the case that a single visual was used for more than one purpose. For example in task #9 (Summary Writing), the students developed Key Visuals to make notes on the key points in the novel. They then used that same graphic as the basis for their oral presentation to the class.

Although we did not talk during our planning sessions about how we would introduce the Key Visuals to the students in a gradual way, I found that we followed a distinct pattern beginning with teacher-prepared Key Visuals as tools for teaching and learning and concluding with student-made Key Visuals as measures of understanding. A step-by-step process which guided students to the point where they could produce their own visuals can be identified as part of the instructional process. For example, in task #3 students are asked to record information on a Key Visual given to them by the teachers. In task #8, students are asked to develop their own Key Visuals based on models provided by my teaching partner and then in task #10 students develop their own Key Visuals independently as a tool for organizing their writing.

By examining the data, I discovered that Key Visuals were used consistently in a variety of ways and were introduced to students in a gradual manner. The following question was asked on a regular basis as part of the planning of tasks:
T: What kind of Key Visual do we want?
(AT 3-#265-266)

Both of us were comfortable using Key Visuals as part of our classroom practice and discussed tasks during planning in light of the Key Visual that would form the central characteristic of an activity. The following quote from our planning sessions illustrates this point:

R: If I do summarizing plot with a graphic then maybe you could introduce the theme graphic.
(AT 10-#234-238)

In conclusion, it would appear that Key Visuals are a constant and fundamental part of ILC instruction in this classroom. My partner described it best when he said in our interview:

T: My whole language arts program is novel-based content Key Visuals.
(I-pg.15-#19-20).

I have already alluded to the sequential way in which the use of Key Visuals were introduced. In the same way that this sequential pattern can be identified, a process for both collaborative planning and ILC instruction can also be described.

Processes

Part of the analysis of data in regard to collaborative planning for ILC instruction involved looking at sequential patterns in planning and instruction. In other words, were there any particular patterns which could be identified during collaboration or ILC instruction? I will examine each of the two areas separately.
On a simplistic level, my teaching partner described the planning sequence in the following manner:

T: We meet and plan units and lessons around subject areas, come up with strategies and ways of teaching... at our school content and language.  
(I-pg.2-#11-14)

As it turns out the above description is quite accurate. It can be described in more detail as shown in figure 4-11. This sequence represents the planning pattern for the entire unit. I have already commented on how the components of the Knowledge Framework, Task Design and Key Visuals contributed to this pattern in the previous section.

It is also possible to identify a pattern for the individual planning sessions. Typically, each of our sessions would begin with a discussion of "where we are". This involved reviewing the lessons already taught and their status, as well as commenting on where we were headed next, as shown in the following example:

R: Let's review our planning schedule. This is where we are: We did yesterday what we thought we were going to do. Today we need to finish our character studies of Mr. Tumnus and put together the class chart. We were going to combine all their word lists and then you're going to model the writing using the Aslan package.
T: Yeah and then writing about Mr. Tumnus and then I believe I was going to read chapter 3.  
(AT 4-#052-067)

After we established where we were in planning, we would begin to plan upcoming tasks until the point where the planning session was
coming to an end. Then we would do two other things. First of all, we would review who was responsible for what, including both preparation and teaching responsibilities as in the following example:

T: I will do the modelling of Aslan and the class can begin writing on Mr. Tumnus. I will read the children's reactions to Lucy coming out of the wardrobe. Then you can do the continuum.
R: Great.
(AT 4-#074-077)

Then we would confirm when we would be together next. This discussion of time was an important part of all planning sessions due to the fact that I was only available to team teach at certain times. The following is an example of one discussion of time:

T: So you could be here the week of Nov.30th
R: Nov 30th I'm here Monday morning, we just have one period though. Tuesday we're both here
T: and Wednesday...
R: Wednesday I'm not here. Thursday I'm here. Let's look at the next week to make sure I'm here then.
(AT 4-#202-206)

Just as a sequence could be identified for the collaborative planning, there seemed to be a pattern to the instructional process as shown in figure 4-12. Some of the categories listed in this figure require further explanation -

Statement of task - applies to any time a task is presented or mentionned. It differs from instructions in that it refers to a
large chunk of information - may be a whole lesson or an activity which spans more than one day. There are essentially 10 tasks in this unit of study as shown in figure 4-3. e.g. "Plot books"

**Teacher Instructions** - applies to the steps taken to complete a task. These may be described or the teacher may state them in the lesson presentation. e.g. "Do a rough copy first".

**Examples** - refers to any time the teacher or the students list examples which help in understanding. These examples may be language or content based. e.g."You may want to use words like... initially, in the beginning" and "You'll want to talk about Cair Paravel and the Stone Table".

**Task Clarification** - applies when the teacher asks questions. e.g. "Does everyone understand" and when the students ask questions e.g. "Should I do it this way?"

**Feedback** - refers to evaluative comments (both positive and negative). These may be directed at the students or be reflective by the teacher e.g. "Good answer" or "The writing was poorly done".

Although we didn't follow this model in a lock step manner for every lesson we presented, it was a prevalent pattern occurring with regular frequency throughout the teaching experiences. Obviously, the pattern as described for our teaching reflects a structured, direct instruction approach to teaching and learning. I was surprised to find that we followed such a structured model. My partner described this level of structure in our interview saying:
T: I think I feel very strongly as a classroom teacher that you have to have control. I don't think you can let the students gain too much control. I want to guide the students in a certain area. I like them to have flexibility to be able to branch off into strains that they are interested in and that they would like to go with. (I-pg.19-#12-22)

Upon closer examination of the tasks and the student work required, I was encouraged to find that students were given a variety of learning experiences within the frame of the instructional process. As already described, the tasks were diversified in the way in which Key Visuals were used to support learning. Also, students were grouped in a variety of ways, - they occasionally worked individually and more often worked in groups of 2 or larger. Sometimes students were given a choice of working individually or in groups. Cooperative learning strategies were used to structure some of the group work such as for task #5 where students were given particular roles to play and had to come up with a choice which reflected the group's consensus. Other groupings were less formal as in task #6 where students decided amongst themselves who would be responsible for what portion of the work. These options for grouping and Key Visual use contributed to the diversity within the tasks presented.

The examination of data around patterns or sequences in collaboration and ILC instruction reveals a structured step-by-step approach to planning and teaching. This is not to suggest that his is the only way to plan and teach using an ILC approach. To the contrary, as already stated, the description of
collaboration and instruction in this study is intended to be a
detailed look at one way in which teachers can follow an ILC
approach. Upon reflection, we were able to comment on the costs
and benefits, as we perceived them, of working in this model.

**Costs and Benefits:**

My partner and I took some time to reflect on the costs and
benefits of working together to plan ILC instruction. It was
immediately apparent that both of us felt overwhelmingly positive,
both about the planning and the teaching. My partner spoke for
both of us when he said:

T: I have a really good feeling with this, a far better
feeling than I would with just myself.
(I-pg.8-#11-13)

I have broken down our comments into six categories in order to
illustrate our reasons for feeling good about our work together.

1. **Benefits of collaboration for teachers:**

One of the important benefits of working together was that
both (T) and I felt we had learned from each other. The following
pairs of quotes include a comment about learning by one partner
and an example of our learning.

T: It's really personally helped my career just watching you
because I pick up ideas and file them.
(I-pg.11-#14-16)

R: (T) had never seen this method before and seemed
interested in trying it.
(FD-pg.8-#8-10)

R: I certainly learn a lot from being in your classroom.
(I-pg.11-#18-19)

R: I found I learned a lot about (T) (during the classroom
observations). He speaks clearly and gives instructions very
clearly. I realized that I haven't ever heard students ask him to repeat instructions after the task has been described. I suspect that he wouldn't be interested in repeating what he has already clearly stated. Also, he often writes the instructions down on the board or on an overhead.

( FD-pg.9-#10-17 )

While I tended to view the collaboration process as supportive, my partner viewed it as a means for providing pressure to excel. Either way, we both saw collaboration as a means for improving our teaching.

T: I think it (collaboration) improves the teacher's teaching ability. I think of before, when you tend to just focus just on characterization and maybe miss something else that you could have brought in, where if you're working with other people they often have very strong suggestions and ideas. It forces you as a teacher to look at it and plan and structure and coordinate the themes better. You're just under that pressure to work even better. It's like a continual check.

(I-pg.3-#8-18)

As I have already commented, one of the important benefits of collaboration was the development of a friendship between us. My partner commented on that relationship in a general way saying:

T: I think that it (collaboration) helps to create a sort of homogeneous atmosphere between...two teachers.

(I-pg.4-5-#27-2)

It is exciting that we both felt that the collaborative planning provided us with an opportunity to learn from each other and improve our teaching skills within an atmosphere of friendship. But the benefits didn't end there. During a recent conversation, my partner commented on the quality of our unit. Those comments echo what he said during the interview:

T: a strong sense of security and pride in a very thoroughly organized and structured unit.

(I-pg.3-#1-3)
Collaboration and ILC Instruction

Obviously, for us, the collaborative experience was a successful one, involving learning, friendship, and feelings of pride. We can also identify in the collected data some benefits for students. My partner expresses this dual benefit in the following way:

R: Some professional benefits are (development of) the teacher's teaching skill and the sense of feeling that you have a colleague in the classroom and there are academic benefits for the kids.
(I-pg.4-#10-14)

2. Benefits of collaboration for students:

In fact, in our discussions and as evidenced in the data, the benefits for students were not solely academic ones. (T) does identify benefits related to the development of academic skills for learning as in the following quote:

T: They (the students) benefit from the collaborative planning and teaching process in the sense that they start to see these strategies that we present to them and take ownership of them.
(I-pg.3-#24-27)

But, he also identifies benefits regarding the climate and structure of the classroom such as:

T: ...by having someone who is not always in the classroom come and be a collaborative teaching partner, it's almost like it's a welcome change from having the classroom teacher always there.
(I-pg.7-#1-3)

T: (The students) benefit from having two teachers in the classroom. The student-teacher ratio is far better.
(I-pg.6-#20-21)

So, from the data collected in this study, it appears that both students and teachers reap rewards from the collaborative planning process. Next, I will examine the positive effects of the ILC
approach.

3. Benefits of ILC instruction for teachers:

I have already described how the use of the Knowledge Framework helped us to structure tasks for students which addressed both language and content goals, in particular through the selection and use of Key Visuals. My partner also comments on the use of the Framework as a unit planning tool. In our case, we used the short story Framework shown in figure 4-8 for this purpose.

T: It (the Framework) helps to refocus your own objectives and put you back on track too and it opens you up to this whole array of opportunities and choices out there. (I-pg.23-#8-12)

In other words, the Framework serves as a tool for relating activities to the goals of the unit and as such frees the planning teachers to pick from a wide variety of possibilities. Once the tasks have been selected, the students benefit from the use of the approach in the classroom setting.

4. Benefits of ILC instruction for students:

My teacher partner gave some thought to the topic of how the ILC approach helps students to succeed. He commented in our interview on how the use of the Framework and Key Visuals helped students to deal with the process of learning.

T: For the students... the Framework helps them organize their thinking. It bridges that gap. It's very easy. It's visual for them ... certainly through the Key Visuals. (I-pg.3-#19-24)

In particular, he made reference to the improvement in students' levels of comprehension:
T: I notice among my students that there's generally a better comprehension rate or comprehension is displayed a lot more readily than it was before. (I-pg.16-#18-21)

This improvement in comprehension is demonstrated in the assignments that students produce. Their assignments seem to indicate that they have effectively learned the skills taught in the ILC approach:

T: I think their writing is sequenced a lot better. The language is there and it's more thorough. (I-pg.16-#21-22)

T: I think their ability to display information and their ideas and to understand the relationships is also good. (I-pg.16-17-#27-1)

Another area where students benefit is through evaluation. Students seem to be more aware of expectations of assignments. (T) says:

T: It not only makes it easier for me as the teacher to evaluate their work, but it makes it easier for the students to understand what's expected of them. (I-pg.21-22-#27-2)

The description of the benefits of both collaboration and ILC instruction is impressive. However, there are costs to these gains for both students and teachers.

5. Costs of Collaboration:

My partner and I were only able to identify a few drawbacks to the collaborative planning process. The first one did not involve us directly. (T) felt that for other teachers there was a certain amount of risk involved with working with another teacher saying:
T: (some teachers) may perhaps feel threatened. (I-pg.6-#1)

We agreed that this was more of a roadblock than a cost - something which might prevent people from choosing to work collaboratively.

Secondly, (T) alluded to the possibility of teachers who were released from their regular classroom assignments to plan with an ESL specialist saying:

T: It (collaborative planning) does take the teacher out of their regular 40 minute period. So perhaps the students are missing to some degree the interpersonal communication between the teacher that would regularly be there. I'm not saying that's a major cost. (I-pg.5-#14-21)

The major cost which we did identify is related to time. Collaborative planning takes time and most teachers have crowded schedules which don't have room for the time needed to plan together with a colleague. In this site, teachers receive support from their administrator who provides release time from teaching duties for teachers who wish to collaborate. My partner and I did not take advantage of that opportunity, however. We did our formal planning once a week during my partner's preparation time. This provided us with a 40 minute block of time where we could plan. This does not mean that we did not plan at other times. We talked informally about our plans while teaching, having coffee and before and after school. (T) makes the following comments about time:

T: I find that the unit moves, in relation to other units before, in all honesty, it moves much more slowly. (I-pg.7-#11-14)
T: From a teacher's point of view, meeting and continually getting together, I think I've given up a lot of ... a spare every Tuesday morning... but that's wht my prep time's for. it's for prep so I see it as a necessary part of creating a structured professional environment for kids. (I-pg.7-8-#27-6)

As is shown in the last quote, my partner has a hard time identifying any real costs to the collaboration process. He was honest about that and characterized himself in the following way:

T: I, in all honesty, am such a supporter of the collaborative planning and teaching process that I can't think of very many (costs). (I-pg.6-#12-14)

The data as presented on costs and benefits is obviously weighted in favor of collaboration and ILC instruction. Both of us agreed that the benefits to this model far outweigh the costs. This is explained further in this last section.

6. The Cost / Benefit Imbalance:

After reviewing the data and based on our own feelings about our experience during this research experience, my partner and I agree that collaboration and ILC instruction are worth the costs incurred. We can see that these costs exist but they can be directly linked to the gains made my both the teachers and the students. My partner sums this up saying:

T: ... it may take a little more time and organization but the students benefit from it in the long run because there's a more comprehensive well-planned unit. (I-pg.7-#23-26)

In summary, this chapter began by describing the goals and roles embraced by the planning teachers during the research project. It emphasized that the negotiation of specific content
and language goals was a prevalent part of the planning process. It also documented the evolving relationship between us as we began to share our areas of expertise and develop a truly collaborative approach to planning. Following that, sequential processes in both planning and instruction were discussed and illustrated with examples from the data. In both planning and instruction, the teachers followed an overarching pattern within which there was room for a fair amount of flexibility. Finally, a discussion of the costs and benefits highlighted the success of the planning and instruction and concluded that it was a worthwhile experience.

Chapter five will present some preliminary conclusions regarding collaborative planning of tasks between a classroom teacher and an ESL specialist including the implications of those conclusions. Suggestions for further research will be offered followed by concluding remarks.
CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

My goal in this case study was to describe collaborative planning and how that transcribed into ILC instruction. Van Maanen (1988) claims that the fieldwork tradition assumes that "experience underlies all understanding of social life" (p.3). In other words, understanding stems from participation and/or observation in a natural social setting. To that end, I immersed myself as a participant observer in the selected setting and gathered data to investigate my research questions. In the words of Shavelson and Stern, I set out to understand teaching, by examining "teachers' goals, judgements and decisions" and how they relate to "teachers' behavior and the classroom context." (p.459)

The case study approach lends itself to rich description of a selected site in order to provide insight into a particular situation. Spindler (1982) states "...ethnographic inquiry by its nature focuses on single cases..." (p.8). Also, Spindler maintains that: "...ethnographers feel that an in-depth study that gives accurate knowledge of one setting not markedly dissimilar from other relevant settings is likely to be generalizable in substantial degree to these other settings." (p.8). Although it is not advisable to make generalizations to other settings based solely on this study, it is possible to comment on how the findings may influence both teachers and researchers who choose to pursue similar work.

Chapter five will be divided into three sections. First of
all, the key findings from each of the sections in Chapter four will be discussed. This will be followed by the possible implications of this case study for researchers. Finally, the chapter will conclude with some remarks regarding the relative success of the project.

**Discussion and Teacher Implications**

1. **GOALS**

   *There was a consistent focus on goals throughout planning.*

   Although some of the early research in teacher thinking implies that goals are not the primary concern of teachers who plan individually (Eisner, 1967; MacDonald, 1965), research in the area of collaborative planning is supportive of the development and discussion of goals related to students' growth and achievement. The importance of mutual understanding in order to work together is one obvious reason why goals would hold more importance in collaborative planning than in individual planning. Another reason relates to this particular case where mutual goals were discussed prior to a commitment to work together as part of the selection of the participating teacher. In fact, the goals related to ILC instruction were fundamental to the purpose and development of the study. Therefore, it is understandable that the focus on goals was maintained during this study.

   *The advance organizer played a crucial role in on-going planning.*

   For the two of us, the advance organizer served as a tool for keeping us "on track". In addition, we used it to help students
make connections between new information and past learnings. Preliminary research into the use of advance organizers, particularly in the study of content area reading has been highly supportive (Luiten, Ames & Aerson, 1980). It may be that other teachers would find a list of content goals as useful as the graphic format we selected. The use of a Key Visual in the form of an advance organizer is something which both of us found to be particularly useful.

Language goals were given equal importance with content goals in task planning.

Our focus on language demands of tasks was a particular feature of this study. It was interesting that the selection of language, more than the selection of content, could be seen as directly linked to an understanding of the Knowledge Framework. I will comment further on this connection in the discussion of the use of the Knowledge Framework. Our experience with planning tasks which had both language and content goals is directly supported by Mohan's recommendations regarding essential classroom tasks which can have both content and language goals.

Implications for Teachers

It would appear that a focus on goals is supportive both of the collaborative relationship and the classroom instruction. This makes sense as it allows two individuals to share a common idea of what should be accomplished during the planning and instruction. It is possible that this common goal or goals allows teachers to plan more freely when tasks of a variety of natures
can be seen to relate to the overall goals of the unit of study. The following statements represent some possible implications for teachers:

It appears to be important to:

• establish content goals prior to collaboratively planning a unit of study.
• relate each task as it is planned to the pre-set goals
• identify language goals for each planned task based on the predominant knowledge structures involved.

2. ROLES

The ESL specialist and the classroom teacher initially related to each other as expert and novice.

Our initial relationship patterns indicated roles of expert and novice. However, both of us had our areas of expertise right from the beginning as shown in figure 4-6. Therefore, unlike Bravi's "expert/client" model where one member of the planning team is inactive, both of us were actively involved in sharing ideas from our discreet areas of expertise. This having been said, it was still the case that my partner had high expectations for me to be the teaching expert. This was surprising to me for a couple of reasons. First of all, I expected my partner to accept me as an equal right from the beginning. I realize now that this expectation was a naive one. I had underestimated my level of experience and knowledge in comparison to my partner's and the impact of my role as a district consultant compared to a school-based teacher. Secondly, I misjudged my partner's expectation
that I was and would be the "expert". In our planning sessions and interview he continually stated his desire for me to be the expert. This type of relationship seems most similar to Champion, Kiel and McLendon's modeler role where the consultant has a responsibility to instruct the teacher so that he/she could learn to use the strategies at another time. This type of instruction was apparent in the planning sessions where on numerous occasions I explained different teaching strategies and how they worked to (T).

Conflict in planning served as impetus for change in the distinct roles.

I have a preference for avoiding conflict, particularly at work, and therefore I found its role in producing change very enlightening. Granted the type of conflict we experienced did not involve shouting or anger, it did represent a definite difference of opinion. Research on collaboration outlines many different roles for collaborating teachers beginning with little or no two-way communication and continuing to grow towards open and complete communication. It is also clear in stating that collaborating teachers often do not move beyond the initial types of roles. In this case, conflict over a particular task appears to have provided the push needed to leave our comfortable roles of expert and novice in order to extend the amount of two-way communication as shown in figure 4-7.
The development of two-way communication when developing tasks was an essential part of the growth in our planning duo. This change in communication led to joint ownership of all tasks. Prior to this change one or the other of us assumed some kind of responsibility for the success or failure of a given task. We became partners in the true sense when we each had an equal stake in the task's success.

Similar philosophies seem to contribute to collaborative planning success.

In the same way that our shared expectation that our goal was to provide ILC instruction for the students, (T) and I had a joint commitment to Mohan's approach as "the way" to accomplish this crucial goal. In addition, (T) and I seem to share a similar style of teaching. In examining the lessons that we planned for students, a predominant pattern of direct instruction can be identified. Our preference for this type of teaching model was supportive of our co-working situation. Therefore, in our planning sessions, we did not need to spend a lot of time talking about our theories, perspectives or styles of teaching. Instead we could focus on the selection of tasks and the specific ways in which to present them to students. I believe that this had the added benefit of reducing the amount of time and discussion needed to work effectively together. In addition, the conflict that we experienced over task #7 was important to the growth of our
relationship, but did not challenge our values or beliefs about teaching and learning.

The development of friendship was seen to be a valuable outcome.

It is easy to underplay the importance of human relationships in the work environment. Certainly, teaching has a history of isolation and lack of communication between teachers (Little, 1987; Goodlad, 1984; Sarason, 1982; Lortie, 1975) However, both (T) and I felt that the relationship we developed during our time together was an essential component of our feelings of success regarding the collaborative planning experience. The bottom line for us was that we would love to work together again.

Implications for Teachers

It would appear that the roles teachers play in collaborative planning do not have to be static. In this case, initial roles of expert/novice were transcribed into two-way communication on task development. Some summarizing statements can be made about this experience.

• An expert/novice relationship may be positive when both teachers have areas of expertise.
• Low level conflict can have a positive effect on relationship growth.
• When one partner has more experience and expertise than the other, it is likely that the partner with more experience will take on a modelling role in some parts of the planning.
• Partners can experience true collaboration by focussing on
tasks not personal preferences.

• It is easier and more time efficient to work with a partner who has a similar philosophy.

• Collaboration can result in the development of valuable personal relationships.

3. THE KNOWLEDGE FRAMEWORK, TASK DESIGN AND KEY VISUALS

The Knowledge Framework played two distinct roles in planning and instruction -

a) provided a generic structure for planning;

b) labelling of knowledge structures on a task-to-task basis informed selection of key visuals and language.

As already discussed, the use of the Knowledge Framework was supportive of the collaborative planning relationship as it provided a common theory for the planning teachers. It is also important to note how this particular strategy informed and improved the classroom instruction. The literature review outlines that content area teachers are looking for ways to meet the language needs of mainstreamed ESL students without compromising the content of their programs. The collected data supports the idea that Mohan's Framework serves as an excellent tool for meeting that need. In this study, the Knowledge Framework functions as both a general planning tool for structuring the unit as a whole and as a specific guide for the selection of goals and strategies within individual tasks.
The Task Design Model was used primarily as a means for providing structure to the entire unit rather than for each task.

I had expected the Task Design model to play a larger role in the development of individual activities or tasks. However, after examining the collected data, I realized that my partner and I always viewed this novel study unit as a whole. All of the tasks were planned to contribute to that whole and to build on the tasks previously undertaken. When viewed from this perspective, it makes sense for the Task Design Model to be used as a whole unit organizer. I believe the most important element of the Task Design Model which is included in our work is the time taken to build the students' background knowledge prior to beginning the unit.

There was extensive use of Key Visuals throughout the novel study unit.

Key Visuals were introduced in a particular way.

I would like to comment on these two findings together. From the beginning of our pilot project, it was obvious that the component of the ILC approach that teachers embraced most easily and frequently was the use of Key Visuals. However, unfortunately, it seemed that teachers often used the Key Visuals indiscriminately and in isolation. Therefore, I was very interested to examine the way in which my partner and I used Key Visuals. In this case, Key Visuals were introduced to students in a way which supported increased growth in students' abilities
to identify and produce their own Key Visuals. In addition, both teachers used Key Visuals for presenting information, making meaning while reading, viewing and listening and reconstructing knowledge. In other words, the data collected supports the use of Key Visuals as an essential tool for linking language and content demands of tasks. They are both valuable and versatile.

Implications for Teachers

The results of this study are highly supportive of Mohan's ILC approach as a tool for collaborating teachers. As already stated, both of the planning teachers were committed to this model prior to working together. The introduction to this study quotes Early saying that there is little information about what ILC instruction looks like. More than anything else this study aims to contribute to that void. It is likely that there are many other ways that the components of this approach can be used effectively. The following statements reflect the data collected in this study only, regarding the use of the Knowledge Framework, Task Design and Key Visuals.

• The Knowledge Framework can be used effectively both at the unit planning and at the task planning levels
• A generic Knowledge Framework may precede the development of a specific Knowledge Framework
• The Task Design Model can relate to the unit as a whole with a particular emphasis on building background knowledge.
• Key Visuals should be used in a planned way which includes:
  - a gradual shift from teacher control to student control
variety of purposeful use including presenting information, making meaning, and restructuring information

4. PROCESSES

A sequential pattern of collaborative planning could be identified on two levels-

a) overall;

b) in individual sessions.

The process which emerges from the collected data is not markedly dissimilar from the typical processes outlined in Chapter two regarding planning for instruction. As found by Dempsey (1994), we did not spend time on "problem identification". Instead, we set our goals and proceeded to plan tasks which supported the meeting of those goals. Throughout the process, there was discussion of how each task related to the overall structure of the unit as well as how each task related to the other planned tasks. The collaborative planning process contributed greatly to this need to be "organized" and "structured" in our planning. My partner commented extensively in the interview on the positive aspects of producing a well planned and organized unit as a result of collaborative planning. I believe that the structured approach that we took to planning not only supported our work together but ultimately improved the quality of the novel study unit.
A sequential pattern of distinct features for direct instruction could be identified at the same time as there was variety within each task.

Again the process identified for the classroom instruction is very similar to the model outlined in the literature review (Hunter, 1976). At first I was very concerned that "our" teaching style was too teacher-directed and that students were not given the opportunity to be creative. On closer examination of the assigned tasks, I don't believe that this was true. We provided a very structured approach to task assignment, but within those assignments, there was extensive variety of experiences and options for students. In some cases the criteria for the product were exacting and precise. However, in other cases, there was room for many interpretations and presentations. All in all, I was pleased with the format of the instruction as it suited my style and preference for classroom teaching. This may not be the case with others who read this study.

Implications for Teachers

I can see the value of having a structure for planning and instruction, however, it is likely that these processes as described will not have direct application for others. At the same time, it is interesting that there are many similarities between the processes identified in this study and the generic models provided by research in planning and instruction. I see these similarities as being very supportive of Mohan's ILC approach. In our case, use of an ILC approach did not require
extensive changes in our teaching practice. It is possible to integrate the components of the approach in a reasonably "painless" manner. The following are some implications for teachers:

- A collaborative planning approach seems to be supportive of providing structure for planning and instruction.
- An ILC approach can be integrated with current practice without causing extensive restructuring of planning and instructional processes.
- There are distinct components of this approach which can be identified and included.

5. COSTS AND BENEFITS

| Benefits of teacher-to-teacher collaboration could be identified for teachers including- |
|--------------------------------|---|
| a) mutual learning; | |
| b) a balance of support and pressure; | |
| c) friendship; | |
| d) quality of product. | |

| Benefits of teacher-to-teacher collaboration could be identified for students including- |
|--------------------------------|---|
| a) development of academic skills; | |
| b) improvement in class climate and structure. | |

The data collected in this study seems to support a multitude of benefits for both teachers and students resulting from teacher-to-teacher collaboration. The benefits as described above encompass both process and product concerns. However, these
benefits are entirely subjective in this context as they are the opinions of the planning teachers only. This is not to discount their value, but to limit their weight in determining the success of the teaching experience.

The ILC instruction model helped teachers to plan more effectively.

The ILC instruction model helped students to-

a) improve their comprehension;
b) improve their presentation of information;
c) improve their understanding of assignments and their evaluation.

As with the benefits of collaboration, the benefits listed for ILC instruction represent the opinions of the planning teachers. It might be possible to statistically prove many of the above claims using the student samples and data collected during the study. However, a product-oriented investigation is not within the scope of this study.

Costs of collaboration for teachers were identified including

a) a possible feeling of being threatened;
b) lack of contact with class during planning time;
c) large amount of time needed.

When viewed in the light of the long list of benefits above, these costs of collaboration seem somewhat trivial. However, in much of the research on collaborative planning, the issue of time is repeated over and over again. The data collected in this study confirms the idea that an extensive amount of time is needed to
Collaboration and ILC Instruction

plan and teach this type of unit. Some of the time is spent on planning and some is attributed to the increased length of time needed to "cover" the novel. I believe that this is time well spent. As a teacher, I will spend considerable time planning instruction for my students. I would much rather spend that time in an enjoyable planning relationship with a partner and friend than in isolation in a classroom, particularly given the possible benefits listed above.

Implications for Teachers

• It appears that the advantages of working collaboratively with a teacher partner far outweigh the disadvantages and therefore it is worth pursuing this type of planning structure.

• The ILC approach seems to result in improved planning and instruction and should be considered for all students but in particular for students who have ESL.

• Collaborative planning takes additional time and this should always be considered before undertaking a collaborative planning relationship.

Broader Implications

In Chapter two, a discussion of Zahorik's work centres on three distinct "conceptions of teaching" as shown in Figure 2-4. Prior to the introduction of Mohan's model in the classroom, teachers were instructed in the theories underlying an ILC approach to teaching. The main teaching components presented to teachers included the Knowledge Framework, Key Visuals and Task
Design. However, their presentation to teachers was more from a theoretical perspective as strategies which "might work". Consequently, teachers involved in developing an ILC approach relied largely on a theoretical conception of teaching or "teaching based on assumptions derived from reasoning and rational thought". This method of developing teaching practice is complimentary to Clark and Yinger's philosophy which states that "what teachers do is affected by what they think."

The results of the data illustrate how two teachers took their theoretical perspective and translated them into classroom practice. The findings clearly show that certain key features emerge as being important as shown above. These key features are the result of combining a theoretical understanding of Mohan's ILC approach and the two teachers' preferred teaching practice. Therefore, the resulting teaching is unique to this situation.

However, at the same time it is possible to discuss the transferability of findings from this site to other similar situations. In order to support discussion of these implications for transferability, it is important to consider both collaborative planning and ILC within the larger context of social change in education as shown in figure 5-1. Clearly, the findings of this study have important implications at all three of these levels.
First of all, the findings related to ILC instruction hold particular significance as a contribution to the lack of descriptive information available on this topic. As more and more teachers in this district face the daily challenge of meeting the needs of ESL students in mainstream classes, they can refer to the findings of this study to provide a valuable starting point and supportive structure for their own work. In addition, the selection of a Language Arts class as the venue for the investigation is a rare choice which recognizes that "language" of all subject areas including "the language of Language Arts" needs to be explicitly taught along with content area instruction. At the same time as we recognize that there are language forms which are supportive of effective and appropriate communication in Science and Social Studies content areas, we can identify specific communicative structures which are essential to effective communication in the Language Arts classroom (as outlined in the language goals in figure 4-5).

The aspect of the findings which deals with collaborative planning between an ESL specialist and a classroom teacher is also significant. As discussed in the introduction to this thesis, the ever increasing numbers of ESL students in this district means that all teachers are facing the challenge of providing effective instruction for ESL students at varying levels of English proficiency. The results of this study indicate that a regular classroom teacher can effectively plan with an ESL specialist in order to meet this challenge. This has wide implications for
schools which are struggling to provide appropriate instruction for ESL students. Furthermore, this thesis not only describes the collaborative planning process, but also documents how that collaboration is translated into classroom practice. Given the statement made in chapter two regarding the limited amount of investigation on the topic of how teacher thinking informs and results in classroom practice, it is likely that the results of this study will provide a clearer picture of the planning and instruction process. This is, perhaps, the missing link in many inservice programs which provide teachers with the theoretical background and practical strategies for developing instruction for ESL students without providing them with the description of what the resulting instruction looks like.

Finally and most importantly, from a more global perspective, many school districts around the world are experiencing similar growth patterns in their ESL populations. They too face the challenge of meeting the needs of ESL learners and could benefit from what we have learned in this research. It is defensible to state that the findings of this study have implications for both ESL and content area teachers around the world as they seek to develop teaching methodologies which are supportive of both language development and cognitive/academic growth for students.

**Implications for Further Research**

Given the broad implications for the research findings of this study as stated above, it is vital that further research be undertaken in related areas. There are several aspects of the
study one could consider including:

a) participant's
  -prior relationship
  -prior knowledge
  -teaching style
  -philosophy

b) setting

c) process / product emphasis

First of all, the participants in this particular study did not know each other prior to the research. They both had prior knowledge and training of the underlying methodology, although at different levels of expertise. They had similar teaching styles and philosophies of learning. Part of the success of this study can be attributed to the "match" between the researcher and classroom teacher. It has already been suggested that the match between these two individuals regarding philosophy, teaching style and theoretical background contributed to the relative success of the project. Therefore, I would suggest that a study which varied two of these components could be useful. First of all, it would be interesting to develop a study which looked at two participants who knew each other and had worked together for an extended period of time prior to the study. Dempsey's (1994) work on collaboration in this same site could provide some insight into this possibility. Second and more importantly, it would be advisable to study two teachers who had similar teaching styles to each other but who were less focused on a direct instruction
I wonder if Mohan's ILC approach could be integrated as easily in a more learner-centred, non-directive classroom. The setting for this research was selected because of the school's perceived success with using Mohan's approach. Therefore, it would be interesting to select teachers in another site where they seem to be successful within the context of a less successful school. Additionally, I would suggest that two teachers who are having difficulty could also be studied.

As already stated, the focus of this study has been on painting a descriptive picture of the processes of collaborative planning and ILC instruction. Comments on product have been limited to the subjective opinions of the participating teachers made under the heading of costs and benefits. Therefore, an obvious extension of the work begun here would be either to further analyze the collected data from this study with a focus on the student product or to structure an additional study which looks at student gains related to collaborative planning and ILC instruction.

Concluding Remarks

Upon concluding this study, I am struck by my feelings of success and pleasure in participating in a collaborative planning and teaching experience in this site. The comments and data found in this thesis represent only a fraction of what I have learned about collaborative planning and ILC instruction. In the beginning of my thesis, I explained that I hoped to provide a description of what collaborative planning and ILC instruction
look like. The data collected and discussed herein provide an exciting and encouraging picture of language and content instruction. In workshops with Vancouver teachers, the following underlying assumptions are presented to teachers receiving training in Mohan's approach:

1) We must find ways of supporting all students' academic and cognitive development while they are in the process of acquiring English.

2) It may take, and indeed, is likely to take, many years of support beyond the ESL classroom to develop the kind of language necessary for academic achievement.

3) A program that integrates language and content teaching is necessary to help students be successful in the mainstream classroom.

4) It is inefficient and ill-advised to teach language as a thing in itself separate from the school curriculum or conversely to submerge students in the language demands of school without structured support: students acquiring English need planned help with their real needs in coping with the language demands of learning in a school context.

The work being undertaken by teachers based on Mohan's theories represents a new wave of language instruction where students with limited English can have meaningful supported experiences within the mainstream content class. In addition, it appears to support growth and learning for all students regardless of their first language. I would like to conclude this study by
responding to the two questions which formed the basis for my research.

1) What does collaborative planning between an ESL specialist and a classroom teacher look like?

   In this case, I believe it looks like time well spent between two professionals. It illustrates mutual opportunities for professional growth, support and excellence. It nurtures both professional and personal relationships and provides an escape from the typical isolation of the classroom. It looks like a structured approach to planning quality instruction which meets the needs of all students.

2) What does ILC instruction look like?

   In this unique situation, it looks somewhat similar to documented instructional processes, while providing distinct strategies for the inclusion of language goals for each task undertaken in the classroom. These strategies support an approach which links thinking skills / knowledge structures, graphic representations of information and language in a meaningful social context. It looks like teachers and students working together to build skills and knowledge in order to increase students' abilities to succeed in a mainstream classroom.

   In conclusion, I believe that the results of this study support both collaborative planning between ESL specialists and classroom teachers and Mohan's approach to ILC instruction. I complete this study with the feeling that we are "on the right track". I am confident that further research into these areas
will add to the growing support for collaborative planning between teachers and instruction for students which supports both language and content growth.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>CLASSIFICATION / CONCEPTS</strong></th>
<th><strong>PRINCIPLES</strong></th>
<th><strong>EVALUATION</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>classifying</td>
<td>explaining</td>
<td>evaluating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>categorizing</td>
<td>predicting</td>
<td>judging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>defining</td>
<td>interpreting</td>
<td>criticizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>data and</td>
<td>justifying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>drawing</td>
<td>preferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>conclusions</td>
<td>and personal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>developing</td>
<td>opinions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>generalizations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(cause, effect,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rules, means-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ends, reasons)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hypothesizing</td>
<td>recommending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>observing</td>
<td>time relations</td>
<td>forming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>describing</td>
<td>between events</td>
<td>personal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>naming</td>
<td>sequencing:</td>
<td>opinions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comparing</td>
<td>spatially</td>
<td>making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contrasting</td>
<td>steps in</td>
<td>decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>DESCRIPTION</strong></th>
<th><strong>SEQUENCE</strong></th>
<th><strong>CHOICE</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Key Visuals for Knowledge Structures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASSIFICATION / CONCEPTS</th>
<th>PRINCIPLES</th>
<th>EVALUATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>webs</td>
<td>diagrams</td>
<td>rating charts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trees</td>
<td>graphs</td>
<td>grids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tables</td>
<td>tables</td>
<td>marks books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graphs</td>
<td>cycles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>databases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tables</td>
<td>tables with numbered steps</td>
<td>decision trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diagrams</td>
<td>flow charts</td>
<td>flow charts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pictures</td>
<td>cycles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plans/drawings</td>
<td>time lines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maps</td>
<td>action strips</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DESCRIPTION**

**SEQUENCE**

**CHOICE**
### Samples of Language Related to the Knowledge Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASSIFICATION / CONCEPTS</th>
<th>PRINCIPLES</th>
<th>EVALUATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content Vocabulary:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Structural Vocabulary:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>generic nouns</em> - animals, cars, trees</td>
<td><em>cause</em> - is due to, the result of, in view of, hence, consequently, etc.</td>
<td><em>describing emotions</em> - like/dislike, satisfactory/unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>stative verbs</em> - to be, to have, to belong, to remember, etc.</td>
<td><em>condition &amp; contrast</em> - if... then, unless, provided that, even if, etc.</td>
<td><em>adjectives</em> - good/bad, right/wrong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structural Vocabulary:</strong></td>
<td><em>scale or amount</em> - all, every, always, none</td>
<td><em>viewpoint</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>possessives</em> - his, hers, theirs, its, etc.</td>
<td><em>prediction</em> - most likely, probable results, forecast</td>
<td><em>verbs of volition</em> - want, wish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>species nouns</em> - kinds, divisions, categories, classes, types, factors, attributes, characteristics, etc.</td>
<td><em>logical probability modals</em> - would, could, might, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>relative clauses</em> - which, who, generally, usually, all, every, never, always, mostly, etc.</td>
<td><em>active verbs</em> - imperatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content Vocabulary:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Structural Vocabulary:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>stative verbs</em> - to be, to have, to see, to feel, believe, know, want, weigh, etc.</td>
<td><em>logical and chronological connectors</em> - first of all, during, after, finally, next, earlier, later, before, initially, in the end, etc.</td>
<td><em>modals</em> - can, will, must, ought, should, would, may, in my opinion, I think that, I choose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>adjectives/adverbs</em> - round, large, etc...</td>
<td><em>propositions of space and time</em> - at, about, against, around, towards, on, over, between, by, etc.</td>
<td><em>requests/offers</em> - I can</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structural Vocabulary:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>relative clauses</em> - who, which</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>quantifiers</em> - some, many</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>articles</em> - the, a/an</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>prepositions of place</em> - at, above, around, below, between, by, over, under, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>adverbs of comparison</em> - similar to, different from, smaller than, faster than, almost the same as, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 1-3

Adapted From "ESL Resource Book" and "Language and Content" (Mohan)
Figure 2-1
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Specific
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Instructional Practice
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FROM: Borko et al (1979) p.139
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONCEPTION</th>
<th>TEACHING TYPE</th>
<th>DEFINITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCIENTIFIC / RESEARCH</td>
<td>1. Teaching which operationalizes learning</td>
<td>&quot;teaching as a mirror image of learning?&quot; (p.197)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Teaching which follows a tested model</td>
<td>&quot;teaching as an aggregate of individual teaching skills&quot; (p.197)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Teaching which follows what effective teachers do</td>
<td>&quot;teaching as a process which generates learning as a product&quot; (p.199)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;derived from research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and supported by</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experimentation and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>empirical investigation&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p.195)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEORY / PHILOSOPHY</td>
<td>1. Teaching based on theory</td>
<td>teaching based on assumptions derived from reasoning and rational thought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;based on what ought to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work or what is morally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>right? (p.201)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART / CRAFT</td>
<td>2. Teaching based on values</td>
<td>teaching based on values held in regard to teaching, learning and society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;depends upon the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individual teacher's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skill and personality&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p.205)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BASED ON: Zahorik (1986).
A Framework for Teaching & Learning

Task Design for Teaching and Learning

Building Background Knowledge

Making Connections
Thinking through reading, listening, and viewing

Reconstructing Knowledge
- Representing
- Speaking
- Listening
- Reading
- Writing

Adapted from "Erica" Model, Morris and Stewart - Dore (1984)
# PRACTICAL COMPONENTS OF AN ACTIVITY / TASK

## SOURCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Doyle &amp; Carter (1984)</th>
<th>GOAL</th>
<th>OPERATIONS</th>
<th>RESOURCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Horowitz (1986)</td>
<td>THESIS</td>
<td>AUDIENCE / ORDER</td>
<td>SOURCES OF DATA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ochs (1988)</td>
<td>GOAL / PROBLEM</td>
<td>ORGANIZATION</td>
<td>CHANNEL / INSTRUMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prabhu (In Long &amp; Crookes - 1992)</td>
<td>OUTCOME</td>
<td>PROCESS OF THOUGHT</td>
<td>GIVEN INFORMATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candlin (In Long &amp; Crookes - 1992)</td>
<td>PURSUANCE OF FORESEEN OR EMERGENT GOALS</td>
<td>JOINT SELECTION OF VARIED ORGANIZATIONS</td>
<td>EXISTING OR NEW KNOWLEDGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurren (1994)</td>
<td>CONTENT / LANGUAGE GOALS</td>
<td>TASK</td>
<td>RESOURCES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4-1
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>GOALS</th>
<th>RESOURCES</th>
<th>FORM OF PRESENTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sort &amp; Defend: Students will sort selected vocabulary into categories &amp; label them.</td>
<td>Content: Students will discuss how categories possibly relate to novel. Language: Students will discuss word meaning &amp; cooperatively decide on labels which they can explain to others.</td>
<td>• novel • dictionaries • vocabulary strips</td>
<td>groups of words on a sheet labelled neatly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Description of Mr. Tumnus: Students will write about this character describing both his good and evil characteristics.</td>
<td>Content: Students will demonstrate understanding of Mr. Tumnus's attributes. Language: Students will use comparison &amp; contrast language.</td>
<td>• novel • Mr. Tumnus chart • sample paragraph about Aslan</td>
<td>5 short paragraphs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Character Development: Students will mark the characteristics of Edmund &amp; Lucy on a continuum. Then they will write about their changes individually. Finally, they will work with the teacher to produce one class piece of writing.</td>
<td>Content: Students will differentiate between Lucy (a character who remains the same) &amp; Edmund (who constantly changes). Language: Students will use comparison &amp; contrast language.</td>
<td>• novel • character • continuum</td>
<td>jointly negotiated text based on individual students' work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Character Relationships: Students will fill out a chart Then they will write about the relationship between Edmund &amp; either the White Witch or Peter.</td>
<td>Content: Students will present evidence from the story to support their opinions. Language: Students will use the language of opinion.</td>
<td>• novel • character • relationship chart • opinion language chart</td>
<td>short paragraphs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. **The Beavers:**
Students will fill out a T-chart giving reasons to go or not go with the Beavers & make a statement of choice.

**Content:** Students will present a variety of reasons for each option.

**Language:** Students will use the language of choice to state their decision.

---

6. **Plot Books:**
Students will work with teachers to develop a list of key points in the novel, graph the plot line & illustrate each point.

**Content:** Students will be able to identify key events as opposed to minor events. They will also be able to match the events to plot development as demonstrated in a plot line.

**Language:** Students will use summarizing language for the key points.

---

7. **Winter/Spring Poems:**
Students will write a 5 line poem about the change from Winter to Spring.

**Content:** Students will be able to comment on the significance of this change to the story.

**Language:** Students will use parallel but opposite forms in poems.

---

8. **Narnia maps:**
Students will plan & draw maps of Narnia.

**Content:** Students will include important sites from the setting.

**Language:** Students will use appropriate symbols to represent locations.

---
9. **4 Step Plot Summary:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students will summarize the plot using 4 steps. Then they will develop a graphic &amp; use it to make an oral presentation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content:</strong> Students will be able to summarize events and include important information only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language:</strong> Students will use appropriate summary &amp; sequence language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oral presentation</strong> for the class using graphic as guide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• novel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 4 Step summary guiding questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Plot books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sequence language chart</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. **Theme writing:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students will develop a graphic &amp; use it to write about setting, characters, &amp; plot &amp; how each of these contributes to the theme of the book.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content:</strong> Students will be able to identify good &amp; evil components in setting, characters, &amp; plot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language:</strong> Students will use comparison &amp; contrast, sequence &amp; summary language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oral presentation</strong> for the class using graphic as guide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• novel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• previous 9 tasks paragraphs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• advance organizer graphici &amp; 5 paragraphs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Figure 4-6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expert</td>
<td>Teaching Strategies</td>
<td>Background on Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ILC Instruction</td>
<td>Novel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novice</td>
<td>Background on Students</td>
<td>Teaching Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Novel</td>
<td>ILC Instruction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Generic Story Knowledge Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASSIFICATION / CONCEPTS</th>
<th>PRINCIPLES</th>
<th>EVALUATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Classify parts of a short story</td>
<td>• See reasons for the order in a short story</td>
<td>• Importance of previous knowledge in understanding story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Classify ways characters are developed</td>
<td>• Find the purpose for each part of the story</td>
<td>• Discuss what makes short stories interesting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Classify types of themes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Classify types of questions that are asked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Describe parts of a specific story</td>
<td>• Identify sequence of events in a specific story and stories in general</td>
<td>• Choose the type of story they would like to read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Describe characters in a specific story</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Select a short story to apply their knowledge to, then teach it to fellow students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identify themes in specific stories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>SEQUENCE</th>
<th>CHOICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Figure 4-8
## Novel Study Knowledge Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASSIFICATION / CONCEPTS</th>
<th>PRINCIPLES</th>
<th>EVALUATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Classify vocabulary</td>
<td>• Predict &quot;the story&quot; based on vocab</td>
<td>• Evaluate character relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Classify setting (winter / spring)</td>
<td>• Principle of plot line</td>
<td>• Establish criteria / reasons for choices (Beavers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Classify key plot points (beginning / middle / end)</td>
<td>• Use of symbols for mapping</td>
<td>• Recommend which are key points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Classify characters (good / evil)</td>
<td>• 4 step summary model</td>
<td>• Evaluate characteristics on a continuum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>SEQUENCE</th>
<th>CHOICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Describe characters</td>
<td>• List character changes in order</td>
<td>• State opinions about character relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Compare / Contrast good / evil characters</td>
<td>• Sequence key points of plot</td>
<td>• Choose 1 option for Beavers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Describe setting</td>
<td>• Follow steps to produce maps</td>
<td>• Choose key points for summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Compare / Contrast setting</td>
<td>• Follow 4 steps of summary model</td>
<td>• Make choices about characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Describe plot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
USE OF THE KNOWLEDGE FRAMEWORK, TASK DESIGN AND KEY VISUALS
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