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ABSTRACT

The study addresses the process of teacher development in the context of close collegial relations. It is a case study of two teachers, Mary and Sadie, who worked collaboratively over two school years in a series of reciprocal cycles of clinical supervision. The main purposes the teachers held for the process were to develop their understanding about their teaching practices in order to grow professionally and to acquire new skills in supervision. Their beliefs, behaviours, and knowledge contributed to shape their relationship and serve their respective needs for growth.

An interpretive methodology was employed. The research approach was derived from the theoretical perspective of George Herbert Mead (1932, 1934, 1938). This provided for an analytical description and interpretation of the meanings and knowledge constructed socially by the participating teachers about clinical supervision, collegiality and teacher development. It also enabled the identification of a number of factors which influenced the teachers' development in the context of a collegial relationship.

The teachers practiced new behaviours in an unfamiliar context of close colleagueship in order to incorporate research-based knowledge into their practical working lives. They devoted considerable effort and attention during the first year to the mechanics of clinical supervision in order to become more proficient with the process. In the second year of the study, the teachers explicitly rejected the term "clinical supervision" in favour of "reflective conferencing". The new terminology reflected their deeper understanding about the processes of collaboration and reflection. As their relationship, knowledge and skills developed, they became more thoughtful about collaboration and purposeful about facilitating each other's development.

The teachers discovered that change takes time and occurs incrementally. Trust was required from both colleagues, in the process and in each other, as they took turns observing each other teach and then meeting to discuss matters related to their
instructional practice. A culture of collaboration took hold, albeit more slowly than either had envisioned. Through repeated practice in reflective conferencing, they acquired an appreciation of the challenges and benefits of collaboration for the promotion of teacher development.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to investigate the development of collaboration, collegiality, and craft knowledge over a two year supervisory relationship. It focuses on the beliefs, behaviours, norms and knowledge of two experienced teachers working collaboratively together for their professional growth. Of particular interest was the knowledge they derived and how they made sense of their relationship in a conference setting while engaged in discussions of each other's teaching.

The teachers determined voluntarily that they wanted to engage in a series of reciprocal observations of each other teaching followed by conference sessions together. The model they adopted initially for their professional development is commonly called clinical supervision\(^1\). The teachers took turns sitting in on lessons and then met afterwards to review the lesson, provide feedback, and discuss issues of common interest.

From the very outset, the teachers identified two distinct but overlapping areas for their cognitive growth. Instructional practices (involving both teacher and student behaviours) provided one area. The second was concerned with their behaviour in a supervisory role and, in particular, their consultation skills with a teacher colleague in a conference setting. Supported by a series of workshops on clinical supervision, collegiality, and teacher development, given by university-based scholars, the two participants in this study also made reflection a key feature of their respective interests in instructional practice and supervision.

Both teachers recognized and made frequent explicit references to the challenges of effective supervision. They also drew clear linkages between effective supervisory

\(^1\) Clinical supervision is explained in detail in Chapter Two. It is a widely acknowledged model of staff development involving a number of stages, or phases.
practices and the promotion of teacher development. Effective supervision, they believed, could validate good practice, facilitate reflection on practice, and advance teacher development. There was, as well, early evidence that they had specific expectations of themselves to develop more fully their consultation skills in their capacity as the supervisor, or colleague-observer. Each of them held administrative ambitions and wished to practice supervisory behaviours in order to become more skillful in that role.

The topics of teacher knowledge, teacher development, instructional supervision, and cultures of teaching are of broad interest to practitioners and scholars. An extensive literature of research and analysis on these four areas is reviewed in Chapter Two. Important concepts and descriptive language are presented and clarified. Embedded in some key terms and concepts are implicit assumptions and associated beliefs. Where possible, these, too, are explicated. As differences in terminology employed can reflect epistemological differences in what counts as knowledge, the eventual presentation of findings is influenced by the assumptions held, questions asked, and concepts identified, as well as the language employed.

Making sense of teacher collaboration depends on paying attention to several factors responsible for its success. A qualitative approach was used for this case study in order to reveal some fundamentals of successful collaboration, as well as examine their linkages with the construction of new knowledge and with teacher development. Some introductory comments about the method of study are provided later in this chapter. A full description of the study’s methodology is presented in Chapter Three. Included in this chapter are the research questions, the theoretical framework which provides sense and direction for the study and an explication of the research approach pursued.

The research questions are answered in Chapters Four and Five in the form of an analytical description and interpretation of the social scene. The analysis highlights features of meaning of the teachers’ beliefs, behaviour, and knowledge which surfaced over the period of study. The presentation in Chapter Four employs a narrative style
which relies heavily on direct quotations from the participating teachers as they make sense of their efforts to work together to develop a deeper appreciation and understanding of their own teaching and of their skills in supervision.

The findings are summarized in Chapter Five. Conclusions are drawn from the findings and a comparative analysis is made with empirical research drawn from the literature on teacher knowledge, collaboration, and development. The final chapter closes with a set of implications for the consideration of teachers, teacher educators and researchers. Suggestions for educational practice are provided and further inquiry proposed.

BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

I became acquainted with the two teachers in the fall of 1989, at which time I was working as a research assistant (field worker) on a large scale research study involving teachers and administrators in three suburban school districts. They had made a voluntary commitment to participate in a longitudinal study on teacher development co-directed by Drs. Peter Grimmett and Patricia Crehan from the Centre for the Study of Teacher Education at the University of British Columbia.

The design of the longitudinal study called for the participants to engage in four rounds of clinical supervision. Over 60 dyads were involved. Most dyads were teacher-teacher combinations engaged in reciprocal rounds of clinical supervision; however, a small minority of dyads were administrator-teacher pairings, in which the observations were one-way.

My duties as a research assistant required me to observe selected teaching lessons of eighteen pairs of teachers (including some dyads of teachers and administrators), videotape the pairs in conference following each observation, and thereafter conduct individual interviews with them using the videotape playback of the conference as the reference point and stimulus for further anecdotal commentary. Other data collected were
about their level of conceptual reasoning, personal biography, and ratings of classroom management during all observed lessons.

THE PARTICIPANTS

Sadie and Mary are pseudonyms for two teacher colleagues who participated voluntarily in this research project. They were both working in a moderate size suburban elementary school. Sadie taught full time a group of grade 5 students, while Mary taught half time a grade 6 group. The balance of Mary's time was devoted to her duties as vice-principal of the school. Although their classrooms were in close proximity and they considered themselves colleagues, the two teachers had little prior experience working together. Neither of them had previously observed the other teach.

This was Mary's first administrative appointment. She had been promoted to vice-principal and assigned to her new school in 1988 from a teacher-librarian position elsewhere in the district. Mary received notification of a routine horizontal transfer to another elementary school at the end of the second year of data collection.

Sadie came to this school from a neighbouring province. At the time she agreed to participate in this study, she held aspirations to become an administrator and viewed her participation in the research project strategically as a means to develop her skills in clinical supervision. She had been actively pursuing a vice-principalship in her district for over a year and was informed at the end of the second year of data collection for this study that she had been successful in the most recent administrative competition. Sadie took up her first administrative assignment in September 1991 as vice-principal in a nearby elementary school within the same school district.

These two teachers are noteworthy for a number of reasons. First, they possessed between them many years (35+) of teaching experience and were highly regarded as teachers by their principal and colleagues. As well, each of them expressed a keen interest in her own growth as a teacher and was willing to collaborate with a colleague to help in
the pursuit of that interest. Third, they both viewed their participation in the longitudinal study as an opportunity to acquire new knowledge about collaboration and teacher development. Fourth, they both held administrative ambitions and to wished to hone their observation and questioning (supervisory) skills. Their choice to work together over a protracted period of time, to watch each other teach, to analyze and reflect on their teaching, and to incorporate research-based knowledge in their joint work presented an opportunity to view teacher development in a collegial context containing some key elements of effective practice. It was the combination of these factors that encouraged me to select them for my own research.

METHOD OF STUDY

The purpose of this section is to provide an overview of the methodology for the study. Chapter Three provides a much more comprehensive treatment of the research approach: its phases, the methods used, and its theoretical assumptions. This abbreviated presentation is intended only to sketch its outline and provide an initial picture of how the study was structured.

The research approach for this case study is grounded in the tradition of qualitative inquiry. A generic definition of qualitative research is offered by Denzin and Lincoln (1994) as being “multimethod in focus, involving an interpretive, naturalistic approach to its subject matter” (p. 2). It stands in opposition to “quantitative” inquiry which favours approaches emphasizing objectivity, context-free causation, and the search for universal truths. Qualitative inquiry embraces a number of research approaches2 (Denzin and

---

2 In addition to “interpretive” and “naturalistic”, a range of (approximately) equivalent terms can be found in the literature. Commonly employed as synonyms for “qualitative” are the following terms: “observational”, “constructivist”, “phenomenological”, and “case study”. To ensure clarity of understanding in this dissertation, a “case study” is a special class of a single qualitative approach involving a limited number of participants in a specific social setting which emphasizes observation and interpretation of meaning. “Interpretive” and “naturalistic” have the same meaning as “qualitative” and are alternately used in the discussion.
Case studies can and do serve multiple uses (Yin, 1984). They are used as a research device, as a teaching tool, and as a form of personal journal. Biddle and Anderson (1986) define case study as "the intensive investigation of a single object of social inquiry" (p. 237). Commenting 10 years later, Ducharme and Ducharme (1996) report on the rapid increase in the use of case study research over the past 15 years in teacher education. Grossman's (1990) observation is particularly fitting to the present study:

The case study approach to research on teacher knowledge represents an attempt to gather in-depth data on the content and organization of an individual's knowledge. (p. 25)

The methodology used in this case study respects widely accepted techniques and procedures found in interpretive research emphasizing naturalistic approaches to apprehending and signifying participants' understanding(s) in social interaction. These methods emphasize description, not prescription. Data collection and analysis relied on qualitative measures and techniques commonly used by social scientists. The analysis of the data involved the successive application of three related qualitative procedures following a developmental research sequence for case studies recommended by Spradley (1979, 1980). The findings of the study are synthesized in the form of a story written, in part, in a narrative style. The explication of the teachers' meanings about teaching and collaboration is aided greatly by extensive use of teacher talk pulled directly from the transcripts. The participants tell much of the story in their own words and, in so doing, reveal their understandings and meanings about the topical interest of the study.

According to Spradley's research program, the analysis progresses in steps. The sequence commences with an initial scanning of the data as they are being generated for patterns in the social scene and features of meaning recurrent in the data. Cover terms are
assigned to segments of the transcript data as interesting conceptual categories are identified. The cover terms represent the initial units of analysis. At a later stage, the data are progressively ordered into larger and larger chunks, or categories of meaning. In turn, these conceptual categories are aggregated into more inclusive domains with broader interpretive power over the social scene under study. Ultimately, Spradley’s research sequence leads to the discovery of themes. Themes are like images\(^3\) in that they provide integrated representations of the teachers' experiences together.

**SOURCES OF DATA**

The dominant (and, consequently, the most commonly examined) social scene in education is the classroom. The teachers’ respective classrooms provide the backdrop for the social scene of primary interest in this study. The supervisory conference is where most of the data are derived. Naturally enough, the focus of much of the discussion during the conferences was on teaching and related classroom events and interactions. The conference transcripts served as the primary source of data for analysis of the social scene.

Eight conferences between the teachers were recorded on videotape. Following each conference, I conducted an interview with each of the teachers separately to elicit further thinking. The videotapes were played back to the teachers individually and served as a catalyst for any reflective commentary they wished to make about significant features of the conferences.

The interviews served as important supplementary sources of data for interpreting the teachers' beliefs, behaviour, and knowledge. Additional complementary data were available from field notes taken on classroom activities. Detailed descriptive field notes were taken by two independent observers (another graduate student and me) every time

---

\(^3\) A fuller explanation of the role of images and metaphors in relation to the use of specialized knowledge for teaching is provided in Chapter Two.
the participants engaged in a lesson observation. The field notes provided valuable contextual data.

All conferences and interviews were transcribed and a computer program\(^4\) was used to support the analysis. Sixteen follow-up interviews were conducted with the participants and transcripts of them were inserted into the conference transcripts at the appropriate moments (interruption points). The transcription phase was labour-intensive, but very useful in the analytical phase of the study because it allowed for mechanical manipulation of the data. The electronic transcriptions captured the teachers' conversations verbatim, as well as their reflective commentary in follow-up interviews which they held individually with me. Over 600 pages of text-based data were generated from the two teachers' talk in and on their experiences in clinical supervision together.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

Writers in the field of teacher education are very interested in teacher knowledge, collaboration, and development. In his comprehensive review of themes in teacher education, Doyle (1990) points out, thus far, "that little attention is given to the knowledge structures and comprehension processes teachers use to interpret classroom scenes and plan strategic actions" (p. 15). The meanings that teachers construct to interpret events in their classrooms presents, for Doyle, the next frontier in research on teachers' knowledge. This study serves that research agenda.

This case study makes a contribution to our understanding of teacher knowledge, collaboration and collegially supported teacher development by means of an analytical description and interpretation of the social scene. Describing the beliefs, behaviours, and knowledge they hold and use to make sense of their work, individually as teachers and jointly as colleagues, enabled a number of conclusions to be drawn from the analysis.

\(^4\) The program is The Ethnograph (Seidel, Kjolseth & Seymour, 1988), designed specifically for analysis of text-based data. It is described in greater detail on page 60 in Chapter Three.
Finally, a set of implications are offered which arise out of the conclusions. These implications are provided for consideration by researchers, research-minded teachers and professionals in school systems charged with the responsibility for staff development.

The findings from this study provide further insight into how teachers' craft (practical) knowledge develops and the factors affecting teacher development. The collaborative process adopted by the two participants in this study placed them in a relatively unfamiliar social situation. Clinical supervision provided them with a structure to construct their roles and responsibilities in order to achieve their desired ends. As the teachers made sense of their collaborative experiences, new behaviours had to be learned and new knowledge constructed in order for each of them to grow and change. These insights allowed for theorizing about teacher knowledge, collegiality, and teacher development. As a result, a theoretically informed understanding emerged of how the development of teachers' thinking about their craft is shaped by close colleagueship.

The theoretical power of this kind of qualitative research is distinct from the testing of formal (alternately called "middle range") theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Goetz & LeCompte, 1984; Hammersley & Atkinson, 1995; Schwandt, 1994; Spradley, 1979, 1980; Wolcott, 1994). Formal theory applies typically to the analysis of large social systems. It has interpretive power over a broad area of human experience. At its highest level, formal theory which informs the whole of humanity is widely referred to as "grand theory" (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984).

The contribution to theory of case studies such as this one is at the "substantive" level. Glaser and Strauss (1967) draw a useful distinction between substantive and formal theory. Substantive theory is at a lower level and offers more limited generalizations. Substantive categories developed from the study of specific forms of social organization can be used in the development of formal theory of a more general type. "Formal categories subsume substantive categories" (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1995, p. 237). Much educational inquiry remains at the level of substantive theory. To be considered
formal theory, the findings must allow for broad generalization about an entire area of education. Social learning theory is but an example of middle range formal theory.

Hammersley and Atkinson (1995) identify four distinct levels of theory. Their categorization is consistent with the foregoing discussion and is represented in Figure 1.

![Four broad types of theory](image)

**Micro substantive theory**  **Micro formal theory**

**Macro substantive theory**  **Macro formal theory**

Figure 1. Four broad types of theory

All four types of theory can be found in qualitative research, but the method is employed most commonly to develop micro theory: initially at the substantive level, then subsequently as formal theory whenever possible. Case study research involving a limited number of persons informs theory at the micro level. Macro formal theory is the most inclusive and universal of the four kinds. It speaks with the same power as grand theory. Mead’s doctrine, discussed in Chapter Three, is an example of macro formal theorizing.

Theory and interpretation can be used as analogous terms (Denzin, 1989; Geertz, 1973; Schwandt, 1994; Wolcott, 1994). Theorizing about any social phenomenon at the micro level, according to Geertz, must always remain context-specific and confined to the local scene. He states that “theoretical formulations hover so low over the interpretations that they don't make much sense or hold much interest apart from them”.

The research approach taken to answer the research questions was a developmental one which progressed through stages to identify a set of conceptual categories. These categories facilitated an analytical description and interpretation of the
social interactions between Sadie and Mary. This approach provided a rich description of
the social scene (the participants, their setting, and their activities). The analytic
procedures generated a number of insights, or knowledge claims, about the factors
influencing the construction of new knowledge in collegial conditions and about
collaboratively supported teacher development. Because the findings are derived from the
shared experiences of two colleagues in a particular social situation, the conclusions
presented in this dissertation are at the micro substantive level of analysis. Thus,
theorizing about teacher knowledge, collaboration, norms of collegiality, and teacher
development is lodged in, and informed by, the set of related knowledge claims derived
from the collected empirical data (Glaser & Strauss, 1967).

One important measure of the adequacy of this particular approach to theorizing is
the degree to which the discovery procedures generate sufficiently useful data to reveal
interpretive findings. Goetz and LeCompte (1984) caution research designs favouring
typologies and related systems of categorizing:

such typologies or systems are only theories, however, when they include a
careful explication of how the components, categories, or concepts are
connected or interrelated. (p. 38)

The search for integrative themes in the data and the subsequent discovery "of the cultural
patterns that made life meaningful to these people" (Spradley, 1980, p. 175) addresses this
concern.

SUMMARY

This first chapter has introduced the purpose and topical interest of the study, the
participants and their motivation for joining the research project, as well as the
circumstances which brought them together. An overview of the research approach was
provided. It was selected to enable an analytical description and interpretation of the
teachers' understandings about collaboration, collegiality and the factors which influenced
their opportunities for professional development which surfaced during the course of their
supervisory conferences together. The selected methods and procedures for discovery are commonly employed in qualitative research and have been demonstrated as adequate in yielding findings and knowledge claims which can be supported on the basis of stable evidence rather than on logical argument and assertions. The chapter ended with a brief commentary on the significance of the study and its contribution to theory.

The dissertation is presented as a case study of teacher collaboration and development in a social context of clinical supervision. Primacy was given to the meaning ascribed by the teachers to describe their knowledge and interpret their experiences together. Consequently, the presentation of the findings allowed for a detailed rendering of the social scene capturing both verbal and non-verbal features in which the two colleague teachers tell much of the story in their own words.
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The topical focus of this study is on a collaborative form of teacher development. Of particular interest is the development of collegiality and craft knowledge as two teachers work together in a series of reciprocal clinical observations and consultative conferences about features of their teaching. The purpose of the study is to describe and interpret the development of their collegial relationship over time. Particular attention is given to the beliefs, behaviours, and knowledge of the two teacher colleagues about collegiality and collaboration which surfaced in the context of their consultative conferences.

The purpose of this chapter is to present a comprehensive review of relevant research to inform the topical focus of the study. The chapter is organized into four sections. The presentation begins with an examination of research and theory on the topic of teachers' knowledge. In the second part of this chapter, the broad subject of teacher development is introduced. The third section of the chapter narrows the focus further through a review of literature on instructional supervision. Although there is no consensus on the most effective model for teacher development (many argue that this cannot ever be so), clinical supervision is identified as possessing considerable promise. The focus of the literature review sharpens further in the fourth section of the chapter dealing with cultures of teaching, collaboration and collegiality. The chapter concludes with a summary of the insights gained from research and analysis on these related topics, and linkages are identified between and among the them.
CRAFT (PRACTICAL) KNOWLEDGE OF TEACHING

Research on teachers’ knowledge has been an active arena of inquiry in recent years. The impressive number of reviews of the literature on the subject (e.g., Carter, 1990; Christensen, 1996; Clark & Peterson, 1986; Clark and Yinger, 1977; Fenstermacher, 1994; Grimmett & MacKinnon, 1992; Peterson & Clark, 1978; Shavelson & Stern, 1981; Tom & Valli, 1990) that have been published provides us with important insights on the knowledge types and sources of knowledge used by teachers to do their work. Although the field of study is still very young, new perspectives are emerging on a domain-specific knowledge base for teaching, the understanding of which is largely tacit, and on the teacher’s active engagement with that knowledge in the act of teaching. These important findings challenge long-standing assumptions about teachers’ knowledge, as well as the role played by teachers in curriculum enactment and in the teaching-learning process (Carter, 1990; Doyle, 1990; Elbaz, 1981, 1983, 1990; Feiman-Nemser, 1990; Feiman-Nemser & Floden, 1986; Shulman, 1986, 1987; Yinger, Hendricks-Lee & Johnston, 1991).

Although current study on teachers’ knowledge is dominated by interpretive research approaches, this has not always been the case. An important shift has taken place in the epistemological commitments to the conduct and purposes of educational research. As Fenstermacher (1994) points out: “the critical objective in teacher knowledge research is not for researchers to know what teachers know but for teachers to know what they know” (p. 50, emphasis in the original). This shift has had a profound influence on our conceptual understanding of the meanings held for “experience,” “truth,” and “knowledge,” as well as their inter-relationships.

Traditional thinking in education (which dominated scholarship for most of this century) held “that teachers had experience while academics had knowledge” (Feiman-Nemser & Floden, 1986, p. 512, emphasis added). Research on teachers’ knowledge was, by and large, ignored because it was invisible to the scholarly community. Teaching was
viewed in a technical and instrumental way. Moreover, the prevailing educational paradigm of quantitative inquiry idealized context-free causation, objectivity, and unidirectional transmission of knowledge. Therefore, scientific knowledge (once discovered) about teaching would be passed on to teachers by the academics. Although the hypothetico-deductive paradigm for the study of teachers' knowledge has been largely displaced by more naturalistic approaches employing qualitative methods of inquiry, remnants of the “teacher-as-technician” (Apple, 1982) metaphor still can be discerned from time to time in the popular press and in public debate on schooling.

**Dimensions of the knowledge base for teaching**

Those of us who teach as professionals know that teaching involves substantial technical ‘know how’ acquired through practice. The knowledge base for teaching is much more than that and certainly much more than the sum of our professional experience. We cannot ignore, or set aside, our humanity as teachers. To understand the full scope of teachers’ knowledge is to acknowledge its emotional and moral dimensions (Fullan and Hargreaves, 1991; Hargreaves, 1997; Giroux & McLaren, 1986). Fullan and Hargreaves (1991) summarize this point in the following way:

> Teaching is not just a collection of technical skills, a package of procedures, a bunch of things you can learn. . . Teaching is not just a technical business. It is a moral one too. (p. 18)

Hargreaves (1997) adds that good teaching “is infused with pleasure, passion, creativity, challenge, and joy” (p. 12).

In addition to its experiential, emotional, moral, and technical dimensions, it is now widely recognized that teaching is an intellectual activity which is both purposeful and reasoned. A number of studies have demonstrated that teachers possess a diversity of knowledge types (Calderhead, 1991; Doyle, 1990; Elbaz, 1981, 1990; Louis, 1981; Shulman, 1987). Teachers have a rationale for doing what they do in class, for why they do it, and for how and when it is done. That rationale is shaped by many factors. It is
influenced in part by a specialized knowledge of their craft (Carter, 1990; Grimmett & MacKinnon, 1992; Louis, 1981; Shulman, 1987; Tom & Valli, 1990), by their personal moral code (Fullan & Hargreaves, 1991; Giroux & McLaren, 1986), and their knowledge of the prescribed curriculum, but it is also affected by the classroom reality, community expectations, prior experience, and their self-understanding (Garman, 1986; Goodson, 1992; Huberman, 1988, 1992, Rosenholtz, 1989).

Teachers draw on a knowledge base that is "vast" (Calderhead, 1991) and varied (Louis, 1981; Shulman, 1986). In their daily work, even when engaged in a single activity, teachers can "be guided by an extensive knowledge base" (Calderhead, 1991, p. 153). Louis (1981) and Shulman (1987) are two educational theorists who have made seminal contributions respectively to our understanding of the knowledge base for teaching. Although the two researchers are addressing a common topic and referencing related concepts, the transfer of apparently equivalent concepts from one author to the other must proceed with care. Nevertheless, there are a number of important points of correspondence. Both writers agree that teachers' knowledge comprises more than propositions (or for that matter, procedures) and that the knowledge base for teaching contains both specialized and common knowledge.

Louis proposes three sources for the knowledge base for teaching, while Shulman outlines four. Common to both schemes is an academic knowledge base which derives from the disciplines. Unique to Shulman's scheme is pedagogical knowledge derived from "research on schooling, social organizations, human learning, teaching and development, and the other social and cultural phenomena that affect what a teacher can do" (1986, p. 8).

The last two components of Shulman's framework are "materials and settings of the institutionalized educational process. . .and the wisdom of practice itself" (1986, p. 8). The remaining two sources of the knowledge base posited by Louis are "craft knowledge," arising out of practical experience in the classroom (arguably specialized
knowledge of a personal nature), and "common knowledge". A fuller understanding of the bases for teachers' knowledge will be served by a closer examination of "wisdom of practice", "craft knowledge", and "common knowledge". All three possess a strong experiential basis.

"Common knowledge" (Louis, 1986) is idiosyncratic and is learned experientially from infancy on up. It is manifested in the constellation of practical principles teachers rely upon to inform their work. Although Louis recognizes the critical importance of common knowledge to successful teaching, she chooses not to explore its nature in any detail in her discussion. This is frustrating because, by her own admission, common knowledge encompasses most of what a teacher needs to know in order to teach. She rationalizes her decision not to probe its nature on the following grounds:

Because it [common knowledge] can neither be created nor easily transferred. Rather, it is part of the general blueprint for behaviour of a subculture. (p. 210)

"Wisdom of practice" (Schwab, 1971; Shulman, 1986, 1987) describes the expertise (i.e., source of knowledge and skill) possessed by veteran teachers with many years experience in classroom teaching. As a source of the knowledge base for teaching, it is the well of experience from which knowledge is drawn and skills refined. Wisdom of practice contains personal and procedural characteristics and is manifested in masterful performance. It is what Schön (1983, 1987) refers to when he states that the knowledge is in the action.

Leinhardt (1990) explicitly links craft knowledge with wisdom of practice in her discussion about teacher assessment practices. Treating the two terms synonymously, she employs "craft knowledge" to characterize expert practice, adding that experts teachers' wisdom is "contextualized knowledge" (p. 19). Her argument resurrects an age-old polemic when she points out that while craft knowledge is valuable to teachers in doing their work (by virtue of its practical basis), craft knowledge can clash with theory and cause cognitive dissonance. Leinhardt explains:
There exists a natural tension between general, subject-based, principled knowledge in a discipline and the specific, eclectic, particular knowledge acquired in the practice of a related craft. (p. 18)

The particular knowledge of teaching acquired by experience is contextualized (Leinhardt, 1990; Calderhead, 1990) and idiosyncratic. It has also been conceptualized as improvisational (Yinger, 1987, 1990) in which teachers set problems and invoke alternate strategies aimed at achieving solutions. The notion of applying "general, subject-based, principled knowledge" is often simply unavailable to teachers.

Grimmett & MacKinnon (1992) also employ the concept of craft knowledge to represent the wisdom of practice possessed by experienced, "crafty", teachers. Using poetry, folk tales, movie scripts, prior scholarship, and case studies of actual teachers, they present a compelling and comprehensive portrayal of craft knowledge. It embodies moral, experiential, political and transformative dimensions. Moreover, it is founded on reflective teaching practice (in the Deweyan sense). They define craft knowledge in the following way:

Craft knowledge of teaching is not substantive, subject matter knowledge. . . It is a particular form of morally appropriate intelligent and sensible know-how that is constructed by teachers, holding progressive and radical educational beliefs. . . in the context of their lived experiences and work around issues of content-related and learner-focused pedagogy. (p. 396)

The Grimmett and MacKinnon (1992) definition is the most comprehensive yet in that it extends the concept beyond mere description. In effect, Grimmett and MacKinnon have broadened our understanding of craft knowledge from an analytical concept to the construct of a model for teacher development (Sprinthall, Reisman, Thies-Sprinthall, 1996) which has:

a powerful contribution to make to teacher education programs that are practice based and whose aim is to instil in teachers a love of learning and a disposition toward student focused reflective inquiry. (p. 434)

In conclusion, they find craft knowledge to be useful in constructing a framework for the education of teachers. whether that be by observation of "crafty teachers", the pursuit of
self-directed study by highly competent and experienced teachers, or related teacher-led action research activities.

Examining the knowledge base for teaching leads to the need to focus some attention on the role of experience in guiding teachers' work. A number of research studies have now demonstrated that experience is significant in shaping a teachers' knowledge for work in the classroom (Carter, 1990; Louis, 1981; Russell & Munby, 1991; Shulman, 1986). An ongoing series of studies on the "authority of experience" (Featherstone, Munby and Russell, 1997; Munby and Russell, 1994) being conducted at Queen's University explores the construct as a career path in which beginning teachers learn to find their own individual voice. Beginning teachers behave deferentially to the authority of experienced teachers. They are reluctant to contribute anecdotes about their own teaching experiences when engaged in social interactions with more experienced colleagues. As teachers find their own individual voice, they are making important linkages. Building on Richert's (1992) view of "voice as the connection between reflection and action" (p. 197), Featherstone, Munby and Russell (1997) add that it also links experience to authority. In particular, Munby and Russell (1994, cited in Featherstone, Munby & Russell, 1997, emphasis in the original) "that giving authority to one's personal experience while learning to teach is central to understanding how and what one is learning from experience." (p. 3)

The authority that beginning teachers accord their more veteran colleagues is well founded. The findings from expert-novice studies have shown that expert teachers possess greater ability to integrate chunks of knowledge in order to make sense of classroom activities. They seem to be able to evaluate their teaching situations more holistically than do novices. Studies of expert and novice teachers, in particular, have informed much recent research on teacher knowledge (Berliner, 1986, 1987; Calderhead, 1990, 1991; Carter, 1990; Fuller, 1969; Yinger, 1987, 1990).

Carter (1990) summarizes three important findings about experts' knowledge derived from research on novice and expert teachers:

Experts' knowledge is specialized and domain specific. . . organized around interpretive concepts and propositions that reflect the task environments in which [experts] operate... [and] finally, much of what experts know is tacit knowledge. (p. 299)

Personal Character of Teachers' Knowledge

Studies on the personal character of teachers' knowledge have produced a substantial body of literature over the past 15 years. Much of the research in this area explicitly acknowledges the influential contributions of Polanyi (1958) and Schwab (1971, 1973). The focus of inquiry is sharply set on the personal understandings of individual teachers in practice situations. The personal characteristic of teachers' knowledge includes a set of intellectual beliefs about the empirical world (Connelly & Clandinin, 1985; Elbaz, 1983, 1990; Irwin, 1988). As well, much of the personal character of individual knowledge is tacitly held (Brauner, 1990; Elbaz, 1983; Hartnett & Naish, 1976; Polanyi, 1958; Sternberg & Caruso, 1985).

A number of related research programs have been responsible for new insights about the personal character of teachers' knowledge. This particular framework for research on teachers' knowledge includes several closely related terms, all of which attempt to capture the notion that the professional knowledge of working teachers is

Connelly and Clandinin’s work on “personal practical knowledge” is perhaps the best known research program of this genre. Michael Connelly, in particular, has been characterized as the “progenitor of ‘personal practical knowledge’ studies” (Irwin, 1988, p. 74). These authors (and most of the others cited in the list of related terms above) have adopted a narrative approach to the study of teacher knowledge in order to try to capture many of the subtleties of teachers’ experience in a holistic fashion. Connelly and Clandinin (1990) argue that narrative inquiry “is the construction and reconstruction of personal and social stories” (p. 2). Beattie (1995) acknowledges the seminal contributions of Connelly and Clandinin for the advancement of the study of teachers’ knowledge by means of a narrative approach.

The approach is commendable for its efforts to bridge the theory-practice chasm, or “dialectic” as many of the authors affiliated with this line of inquiry prefer to represent it. The aim of this line of inquiry is to formulate images\(^5\) in order to understand the narrative unity which enables a teacher to integrate theory and practice. Theory can be found in the practice. Connelly and Clandinin (1985) elaborate on what is meant by narrative unity:

\(^5\) The concept of image is important both to this study as a surrogate for socially constructed meaning and to the line of inquiry under discussion in this section. Further explanation of the role and function of images appears later in this section of the chapter.
Narrative unity is a continuum within a person’s experience which renders life experiences meaningful through the unity they achieve for the person. What we mean by unity is a union in a particular person in a particular time and place of all that has been and undergone in the past of the tradition which helped to shape him. (p. 198)

Notwithstanding the value of narrative inquiry as method, the drive for narrative unity in the analytical phase has been criticized on epistemological grounds in some academic circles (e.g., Willinsky, 1989; Hargreaves, 1996) as unduly limiting the interpretation of the data. Hargreaves (1996) cautions fellow researchers working with the teachers’ voice to represent their subjective meanings of their teaching experiences. He points out a grave error in scholarship can occur if the teacher’s voice is decontextualized through attempts to synthesize individual voices into “the teacher’s voice” (p. 16; emphasis in the original). Nevertheless, narrative approaches to research on teacher thinking enjoy considerable support and active pursuit. Research in this genre continues to make an important contribution to our understanding of the personal, contextualized and quite idiosyncratic characteristics of teachers’ knowledge.

Categories of Teachers’ Knowledge

Elbaz’s work (1981, 1983) is noteworthy for its identification of the orientation and organization of teachers’ knowledge. Working under the guidance of Michael Connelly, Elbaz’s dissertation was an ethnographic case study of the “practical knowledge” of “Sarah”, a secondary English teacher in Toronto. Her conception of practical knowledge has considerable affinity with the genre of research emphasizing the personal character of teachers’ knowledge.

---

6 Thus far in the review of research on teacher knowledge, I have exercised caution about the description of a specialized knowledge for teaching. Henceforth, “practical knowledge” and “teachers’ craft knowledge” will be employed as synonyms. Other terms, such as “working knowledge” and “practice knowledge” are equally acceptable, yet are not widely used by teachers, or scholars. The addition of “personal” to practical knowledge, per se, does not help clarify the concept, although the personal character of a teacher’s practical knowledge is not disputed.
Elbaz’s study demonstrates that Sarah’s practical knowledge encompasses much more than technical (i.e., procedural knowledge) about how to teach. Her findings provide empirical support for the notion that there is a depth and breadth to the personal character of a teacher’s practical knowledge. In addition, a knowledge of curriculum content and its development, the culture of the community, and of theory pertaining to the teaching-learning process are, for Elbaz, constituent parts of Sarah’s practical knowledge. Elbaz posits that a teacher’s cognitive style is revealed by her practical knowledge in use. Following up on the “Sarah” study, Elbaz (1983) suggests that teachers develop a “construct system” as they seek to understand and improve practice. In addition to intellectual beliefs, a teacher’s “perception, feeling, values, purpose and commitment” (p. 17) are all brought to bear in developing her individual construct system. She employs the construct of cognitive style to develop a conceptual scheme of five categories which enables her to organize the content of a teacher’s practical knowledge. Her classification scheme employs the following categories: (1) knowledge of subject matter; (2) knowledge of instruction; (3) knowledge of self; (4) knowledge of curriculum development; and (5) knowledge of milieu of teaching. Elbaz (1983) points out that these five categories of teachers’ practical knowledge are commonplace and “reflect differences that are relevant to teachers, rather than academic distinctions among disciplines of study” (p. 14). Nevertheless, her discussion of the personal orientation and organization of teachers’ knowledge has an important heuristic value which has provided considerable insight and momentum to other research interested in its personal character.

Representations of teachers’ knowledge in the form of images, similes, metaphors, and the like allude to the integrative capacity of the characteristics (i.e., forms, or content) of that knowledge (Brauner, 1990; Calderhead, 1991; Clandinin & Connelly, 1985; Elbaz,

---

7 The term “construct system” incorporates the notions of disposition and motivation with perspective, or point of view. For examples of theoretical linkages between perspective and motivation, see the psychological theories of Kelly (1955) and Maslow (1962).
1981, 1983; Munby, 1986; Yinger, 1987, 1990). Calderhead (1991) argues that the concept of image can be analyzed at various levels of abstraction. According to Brauner (1990), "similes, metaphors, concept cascades, and other kinds of notions are all devices for arresting impressions that serve as concept surrogates" (p. 42).

Elbaz (1983) reports that images represent the highest level of abstraction in a teacher's practical knowledge. The number of images held by a teacher may be few in number compared with other levels ("rules of practice" and "practical principles"), yet they serve to orient a teacher's overall conduct, express a teacher's purposes, or extend knowledge.

The teacher's feelings, values, needs, and beliefs combine as she forms images of how teaching should be, and marshals experience, theoretical knowledge, school folklore to give substance to these images. (p. 134)

Calderhead (1991) offers the descriptive label, "case knowledge" to represent a teacher's acquired imagery of teaching situations. Case knowledge, too, has personal and experiential characteristics because "it refers to a memorized repertoire of events or people" (p. 7). When confronted by some perplexing situation in teaching, experienced teachers tend to think back to previous experiences for possible solutions. They dip into their well of experience to inform their perceptions and guide their action. According to Calderhead:

These images of practice are economical ways of storing the vast amounts of knowledge that teachers appear to draw upon, and that they represent appropriate means of encoding complex classroom situations, enabling a ready association between a complex knowledge base and ill-defined classroom situations. (pp. 11-12)

Yinger (1987, 1988) finds the metaphors "conversation" and "improvisation" to be instructive tools to capture the process of teachers' interpretation and invention to solve enactment problems. In the process of conscious interaction (the conversation) with a problematic aspect of teaching, involving forms of experimentation (the improvisation), Yinger points out its potential for integrative application of multiple types of knowledge in teacher development. By logical extension, it would thus appear reasonable to assume
that forms of staff development involving peer coaching, or clinical supervision, can create
the conditions favourable to Yinger’s conversation and improvisation on teaching
practices and curriculum enactment.

TEACHER DEVELOPMENT

The topic of teacher development has generated an impressive body of research and analysis\(^8\) over the past decade. The review of literature which follows in this section is provided to summarize what has been learned thus far about the concept, to identify some key elements of effective teacher development programs, and to reveal some factors which affect teacher development.

While there is much agreement about the critical role played by teacher development in educational change and professional renewal, there is not yet an authoritative definition around which we can build a coherent theoretical framework. Burden’s (1990) thorough summary of research on teacher development stops short of providing a definition, because it is not yet a “fully articulated concept” (p. 325). Burden does however point out what purpose it serves. “Teacher development deals with changes that teachers experience throughout their careers” (p. 314). Neufeld and Grimmett (1994) conceptualize development “as movement toward some ultimate state or image of perfection”. MacKinnon and Erickson (1992) regard teacher development as a continuum occurring “in the context of reflective practice in educational situations” (p. 209). What does emerge from the recent literature on this topic is that teacher development speaks to a change process involving a continuous spiral of experimentation requiring both thought and action.

\(^8\) See, for example, Burke, Heideman & Heideman (1990); Fullan & Hargreaves (1992); Grimmett & Neufeld (1994); Hargreaves & Fullan (1992); Holly & Mcloughlin (1989); Hughes (1991); Joyce (1990); Joyce & Showers (1988, 1996); Levine (1992); Lieberman (1994); Pink & Hyde (1992); Richardson (1994); Wideen & Andrews (1987).
Is teacher development then the same as teacher education? For many, a distinction exists between pre-service and in-service teacher education. Wilson (1975, cited in Floden & Buchmann, 1990) associates teacher development with in-service (career) teacher education, while pre-service teachers engage in “teacher preparation” (p. 44). Grimmett (personal communication) contests this simple association of teacher development with in-service and of teacher education with pre-service. While insisting that teacher education and teacher development are not, and should not be, synonyms, he characterizes the process differently. Teacher education refers to the processes structured for teachers by others: be they teacher educators in faculties of education, or fellow educators/administrators in school systems. Clearly from this perspective, teacher education occurs at all stages of a teacher’s career: from pre-service through induction to in-service experiences. Throughout, the purpose of teacher educators is to provide appropriate and relevant opportunities for teachers to construct new knowledge about their craft. In contrast to teacher education, Grimmett explains that teacher development refers to those processes that are initiated and structured by teachers themselves in their efforts to understand and improve their professional practice. The challenge for many teachers remains how to interpret and incorporate research-derived knowledge received from teacher educators into their own practice. The processes of both teacher education and teacher development take place and can be studied within and across all phases of a teacher’s career.

A great deal has been learned about teacher development since John Dewey (1904) opened the doors for discussion in his treatise, “The relation of theory to practice in education”. His inextricable linkage of theory and practice continues to influence educational scholarship today. Take, for example, a recent definition of teacher development by Lieberman and Miller (1992) “as continuous inquiry into practice” (p. 107). All forms of inquiry, irrespective of their epistemology, are theory-laden.
The Lieberman and Miller definition, which focuses on the teacher as the key to teacher development, is consistent with ongoing research by a growing number of scholars in education. This emerging view of teacher development recognizes the convergence of two dimensions of learning. The first "strand" is collegial in nature and highlights the social organization of schools. Teachers must learn "how to work together, how to make collective decisions and how to structure continuous opportunities for their growth" (Lieberman & Miller, 1992, pp. 120-121). At the same time, developing teachers must continue to learn about their students and how to teach them in new and different ways.

The elements of effective teacher development programs are summarized by Griffin (1986), based on a large scale research program comprising three major studies conducted in the United States.

The program must be embedded in a school context (defining property), and be (1) context-sensitive, (2) purposeful and articulated, (3) participatory and collaborative, (4) knowledge-based, (5) ongoing, (6) developmental, and (7) analytic and reflective. (p. 7)

Participation in such programs affords teachers opportunities to interact on a professional level, to learn new techniques, acquire new knowledge, and derive new meaning from their work. Through professional discourse, reflection, and guided practice of new techniques and skills, teachers gain insights which enable the improvement of their teaching practices.

Much effort is put into professional development programs to promote teacher growth. A recent review of the research literature on teachers' professional development conducted by Sprinthall, Reiman & Thies-Sprinthall (1996) identifies a number of models of teacher development, each with distinct assumptions and approaches. A common theme in much of the current interest in teacher development is an orientation which focuses on the teacher, involves sustained application, and is sensitive to the cultural context within which teachers work. Linkages to school renewal/reform are pervasive in this literature. When special consideration is given to the needs of teachers as adult
learners with individual differences then the impact of teacher development programs is enhanced considerably (Conners, 1991; Joyce & Showers, 1996; Lieberman, 1994).

As adult learners, teachers' requirements for growth evolve over time (Huberman, 1992; Sikes, 1985) as their understanding of their craft expands. Lessons learned from developmental psychology (e.g., Charlesworth, 1972) suggest that the interaction of factors relating to the maturity, personal characteristics, and environment serve as the forces of change. When teachers learn new skills and techniques, or when they experiment, reflect, and analyze their work, they grow professionally. Growth is an outcome of a change in practice, or thinking, and, as such, can be viewed as development. Therefore teacher learning, growth, and development are considered to be equivalent terms.

It is assumed that teachers (generally speaking) are committed to their ongoing professional development, that their commitment is continuous throughout their career, and that their requirements for growth change over time as they move from pre-service through induction on to mature practice. Darling-Hammond (1998) applauds the direction of new teacher education programs which "envision the professional teacher as one who learns from teaching rather than as one who has finished learning how to teach" (p. 7).

The motivation theory of Frederick Herzberg (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959) supports the premise that teachers are motivated to achieve higher levels of competency in their craft. Sergiovanni (1967) was able to replicate the findings of Herzberg et al. in his study of teacher motivation. Through experience, recognition, and achievement, teachers gain greater control over the learning environment in their classrooms and, thereby, derive greater satisfaction in their work. Typically, teachers receive feedback on their instructional efforts from their students. They know when a lesson or unit has gone well by the performance and emotional response provided by the children. Although much less common, teachers can be motivated by the recognition their peers or administrative superiors for work well done. Teacher motivation and
commitment to excel is, according to Herzberg's theory, intrinsic in nature and based on a psychological drive towards continuous growth. This drive, nevertheless, will be mitigated if there is an absence of hope, lack of comfort, control and collegiality in the workplace.

Teaching today in a complex and rapidly changing society is placing extraordinary pressures on teachers' ability to meet adequately the educational and emotional needs of their students (Hargreaves, 1997). The many challenges of an uncertain future confronting the profession and its toll on teacher morale must be acknowledged and confronted if a climate of continuous learning is to flourish. Hopelessness, discomfort, dissatisfaction and poor performance can be products of unsatisfactory working conditions, an absence of interpersonal relations, externally imposed policies respecting the kind and quality of work to be done, or a lack of common goals (Rosenholtz, 1989). In Herzberg's terms, inattention to these "hygienic factors" (i.e., primarily extrinsic in nature and affecting the conditions of their work) will result in a dissatisfied teacher and exacerbate the uncertainty many teachers feel. Attending to hygienic factors will not, however, have a direct bearing on the degree of motivation to grow that teachers feel. Motivation is to be found in the quality of the work teachers do and can be enhanced by recognition, achievement, and (to a much lesser degree) responsibility (Sergiovanni, 1967). It is for this reason that Fullan (1997) observes "the centrality of individual motivation and societal relationships" (p. 229) in his current search for to connect educational reform to a renewal of hope and emotionally nurtured optimism.

INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION

Supervision in teaching means working with teachers for the improving of instruction and contains the key features of observation and feedback. Glickman (1982) identifies the following concepts as being central to the construct: "assistance, monitoring, observing, and dialogue" (p. 549, emphasis in the original).
Supervision of instruction is widely cited as an effective means to change teaching practices and to promote professional growth (Doyle, 1990; Glickman & Bey, 1990; Pajak, 1990; Sergiovanni, 1982; Sparks & Loucks-Horsley, 1990; Sprinthall, Reiman, & Thies-Sprinthall, 1996). Pajak's (1990) review of the literature on instructional supervision identifies it as "the primary process by which instructional excellence is achieved and maintained" (p. 1). Sparks and Loucks-Horsley (1990, p. 237) characterize it as "powerful" in its ability to improve teaching practices. In his thematic review of teacher education research, Doyle (1990) points to instructional supervision as a valuable resource to teachers in their quest for answers to questions of classroom conduct and curriculum enactment. Glickman and Bey (1990) presume it to be "vital to school success" (p. 549).

Despite its avowed value as a model for teacher development, supervision of instruction is regarded warily by teachers because of the evaluative overtones it holds for them (Darling-Hammond, 1990; Garman, 1990; Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1988; Sparks & Loucks-Horsley, 1990; Wise & Darling-Hammond, 1985; Withall & Wood, 1979) and because of its "watchdog origins" (Goldhammer, 1969, p. vii). They accept it, nonetheless, with a sense of resignation due to its mandated status in most jurisdictions (Darling-Hammond & Sclan, 1992). Instructional supervision has been, after all, a feature of most teachers' lives since their first tentative steps in the profession.

**General Views on Supervision**

Supervision and evaluation of pre-service teachers in practica are the norm (Glickman & Bey, 1990). While it can (and often does) serve a developmental purpose in the practicum setting, supervisory observation ultimately leads to a summative assessment (grade) about the pre-service teacher's competency in the classroom. Judgments about teaching skills and teacher effectiveness begin as soon as a student teacher assumes some professional responsibility for a class of students.
Following graduation from university, supervision remains a key component of the certification process whereby beginning teachers obtain their professional credentials (Darling-Hammond & Sclan, 1992). For the beginning teacher, survival is paramount and the anxieties relating to performance considerable (Joyce & Clift, 1984; Huberman, 1992). This is a period of time when teachers feel especially insecure and attrition from the profession high (Haberman, 1987, cited in Zimpher & Grossman, 1992). Commenting on recent trends in the supervision and evaluation of beginning teachers in the United States, Darling-Hammond and Sclan (1992) report "a substantial increase in state involvement" (p. 11).

There is nothing new, however, about the public's interest and involvement in supervision and evaluation. Society's requirement of accountability in education is older than public schools (Haney, Madaus & Kreitzer, 1987). Although standards for teaching have changed greatly over time, the community's interest in and concerns about educational quality have remained constant. Supervision of teaching has been a fact of school life for over 300 years (Withall & Wood, 1979). Initially, teacher supervision and evaluation were the domain of community leaders. They made visits to classrooms to observe teachers at work and to inspect student work in order to inform their judgments about the learning situation for the students. With the advent of public primary schooling in the mid-nineteenth century, this function became the domain of public school inspectors (Bolin & Panaritis, 1992).

Today, supervision continues to be predominantly an administrative function whose purpose remains evaluative (Glickman, 1992). The prevailing wisdom in most education systems assigns the responsibility for instructional supervision to school administrators, or to faculty advisors in the case of pre-service teachers. Coursework in supervision is a common feature of graduate programs in educational administration so that it might be practiced with an acceptable level of skill and expertise.
It is, therefore, quite regrettable that a model for teacher development with such
great potential is so narrowly (and negatively) perceived by the individuals who stand to
benefit the most. There appears to be quite a gulf between theory and practice.
Sprinthall, Reiman, and Thies-Sprinthall (1996) bemoan the fact that while instructional
supervision is "crucial [to teacher development]. . .there is a paucity of school settings in
which such practices are the norm" (p. 667). To explain this discrepancy, the authors note
that "rarely are teachers able to employ the skills with adequate depth and versatility."

Clinical Supervision

A special form of instructional supervision is commonly known in the literature as
"clinical supervision"9. As a form of staff development, clinical supervision is widely
practiced both at the universities with pre-service teachers and in school districts across
North America. In their comprehensive review of the research literature on teacher
development models, Sprinthall, Reiman, and Thies-Sprinthall (1996) single out clinical
supervision as an exemplary model for facilitating teachers' professional growth.

Clinical supervision was pioneered at Harvard University in the late 1950s and
early 1960s by Morris Cogan, Robert Goldhammer, and their associates. The model was
developed in response to their realization that they were failing to provide effective
preparation to pre-service teachers for classroom teaching. The key to this innovation on
instructional supervision was in situating the learning experience for the pre-service
teachers in the classroom and thereby deriving all data about their teaching behaviour
directly from "clinical" classroom performance.

The purpose of clinical supervision, as defined by Cogan (1973), is "the
improvement of students' learning through the improvement of the teachers' instruction"

9 See Cogan (1973), Goldhammer (1969), Mosher & Purpel (1972), and Weller (1971) for
samples of early scholarship on the topic. See also Glatthorn (1983), Glickman (1981, 1985), and
Sergiovanni & Starratt (1993) for important subsequent contributions.
Weller's (1971) definition of clinical supervision is provided because it is both cogent and comprehensive:

Clinical supervision may be defined as supervision focused upon the improvement of instruction by means of systematic cycles of planning, observation, and intensive intellectual analysis of actual teaching performances in the interest of rational modification. (p. 3)

The model is differentiated from general supervision by the fact that the locus of interest and activity centres on classroom interactions, hence the inclusion of the term, "clinical". As conceived by Cogan, it is a hierarchical model because the supervisor possesses competencies not held by the teacher being supervised, yet there is parity in most of the responsibilities for both roles. Cogan stresses the importance of close colleagueship in the supervisory relationship. Recent theorists including Sergiovanni (1992), Pajak (1993), Eisner (1998), and others do not view the model as hierarchical. They discuss clinical supervision in terms of moral practice, or reflective practice (Grimmett, Rostad & Ford, 1992), transferring the responsibility for development over to the teacher.

One complete cycle of the clinical supervision model involves five "stages" (according to Goldhammer, Anderson & Krajewski, 1980) or eight "phases" (according to Cogan, 1973). Given that there is considerable overlap between the two schemes, Goldhammer’s five stage model of clinical supervision is enumerated. They are: (1) a pre-observation conference; (2) an instructional observation; (3) analysis and strategy; (4) a follow-up supervision conference; and (5) post-conference analysis.

Cogan’s (1973) monograph, Clinical Supervision, was written primarily to clarify how the model was devised to work and what it is intended to accomplish. His model has been adopted (many would say “co-opted”) by many school systems across North America for their own bureaucratic purposes. Administrative control and bureaucratic accountability were not at all the purposes for which Cogan and his colleagues first devised the model. Hence, it has been suggested that Cogan perceived a need to write a
monograph about clinical supervision some 15 years after its introduction at Harvard University in order to set the record straight about the purpose and mechanics of the model.

The merits of this approach to teacher development have been the subject of widespread and ongoing debate within the educational community for over twenty-five years. There exists a vibrant international association (Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development) which produces regular journals and yearbooks to try and satisfy the demand for scholarship in the topic area. While many scholars extol the power of clinical supervision to effect positive change in teaching practices, it has been criticized by others as "positivist/behaviorist" (cited in Holland, 1988, p. 99; although she argues in its favour), and as "managerial and undemocratic" (Smyth, 1986, p. 332). Teachers, too, express ambivalent emotions about clinical supervision. For teachers, supervision (of any kind) and evaluation are discomfortingly associated in their minds.

Madeline Hunter (1980, 1984) is an academic who has had widespread influence on teachers around North America. She proposes six different types of supervisory conferences for use in clinical supervision, of which one is explicitly intended to address summative evaluation of instructional performance. The remaining five types of instructional supervision have distinct purposes and objectives which the supervisor selects a priori. Three of them are designed to focus exclusively on effective teaching witnessed during the observation, while four of the types actually proscribe "negative or critical" commentary by the supervisor. Effective teaching is defined in specific ways by Hunter (1984) and is characterized by particular teaching behaviours. Only one of the several supervisory approaches allows for any degree of critical examination of areas of weakness in teaching effectiveness. Even then, she maintains that negativity need not come into play.

Hunter's approach to supervision is very prescriptive and is referenced explicitly to her model of teaching (Hunter, 1984; Russell & Hunter, 1984) which comprises seven
elements of effective instruction. Dedicated to systematically improving the quality and consistency of instructional supervision, she developed a training model with certification credentials issued to graduates upon successful completion of her program. Consistent with her model of teaching, the Hunter trainers taught a curriculum based on a set of specific supervisory behaviours designed to reinforce and develop effective teaching behaviour.

As can be expected, there is not ubiquitous agreement on the utility of all phases, or stages, of the Cogan/Goldhammer model of clinical supervision. Again, Hunter (1986) created much controversy when she called for the elimination of the pre-observation conference. Citing time constraints, subjectivity and risks to the supervisory relationship, she argues that it:

is not only a waste of time but it can create bias in both observer and teacher which interferes with objective observation of teacher performance and results in a less productive post-observation conference. (p. 69)

In addition and, perhaps, even more damaging to the process, Hunter asserts that the pre-observation conference can serve to undermine trust between the teacher and supervisor.

A major innovation on the original (i.e., Cogan's) model was introduced by Glatthorn in 1984 with the publication of Differentiated Supervision. While retaining the label of supervision in his title, Glatthorn is advocating a goal-oriented model which accepts that teachers have different needs for growth at various stages in their career. It can even be a collegial process in which two teachers join together for “cooperative professional development” (Glatthorn, 1984, 1987). In such case, each teacher has individual expectations for growth. The metaphor of “team” comes readily to mind as the partners in differentiated supervision are both teachers, entering into the relationship as peers, and engaging in a reciprocal process. Thus Glatthorn’s differentiated supervision can be distinguished from clinical supervision on two significant grounds: the lack of hierarchical relations and the reciprocal nature of the relationship.
A second substantive innovation on the Cogan model was introduced by Glickman (1981, 1985) which he characterized as “developmental supervision”. Deeply committed to the Cogan model, Glickman encourages supervisors to examine their teaching partner’s conceptual level of thinking and degree of commitment to improvement in order to establish the teacher’s developmental stage. Once these are ascertained, the supervisor proceeds using one of three possible supervisory approaches: directive, non-directive, or collaborative. It is not surprising that Glickman (1985) reports that survey studies show that teachers prefer the collaborative approach.

In recent years a number of scholars have devised new and innovative labels for their particular approaches to clinical supervision in order to shift the focus from processes which are externally-directed, hierarchical and evaluative to models which are teacher-directed, collegial and formative. Some notable examples of these models include: “peer coaching” (Joyce & Showers, 1980, 1982; Grimmett, 1987; Showers & Joyce, 1996), “reflective coaching” (Schön, 1987, 1988; Zahorik, 1987), “cognitive coaching” (Costa & Garmston, 1988), “collegial coaching” (Dantonio, 1995), and “peer collaboration” (Miller, 1988; Pugach & Johnson, 1990). This trend is noteworthy and not simply a semantic game being played in the literature, although one is inclined to draw an analogy with Andersen’s fable, “The Emperor’s New Clothes”. While all of the aforementioned approaches have shorn the cloak of “supervision”, each retains the key threads of colleagueship, observation, analysis, and feedback which are consistent with Cogan’s model.

The invention of new terms, such as “peer coaching”, represents a conscious attempt to reformulate an important model for teacher development in more teacher-friendly terms. While the norms are consistent with clinical supervision, “coaching” connotes a more supportive relationship. Helping behaviours expected of the coach (i.e., colleague-observer)—such as observation and feedback, experimentation, guided practice and modeling—are all implicit in coaching. The inclusion of the term “peer” attempts to
resolve the issue of autonomy, which is an increasingly important one for teachers. In the context of the classroom, peer coaching suggests the notion that two teacher colleagues are engaged in an ongoing process to stimulate teacher thinking and reflection on instructional practices, as well as encourage and support experimentation, thereby enhancing the quality of education in their classrooms.

Much of the ongoing debate on the role of clinical supervision in teacher development centres on issues of form and function (i.e., top-down and bureaucratic for summative evaluation or bottom-up and collegial for formative growth). Of all the questions being examined by many ongoing research programs pursuing this line of inquiry, the essential one for teachers is: “Whose agenda is it really?” The question captures their concerns about professional autonomy and control over the process.

CULTURES OF TEACHING--COLLABORATION AND COLLEGIALITY

Teachers’ work is grounded in the classroom. The classroom setting provides both a structural frame and a cultural context for teaching (Goodlad, 1984; Hargreaves, 1992; Jackson, 1968; Lieberman, 1986; Lortie, 1973, 1975; Rosenholtz, 1989). Lortie’s (1975) famous egg carton analogy to describe the cellular structure of schools invokes an image of impermeable compartments. The structure of the school has a very powerful influence on the quality and kind of professional culture commonplace within it.

It is now widely acknowledged that teachers are routinely isolated from their colleagues by the conditions of their work (Flinders, 1988; Goodlad, 1984; Lieberman & Miller, 1984; Lortie, 1975; Rosenholtz, 1989; Silver, 1983; Waller, 1932; Zahorik, 1987). The singular nature of teachers’ work is a defining property of the profession. Working individually with a group of children, teachers spend most of their professional lives out of sight of even their closest colleagues. For this reason teaching is often characterized as "a lonely profession" (Sarason, Levine, Goldenberg, Cherlin, & Bennett, 1966).
Learning to teach is a journey. The path to expert teaching practices begins with one’s pre-service training and continues throughout a teacher’s career. We have seen that teacher development is an ongoing and open-ended process of learning to teach in new and more effective ways. It can be viewed as an expanding repertoire of skills, understandings, and knowledge directly bearing on student learning and related classroom work. Opportunities for teacher learning can occur both in and out of the classroom and in a variety of ways (Fullan, 1987; Fullan & Hargreaves, 1991; Rosenholtz, 1989). They can be individually based or group opportunities. Unfortunately, teacher isolation adversely constrains collegially based learning opportunities. Feiman-Nemser and Buchmann (1985, 1989) point out that once beginning teachers master many of the technical skills and routines required for teaching, they become unlikely to question many of prevailing norms of the profession.

Rosenholtz (1989) characterizes teachers’ lives as “professionally orphaned”. Consequently, professional interaction is not a natural, ongoing feature of their work life. Lieberman and Miller (1984) summarize the social reality of teaching in the following way.

Once graduated from a preparation program, teachers find themselves alone in the classroom with a group of students without peer or supervisor in sight. The neophyte teacher is left with degree in hand, high expectations internalized, a fistful of untried methodologies, and few adults with whom to share, grow, and learn. (p. 4)

Two important outcomes tend to stem from this enforced isolation: (1) a prevalent and inherent uncertainty about many practical aspects of teachers’ work (Lortie, 1975; Rosenholtz, 1989; Sarason, 1982); and (2) the creation of a culture of individualism (Fullan & Hargreaves, 1991; Hargreaves, 1992; Jackson, 1968; Lortie, 1975). Clandinin (1983) found a relationship to exist between a teacher’s uncertainty about the quality of her work and a fear of criticism suggesting an insecurity about inviting close collegial relations.

In and of itself, individualism is not necessarily bad (Naisbitt & Aberdene, 1990; Storr, 1988); however, in combination with enforced isolation, a paucity of professional
interaction, and prevalent uncertainty, a dismal picture of the profession is portrayed. The chemistry of the combination frequently produces an unhealthy "educational conservatism" (Fullan & Hargreaves, 1991, p. 39) which tends not to foster ongoing professional growth, nor enhance student learning opportunities. Court (1988) suggests that the individualism issue may be a factor in sustaining teacher isolation because of their much valued professional autonomy.

There has been a proliferation of research in recent years seeking to link norms of collegiality and collaboration with organizational culture, teacher development, and school improvement (Ashton & Webb, 1986; Barth, 1988; Bird & Little, 1986; Fullan, 1982; Fullan & Hargreaves, 1991; Fullan et al., 1990; Goodlad, 1984; Grimmett & Crehan, 1992; Hargreaves, 1992; Joyce, 1990; Lieberman, Saxl & Miles, 1988; Little, 1986, 1988, 1990; Rosenholtz, 1989). A recurring theme in much current educational research is that an ongoing process of meaningful consultation between teachers on professional matters can contribute positively to building a more collaborative professional culture conducive to school improvement.

Collaboration between and among colleagues on improving teaching in a non-threatening environment can address concerns about professional isolation, educational conservatism, and the uncertainty many teachers feel about their effectiveness (Fullan & Hargreaves, 1991, 1994; Glickman, 1989; Joyce & Showers, 1983; Rosenholtz, 1989). Fostering teacher collaboration and collegiality can lead to the establishment of norms of continuous improvement efforts (Fullan, 1990), however, collaboration is not the panacea for what ails the profession. In fact it can work in counter-productive ways just as forcefully as not.

There is nothing virtuous about collaboration per se. It can serve to block students or put students down as well as to elevate learning. Thus, collegiality must be linked to norms of continuous improvement and experimentation in which teachers are constantly seeking and assessing potentially better practices (Fullan, 1990, p. 15).
Rosenholtz (1989) proposes that teacher isolation and staff cohesiveness form a continuum. At one end there is “professional estrangement” (p. 18) in which the faculty rarely engage in talk about teaching practices and related professional matters; while at the other end there is “professional involvement” (p. 18) which is characterized by a higher level of shared beliefs, values, instructional practices and goals.

Teachers working in isolation from one another do not routinely interact about their work and thus lack a shared language of their craft (Sarason, 1982). Collaboration can provide the conditions for collegial help and assistance. Lieberman (1994, p. 27) asserts that teacher collaboration can prove powerful in establishing a professional community in which “norms of collegiality, openness, and trust” have the opportunity to flourish. As teachers begin to develop a common language about their craft through sustained collaborative practices they build the foundation for a shared technical language about teaching. With the development of a common vocabulary of practice, teachers are then able to discuss the meaning of educational change in their practice (Fullan, 1982).

The work of Judith Little (1982, 1986, 1987, 1988, 1990) has had a profound influence on scholarship seeking links between teacher collaboration and the development of norms of collegiality. She was among the first educational scholars to show that the establishment of collegial norms in schools served instrumental purposes for teacher development and for school improvement. Although strong collegial relations among teachers are relatively uncommon, they can be powerful in their ability to break down the figurative and literal walls which separate teachers from each other and which characterize the loneliness of teaching (Little, 1987). Her research also suggests that collegiality is more common in elementary and middle schools than in high schools, a finding widely accepted by teachers and scholars alike (Fullan & Hargreaves, 1991; Grimmett, 1992; Hargreaves, 1992; Rosenholtz, 1989).

Little’s (1987, 1988) research suggests that strong collegial relations provide intrinsic and extrinsic benefits to the participants. Loneliness is mitigated through ongoing
professional interaction and a sense of pride as the collegial relationship develops. There are opportunities for recognition of good pedagogical ideas and exemplary teaching practices. Collegiality enables teachers to be better prepared for classroom work.

Collegiality occurs when teachers get together to talk about their teaching practices, engage in team planning for instruction and in the preparation of learning materials, when they observe each other's teaching and follow that up with the provision of emotional and psychological support to each other (Little, 1982, 1987). These attributes which comprise the collegial relationship are what Little (1987) calls the "architecture" of collegiality. Moreover, she asserts that there is an opportunity for sustaining teacher development when these norms are present.

Little (1990) identifies four different types of collegiality between and among teachers. The first three types are relatively weak forms of collaborative relations. She labels them as: "scanning and story-telling", "help and assistance", and "sharing". Her fourth type, "joint work", seems to be the one most capable of effecting positive change in schools through improved teaching practices, professional depth, and appreciation (Little, 1987).

Collegiality became an especially compelling concept for educational theorists and reformers following the publication of influential critiques of public education in the last decade. As a response to calls for the restructuring of schooling, collaborative practices are being considered and implemented by school systems seeking ways and means for effecting school reform. Some systems of education (e.g., Ontario) mandated collegiality through the collective bargaining process with teacher unions in the provision of increased non-instructional time. At the same time, collegiality is alien to most teachers given the conditions of their work. Hargreaves (1991, p. 48) warns that "much of the burden of educational reform has been placed upon its fragile shoulders."

Collegiality can take a number of different forms (Hargreaves, 1991). While some forms are capable of fostering the development of a shared professional culture within
schools (Fullan & Hargreaves, 1991; Hargreaves, 1991, 1992; Little, 1982, 1987, 1990; Lieberman, Saxl & Miles, 1988), others can actually prove damaging to school reform initiatives (Hargreaves, 1991, 1994, 1997; Hargreaves & Dawe, 1990; Little, 1990). When collegial exchanges focus on deficit discussions in which exchanges of complaints about "the way things are" occur, then what transpires in the name of collegiality can be truly damaging to the development of a shared professional culture and to school improvement initiatives (Little, 1990). If collegial relations are to make a positive contribution to school reform and norms of continuous improvement in practice then they must have a focus on goals which are specific and concrete (Schmoker, 1997).

Recent scholarly interest in the role that reflective thinking can play in teacher development suggests that a variety of collaborative practices are available to teachers. They include a number of related strategies such as reflective coaching (e.g., Schön, 1987, 1988; Zahorik, 1987), peer observation and collaboration (e.g., Miller, 1988; Pugach & Johnson, 1990; Rosenholtz, 1989), and action research (e.g., Carr & Kemmis, 1986; Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1990; Corey, 1953; Elliott, 1988; Lieberman, 1986; Stenhouse, 1983) offer potentially useful strategies to redress the lack of certainty and isolation that teachers feel in doing their work. When successful, collegial relationships can help to establish collaborative practices and, thus, build a "shared technical culture" (Lortie, 1975).

Grimmett and Crehan (1992) offer the descriptive label of "interdependent collegiality" for their conceptualization of a strong form of collegiality, akin to Little's notion of "joint work". It stands in contrast to "contrived collegiality" (Hargreaves, 1991), in which relationships are administratively initiated, bureaucratically sustained, and externally rewarded. Little (1987) points out that interdependence is a key feature to the stability of the collegial relationship as it evolves. Grimmett and Crehan provide case evidence that interdependent collegiality facilitates teacher development through the
incorporation of "research-validated knowledge conceptually and metaphorically" (Grimmett, Rostad & Ford, 1992, pp. 198-199).

Hargreaves' (1991) identification of contrived collegiality arose out of a study of teacher collaboration involving several elementary school sites in two school boards situated in southern Ontario. Teachers in these jurisdictions had obtained through collective bargaining significant increases in the amount of preparation time per week (120 minutes). He was interested in discovering the issues, working patterns, and impact on teachers' lives which arose in close collaboration with teaching colleagues. Contrived collegiality is, for Hargreaves, a prescribed model of collaboration:

- that is forced, rather than facilitated, that meets the implementation needs of bureaucratic systems rather than the development needs of teachers and schools, that is designed to be administratively predictable rather than instructionally flexible in its outcomes. (p. 67)

Even when collaboration is teacher directed, we must keep in mind that the relationship is, for most teachers, unfamiliar and potentially threatening. Such experiments in collegiality are, therefore, not without risk (Fullan & Hargreaves, 1991; Little, 1982). Talking candidly about practical concerns without a supportive context can become threatening if such revelations offered by the colleague-observer are used in passing judgment on the teacher's professional competence. There is a tension inherent in professional collegiality between the autonomy of the individual to determine appropriate courses of action and a dependence on the other to receive feedback on selected problems.

Feedback can take many forms. It can involve reinforcement of effective techniques (à la Hunter), providing empathy and other forms of related support such as perspective taking. Feedback can also involve more substantive responses such as making specific suggestions or providing direct assistance. When interdependent collegiality is present, feedback can facilitate teacher thinking on problematic aspects of practice.

Trust is an important feature in collegial relations (Giddens, 1990; Hargreaves, 1994; Little, 1987). According to Giddens (1990):
Trust may be defined as confidence in the reliability of the person or system, regarding a given set of outcomes or events, where that confidence expresses a faith in the probity or love of another, or in the correctness of abstract principles. (p. 34)

Trust develops when there is evidence of interdependence in collegial relations. Trust is displayed by "professional reciprocity" (Little, 1987). While Giddens (1990) points out that risk is in a reciprocal relationship with trust, it is sustained by predictability, professional discourse, equitable responsibilities and obligations (Little, 1987).

Fullan & Hargreaves (1991) talk about two levels of trust: individual trust and trust in processes. When there is trust in the colleague, complemented by a trust in the process which brings them together, the prospects for interdependent colleagueship are good. When the conditions for trust are established, collegiality can provide a salutary influence by enhancing teacher pride in quality instruction and support for the creation of innovative ideas for teaching. McBride and Skau (1995) posit that trust is the foundation of a supervision process which values authenticity, social support, and growth.

There is a growing body of research linking norms of collegiality with teacher development and school improvement. The existence of a strong school culture in which beliefs and values are shared and norms of collegiality and experimentation are present can foster teacher development and promote educational change (Grimmett and Crehan, 1992; Neufeld & Grimmett, 1994). Fullan and Hargreaves (1991) identify the teacher as a critical agent in the change process. Collectively, a growing number of researchers are joining voices in a declaration that a sustained focus on collaborative processes for the continuing development of teachers is the key to educational change (Fullan & Hargreaves, 1992; Sikula, 1996).

SUMMARY

This chapter has provided a review of research on a number of related topics which are of particular interest to this study. The review of literature began with a presentation of research findings on teachers' knowledge. Next, attention was directed to
teacher development, and narrowed to a particular focus on forms of instructional supervision which are indicated as being particularly effective. Finally, the review examined literature on cultures of teaching to demonstrate that certain forms of teacher collaboration can (and do) serve important professional, social, and psychic purposes.

Although there is no consensus on the most effective model for promoting teachers' growth, it can be concluded from the extensive literature available that collaborative processes involving collegial observation, reflective analysis, and feedback on teaching practices can be effective in promoting teacher thinking and development under certain conditions. The survey of literature further suggests that strong forms of collegial relations can promote school reform initiatives, as well as provide psychic rewards to counter the loneliness teachers feel and which validate good practice.

Collaborative practices for the promotion of teacher development can be seen in terms of constraint and opportunity. The constraints which mitigate teacher development are numerous. First, teachers are isolated by the conditions of their work. They remain responsible for their respective classrooms full of students and are not typically available to sit in on colleagues' lessons. Second, there is the legacy of bureaucratic supervision. When teachers equate supervision with evaluation then their individual requirements for growth can come in conflict with system demands for control. Third, there is a pervasive culture of individualism and conservatism in schools. Many teachers are not sufficiently self-confident about how they do their work to risk opening their doors to another colleague. Nonetheless, these constraints can be surmounted when the elements of effective professional development are present. When the relationship emphasizes a form of colleagueship which is supportive, ongoing and purposeful, when there is a focus on the teacher in the classroom, and when there is congruence in the colleagues' desires for change and growth then there arises an excellent opportunity for teacher development.
CHAPTER THREE

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE AND RESEARCH DESIGN

The review of literature in Chapter Two pointed to collaboration and collegiality as potentially fertile concepts for further inquiry into the topic of teacher development. It indicated that making sense of collaborative teacher development involving close collegial relations can be well served by an interpretive research approach employing qualitative case methods.

This chapter is organized into three principal sections. The first section provides an explanation of the theoretical framework supporting the research approach. Some assumptions about what counts as knowledge are explicated in the course of this discussion. These core assumptions undergird the theoretical framework of the research approach. Next, the research problem is presented as a series of three substantive questions for empirical inquiry. The third section of the chapter outlines the research approach. The presentation of the research approach includes the particular discovery methods (procedures) for data collection, the treatment of the data and the analytical procedures for making sense of these data, and the measures taken to ensure the trustworthiness of the research findings. The chapter closes with a summary of the study's methodology.

THE THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The framework employed in this case study relies heavily on the scholarship of George Herbert Mead (1932, 1934, 1938). A professor of philosophy and social psychology at the University of Chicago from 1894 until his death in 1931, Mead’s impact on modern sociological thought was rather restricted during his lifetime as he published only a limited number of essays and articles elaborating his philosophical and social
psychological beliefs. The principal beneficiaries of his great intellect were his colleagues at the university (notably John Dewey and Herbert Blumer) and the graduate students from a wide array of social science disciplines who attended his classes on social psychology. The publication of four posthumous collections of his essays and lectures made Mead’s contributions much more accessible to the world beyond “the Chicago School”, as the University of Chicago came to be known during the early decades of this century.

Although the treatment given to Mead’s social theory is admittedly cursory in this chapter, Mead’s “doctrine” (Pfeutze, 1954) puts forth a coherent set of premises which comprise the theoretical framework for the mentalist perspective adopted for the conduct of this study. In the following discussion, some of the core concepts, assumptions, and origins of Mead’s social theory are elaborated.

Mead’s social theory is outlined in three posthumous volumes: Philosophy of the Present (1932), Mind, Self and Society (1934) and The Philosophy of the Act (1938). His world view is pragmatic and is premised on a number of philosophical beliefs about behaviour, human intellectual development and group life. Charles Morris compiled two of these works and speaks with considerable authority on Mead’s thinking. In the introduction to the 1934 volume, he characterizes Mead’s philosophical position as:

empirical naturalism. . .a naturalism which sees thinking man in nature and which aims to avoid the inherited dualisms of mind and matter, experience and nature, philosophy and science, teleology and mechanism, theory and practice. (1934, p. x)

Mead characterized himself as a social behaviourist and challenged theories of behaviourism which did not account for the mediating influence of social action in determining individual behaviour. As well, he embraced introspection, as opposed to its rejection by many other behaviourists, in his accounting of social action.

Mead’s philosophical stance owes a profound debt to Charles Darwin. Mead embraced Darwin’s (1859) evolutionary theory of nature expressed in On The Origin of
Species and adapted it to his own thinking about the nature of human psychology. Just as Darwin sought to unhinge science from determinism, so too did Mead in his thinking about social behaviourism. Mind, experience and community are explained by Mead in ways which are interactive, complex and evolutionary. He gives special weight to emergence, perspective and process in all social relations. In Mead’s ideal society, communication and other forms of social interaction create opportunities for change and development: both individual and communal. To live in group life is to engage in forms of social interaction in which mental activities are an integral part of the social act. Mead associates reality with human experience.

Mead proposes that humans construct their understanding of their world socially. People are sense-makers. That is, they seek meaning in their lives. When an individual interacts with another person (or persons), there is a dynamic formulation and reformulation of meaning as they engage in a "social act". Joint action is accomplished as individuals orchestrate their behaviour together in some particular way for some specified purpose(s). Social interaction is the arena within which the participants in a social scene construct their roles and responsibilities in order to generate appropriate behaviour to meet desired ends.

The concept of “meaning” is fundamental to an adequate understanding of Mead’s world view. Mead explains that “awareness or consciousness is not necessary for meaning in the process of social experience” (1934, p. 77), nor is meaning the unique domain of humans. It is its symbolic interpretation which is a unique characteristic of humanity. Meaning exists in nature and it is the human mind which alone is capable of its formulation as an idea. Mead situates the emergence of meaning centrally in the dynamic of social intercourse. Meaning arises out of the social act and is mediated by persons as a consequence of their experience.

The formulation of meaning is achieved through an inherently human capacity for symbolization. According to Mead, the use of symbols (including gesture and language)
enables a process of interpretation of meaning. Language comprises ideas and this symbolic translation of experience enables its interpretation. Pfeutze (1954) eloquently and cogently describes the relationship among meaning, language and the self held by Mead in his declaration that: "language is the matrix of mind and meaning" (p. 38). The interpretation of meaning through symbolization is a function of one's life experience.

Mead situates the interpretation of meaning in the social act. Action is the crucible in which meaning arises. "The unit of existence is the act, not the moment" (Mead, 1938, p.65). Thus relationships between people are of crucial significance to the interpretation of meaning. Moreover, people use meaning for specific social purposes. Group membership is symbolic, too, and the influences of time and place affect constructed meaning resulting in its continually remaining in a state of flux. Construction and reconstruction of meaning occur endlessly as a result of one's interactions with oneself, with others, and with one's environment. The meaning one attributes to things is essentially dynamic, rather than static, and always evolutionary.

Meaning is implicit—if not always explicit—in the relationship among the various phases of the social act to which it refers and out of which it develops. And its development takes place in terms of symbolization at the human evolutionary level. (Mead, 1934, p. 76)

According to Mead, there are two necessary parts to the symbolic interpretation of meaning. First, there is self-communication about experience. An individual must identify those things which hold meaning. Second, the person has to do something with the identified meanings from experience. Meaning can be questioned, categorized, changed, or even rejected. It all depends on the social situation and prior experience. To understand the first aspect of symbolic interpretation of meaning, we need to further explore Mead's concept of "self" and the complementary notions of "self-objectification" and "the generalized other". In his elaboration of these concepts, Mead establishes an important relationship between experience and the self which is socially reflexive and ever emergent.
Mead (1934) posits the existence of two "selves" in all people, which he calls the "I" and the "Me". The intercourse between our two selves allows for self-communication about experience to occur. It is a process which Mead calls "reflexivity". Each self plays an essential role in determining individual conduct and each is often in dynamic tension with the other. The existence of a dialectic between the "I" and the "Me" enables the juxtaposition of perceptions whereby contradictions are mediated. The "I", according to Mead, responds to social and environmental influences, while the "Me" is guided by the organized set of values and beliefs which develop in the individual over time through the process of social interaction. When the "I" and the "Me" harmonize, as in the accomplishment of a difficult group task or in a profound religious encounter, there is a "fusion" in the mind and a feeling of elation results.

A second defining characteristic of our humanity, according to Mead, is our ability to perceive ourselves objectively, a process which he calls "self-objectification". In so doing, we are capable of becoming the object of our actions. As a consequence of this ability of our minds, we are able to account for ourselves in relation to our actions. We internalize this perception of ourselves through the "Me". Engaging this mechanism of self-conscious role-playing, we can just as readily be pleased as angry with ourselves as a consequence of our response to external stimuli. Social conditions determine our response.

Mead introduces the notion of "the generalized other" to account for the fuller development of self.

The organized community or social group which gives to the individual his unity of self may be called "the generalized other". The attitude of the generalized other is the attitude of the whole community. (1934, p. 154)

However, it is possible for humans to identify any object--animal, vegetable, or mineral--as "the generalized other", so long as the relationship with the object in question is a social one.
Any thing . . toward which he acts, or to which he responds, socially, is an element in what for him is the generalized other; by taking the attitudes of which toward himself he becomes conscious of himself as an object or individual, and thus develops a self or personality.

A person incorporates the social forces and group expectations into the perceptual lens through the mechanism of self-objectification. It is a learned behaviour which begins in childhood play and games. Role-playing, so important to early childhood development, creates the opportunity for practicing the perception of the self as an object in social situations. Mead asserts that mature human development (the adult self) depends on this.

If the given human individual is to develop a self in the fullest sense, it is not sufficient for him merely to take the attitudes of other[s] toward himself . . . he must also . . . take their attitudes toward the various phases or aspects of the common social activity or set of social undertakings in which, as members . . . they are all engaged, and he must then, by generalizing these individual attitudes . . . act toward different social projects which at any given time it is carrying out, or toward the larger phases of the general social process which constitutes its life. . . (1934, pp. 154-155)

Mead points out that, although humans possess the capacity for self-objectification, it does not happen instantaneously, or necessarily involve reflection.

The making of an individual an object to himself is not found in immediate experience. In immediate experience the introduction of one's self is hampering and embarrassing. In conduct with which readjustment must take place before the act is completed, there is at least a place for such an involution as that of making oneself an object in acting with reference to the environment. (1938, p. 368)

The process of self-objectification serves the further function of selecting appropriate behaviour for the purpose of control over conflict or failure. It can proceed either by trial and error, or by reflection.

Control in intelligent conduct takes place through attentive selection of stimulations. There is no control of the response. Control is secured through the finding and emphasizing of the appropriate stimuli in their relation to the other. (1938, p. 368)

Whether control is accomplished by trial and error repetitions, or by introspection, individuals are uniquely equipped to self-regulate their impulsive reactions to external stimuli. Mead points out that without self-conscious reflection, "the solution of problems [is] by trial and error" (1938, p. 368). While trial and error failures can (and do) train
other animals to select an appropriate response, multiple repetitions of failure are required. Humans alone retain "a memory image" of failure that can be formulated after a single incidence. This image of self in the context of a first incidence of failure provides humans with an adequate evidentiary basis for subsequent readjustment through which control over failure or conflict can be achieved.

In Mead's doctrine reality is essentially and fundamentally social in nature. Understanding the relationships between people is of crucial significance to the interpretation of their constructed reality. Individual behaviour is in a dialectic relationship with the social situation in that what the participants say and do is both determined by and helps shape the social situation. The contextual features of time and place figure prominently, as does self-objectification, in determining social behaviour. Reflection on experience and experimentation with alternate responses to repeated instances of a problematic experience are unique features of human intelligence which serve the function of achieving a measure of control. Thus, human conduct is considered inherently interpretive because of the interaction which takes place between and among the mind, self, and society.

The application of these elements of Mead's social theory to the research approach of this study allows for an analytical description of two teachers' collaborative work together. Understanding their meaning as they engage in social action together can be apprehended and described through a careful examination of what is said and done by them. Their constructed meanings about collaboration and collegiality can be apprehended in terms of what they say and do together, as well as by their reflections about features of their relationship. This, then, is the ultimate utility (and true beauty) of Mead's philosophy. Meaning exists in the real world and is recognized in social acts. Humans are uniquely capable of symbolically interpreting meaning in the form of ideas as they engage in social action. Through a careful analysis of an individual's ideas as
expressed in language and action, their meaning can be apprehended and verified empirically.

THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The research act began with the questioning of some selected aspects of the teachers’ experiences in clinical supervision together. A number of questions were considered, many rejected, and led inductively to the formulation of a substantive problem worthy of empirical inquiry. The review of literature on teacher development, collaborative forms of clinical supervision, and collegiality indicated a compelling area of convergence among the three topics.

Preliminary analysis of the collected data determined that the teachers were actively engaged in a structured form of collaboration in order to pursue their respective aims for professional growth. Over time, the focus of interest narrowed down to three research questions. The common ground for the three research questions is the development of a collegial relationship through ongoing collaboration in clinical supervision.

Three research questions were developed during the preliminary analysis of the data and evolved progressively to become the following:

1. What meanings about collegiality and collaboration do the teachers construct during their relationship?

2. What factors (e.g., beliefs, behaviours, skills, norms) promote or constrain the development of collegiality in close collaboration?

3. What knowledge do the teachers rely on when constructing their meanings about collegiality and collaboration?

The methodology used to pursue these questions is presented in the next section.
THE RESEARCH APPROACH

The focus of this research study is on collaboration and collegiality set in the context of two teachers’ work together in clinical supervision. The search for answers to the three research questions progressed incrementally, but did not follow a linear or singular path. Rather, the analytical approach followed seemed more analogous to the exploration and mapping of two active branches of a great river: each similar and with many common features, but each essentially distinct. The flow of the teachers’ shared experiences in clinical supervision was influenced by a number of different currents, bends, and even a blockage or two to be navigated along the way.

The methodological challenge presented by the research problem was concerned with the matter of deciding how best to apprehend the teachers’ meaning about collaboration and collegiality in a dynamic social situation, as well as to describe and interpret the beliefs, behaviour, knowledge and norms they rely upon to make sense of their experiences together. The nature of the research questions suggested qualitative methods appropriate for interpretive study. Qualitative approaches work best when holistic understanding of social processes is the goal (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984; Wolcott, 1994). By holistic, it is meant that conscientious attention is given to descriptive mapping of the context and social organization in the setting, as well as to capture all aspects of the participants’ social interactions in the conference setting.

A case study approach was taken to address the research problem. As method, it is concerned with acquiring a deep understanding of a particular situation or relationship and its meaning for the participants (Becker, 1968; Merriam, 1988; Stake, 1978, 1996). Situated within the qualitative tradition, case studies emphasize description and explanation. They presume the impossibility of identifying the important features of the situation a priori.
To begin to construct a more comprehensive conceptualization of case study methodology, an explanation of the term ‘case’ is provided by Christensen and Hansen (1987):

a case is a partial, historical, clinical study of a situation...presented in narrative form...it provides data--substantive and process--essential to an analysis of a specific situation. (p. 27)

Case methodology includes specialized techniques for data collection, analysis, and presentation. Merriam (1988) defines a qualitative case study as “an intensive, holistic description and analysis of a bounded phenomenon such a program, an institution, a process, or a social unit” (p. xiv). Case study research proceeds inductively and in a systematic fashion.

In this section of the chapter, the research approach for the case study is explained in detail. The organization of the presentation is in three parts: (i) discovery procedures; (ii) analytical procedures; and (iii) trustworthiness of the findings. The presentation begins with a description of the events comprising the two teachers’ collaborative work in clinical supervision, as well as the procedures and techniques employed to collect relevant data for subsequent analysis. Next, the two analytic procedures employed for interpreting the data are explained. The final sub-section discusses the measures taken to ensure the trustworthiness of the findings and knowledge claims derived from the analysis. Throughout all its phases, the research approach is consistent with qualitative case methodology as outlined by Becker (1968), Kemmis (1983), Merriam (1988), Stake (1978, 1995), Yin (1984), and others.

**Discovery Procedures**

Data collection proceeded incrementally as the participants engaged in a number of reciprocal cycles of clinical supervision. Four rounds of clinical supervision involving Sadie and Mary occurred spanning a two year period. Within each round of the process, there were two cycles. The participants alternated in the roles of colleague-teacher and
colleague-observer (supervisor/coach) with each new cycle of the model. In addition to the colleague-observer, two fieldworkers (another graduate student and myself) were present for all of the observed lessons included in this study. Following the observation (always on the same day), the two teachers held a post-observation (consultative) conference which focused on features of the lesson. Following their post-observation conference, I conducted an interview with each of the teacher participants separately. A detailed description of each of these events is provided in the following sub-sections of this chapter to clarify how the study advanced, who was directly involved, and how the data were generated.

The pre-observation conference. A pre-observation conference constitutes the first phase of the clinical supervision model advocated by Cogan, Goldhammer, and others; however, in the early rounds of this study the participants met only briefly to set the observation date and time. In the first two rounds of clinical supervision, there were no pre-observation conferences held to discuss an observation focus for the visits as the teachers were employing a version of clinical supervision recommended by Madeline Hunter for observing competent teachers. It was understood by the participants that the objective of the post-observation conference was to focus exclusively on positive features of the teacher's instructional practices. The purpose, according to Hunter, was to validate effective instructional practices and thereby encourage more explicit use of these behaviours. Thus, the teachers did not perceive any need to hold a pre-conference.

A change in the teachers' approach occurred mid-point in the study and, as a result, pre-observation conferences were held prior to each of the final four observations (Rounds Three and Four of the series of clinical supervision cycles). No direct data were collected on the time, duration, or content of the pre-observation conferences. Nevertheless, the participants consistently mentioned the identified focus for the colleague-observer in each of the observations during their post-observation conferences.
Other indirect access to the pre-observation conference dialogue was made available during their interviews with me.

*The observation.* Eight lessons were observed for the purposes of the case study. Four lessons per school year were scheduled. In all instances, the teacher responsible for instruction determined the duration of the lesson observation. Most of the time there was a natural break point indicated by the end of the lesson and a transition signaled for the students to change subjects; however, on a couple of occasions, the teacher called an end to the observation while the students were engaged in seatwork related to the lesson we had been watching.

In addition to the colleague-observer, there were two of us from the university in attendance for all lessons. We entered and left the classroom with the colleague-observer. Our visits to the classroom were typically announced to the children in advance. We sat at the back of the room and tried to remain as inconspicuous as possible, as did the colleague-observer. On a few occasions the colleague-observer got up and moved around the room. The selection of a time and date for the visits required greater coordination of schedules because there were four of us implicated. The dates were set collaboratively so that all could be available for the observation.

The colleague-observer always took notes during the observed lesson. In the early rounds of the study, the notes were very extensive. A feature of the Hunter Model of clinical supervision requires the supervisor to “script” the lesson. Although I did not see these notes, I learned of their content when the colleague-observer made reference to them (or literally read aloud from the script) during the post-observation conferences which followed. In the latter rounds, the colleague-observer’s notes were more varied in substance and in format depending on the agreed-upon observational focus which had been selected. In one instance in Round Four, most of the note-taking made by the colleague-observer was on a spontaneously constructed seating plan.
The post-observation (consultative) conference. Following each observed lesson, the two teachers sat down together for a consultative conference. All eight conferences were conducted on the same day as the observation. The location and length of the conference was always at the discretion of the participants, although, there was a consistent pattern of deference to the colleague-observer to take a leadership role. The focus of their conversations held during the early conferences were consistently on “what went well in the lesson”. The colleague-observer typically asked her partner to identify elements of the lesson which has been particularly successful. Following that, the observer reconstructed the lesson from her scripted notes. The conference wrapped up with a summation of the highlights which was supposed to be made by the colleague-observer (according to Hunter); however, this was not consistently the case. As the study progressed, there was much greater conversational content to the conferences. Discussion topics were more varied in Rounds Three and Four and there were more questions asked of the colleague-teacher. The observer frequently shared her observational notes with the teacher-colleague during the consultative conference.

The teachers conducted their consultative conferences in a quiet room chosen by them. A “Do Not Disturb” sign was posted on the door to ensure privacy. A video camera was set up in the conference room and the participants turned it on to “Record” when they were ready to begin their conference. The recording ended when the conference was concluded.

The participant interview. Following every consultative conference, the teacher participants joined me individually for a participant interview. The interviews were conducted in the same room as the consultative conferences and the same precautions were taken to ensure privacy (i.e., the door was closed and a “Do Not Disturb” sign posted outside). The interview was started once the participant had demonstrated she was feeling at ease and following some introductory comments and directions. Each
participant interview was held on the same day as the consultative conference to which it was related. However, in the final round of observations the conferences were lengthier than ever before and it was not always possible to complete the interview in a single session.

Together, the interviewee and I reviewed the videotape recording of the conference which had just been held between the two colleagues. The purpose of this activity was to provide the teachers with opportunities to make further comment on salient features of the conference. We sat side-by-side facing the television monitor and an audiocassette recorder with a microphone was placed in front of us. I provided the participant with a remote control device to stop the video playback at any time she had a comment, question, reflection, or insight to make about any aspect of the conference being reviewed. She was also encouraged to differentiate between thoughts and feelings which arose during the conference (in action) and those arising from her viewing of the playback (on action).

I took care to ensure that the participants remained in control of the procedure. Only after the videotape had been paused by the teacher and initial commentary had been made would I speak. Even then, I restricted my active involvement to open-ended and clarifying questioning, and paraphrasing. Open-ended questions, such as “Tell me more.” “What does that say to you?” were particularly useful in eliciting additional data from the participants during the interview. The teacher always retained possession of the video remote control device and could resume the conference playback at her discretion.

I conducted a total of sixteen interviews with the two teachers. One half of the interviews were held following cycles in which the participants had taught a lesson, while the remaining sessions were conducted following conferences they had led as the colleague-observer of a lesson taught by her partner.
Participant interviews of this nature rely on a technique known as "stimulated recall". Using the video replay to provoke the participant's memory relies primarily on visual references provided by the playback. The procedure employs a "think aloud protocol" (Calderhead, 1990, p. 157) to elicit further commentary about the meaning of interactions recently held. The rationale for stimulated recall was explained to the participants and encouragement given to provide as complete and accurate a picture of the conference setting as possible, thereby reducing the prospect of inaccurate interpretations of the interactions made during the subsequent analyses of the data.

The use of visual stimuli to provoke disclosure of mental processes was first speculated upon by Bloom (1953, cited in Tuckwell, 1980).

A subject may be enabled to relive an original situation with vividness and accuracy if he is presented with a large number of cues which occurred during the original situation. (Tuckwell, 1980, p. 161)

Bloom based his conclusion about memory stimulation to covert recall on tests he conducted with subjects' overt mental processes, wherein he found their recall accuracy to be 95%, if tested within 2 days. Since the advent of videotape recordings, the use of this procedure has become widespread in qualitative research in the areas of medicine and education (Tuckwell, 1980).

Field notes and videotapes. I was responsible for preparing independent field notes of as much of the classroom interactions and verbatim teacher talk as could be captured. The objective in notetaking was to paint a picture of classroom events in words. Teacher and student movements were noted and a plan-view map of the classroom was drawn. Who speaks, what is said, how it is said; who moves, where to, how and when, what precedes and follows the movement; who works, who does not, what is the nature of

10 The stimulated recall protocol presented in this dissertation follows closely the guidelines set forth by Tuckwell (1980).
this work, where, when and how is the work done—these are typical elements in the kind of thick descriptive field notes\textsuperscript{11} taken during each observed lesson.

The field notes taken during each observation provided substantial data on classroom interactions. These notes offered an important secondary source of data for analysis. Given that aspects of the observed lessons provided the basis for most of the teachers' talk in the consultative conferences, routine reference to the field notes was required to provide important contextual understanding for the interpretation of the teachers' meaning during the consultative conferences which followed.

The videotapes of the consultative conferences between the two teachers were also useful raw data and served as reference material during the analytic phase of the study. I reviewed the tapes from time to time when I wanted to observe the non-verbal aspects of a particular exchange between the two teachers in a consultative conference.

\textit{Treatment of the data.} I prepared verbatim transcriptions of all participant interviews from the audiotapes using an audiocassette playback device and a word processor. Each of the transcribed interviews contained the full text of the consultative conferences, as well as the stimulated recall data provided by the participants during the conduct of the follow-up interview. The stimulated recall segments were coded to differentiate them from the source conference data\textsuperscript{12}.

These transcripts generated hundreds of pages of text-based data to analyze. The task of effectively (and efficiently) manipulating these data in the analysis phase of the study was accomplished by a combination of manual and mechanical means.

The Ethnograph (Seidel, Kjolseth & Seymour, 1988) was selected to accomplish the bulk of the mechanical data manipulation. It is a DOS based computer utility program which was developed by a team of sociologists to assist qualitative researchers in the

\begin{footnotes}
\item[11] This technical reference is aptly defined by Erickson (1986) as "writing like crazy" (p. 119).
\item[12] An extract from a sample conference transcript (stimulated recall commentary appears in italics) is provided in Appendix A.
\end{footnotes}
organization and manipulation of their text-based data. The application transforms the file from its word processor format into an ASCII format and assigns line numbers to the entire document. A separate numbered Ethnograph file was created for every participant interview. A wide margin at the right provided for observational notations and category labeling ("coding") during the analytical phases of the research. The utility proved to be an invaluable tool to facilitate a rigorous analysis of the data. The numbered data sets in Ethnograph format became the basis for all subsequent interpretive work.

Summary. The discovery methods and procedures employed to collect and prepare the data for analysis have been explained in this section. They conform closely to widely accepted practices in interpretive research. The methods and procedures used in data collection were designed to be unobtrusive and respect the structure and purposes of clinical supervision. Every effort was taken to ensure that the teachers' integrity and control over the process remained intact.

Table 1 provides a chronological summary of the events and activities which generated the data for analysis. The dates of the events, elements of the data set, and the particular discovery procedures employed are included.

Analytical Procedures

A developmental research sequence recommended by Spradley (1979, 1980) was selected to facilitate answers to the three research questions. First, it provided for an analytical description of the shared experiences of the participants during their collegial interactions in the consultative phase of clinical supervision. Second, it served to identify the factors (e.g., beliefs, behaviours, skills, and norms) which influenced the development of their relationship in the supervisory context. Third, the research sequence enabled an

---

13 An extract from a sample coded transcript of a stimulated recall interview (#3B) conducted with Sadie in Ethnograph-ASCII file format is provided in Appendix B.
examination of the impact of these factors on the participants’ collegial relationship and on each teacher’s practical knowledge of her craft.

Two closely related analytical procedures commonly employed in qualitative research were successively followed as the study progressed. The two procedures progressively organized the data into inclusive conceptual categories. This helped to identify the interactional symbols, comprising gesture and language, which seemed significant in the teachers’ collaborative work. The approach also assisted in clarifying the meanings held by the teachers about collegiality and development through an examination of their beliefs, knowledge, and behaviours in close collaboration. The identification of interactional symbols was key to a theoretically informed interpretation of the data as well as in determining relationships between and among elements of the data.

The first step in Spradley’s (1979, 1980) developmental research process calls for broad scanning of the transcript data to identify as many conceptual categories as possible as part of conducting a preliminary “surface analysis” (Spradley, 1979). As well, evidence of patterns or, conversely, inconsistencies is sought. The identified conceptual categories are the initial analytical units for understanding the teachers’ meanings about collaboration and collegiality, as well as for describing significant features of the teachers’ collaborative work. These conceptual categories are “sensitizing concepts” (Blumer, 1969) which direct further analysis. Some of them may be well formed in the minds of the participants, others are inferences made by the researcher from their gestures and other behaviour evident in the data.

This type of introductory analysis is a form of analytic induction. Analytic induction is widely used in qualitative inquiry as an initial point of entry into the data. It allows for the ongoing development of conceptual categories resulting from a careful reading (i.e., “surface scan” according to Spradley) of the data generated from the observed social situations. Using analytic induction first, I was able to begin to account
TABLE 1

CHRONOLOGICAL SUMMARY OF RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTICIPANT</th>
<th>EVENT</th>
<th>(DATE)</th>
<th>DISCOVERY PROCEDURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sadie</td>
<td>Observation 1A</td>
<td>90.02.21</td>
<td>2 field notes &amp; management scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conference 1A</td>
<td>90.02.21</td>
<td>1 videotape recording</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S/R Interviews 1A/B</td>
<td>90.02.21</td>
<td>2 audio recordings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Observation 1B</td>
<td>90.02.28</td>
<td>2 field notes &amp; management scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conference 1B</td>
<td>90.02.28</td>
<td>1 videotape recording</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S/R Interviews 1C/D</td>
<td>90.02.28</td>
<td>2 audiotape recordings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Round Two**

| Sadie       | Observation 2A | 90.05.23 | 2 field notes & management scores |
|             | Conference 2A | 90.05.23 | 1 videotape recording |
|             | S/R Interviews 2A/B | 90.05.23 | 2 audiotape recordings |
| Mary        | Observation 2B | 90.05.29 | 2 field notes & management scores |
|             | Conference 2B | 90.05.29 | 1 videotape recording |
|             | S/R Interviews 2C/D | 90.05.29 | 2 audiotape recordings |

**Round Three** *(Pre-conferences held prior to both observations)*

| Mary        | Observation 3B | 90.11.01 | 2 field notes & management scores |
|             | Conference 3B | 90.11.01 | 1 videotape recording |
|             | S/R Interviews 3C/D | 90.11.01 | 2 audiotape recordings |
| Sadie       | Observation 3A | 90.11.22 | 2 field notes & management scores |
|             | Conference 3A | 90.11.22 | 1 videotape recording |
|             | S/R Interviews 3A/B | 90.11.22 | 2 audiotape recordings |

**Round Four** *(Pre-conferences held prior to both observations)*

| Sadie       | Observation 4A | 91.02.08 | 2 field notes & management scores |
|             | Conference 4A | 91.02.08 | 1 videotape recording |
|             | S/R Interviews 4A/B | 91.02.08/11 | 2 audiotape recordings |
| Mary        | Observation 4B | 91.02.12 | 2 field notes & management scores |
|             | Conference 4B | 91.02.12 | 1 videotape recording |
|             | S/R Interviews 4C/D | 91.02.12/20 | 2 audiotape recordings |
for significant behaviours in the social scene. Although researcher subjectivity in the analytic phase is something to be concerned about (Lofland, 1971), the generative capability of analytic induction enabled the identification of a substantial number of conceptual categories drawn from the data.

I began the early surface analysis of the conferences and participant interviews as they were being transcribed at the computer and continued in the same vein for a long time thereafter. I assigned a unique cover term to each new sensitizing concept and noted it directly on the transcript copy. The cover terms were subsequently entered into the Ethnograph program and tagged to a range of numbered transcript lines using “code words”. Code words are nothing more than an abbreviation of the selected cover term. Coding the data during the surface analysis served the purpose of indexing segments of transcript data which seemed noteworthy.

Spradley observes that the initial surface analysis helps to establish the researcher’s relationship with the data. In this case study, a number of significant beliefs were revealed to me by the teachers’ conversations in the early period of their relationship. The meaning held by each of them on the sensitizing concepts of “role”, “relationship”, and “teacher development” were all very instructive in my emerging understanding of their interactions. Interconnections between and among these concepts were developing in the minds of Sadie and Mary. Their categorization during the surface analysis helped me to map the norms of collaboration they were creating in their conferences and served to clarify the teachers’ meaning about each of them.

By way of further example, the teachers demonstrated an early preoccupation with positive and negative influences on their developing collegial relationship. In such instances, the code word “posineg” was used to map the segments in the transcripts where they surfaced. As the analysis progressed, the sensitizing concept of “posineg” was reformulated into more precise conceptual categories reflecting its discordant elements. Out of “posineg” arose the conceptual categories of “evaluation” and “colleagueship”. In
the minds of the teachers, the attributes of “evaluation” are wholly negative in orientation and militate against the development of collegial relations. While each of the teachers was concerned with its spectre in their joint work, they explored a variety of ways and means to address “evaluation” and achieve “colleagueship”. This exploration began separately and privately. Then, over time, they began to “bring it onto the table”, if only indirectly through their behaviour. Additional concepts, such as “fun” and “flow”, were noted as possessing positive attributes and seemed affiliated with colleagueship. They, too, stood in opposition to evaluation.

As my surface analysis proceeded, the Ethnograph program proved invaluable in taking the analysis to higher levels of refinement. A feature of the software program which assisted the identification (and subsequent comparison) of analytic units is its word search capability: either directly from the teacher talk, or from the code words tagged to sections of the numbered data sets. It enabled me to make ongoing comparisons between and among instances of coded concepts in the numbered data sets. It also allowed for a means of verifying the affiliation of newly identified instances of a sensitizing concept with pre-established occurrences drawn from other segments coded into the data sets. As a result, I modified conceptual categories and added new ones as required.

I introduced a more objective method of analysis as data sets accumulated and instances of categories appeared recurrently. I began a comparative content analysis of the sensitizing concepts identified in the conference transcripts following the completion of the fourth (and final) round of observations and collegial consultations. This procedure, commonly referred to as “constant comparison”, was developed initially by Glaser and Strauss (1967). It has received considerable attention since then (Denzin and Lincoln, 1994; Glaser, 1978; Strauss, 1987; Strauss and Corbin, 1990) and is now widely employed in interpretive research.

The analytic strategy of constant comparison is a closely related procedure to analytic induction in that it is highly inductive and generative in nature. It is, nevertheless,
differentiable from analytic induction in two important ways. Goetz and LeCompte (1984) differentiate analytic schemes commonly employed in qualitative research according to their assumptive modes. Constant comparison is a procedure which is both more objective and enumerative than analytic induction. Constant comparison mitigates some of the subjectivity inherent in analytical induction by virtue of its emphasis on comparing the internal coherence of sensitizing concepts which appear similar. The constant comparison procedure demands there be a continuous feedback loop of instances illustrating the identified categories of meaning.

Constant comparison enabled me to develop further the set of conceptual categories coded during the initial surface analysis of the data sets. During this subsequent phase of the analysis, a number of existing conceptual categories were refined and, in some instances, redefined. As coded transcript data accumulated, the method enabled a higher level of objectivity in the analysis because of its requirement to compare (and contrast) the identified sensitizing concepts across categories appearing in different social situations.

Table 2 lists the conceptual categories which were identified by the analysis at this stage of the research project. Some of the concepts are self-evident from what the teachers are saying, or doing. Others, however, are inferences which I made as a result of my analysis of what is being said, or done. Each conceptual category was assigned a code word which was used as a tag to demarcate appropriate sections of the transcript data.

**Trustworthiness of the Findings**

The term “trustworthiness” (Guba, 1981) has become common parlance among qualitative researchers. It embraces both “credibility” (i.e., validity and reliability) and “transferability” (i.e., generalizability) of the research findings, or knowledge claims, generated by empirical research emphasizing naturalistic approaches. These are substantive methodological concerns regardless of the research approach adopted,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE WORD</th>
<th>CONCEPTUAL CATEGORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belief</td>
<td>Belief statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Lang</td>
<td>Body language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern</td>
<td>Collegial concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Control (in class or conference)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Direct instruction/prescriptive teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluat</td>
<td>Evaluation (of students or the colleague)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow</td>
<td>Flow of the collaborative conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fun</td>
<td>Fun or humour in teaching or relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Focus of the observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn</td>
<td>Learning (student or teacher)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>Clinical supervision/reflective conferencing [sic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note</td>
<td>Notetaking (in conference)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Stating objective, intent, or purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particip</td>
<td>Active participation (student or teacher)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>Personal history disclosed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praise</td>
<td>Colleagial praise given or sought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probe</td>
<td>Probing of alternate teaching strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Questioning strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflect</td>
<td>Reflection, reflective thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relation</td>
<td>Relationship between colleagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>References to role (ideal and actual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>Stimulated recall excerpt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Structure of lesson or conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>References to students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Dev</td>
<td>Discussion of teacher development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Time factors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
requiring care and attention in all phases of the inquiry. The unique problem for qualitative inquiry is that these issues are not accounted for *a priori*.

Guba and Lincoln (1981) identify four dimensions for determining the trustworthiness of qualitatively derived findings. They are: truth value, applicability, replicability, and bias. Each dimension can be framed as a question to be addressed in determining the trustworthiness of a piece of qualitative research. Are the findings truthful? Are the findings applicable to another similar social situation? Would the findings be consistent if one were to replicate the research design at another time? Are the findings untainted by the biases of the researcher?

Blumer (1969) adds further methodological insight into the notion of trustworthiness. A protégé of Mead, whose work provides the theoretical perspective guiding this study, Blumer points out that "empirical science is an enterprise that seeks to develop images and conceptions that can successfully handle and accommodate the resistance offered by the empirical world under study" (pp. 22-23), while cautioning that interpretation of the data "has to fit the obdurate character of the empirical world" (p. 24). The adequacy of the "fit" provides an important measure of the trustworthiness of the knowledge claims made. In other words, a credible interpretation must be suggestive of the characteristic relations discovered among aspects of the data.

The remainder of this section provides an account of the measures taken to ensure the trustworthiness of the study's findings. The issue of credibility (validity and reliability) is addressed first, followed by a discussion of transferability (generalizability) of knowledge claims in social scientific inquiry.

_Credibility (validity and reliability)._ The term "credibility" (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984; Lincoln & Guba, 1985) is the equivalent in naturalistic research of the terms validity and reliability used in quantitatively-derived research findings. A qualitative study can ensure credible findings through careful attention to its methodology at all stages of the research process: from initial entry into the field through to the writing phase.
An important condition for ensuring credibility is the degree to which the participants and the setting match the goals of the research (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984). The selected subjects must be typical of the larger population and the process or setting must be appropriate to the purposes of the study. The rationale can be based on "theoretical significance, empirical uniqueness, or simple convenience" (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984, p. 238), but it must be convincing.

Sadie and Mary are assumed to be reasonably typical teachers. They possess many years of practical experience and exceed the minimum professional qualifications for their profession. The social scene of collaboration, involving observations and consultative conferences together, is however somewhat atypical for their population. It is, nevertheless, appropriate to the purposes of the study given the topical interest in teacher development and collegiality.

The credibility of some knowledge claims arising out of case study research can be affected by the role assumed by the researcher (Geertz, 1973; Goetz & LeCompte, 1984; Wilson, 1977), especially when the study requires focused data collection (Erickson, 1977). The researcher should take care to acquire the necessary skills and experience to be able to collect appropriate data for the purposes of the study. In order to understand the behaviour of the subjects in a particular social situation, the researcher must have an “understanding [of] the framework within which the subjects interpret their thoughts, feelings, and actions.” (Wilson, 1977, p. 249, emphasis in the original). I possess 16 years teaching and administrative experience in public and private schools in three Canadian provinces. For the latter 13 years I have been working as an elementary principal. Although I cannot “know” their individual professional experience, I can reasonably lay claim to a thorough professional understanding of both the elementary school setting in which the teachers work and of clinical supervision as a framework for collegially supported professional development.
Through the provision of detailed information on research design specifying the
categories of data, as well as the methods for data collection and analysis (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984), the credibility of a study's knowledge claims is also enhanced. Clearly labeled conceptual categories and other units of analysis should be presented in language which follows recognized conventions for description. Many of the conceptual categories employed in the present research are wholly consistent with terminology drawn from the research literature on the topics of collegiality and teacher development.

The credibility of the findings is also enhanced by the application of successive analytic procedures. In this case study, I began with analytic induction to identify a number of initial conceptual categories. As a form of theorizing, the power of analytic induction is limited due to its reliance upon inductive reasoning and its high level of subjectivity (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984; Hammersley & Atkinson, 1983). A higher level of objective interpretation was achieved by the application of the constant comparison procedure subsequently to test the applicability of the conceptual categories at different times. By testing the internal coherence of the identified conceptual categories over time, they can be considered to be more stable.

Finally, credible knowledge claims can be assured by utilizing multiple data sources and collection methods. The use of a variety of discovery procedures for generating appropriate data from various vantage points, methods, or sources, helps to ensure that an accurate portrayal of the cultural scene emerges. Such techniques enable "triangulation" (Webb, Campbell, Schwartz & Sechrest, 1966) of the study's findings.

Triangulation methods were developed partially in response to criticisms of the stability of data generated for analysis in much qualitative work. The argument proposes that deriving an adequate analytical description of a selected social phenomenon should be based on more than a single perspective, method, or data source.

Triangulation is a method comprising three substantive techniques (Denzin, 1989; Mathison, 1988). They are: (1) data triangulation; (2) investigator triangulation; and (3)
methodological triangulation. Triangulation techniques allow for testing inferences from three distinct sources, perspectives, or means. The capacity to examine some phenomenon of interest in the data from multiple vantage points improves the methodological rigor of the research approach and, thereby, raises the credibility of the findings. In practice, qualitative researchers tend to use only one triangulation technique in any given research project because inferences can be somewhat inter-related, depending on the selected discovery procedures.

Data triangulation was the primary method to obtain credible findings in this case study. It is a fairly self-evident procedure involving the collection of data on a social phenomenon under study from three distinct sources. Data triangulation was viable in this study because of access to multiple data sources. The interpretation of constructed meaning was made credible by triangulating social phenomena emerging out of the consultative conferences with data from the thick descriptive observation field notes and/or from the stimulated recall interviews held with each of the participants. My lesson observation field notes and each of the teachers' reflective commentaries during the stimulated recall interview provided distinct or separate perspectives for interpreting the social scene.

Denzin (1989) also stresses the importance of time and space in data triangulation. He argues that the credibility of a researcher's knowledge claims is stronger when the data are collected incrementally over a protracted period of time and in multiple contexts. In this case study, the period of engagement continued over two consecutive school years and data were collected in classroom and conference settings. In addition, a form of data triangulation occurred during the stimulated recall sessions. There were three perspectives gained during each of the stimulated recall interviews. By interviewing each of the participants separately about their conferences held jointly, data were collected on both participants' thoughts and observations about the consultative conferences. As the second participant to all interviews, I was able to corroborate individual perceptions.
Transferability (generalizability). The issue of transferability (generalizability) continues to be a contentious one in all social science research (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1990; Eisner & Peshkin, 1990; Erickson, 1986; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Zumwalt, 1982). Part of the controversy has centred on the unthinking (or misinformed) application of traditional, or hypothetico-deductive, notions of generalization to interpretive research studies of human interaction. A second issue attends to the standards established for its determination. These are issues of criteria and method, respectively.

The ideal of traditional views from the natural sciences on generalizability is to be able to strip away the particulars of time and place in order to reveal the underlying laws of cause and effect on some phenomenon or object. The application of this ideal to social scientific research has proven to be very problematic and many methodologists now assert its inappropriateness (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994; Donmoyer, 1990; Eisner & Peshkin, 1990).

The theoretical framework for this study underscores the difficulty of transference from the natural to the social sciences. Understanding social behaviour, according to Mead, is premised on a belief that humans understand their world cognitively through a dynamic interpretation of meanings. Context, temporal considerations and the vagaries of human behaviour must be accounted for and do not conform to any universal laws of cause and effect. Zumwalt (1982) suggests that attempts to generalize about teaching and learning are inappropriate and reminds us of Guba's (1980) assertion that "it is virtually impossible to imagine any human behavior which is not mediated by the context in which it occurs" (p. 235).

In the void left by the imponderability of context-free generalizations being applied to findings derived from social science research, Lincoln and Guba (1985) offer the notion of "transferability" as a naturalistic alternative. The onus shifts, according to these methodologists, from the researcher to the consumer. They suggest that ultimately it is left to the reader of interpretive research to determine the "fittingness" or degree of
similarity, of the context reported on with other settings with which the reader has a degree of familiarity. They offer the following premise about transferability:

The degree of transferability is a direct function of the similarity between the two contexts, what we call “fittingness”. Fittingness is defined as the degree of congruence between sending and receiving contexts. If Context A and Context B are sufficiently congruent, then working hypotheses from the sending originating context may be applicable in the receiving context. (Lincoln and Guba, 1985, p. 124)

Donmoyer (1990) addresses the matter of transferability in the specific situation of case study research. In his treatment of the issue, Donmoyer is prepared to go further than Guba and Lincoln on the matter of similarity of contexts for transferability to be achieved. He suggests that a case study, richly presented, allows the reader the opportunity to engage in a vicarious experience which has three distinct benefits. They are: “accessibility”, “seeing through the researcher’s eyes”; and “decreased defensiveness”.

Clearly, Donmoyer is alluding to establishing a personal connection between the reality of the case study and that of the reader: accessing the reader’s personal knowledge. If the two synchronize, the test of transferability has been met.

Goetz and LeCompte (1984) acknowledge that traditional notions of generalizability cannot apply to qualitative research findings. These scholars address the problem somewhat differently from Donmoyer. Their approach is closer to that offered by Guba and Lincoln mentioned above. Goetz and LeCompte offer the notions of “comparability and translatability” (p. 9) as being essential features of qualitative knowledge claims. These two related concepts apply to context and conclusions. They posit that the transferability of research can be enhanced when there is congruence between a given study’s findings and conclusions with previous work. There is, in their terminology, a measure of comparability and translatability. The use of widely accepted terminology and commonly employed analytical support the “transference” of findings to similar groups, or situations.
SUMMARY

The methodology outlined in this chapter has been developed to respect widely accepted principles of interpretive social scientific research. The methodology is pragmatic and realistic. While it is derived from and supported by the epistemology and social doctrine of George Herbert Mead, the research approach has also been informed by contemporary interpretive methodologists such as Spradley, Glaser and Strauss, Goetz and LeCompte, Hammersley and Atkinson, and Denzin, among others.

Discovery procedures for data collection were determined, in part, by the research problem and, in part, by the social setting of the collaborative conferences agreed upon by the two participants. The two primary discovery procedures employed in this study were observation and interview. The theoretical perspective adopted for the study directed me to seek access into the teachers’ thinking through careful examination of their social interaction in conferences together and with me about their shared experiences in clinical supervision. The meanings each teacher ascribed to the study’s topical interests in collaboration, collegiality and development was there to be discovered in their conferences together.

Two related analytical procedures were successively applied to work with the collected data. Initially, a number of conceptual categories were devised to begin organizing the data into a more meaningful chunks. Subsequently, these concepts were recursively examined following the period of the engagement in order to develop a number of interactional symbols of meaning which the teachers constructed to make sense of their collaborative experiences together. These interactional symbols are, in part, tacit and learned in the social context of close collaboration. They are used by the teachers to interpret their shared experiences and to generate appropriate behaviours for their desired ends.

The research approach enabled a theoretically-informed interpretation of the teachers’ collegial consultations. The methodology accomplished its purpose of attending
to the research problem and providing an analytic description of the meanings constructed by the two teacher participants about collegiality and collaboration. The presentation of the research findings in the next chapter provides a portrait of collaboratively supported teacher development in which collegiality plays an important role.

Generalizations from case studies should be undertaken with caution, if at all. We need to be mindful of the significance of the many factors particular to the present situation in order to determine the transferability of the findings presented in the next chapter. The onus lies with the reader to ascertain if the features of the social setting, the process followed, and the participants within it are sufficiently familiar for extrapolation beyond the present context. Nonetheless, the situation and teachers described in this case study are considered to be typical. Therefore, the reader is encouraged to view the discussion in Chapter Four as an interpretive case study of teacher development: one which may be fairly representative of the larger population.
CHAPTER FOUR

INSIGHTS ABOUT COLLABORATIVELY SUPPORTED TEACHER DEVELOPMENT

The focus of this study is on teacher development and collegiality through a structured form of teacher collaboration. The presentation of the findings in this chapter tracks the efforts of two teacher colleagues working together to develop their own teaching practices, as well as their clinical observation and consultative skills. They entered into the relationship agreeing to work together using a model of staff development commonly known in the profession as clinical supervision. Their joint work in clinical supervision over two school years provided extensive data for an analytical description and interpretation of their interactions focusing on collaboration and collegiality. The study revealed a number of insights about collaboratively supported teacher development employing clinical supervision as a framework for structuring the collegial relationship.

Understanding the social scene was achieved by means of an interpretive process which identified a number of significant conceptual categories of meaning. The analytical procedures enabled a description and interpretation of the teachers’ respective beliefs, behaviour, and knowledge which surfaced during their collaborative work. Of particular interest to this study were the factors influencing the teachers’ relationship in the practice of clinical supervision and their respective meanings about collaboration and collegiality. The knowledge that each teacher used for making meaning of her experience, although similar to that used by her colleague, was not the same, neither were their associated beliefs and behaviour. The conditions for each teacher’s development were, as a result, distinct in some key respects.

In this report, a narrative form of presentation has been employed. This form relies heavily on Sadie and Mary to describe and interpret the social scene in their own
words. The style of the presentation is akin to a "realist tale" (Van Maanen, 1988), in which the telling of much of the story through the participants' voices strikes a balance between autobiographical and analytical description. The knowledge claims presented in the chapter are derived solely from the data collected during the study period and are supported by direct quotations from the participants. As a result, the presentation is grounded in and supported by the beliefs, behaviours, and meanings constructed by the participating teachers. In doing so, the research questions identified in Chapter Three are addressed.

There are three principal parts to this chapter. The first section presents, in chronological fashion, the teachers' efforts to develop a functional model of clinical supervision in order to achieve their respective aims and purposes. Changes to the model are noted over time and there is a commensurate evolution in the teachers' beliefs and behaviours as they construct new norms. The second section focuses on the development of a collegial relationship and provides a number of insights about factors which had an impact on the teachers' efforts to support each other's growth. The teachers identify a number of beliefs and behaviours which served to promote or, conversely, impede the construction of new meanings about collaboration, collegially supported professional development, and about collegiality itself. The third section draws out the craft knowledge which emerged in the context of their collaborative relationship. Craft knowledge developed over time and with practical experience as the teachers engaged in continuing negotiations on the co-construction of their model of clinical supervision. Through successful experiences in the evolving process, the teachers gained greater confidence in their craft knowledge. In turn, they used their craft knowledge to achieve a deeper understanding of clinical supervision: its structure, purpose and power as a model of staff development.
DEVELOPING A FUNCTIONAL MODEL OF CLINICAL SUPERVISION

This part of the story deals with the rejection of a formulaic model of supervisory practice and behaviour, bound tightly by its prescriptive structure, in favour of a “made at home” model in which the teachers' image of themselves as teachers and colleagues can find fuller expression. The teachers’ notion of clinical supervision, its form and function, evolved over time as they gained experience (and insight) taking turns observing each other work, giving feedback, and striving for a deeper understanding of their craft and of collegiality.

Sadie was a full-time classroom teacher of grade 5 for both school years covered by the case study. Mary was a part-time classroom teacher of grade 6 and the school’s vice-principal. Both teachers had many years of experience in teaching at the Intermediate level. Their school had a student population of approximately 400 students and was situated in a residential suburb of metropolitan Vancouver. The teachers’ classes were composed of predominantly English-speaking students, although there were both English as a second-language and special needs students integrated into the class groupings. The only other noteworthy feature of the teachers’ classes was that Sadie’s second year class was, by her own admission, the most challenging group in her career.

Both teachers entered into the relationship as relative neophytes in instructional supervision, especially in the clinical observation of teaching and providing analytical feedback for reflection. Mary had some limited prior experience in supervision in her capacity as vice principal and so it was decided that she would observe the first lesson then lead the ensuing conference. Sadie, on the other hand, had no previous experience in conducting clinical observations of teaching, or in leading post-observation conferences with another teacher. Based on the strength of her previous experience in clinical supervision and her training as vice principal, Mary established a framework for the process at the outset.
They were both motivated to collaborate together to help one another grow professionally and to improve their own supervisory skills. Mary spoke about this at the beginning of the study:

I think Sadie is my reason for going into this [project]. She has aspirations to be an administrator. And I said to her that this would be wonderful to do together because of the potential value for an administrator--for the evaluation of teachers, and supervision, and whatever you want to call it. It's all there! (SR1B-MAM, p. 22)

However, it was evident (and natural) that the two colleagues had not come to any deep (or shared) understandings about the mechanics and purposes of clinical supervision. They had a sense of what is was and what it was not. “It’s important that it isn’t evaluation. It’s more [a form of] of development of teaching--professional development” (SR1A-MAM, p. 4).

Sadie formulated her motivation to become involved in the research project in the following way:

to improve my teaching and to be able to help somebody else as a fellow teacher. . . how to communicate more effectively with somebody about certain techniques and certain aspects of instruction. (SR1A-SC, p. 18)

Sadie confirmed to me her understanding of the mechanics of the model they were using for the clinical supervision cycle. Mary would observe her teach a lesson and take extensive observational notes (which she referred to as “scripting” the lesson) during the observation. Then, in a post-observation conference together, Mary would provide her with feedback on the lesson. The focus of the conference would be to reinforce positive aspects of the lesson. Critical discussion about problems of practice and negative references about instructional effectiveness were prohibited.

Mary set an agenda for their first conference right at the outset.

I am going to outline two parts to this conference. One part is that, ah, I'm going to ask you some questions about your lesson. And the second part is that I'm going to take the time to reinforce a particular skill that I noticed this morning. (Conference 1A, p. 1)
The colleague-observer had primary responsibility for the conduct and direction of the conference.

The lesson Sadie selected for us to observe was on geometry. Her objectives for the lesson were for the students to “become familiar with the terminology, that they understand what it [each term] meant, and that they were actually able to give the examples of the geometric concepts that we were defining.” She wanted, as well, to be “deliberately precise with the terminology” (Conference 1A-SC, p. 1)

Sadie holds a Masters degree in mathematics and was experimenting with a new approach to teaching three-dimensional shapes.

Well, I was trying to figure out how to use something other than the blackboard because geometry actually is a three-dimensional topic. And if you’re using the blackboard all the time, then they had a construct that is really only two-dimensional and don’t have any idea that [the shapes are] actually three-dimensional. So that’s why I thought, “Well, OK, we’ll try a string and pins.” But I don’t know how successful it was. [And] I wanted them to understand that it can actually be anywhere in space. (Conference 1A-SC, p. 2)

Mary took extensive notes during observation. Reliance on the observational notes in conference together also set limits in their emergent relationship.

Yeah, she had decided that that she was going to script it [the lesson] all and then explain to me some of the observations she had scripted. (SR1A-SC, p. 17)

In stimulated recall with me following their first post-observation conference, Mary made a few clarifying comments about her perceptions of her role as colleague-observer in clinical supervision, as well as identify some areas of uncertainty:

I wanted to be responsive, but I wasn’t sure if I should be acknowledging every statement she made. I took notes because I wanted to keep track of the things she said. And I wanted to value what she was saying and prove to her they were her concerns. But I wanted to keep eye contact, as well. . .but I don’t know if I would take the notes again for next time. I’m not sure. (SR1A-MAM, p. 2)

Yet when Mary asked Sadie to comment on any positive aspects of the lesson, Sadie indicated following an expressive sigh and soft laughter. "Positives? I could give a few negatives" (Conference 1A, p. 2). In response, Mary emphatically declared, "No!"
She would have nothing to do with it. Nevertheless, Sadie explained that she had been struggling with her reliance on teaching geometry, "a three-dimensional topic using the blackboard all the time" (Conference 1A, p. 2). Mary chose not to venture into a joint exploration of Sadie's issue. Rather, she responded by asking if there was "anything else?" (i.e., positive aspects of the lesson) which Sadie might wish to comment on. Sadie responded candidly that she "forgot to sum up [at the end of the lesson]" (Conference 1A, p. 3). Again, Mary avoided engaging Sadie about her concern by asking if there was "Anything else?" to which Sadie answered, "That's about all I can think of" (p. 3).

As we reviewed the conference videotape together in stimulated recall replaying this exchange between the two colleagues, Mary lunged to the pause button and took time to clarify her agenda to me:

See there! I wanted positives, but she really badly wanted to talk about negatives. And I really didn't want her to do that. I would do it [the same way] again knowing about the positives, to really reaffirm the image that in there I'm picking up the good [aspects of the lesson]. I don't want her to go sidetracking, or any teacher I'd work with, into the negatives. I believe it defeats the purpose. I think that setting the tone [of the collegial relationship], I wouldn't let her go into the negative... it would have taken away from the main objective of the conference... I basically wanted to start out with reinforcement of what's good in the lesson and to begin to work on strengths. (SR1A-MAM, pp. 3-4)

Mary had effectively established her control over the conference--its direction and its tone--early on with her insistence that Sadie provide some initial comments on effective aspects of the lesson. In effect, Mary's perseverance on attending exclusively to what went well in the lesson served as a conversation stopper for Sadie. Sadie's interest in exploring some problematic aspects of the lesson had been left untouched.

Sadie then made a few cursory observations on student understanding of terminology and concepts, concluding with an observation that she felt she had accomplished the objectives she had set out for the lesson. From that point on in the conference, Mary dominated the talking in the conference with an analysis of the lesson as she reviewed her observation notes.
Mary systematically reconstructed the events of the observed lesson from her detailed notes. The feedback was provided in a chronological fashion and was interspersed with praise for effective elements. The conference was explicitly structured by Mary to provide Sadie with positive feedback about features of her lesson. Some examples from the transcript (Conference 1A) include:

[the students] were right with you! (p. 6). . . the length [of the lesson] I felt was appropriate (p. 9). . . I don’t think you lost anyone in the lesson . . . the transfer was really good, from what you taught to the transfer to the board (p. 10). . . your questioning techniques were very good (p. 11). . . You did good feedback. If they didn’t get it, you explained for everybody. . . you definitely met your objective which you [had] stated at the beginning [of the lesson] (p. 12). . . I was really impressed! (p. 13). . . you were really successful, and your lesson [plan] was obvious. I mean you met your objectives. . . You were good! (p. 15)

On occasion, Mary’s praise had a directive component to it, as in the following comment, “So you met the objective right there [in the lesson]. I’d like you to continue doing this, you know, kind of style to your lessons because it’s meaningful for the children.” (Conference 1A, p. 11)

Sadie did not interject very much during Mary’s feedback presentation and, as a result, there was virtually no substantive dialogue between the two colleagues during the first conference. Throughout the entire session together, Mary actively invited Sadie to comment only two times. The first occurrence was at the beginning of the conference after outlining the way she wanted the conference to go:

I want you to think about your lesson and describe some of the instructional skills that you felt went well, or were reflected this morning. (Conference 1A, p. 1)

The second time she invited commentary from Sadie came up at the end of the conference:

Now, to see if I did a decent job in reinforcing you in this conference, could you please do me a favour by telling me what still is effective? Summarize what you have just heard? (Conference 1A, p. 13)

As to whether she found the approach taken by Mary insightful, Sadie answered succinctly, "Yes", while noting that Mary’s approach was “business-like and. . . perhaps a
Sadie accounted for her lack of active involvement in the following way:

If I don’t interject all the time then that’s because I’m listening to her perceptions of that, or whatnot, and trying to figure out how it looked from somebody else’s point of view. (p. 17)

Sadie’s explanation about her lack of active participation in the conference is both clear and cogent. She explained that to have interjected Mary’s résumé would have broken the thread of her recapitulation of the lesson. Hearing about her lesson from another point of view was sufficient for Sadie’s development in the first round.

Following her first experience in clinical supervision with Mary, Sadie admitted to a certain discomfort. She described her in-class behaviour while being observed by Mary as “a little stilted”. Later in an interview with me, she expressed some of her feelings about her recent experience in having been observed. “I guess when anybody is observing you then you sort of take it as evaluation; whether it's informal, or formal, it's a little unnerving” (SR1A-SC, p. 17).

The implication of evaluation was assumed by Sadie to be a feature of the process and this influenced her ability to feel comfortable when a colleague was present in her classroom. As to what she meant about evaluation, Sadie elaborated on her meaning:

Evaluative in the sense that I would use it and it wouldn't go any further than that. I mean I’m not thinking of it as evaluative in the sense that a report would be written up... it's a personal evaluation that we share between the two of us, so that she's coaching me and I'm coaching her. Only in that sense. (p. 18)

When the two colleagues exchanged roles a week later, Sadie began their conference together with a similar statement of intent:

What I plan to do in this conference is, first of all, I would like to hear your point of view about positive aspects of the lesson. And after we’ve been through that, and thought about it for a little bit, I would like to give you my observations of the skills that I think you exhibited particularly well throughout the lesson. (Conference 1B, p. 1)

Mary had invited us to observe a Language Arts lesson on the identification of nouns. The class had been working through a grammar unit on the parts of speech and
this particular lesson formed a segment in Mary’s unit plan. The observation lasted well over an hour (considerably longer than Sadie’s observed lesson the previous week). Mary employed a discovery learning approach which required the students to recognize nouns in expository writing. They constructed word lists of nouns found in the text following a set of word attributes they developed in small cooperative work groups. Mary used a “thumbs up, thumbs down”, or “dip-sticking”, strategy to keep active student participation at a high level.

Hearing references to “scripting” and “dip sticking” made by the teachers, I had begun to speculate privately that Hunter’s views on instructional supervision might have had something to do with the structure and focus that Mary had introduced for the pair to follow in the first cycles. They had both referred to writing observational notes as “scripting” a lesson: a Hunter expression for note-taking. “Dip sticking” is another term used by Hunter to ascertain student comprehension. When I asked Sadie if there was any relationship, she confirmed that the model of clinical supervision they were practicing was derived from Hunter (and other sources, too).

Yeah, in some ways—the underlying structure, the flow of the conference, the pulling out of the positive. . .What else? Oh yeah, the reinforcement of just the positive, the dip-sticking, the checking for [understanding]. “Is this what you said? Did I hear you say...? You’re not just a...” Those kinds of things. (SR1B-SC, p. 11)

Sadie also commented on Madeline Hunter’s approach to teaching, as well as it influence on practice. She had formulated a number of opinions on its relative merits, too.
Madeline Hunter is an educational leader that does a lot of conferences on various different aspects that are supposed to be in your lesson: motivation, attention, reinforcement, and those kind of things. She has a lot of gimmicky strategies that you can employ and one of them is the “thumbs up, thumbs down, thumbs sideways” signal which you call “dip sticking”. And I guess every district has been Madeline Hunterized at one time, or another (Sadie laughs). I think I probably use some of it, but I don’t do it in a very direct and conscious way. I find that some of her material is just too structured—and actually this is a real bias of mine—but it puts down the teacher, rather than giving you the sense that the judgments [you make] are your own. I guess its too prescriptive. You know? “This is the way it should be done.” The books that she produces [are] like manuals. You know? You read, “This is what the teacher says . . . This is what the teacher does . . . This is what your response should be: a, b, c, or d.” And I’m not really a big fan of that kind of thing. But she has some really good ideas about how to get the kids attention right off the bat when they come into the classroom. She’s very big on time management and making sure that when they come in the classroom, they’re actively involved from the moment they set foot in the door. (SR 1B-SC, p. 10)

During their conference following the observation, Mary had a lot to say about her lesson. Whenever prompted by Sadie, she was able to reflect on aspects of importance to her. The résumé touched on the objective, strategies for concept attainment, student participation and active learning, transitions between segments and the overall length of the lesson. At one point in the conference, Mary worried that the lesson had gone on for too long a period of time. She had spent some time discussing her interest in keeping the class actively involved and how she knew that the students were with her. Sadie acknowledged Mary’s concern and responded in a supportive fashion:

Yes, it was a long time. But I felt they were actively involved for the entire time. I looked around for students who were tuning out, but they—except for Michael and perhaps a little blond haired boy—it looked like everybody was involved. (Conference 1B, p. 12)

Mary expressed gratitude that her partner had noticed the blond haired boy named Shawn. It served to prompt Mary to discuss her concerns about the student.

Mary’s sentiments about the conference were effusive when, at its conclusion, she laughingly commented: “It was great! It was fun! I enjoyed it! That’s it?” (Conference 1B, p. 14). For her part, Sadie was reasonably satisfied with her first attempt at leading a consultative conference and, in so doing, making some positive steps in establishing their collegial relationship.
I thought I accomplished the main things I wanted to do and I think I was able to elicit from her lesson the key points she was trying to work on... and I think the conference flowed reasonably well. I hope that by the time she came out of it, she felt reasonably positive about it and [that] she feels confident enough to continue working on the aspects that she set out to work on...it went quite well. (SR1B-SC, p. 19)

Round Two of reciprocal cycles of clinical supervision got underway three months later, in the Spring of the same school year. Again, Sadie was the first to be observed and this time she selected a Language Arts lesson for the observation. Her objective was “to illustrate [a] fairy tale fantasy and elicit from [the students] the elements of it” (Conference 2A, p. 1). In particular, Sadie wanted to draw out the elements of imagination, olden times, setting, and good versus evil. She was not completely satisfied that all the students had grasped all the elements and was particularly concerned about concept attainment by a number of children: notably her special needs and E.S.L. students.

Mary’s approach in directing the post-observation conference was ostensibly unchanged from the first round in that she planned to focus on reinforcing what went well in the lesson. Mary added that she wanted to draw her partner into the conference more actively through some reflective questioning.

I wanted to follow the basic format as we did in the other conferences [Round One] like setting up a positive introduction, having her tell what went on. And then I would reinforce all her positives, and then lead into, somehow by my questions, a reflection that she would come across. (SR2A-MAM, p. 2)

For her part, Sadie had the same understanding of the conference purpose as Mary had expressed. This was confirmed when she explained to me during our stimulated recall session, “we’ve kind of set [the conference] up that way, I guess, to emphasize the positive, rather than sort of be more analytical, you know?” (SR2A-SC, p. 7). Her assessment of the approach appeared to be mixed, however, when she commented further:

I guess it’s effective in a way. I think I know what went well and what didn’t go well. On the other hand, it makes me reflect more on it and just think about it: sort of check out my thoughts about [the lesson]. Then later, she gives me her perceptions about what went well. (p. 7)
Nevertheless, Sadie welcomed feedback from Mary about her lesson. In the following excerpt, she commented on the value of hearing another perspective:

Well, I like to hear somebody else's perceptions of how [the lesson] went. From where I'm standing, I can see one thing. You know? I think I need that feedback from somebody, to hear their thoughts on the matter. (p. 7)

Mary had begun the conference by encouraging a focus on positive features of Sadie's lesson. However, she had a few concerns about the level of student participation in the lesson and she tried to elicit some reflective thinking by Sadie about this issue.

What was going through my mind as I was listening to her was that she seemed to feel that the participation was fine for the students. And I thought differently. OK? And so that was very obvious [to me] that her impressions and mine were different. That's one thing I want to concentrate on in the conference is somehow getting her to reflect on the participation of the students in a way that she could maybe see something different—not necessarily that I wanted to manipulate her, but I felt that students weren't participating as much as she thought they were (SR2A-MAM, p. 3).

Mid-point in their conference, Mary was still of the opinion that Sadie was not seeing her concern and she disclosed a degree of impatience about their difference of opinion. In a reflexive fashion, Mary struggled with the dichotomy between the "I" and the "Me" in herself. In stimulated recall with me, there are several instances where Mary is reflexive and self-objectifying in order to make sense from her experience as the colleague-observer. The following excerpt from our interview is a good example:

I tried to shift into the reflection part. . I tried to choose a question zeroing in on "element" and the other three questions focus on the "participation" angle. Getting her to reflect. . but it's very difficult coming up with the question in the right way: [one] that isn't confrontational. And at the same time, I wanted Sadie to pick up the idea and to come up with the answers. (SR2A-MAM, p. 12)

Mary's efforts to provoke reflective self-evaluation about the level of student participation were not succeeding. She had hoped her line of questioning would invite Sadie to look at the issue with fresh eyes. Nevertheless, she would not let go of the issue and came back to it repeatedly, through her questioning, to try and get Sadie to recognize her concern.
I wanted to bring the participation element into it [the conference]. I asked three different questions in a row and I didn’t give her an opportunity to answer each one. I didn’t want to hurt her feelings, but I wasn’t happy with the responses [Sadie provided] as to the participation. At this point [in the conference], I didn’t think that she really was aware that she didn’t have the class with her. And yet that was my impression. She just felt that she had the whole class. Everyone was with her. (SR2A-MAM, pp. 18-19)

Mary’s perseverance on this tack lasted for more than 10 minutes in the conference. Casting about for a new angle to examine the level of student participation, Mary made a number of references to how she might involve students by incorporating elements of the lesson into her own teaching. Following the conference while observing the videotape replay in stimulated recall, Mary perceived this strategy as setting up a comparison between them and she was disappointed with herself as she watched the videotape playback of herself in conference with Sadie.

Something I do, I just noticed, is that I always bring it back to comparing what I would do, or where I would go with the class, or whatever. I have to be conscious of that because I don’t want to be comparative and set myself up as “the model”, or that I wouldn’t do it. I mean it’s almost like a judgmental [comparison], saying that I’m perfect. And it’s a measuring stick. I’ve got to work on not bringing me into this element. Because it isn’t fair to Sally to say that, you know, “I’m the expert”. I’m pretending to be the expert. (SR2A-MAM, p. 13)

On hearing Mary declare her concerns about her handling of the conference at this point in time, I asked her to explain to me her thinking about with whom the responsibility for any change in practice, or approach, should lie. She answered promptly and emphatically:

The classroom teacher. Sadie, not me! I mean I could... whatever I take from this conference and whatever I see in the classroom and whether I apply it, or not, has nothing to do with her, or her decisions. I mean [the purpose of] this conference is ultimately helping her come to terms with herself, not with me coming to terms with me and my practice. I’m going to have to be conscious of that because it serves no real purpose by me saying those things that are comparisons. (SR2A-MAM, p. 14)

As the conference progressed and Mary worked her way through her script of the lesson, Sadie paused the videotape replay to make the following observation:
The conference is quite directed by [Mary] and I guess I'll have to give some thought as to maybe balancing it a bit more. I know I tend to listen more than [others]. I guess I listen and reflect more than I talk (SR2A-SC, p. 13).

Shortly thereafter, Sadie began to notice something distinct from and more profound than an imbalance in talk time between the two.

I guess, ah, I don't know. Maybe it's my perceptions this time, but I get the feeling when we started into this [model] there was more time for me to reflect on what I was doing and commenting on what I was doing. Today I sense that it's sort of more evaluative, I don't know, on Mary's part. . . I don't know, just going through the various different points [in the lesson], you know, "This is what I see." . . . I have to think about whether the time gap has any effect here. There were [in the previous round] more openers for me to do [the] talking. I feel at this time Mary is taking more control, giving her view of what's going on. And obviously there are some things in here that she's questioned, which comes through more strongly than in [the] past. (SR2A-SC, p. 15)

Sadie had identified a second issue in addition to an imbalance in conversational content. It concerned the effect of her colleague's control over the conference which she perceived to be evaluative. Mary's sustained questioning about the level of student participation left her puzzled. Sadie was trying to make sense of Mary's behaviour and motivation, as well as own response to this experience.

While this second consultative conference actually had a much higher level of conversational content and engagement from Sadie than in the first round, she felt less in control. Moreover, she was uncertain about how to handle Mary's concerns regarding the level of student participation in the lesson. Her own assessment was very clear as she declared at the beginning of the conference when Mary had asked her what went well.

In the beginning there was [sic] a few people participating. And then it sort of grew and grew and there were just about everybody was participating. There were maybe one or two that I had to watch out for, but I think on the whole the participation was good. When I read the story out [loud], I had everybody. They were really involved in it! (Conference 2B, p. 1)

As she tried to clarify her thinking about clinical supervision and its mechanics, Sadie speculated about the possible value of a pre-conference and how it might serve to focus the conference better and thereby make the experience more productive.
I know that because Mary explained it to me. She said, "We've been really busy and we haven't really pre-conferenced. We're just going to wing it." I think pre-conferencing would be valuable. We talked about we were going to set it up—the mechanics of it—what time it was going to take place and that kind of thing. But I have not conferenced with her, pre-conferenced with her about the intent of the lesson in any of [the cycles]. And she hasn't with me, and I think that would a valuable thing to consider. Because it gives the person more insight into what they are looking for when they're observing. And not just sort of writing down anything and everything, but there would be more of a focus.

I asked Sadie at this point to amplify on her notion of how reflection might be facilitated. In her response, she alluded to the purposefulness of teaching, to professional autonomy, and to the value of asking non-judgmental questions which were open-ended.

I guess it's where the facilitator manipulates the conference in such a way that if you ask key questions, you can get the teacher, or the instructor, or whoever, to think more about what they were doing, why they were doing it, how it came off, rather than dumping on their impressions. I think that's important because you know what you set out to do, even if it's not perfectly clear to the observer. I think most teachers, being professionals, have a good idea or what it is they are trying to do. They're not just standing up there [at the front of the class] to kill 40 minutes. [Questioning which] makes you think, "Did I do what I set out to do? Where were my stumbling blocks? What went well? What didn't go well?" I think that is initially what Mary had set out to do in her conferencing. Only this time I feel the weight has shifted [the focus] a little bit and more of it is her talking, and controlling, and giving impressions, rather than pauses and [asking questions like] "What do you think? Can you tell me. . .?" and that kind of thing. (SR2A-SC, pp. 15-16)

By the end of end of our stimulated recall session, Mary became quite critical of her own performance as a colleague-observer and worried about the impact of her behaviour on her colleague.

I guess what I'm sensing is that she's uncomfortable and I'm trying to make her feel better. So I'm helping her with the summary and I shouldn't be. (SR2A-MAM, p. 23)

Her attempts to be a supportive colleague by providing a summary for Sadie were, by her own assessment, misguided and counter-productive. At the end of the stimulated recall session, Mary concluded:
Well this blew it when I took over the summarizing. I started telling her my opinion and that's wrong in the conference. OK? What I have to watch [out for] is that if I ask [Sadie] to summarize, that [it should be] her summary and [through] her talking, the reflection will come through. . . . I don't have to add any more to it. I think I totally destroyed the conference at this point. (SR2A-MAM, p. 24)

Mary and Sadie were both less-than-satisfied with the conference. Both understood that changes were required, in their model and in their roles, if they were really going to achieve their respective aims and purposes for their collaborative work. The steps they took in the succeeding rounds involved changes to the model and in their approach to their respective roles. These changes involved the inclusion of pre-conferences to establish an observational focus during the lesson, as well as changes in attitude and behaviour for both the colleague-observer and the colleague-teacher. For the colleague-observer, a progressive suspension of judgment was identified as important. Likewise, the transformation of their model entailed a shift to a more assertive attitude for the colleague-teacher.

Mary's lesson the following week was again in Language Arts. This time her instructional focus was to have the students develop a broader repertoire of verbs to introduce direct quotations in narrative writing. Mary explained to Sadie in conference what she wanted to accomplish:

The instructional objective was [to develop] an awareness for them to get rid of "said" and use other words instead of it. And I also wanted it [to be] fun for them. (Conference 2B-MAM, p. 1)

In the conference which followed Mary's lesson, Sadie took the opportunity to experiment with the conference format. She was explicit about the changes, though somewhat anxious about how they would be interpreted by Mary. It had become clear to Sadie that her role as the colleague observer in clinical supervision should focus more directly on facilitating her partner's thinking about teaching. The only trouble she envisioned was that her efforts at eliciting her colleague's thoughts might be interpreted as "evaluation". She was gaining a greater appreciation of the challenges of effective facilitation through questioning. Sadie's opening comments to Mary at the beginning of
their conference clarified the aim of her new approach and identified her primary concern for Mary’s possible interpretation of it.

Um, I've changed the format of the conference just a little bit. I hope it doesn't bother you, but I thought we'd play around with it a little bit and we'll see whether it's meaningful for you. I've set it up differently to, uh, well to do two things, I guess, so that you do most of the talking and so that it gives you time to think about what you've done. Um, I hope it doesn't sound like an inquisition. That's the only thing [I'm concerned about]. I don't want it to sound like an inquisition because I'm not evaluating, or anything like that. I just want to give you a chance to think about what you would do (Conference 2B, p. 1).

Mary expressed receptivity to the suggested changes and indicated to Sadie that her feelings would not be hurt. She sensed that the new format of the conference was important to Sadie and she wanted their collegial relationship to grow. In stimulated recall with me afterwards she evaluated the new format:

It was good. I mean I was glad she changed it and I was really looking forward to how she'd, ah, how she'd direct it. I wasn't quite sure which way she was going to go and I was really glad she changed the focus. She was uncomfortable and I wasn't. It was interesting to see that. (SR2B-MAM, p. 1)

After reviewing the videotape of her introductory comments about the new format, Sadie paused the playback to elaborate on her rationale for taking a different approach to the conduct of the conference. She wanted to model a new role for the colleague-observer. The new structure of the conference was explicitly designed by her to shift the control back over to the colleague-teacher and to bring out the teacher's voice.

What I wanted to do today was to shift the emphasis so that I structured the interview in such a way that Mary did most of the talking and not myself, to get her to reflect more on what she had done. . . get her to think herself whether she was happy with what she had accomplished in the classroom (SR2B-SC, p. 1).

The mechanics of consultation and facilitating reflection were becoming much clearer in Sadie's mind. Changes in attitude and in their model were well underway.

I felt less-than-satisfied with [the structure of the previous conferences] because I felt that more of the emphasis was on evaluation, rather than peer coaching, or introspection and self-development. And I wanted to shift the focus to. . . make it more meaningful for both of us (SR2B-SC, p. 1)
Mary, on the other hand, was keen for feedback in Round Two. Her attempts to receive some specific feedback on aspects of her teaching went unheeded in the second conference. The effect was, contrary to her earlier comments, unsatisfactory for Mary in her role as the teacher. While Sadie’s emerging vision and practice of "peer coaching" focused on promoting Mary’s thinking, the absence of feedback and reinforcement of some of the things she is doing well left Mary unfulfilled. Although Mary appreciated the opportunities Sadie structured for her to reflect on aspects of her teaching, it was not sufficient for her own growth. In her mind reinforcement and feedback constituted key components of "a good conference".

The purpose for this conference was really just questions for my reflection. I don’t see the point of the conference other than [questioning to promote] my reflection. If you build in reinforcement--there wasn’t any there!--or feedback, or any of those things... A good conference should have a lot of that, all those things in it (SR2B-MAM, p. 27).

Mary’s understanding of her own requirements from a collegial conversation were unambiguous. She required feedback, validation of good practice and suggestions for solutions to problems. She did not perceive “questions for my reflection” as sufficient. When I asked to elaborate on how her partner could better meet her needs, she provided the following thoughts on what a good coach might offer:

The conferencer could have... offered some advice, or offered a different strategy to try, or some kind of feedback, or whatever--to say, “Well, you know what I think? I think it was fine, but here are some other [things to think about]. Let’s brainstorm some solutions together with some other alternatives.” I really wanted to get some advice and some feedback. (SR2B-MAM, p. 21)

Later on, Mary returned to the same issue again.

I find that [if] I’m the learner then I really want to be able to know whether I’m on the right track. Not an evaluation--judgmental, but maybe as a team if we can support each other and say, “Well gee, I’m not quite sure of this questioning. Can you give some ideas for different ways to approach it?” (p. 27).

Sadie and Mary evaluated the effectiveness of Sadie's new approach at the end of their conference together. Mary refrained from speaking critically about the changes, and
directly on the matter of her own needs for growth and development. Although it had been Sadie who had discussed with me the potential value of pre-conferences as a part of the cycle, it had not yet been implemented. It was Mary who introduced this new element first to Sadie. She proposed holding pre-conferences in Round Three so that the observational focus might become more specific, thereby directing the topics under discussion during their post-observation conference. Up until this time, both the observation and the subsequent conference had been heavily directed by the colleague-observer. Feedback wasn't high on Sadie's list of priorities as the colleague-observer, but this is precisely what Mary was looking for.

Sadie: What can I do to help you get the most out of these conference sessions? You know? I'm wondering whether you feel I've been valuable, or whether there's a way I could facilitate you in more [overlapping talk]...

Mary: No, well I found this one [useful], of course. It's different than what we've done before because you controlled it by the questions. And I've appreciated the questions. I think I'd like you to tell me, um, on an area that you could see that I need to, maybe, to work on for the next conference, or the next lesson. Is there something that I did today that I could be thinking about for the next lesson that you'd observe? Did my beginning need work? You know? Can I [overlapping talk].

Sadie: I was trying to avoid evaluating [overlapping talk].

Mary: No. I don't see that as evaluating. I see it as you, um, maybe you and I need to sit down even before we do the next lesson to say, "OK. What is it that you want me to specifically notice about this lesson?"

Sadie: Mm, hmm. So I can get a brief conference going [overlapping talk].

Mary: Yeah, a pre-conference. Maybe that would help.

Sadie: I think it would be beneficial. Yeah, I think it would be quite helpful to do that.

Mary: Yeah. I think we're ready for the pre-conference. I mean, we've had, what, four conferences? But it's been getting to know each other--from that point of view--but now we're ready for, OK, let's be a little bit more specific. (Conference 2B, pp. 19-20)

While Sadie and Mary referred to their model, which did not include pre-conferences, as "clinical supervision", they shed this label in the second year of their
engagement (Rounds Three and Four) in favour of “reflective conferencing”. Reinforced and encouraged by their participation in workshops which they took together on the topic of collegially supported professional development, “reflection” became their collective rallying call and reflective questioning their banner.

Mary was scheduled to teach the first lesson in Round Three. In their pre-conference, she asked Sadie to give her feedback on her reflective questioning strategies during a Language Arts lesson on editing a descriptive paragraph which Mary had written on the chalkboard. The selected paragraph had a confused sequence, some misspelled words, punctuation omissions, and was bereft of adjectives. Mary had used this paragraph to teach a similar lesson in a previous year.

In the following exchange between the two colleagues, there is a fine example of reflective conferencing by Sadie in the role of colleague-observer:

Mary: I felt the main thing was that I tried to get [the students] to think and go off in different areas. I think they did that. They enjoyed that. But I have to be conscious of making it reflective, rather than [giving] my own opinion.

Sadie: I guess what you’re trying to say is you tried to get them to think about their own opinions.

Mary: Yes.

Sadie: That was one thing that you did. Can you think of other ways that you structured the questions so that there was a different angle on it?

Mary: Um. They had to give reasons.

Sadie: OK. So, defend their answers, or give reasons.


Sadie: Such as?

Mary: “Think about this.” I would read a sentence aloud. “Does this make sense?” Um, information type questions. “What would you put in there? . . .
Sadie: Um, hmm. So, when you were asking me to focus on questioning strategy, what kind of things were going on in your mind when you wanted me to focus on that?

Mary: I wanted you to see if I had the variety and if I was getting the kids to be reflective. Or was I—you know me, I can be very opinionated. Was my opinion too evident? Were the children having input into their own ideas and having ideas that were important? Or was I trying to manipulate them [and] was that so obvious?

Sadie: How do you feel about that? Do you think you are answering your own question there?

Mary: Yes. (Conference 3A, pp. 12-14)

Both teachers agreed that the addition of a pre-observation conference as a first phase of the cycle was very influential in the renewal of their respective commitment to the process. In the third and fourth rounds of observations, pre-observation conferences were held. Some of these sessions were very brief. The teacher to be observed, in each instance, identified an area (or two) for her colleague to focus on. The colleagues came to a shared understanding that they must become more explicit about their needs from the colleague-observer in order for the continued development of their relationship and of their teaching practices.

They were also increasingly cognizant of the issue of allocating sufficient time to the pre-conference phase of the cycle if they were to derive maximum benefit. In the final round of reflective conferencing, the pre-conference was too hurried and the focus too obtuse. Without a clear focus for the observer, confusion can ensue in the reflective conference. Sadie commented on this point in the following interview excerpt wherein she wondered what Mary was driving at with her line of questioning:
Maybe I wasn’t paying attention, but I found [Mary’s] question a little bit vague and I wasn’t sure where she was going. ... maybe it’s because we, ah, we had decided to pre-conference, but we hadn’t had a lot of time to pre-conference, other than sort of a parting comment, “This time I’d like you to look at the kids.” Mary’s quite familiar with some of the problems that have been going on, so I wasn’t specific about well “looking only for this”. But I just said, “Could you watch the interactions between the kids and make some notes and let me know what’s going on”, because when you're at the front of the room teaching, you are kind of watching the group as a whole. ... I guess I didn’t say, “These are specifically the things that I want you to watch for.” So that when she came back with the general things, I wasn’t quite sure what she was getting at. (SR4A-SC, p. 8)

Sadie had identified something new and valuable to her in this cycle of reflective conferencing with her partner. In her previous observation, she had been more specific about the pre-conference focus and had found the quality of the consultative conference to be superior. She had requested a focus on data collection involving student-student interactions for them to examine together. The teachers had moved their collegial relationship into joint work which Sadie found meaningful. Essentially, more time and effort had been expended in the previous pre-observation conference. She was reminded of the correlation which often exists between effort and effect: that time spent in pre-conferencing together was an important factor if she was to derive optimal benefit from her colleague’s observations of substantive issues to assist her growth and understanding of her own teaching. Nevertheless, their experience with the collaborative process had developed sufficiently for them to partially overcome this shortcoming. Through experience in their collaborative work, they were becoming more skilful in their roles and were able to compensate. Mary improvised a seating plan during the observation and collected frequency data on individual student participation in lieu of scripting the lesson. The participation matrix provided the two colleagues with useful raw data for them to sort through and, in so doing, provide a focus for their reflections in the ensuing conference.

During the consultative conference, Sadie and Mary got directly onto the task of analyzing the data. Sadie speculated during our interview on the reason why she and Mary had dispensed with the introductory portion of their conference so quickly and
proceeded into a collaborative analysis of the data. Two reasons came to her mind. First, she found the data useful. "It was quite helpful for us to go over." (Conference 4A, p. 8). She thought of the matrix as "a frame of reference so that you can talk about the kids and make notes" (p. 9). The second observation alluded to their acquired experience in working together: "Well, maybe that's just because we've been at this for a while" (p. 9).

The two teachers worked with the data together to help Sadie assess the student interactions during the lesson. In her experience, Sadie found the current group of students to be the most challenging of her career. She had constructed cooperative work groups of four students and had dispersed all her at-risk students among the several groups. She was keen to examine the effectiveness of her organization. During the conference they developed a number of heuristic categories to assist their analysis: "behaviour-individual", "how well they worked together", "group make up", "product produced", "attentiveness" (Conference 4A, p. 8).

With some practical experience in reflective conferencing, Sadie and Mary were gaining confidence and competence with the process. As well, they were becoming much more insightful as to its purpose and potential. Some of the necessary conditions for their continuing professional development were clearer now. Their understanding of the processes and pitfalls of collegially supported teacher development were far deeper at the end of the study period. Mary's comments at the end of her final interview in Round Four as the teacher-colleague reveal this:

"Just reflecting on all four conferences, each one of them was different, very different. Yeah, it was good. There was some growth and some potential [growth]. I see confrontational spots on the [video] tape and yet I didn't feel defensive at all. . .So that indicates a lot of growth. We're feeling comfortable with each other. . .Oh, it went well. (SR4B-MAM, p. 45)

For her part, Sadie made the following observation about collegially supported teacher development at the end of the final cycle:
I guess I would measure [the colleague's] growth by the ability they have to reflect on what they’re doing and they actually, consciously, do the thinking about it and make the changes that are necessary to make it a better lesson. Or, you know, [make] incremental changes over time so that [if] you go in and observe at one point in time, then two or three months later you go in and observe again. And it’s obvious that they’ve done a lot of thinking about the kinds of things you have talked about and they’ve put some of those things in place. That, to me, would be growth. (SR4B-SC, p. 49)

The discussion in the next section follows their path of discovery as they sought first to make sense of their relationship within the initial (Hunter) model then, later, begin to identify and interpret those factors which promoted, or impeded, close collegial relations. As they make sense of their collaboration together and construct new meanings about these influences which affected the development of their relationship, they made changes to their model and, in so doing, moved towards interdependent collegiality.

DEVELOPING A COLLEGIAL RELATIONSHIP

Our attention now turns to an analysis of the quality of the relationship between the two colleagues and focuses on the factors which influenced the development of their collegial relationship. The second research question called for an examination of the beliefs, behaviours, skills, and norms which influenced the development of collegiality. This section describes Sadie’s and Mary’s progressive series of steps to shape their collegial relationship. As they take each tentative step outside of their initial, prescriptive, framework for their conferences together, they learn something new about collegiality and its benefits. What counts as important to each teacher in developing a collegial relationship is in many ways similar, but there are differences, too.

Both teachers demonstrated an initial willingness to establish a collegial relationship by voluntarily agreeing to participate in this study. There was no evidence of encouragement from their principal, nor from any other individual of significant influence, such as district staff. From the outset, they understood that they could withdraw from participation at any time. No evidence arose at any time of any consideration to withdraw.
Mary had some initial notion of steps, or stages, in the development of their relationship. The relationship should be built on rapport. To establish an early rapport, their conferences together should have a “natural” feel to them with a focus on “positives” (i.e., validating good teaching practices).

I think it was just sort of an understanding that Sadie and I have: that we be positive. . . we never really discussed it . . . I was the one who set it up to be positive. I didn't want Sadie to have a lot of leading information. I wanted it to be natural, too (SR1B-MAM, p. 2).

Sadie shared Mary's orientation of focusing on the positive aspects of each other's teaching in the early going. She suggested that the focus on positives was more explicitly understood and had been negotiated between them. Sadie explained:

I knew what her intent was, you know, “Here are the positive things . . .” and we should stress the positive. Because we had talked about this [focus] earlier that she was going to try to pick up on . . . the strength of the lesson. (SR1B-SC, p. 18)

Naturalness in the relationship was, according to both participants, a key to any success they experienced in achieving a meaningful collegial relationship. The “flow” of their conferences was closely related to naturalness. Trust, too, was crucial: trust both in the process and in the other person. They both discovered over time that note-taking during their conferences interrupted the flow of their collegial interactions and impacted adversely on the naturalness of their conversation together. Each of them evinced reflexivity to the situation. The symbols (particularly gesture and to a less extent comments) apparent during note-taking were causing them to reassess their behaviour and its impact on their relationship.

Both teachers expressed concern repeatedly over the two years of their collaboration about how their note-taking seemed to break the flow of their conferences. Sadie was the first to raise the point with me in stimulated recall while observing her conference behaviour in Round One. Initially, Mary thought that her note-taking during their first conference together (in her role of colleague-observer) signified interest and value in what Sadie was saying, that what was being said was important to retain.
In the beginning I took notes because I wanted to remember [what Sadie had said] and I felt it was important for me to write things down so that I could refer to it later. And I don’t think it detracted from [the conference flow]. It may have added a little bit of importance that I was interested enough to put down all her ideas. (SR1A-MAM, p. 16)

At the end of the conference, Mary’s awareness of her colleague’s apparent interest in the script and associated conference notes motivated Mary to spontaneously offer her a copy. Sadie politely accepted without hesitation.

Mary: Do you want me to type this up for you?
Sadie: Sure!

Mary: The script? OK. I don’t know when I’ll be able to get it to you. But I’ll see if I can get it typed up for you.
Sadie: Well...you don’t have to type it up.
Mary: OK.
Sadie: But I wouldn’t mind reading it sometime.
Mary: All right. What I... (overlapping talk)
Sadie: It doesn’t have to be right now, but I wouldn’t mind going through it. (Conference 1A, p. 14)

By Round Two, Mary was clearly sensing Sadie’s discomfort when she wrote notes during their conversation.

At this point I wanted to jot some ideas and it made her uncomfortable. She stopped [talking]. She looked at the paper and it was interesting. Her talking [stopped]. So I think I was able to just jot a couple of ideas down. I stopped after that because it was interfering in the natural flow of [the conference] (SR2A-MAM, p. 2).

Their emerging notion of a good collegial relationship equated flow of conversation with rapport. Notetaking, particularly by the colleague-observer, in a conference broke up the flow of the conversation. It communicated nothing to the colleague-teacher. The previous offer to share the notes at the end of the conference did nothing to enhance the natural flow of conversation.

I asked Sadie if she had identified any particular objectives for herself at the end of her first stimulated recall session after observing herself in the role of colleague-observer.
She commented on comfort, predictability, reciprocity and maintaining flow as being features she wanted to pay attention to as their collegial relations were becoming established:

I guess just the flow [of the conference]. Not having done one before, I wanted it to be reasonably comfortable for both of us and to keep it flowing, but maintain some kind of structure where she knew what I was going to talk about. She had a chance to express her thoughts on it and I had a chance to give her some feedback, as well as positive comments and reinforcement on what I saw. So that by the time she came out of it, she hadn’t just sort of spilled everything out and I hadn’t really commented on anything which, you know, can happen. (SR1B-SC, p. 19)

The collegial relationship was not yet well established at the end of the first school year. Sadie and Mary had completed four cycles of clinical supervision and were becoming clearer about their respective needs and how they could be better met within the context of their continuing relationship. Their needs were, in some respects, quite distinct from each other.

Sadie’s greatest needs were for “introspection and self-development” (SR2B-SC, p. 1). She saw this being capable of achieving through “peer coaching” (p. 1). The colleague could help to facilitate her self-development by assuming a non-judgmental attitude and questioning in a deferential way. When I asked Sadie to identify some of the behaviours she valued in a peer coach, she answered “having somebody just make you think about what you’re doing. . make you come to your conclusions yourself, making changes yourself. That kind of thing.” (p. 2)

Mary’s greatest needs were for validation and support. She, too, perceived this occurring through peer coaching. Although she understood that their roles required changes for their relationship to grow and that Sadie’s initiative was an important step in a positive direction, the greatest lacuna in the new format was the absence of feedback provided. “I need the feedback” she declared at the end of Round Two (SR2B-MAM, p. 6). Supportive collegial behaviour from the coach would be characterized by the sharing of ideas and suggestions for her consideration.
As a team if we can support each other and say, 'Well, gee, I'm not quite sure of this [technique or concept]. Can you give me some ideas for different ways to approach it?' I want to be able to feel comfortable (SR2B-MAM, p. 27).

The two colleagues talked together on a number of occasions following the second round of collegial consultations. While nothing of those conversations is directly available as data for this study, there are references to them in subsequent stimulated recall sessions. Changes in behaviour and attitudes were noticeable in the fall of year two, particularly in the case of Mary. They both realized that changes were required to take their collegial relationship to a deeper level.

Beginning in the third round of observations, Mary became more aware of a transformation in her perception of herself during her conferences with Sadie. It is noteworthy that Mary's reflections on her changing behaviour follow Sadie's active work on restructuring the relationship. She had learned a few lessons from Sadie's modeling and had recognized that she must make changes for their joint work in clinical supervision to become more effective. Mary had constructed a new meaning in her mind about collegiality. In stimulated recall with me, she reflected on her changing behaviour:

I saw myself more as a listener and an encourager, rather than "the expert". I wanted to get away from that. So I was pleased with myself. You change perhaps. Internally, through the conference, I was a little uptight, tense, because you don't know how it's going, because I had no script. I wanted to do [the conference] as "freestyle" as I could. You don't know how that's going to work out, so you're a little bit [anxious] (SR3A-MAM, p. 35).

Mary's taste of success in leading a productive reflective conference with Sadie provided her with further impetus for rejecting her earlier model ("clinical supervision"). Practical experience with a different approach leading to a successful outcome gave her renewed confidence and a fresh insight into a new role for herself in facilitating teacher development. Her recent successful experience in reflective conferencing provided her with the self-confidence to make a break with the past.
[I] just let it go naturally. That's what I tried to do, freestyle, and I think I succeeded with it. Other than asking too many questions and too much [seeking for] clarity, I think I've succeeded. . .I feel good about it because I'm confident that I know what I'm doing in the conference. Where[as] before, I really wasn't sure. I always thought you had to have a model, and a step. You don't have to. You know? Sadie got a lot out of it in terms of reflection, looking at herself, looking at her students. You would think the few times I did give some feedback, it was meant more for encouragement, rather than my opinion. And that's a big difference. It's like a whole turn­around with different people and [unintelligible due to laughter]. It's good! [laughs] I feel good about it! [laughs again]. (SR3A-MAM, p. 36)

Sadie was encouraged by the changes made by Mary, but not yet satisfied that the spectre of evaluation had been expunged from the relationship. Indeed, she continued to struggle with the issue of balancing a respect for her colleague's autonomy with her own professional opinion during the final reflective conference with Mary.

In Round Three Mary had taught a lesson focusing on the skill of fact collecting (i.e., note taking). Her goal for the students was mastery of the target skill and she had allowed the students to select their own excerpts from a given text. Mary had requested during their pre-observation conference that Sadie focus her observations on her questioning techniques, as well as the structure and flow of the lesson. Sadie, however, was preoccupied with her own concern about the meaningfulness of the selected instructional strategy for developing the identified skill.

I found it [the strategy] very confusing that they would be allowed to use any page in the textbook to draw facts from, rather than have a focus. A common focus, so that the facts would be meaningful and be organized in a meaningful way on the blackboard. I found that confusing. And I sort of hinted at that a little bit, but I tried not to sort of blunder in and say. . .

"Why did you do it that way?" . . . but [it was] my own personal bias and I'm not supposed to be the evaluator. . .Why not have a common focus?. . . And I also found it really confusing that [Mary wanted the students to] "Keep it short, keep it short!" And then I had the question in my mind, "What if it became so short it became meaningless?" and then when you [the students] go back to it, it didn't mean anything to you. . .Things like that were really on my mind, but I was trying to focus on what [Mary asked me to]. . .maybe too much evaluation is coming out when I'm asking her because I get the feeling that my perceptions are coming through too much. (SR4B-SC, p. 16)

In the following commentary, Sadie outlined the kind of collegial role she believed might be of value to support her own growth:
I would like to see her as being a, like a, peer teacher—one of my peers basically. Somebody who is going to help me follow the guidelines I've set for myself . . . get her to help me think about what I've done and pick up on things I might have missed . . . and just to have another person's perspective. (SR3A-SC, p. 35)

Reliance on the observational notes to structure the consultative conference, too, seemed to counter their efforts at achieving rapport between them. Furthermore, it interfered with the natural flow of conversation. Notetaking by the colleague-observer during the conference also was an effective conversation stopper. Mary commented on its stifling effect first.

In Round Four, Sadie was continuing to struggle with the issue of handling her conference notes when she was in the observer role. Her perception of herself during the video replay shuffling around in her notes taken during the observation caused Sadie to observe that, not only was her reliance on her notes discomforting for the colleague-teacher, the role of colleague-observer required thorough and thoughtful preparation:

I can see one thing. I shuffle papers a lot and whatnot . . . in the time you have to get ready, there's really not enough time to have it all here [in the mind], without referring to anything. It would be an art. I think that would be an art to learn, so that you can have all this [referring to her observational notes] out of the way. Because I am sure that this is an interference for her comfort level. (SR4B-SC, p. 23)

In her last stimulated recall interview with me at the end of the final cycle, Mary assessed the impact on her decision to conduct her last consultative conference with Sadie without any reliance on the notes she had taken during the observation. Her decision not to rely on her scripted notes required her to take a risk she was uncomfortable about yet, at the same time, curious to try.

Remember the last conference? The last session we did . . . where I decided to go in cold, without any notes? I mean I had it prepared in my mind . . . and I found it was one of the best ones we ever did because we flowed with the conversation (SR4B-MAM, p. 22).

In this passage, two features of Mary's understanding about a good conference are particularly noteworthy. First, she recognized that preparation for the conference in advance was required for it to be successful. She accomplished this by visualizing how
she wanted the conference to go. Second, Mary applied her conception of excellence to
that pre-visualization. A good conference had to have a natural flow which enabled a
rapport to emerge.

Rapport was a key component of collegiality for Sadie, too. It was a necessary,
but not sufficient, condition for a productive, collegial conference. In Sadie's mind,
indicators of rapport are flow (i.e., a rhythm, balance and direction to the talk), acceptance
(i.e., a non-judgmental attitude) and comfort (i.e., being naturally at ease). In the
following excerpt, Sadie commented on the relationship between collegial rapport and the
promotion of growth through reflection:

And running the interview I found quite challenging so that it's productive
and both of you feel comfortable doing it. And that's when the person
comes away from the whole thing, that they feel they haven't been
undermined, or picked at or, you know, that it's just been a comfortable
session where they've had a chance to sit and reflect on what happened
from the mind of somebody else (SR4B-SC, p. 50).

In Sadie's mind, once rapport was established, the key to leading a productive
conference lay in the kind and quality of the questioning. It is in this regard that she and
Mary diverged noticeably in their respective visions of collegially supported teacher
development. Sadie characterized questioning as an "art" requiring substantial practice.

I find the whole questioning thing a very fine art, and I guess it's something
that you just have to keep doing and doing and doing until it is very relaxed
and you know what you want to ask in such a way that the person doesn't
feel like they're being interrogated and they're actually coming up with
ideas. I think it's something you have to work at very hard and you have to
develop and fine tune because I don't know how easy it is to do unless
you've developed a rapport with somebody. Um, I don't know. Just the
whole idea of being familiar with their style and what they're doing and
what they're trying to do and--so that you're not just picking holes in what
they're doing. (SR4B-SC, p. 48)

It is clear from the foregoing that, in Sadie's mind, the development of a deep level
collegiality sufficient to probe and challenge practice takes time, trust, familiarity, and
rapport. Her level of self-confidence in "the art of questioning" is still somewhat tenuous.
I feel a little bit like if I'm asking questions, there tends to be [evaluation]. You know? I don't know if I ask them softly enough, or whether I'm [too direct]. I [try to] come around through the back door, or how you do it so the person is at ease. And I'm probably not very good at that part of it. You know? All the little things that you say so that person is definitely at ease before you come up with all of these questions. And I tend to just go right in and [laughs] start firing questions and then I wonder well maybe they [the colleague] feel fairly uncomfortable about the whole thing. (SR4B-SC, p. 47)

One of the teachers’ goals in participating in the study was to develop skills in conducting effective conferences. They both perceived this particular skill as essential in their future administrative careers. Effective conferencing means that a desired result would be achieved. It could mean that good practice is acknowledged. Or it could mean that a reflectively induced change in practice takes place as a result of probing, thought provoking questioning by the administrator. As Mary and Sadie demonstrated, it all depends on the needs of the teacher.

Sadie and Mary both valued close collaboration involving observation of teaching and conversation around instructional issues and practices in order to promote teacher development. Based on the evidence from the conferences that both teachers were wary of being evaluated and that it played no useful role in coaching for teacher development, it can be surmised that they would remain cognizant of this concern in any future supervisory work they might undertake with their staff.

As can be expected, Sadie and Mary began their relationship tentatively. Their early focus on positive aspects of their teaching was a safe place to begin and got them started in their collegial relationship. However, its utility was limited in that it did not enable them to explore issues of practice. By focusing exclusively on effective instructional behaviours in the early rounds, they were confined to a superficial level of collegial relations. As experienced teachers, they had a reasonably clear sense of how to teach and to ascertain what they did well in their teaching. They knew how to interpret student behaviour to determine if they were connecting with the children through their
teaching and, conversely, when the students were making meaningful connections with the content presented during their lessons. As Sadie put it:

neither of us are in a position of teaching something brand new because we have taught for 16 or 17 years, at least! So a lot of the topics we’re familiar with. But I guess [what we are looking for] is encouraging each other to be current, to be aware of what the students need, to improve on our own teaching techniques. I guess so that we’re not stagnating. You know? I think you’re developing yourself. (SR2B-SC, p. 2)

The teachers’ collegial relationship deepened and broadened over time. Using the Hunter Model of supervision at the beginning, the conference control was in the hands of the colleague-observer. Thus, their collegial relationship was contrived by an explicit and delimited focus in the consultative conferences. The introduction of a pre-observation conference gave authority to the teacher’s voice. It enabled her to assume greater control over the process and thereby serve her own needs for development. Through cooperative planning and conversation on features of their teaching which the colleague-teacher had identified, they began to go deeper into substantive issues of practice during their consultative conferences. Their discussions became more balanced in that both of them were contributing to the conversation. The teachers achieved an interdependent form of collegial relations over the period of time they worked together. They discovered that it takes time to understand the processes of close collaboration and to establish a supportive rapport built on trust. As their insights about collegiality and its benefits grew, so too did their appreciation of the challenges of facilitating reflection on issues of practice in ways which were engaging without being perceived as judgmental.

DEVELOPING CRAFT KNOWLEDGE

The study’s third research question asks about the issue of the knowledge which the teachers relied on when constructing meaning from their collaborative work. The literature review on the forms of knowledge teachers employ doing their work spoke forcefully of the role and value of craft knowledge in the construction of new meaning
about their professional practices. Craft knowledge is acquired through sustained practical experience in doing something. Many identify this kind of knowledge as possessing practical "know how".

The discussion in this section examines the craft knowledge Sadie and Mary constructed about clinical supervision with linkages to the related topics of collaboration and collegiality. The teachers did not have much practical knowledge about the model they initially adopted to structure their collaborative work because of their inexperience with it. They did, however, have academic knowledge about the "Hunter Model" of instructional supervision (Hunter, 1980, 1984, 1986). This academic knowledge comprised both propositional and procedural features.

The Hunter model of instructional supervision provided the teachers with a prescriptive formula to give an initial structure for them to begin to work together. If nothing else, it was predictable and this feature alone was a reassurance to them. The model provided them with a recipe for instructional supervision that, if adhered to, seemed to promise that they would be successful right at the outset. Mary identified the key elements of a Hunter Type 1 conference in stimulated recall:

setting up a positive introduction, having her tell what went on. And then I would reinforce all her positives, and then lead into, somehow by my questions, a reflection that she would come across. (SR2A-MAM, p. 2)

There were other features of the Hunter model of supervision clearly apparent in the early conferences. Their focus on the concept of "flow" and the use of paraphrasing to confirm understanding were both prevalent in the early post-observation conferences.

The source of their academic knowledge for conducting clinical supervision was Hunter's manual on instructional supervision\(^4\) which they followed closely to set up their conferences in the first round. Mary lent Sadie her copy of the manual to use when she was getting organized to lead her first conference. Sadie followed the same agenda in

\(^4\) The precise reference for the manual the teachers used is not available.
leading her first conference and faithfully held to the focus on highlighting what went well in Mary’s lesson. She confirmed this fact to me when I asked her about it.

Yeah. I set up my interview in a similar fashion, only because I hadn’t done one before and I needed to start somewhere. Perhaps at a later date, after I’ve done a few [conferences], then I’ll start to do it my own way. But I didn’t have a model to go by because I hadn’t done it before. So I basically took the same model that Mary was using. (SR1B-SC, p. 11)

Sadie structured her questions to draw out all the positive aspects of Mary’s lesson and offered praiseworthy comments for reinforcement. There was frequent use of the adjective “good” in reference to features of Mary’s lesson. Without any prior experience in collaborative teacher development, she had little or no basis on which to challenge this initial structure.

It did not take too long for Sadie to begin to formulate her own understanding of a productive (i.e., positive) conference experience in clinical supervision. A good conference was one that enabled her thinking about her teaching. It did not, necessarily, have to involve praise and reinforcement of what another thought about her effectiveness. If there was no effort to stimulate the teacher’s thinking “about what they were doing, why they were doing it, how it came off” (SR2A-SC, p. 15), then the conference was not productive and, by implication, not a positive one.

The teachers’ exclusive focus on positive aspects of their partner’s teaching practices effectively delimited the scope of their conferences. While both participants acknowledged their appreciation of the value of validation of their methods and approaches in their lessons, there was precious little opportunity for the construction of new meaning of their pedagogy. This was an important insight which provided them with a stimulus to begin to construct craft knowledge about the purpose of clinical supervision.

Separately in their individual interviews with me, the teachers began to call into question the value of the formula for supervision they were following with its exclusive focus on reinforcement of positives. Sadie was looking for more substance in the conference. “I think there has to be a lot more cooperative planning so that there is a fair
balance [in the conference]" (SR2A-SC, p. 17). In the same vein, Mary's craft knowledge was indicating to her that a pre-observation conference might help out. She was the one who put the suggestion out for their consideration and Sadie quickly agreed.

Mary: I see it as you, um, maybe you and I need to sit down even before we do the next lesson to say, "OK, what is it that you want me to specifically notice about this lesson?"

Sadie: Mm, hmm. So I can get a brief conference going.

Mary: Yeah, a pre-conference. (Sadie nods). Yeah, maybe that would help.

Sadie: Mm, hmm.

Mary: OK.

Sadie: I think it would be beneficial.

Mary: Yeah.

Sadie: We haven't done it.

Mary: No, we haven't done it.

Sadie: It would be beneficial. So that, ah, we are both looking at the same thing.

Mary: Yeah. And so that we're not looking at a whole total [lesson].

Sadie: Yeah.

Mary: We're looking at one specific thing, whether it's the script, or whatever.

Sadie: Mm, hmm.

Mary: I think I'm ready for that.

Sadie: OK.

An important finding revealed in the first section of this chapter was that all phases of the Cogan model of clinical supervision are essential for the development of the teachers' professional knowledge, as well as their collegial relationship. The Hunter manual did not require a pre-observation conference be held. Hunter denounced the pre-observation phase as a waste of time which promoted observer bias, and undermined trust.
However, through practical experience the pair acquired further craft knowledge which pointed to the value of pre-conferencing so that their collaborative consultations could allow for a focus to guide their post-observation discussions.

It was their craft knowledge, based on some practical experience in conferencing, which enabled them to recognize certain limitations imposed by their initial model of supervision. Their behaviour in the social setting, using the Hunter version of clinical supervision, kept the discussion at a superficial level by virtue of its explicit delimitation on positive reinforcement. Once they inserted a pre-observation conference phase to provide a focus for the colleague-observer to zero in on, they discovered that there could be more depth to the ensuing conference. Each of the conferences they held in Rounds Three and Four were progressively longer as they found they had more to talk about by focusing on less.

Following the introduction of some cooperative planning for a clearer focus to the observations, the colleagues began to find themselves scratching below the surface veneer of positive reflection to new depths in their discourse during their collaborative consultations. Thus, opportunities to examine together substantive issues of practice became not only possible, but legitimate. It was the emergence of their craft knowledge of the process of clinical supervision which empowered them to make changes to an academic formula.

Arising out of the craft knowledge that Sadie and Mary construct to make sense of their conference structure and purpose is a related finding about their understanding of the concept of "positive". It was being renegotiated continually by the teachers through their conferences. Their thinking about what a positive conference was, as well as what it meant to be a positive colleague, changed dramatically over the period of the study.

Mary believed initially that a positive conference was one that could be characterized by a flow (i.e., "a nice back and forth conversation" (SR1A-MAM, p. 14), "building rapport" (SR1B-MAM, p. 21), and a focus on explicating all of the positive
elements of the lesson. Reinforcement of effective behaviours, she believed, would lead to more purposeful action in the future. However, she was not clear on how reflection would be activated. "I would reinforce all her positives and then lead into, somehow by my questions, a reflection that she would come across" (SR2A-MAM, p. 2).

She structured her questions to draw out positive comments from Sadie and was immediately thwarted. "See there! I wanted positives, but she really wanted to talk about negatives" (SR1A-MAM, p. 3). This frustrated and confused Mary about her plan to ensure that they concentrate on what went well.

I wanted to be responsive, but I wasn’t sure if I should be acknowledging every statement she made. . . and I wanted to value what she was saying and prove to her they were concerns. I wanted to keep eye contact as well. (p. 1)

Mary found herself caught in a dilemma. On the one hand, she wanted to offer supportive verbal and non-verbal behaviour which acknowledged and valued her colleague’s perceptions. This was appropriate supervisory behaviour for establishing rapport and building a positive relationship. Yet, in so doing, she would be acting as an accomplice in derailing the conference from its achieving its objective. Mary was struggling with an apparent contradiction between her craft knowledge to remain learner-focused and her academic knowledge which compelled her to maintain a focus on positives. She decided that she could not allow Sadie to raise her concerns.

I don’t want her to go sidetracking, or any teacher I’d work with, into the negatives. I believe that it defeats the purpose. I think that setting the tone [of the conference] is important. I wouldn’t let her go into the negative. . . it would have taken away from the main objective of the conference. (p. 4)

Initially, Mary believed not only that positiveness was the objective of the conference, but that she could also control their attention on remaining positive. Moreover, she believed that she had an active role to play in maintaining a positive focus. If need be, she would guarantee the achievement of conference objective by providing her colleague with her own positive observations from the scripted notes.
I think too with the body language and the verbal talking and everything else. ..when I'm really giving her a lot of positive strokes, she's really feeling good about [her teaching]. It's just like her nodding her head and things. That's the key to me that she's understanding what I'm saying. (p. 17)

Mary was applying a form of propositional knowledge to the concept of positive at the outset. She believed that she could control the conditions in the conference through her behaviour and force of will to accomplish her objective of reinforcing positive features of the lesson. If Sadie would not, or could not, provide appropriate examples, then she would provide them for her.

The negotiation of a common understanding of the meaning of positive was not easy. Perhaps the convergence in their respective meaning of the concept was exacerbated by their respective strength of character. Mary speculated on this when she and I were chatting in Round Three.

We're both very strong individuals. Sometimes it's difficult for us to give, or to acknowledge (Mary laughs). But that is coming into the relationship. I mean we're consciously trying [to give and take] with each other in order to understand each other. (SR3B-MAM, p. 31)

The two teachers successfully negotiated a common understanding about the purpose of conferencing. Through their shared experiences, the two respective images of a positive conference began to merge. The shift from praise and reinforcement to problem identification, clarification and resolution was significant. A convergence in meaning was crafted in the crucible of their social interactions. Their craft knowledge began to supersede their propositional knowledge about the concept of positive when they agreed that a pre-observation conference was required. Negotiations about the nature of appropriate feedback and how to provide it in a collaborative setting continued to be co-constructed through to the end of the study period.

Their search for effective strategies to facilitate each other's reflection in the conference was by trial and error. In the latter rounds of the study, they worked with purpose to develop conferencing strategies which problematized issues of practice without engaging in value judgments about those same practices. Much thought and effort was
invested in finding the ways and means to give feedback through their questioning to make features of their colleague’s teaching behaviours problematic without being perceived as prejudicial. In a very real sense they were preoccupied with reconciling reflective critical analysis and collegial feedback.

Critical analysis of practical problems was the kind of feedback that Sadie wanted the most out of their reflective conferences. A brief recapitulation of Sadie’s instructional objectives readily reveals that Sadie was pre-disposed to addressing problematic aspects of teaching. In Round One, she wanted to bring out the concept of geometry as being three-dimensional by reducing her dependence on the chalkboard. In Round Two, she was concerned about concept attainment by a number of children with language or learning deficiencies. In the second school year (Rounds Three and Four of the study), Sadie had a very challenging class with a number of disruptive students and others with worrisome emotional issues which was dealing with. The objective for both of these last two lessons addressed the quality of student participation with a particular focus on mitigating the negative influence of the disruptive students.

At the end of Round One, Sadie reflected on past experiences where there had not been any feedback. “I’ve been in situations where you’ve given your whole side of the story and the other person says, ‘Mmm. That’s nice.’” (SR1B-SC, p. 19). Feedback for her introspection was vital to Sadie.

Mary wanted introspective, reflective feedback, too. Gaining perspective through collegial conversation was especially clarifying and helpful.

I can’t see myself as other people see me. [Sadie helps me] come up with other ways to look at it--something in the lesson that you think went well but through the talking, you see that there’s another point of view... giving me something to think about which is important. I think I try to be objective about my teaching, but one never knows... How do we know what’s wrong? What needs fixing? Or needs changing? Unless you make an attempt, a conscious attempt to doubt, to be introspective? Is that the right word? Reflective. Maybe the conferencing sets these reflections up just from the dialogue with somebody else. (SR4B-MAM, pp. 45-46)
Sadie’s craft knowledge of the demands of feedback through reflective questioning pointed out to her that it is a skill requiring considerable time and practice. At the end of the study she made the following observation:

I find the whole questioning thing a very fine art. And I guess it’s something that you just have to keep doing and doing and doing until it is very relaxed and you know what you want to ask in such a way that the person doesn’t feel they’re being interrogated and they are actually coming up with the ideas. I think it’s something you have to work at very hard and you have to develop and fine tune because I don’t know how easy it is to do until you’ve developed a rapport with somebody. . .being familiar with their style and what they’re doing and what they’re trying to do. . .so that you’re not just picking holes in what they’re doing. . .I found it quite challenging running a comfortable, productive conference. (SR4B-SC, p. 48)

With practical experience, the teachers gained insights into the “art” of reflective questioning and into their respective requirements for reflection in collaborative dialogue. However, the “look” of that feedback differed somewhat for each of them. Both teachers were desirous of feedback for their own introspection, which they referred to as reflection. Their co-construction of a collegial relationship was accomplished socially in their joint work, which Mead refers to as the “social act”. In the course of time working together, Sadie and Mary orchestrated their behaviours in order achieve their mutually negotiated purposes.

A degree of reflexivity between the “I” and the “Me” was observed in both teachers as they struggled to make meaning of their experiences in a reflective conference setting. Their subjective voice was guiding their behaviour to some extent as they modeled the coaching behaviour they wanted the colleague to offer. While both of them valued a feeling of comfort and an absence of defensiveness, the shape of their ideal conference was a bit different for each of them. Mary wanted a balanced conversation about issues of practice, while Sadie wanted thought-provoking questions for her to reflect upon. Nevertheless, as the final rounds of conferences grew progressively longer, their craft knowledge of reflective conferencing permitted them to plunge into the complexities of their practice and achieve a depth of collegiality they had not previously
experienced. Through social interaction in reflective conferencing, Sadie and Mary constructed new roles and responsibilities for themselves in order to achieve their desired ends in a more satisfying way.

SUMMARY

Sadie and Mary adopted clinical supervision as the framework for structuring their collaborative work and establishing their collegial relationship. The teachers' introduction to clinical supervision was, at the outset, quite comfortable. They employed a model proposed by Madeline Hunter which had been drawn from the academic literature on instructional supervision. This particular approach had a prescriptive structure and a predictable outcome. Its purpose was to validate and reinforce effective teaching behaviours observed in the lessons they taught for each other. The two teachers believed that through sustained application of reciprocal rounds of clinical supervision they would deepen their relationship and grow professionally.

Led by Mary, the practicing administrator, they assumed a posture of positivity and unconditional acceptance of the value of other's work in the classroom. They understood that critical analysis and negativity had no role to play in the post-observation conferences. It was also understood that pre-conferences were unnecessary if the supervisor's role was to remain "positive" during their consultative conferences together. Following Madeline Hunter, the use of pre-observation conferences was considered a waste of time and could introduce inappropriate observer bias.

During the observation, the supervisor's task was well defined. She would "script" the lesson, which meant that she was to try and capture as much of the narrative and social interactions as possible: basically, to paint a picture of the lesson in words. Following an analysis of the script for effective behaviours using Hunter's standards, the supervisor met with the teacher to try and elicit all the positive elements and provide reinforcement. However, the teachers soon discovered that an unfocused approach in the
observation phase, without any pre-conference input from the colleague-teacher, resulted in an unfocused conference characterized by imprecise dialogue, frequent clarifying questions, and much second-guessing about the intent and direction of the conversation. They also discovered that they required more than positive feedback in order to foster reflective inquiry on their teaching practices.

The Hunter model proved to be an approach of very limited utility from a developmental perspective. Sadie and Mary wanted to grow as teachers and as supervisors. They also viewed their participation in the study strategically. The skills learned in supervising each other would, they believed, enhance their prospects for career advancement. Restricted to a focus on identifying effective behaviours to praise and reinforce, the supervisor was constrained to skimming the surface of her colleague’s thinking and teaching. The teachers found themselves in the shallow end of the learning pool.

The role of colleague-observer as a “supervisor” was implicit in the teachers’ initial model of instructional supervision. The meaning that they attributed to this role was not positive, nor trustworthy. Without any teacher input about what to focus on during the observation, the supervisor’s (already formidable) influence in the post-observation conference setting was virtually incontestable.

The colleagues found themselves in an unstable relationship in the Spring of their first year together. They were caught up in a web of uncertainties characterized by a lack of confidence in their model, unmet expectations and a degree of discomfort about the spectre of evaluation. The Hunter model was not serving their requirements for growth or facilitating healthy collegial relations. So they began to tinker with the framework and some tentative changes were introduced in Round Two. The intent of these changes was to make the process more meaningful for them and better suited to facilitating growth.

Over time, and with the benefit of further practical experience in clinical supervision, the pair were able to gain perspective and begin thinking more deeply about
the purpose and structure of collegially supported professional development. The first change they made was designed to make the conference dialogue more thought provoking for the colleague-teacher through the reflective questioning structured by the supervisor. Drawing again from Mead’s social theory, the participants introduced role-playing in order to account for the emerging social forces in their relationship. Sadie and Mary engaged in self-objectification in order to select more appropriate behaviour for their negotiated purpose (i.e., “group expectation”).

A subsequent change to the process was the introduction of a pre-observation conference phase. The introduction of a pre-observation conference served to direct, or focus, the supervisory behaviour during an observed lesson. By enabling the teacher to establish the parameters for the supervisor’s instructional observation, in areas of interest to the teacher, they hoped that the process would become more meaningful and pertinent. This, in turn, served to increase the depth of conference discussion by reducing the range of topics to be discussed during the post-observation conference. The pre-observation conference only became a feature of their framework after some unfulfilling and, at times, uncomfortable efforts in clinical supervision. The colleague-teacher could now identify her own areas of interest and direct the observer’s attention to them. It gave authority to the teacher’s voice by shifting greater control over the process to the colleague-teacher, for whom it was intended to serve. The co-construction of purpose was negotiated in the social act.

Once they had determined that the colleague-teacher should direct the observational focus, it forced the teachers to rethink and recast the supervisor’s role into that of an interested colleague (“peer coach”). In so doing, they validated the change they had previously introduced to the conference phase through a focus on reflective questioning. Now, the teachers had a model quite different from the academic model they had begun with at the beginning. The role that they had begun to conceptualize for the peer coach was significantly distinct from the initial supervisory role. She was now at the
service of the teacher and her function in the conference was to facilitate reflection in areas selected by the teacher.

Concerns about evaluation were incrementally dispelled as the colleague-observer learned deferential collegial behaviours. With practice and effort each teacher became more capable of suspending personal judgment (or at least keeping it in check) and directing her energies into reflective questioning. As collegial norms became established, the teachers developed greater trust in each other and confidence in their evolving process. In the course of this transformation, they dispensed with clinical supervision in favour of “reflective conferencing” to describe their model.

The teachers struggled continually through to the end of the study period to find the ways and means for their collaborative work to serve their individual needs. The “art” of reflective questioning in the conference setting proved to be very challenging for them. They demonstrated a remarkable commitment to making their collaboration meaningful and to grow professionally. Over the period of their engagement they acquired new knowledge and skills in collegially supported teacher development.

The insights they gained about collaboration and collegiality are reflected in the changes they made to their model, its aim and purpose, as well as their roles within it. The teachers came to a new appreciation of the challenges of collegial coaching to facilitate reflection leading to the construction of new meaning about teaching and learning and ultimately to professional growth. The changes made by the teachers took considerable time and effort to achieve. Collaboration proved to be hard work. In the end, the teachers perceived that growth had occurred. This, then, is teacher development in the sense that they had moved from using a process structured for them to one which they had structured for themselves.
CHAPTER FIVE

COMMENTARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

The findings from this case study allow for informed comment on the value of teacher collaboration and its relation to collegially supported professional development. "The believing game" is a metaphor provided by Peter Elbow (1973) which will serve to anchor the speculations offered in this closing chapter of the dissertation. The chapter is organized into two main sections. The first section offers a commentary and a number of conclusions about the findings. The second section of the chapter offers a number of implications for practice and research.

COMMENTARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Three themes were reported in Chapter Four, each addressing one of the study's three research questions. These questions were:

1. What meanings about collegiality and collaboration do the teachers construct during their relationship?

2. What factors (e.g., beliefs, behaviours, skills, norms) promote or constrain the development of collegiality in close collaboration?

3. What knowledge do the teachers rely on when constructing their meanings about collegiality and collaboration?

We have learned from this study several important things about teacher development, collaboration and collegiality. The analysis has demonstrated that teachers can derive instructional range, depth and flexibility from working together. They also educe influence and respect from their collaborating partners. Peer support and assistance helps teachers to experience greater satisfaction from their work in their own classes and in their relationships with collaborating colleagues. Working closely with a teacher-
colleague creates opportunities for learning in the context of practice and thereby reduces the uncertainty which is so prevalent in the profession. When time is provided for trust to become established, the findings from the case study demonstrate that teacher collaboration can lead to the establishment of collegial norms which support development.

The analysis of the change process the two colleagues underwent revealed that the initial model they adopted was not working well for them. While it provided a prescriptive structure and predictable script which they could easily follow, it created more obstacles to collegiality and development than it did opportunities. Caught up in the action of working together and of making the model work for them, the teachers were challenged to sort out their thinking on teacher development and collegiality, as well as the relationship between them.

Over time and with emerging insights into the requirements of a colleague-observer, the teachers began to make some important first steps in clarifying their understanding of the function of clinical supervision, the structure of the model itself and their individual roles within the process. They came to an awareness that the role of a supervisor was evaluative, whereas that of a colleague-observer was to fulfill a 'helping' function to facilitate reflection and growth. The teachers gained new insights from their collaborative experiences which enabled them to apply a practical 'know how' derived from their experience to make changes to their model. An evolution in their thinking about helping behaviours, combined with a commitment to facilitating reflection, enabled the pair to construct a more profound understanding about collegiality and its benefits. This occupational savvy is what Grimmett and MacKinnon (1992) speak about in their elaboration of the construct of craft knowledge. It was this transformation of perception which acted as a catalyst for reframing their relationship and, in so doing, redirect their relationship towards a deeper level of collegiality.

The literature review revealed that clinical supervision is a model which has received mixed reviews from the field. Although it is widely considered as an effective
model for teacher development (e.g., Griffin, 1986; Pajak, 1993; Sprinthall, Reiman, Thies-Sprinthall, 1996), many practicing teachers view it with trepidation because of issues relating to evaluation, autonomy, and control (e.g., Starratt, 1993). Moreover, the literature review demonstrated that there a number of forms of clinical supervision with substantive differences in purpose and even variations in the number of phases, or stages, comprising the model.

The two teacher participants began their collaborative work using a formulaic model of clinical supervision advocated by Madeline Hunter (1984, 1986) for use in working with capable teachers. Notwithstanding the purported preoccupation on reinforcing effective teaching behaviors of the initial model of clinical supervision adopted by Sadie and Mary, an exclusive focus ‘effectiveness’ proved to be problematic. The teachers soon recognized just how close to the surface the issue of evaluation lies when inexperienced colleagues practice clinical supervision. Even though they entered into their relationship on assumptions of peer-to-peer relations and non-judgmentalism with an explicit focus on reinforcing effective teaching behaviours, concerns about evaluation and critical judgments came to the surface early on. A number of scholars have expressed their concern about the dual emphases on effectiveness and objectivity embedded in the Hunter model of clinical supervision (Darling-Hammond & Sclan, 1992; Mandeville & Rivers, 1991; Sergiovanni, 1984, 1989). Sergiovanni (1984) characterizes this approach to supervision as “primitive scientism”, adding:

the consequence of this stance is a preoccupation with “looking” at classrooms, teachers, and teaching at the expense of “seeing”. To look is to attend and describe; to see is to discover and understand. (p. 361)

This observation is consistent with the discovery made by Sadie and Mary following some discomforting practice with the Hunter model. Their efforts to avoid observer bias and problems of perception actually fed their fears about evaluation. The findings from this study showed that a prescriptive version of clinical supervision (à la Hunter) produced a predictable environment, fraught with evaluative overtones, which
was not learner-focused. Consequently, opportunities for reflection and growth leading to
teacher development were suspended pending resolution of the issues relating to bias,
evaluation, control and autonomy.

Notwithstanding the important issues of control and direction, the study further
revealed that close collaboration is hard work, requiring time, trust, and skill if teacher
development is to be its result. In the early rounds of clinical supervision, the explicit
focus was on reinforcing effective behaviours. While both colleagues acknowledged the
salutary effect of praise, they also came to realize that strict adherence to this focus served
as a major delimitation on the range of topics for joint exploration. When the colleague-
observer exercised a measure of authority over the questioning, it became a conversation
stopper. Moreover, it prevented any opportunity for an in-depth examination of a
dilemma or other aspect of their teaching-learning environment about which they were
perplexed. This approach to peer coaching would neither allow, nor facilitate, reflection
on practice and joint exploration of possible alternate strategies to address problems of
practice.

Both colleagues valued feedback on their teaching. Generally speaking, they were
keen to hear about features of their lessons from a different perspective. In particular, the
opportunity to hear about student interactions and behaviour from a different vantage
point was viewed as valuable. One important reason for the limited success of the model
in the early rounds was that the teachers did not share any deep understanding of the
mechanics of facilitating reflection through peer coaching. At this level of social
interaction, their relationship can be viewed as a kind of contrived collegiality. The terms
of their engagement were contrived by the Hunter model of supervision to preclude any
discussion of problems of their practice.

A remarkable similarity was revealed by this study between Giddens’ (1990)
findings on trust and the necessary conditions for collegially based staff development.
Giddens defined trust in terms of “confidence in the reliability of the person or system,
regarding a given set of outcomes or events”, adding that the individual had to have “faith in...the correctness of abstract principles” (p. 34). The trust which developed between Mary and Sadie emerged only after they applied their craft knowledge to change their process. The abstract principles alluded to by Giddens refer to their faith in the principles of reflective conferencing to achieve their needs for introspection and growth.

Faith in each other was insufficient to bring about the desired changes sought by the teachers. Without a process that worked well for them, their collegiality was confined to a superficial level. In the early period of their relationship, when they were relying on the Hunter model of instructional supervision, the teachers were guided by an ethic of politeness. The two teachers were engaged in a weak form of collegiality characterized by “scanning and story-telling” and “sharing” (Little, 1990). They were reluctant to articulate their concerns about each other’s teaching and did not ask critical questions which might initiate reflective dialogue on problems of practice. Although these behaviours are precisely what Hunter recommends, the teachers discovered that they did not allow for the co-construction of new knowledge leading to positive change.

It can be concluded from this study that the development of collegial trust takes time. Trust develops through experience, rather than faith. While Sadie and Mary came together believing in the process and in the power of close collaboration with colleague, the teachers discovered that faith in the process and in each other was insufficient. Certainly, it can be argued that there has to be a pre-disposition to faith: a necessary pre-requisite. Without a positive pre-disposition at the outset to collaborate together for the purpose of professional growth, any contrary development, or setback, will have a negative effect on their emerging collegiality. However, the study demonstrated that trust had to be worked out through the teachers’ practice in reflective conferencing within an environment of reciprocity (Little, 1987), authenticity and social support (McBride & Skau, 1995). It was only through sustained effort and collaboration that they achieved a satisfactory comfort level in their relationship and in their model, consistent with the two
levels of trust identified by Fullan and Hargreaves (1991). Trust in each other and their process emerged over time.

Furthermore, this study confirms findings summarized from available research by Sprinthall, Reiman, and Thies-Sprinthall (1996) under certain circumstances. There appears to be a reciprocal relationship between trust and some forms of clinical supervision. When clinical supervision is structured to provide support, encourage professional discussion, and respect the issues of practice identified by the teacher, then trust in the relationship and in the process will have an opportunity to flourish. Trust in non-hierarchical forms of supervision is sustained by predictability, professional discourse, and equitable responsibilities and obligations. These key elements conform to Little’s (1990) notion of “joint work”, and Grimmett and Crehan’s (1992) “interdependent collegiality”. Trust in the relationship speaks to an appreciation and acceptance of the colleague’s needs: both as a teacher and as a person.

Mary and Sadie learned to keep their personal judgments about the other’s rationale and approach in check and not infuse evaluative commentary into their reflective conferences. They learned that the successful supervisor assumes an empathetic, or supportive, role adapted to serve the needs of the teacher-colleague. She must try to connect with the concerns and issues of practice identified by her colleague and provide opportunities for introspection through reflective questioning.

Sensitivity to the teacher’s perspective is required for a colleague-observer. Based on findings from this study, a peer relationship was much more satisfactory than a hierarchical one. It was their craft knowledge, constructed in the practice of clinical supervision, which led to a mediated understanding of peer coaching for teacher development. In this regard, craft knowledge drawn experience progressively superseded formal knowledge drawn from an academic source. The participants had to learn the behaviours of collegiality in order to give their trust to the other and thereby become peers in their relationship.
Trust develops between two colleagues when there exists acceptance, openness, and understanding. Sadie and Mary struggled with the issue of trust in this study. The lack of trust in the early rounds of clinical supervision is closely linked to the foregoing observations about supervisory role, control, and evaluation. Without any explicitly negotiated focus or direction for a classroom observation, there emerged a persistent theme of evaluation arising out of supervisory questioning being construed as critical by the observed teacher. As adult learners and acknowledged professionals, both teachers expressed antipathy to criticism: real or perceived; direct or implied. Concerns about evaluation effectively impeded the development of trust in their relationship.

One of the core beliefs shared by both Sadie and Mary was that their own professional development was promoted by reflection on their practice. They respectively acknowledged the challenges of posing reflective questions in the role of colleague-observer. Of the two, Mary’s approach to the conduct of a reflective conference changed more over the two year period of study than did Sadie’s. The irony of this is that it was Sadie who was the more forceful in initiating changes in their supervisory behaviour.

A significant insight which the teachers achieved was that one can engage in endless thinking without a whit of reflection taking place. Recapitulation of the lesson using the scripting and questioning techniques from the Hunter model of supervision constrained their conference thinking to what actually occurred in the lesson. The kind and quality of reinforcing feedback they provided each other was confirmative, not transformative. Cogitation about experience through a process of recapitulation of all its positive elements does not allow for the recognition of a problem situation. The teachers’ use of the Hunter model proscribed the examination of problematic features of the lesson. Naming the problem, which is what the teachers began to do much more consciously in later rounds of clinical supervision, is the first step in reframing the meaning they construct of their teaching experiences. Moreover, their use of the Hunter model did not enable “the reconstruction of experience” (MacKinnon & Erickson, 1992, p.198) which is the
essence of reflection. Once Sadie and Mary began to focus their attentions to issues valued by the colleague-teacher, they began to understand more clearly the role played by reflection in the reconstruction of their teaching experiences to accomplish the transformation of practice.

In their case, opportunities for growth did not present themselves immediately. They came slowly and over time as the relationship deepened. It also required an ability to articulate perceptions and ask questions in ways which facilitated reflective commentary by the colleague. Making explicit their intuitive understandings of their behaviour in teaching proved to be a long term challenge. Once trust was established, they had to learn a shared language to penetrate the surface of their issues about their work with children.

The collegial relationship established by the participants was a learning one. Learning was the *raison d'être* of their collaboration in clinical supervision. In this setting, a relationship exists between teacher development and certain norms of collegiality determined by the participants. With experience, their vision became less myopic about how to support and sustain reflection leading to new knowledge about teaching and learning. A path was discovered and charted (figuratively) by the two colleagues in their pursuit of new insights about aspects of their teaching and their supervisory effectiveness. In the process of charting this new terrain, they began to develop a norm of collegiality which gave struggle and change a measure of legitimacy. The findings of the study demonstrate that culture building requires a willingness to allow time for development and a recognition that change is possible.

A feature of Little's (1987) framework for collegiality was initially absent from the model of clinical supervision adopted by Sadie and Mary. The teachers did not engage in shared planning and preparation through the pre-conference phase (which they forewent in the early rounds). Once they determined that a pre-conference would be helpful, there arose opportunities for shared planning and preparation which enabled a more collaborative form of teacher development and created the necessary conditions for a
deeper level of collegiality. The findings suggest that cooperative planning will occur when teachers perceive a need for it. Teachers' craft knowledge tends to override academic knowledge. Once the teachers had made this accommodation, the benefits of collegiality all appeared to be present. There was evidence in the data that their relationship together provided for:

- break down of classroom isolation;
- fresh insights on classroom work;
- recognition of good work; and
- pride in the relationship.

These findings confirm Little's assertion that shared planning is indeed required to achieve deeper forms of collegiality. It can therefore be concluded that clinical supervision is a worthwhile staff development model when certain conditions are provided. Opportunities for collegiality, professional growth and fulfillment are all available through collaborative consultation involving peer observations followed by consultative conferences which focus on substantive practical matters.

Participants' shared beliefs, assumptions and values are frequently invisible in a given social setting. Yet, we "know" them through our understanding of social norms for appropriate behaviour. These are typically consensual in nature. The structure and form of social behaviour are visible and, thus, are important manifestations of a cultural scene. Other manifestations of culture are objects, talk, behaviour and emotion. Of all these, emotion is least readily observable. Yet, it is capable of speaking with great force. This is the "silent language" that Hall (1973) speaks of. Although difficult to bring forth transcript evidence in Chapter Four of incidences when the teachers were taking emotional cues from each other, there was no doubt in my mind that they were very attentive to each other's emotional response to their collaborative experiences. Much of the data reported in the section on "developing a collegial relationship" is pregnant with emotional significance. A great many of the coded transcripts tagged to the conceptual categories of
"body language", "flow", "fun", and "relationship" contain emotional cues which assisted Mary and Sadie to make sense of their experience and negotiate the currents affecting the direction they are trying to steer the social situation. Trust develops, in part, through careful attention to a colleague’s emotional responses to social interaction.

Findings from this study confirm the assertion that teachers who are collaboratively engaged in discussions about their teaching practices offer opportunities for meaningful professional development. In the preceding pages we have seen evidence of development through the mouths of Sadie and Mary. As their collaborative relationship extended over time a collegial norm developed which provided them stimulation and support (Fieman-Nemser & Floden, 1986). Their collaborative work countered their feelings of isolation (Lortie, 1973, 1975; Silver, 1983; Waller, 1932). As they negotiated common understanding about aspects of their joint work, they developed common knowledge (Little, 1987).

This case study has demonstrated that clinical supervision, involving shared planning and practiced by thoughtful colleagues over a sustained period of time, can accomplish much to redress feelings of uncertainty and professional stagnation. It also validates the findings from Rosenholtz (1989) and others that teacher collaboration is a source of professional renewal by providing opportunities for social learning. Clinical supervision can be effective in promoting teacher development (cf. Sprinthall, Reiman, & Thies-Sprinthall, 1996).

In summary form, the conclusions drawn from this study are the following:

• close collaboration between colleagues breaks down the isolation of the classroom;
• close collaboration reduces some of the uncertainties that teachers often experience about the effectiveness of their teaching practices;
• interdependent collegiality requires time and trust;
• reflective questioning is a learned skill;
• clinical supervision can support teacher development when all phases are present and when the process is teacher directed;

• evaluation is counter-productive to collegiality and teacher development;

• craft knowledge is constructed in the crucible of practice; and

• craft knowledge interacts with academic knowledge in effecting change in practice.

IMPLICATIONS

The implications of the findings from this study can be considered from two distinct perspectives. There are implications for the thinking of those working in school districts who are responsible for teacher/staff development. There are also implications for those who are engaged in the pursuit of new knowledge.

The findings of this study confirm the analysis of many scholars and practitioners interested in the development of craft knowledge. There arises, therefore, an implication for administration and practice. Variously referred to as “wisdom of practice”, “intelligent and sensible know-how”, “occupational savvy”, or even “contextualized knowledge”, the craft knowledge acquired by Mary and Sadie was constructed through their experience together in collaboration. If the co-construction of craft knowledge is important enough to determine what teachers do and furthers their understanding about how they should conduct themselves in doing their work, then it seems important that structures be in place to provide opportunities for that to happen. One way by which teachers can develop their craft knowledge is through action research, or teacher-research groups. Individuals responsible for staff development are advised to examine processes which enable teachers to engage in collegially based inquiry.

The findings from this case study demonstrate clearly that establishing norms of collegiality through collaborative consultation takes considerable time. School district and ministry personnel responsible for implementation and innovation cannot expect “a quick fix” when introducing staff development programs with a collaborative focus. Attempts to
create the conditions for teacher collegiality will fail if immediate results are expected. Patience is required to allow the teachers time to experiment, to struggle and, hopefully, to establish collegial norms. Time is also needed to enable the teachers to establish trust, both in the selected staff development process and in each other, in order for staff development to occur in ways which have a positive impact on teaching practices.

The findings from this study also revealed that the "art of reflective questioning" was a skill which had not been previously developed by this pair of very experienced teachers. Mary and Sadie found the stimulated recall interviews to be instructive in helping them to develop skills in making their consultative conferences productive through reflective questioning. They had to learn how to make aspects of their teaching practice problematic without being perceived by the teaching partner as judgmental or evaluative.

An implication for those responsible for developing school-based administrators is that professional development is recommended for effective questioning. Both teachers from this study held administrative ambitions (for Mary to become a principal and for Sadie to become a vice principal) and both spoke about their hope to become more effective in working with teachers in a supervisory relationship. Both teachers commented on the challenges of structuring a productive conference through their line of questioning. They found the "art of questioning" to be particularly challenging. As well, they found the stimulated recall sessions, during which they had opportunities to revisit their performance as the colleague-observer, to be very instructive. Therefore, it is recommended that school systems and graduate programs in administration at university consider structuring professional development opportunities for teachers interested in administration and practicing administrators to engage in supervisory conferences using reflective questioning which can be videotape recorded for the participants to replay, reflect upon and critique.

A further implication arising out this study is that Mead's framework warrants careful consideration by interpretive scholars interested in capturing and representing the teacher's voice about their practice. The theoretical perspective of Mead proved very
useful for interpreting the social interactions of the two teachers. Its relevance today is as strong as when first posited by Mead in his lectures at the University of Chicago some 75 years ago. Scholars today routinely cite Schön in discussions about reflection and the reflective transformation of practice. Many trace Schön’s thinking about reflection back to Dewey, but few acknowledge the profound influence Mead had on Dewey’s thinking about this important concept.

Mead’s premise that humans construct their understanding of their experiences socially helped me to interpret the changes in behaviour and in the model of clinical supervision practiced by the participating teachers in this case study. The emergence of new meaning about their roles and responsibilities in their joint work was mediated by their experience in the process. The relationship which developed between Sadie and Mary was socially reflexive involving a dynamic interaction between the self and their experiences together. Through reflection, role-playing and improvisation, the participants achieved new insight into their partner’s requirements for growth and how it might be facilitated collegially. Their individual behaviour was in a dialectic relationship with their co-constructed relationship. The participants’ collegial behaviour was both shaped by their joint experiences and helped to frame the changes they made to the process.

Furthermore, Mead’s theory allowed me to understand how craft knowledge emerges. The meaning the teachers attributed to their new knowledge and the use they made of that knowledge was wholly consistent with Mead’s understandings about the social construction of meaning. Meaning was continually negotiated by the teachers as they co-constructed the structure and purpose of their collaborative work. Mead’s notions of emergence, perspective and process in social relations were all present in the data from this study. In an evolutionary way, Sadie and Mary’s joint work created opportunities for their individual development and for growth in their relationship.

Through an analytic focus on the social interaction occurring in the collaborative conferences, Mead offers a lens for the symbolic interpretation of the craft knowledge co-
constructed by the two participants. In particular, the function of the colleague-observer was shaped in terms of its role and responsibilities to generate appropriate behaviour from the colleague-teacher in order to achieve their mutually desired ends. In the early rounds of the process, these desired ends were to reinforce positive teaching behaviours and to validate good practice. In later rounds of the process, which they came to call “reflective conferencing”, the role of the colleague-observer became more empathetic and facilitative. This transformation of the role enabled control to shift over to the teacher and better serve the teacher’s needs for reflection and growth. Mead’s theoretical framework for revealing the social construction of meaning proved very instructive. Like-minded scholars would be well advised to consider his theory for application to their own interpretive inquiry.

What we do not know much about yet is how teachers’ craft knowledge develops. Nevertheless, this study has revealed that craft knowledge develops over time in an environment of a productive and positively valenced set of experiences. Further research is recommended on the mechanisms for the construction of craft knowledge and on the conditions for its development. A number of important questions for further research in this topical area come to mind. They are provided for consideration by qualitative researchers in consideration of their own lines of inquiry:

- What kind of structures favour teacher development?
- What kind of past experiences predispose certain teachers to engage in collaborative forms of staff development?
- What psychological factors influence the development of interdependent collegiality?
- What role does emotional intelligence play in collegiality?

There is much we do not yet know about collaboration, collegiality and the power of craft knowledge to create the conditions for change. If, as much of the of current research suggests, the teacher is the key to school improvement efforts, then we must continue to invest our efforts to support and sustain collaborative forms of teacher development which develop norms of collegiality in the workplace.
AFTERWORD

Much time has passed since the data were collected for this case study. The field of supervision continues to be an active subject of discussion among scholars. A rift has developed in recent years between academics who insist that supervision is an important field of study worthy of continued scholarship (e.g., Alfonso & Firth, 1990; Pajak, 1993) and those advocating its abolition (e.g., Starratt, 1992). Many observe its demise in terms akin to a death by natural causes (e.g., Glickman, 1992; Grimmett, 1996; Sergiovanni, 1992; Smyth, 1991).

Starratt’s (1992) attack is particularly stinging due to the fact that he takes a strong position in opposition to the further pursuit of teacher supervision after having established over a 20 year period a distinguished reputation as an authority in the field. He cites numerous studies which fail to demonstrate enduring benefits of teacher supervision over time. Teaching, he argues, is too complex an enterprise and teachers’ negative attitudes arising out of their supervisory experiences too powerful for supervision to be considered an effective model for teacher development.

Grimmett (1996) identifies five different issues which must be confronted for supervision to have a beneficial impact. He characterizes them as struggles for “authenticity” and they are all identified in the conclusions from this case study. Authentic teacher development involves professional discourse, mutual support, stable relations...
(involving trust), critical inquiry into practice, valuing the teaching-learning process, and a
classical orientation to professional growth. These were the same issues which Sadie
and Mary confronted in their joint work in supervision several years ago and remain just as
pertinent today.
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APPENDIX A

Extract from Stimulated Recall Interview
Transcript #4B with Mary

(in word processor format)
CONFERENCE #4B
STIMULATED RECALL INTERVIEW WITH Mary (TEACHER)

Conference held between Sadie (colleague-observer) and Mary (colleague-teacher).

NB: All text appearing in *italics* contains data obtained in stimulated recall with Mary during the replay of the conference videotape. The code [USR] indicates the beginning of a stimulated recall passage, while the code [END SR] indicates the resumption of the conference transcript. No attempt has been made to correct language in the transcript.

(Conference begins.)

Sadie: OK. Now, just to clarify the focus you asked me to take was "questioning". You wanted me to examine your questioning and you wanted me to look at the structure and the flow of the lesson. So I've broken it down into those two parts.

Mary: Good.

[USR]

Mary: That's probably too many things to ask for. I should have just either asked for questioning, or asked for structure...

DAVID: Mm, hmm.

Mary: ...but two variables was bit too much. I didn't even know what I was doing until last night quite late. I was planning and this morning I revised it, so I think I just wanted a sense from her...what she saw.

DAVID: Mm, hmm. I had a sense that it was...I anticipated it to be last moment [planning] because you had made a remark to me.

Mary: Yes, yeah.

DAVID: "I'm still not sure about what I'm going to do." And as a teacher, I understand that position perfectly!

Mary: [laughs]

DAVID: Sometimes it is not appropriate until the night before to really fine tune what you're doing. And I asked Sadie if she had had any input into delimiting the extent of the observation focus and she said, "No, there simply wasn't time"..."I thought I could handle it."

Mary: Like I knew the objective of my lesson. I just wasn't sure of the strategy at that time. I knew what I wanted to accomplish. Also, there wasn't time, and I thought if I just said, "question or structure", it would be suitable. I knew she could do that, but it wasn't enough time for pre-conferencing. We should have sat down. There wasn't time, um, you know? Since last...maybe from last Friday to today wasn't enough time for use to get together [the first observation of the fourth round occurred last Thursday]. OK? It were just so busy, because we had the weekend and then we had Monday, then I was with you [finishing the last part of her stimulated recall interview]...

DAVID: Yeah.
Mary: ...then we had meetings and we had staff meetings...

DAVID: Yeah.

Mary: ...There wasn't time for pre-conferencing and that was, I think, a real drawback. We should know better [laughs]!

DAVID: And put the dates [of reciprocal observations] so close together?

Mary: Yeah. We should also know better: that we need to, at least, spent 15 minutes quiet time pre-conferencing. I mean in the hallway on the run is just...that doesn't do the conference any good.

DAVID: No?

Mary: No.

Sadie: OK? Um, I found it kind of hard to analyze visually. So I'll just sort of take it a bit at a time. Um, I need to know what concerns you had about your questioning. What, I guess, you wanted to try to do for yourself.

Mary: OK.

Sadie: OK?

Mary: Let me start, OK? My turn. Over to me. Um, I had a hard time with this because by Grade 6 I naturally assume that they know a little fact collecting, and the strategies, and whatever.

Sadie: Mm, hmm.

Mary: And over the last month I'm realizing that they don't.

Sadie: Mm, hmm.

Mary: They, they're not...They hate grid sheets. They're copying sentences right out of the book, and everything. So I wanted to do a preview to the Japanese food section [of the ongoing Social Studies unit on Japan]. My mind...I couldn't come to terms with the strategy on how to do it. And as I was doing it this morning...what happened this morning wasn't planned.

Sadie: OK.

Mary: OK?

Sadie: Mm, hmm.

Mary: And I was very hesitant and uncomfortable because I didn't know how to approach fact collecting and it was a spur of the moment where I had them look at sentences and pick facts and do it on the board.
Mary: The web sheet after was what was planned. OK? And I really wanted to, um... I was concerned about my questioning because sometimes I tend to give them the information, rather than ask them a question so that they, they can come up with the information themselves.

Sadie: Mm, hmm.

Mary: OK? I think that, that...

Sadie: So you wanted more to come from the students...

Mary: Yes.

Sadie: ...and less to come from you.

Mary: Yeah. And I wanted to see if my questioning reflected that.

Sadie: All right.

Mary: You know? To see if I, if I've asked more questions than I give information.

Sadie: So you're thinking about numbers, or you're just thinking of keeping it balanced between you and the students?

Mary: Well, let's talk about the balance.

Sadie: OK.

Mary: Just to see.

Sadie: Well, all right. How did you feel about it?

Mary: Ah....

Sadie: Did you feel that it...that there was a reasonable balance? For sort of like your...you got it, um...they were able to give you a lot of the information, rather than you feeding it to them?

Mary: Um, I think that it was...how do I say this...there were a lot of silences and gaps...

Sadie: Mm, hmm.

Mary: ...between the class and myself...

Sadie: Mm, hmm.

Mary: ...and it was not comfortable for me. One because I don't think I was as prepared, because I switched gears right in the middle. Um, I'm tired. I mean I'm really tired and I can't focus in that respect. And I'm finding that if, with the class because they're the type of class to have a project and get on with it...

Sadie: Mm, hmm.
Mary: ...when I do this kind of activity and ask questions and there's only a handful of people that participate...

Sadie: Mm, hmm.

Mary: ...that's why I tried to do the strategy, "OK, turn to your partner and discuss." I discuss the response, or the fact, to that sentence. Then I had more hands up.

Sadie: Mm, hmm.

Mary: OK? Rather than them just sitting there and some will never, ever have talked[?]. And I'm not sure if they're absorbing it, or listening at the same time.

Sadie: OK. So you've already mentioned that to try and keep more of them involved...

Mary: Yeah.

Sadie:...you had them talking to each other. Um,...

Mary: As a break in the questioning. So that I would get more feedback...

Sadie: Ah, huh.

Mary: ...when I started questioning again.

Sadie: OK. Well, taking it...picking up on that. What other things do you felt [sic] that you did in order to keep more of them involved?

Mary: Um, I had them do the group [unintelligible]. There was a group task, a pair task, triad task.

Sadie: All right.

Mary: Then...OK. First of all, we started with the questions...

Sadie: Mm, hmm.

Mary: ...then the group task...

Sadie: Mm, hmm.

Mary: ...then the questions. Then when I felt it was getting bogged down again, I had them turn to each other...to verbalize to each other...

Sadie: Mm, hmm.

Mary: ...and then respond to me. And that helped. I had more responses after that.

Sadie: Mm, hmm.

Mary: And then, ah, I gave them and they were...I looked at their faces and they were lost. So then I thought, "Well, OK, we'll do sense instead of sentence to clarify."
Sadie: Mm, hmm.

Mary: ...for them, and that helped.

Sadie: Mm, hmm. OK, we're meet...we're kind of digressing...

Mary: I know.

Sadie: ...from the questioning. So I'll come to...but maybe what we'll do when we get to that part, we'll look at the structure...

Mary: See? I felt that Sadie through the whole time was uncomfortable with being in that role, that she's a lot easier if she's being interviewed. And she made the comment later on, um, on the tape and that it was easier to have...to sit there and answer the questions than ask them. And I think she had had everything on paper planned. And I found several times through the flow that she had...she had to go back to the paper, rather than pick up the flow of the conversation. And that, and that...and that was a stopping and starting kind of thing. And it was a little awkward for me.

DAVID: It threw you off, did it? When she handles her papers. ...does it affect you in any way?

Mary: It doesn't, it doesn't bother me, but I think it presents not a smoothness to the interview. And I think she isn't comfortable with that.

DAVID: Mm, hmm.

Mary: OK?

DAVID: The other aspect of this is: would you have preferred to have let this segment flow in the direction it was heading...toward structure and flow...

Mary: Yes. [laughs] I know.

DAVID: [chuckles too] It's not intended to be a pun.

Mary: I know.

DAVID: ...or were you glad for her to have pulled you back to the questioning focus? [pause] She asserted herself here...

Mary: Yes.

DAVID: ...I think it's fair to say.

Mary: That's fine because she had an agenda...

DAVID: Mm, hmm.

Mary: ...and, um, I think that for conferencing to flow sometimes you have to get rid of that agenda. Maybe just keep the agenda in your head and not on paper. I would have
preferred to go with the structure because I think that was maybe the main part of it. Because it just seemed ah...

DAVID: For you as a teacher?

Mary: For me, yeah. The questioning and at that point in the conversation the structure needed to be addressed because the structure and the questioning depended upon each other. Where in the interview, she chose to keep them separate.

DAVID: Mm, hmm.

Mary: OK?

DAVID: Could you envision yourself making that...a case for that line of inquiry? Is it a mutual inquiry?

Mary: Yeah, yeah. Now I can. At the time in the conference, it, it, yeah, I felt...

DAVID: Deferred to her?

Mary: Yeah. I deferred to her because she had the papers and pencils and was looking down and because she was asking me questions. I didn't want to take over and direct it in another way that she may not be ready for. OK? Or prepared for.

DAVID: Mm, hmm.

Mary: OK, so it's a different role being the interviewer. You know? You're not the person that, that's going to be asked the questions and do the reflective thinking. So, sometimes you just...I, I...this time I just didn't want to say anything.

DAVID: Right.

Mary: Thank you.

[END SR]

Mary: OK.

Sadie: ...and the flow...

Mary: OK.

Sadie: ...for that one. Um, OK. So your basic concern with the questioning was that you wanted more to come from the students and...

Mary: Yes.

Sadie: ...and less to come from you. Um, when I...looking on paper...I mean it's kind of...

Mary: Mm, hmm.

Sadie: ...unless you have a video camera running, or, or something...um, on paper it does look like there was a balance. I don't know if this is the best way to record it, but I had you on one side and the students...
Mary: OK.
Sadie: ...on the other side.
Mary: Oh, well that's good...
Sadie: And it's really hard to, um, get everything...
Mary: I know.
Sadie: ...that everybody says. I mean, if I only focused on you, I could probably get the whole thing, but then to get both...So I know I missed things that were said...

Mary: You see? She's trying to make it better by justifying the script and I appreciated the script. I didn't tell her that. And I probably will when I see her. I liked the script because that means that she was really attentive to my questions and looking at the balance. OK? But she was awkward with it. About, she's almost apologizing to me that she'd have to write the questions down. OK? And to me, I don't see that as a problem.

Mary: OK.
Sadie: ...um, by either group. Right? But, um, the essence was that the beginning, um, you had...I'll give you some examples. OK?
Mary: OK.
Sadie: You know? "Was there a skill that I was concerned about?" "Why was I concerned about that skill?" "Why was that important?" And you were eliciting those kinds of things from them. And, I guess, did you feel that at that point, you know, you had the students with you and they were sort of challenged to think about you were saying and respond to what you were saying?
Mary: Yes. I think...I know they did. Um, I tried to get a hook into them so that they remember their actions.
Sadie: Yeah.
Mary: "Do you remember when?"
Sadie: Mm, hmm.
Mary: ...was the lead in. And I kept that intro(duction), um, very short. I didn't, um...
Sadie: Yeah. That one didn't go on very long. I mean you got from them things like sentences, reports...
Mary: Yeah.
Sadie: ...some we put the facts into groups...
Mary: So they knew where I was leading to...

Sadie: Yeah.

Mary: ...so then when I was able to tell them, "We're going to talk about facts", I put them immediately into the book.

Sadie: Mm, hmm.

Mary: And then I was able to ask questions from there...

Sadie: Mm, hmm.

Mary: ...but, but the board work was the difficult part.

Sadie: Yeah, OK. Well, those were the...those were the initial questions that I had. And then you sort of led into, um, there was a very brief example on, ah, earthquake...earthquakes and whatnot...

Mary: Yes.

Sadie: ...and people talked about that. Um, OK, now there wasn't a lot of questioning here because then you gave them a task. OK?

Mary: Yes.

Sadie: "OK. Get your textbook. Turn to any page." And then, again, a lot of this was instructions. Then you had your, um, brainstorming sort of circle, or webbing, on the board. And then you got back to your questioning. OK? "Can we cross out some words?" And I didn't have the exact words that you said, but you were get...you were alluding to "getting rid of the unnecessary ones and getting rid of the excess baggage" that, ah, whatever you referred to there.

Mary: That was...that...this part here was difficult...

Sadie: Yeah.

Mary: ...for me...the questions.

Sadie: OK. And you've got...I think...You know? There was, um, one time here you said...[VCR is paused]

[USR]

Mary: You see, I had said "this part here was difficult" and she didn't come back and ask, "why?", or try to work that through. I kept...it was difficult from the point of view that I wasn't mentally prepared for them [the children]. I didn't know if I was doing an effective job and the opportunities for her to make me reflect and question, but she chose not to even pick it up. She went on to her agenda, rather than concentrating on what I was saying.

DAVID: Was that an intentional cue that you were giving her, or did it just work out that way?
Mary: It just worked out that way.

DAVID: But at this point in time, do you see it as an opportunity lost?

Mary: Yes. That's how I felt for most of the interview. There were opportunities, but weren't picked up because Sadie had an agenda that she wanted to get through and question and clarify. And some of her questions were questions, but also in a form of a clarification for herself. That's when she gave a question and more information. Question and then an explanation of the question. OK, so we'll watch for that.

[END SR]

Mary: ...that "the purpose of fact"...now this isn't verbatim...

Mary: Yeah.

Sadie: OK? But, but you did say, "OK. We're trying to get down the basics. It should be fast. It should be efficient."

Mary: Yes.

Sadie: Um, there you did give them information.

Mary: I know.

Sadie: OK?

Mary: They found that...as I said, I found that part really difficult because, ah, I was conscious of time...

Sadie: Mm, hmm.

Mary: ...and I wanted to get to these parts and...

Sadie: Mm, hmm.

Mary: ...they were looking at me blankly and I thought, "Well, if I give them some information maybe I'll be...help with the questioning.

Sadie: Yeah. The questions diminish. I must admit.

Mary: Ah!

Sadie: OK?

Mary: That's interesting!

Sadie: In the beginning, you had a lot to get it going. Then the questions diminish, other than...like, it was clarification kinds of things. Because you were alluding to the brainstorming...

Mary: Mm, hmm.
Sadie: ...on the board. OK? Um, Kim says, "That doesn't sound right." Ah, I didn't write that down...

Mary: OK.

Sadie: ...That's where she was...you were chopping the words out. And, and then Jason, I think, added, "Well, it doesn't have to." And then you got back to, "Well, yes. You can write the full sentence when you write your report." Um...

Mary: [unintelligible]

Sadie: ...and then Julie started talking about, "Well, changing 'to go to', um, and putting 'travel in.'"

Mary: Mm, hmm.

Sadie: Um, and then you started...it was...there was a lot of things where you went back and forth between the students to get more clarification on what they meant...

Mary: OK.

Sadie: ...And what the rest...how the rest of the class saw it. There were those kinds of things going on.

Mary: Was I ask...was I sort of repeating for clarification? Or was I asking for clarification?

Sadie: Ah...

Mary: When they [unintelligible] see me?

Sadie: ...good question. Um, I think you were trying to get agreement from the class. That's the way I interpreted it. [Mary pauses the VCR playback]

[USR]

Mary: That's diplomatic of her. [she laughs]. I wanted something specific and maybe she didn't know, but she came with a very diplomatic and neutral answer which was fine. Maybe I was, I think, feeling very comfortable the way she was looking at my questions. For me to even ask for that. I don't think I even asked her a lot of questions in our previous conferences.

DAVID: Mm, hmm.

Mary: I mean, to ask that question of her opinion and, um, it was comfortable. Certainly, I mean the exchange was there and she seemed to appear comfortable responding.

DAVID: I have only seen part of this video tape, as you know, and I recall it coming up only once.

Mary: Oh, OK. That's...we've never done that before with me asking. So that's another change in it [the developing relationship], isn't it?
DAVID: Mm, hmm.

Mary: Let's see if I can pick any more up and see why it's different.

[END SR]

Sadie: ...I mean, there were times when you...there would be words crossed out and then somebody would change it around...

Mary: Yeah.

Sadie: ...and whatnot. Um...

Mary: I think I was getting too...Like the balance was off here. I think I was giving them too much information...

Sadie: Mm, hmm.

Mary: ...trying to rush through the lesson, rather than using the questions to get it from them.

Sadie: Yeah, yeah. There were more directions in there.

Mary: Yeah, yeah. So the beginning was...

Sadie: So there are questions at the beginning...

Mary: And directions.

Sadie: [overlapping] ...and directions, and then, like, some questioning for clarification...

Mary: Yeah.

Sadie: ...and, um, and then you, I guess, were getting ah...no. Did I...this is just before you gave them the exercise...

Mary: Yes.

Sadie: ...um, [pause] What were you referring to here? "How many think the word 'removal' is necessary?" I'm not sure which one that was referring to because then you had, "In Japan today everybody you knew wears western clothing."

Mary: Yes.

Sadie: Um, and then there was an allusion to, "Well, there's going to be times when in a sentence there might be more than one fact."

Mary: OK.

Sadie: Um, one, two...OK. When you got to the specific example...when you had the food article...

Mary: "Sushi", yeah.
Sadie: ...then you got back to questioning again.

Mary: Oh, OK.

Sadie: All right? "What, what's treated as a fine [unintelligible]?" "What's important?" Um, "What are we saying?" "What does it mean?" "What the most interesting element?" And then clarification about word meanings. And then towards the end, you had, "OK. Well what have we learned?"

Mary: OK.

Sadie: All right? So, I guess, if there was sort of...as far as the questioning goes, I saw a lot of questions at the beginning. Um, and then it became necessary to, you know, give directions...

Mary: [unintelligible] questions.

Sadie: ...and then there was questioning for clarifying. And then questioning over the exercise that they had before them. And questioning in order to come to a conclusion. So those are, I guess, the way I saw it breakdown.

Mary: So if we look at the parts of the lesson...

Sadie: Well...

Mary: ...I, I'm just, I'm just saying roughly four...there's maybe four parts. I haven't even counted: four parts [Mary pauses the VCR playback at this time]...

[USR]

Mary: Now she wasn't ready for the structure. She still wanted to complete the questioning. And I, I...I don't know. I sense little bit that she was uneasy with what I wanted from her. You know? Maybe she had questions rolling to get um some responses from me. I think she's really most interested in her agenda.

[END SR]

Mary: ...to the lesson. I would say that maybe three parts are questions and one part...the major part though...was the clarification and that I would say, "Would it be the teaching part? Or information part?"

Sadie: Mm, hmm.

Mary: That went OK.

Sadie: OK.

Mary: That's interesting to note. Yeah, I knew exactly where...which part was the bothersome one for, for the questions.

Sadie: Well, you have to sort of weigh in your own mind, too. Is it really important to keep the questioning going for 40 minutes? Or is it more important that you look at the
quality of the questions and, um, you know, the...for, say, a short period of time, there is a real purpose to...

Mary: OK.

Sadie: ...the questioning? I guess we have to sort of look at that, too. And I had a few other questions that I was thinking about...

Mary: OK.

Sadie: ...just as far as the questions go. Um, I had, "Do you feel that the students were challenged to think and respond when you were asking them questions?"

Mary: Um, for some of the students, "Yes."

[USR]

Mary: That was an excellent question [that] she asked! It really made me think of another...not the kinds of questions, but the purpose of questions. And, ah, I think the conversation over here could be challenged and bring in others in as [unintelligible].

DAVID: Mm, hmm. Well she is, as you pointed out, discretely in somewhat, in unobtrusively bringing redirecting you back to questioning.

Mary: Mm, hmm. Mm, hmm.

DAVID: You attempted "the four parts", but "No, no. We're not going to talk about..."

Mary: Mm, she's still...she's not ready.

[END SR]

Sadie: Mm, hmm.

Mary: ...For some of the students, "No." And I could by how many people participated now...

Sadie: Yeah.

Mary: ...but that's normal with that class.

Sadie: Mm, hmm.

Mary: It's always those people who raise their hands...

Sadie: Mm, hmm.

Mary: ...the others just sit there...

Sadie: Mm, hmm.

Mary: ...They behave. And it's not as...I mean, they're not absorbing it. Um, if you took, like, one lesson and saw...oh, you know? Five people only say something. You have to wonder. Maybe they're not...
Sadie: Mm, hmm.

Mary: ...into it, but that, that's always the way it is.

Sadie: OK. Well, which...maybe we should look at then...which element do you see sitting there not responding to the questions? Which group?

Mary: Oh, the shy, quiet people that...you know?...

Sadie: Mm, hmm.

Mary: ...Julie...

Sadie: Mm, hmm.

Mary: ...who would say, "Well, leave me alone, but I'm still paying attention" kind of thing. "I'd rather someone else do it."

Sadie: Mm, hmm.

Mary: So, um, I don't think my questions were challenging enough. Or, um, or in...even if they were challenging, they were put in such a...maybe, maybe they were too threatening for some of those others? [pause] I'm not sure. You have to look at the personalities of the children...

Sadie: Yeah.

Mary: ...I went down the class list. I know which ones are participating and which wouldn't.

Sadie: Mm, hmm.

Mary: You know? Leave some very...

Sadie: But it, it is, sort of, a comfort level. I mean, do you think that most of them are comfortable? It's half-way through the year.

Mary: Yes.

Sadie: So most of them, you feel like they're comfortable...

Mary: Yes.

Sadie: ...and they're not...

Mary: Yeah.

Sadie: So, to take it really like they feel that threatened, or they're just sort of...

Mary: No...

Sadie: ...fairly ambivalent, or...
Mary: ...I think...
Sadie: ...but, I guess...

Mary: Yeah.
Sadie: ...you know? How can we, um...What's a way of looking at getting more of them involved? Um, I, I saw...or, which...well, which students did you see as most involved?

[\(\uparrow\)SR]

Mary: Now she's brought another element into this and that's participation.

DAVID: Mm, hmm.

Mary: Rather than the questioning and structure...the participation aspect and thinking about it, maybe she's noticed something about what I did and...

DAVID: Mm, hmm.

Mary: ...I mean it fits. It certainly fits in I mean questioning and participation fits in [go together], but it's another focus that we spent a lot of time talking about.

DAVID: Yes, you did.

Mary: Yeah, a long time. And, um, ah, [pause] I'll leave it like that. I'll think about it some more.

[\(\uparrow\)END SR]

Mary: Well, Mel is one of my top students...
Sadie: Mm, hmm.

Mary: ...and she was whispering the answers to Jason. And Jason raised his hand. Winnie...
Sadie: Mm, hmm.

Mary: ...you know? Cindy was really good about that...
Sadie: Mm, hmm.

Mary: ...Corey, Kevin, Wes...
Sadie: Mm, hmm.

Mary: ...ah, Nicole. But the rest, the type of personalities they are, I think they are quite comfortable letting somebody else do the answers...
Sadie: Mm, hmm.

Mary: ...Julie raised her hand at one point, I think...
Sadie: Mm, hmm. Or would...what if there were people that just never raised their hand. Would you call upon them?

Mary: No.

Sadie: No?

Mary: Not at all.

Sadie: Why not?

Mary: Ah, I don't like putting people on the spot because I don't like that for me. What I do is say, "Turn to your partner and discuss it."

Sadie: Mm, hmm.

Mary: So then that involves a different kind of participation and commitment to that partner to get involved and give some answers.

Sadie: Mm, hmm.

Mary: OK?

Sadie: So you feel that if, if they haven't volunteered an answer and...but they're reasonably comfortable in there that you still wouldn't call upon them.

Mary: No.

Sadie: OK.

[SR]

Mary: That's almost if I wasn't comfortable and, and understand the nature of the conference and everything...

DAVID: Mm, hmm.

Mary: ...that was almost a confrontational question she just asked.

DAVID: Mm, hmm.

Mary: OK? And it could set up for anyone else to be defensive. Like if she's conferencing with another teacher for the first time. That would be, um, it almost puts an anxiety in the relationship. I mean I never thought of it that way. I mean I thought it was OK to ask, the flow, but seeing it here...

DAVID: Yeah.

Mary: ...the way she phrased it is not really reflective.

[END SR]

Mary: 'Cause I find other ways of finding out whether they're absorbing it...whether through the exercise, or I'd walk around and listen to the conversation.
Sadie: Mm, hmm.

Mary: OK? And when they were with...in pairs, they were conversing about what was there...and looking at the book and picking out the sentence and picking out the fact.

Sadie: Mm, hmm.

Mary: And looking at the board, I don't think I saw anyone fidgeting, or playing in their desks, or anything. They were all focused on there, so their participation was there. It just wasn't verbal.

Sadie: Mm, hmm.

Mary: And I just...I guess [it's] my personal belief system. And I wouldn't call upon the student.

Sadie: Yeah. Yeah. Well, no. I'm not saying that, you know, to put them on the spot...

Mary: Yeah.

Sadie: ...and make them feel really embarrassed. It's just that if, if they've been in a classroom for quite a long time, they're reasonably, you know, quite comfortable...that maybe they should be encouraged to participate more...

Mary: Yeah.

Sadie: ...and, you know? Just sort of...

Mary: That's a good point.

Sadie: ...in a gentle way pull them in. And I was thinking, um, more to people at the back.

Mary: Yeah.

Sadie: Um, and I think there was a larger number of E.S.L. kids there. OK? Um...

Mary: Yes, there's, um, five left who...you know?...who you don't know what English they're going to get. I mean...

Sadie: Yeah. So there were the people at the back and I didn't...did Francis volunteer anything?

Mary: No, but he was really on task.

Sadie: Yeah.

Mary: And that's, um, that's unusual.

Sadie: Mm, hmm.

Mary: Well, it's getting better...

Sadie: Yeah.
Mary: ...for him.

Sadie: And I noticed Pierre OK when you helped him...

Mary: Yeah.

Sadie: ...get set up.

Mary: Yes.

Sadie: Yeah. OK.

Mary: I, I just, um, you've got a good point about their participation: to encourage them. It, it's interesting. Bonnie, which [sic] is an incredible student. And in class, she'll come up and talk to me, or give answers just one-on-one. And I could hear David hear her!

Sadie: I know.

Mary: And then on the playground, or basketball...This kid has a voice! You know?

Sadie: I used to tease her a lot last year, too...

Mary: So...you know?

Sadie: ...and we had to work on it a lot.

Mary: I wonder if some of that is a cultural thing for some of those girls?

Sadie: Ah...

Mary: ...Because most of them are Chinese and they just...

Sadie: It's certainly not...well, in, in her case [Bonnie], I wouldn't want to generalize and say that...

Mary: Yeah.

Sadie: ...for all of them...

Mary: Yeah.

Sadie: ...but, um, she has expressed, too, that it is not a concern as far as her family is...

Mary: Yeah.

Sadie: ...involved. I mean, they do not...To them, the written...you know?...production...

Mary: That's right.

Sadie: ...of things and, um, academics and whatnot. And marks are really important, but, um, how vocal she is in the room is not taken as a...

Mary: Yeah.
Sadie: So I think to a degree, certainly in her family, it would be...

Mary: I think...

Sadie: ...it's stressed to be quiet and be...yeah.

Mary: ...so that there's a lot of factors. What, what I think I may try is, um, a cooperative learning jigsaw.

Sadie: Mm, hmm.

Mary: So that might get those quiet ones having to participate and speak to somebody else...

Sadie: Mm, hmm.

Mary: ...or do more cooperative learning activities where...and keep that group for, maybe, two weeks.

Sadie: Mm, hmm.

Mary: And everyone in that group has to present. Caroline does a lot with them in Drama.

Sadie: Yeah. I, I know it's...

Mary: So, so you know?

Sadie: ...there's...

Mary: It, it comes out there, but as to participation in a lesson like that...

Sadie: Mm, hmm.

Mary: ...I try to do different kinds of participation, "Turn to your partner. OK, discuss." OK, those take responsi(bility)...You know?

Sadie: OK, so...

Mary: Those kind..."Write the question up", so it isn't me up there questioning...

Sadie: Yes.

Mary: ...and they're sitting there all the time.

Sadie: Well, OK. I guess. just sort of interpreting what you're saying then is that your concern when you're questioning is that there's a reasonable balance between your involvement and their involvement. On the other hand, um, you're not expecting everybody to participate then.

Mary: No. My concern was whether my questions were...not so much they're...the balance of the students and me...
Sadie: Mm, hmm.

Mary: ...it...my...it...to whether my questions were questions. And not information.

Sadie: Yeah, OK...

Mary: And we talked about that.

Sadie: ...Yeah. I, I didn't say that very well. I meant that you are not feeding them information....

Mary: Yeah.

Sadie: ...that the questions were posed in such a way so that they had to give the information.

Mary: Yes.

Sadie: OK?

Mary: Now we're back from participation back to questioning again. OK? So she's still trying...it's almost like she has questioning: a beginning and a discussion. She wants to close it off before she goes on to the next [topic].

DAVID: Oh, I think so.

Mary: Yes. And it doesn't it for a real smooth...like a smooth flow, or that, um, I'm feeling that what I'm saying is, is listened to and that I have the reflections, so that, um...And that's not entirely her fault, or anything. There's no fault in here. I mean you go...you do something like this, it's a risk no matter what you do. I don't think we pre-conferenced and again I have emphasize one focus would have been enough.

DAVID: Mm, hmm.

Mary: I think for...There was, um, I think half and half. Half, I gave the questions. Half I gave the answers.

Sadie: So you wouldn't use questioning as a strategy for checking then all of the students.

Mary: No.

Sadie: You would, maybe, just expect to hear from a sample of students. And you would get to the other students in other ways.

Mary: Yes.

Sadie: Like where you said they could talk in their pairs...

Mary: Yes.
Sadie: ...and they could talk in their groups...

Mary: Mm, hmm.

Sadie: ...or, um, what other things might you do then?

Mary: Well, um, I would have... put... maybe another strategy for that is to put a sentence on the board...

Sadie: Mm, hmm.

Mary: ...and they each have to, on a slip of paper, write down the fact. And I would just briefly run through to see if it was OK. Or, um, another one is, um, come up with 30 sentences and each one [student] gets a different sentence. They have to put [down] a fact. And then they have to find somebody else, just, and then they would share each other's sentences and facts... kind of thing.

Sadie: Mm, hmm.

Mary: And the activity that I'm doing today, they'll hand it in. And, um, I would check to see how their facts were. So that I know they're in class listening.

Sadie: Mm, hmm.

Mary: OK? And, um, maybe possibly have them work in groups of three or four... Have them look at a paragraph together and say, "OK, what are the facts?" So the dialogue and the checking between them, and not me so much...

Sadie: Mm, hmm.

Mary: ...so that they're teaching each other. So I would do a lot of different things like that. I know what it was like for me when I was in school...

Sadie: Yeah.

Mary: ...I mean, it... you know? For some of those children, they just can't do it. You know?

Sadie: Mm, hmm.

Mary: But I know Kelly, in your room. She's coming along quite nicely. It's not such a...

Sadie: Yeah.

Mary: ...Scary thing.

Sadie: Yeah. Well, no. She's wouldn't want to be up... put in a position where she has to speak in front of the whole group. Um...

Mary: I think if I...

Sadie: ...Like that.
Mary: ...if I said to them, "You all have to a presentation within in a week in front of the whole class." And then they could do it.

Sadie: Mm, hmm.

Mary: But on, on a spur of the moment question. "OK, Bonnie. What's your answer?" You know? She would give it to me, but, but it's not something she'd naturally volunteer for because it isn't that important.

Sadie: Mm, hmm. OK. Then you don't see it as being that important for the children to be able to give answers?

Mary: Ah, verbally?

Sadie: Yeah.

[USR]

Mary: That's a rather defensive question. You know. It could be confrontational. Like I'm not sure if she is disagreeing with me and it's sort of making me feel a little insecure about my feelings. And several times I've had to say, "Well, this is what I believe. It's my value system." Like I'm having to defend my perceptions, so it, um, I think we've come a long way and we're comfortable enough, but I don't sense any, um, defensiveness in my tone there, or anything else in the conference. I just accepted it as being what it is, but looking at it [the conference playback], and anyone else looking at it, could see that maybe, um, I'm not sure if there's a hidden agenda in Sadie's part, or what. Why she's asking it that way.

DAVID: Mm, hmm.

[END SR]

Mary: Not, not...In a session like that? No I don't.

Sadie: Yeah? OK.

Mary: That's just my personal belief.

Sadie: OK. Well, that's interesting. Um, I think we've touched on a lot of these [referring to her consultation notes and questions. Mary pauses VCR playback]...

[USR]

Mary: Again, she has to look back at her papers. OK? It's very important for her to go through those. Remember the last conference? The last session we did? In the spring...in the fall time [she's referring to Nov. 1990], where I decided to go in "cold" without any notes?

DAVID: Yeah.

Mary: I mean I had it prepared in my mind. The whole...And I found it was one of the best ones we ever did because we flowed with the conversation...

DAVID: Yeah.
Mary: ...and I think that...if we can come in and prepare that way, that's the best.

[END SR]

Sadie: ...Do you think that the students were able to follow where you were going? Um, well look, maybe I should ask that one in a minute when we look at the flow of the lesson.

Mary: OK.

Sadie: Um, we'll come back to that one.

Mary: OK.

Sadie: Um, [consults her notes] OK. Do you want...Do you have any, sort of, any more thoughts on questioning? And then we'll...

Mary: Yeah.

Sadie: ...look...

Mary: Yeah.

Sadie: ...at the structure and the flow of the lesson.

Mary: You've made me think about the participation, um, issue. And, um, as I'm thinking, I still think that I wouldn't call any specific person out...

[USR]

Mary: I must have a sense that I'm defending myself. So I have to keep coming back to it, so that she understands that there's nothing wrong with my view.

[END SR]

Sadie: Mm, hmm.

Mary: ...um, I think Zuben was whispering answers to me when he gave his answers, but I think if was in the back, he may not raise his hand. Maybe because I'm closer to him, so walking around the room...standing by the people may be a better way...

Sadie: Mm, hmm.

Mary: ...to say, you know, quietly, "Do you have anything to say?"

Sadie: Mm, hmm.

Mary: So that may be another way...positioning myself in the room...

Sadie: Mm, hmm.

Mary: ...for them to feel comfortably close to me...

Sadie: Mm, hmm.
Mary: ...another way to do it. Another way is, um, you know? Francis has ideas and the class often encourages him. And several times since Christmas, which is a miracle, he's gotten up and spoken with big sheets. And so they clapped. And they cheered. And they really encourage, you know, been really supportive. I think that with...among themselves, they're a very supportive group...

Sadie: Mm, hmm.

Mary: ...for the answers, the encouraging...and Jason and Marilyn are working so good together, it's incredible! You know? He's learning a lot from her and she's really been able to coach him along. So, you know? She doesn't give the answers out, but, but I think they're learning from each other. Um, for that respect, I wouldn't ask Marilyn to raise her hand all the time...to pinpoint her because she's just shy...

Sadie: Mm, hmm.

Mary: You know? But it doesn't mean that she doesn't have it. I look for ways to make sure that she's gotten her concept. That's all that really matters to me...that they've gotten the concept.

Sadie: Mm, hmm. I guess I was thinking, too, though if, if you set it up so that they're going to be successful...! mean, you don't want to set it up so that they're going to be unsuccessful and be embarrassed...

Mary: That's right.

Sadie: ...um, because that would defeat the whole thing, but you set it up so their chance for success is pretty well, you know, 95%....

Mary: Yeah.

[SR]

Mary: This is almost the first time in the conferences that Sadie's given her opinion, which is a nice change. That she must feel comfortable enough to do so that, that she feels that I want to hear what she has to say. So that, that's nice to see. It means that we trust one another.

[END SR]

Sadie: ...unless they haven't been listening at all, um, then do you see a lot of harm in having, um, all of them called on to answer? Or participate...

Mary: It depends on...

Sadie: ...verbally?

Mary: ...depends on the activity. I mean like math, I would find that it would be easier to do it with something like math because that's really, you know, right or wrong, yes or no answer, but something to deal with concepts and thinking might be difficult. I know one group at the back never gave their sentences. They never raised their hand when I asked...

Sadie: Mm, hmm.
Mary: ..."Was there anybody else who didn't raise their hand?"

Sadie: So what do you do about that?

Mary: So when I went by them, they said, "Mrs. M., we didn't give a sentence." I says [sic], "Do you want to now?" They says, "No, we'd rather not."

Sadie: Mm, hmm.

Mary: I says [sic], "Well, that's fine." I wasn't worried about them because they were good students. OK? And so something...

Sadie: Well, how would you avoid having kids that just didn't contribute at all and were...

Mary: Well, I would keep better track in my mind which group it was. Normally, in other situations, because I was pressed for time here, I let it go. In other situations, I'd make a big deal and I'd joke and tease them. And the class would get after them and then they would respond...in a really kind of fun atmosphere. It wouldn't be threatening at all. Can you think of other ways to do that participation? You know, there are some students don't raise their hands, or, or...

Sadie: I, I, I guess what I try to do is, um...you know? Not that it's right or wrong, but just...if, if, you know? There's been a lot of discussion about it and everybody's had a chance to be successful in the small group where they're on their own, then, um, it's...I think it's kind of valuable for the kids to learn to learn the skill of being able to share their ideas with other people and work in the larger group, as well.

Mary: OK.

Sadie: Um, maybe because they didn't realize in situations you have to do that.

Mary: Yeah, OK.

Sadie: Um, you know? I grew up that way too...sitting back and not saying a whole lot. It made it very difficult as an adult. It made it really difficult as an adult.

Mary: Yeah. You, you have no problems now, because you...

Sadie: Yeah, but I learned along the way. I've been...

Mary: You got cured [laughs]!

Sadie: I, I got cured when I went up North.

Mary: Oh, yeah.

Sadie: Because I...you were called upon to speak at any time in front of a whole village and at first it just, ah...I declined. And then I was told I was being insulting. Um, so when you are asked to speak, it was a privilege to speak. They were trying to honour the fact that your ideas were important. And so I learned a lot from that. And you were insulting them by telling them that you didn't want to speak.

Mary: Mm, hmm,
Sadie: Um...

Mary: Yeah, I can see from the cultural thing, "Yes".

Sadie: Yeah.

Mary: Say you have to learn.

Sadie: Yeah. So...

Mary: I think there's other strategies, you know, you've given me...

Sadie: Yeah.

Mary: ...something to think about as, as, as the whole response to participation. Um, I guess in group work, they participate and share and when they're editing some piece of writing as they have to find four people to edit and proof-read and share something with [that person].

Sadie: Mm, hmm.

Mary: And, um, ah, songs or stories that they've written in groups, or by themselves, we have sharing in the whole class. So there...I've done it...

Sadie: Mm, hmm.

Mary: ...but it's something like this that, I guess, time and conscious decisions on personalities...

Sadie: Well yeah. You have to look at the time.

Mary: ...I think there is...I don't think I do enough of that participation, or, um, not, um, sharing of the students' work in front of everyone else because of the elements of time and what you're trying to accomplish in a day. I do some of it, but not probably nearly as much. But then...

Sadie: Well...

Mary:...Caroline does a lot of it in her class in the afternoon.

Sadie: Yeah. Well, you do have to balance it.

Mary: Mm, hmm.

Sadie: Um, [consults her notes] OK. Do you feel comfortable then moving on? If we go and move on...

Mary: Sure.

[End of extract from Conference #4B. Full transcript ends on page 50]
Extract from a Coded Stimulated Recall Interview

Transcript #3B with Sadie

(in Ethnograph ASCII format)
SC: I guess to give you a little bit of background here, the last year, when we started off, the model that we used for the conferences was one that Mary provided...

DL: Um, hum.

SC: ...that was really a clinical supervision model.

DL: Um, hum.

SC: And because I hadn't been involved in a lot of this type of thing...

DL: Um, hum.

SC: Um, what we usually agreed that's what we would use. Um, but I guess towards the end I became less and less enamored with it because the model, I mean it became exactly the same. You knew exactly how the conference was going to go. It was, um, difficult to lead into new stuff. Um, and it made the person reflect because really you were just saying, oh you know, what was good about it, mm, that kind of thing. And there was a lot of patting on the back. And, ah, for me that wasn't enough. I mean, I didn't just want to get a pat on the back and say, "Well, that was very nice", because you really to think more about what you were doing.

DL: Um, hum.

SC: Um, so I tried to structure the interview differently [this time].

DL: I recall.
SC: Um, that didn’t go over very well [laughs] the first time!

DL: From your perspective, or...

SC: Well, from my perspective, I thought I hadn’t done too badly because it was a first attempt. Um, it’s very difficult, you know, how to phrase your questions, ah, when it’s your first attempt. And also, I find from the workshops that we’re having, um, there’s really very little information on how to phrase reflective questions. And, and so you’re kind of breaking new ground and you’re trying to figure out, "Well, what can you say?" And, "How can you word this?" And we don’t have a great repertoire to fall back on, ah, for structuring the questions. So, um, anyway, it was interesting at the workshops that, that the issue came up again and...but I think it’s been resolved in that we pre-conferenced this time. That was a decision that we made. And, um, we pre-conferenced and we decided that we would, uh, work further on this reflective questioning type of strategy, rather than [on] that clinical supervision model.

DL: Um, hum.

SC: And, um, the other thing is that we would want a focus

#-SUMM #-FOCUS #-QUESTION

SC: Well, I’ll just summarize a little bit for the purposes of the tape, um, at our preconference, um, before the lesson you said what you’d like me to focus on is your questioning.

MAM: Um hum.

SC: And in particular what you were going to do is, uh, an editing
exercise with the students. And you had a paragraph on the board. And, you were going to take them through editing this paragraph and coming up with ways that they could improve upon it.

MAM: Yes.

SC: So, I’ve really attempted to focus in on the questioning. And, I guess, to begin with, just, sort of for some background on myself. I was curious to know whether you used any special criterion in selecting the sample paragraph to set up the lesson.

MAM: Um, the sample paragraph was the basis from the students’ work that I’ve accumulated over the years. It is a student I had from 3 years ago and his paragraph was basic, but I did a lot of changes to the paragraph and exaggerated the mistakes.

SC: Um, hum.

MAM: OK, I exaggerated the mistakes because I was very conscious with my class. Their editing and proof-reading was very minimal. I still have students at this level who don’t put periods in. They don’t know what a...where sentences go, or thoughts end and begin. Never mind paragraphs. I have just to go to square one with sentences.

SC: Um, hum.

MAM: And, uh, I had done this with, I had grade 3’s years ago, and I found it very useful to do this every day because they learned. The pressure was taken off them. Uh, I did all the work on the board for them and they could really, you know, have attention and focus, plus it was modelling for them on the board. Some of the things they would transfer to their writing. OK? I either could go this way with modelling, or worksheets. And I find worksheets don’t work for me. OK?
MAM: And after recess when I went back to the class and I had put down the "before" and "after" on the board and they were all reading it. They made some comments. It was longer and it was better description, and I asked how many of them enjoyed it. They all raised their hands. And, uh, I asked them if would want to do this every day for 20 minutes and they agreed.

MAM: I said, "Well, why did you enjoy it?" And they gave me some reasons: that it was fun, and uh, the time went quickly. And I said, "Did you learn?" They said, "Yes." I said, "What did you learn?" "Well, describing words. I learned to make the story not boring.

MAM: "I learned that thoughts go..." So, that's a beginning. So, I've accomplished what I wanted. Getting their attention. The paragraph that I put on the board had to be exaggerated and funny and weird and a little bizarre to hook them into this. All right? And, you know, hopefully, if you'd like to come in in 2 weeks, or 3 weeks, to see a difference in their editing and proof-reading, that might be fun.

MAM: Just feel free to come and see if there is a difference. Today there was only 2 or 3...well, not 2, I should say...about 6 or 8 students who were consistent in their hands up. OK? Uh, Zubin was one who only offered once. Frank was an ESL student [who] offered one, but he made a very good connexion.
SC: Um, hum.

MAM: I mean his thought was there.

SC: Um, hum.

#-TIME
MAM: Um, hopefully in 2 or 3 weeks we'll see if a lot more people are able to have their hands up and become a little bit more complex in their reasoning...and explanations in giving changes. I also said changes rather than editing and proofreading. Uh, just hook them. But later on, uh, once we introduce editing and proof-reading, I'm going to say, "What change was that? Was it an editing change, or proof-reading change?"

SC: Um, hum.

LEARN -STUDENT
MAM: OK, so then they'll internalize that concept later on. And then when we're finished, we will come up with charts, class charts, of what editing looks like, sounds like, looks like...

SC: You're using editing and proof-reading differently, do you want to clarify what...?

MAM: OK, proof-reading is your mechanics, your spelling, your punctuation, capital letters, everything. Um, your editing is adding words, taking words away, describing words. Giving it a, a, a life to, and a tone to, a piece of writing. That's what editing is to me. And, and, uh, I, if you noticed, they do all the proof-reading first. And then they highlight the, they go into the editing. And that's natural. I've done it many times.

SC: Um, hmm.

MAM: And so, hopefully, as my teaching will be to make the difference
between editing and proof-reading for them to internalize that part of it. And then to transfer that into their writing, and to be, I'd like your impression, you know, have we, to see if that's happening. What I am doing...this will be done every day. So,...

#-SUMM $-FOCUS %-QUESTION
SC: OK. So, just, I guess, to summarize then. You're, you're emph...the emphasis that you wanted the students to get out of the lesson was picking out the proof-reading that needed to be done, making the changes and whatnot.

MAM: Yes.

SC: OK. Um, OK, to move to, I guess, the emphasis that you wanted me to watch for, which was, um, your questioning. Uh, I'd first of all like to ask you how you felt about how your questioning went. And, um, you know, if you had some ideas in the back of your mind before you went into the class about questioning strategies.

MAM: OK. I really didn't think a lot about the questioning strategies because I wanted it to be natural for me.

SC: Um, hum.

MAM: OK, I didn't want to focus on, um, you know, what should I, how should I plan the questions, or what should I do? Um, the only thing I wanted to do was to be conscious not to give them too much information. Or to teach them too much. Or to tell them too much. I wanted, through my questioning, for them to tell me.

SC: Um, hum.

MAM: OK? Um, And that wasn't 100% successful. [laughs]

SC: Yeah, I was going to ask how you felt about that, but OK. So you
tried to be conscious of not giving away answers...

MAM: Yes.

SC: basically. OK. Um, how do you feel about that then?

MAM: Um, there were times when I caught myself giving the information.

SC: Um, hum.

MAM: OK. There was one line that said "the super rod". No, "the fisherman". And I says I have to tell you this. OK? 'Cause it's bothering me. To make light of it and make fun of it. Um, but there were times when I found myself giving information and then asking a question where I could have asked questions to get them going on this.

SC: OK, can you think of a time?

MAM: Uh...Oh! Conjunction, "because". I told...they... remember the part where they put a period, then a capital "B" for "Because"?

SC: Yeah.

MAM: And then they came back to that and I said, "Well, why?" And Orin gave the reason. And I says, "Yes, you're right because this is a conjunction. And it's a joining word..." and all this stuff.

SC: Um, hum.

MAM: And I thought well I shouldn't have done that. I should have asked the question for them to come up with the idea, or the concept of what a conjunction was.

SC: OK. So you could have elicited from them...

MAM: That's right.

SC: What it was. OK.
MAM: Yeah. And then I was, uh, it's just a consciousness of, of, of certain...I think maybe... Oh, I don't know. I'm just estimating about 6 or 7 times where I gave them information rather than asking questions. There was a couple of times where I should have...I'm trying to ask them reflective questions where they are thinking.

SC: Um, hum.

MAM: And that's when I stopped because I wasn't getting much from them. I stopped and asked them [to] share ideas. OK?

SC: So, you tried to encourage reflection.

MAM: Um, hum.

SC: Can you give an example where you tried to encourage reflection?

MAM: Oh! Uh, um...Oh, um, when I asked them, what's it called? Um, as a reader, I would like to know certain things about this piece of writing. Some information.

SC: OK.

MAM: OK? And I wanted to get them more at being a little more descriptive about the man and the woman and the place where they were living. And, like they weren't giving enough details, or [leaving] some really unanswered questions, like...I said to them, "You said this sentence, but my question to you was 'Why?'" And, and that was...that, I could have worded that differently.

SC: I don't know if I have a specific question in mind so that we could think of how you could have worded it differently.

MAM: Yeah,
SC: Can you, um, that was when you were delving for, um, it was just before you put them into their pairs.

MAM: Um, hum.

SC: OK, and oh, what was the wording?

#-NOTE

MAM: It was about the wife. (shuffling of papers)

SC: Yeah, they were getting to that.

MAM: Or, or, (more paper shuffling) um, was it about the wife or was it the...

SC: Or was it the crazy?

MAM: The crazy.

SC: It was where the, the student left the impression the man was crazy because he had a wife.

MAM: That's right.

SC: All right. And then you delved into...I guess you...now where is it (looking at notes)...

#-STRUCTURE #-STUDENT #-LEARN

MAM: And I gave...and I said to them...I gave my opinion and shouldn't have. I said, "Well, I'm not sure. Is he crazy about his wife?" And my tone of voice was giving them my opinion rather than me asking, leading about the, the crazy idea.

SC: I'll just write "crazy" so I remember.

MAM: Yeah. OK?

SC: So you didn't feel that that was particularly successful the way it was...

MAM: No. No. And that's why...
SC: ...structured?

MAM: Yeah, that's where I got bogged down, and that's when I stopped and I said, "OK. I want you to turn to somebody and see where you have...where you can put details in more places." I'm not sure how I phrased that, but I wanted them...

---CONCERN ---BELIEF
SC: (consulting her notes) It says...oh, I forgot. You're not supposed to do that! [both laugh]

MAM: No, that's...OK, I wanted...how did I phrase that?

SC: (reading from notes) "Now I want you to think about the information that's been left out."

MAM: Yes.

SC: (still quoting) "Now turn to a person beside you and discuss."

MAM: See, there again I'm assuming they know there's information left out.

SC: Um, hum.

MAM: What if they feel there's no information left out and they like it the way it is?

SC: Um, hum.

---PROBE
MAM: OK. So, I could have probably phrased...how could I have phrased that differently. Uh..."Can you turn to each other and discuss this piece of work on the board and see if you can add more information?" No. "Can you make it more clear for the reader?"

SC: Um, hum.

MAM: That might be better than saying "information left out."

SC: Um, hum...OK.
$-QUESTION  $-STUDENT
MAM: And that gets them to come back
with, "Yes. There are things left out
for these reasons..." And then I
could ask "why?"

SC: Um, hum.

MAM: Yeah. Another thing. When they
gave, um, information or changes on
the board, I tried to ask, "Why did
you give that information?" That
wasn't all the time that I could ask
that, but I wanted them to give me a
reason why that was in there. (pause)
Jason was really good at saying,
"Maybe he was a commercial fisherman.
That's why he..."

SC: Um, is that Jason Mangat?

MAM: Yah. No, that was Jason...

SC: Wateman?

MAM: (simultaneously) Wateman. Yeah, so
that was OK.

#$-QUESTION  #$-STUDENT
SC: OK. Um, carrying on with the
questioning, I wondered how you felt
about, or how you feel the
questioning went with regards to the
kinds of questions that you asked?

MAM: Um, hum. Ah, you mean my...I can't
think of them right now. I tried to
ask a lot of "Why?" reflective [type]
questions.

SC: Mm, hmm.

MAM: I know there were some "What?"
questions in there. Uh, unless I saw
a transcript of the questions I used.
That might give me an indication.

SC: Shall we go over some?

MAM: Sure. Maybe, yeah. I'd like to
see that.

SC: I don't know if I caught them
all...
MAM: That's OK.

---

SC: ...but, uh, I've got some. You had them sit at the front. Oh, you had...at the beginning as they're reading it...you had um, "Can you find 4 good things?" And, they volunteered detail, "That it was funny. That it was imaginative. That it was interesting." "What can you tell me about this paragraph?" Um, I haven't got all of the responses all of the time, because I tried to zero in on the questions.

MAM: Yeah, that's fine.

---

SC: OK? Um, "Tell me what changes you can see?" And then they carried on with that for a few minutes. Um, "What do you like about this?" That was another one. When somebody volunteered an answer, um, then you went into that conjunction.

MAM: Um, hum.

SC: Um, "When would you put the period? When did you put the period?"

MAM: OK.

SC: "Does this make sense?" Um, and I don't know if this is the exact wording. That's why I put it in brackets, but the gist was; "What can we do to have it make sense?" Ah, um, "How many agree that the sentence is good?" Ah, um, "Do you want to add any ideas?" And you asked that a couple of times. Um, "What kind of a word did we add?" "Which way sounds better?" Then you read it out.

MAM: Um, hum.

SC: And then you asked the class, "Well, how many like it with the..." it was with the "and" and without the "and". Um, and then you asked again, "Does it make sense?" What does it have to do with the wife?" That was,
um,...

MAM: Yes, I remember.

#-PROBE

SC: ...when you were coming back to the use of the connexion to being crazy. Um, oh then you, yah, then you came in with, "What am I going to ask you? What? What comes into your mind?" And, I think, that was where you were trying to have them focus on the connexion that was made there.

MAM: Yah, this...that was that crazy connexion where...and uh...um. Again, that was my opinion. Maybe they wanted him to be crazy because he had this wife.

SC: Yah.

MAM: So then I had to be really careful with that at that point...of not putting in my views. And that’s, that’s difficult.

SC: Another sample one is with the commercial fisherman fit into the story. That was when Jason made the comment about commercial fisherman. Um, "How many would like it left in there?" And you were focussing on...

MAM: Um, hum.

SC: What were you focussing in on? The connexion that he had made?

MAM: Yes.

SC: Um, "How can we make it powerful? How can we make it come alive?"

MAM: You see. And there I didn’t...What does powerful mean? You know, what does "come alive" mean?

SC: Yah.

#-BELIEF

MAM: Again, I, um, is it my belief, or theirs? You see, and I wanted this to
be from them.

SC: Um, hum.

MAM: OK?

SC: "Why would you put a comma in there?" You were focussing on the use of the comma that somebody put in. Ah, you asked that again. (shuffles paper) And then there weren't specific questions, but there was like you called on Winnie. You called on Zubin. You called on Kevin. Um, (more shuffling) "Have you come up with more ideas?" That was after the discussion. There was the discussion, then you said, "Have you come up with more ideas?" Um, "How would he get a different rod?" "Where else would he get different rods?" And then, "Where else?", you ask again. Um, "What else do you want to add?"

#-BELIEF

MAM: This part seems to be going along better...after the discussion. Maybe because there was more input.

SC: OK.

MAM: OK.

#-QUESTION #-STUDENT

SC: Um, "Why would they call him Super Rod?" That was, ah, somebody volunteered...

MAM: Um, hum.

SC: OK. Um, "What else do you want to include?" "Who put huge...", or, "Who put huge in here?" Oh, "I can't remember when you said that."

MAM: Yeah.

SC: OK, it was referring to the box, I guess. Um, "Why?". "Where would you get a huge box?" Um, then you called on Orin, "How does it sound?" Um, "Does that clarify it?" "Do we need to add something?" Ah, "How many like that?". That was after they
talked about the box and whatnot.  
Um, "What would we need to clarify again?" Um, you were reading part about the Big Mama, OK? And there were quite a few questions from that. "OK, where do you want to put this?" "How many like the box idea?" "How many like the house idea?" "Let's work with this." And I think, I wasn't sure that meant you were referring back to the box.  

#-TIME   #-FOCUS  
MAM: Well, they were trying to put some other...another idea in there that I felt didn't fit in and we were also running out of time.  
SC: Yeah.  
MAM: So, I wanted to just focus them on the two sentences at the end...  
SC: Um, hum.  
MAM: ...without adding any more. Because I think they were getting it. They were there for 35 minutes and that was a long time to sit and work at this.  
SC: Um, hum.  
MAM: And they were getting little bogged down on those two sentences because it didn't fit...  
SC: Um, hum.  
MAM: ...to the rest of it.  
SC: There's just a little bit more here.  
MAM: Yeah.  
SC: Ah, maybe there's not that much because you called on individuals. Sort of like you questioned "town".  
MAM: Yeah.  
SC: And that was it. Uh, and then you made a comment about how well they had done. OK? So I guess I'll come
back to my question now. All right? Uh, how do you feel the questions went with regards to the kinds of questions you asked? Um, (pause) I'll just leave it like that.

MAM: OK. Um, looking at that, I'm...I...I'm pleased with it. I think there was a variety of questions.

SC: Um, hum.

MAM: I have to be conscious that my question doesn't give my opinion. Because as a writer, um, Ozum...no, Nicole came up to me at the end and said, "I'd like to put fat in there." And I said, "If you were a writer, you could put anything you wanted in your story, because it's in your control."

SC: Um, hum.

MAM: And I, I, I need to impress upon that when we continue this.

SC: Um, hum.

MAM: Rather than giving my opinion, or by my tone, or my non-verbal communication, or,...

SC: Um, hum.

MAM: ...or, ah, that, that it's going the way I want it to go. Not the way they want it to go.

SC: In this, you're talking about editorial changes then, not proof-reading changes.

MAM: Yeah, editorial.

SC: OK. All right, so description, and elaboration, and that kind of thing.
MAM: Yes, yes.
SC: So that I understand. OK?

#-PROBE $-CONTROL
MAM: Yes, yes. Because with the commercial fisherman, if I stuck that in it would have changed the whole tone of the paragraph.

SC: Um, hum.
MAM: And changed the whole direction of the story.
SC: Um, hum.
MAM: So I was trying to dissuade having that part in. But then, that should have been a class decision, not mine.
SC: Um, hum.
MAM: But I guess as, as the teacher, you have control...uh...to make those decisions very suddenly.
SC: And how do you think it would benefit the lesson? I guess, by making those decisions?
MAM: Well, they would feel that, I think that if the commercial fishing part was in there, I think they'd have to add another element to it.
SC: Um, hum.
MAM: They would put that in. They'd see where it had to fit in and give reasons and why and decide that they want it in there at the end.
SC: OK, so you'd, you're arguing for them having more control over what goes in?
MAM: That's right.
SC: Or that you take control?
MAM: Well...
SC: And guide it more? I guess I'm sort of...I'd sort of like you to clarify that.

MAM: Some situations I feel they need the control and some situations I feel I need to control it.

SC: OK. How do you decide that?

MAM: I guess just when it happens. I don't think you, you, you, when a situation, a lesson like this, there is no plan, or guided script to it. Um, I guess at the time I made a conscious decision that I didn't want to put the commercial stuff in there because it would have changed the tone of the story and added another element.

SC: Um, hum.

MAM: So I, I guess through my questioning, my body language, uh, I steered it away from that; although I acknowledged to Jason that it was a good idea.

SC: Um, hum.

MAM: OK?

SC: OK.

MAM: I tried to be positive with all of them with the ideas and tried to get those who had their hands up only occasionally.

SC: Um, hum.

MAM: And um, I felt the questions were, were OK after looking at this script. Um, but I need to be a little...I want to concentrate on the reflective questions again.

SC: Um, hum.

MAM: But then you're, you're...they could have gone another way and
changed it and argued among themselves and discussed what they wanted in there.

SC: Um, hum.

MAM: So I guess you're...I have to have a beginning and an end to this. And maybe that was the conscious decision where I make that "No, we, we, we go this way for these reasons: time, and everything else."

SC: OK, we're coming, um, can you think of, like, the specific kinds of questions you almost deliberately tried to put in?

MAM: Um, well again was giving them a choice. "How many like the box?" And, "How many like the house idea?"

SC: So, opinion.

MAM: Opinion. Yeah. OK?

SC: Um, hum.

MAM: So then they had to vote on it.

SC: Yeah.

MAM: Right. Without...and then, ah, um, when I felt they were getting bogged down and concentrating maybe too much and missing some of the things, I said, "Turn to your partner and discuss..."

SC: Um, hum.

MAM: Um, "...some of the information you would need to add more in there." So that was opinion. Or was that just thinking out loud to somebody else...

SC: Um, hum.

MAM: ...rather than to me.
people in there.

SC: Yeah.

MAM: And as one...Winnie said, "Well, Marilyn had this great idea." Marilyn didn’t want to say it, but Winnie said it for her.

SC: Is Marilyn an ESL?

MAM: No.

SC: Which Marilyn? Gills?

MAM: Yeah.

SC: Oh. Yeah, OK.

MAM: So, she’s shy.

SC: But she can speak for herself.

MAM: But Winnie did it. So, um, I felt the main thing was that, um, the questions, I tried to get them to think and go off in different areas. I think they did that. They enjoyed that, but I have to be conscious making it reflective, rather than my opinion.

SC: OK, so, but you did...I guess what you’re saying is you tried to get them to think about their own opinions.

MAM: Yes.

SC: That was one thing that you did. Can you think of other ways, other ways that you structured the questions, so that there was a different angle on it?

MAM: Um. They had to give reasons.

SC: OK. So, defend their answers, or give reasons.

MAM: Yes. I would ask, "Why? Why did you say that?"
SC: Um, hum.
MAM: Um, I asked them to elaborate.
SC: Um, hum.
MAM: Um, "Explain what do you mean by that?"
SC: Um, hum.
MAM: Elaboration. A reflective type of question. Um,...
SC: Such as?
MAM: "Think about this?" I would read the sentence out loud. "Does this make sense?"
SC: Think about...
MAM: Yeah. "Does this make sense?" Um, information questions. "What, what, what would you put in there?" "Why would you put that in there?" Um, I'd give them a choice. But the individual person... I think there was one that wanted the comma part in there.
SC: Um, hum. I remember that.
MAM: OK. Yeah, so that's almost like a teaching question, too. OK? That by asking the question, you're also teaching something.
SC: Um, hum.
MAM: OK, I can't think of anything else at this time. I can't...
SC: Well, you've got quite a variety.
MAM: Yeah.
SC: Um, I guess I was trying to get you to think about, well, not Bloom's taxonomy...
MAM: Oh, yeah.
SC: ...because that's, uh, quite old, but just sort of if there was a way that you were trying to tap into levels of questioning.

MAM: I hadn't even thought of that.

SC: OK.

MAM: No, I hadn't even thought of...I may have to go back and look at that.

SC: Um, hum. So, when you were asking me to focus on questioning strategy, I guess what kinds of things were going on in your mind when you wanted me to focus on that? -#

#-BELIEF $-CONTROL $-LEARN

MAM: I wanted you to see if I had the variety and if I was getting the kids to be reflective. Or was I, you know, you know me, I can be very opinionated. Were my, was my opinion too evident? Or was...were the children having input in their ideas and having ideas that were important? Or was I trying to manipulate them that was so obvious? -#

SC: How do you feel about that? Do you think, er, are you answering your own question there?

MAM: Yes.

SC: Do you think that you did inject your opinion a lot? Or, do you think that they had a fair amount of input? Maybe sort of think of, think of some examples of cases.

MAM: Um, ah, I know we talked about some of the opinions...ones that I've done. I think that I had them [give] input as much as possible. And I think it [was] more their input than mine. Although, one or two times, it was...I had to, sort of, guide them in another direction from the way they were going.

SC: Um, hum.
MAM: The commercial fisherman, for example. And then they were getting bogged down on the house and the box kind of ideas. I did direct them that way. And that wasn’t mainly opinion. That was direction. But, manipulation? You know, but that’s teacher choice [laughs]. Um, but I think that by the fact that they enjoyed it and were into it.

SC: Um, hum.

MAM: Um, they had a lot of input. Even when I had them talk and share with each other, there were only 2 people that weren’t involved.

SC: OK. That’s, that’s sort of my next question. It was, "How did you feel about the questioning in regards to student participation?"

MAM: Um, for the first time out, as I said there was 6, 7, 8 children who consistently had their hands up. And then there were maybe another 6 to 8 who volunteered 1 or 2 answers. OK? The rest were quiet. But you need to know that there was ESL in there.

SC: Um, hum.

MAM: OK. And there was Francis. OK? So, I would say that the majority of the students were participating what, um, ah, overtly with their hands up giving. But the majority, say maybe 3, and that was ESL and Francis, were not participating, um, at all. OK? Um, well, I’m not sure what Francis, whether he was listening, or not. And I’m not sure about Felix.

SC: He [Francis] was sort of hidden behind another student. So I’m not going to lend my...I, I know at the beginning he kind of shut down because you took away his paper and his pencil box.

MAM: Yeah [laughs].
SC: Um, but he was hidden behind another student. So, I was sort of watching to see what he did, but... 1227
1228
1229
MAM: As long as he was hearing, that was fine. Felix, uh, has no English, so he was... 1231
1232
1233
SC: Felix was the one sitting next to Francis? 1235
1236
MAM: Yeah, and he slid back. 1238
SC: OK. 1240
MAM: Yeah. And, uh, um, those were the 2, ah, 2 that I was just conscious of. The rest were participating: whether it was hands up or else participating in their own minds. 1242
1243
1244
1245
1246
SC: Um, hum. 1248
MAM: When I had them share, uh, Francis didn't participate and Leif didn't share. OK? Leif, partly because nobody asked him. He was sitting in a position where... 1250
1251
1252
1253
1254
SC: Sharing after the discussion? 1256
MAM: Sharing when I asked them to... 1258
SC: Is that what you're talking about? 1260
MAM: Yes, sharing when I asked them, "Turn to your partners and discuss..." 1262
1263
1264
1265
SC: That's what I mean, like the 2 minute discussion? 1266
1267
MAM: Yes. Every one else was sharing ideas. And they were really involved in the conversation. I watched them. They were really pointing to the board and, and talking with each other. So I knew they were on task. So, from that point of view, I feel that it was successful for them. That they could do that with each other... 1269
1270
1271
1272
1273
1274
1275
1276
1277
1278
SC: Um, hum. 1280
MAM: ...then that they were getting what I was hoping that they were involved in it. And being able to see that changes were possible and for what reasons. And I think that the fact that they had to suggest changes to each other, they had to give reasons to each other.

SC: Um, hum.

MAM: And I found that that was good, too.

$-PROBE

SC: Yeah. Um, in another instance would you, say, have them write down some of the things that they had come up with in their discussion?

MAM: Um, possibly. Um, but that was another element that I didn't want to introduce at this time because there was a lot there. The questioning, and the participation element, and, ah, ah, it was learning a new way of doing things, a modelling. I wanted to model for them. The questioning also was that they go and do their own editing and proof-reading, or do it for somebody else. They would have the questions in their mind. OK?

SC: Um, hum.

MAM: That they would ask a "Why?", and a "What?", and "Do you think...?"

SC: Um, hum.

MAM: So, hopefully if it's...

SC: So, that's, that's sort of what you were trying to get after?

MAM: Yes.

SC: So you had What?, Why?, Do you think?
MAM: Yeah. So that they could ask each other that when I'm not around.

SC: Um, hum.

MAM: So that transference thing. So when you come in 2 or 3 weeks, ah, maybe you'll see a difference in them. And I'm also going to watch their journals from now on. Just to see if they're transferring into their journals what they're seeing on the board. But I feel that it went well, other than being conscious of my opinion and direction. I felt that the questions were OK. And I seemed to have a variety there. OK?

SC: Um, hum.

MAM: But it's also next, I'll be pulling more children in. You know, getting more participation.

SC: So you saw quite a bit of overt participation and, I guess, you said, "OK, some of them were doing it in their minds." I guess, how do you verify that they were doing it in their mind, or not? Um, just...

$BODYLANG$

MAM: Yeah, just...

SC: ...body language?

MAM: ...body language. They were all on the board. They were listening.

SC: Um, hum.

MAM: OK? Even Leif, who has a hard time to sit still. OK? He's, he's one of those children that is always, has something in his hand. A pencil, an eraser. And he's always tapping. He didn't do any of that. He was right with us the rest of the way, other than when I asked him to turn to some other than that, he was with us, so the participation was there. Also, the board, I don't know if you noticed, I had 3 children come up to me with