TEACHER DIRECTED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

B.Ed., University of Lethbridge, 1970

A Thesis
Submitted to the Faculty of Education
of The University of Lethbridge
in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF EDUCATION

LETHBRIDGE, ALBERTA

April, 1994

Dedication

This work is dedicated to my wife,
Linda,
who continually invites me to dwell in the
impossible world
of the possible
and, to my children,
Michael and Jana
who ground me in whatever I do.

Abstract

This thesis is an interpretation of the meaning of a professional development project for six high school English teachers in a small, rural jurisdiction. The project design attempts to incorporate guidelines for effective professional development, especially in regard to the way in which authority influences the experience. This study is a case study from a naturalistic inquiry perspective using ethnographic techniques. Further, the methodology is educative in the sense that the study was intended to change the situation studied.

The analysis attempts to articulate the voices of various authorities in this professional development activity: the voice of leadership, the voice of the collective, the voice of external influences, and the voice of the individual participant.

As a professional development activity, this study indicates that, for the participating teachers, self-directed professional development created conditions conducive to change. Although the voices of professional development authority are incomplete and contradictory, this study provides a view of the landscape of teacher change and growth that is shaped by professional development guidelines concerning function, governance, cultural milieu, leadership, and reflection. These conclusions suggest ways for researchers, administrators, teacher leaders and teachers.to enhance professional development

Acknowledgements

There is humility in discovering that the worth of a work often rests in the community it creates. I humbly acknowledge the contributions of my friends and colleagues to the completion of this study:

Dr. Pamela Winsor for her insight, her high expectations, her friendship, and her wisdom in expressing all three,

Dr. Myrna Greene for her supportive challenges,

Dr. David Townsend for his enthusiastic support for inquiry,

Dr. Brian Titley for his constructive questions,

Mr. John Bolton who daily lives his faith in the educative process, and especially,

My fellow English teachers who, out of friendship, gave of their precious time to help me with this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Rationale

In spite of the long recognized interdependency of the quality of instruction and the overall quality of education in our schools, much of the research related to the professional development of teachers has been accumulated only in the last twenty years. Especially in the last ten years, the knowledge base regarding professional development has expanded rapidly (Showers, Joyce, & Bennett, 1987). Whether the research speaks of professional development, staff development, professional growth, or teacher learning, essentially what is being addressed is change within teachers and their practice. Although the terms have different implications in some contexts, in this study they will be used interchangeably to discuss this common element of teacher change.

The professional development literature provides substantial data that allow the formulation of hypotheses concerning how to change teachers. More recently, there seems to be a shift in focus. The most recent literature suggests that this process should not be thought of as how to change teachers; it is better to think of it as how teachers change. It marks another way of looking at teacher development, a way that is more educative and less related to skills and strategy training than earlier work (Richardson, 1990). This shift is further articulated by Smylie and Conyers (1991) who identify four important changes in our conception of staff development: (a) from deficit-based to competency-based approaches, (b) from replication to reflection, (c) from learning

separately to learning together, and (d) from centralization to decentralization.

This shift in understanding professional development is a consequence of, or at least, concurrent with a shift in the understanding of teaching itself. Traditionally, the teacher's role has been seen as one of transmitting information and knowledge as a commodity in a factory model: "if the appropriate quantity and quality of inputs are provided, effective teaching will occur and desired outputs--student learning--will result" (Smylie & Conyers, 1991, p. 13). However, as more is understood about learning, it becomes apparent that teaching is a dynamic, interactive, intellectual activity and not a collection of mechanical, trained behaviors (Smylie & Conyers, 1991). It therefore stands to reason that efforts in professional development that have traditionally relied on the transmission model for educating teachers have little chance of success. Programs for change that are initiated by school administrators or external experts to manipulate teachers into replicating preferred instructional strategies are not appropriate for enhancing the performance of the type of autonomous, decision makers that new trends in education seem to demand (Smylie & Conyers, 1991).

These trends, and hence the need for sound professional development, are readily apparent in the area of literacy instruction. Knowledge about language learning has grown tremendously in the last decade (Wollman-Bonilla, 1991). Literacy is understood as an emerging social process that enables one to explore the world, construct meaning and communicate ideas. Control and authority of literacy reside not with the teacher and the curriculum but with the student (Willinsky, 1990). The new understandings about literacy, which appear under such

rubrics as whole language and language learning, are soundly supported by a knowledge base derived from research conducted over the past 20 years (Henk & Moore, 1992). The effect promises to go well beyond particular teaching strategies to affect the very nature of curriculum, instruction and student learning, changing traditional beliefs about teaching and learning (Pahl & Monson, 1992). Sound research has identified practices that clearly enhance literacy development. Now the means must be identified to allow teachers to incorporate these new perceptions into their practices. The implication seems to be that failure to do so might be the only thing that prohibits language learning theory from permanently changing the face of education.

The expansion in theory and research concerning teacher change has not, unfortunately been reflected in practice. Professional development approaches continue to be generally short, one or two day sessions dealing with disconnected topics determined by administrators or teacher groups based on relatively inaccurate assessments of need. Nor has research into language learning been particularly well received, especially by secondary English teachers. Vacca and Manna (1985), for instance discovered that 76% of the 314 teachers they surveyed tended toward a heritage or traditional view of the English curriculum, leaving only 24% who supported the process or student-centered model. These figures might be in part explained by the demographics of the current teaching population. Teachers remain in their positions for longer periods of time and there is less demand for new teachers (Guskey, 1986) resulting in a large proportion of teachers who are 35 to 55 years old (Howser, 1989). Enhancing the performance of practicing teachers is becoming crucial to effecting change in teaching practices since fewer

teachers are likely to have recent exposure to developments in research except as they come to them through on-the-job professional development activities.

The accumulation of new knowledge about teacher change, a reconceptualization of teaching and professional development, new understandings about how language is learned, and the slowness of putting this new knowledge into practice make it imperative to conduct further research into effective and practical ways of applying existing research to understand how to bring about change in teaching practice. Further, an examination of change as it relates to literacy can have important implications for other areas of instruction as teachers begin to embrace new conceptions of the learning process. There have been large, system-wide initiatives, such as the Bay Area Writing Projects, that have focused on introducing new assumptions about the writing process (Courtland, Luke, & Letourneau, 1989), but inquiry should be made in small, rural jurisdictions as well.

These areas present somewhat unique circumstances. The usual problems are exacerbated by teacher isolation, limited funds for professional development, and scarcity of support personnel and curriculum leaders. As well, more attention must be given to secondary school instruction that has been relatively untouched by recent language learning theory and where average ages and limited staff turn-over offer few opportunities for change to occur. It is the particular challenge of rural professional development that is the focus of this study.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to explore one form of professional development opportunity for secondary teachers of English as they initially addressed concerns related to their practice and language learning theory. The opportunity under study was one designed in light of recent research findings concerning effective professional development and specifically those findings that concern teacher change. The opportunity was participant (teacher) directed and educative as opposed to prescribed and skills-based. In particular, this study attempted to carefully document the development of this opportunity. It focussed attention on the nature of the participants' interactions and the surrounding, resultant climate of those interactions. The primary intent was to determine the factors that contributed to or hindered the development of a climate for professional growth and ultimately to provide a window on the influences of change, particularly change in practice. In other words, the goal was, as stated by Courtland (1989), "to document and illuminate teachers' perceptions in a holistic portrayal of persons and their experiences with change in the context of the school setting."

Research Questions

The nature of the study suggested that the potential value would not be limited to specific issues; however, the study initially was framed by the questions that emerged out of the professional development situation that was created.

When seven teachers who share common curricular and teaching responsibilities in a small rural jurisdiction direct their own professional development activity: (a) What is the nature of their interaction? (b) Does a climate for change develop? (c) What factors contribute to or hinder the development of a climate for professional growth? (d) What concerns do the participants individually and collectively bring to the group, especially as they relate to language learning theory?

Limitations of the Study

The primary limitation is the time constraints of the project both in the planned duration and in the actual time the participants spent on the project. Change in professional practice is known to take time, and five sessions over a four month period is not enough time to bring about significant change. Within this planned time frame, the participants attended only 64% of the sessions further diminishing the possible effects of the study. In spite of the limitations of time, some light was shed on self-directed professional development, but there was little opportunity to illuminate the paradigm shift faced by high school English teachers.

The sample selection is another limitation. The participants of the study constituted virtually the entire high school English faculty of this jurisdiction. The participants all volunteered, but there is a good deal to indicate that they volunteered out of friendship and obligation to the researcher and not out of commitment to the principles of self-directed professional development. If the participants were invited from a larger potential sample and they volunteered on the basis of interest or need, the results might have been significantly different.

This study occurred in a small, rural jurisdiction so that the results reported may not be applicable to larger, urban settings. The teaching reality in a rural school, especially as it relates to collegial relations and curriculum support, might be considerably different from that in an urban school.

Value of the Study

The value of this study may not be the unique insights into professional development that it provides; rather, the value may be in the platform from which the observations are made. That is, this study is somewhat unique in that the governance and leadership functions move further toward a bottom-up structure of professional development than that found in many other studies. What is said about professional development is important in as much as it confirms or questions existing understandings accumulated through the study of traditional top-down models.

This study contributes descriptive data to the research concerning professional development initiatives by building upon what is known about teacher professional development. Specifically, it provides a window on professional development for these six teachers revealing how needs may be determined, and how conditions for change might be created in a way that presents an alternative to top-down, resource intensive professional development projects that are presently the norm. In a time when the demand on educational institutions to adapt to new conditions far exceeds the resources to meet the demand, there is a need to explore creative and cost-effective alternatives to meet the professional development needs of teachers.

This study focusses on the needs of secondary English teachers as they try to address the sometimes divergent expectations of the public and educational theorists. It identifies issues of concern for these teachers as they address these and the myriad of other concerns that demand the attention of today's teacher.

Finally, it has been a stimulating experience for the six participants. They had an opportunity to learn language theory, develop peer support, reflect upon and assess their own teaching, and move toward self-actualization in a supportive and collegial environment.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Much of what is understood to be professional development involves teacher change. The literature on teacher change brings together extensive research and discussion from a wide range of areas including teacher effectiveness, educational leadership, adult learners, reflection, and teacher education, to name but a few. This literature reveals the concept of teacher change as being extremely complex. Many variables interact when professional development and teacher change occur. To make some sense of the influencing factors, the literature will be discussed as it concerns the definition, function, governance, and cultural milieu of teacher change, as well as, teachers as learners, reflection and language learning.

Examination of some of the variables leads to an evolution in the understanding of change from the traditional view of teacher development and growth as being defined and directed by experts outside of the classroom to a view that empowers teachers to take more responsibility for their professional lives.

Defining Teacher Change

What constitutes teacher change? Change is generally discussed as a process resulting in change in practice, change in attitude or belief and change in learning outcomes of students. Guskey (1986) points out that previous assumptions regarding the sequence of events in the process may be inaccurate so that attempts of staff developers to change

attitudes and beliefs about certain practices to effect specific changes in classroom behaviors were misguided. Crandall (1983) also maintains that change begins with a staff development initiative that creates a change in classroom practice. Apparently when student learning outcomes change, the result is a change in teachers' beliefs and attitudes. This sequence is supported by the seven stages of concern about an innovation established by Hall (1979): (0) Awareness, little concern about or involvement with the innovation; (1) Informational, a general awareness and interest in the innovation; (2) Personal, uncertainty about adequacy and role regarding the innovation; (3) Management, issues related to efficiency, organization, management, and scheduling; (4) Consequence, impact of the innovation on students; (5) Collaboration, coordination and cooperation with others regarding the innovation; (6) Refocusing, examination of major changes or alternatives to the innovation. Each of these stages suggests further personal commitment to a specific change based on practical experience with the innovation. After teachers are somehow persuaded to try the innovation and are able to see a positive impact on students, they become more involved.

Although moving through this type of process and exhibiting these stages of concern might result in an attitude change, positive attitudes can exist without a change in practice. Wilson (1988) noted in her study of writing projects that while teachers' stated beliefs generally changed during and after writing project workshops, the same could not be said about their practices. And as Duffy and Roehler (1986) discovered, teachers endorsed certain training but this did not mean that their practice changed. Further ambiguity arises regarding change when we

consider that teacher change is not only concerned with teacher performance but ultimately with improved student performance. It is in this area that the least conclusive results have been recognized. "Few attempts have been made, however, to evaluate the effectiveness of staff development using measures of change in actual teacher performance or student learning both in the short term or over time" (Smylie, 1988, p. 3). So it is questionable whether significant change, in fact, originates in practice as described by these models.

The problem is not that Guskey (1986) and Hall (1979) are inaccurately describing the process of traditional professional development models; rather, the problem lies in traditional professional development. The issues of stages of concern and the effect of positive attitude on change in practice, discussed above, arise when a predetermined innovation is introduced to teachers either from researchers or from school administration. In other words, the innovation is introduced or imposed from outside.

> It is important, however, to note that *change*, research based or otherwise, is defined in [change literature] as teachers doing something that others are suggesting they do. Thus, the change is deemed as good and appropriate, and resistance as bad or inappropriate. . . . Further, the constant changes that teachers make when meeting the changing needs of the students in the classroom or trying out ideas they hear from other teachers is not recognized in these formulations (Richardson, 1990, p. 11) (Emphasis in original).

To say that change in practice or student performance did not occur as a result of a professional development activity often means only that the change desired by some outside authority did not come to

fruition. These models do not address situations where teachers engage in change of their own volition--where teachers control the direction and process of their own professional development. It may become less important whether attitude or practice comes first when a degree of autonomy is involved in change. It may only be important to be aware that true change has occurred if there is a shift in attitude and practice.

Functions of Teacher Change

It must be understood that change cannot be considered in only the traditional context as having the function of moving teachers to behaviors consistent with the goals of administrative or academic experts. Change through professional development activities can have significantly different functions. Smylie (1988) has identified these functions.

> First, they can serve an "establishing" function to promote organizational change through the introduction of new programs, new technologies, and new procedures in schools and school districts. Second, staff development can serve a "maintenance" function to change practice to ensure compliance with preferred administrative routines and to support organizationally preferred modes of operation. Third, staff development can serve an "enhancement" function to improve the individual teacher's performance in the classroom (p. 2).

All of these are functions that serve an authority other than the teacher. Only the enhancement function named by Smylie seems compatible with a teacher directed, autonomous pursuit of change through a partnership between expert and practitioner. However, to identify enhancement as the goal of a professional development activity

does not guarantee that the result will be an educative, autonomous process. If enhancement is considered as a remediation of a deficiency rather than the improvement of a competency, teachers are still pathologized by an outside authority (Smylie & Conyers, 1991). But it is not the case that the autonomous and educative qualities of the process are lost just because establishing and maintenance functions serve institutional needs.

Nevertheless, the goals of professional development have usually been interpreted in terms of skills and observable methods leaving some of the higher order cognitive and affective aspects of teaching relatively untouched. Teaching has often been seen in professional development contexts as the technical implementation and application of skills rather than in broader educative terms.

> First, relatively simple teaching skills and behaviors (such as questioning and giving feedback) have received much more attention than have teaching strategies and curriculum implementation. Teaching skills have much more often been the objectives of training than have academic content and its role as a component of teaching competence. Second, manifestations of visible behavior have been studied much more than the intellectual aspects of teaching, such as the appropriate use of a skill or strategy. In addition, only a dozen or so studies have included transfer, or incorporation of skills, strategies, and curriculum patterns into participants active repertoires. Nearly all of these have been done in the last ten years. . . (Showers et al., 1987, p. 84)

Even with this acknowledgement of a need for expanded horizons in teacher change, there is still the suggestion of teacher training rather than teacher education. For instance, Cook (1985) suggests that one

aim of staff development should be to enable teachers to analyze their own teaching to identify genuine needs and interests. Possibly more attention should be given to change that prepares teachers to become researchers in practice. Teachers should be provided with a problem solving orientation (Valencia & Killion, 1988) so that they can become teacher-learners rather than masters of a repertoire of skills.

Governance of Teacher Change

To a large degree, the question of who professional development and change serve determines who makes the executive decisions about what direction and in what manner change should be pursued.

Fenstermacher (1987) describes four approaches that have been and are being used to bring about teacher change and which are based upon who controls the desired change. He gives the approaches humorous and revealing names: (a) Make them eat cake. This is an authoritarian, mandated change directed from the upper levels of the education bureaucracy. (b) Where's the cake? This is a more subtle approach that first exposes a problem for which teachers are held accountable and then offers predetermined solutions. The teachers are unaware of the administrative agenda until the process is almost over. (c) Let them eat cake. Here, more teacher involvement is invited, especially in designing the program, but the desired outcome or direction of change is out of their control. Finally, (d) You can have your cake and eat it too. This type of in-service approach is deemed a more educative approach. Here teacher and the researcher become partners so that the researcher's knowledge is used by teachers to meet the goals that they desire.

The implication here is that teachers should be more involved in the governance of professional development processes. Vacca and Manna (1985) concluded that the "exclusion of teachers from the initial planning stages undermines and lessens the impact of the in-service." A review of the literature to date indicates that this has not been the case for most professional development activities since usually someone outside the classroom has decided what kinds of changes are needed (Richardson, 1990). Valencia and Killion (1989) suggest that teachers should be involved in designing staff development programs. Some of the more recent attempts at teacher change are beginning to take this issue into account. For example, in their study regarding the implementation of a new approach to reading instruction, Anders and Richardson (1991) took extensive care to ensure that their process was neither top-down nor bottom-up by attempting to place equivalent value on the practical knowledge of teachers and the theoretical knowledge of researchers.

The emphasis of teachers as decision makers seems to be modified by Crandall (1983) who found that strong administrative direction and support could facilitate change even if the change did not originate with teachers. Writing about the same study, Loucks (1983) points out that teachers must be involved in training and support capacities. Indeed, in Boiarsky's (1985) review of the literature, she found evidence that teachers need the help of experts and direction from school and district administration. Further clarification is required regarding the nature of the direction, support and expertise that is seen to be needed. Do teachers need direction about the kind of changes they are expected to make and the process in which they are to engage, or do they need direction and support so that institutional impediments to change are

removed and the trauma of change is lessened? Does expertise only come from outside the classroom or can teachers themselves be recognized as possessing much of the important expertise required to make desirable changes?

The questions regarding governance do not suggest that merely shifting decision making responsibilities to teacher groups will result in more effective change processes since both teachers and administrators are likely to make similar, and often wrong, decisions: "[federally funded] teacher centers generally produced the same type of programs that were sponsored by education agencies. They ran into the same problems of participation (generally already active teachers) and 'follow-up' (nearly all their offerings lacked provision for coaching or other arrangements to facilitate transfer)" (Showers et al., 1987, p.76). Even attempts to identify perceived needs from individual teachers are fraught with pitfalls. Both administrators and teachers concerned with professional development have used the standard survey or open-ended questionnaire to determine need which, though they are better than someone autocratically determining directions, have three problems: they are addressed to the majority, conditions may change by the time the in-service is implemented, and teachers may not have sufficient insight into what their real needs are (Cook, 1985).

It might be impossible to reach a definitive answer regarding who should make the executive decisions about staff development. It is probably clear that merely shifting the power structure of change will not guarantee success, and that an appropriate environment should be established so that the individual teacher is empowered when it comes to determining the goals and processes of change.

The Cultural Milieu of Change

The nature of the educational environment has varying degrees of impact on teachers' ability to engage in change. Apart from the systemic aspects of the educational organization, researchers have identified informal cultural traits that can inhibit change. Rogus (1988) discovered that there is a sense among teachers that change is restricted by the expectations of the curriculum and the expectations of the school and community that are often in conflict with educational goals, especially in regards to the importance placed on standardized test scores. Other inhibiting aspects of school culture that he identified included: the norm of problem denial rather than problem identification; teacher isolation in most of their work; lack of support services, and the inherent busyness of a school that tends to inhibit reflection so that schools tend to be anti-intellectual places. If these factors are endemic in most schools, and indeed they would seem to be, it would seem that there would be other factors that could support change.

In his study Smylie (1988) isolated the following interactive contexts that are part of the school organization: principals' emphasis on goals, principals' supervision and facilitation of teachers' work, teachers' interpersonal relationships, openness of expression, participative decision making, encouragement of experimentation, collegial interaction about instruction, and principals' facilitation of collegial interaction. Surprisingly, Smylie found, in this particular study, that these school-level factors made little difference directly or indirectly on teacher change. He points out that these findings are inconsistent with other studies and that these factors could not be

dismissed on the basis of his data. He also stated that this study differs from most in that no system-level innovation was at stake, no new program was introduced to provide a common objective and that participation was voluntary (Smylie, 1988). In other words, a program that is not mandated from the top may reduce the impact, positive or negative, that institutional factors may have on teacher change.

A study that differed in scope and design to Smylie's (1988) study, examined a state-wide initiative to bring about large scale changes in language related instructional curricula. Henk & Moore (1992, pp. 561-562) concluded that the factors influencing change rest with the institution and include: (a) A district-wide commitment to the initiative, (b) administrative support, (c) observation opportunities and support systems, (d) reasonable time frames, (e) establishment of a professional library, (f) abundant instructional resources, (g) realistic number of simultaneous initiatives, and (h) parent communication.

The factors identified here are related to administrative or system concerns of finances and personnel and not with the individual teacher. But, in some other studies concerning change and language learning that involved relatively small numbers of teachers at the school or local level (Courtland et al., 1989; Perl & Wilson, 1986), the change factors that emerged rested with the individual learner. The somewhat contrasting conclusions of these two studies suggest that as the institutional investment in the proposed change diminishes, the potential positive or negative influence of the institution's formal and informal cultural milieu diminishes. This is not to say that either of these research perspectives is better than the other, rather it may be that depending upon the scale of the change and the source of the change

mandate, different factors will come into play and hence alter the issues that planners of change must address. This is a fairly tenuous inference to draw from a comparison of these studies; however, it is congruent with other trends that point towards the importance of empowerment and autonomy for individual teachers over their professional lives.

Leaders of Teacher Change

The question of governance as it relates to executive decisions about what issues are addressed and how they are to be addressed, and the question of what factors in the school culture affect change requires further exploration. However, there seems to be considerable consensus concerning who should make the educative decisions and provide support when staff development programs are actually presented.

From a review of the research, Showers concluded that the effects of training do not seem to be influenced by who gives the training, teacher or outside expert (Showers et al., 1987). In addition, in a very strong experimental design, Stringfield and Schaffer (1986) noted no difference in change of behavior in teachers who were instructed by a teacher, a principal and an outside consultant. This might indicate that the external expert is not necessary, but this is not to say that the involvement of practicing teachers is dispensable. Quite the contrary is the case.

If one conclusion can be safely drawn from the research, it is that collegiality, collaboration and peer support are essential for teacher change (Boiarsky, 1985; Guskey, 1986; Joyce & Showers, 1983; Valencia & Killion, 1989). The interaction between teachers serves to encourage and support change, facilitate risk-taking and experimentation, and

combat teacher isolation--all of which are pre-conditions to change. In fact, when no other school-level variable seemed to make a significant difference to change, Smylie (1988) found that the interactions that teachers have with their colleagues did. A similar weight of support can be found for peer coaching and modelling in which the teacher becomes even more significant by providing instruction, feedback, and follow-up. Joyce and Showers (1988) discuss the value of coaching under two different categories. First, coaching contributes to transfer of training in five different ways: (a) more frequent practice to develop a greater skill with a strategy; (b) more appropriate use of a strategy; (c) greater long term retention; (d) more likely to explain the strategy to their students, and (e) clearer cognitions with regard to the purposes and uses of the new strategy. Second, coaching also appears to facilitate the professional and collegial relationships including the development of a shared language and norms of experimentation.

While much research has been done to establish the effectiveness of professional development activities in which teachers have an important role as collaborators and coaches, they have been almost entirely confined to implementing and enhancing processes that are initiated by others. Even in some of the more educative projects there has been a tendency for administrators and external experts to be the prime movers. Courtland (1989) adopted an inductive model for implementation of the writing process, but the project was presented to the teachers by a new administration in a top down manner. Both the objective and the process were predetermined though teachers had a great deal of input into the content of the sessions. Courtland notes that: "In retrospect, greater input from teachers in the planning stages

might have allayed suspicions and heightened teacher ownership" (p. 99). There have been few researchers who have made a special effort to minimize the effect of external authority. Anders and Richardson (1991) opted for a constructivist orientation that used the analytical framework of the practical argument (Fenstermacher, 1987) that allowed teachers to investigate their cognitions about their practice and current research without a predetermined agenda of what strategies or ways of thinking were desired. To this end, they were sensitive to the degree to which their own specialized knowledge would inhibit a bottom-up process (Anders & Richardson, 1991).

There seems to be little doubt about the effectiveness of teachers teaching teachers in a collaborative atmosphere. However, the success of empowering teachers in this role has not been adequately explored with the intent of expanding that degree of control to other influencing factors of change. An understanding and respect for teachers as learners will be necessary before teachers can become more self-directing.

Teachers as Learners

Until recently, what is known about learners, and especially adult learners, has been ignored by planners of professional development. Richardson's (1990) review of the literature on teacher change reveals a progression in research from viewing teachers as resistant, conceptually simplistic and intuitive to viewing teachers as having personal attributes that affect whether or not they implement new programs.

This growing appreciation of teachers as learners in an educative process rather than objects of external manipulation has made research in adult learning increasingly more important.

> The research and theory on adult developmental stages and adults as learners indicate all adults, even middle-aged reluctant teachers, can learn and grow. Creating dissonance, looking at individual needs, allowing teachers to control their own learning, and providing evidence as reasons for change challenge teachers to move into more productive career and life stages (Howser, 1989, p. 16).

An appreciation of age theories and stage theories of adult development indicates that planners of staff development programs must take into account the different needs and interests of the people they intend to serve (Cook, 1985).

One such attribute, which is slowly being recognized, as indicated by the above discussions of governance and leadership, is that the adult learner is one who is self-directing. Teachers, as much if not more than other professionals, make innumerable independent decisions daily. On their own, they control much of the education of others. As adults, they direct the personal and financial lives for themselves and their own children, but when they enter into a professional development activity, they are often expected to be passive and dependent (Knowles, 1984).

Second, adults are oriented to life-centered, task-centered, or problem-centered learning (Knowles, 1984). Teachers are, after all, professionals who, for much of their day, must deal with the job at hand--the one they are paid and trained to do. It follows that a professional development curriculum should be grounded in life situations and incorporate a process based on problem solving and inquiry.

Third, readiness to learn occurs when there is a need to know something in order to perform more effectively (Knowles, 1984). Teachers

constantly change to meet the every day challenges that come to their attention in their classrooms. Professional development programs can facilitate learning readiness or capitalize on the existing facility for change by creating cognitive dissonance through role models, career planning, and reflection so that teachers can analyze and set directions for change themselves. This cognitive dissonance can be further facilitated by teachers' innate desire to know the theoretical underpinnings of innovations as they relate to their classrooms (Aber, 1988).

Fourth, adults are motivated by some external motivators, but more potent motivators are internal: self-esteem, recognition, better quality of life, greater self-confidence and self-actualization (Knowles, 1984). Teachers find motivation in student performance and personal engagement rather than external rewards (Richardson, 1990; Vacca & Manna, 1985). One of the strongest qualities that seems to affect change is teacher efficacy. Smylie (1988) constructed a path model explaining change in teacher practice. His conclusion was that:

> The direct relationship between personal teaching efficacy and change suggests that teachers are more likely to change their behavior in directions that may improve their classroom effectiveness if they believe that they themselves are instrumental to the learning of their students (p. 23).

The leap of faith required to adopt a change (Wilson, 1988) would certainly be facilitated by a strong sense of efficacy as would conceptual flexibility that is a personal attribute that also has been shown to affect the ease with which teachers acquire new strategies for teaching

(Showers et al., 1987). And although the impact of self-concept on change has not been studied extensively, where it has been, it seems to be a very strong influence on the ability to implement new teaching strategies (Showers et al., 1987).

Fifth, growth is also influenced by teachers' subjective reality. The role of the learner's experience is twofold: adults are themselves the richest resource for themselves and others, and their experience is a source of their self identity (Knowles, 1984). To ignore what a teacher brings to a professional development program is not only to ignore an important source of knowledge but to ignore the identity of the individual. Failure to value the teacher's practical knowledge when introducing change results in the kind of frustration expressed by Duffy and Roehler (1986).

> There are at least four sets of "filters" that constrain teacher decision-making. Teachers restructure new information in terms of their conceptual understandings of curricular content, their concept of instruction, their perception of the demands of the working environment, and their desire to achieve a smoothly flowing school day. As the information is processed through these filters, teachers' thinking changes relative to the innovation. Hence, an innovation that is sensible when discussed in a course or an in-service session is modified by the filters; sometimes, the modification is so great that what seemed sensible in the teacher education situation cannot be implemented on a regular basis in the classroom (p. 57).

Here, the filters of practical knowledge are viewed as inhibitions to change--something to overcome. Rather than attempting to understand

the subjective reality of teachers in order to overcome or circumvent what experience has shown to be valuable practice in the classroom, those interested in encouraging change should bring teachers to value and understand their own practical knowledge so that through it they can enhance their teaching.

> The learning-to-teach literature suggests that classroom actions are of less importance as a focus of change than the practical knowledge that drives or is a part of those classroom actions. Practical knowledge allows a teacher to quickly judge a situation or context and take action on the basis of knowledge gained from similar situations in the past. Reflecting on the action and its results adds to the teacher's practical knowledge. . . . Thus a strong focus should be placed on teachers' cognitions and practical knowledge in a teaching change project, and these should be considered in relation to actual or potential classroom activities (Richardson, 1990, p. 13).

The opportunity to analyze and reflect upon current practice seems an essential factor in providing conditions in which teachers can themselves bring about change. Unfortunately, it is often forgotten that teachers are reflective, self-directing, life-centered learners with idiosyncratic needs and drives functioning in circumstances as unique as each of the students in their classrooms. This appreciation of the learner as an individual that most educators bring into their classrooms as a matter of course is often forgotten when the objective is to bring about development and change in teachers.

Reflection and Change

It would, therefore, seem impossible to affect change in adult learners without considering the significant role played by reflection (Mezirow, 1990). Reflection in itself does not create change, but it is a process by which experience and knowledge can be critically examined in the context of the individual. Without reflective learning a person would never change but would repeat the same behaviors (Boyd & Fales, 1983). If teachers are to expand their perceptions so that they see what is possible, they must engage in reflection.

As we begin to understand change in teachers in more educative terms, as involving more than the inclusion of certain behaviors into a repertoire of strategies, it becomes apparent that real change requires the kind of shift in thinking that is described in the reflective process. Boyd and Fales (1983) define reflection as:

> The *process* of creating and clarifying the meaning of experience (present or past) in terms of self (self in relation to self and self in relating to the world). The outcome of the process is changed conceptual perspective. The experience that is explored and examined to create meaning focuses around or embodies a concern of central importance to self (p. 101). (Emphasis in original)

Reflection, then, occurs as the second of three stages of the learning process that begins with experience involving the learner's behavior, ideas and feelings. It then moves through reflection, a conscious mental return to experience, and proceeds to the outcome, which is the developing of new perspectives on the experience and its

significance to the learner (Boud, Keogh, & Walker, 1985). Boyd and Fales (1983) elaborate on this three stage process by identifying the following components: (a) A sense of inner discomfort, (b) identification or clarification of the concern, (c) openness to new information from internal and external sources with the ability to observe and take in from a variety of perspectives, (d) resolution, expressed as "integration," "coming together," "acceptance of self-reality," and "creative synthesis," (e) establishing continuity of self with past, present and future, and (f) deciding whether to act on the outcome of the reflective process (p. 106).

The reflective process, then, moves toward change--a change that is based upon experience and moves forward in a way that is also consistent with the experience of teachers who know that teaching is by nature problematic having no final, irrefutable solution. The outcome of reflection is not an absolute resolution of a problem, rather a tentative conclusion open to many revisions as experience is framed and reframed through different perspectives as the learner converses with the experience and "the situation talks back, the practitioner listens, and as he [sic] appreciates what he hears, he reframes the situation once again" (Schön, 1983, pp. 131-132). Learning is a hermeneutic or phenomenological event that pursues making sense of the experience over the pursuit of truth or fact (Grimmett, 1988).

Apart from having its origin in experience, the conception that reflection is a process that begins as perplexity (Grimmett, 1988) coincides with the nature of the adult learner who is oriented toward problem solving. As such, whatever change or action that results is internally motivated and totally owned by the individual. Reflection, as it relates to educational change, is concerned with the self making sense

of innovative practices as they relate to the self. Understanding change in this way acknowledges that change is not something that is done to and individual, but something that occurs within the individual.

This understanding of reflection as the process of making meaning of experience is not the only conception of reflection, but it is the most useful in respect to change. Grimmett (1988) identifies three broad categories of reflection, the last of which is the one based upon experience. The first category of reflection is a thoughtfulness that allows one to apply educational theory to direct and control practice. The controlling information originates with authorities and not with the practitioner. The second category presents reflection as a deliberation or choice between alternatives, taking into account the particular context. Reflection, then, informs practice. The third category has the practitioner making meaning by examining practice through different perceptions, structuring and restructuring practical knowledge, or reconstructing experience and conceptions about teaching. Here, reflection allows a teacher to apprehend or appreciate practice.

Each of these categories of reflection has their place in professional practice, but the third is most important here because it is most consistent with what is known about adult learning. It advocates reflective practice as opposed to technical rationality (Schön, 1983) refuting "the idea that a science-like corpus of propositional knowledge can 'drive' practice" (Grimmett, 1988, p. 9). The self and the experiences of self become an important source for professional knowledge-in-action, which is generated by experimentation that occurs in the midst of practice, and knowledge-on-action, which is practice modified by deliberation on past experience (Schön, 1983). Reflective practice has

historically been neglected in favor of scientific rationality (Zeichner & Liston, 1987).

This neglect requires that reflection on experience requires a certain amount of support and assistance. The technical rationality background of many teachers requires a re-education in modes of thinking that do not control or inform practice, but allow one to apprehend or appreciate practice. Also, teachers need to become more comfortable with collaborating as reflective practitioners because reflection is not entirely the domain of self. It has a social dimension. Zellermayer (1991) suggests that thinking may be a function of social interaction and reframing begins as one member of a group problematizes common experience causing a weakening in the structure of events for other participants that makes them more open to reframing that experience. Boyd and Fales (1983) were able to improve the abilities of teachers to utilize reflection. For instance, they found that the mere naming of the natural process of reflection can enhance reflective learning and can motivate individuals to attempt to control the process to gain more from their experience.

There are a number of ways by which the reflective process can be facilitated. Kottkamp (1990) presents a catalogue of such means as: journals in a variety of forms, case records of problematic situations, contrived situations including role plays, instrument feedback like the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Myers & Briggs, 1977), and electronic feed back through video and audio tapes. Providing an appreciation of the process of reflection and facilitating that process seems a necessary element in providing the opportunity for teachers to change.

The importance of reflection in learning of any kind becomes critical to teachers who must acquire professional knowledge as they engage in their practice. They must teach to discover what needs to be known and then reflect to assemble the knowledge upon which to make decisions in the complex culture of the classroom. These choices, which appear to be intuitive, are, in fact, a result of reflection in and on practice. In order to encourage change, it is not enough to present current theory to teachers as articulated by authoritative experts. Rather, change involves a shift in paradigm that can only be realized through reflection. And although anyone who learns engages in reflection, the process can be enhanced and made a more powerful tool for learning.

Teacher Change and Language Learning

The application of teacher change theory to change in literacy education is at once formidable and extremely appropriate. Change in literacy education is formidable because for teachers to embrace what research tells about how children learn language requires no less than a paradigm shift from a transmission model of education to a transactional model. In order to make this shift, teachers are not merely required to adopt different teaching strategies and instructional behaviors, they must redefine their identity as a teacher and embrace a distinctly different philosophy of the role and the process of education. Pahl and Monson (1992) graphically illustrate the profound changes involved in a shift from transmission to transaction as shown in Table 1 and Table 2.

Table 1
The changing role of the classroom teacher: A new orientation toward instruction

Transmission model		**Transaction Model**
Acquisition of knowledge	(PURPOSE)	Construction of meaning
Defining what we know	(OBJECTIVE)	Interacting with the unknown
Fact orientation	(OUTCOME)	Process orientation
	WHAT IS LEARNED	
	HOW IT IS LEARNED	
Teacher-centered instruction	(METHODOLOGY)	Student-centered learning
Disseminator of information	(TEACHER ROLE)	Catalyst for problem solving
Receptive learning	(LEARNER ROLE)	Active learning
Part to whole	(INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGY)	Whole to Part
Skills-based	(CONTENT)	Concept-based
One dimensional Homogeneous groups	(CLASSROOM DYNAMIC)	Multidimensional Flexible groups
Testing	(EVALUATION)	Assessment

Note: From "In search of whole language" by M.M. Pahl and R.J. Monson, 1992, Journal of Reading, 35, p. 520. Copyright 1992 by the International Reading Association. Reprinted by permission.

Table 1 clearly shows that there is very little of a teacher's professional life that is not affected by moving from one paradigm to the other. And, as Pahl and Monson (1992) also illustrate, a transactional view of learning creates a shift in the perception of curriculum (see Table 2).

Table 2
From implementation to innovation:
A new orientation toward curriculum

Curriculum implementer		**Curriculum innovator**
"Musician in the orchestra"	(METAPHOR)	"Conductor in the orchestra"
Transmission (Teacher-Directed)	(INSTRUCTIONAL ORIENTATION)	Transaction (Student-centered)
External Source (Guide)	(CURRICULUM ORIGIN)	Intrinsic source (Students)
Maintenance	(OBJECTIVE)	Experimentation
Static	(PERCEPTION)	Dynamic
Prescribed	(STRATEGY)	Choice
Review Accept		Question Construct
Adopt Prepare Deliver Reinforce	(METHODOLOGICAL PREFERENCES)	Adapt Modify Design Refine
Administer Score	(EVALUATION)	Assess Interpret
Convergent	(THINKING STYLE)	Divergent

Note: From "In search of whole language" by M.M. Pahl and R.J. Monson, 1992, Journal of Reading, 35, p. 521. Copyright 1992 by the International Reading Association. Reprinted by permission.

This paradigm shift requires that educators become more than implementers of curricula with a repertoire of pre-packaged strategies; they must become innovators who are able to occupy a *Zone of Between*, "guided by a sense of the pedagogic good . . . alert to the possibilities of our pedagogic touch, pedagogic tact, pedagogic attunement" (Aoki, 1991, pp. 7-10). A shift to whole language instruction "requires, of most teachers, a redefining and an improved understanding of the professional self" (Ohlhausen, Meyerson, & Sexton, 1992, pp. 538-539). This new role can only be realized as teachers take on more and more decision making

power and increased autonomy to follow up on their decisions. They must be able to take ownership of the curriculum so that they can share that ownership with their students. The transactional model sees the learning experience being negotiated by teacher/learners and learner/teachers (Freire, 1970). A model for teacher change in language learning instruction must be a transactional, empowering model. A model that focuses on the top down dissemination of knowledge and performance-based skill development would certainly be at cross purposes to this type of change. It is here that language learning theory and teacher change theory become congruent, which makes efforts that allow teachers to move toward proven practice in literacy in a educative, transactional way particularly important and may provide insight to similar changes in other curricular areas.

Courtland (1992) draws the parallel between what is known about effective models of teacher change and the principles that underlie new approaches to literacy. She notes the similarity in tension that exists between meeting curricular goals of a writing program and meeting the developmental needs of each individual writer as compared to the tension that exists between the goals of a staff development program (the desired shift in knowledge, skill and reflective practice) and the individual needs of the each teacher. Another parallel exists where strategies consistent with the theoretical framework of literacy find expression in the form of writers workshops while strategies consistent with the theoretical framework of teacher change occur when sessions are based upon emerging concerns of the participants.

Drawing a parallel between change related to language instruction and the personal nature of literacy learning suggests an aspect of change

specific to teachers of language arts. So that teachers can begin to embrace new perceptions of their role and the curriculum, they must rediscover and nurture their own literacy (Courtland, 1992). One's own literacy should be included in the change process (Valencia & Killion, 1988). One might speculate, however, that an exploration of a teacher's personal relationship with a discipline of study would be no less important in other curricular areas. For instance, change in science teachers would probably be facilitated by the nurturing of the science teacher's own sense of inquiry and exploration and by understanding change in ways consistent with this process.

Guidelines for Facilitating Change

The research into the many variables influencing teacher change posits a number fairly strong principles to guide planners of professional development programs. There is a great deal of agreement on most of the guidelines. The differences appear to originate from differing views about who is in control of the direction and purpose of professional development. For instance, Henk (1992) cited guidelines that were primarily directed at administrative conditions. A different list of guidelines was assembled by Showers, Joyce and Bennett (1987) in a summary of the meta-analysis of nearly 200 research studies that included all kinds of perspectives on change. They found that research suggests:

> 1. What teachers think about teaching determines what they do.
> 2. Almost all teachers change practice when training includes theory, demonstration, practice, and feedback.

3. Expert or peer coaching is effective.
4. Competent teachers with high self-esteem benefit more from training.
5. Flexibility in thinking helps teachers learn new skills.
6. Individual teaching styles and values have relatively little effect on change.
7. Some knowledge or skill is necessary before a teacher "buys into" an innovation.
8. Training design is more important than who presents or where it presented.
9. Initial enthusiasm has little effect on learning.
10. Cohesion and shared understanding facilitate a willingness to experiment (p. 81).

Although many of these highlights are generally accepted as necessary for change to take place, some of them suggest that either much of the research up to this time has been primarily concerned with training teachers in specific skills, strategies and behaviors that the researcher or theorist have determined necessary; or, the guidelines were formulated with this kind of professional development in mind. For instance, the importance of reflection, decision making, inquiry, and experience would seem to contradict the notion that individual teaching style and values have little effect on change beyond the mechanical adoption of teaching skills as indicated in point six above. In number seven, "buying into" an innovation implies that the teacher must be *sold* on an idea rather than being given the opportunity to determine whether the idea has merit for the teacher's own situation and philosophy. This approach adheres to the subject/object relationship between expert and teacher and incorrectly assumes authority.

> It is important, however, to note that *change*, research-based or otherwise is defined in this literature as teachers doing something that others are suggesting they do. Thus, the change is deemed as good or appropriate, and resistance is viewed as bad or inappropriate. Even the recent work that is more sensitive to teachers' norms and beliefs fails to question the reforms themselves. . . . A critical feature in this literature is that someone outside the classroom decides what changes teachers will make (Richardson, 1990, p. 11). (Emphasis in original)

Therefore, by combining the principles already established by research with the recent, more educative trends, a set of guidelines for designers of staff development has been proposed by Valencia & Killion (1988).

1. Long-term in-service or teacher training programs that incorporate application activities and include follow-up have longer lasting effects on teachers.
2. Establishing a need, including teachers in the design of the program, and communicating that the status quo is unacceptable, stimulate commitment to change.
3. Addressing the needs of teachers as learners, through the instructional program and interventions, promotes a safe climate for them to take risks.
4. Providing opportunities for increased collegiality and collaboration enables those responsible for implementing change to feel part of a professional community. By reducing teacher isolation, teachers have more access to the support they need for change.
5. Program designers must view teachers as decision-makers. They must build in room for flexibility, personalization and adaptation. When given encouragement to make a new program fit their needs, rather than adhering strictly

> to a prescriptive approach, teachers are more effective and more willing to implement change (p. 7).

These last guidelines are comprehensive and consistent with adult learning and change theory. The literature suggests that three revisions would make these guidelines more comprehensive. First, number two above still implies a top down model for to assume that teachers must reject the status quo is to assume that an innovation is better for every teacher in every situation. It would seem more appropriate that teachers be educated to be questioners who do not reject the status quo because they are told to do so, but challenge it as well as the innovation, continually pursuing evidence that tests the desirability of all practice and theory. Second, reflection must be a part of any serious attempt at change. In order for present practice and experience to inform directions for change in future practice, teachers must be reflective. "Experience is educative only with reflection. This suggests that the improvement of the teacher-learning process requires acknowledging and building upon teachers' experiences, and promoting reflection on those experiences" (Richardson, 1990, p. 12). And finally, in the case of language instruction, teachers' own literacy must be nurtured (Courtland, 1992). Insufficient research has been done to establish academic content as a general factor for change in any discipline or content areas (Showers, Joyce, & Bennett, 1987); however, attention to the rediscovery of the teacher as learner seems to be implicit in the changing role the teacher.

Summary

This review of the literature on professional development and change indicates a shift in understanding about the meaning and

process of change. Existing models that confine the scope of change to the technical aspect of practice and view the decisions concerning goals and process of change as the purvey of outside experts show little promise for providing the necessary climate for development. The function of professional development initiatives is moving from the inculcation of skills and behaviors to the development of inquirers in practice. The governance or decision making process being designed to recognize the importance of empowering teachers rather than treating them as passive learners to be in-serviced. The influence of the school culture, which is often seen as being a major factor in change, may be lessened as the power of teachers as self-directed learners is appreciated. Educational leadership is being recognized as coming from the teacher as expert as well as from the traditional outside experts. The understanding of the teacher has moved to teacher as an autonomous learner who constructs professional knowledge from experience rather than teacher as an object of manipulation. From this paradigm shift in teacher change comes some promising guidelines for supporting teacher growth and development that require extensive inquiry using research methods that respect the educative nature of the process.

CHAPTER 3

METHOD

Research Design

This study is a case study from a naturalistic inquiry perspective using ethnographic techniques to study a small group of senior high school English teachers who engaged in designing and implementing professional development activities over approximately three months.

Although I had been temporarily away from the public school classroom in my temporary position at the university, it was not my intention to separate myself from the participants. To the contrary, I attempted to enter into a dialogical relationship as a colleague with the other participants in what Gitlin (1989, p. 248) refers to as educative research which "pushes all those involved to see the world differently and to act on these new insights." We attempted to understand ourselves and the change process so that our common interests could be worked out within our particular context and thereby affect our own professional development.

Just as it is appropriate to address changes in language learning theory that are characterized as educative using an educative model of professional development, so it is that the study design used to examine this project was educative in nature. The educative approach shares the characteristics of qualitative research as described by Bogdan and Biklan (1982).

First, qualitative research has the natural setting as the direct source of data and the researcher is the key instrument. The study

involved practicing teachers as we engaged in actual professional development. All the factors that affect teacher change were involved. As a participant observer, I gathered the qualitative data using the three data gathering devices of observation, interview, and document analysis. Furthermore, objectivity was not pursued, rather there was an attempt to gain an appreciation and understanding of the subjectivity of all involved (Gitlin, 1989). Group members were invited to provide interpretations of the meanings that emerged from their experience in dialogue with the researcher.

Second, qualitative research is descriptive. Because, as stated in the rationale of this study, there seems to be a shift from teacher change as training to teacher change as education, there is a need to examine the established variables under a more open research design. As well, since new variables may emerge, it is appropriate to explore teacher change using qualitative methodology.

Third, qualitative researchers are concerned with process rather than simply with outcomes or products. This study is concerned with how a group of teachers negotiated their own professional development. The failures were as important as the successes in defining significant patterns in this process.

Fourth, qualitative researchers tend to analyze their data inductively. It is not the intent of this study to prove or disprove an hypothesis already held. Rather it is an attempt to establish grounded theory as it applies to this particular group. So though the research questions could be worded as hypotheses to be tested, they are, rather, questions to be answered.

Fifth, meaning is of essential concern to the qualitative approach. The way in which individual teachers incorporate the demands of their daily lives, in and out of school, with the expectations of often difficult and time consuming professional development is at the core of what research has shown to be some of the most significant variables in teacher change.

Participants

The participants in this study were six teachers from a small rural jurisdiction who teach one or more high school English courses. As the researcher, I included myself in this count although I was on leave as a Faculty Associate at the University of Lethbridge. The five other teachers volunteered to participate having given informed consent as required by the Human Subjects Guidelines of the University of Lethbridge (Appendix A). Our teaching accounts for approximately 85% of the high school English classes taught in this jurisdiction. To preserve anonymity, the participants' names and the place names have been changed.

I contacted each teacher in person to invite them to participate. I made my first contact near the end of January 1993 with Shari and Shelly at Greenwood High School. Their response was reserved but positive. At North Fork, I asked Gordon and Edith both of whom readily agreed to participate. With at least a few participants confirmed, I went to the superintendent, outlined my proposed study and requested permission to proceed. I then contacted the two remaining high schools and asked Sean and Jim in Hillside and Wesley in Naylonville if they would like to participate. All but Jim agreed to participate and signed

the consent form; however, Wesley withdrew from the study very shortly after it began.

A summary of the personal information for all participants is presented in Table 3.

Table 3
Profile of Participating Teachers

Teacher	Age	Years Experience	Years English Instruction	Education	Major
Sean (male)	26	3	2	B.Ed.	English
Wesley (male)	38	11	11	B.Ed. & Grad Study	English
Edith (female)	41	14	2	B.Ed.	Mod. Lang
Gordon (male)	43	20	20	B.Ed. & Grad Study	English
Bryan (male)	44	23	23	B.Ed. & Grad Study	English
Shari (female)	46	22	22	B.Ed.	English
Shelly (female)	47	27	15	B.Ed & B.Mgt.	Social Studies
Mean	40.7	17.1	13.6		

Organizational Setting

There are four secondary schools in the jurisdiction--three are junior/senior high schools and one is a high school. The schools are all in rural communities; each one is at least fifteen miles from its nearest neighboring school. There are as few as one English teacher and as many as three in one school.

The support personnel for curriculum and instruction are a superintendent and an assistant superintendent. There are no department heads or consultants in the employ of the school

jurisdiction, although the University of Lethbridge and the Alberta Education Regional Office are near.

There are two regular professional development activities for this jurisdiction. One is a one half-day workshop organized by the Local Alberta Teachers Association (A.T.A.) and supported by the School Board that addresses topics of general interest by a speaker or presenter. The second is a two-day A.T.A. Convention also organized by A.T.A. Locals in the area and supported by the respective boards under provisions in the School Act. Many of the convention sessions are subject based and usually of fairly broad appeal. Apart from these two regular activities, other ad hoc sessions are held on the basis of need as determined by the senior administration. Teachers also have access to limited funds for attendance at other professional development activities. These funds are usually sufficient to assist, but not fully cover, the expenses for a teacher to attend a conference once every two years.

Preliminary Considerations

Change Guidelines

As the review of the literature suggests, there seems to be no shortage of suggestions regarding principles that should be employed to create conditions for change. The literature is so consistent that it seems sure that the application of any one of these lists would bring about many predictable, and some unforeseen, successes in professional development (Smylie & Conyers, 1991). My synthesis of the many suggestions for effective professional development yields six guidelines that I attempted to incorporate into the process of this study.

First, change must be understood as a long-term process involving a shift in attitude and a shift in practice. Whether one of these is a consequence of the other is unclear, but, what is clear is that movement in both must be present if professional development efforts are to have a lasting effect. In addition, as teaching comes to be seen as an extremely complex process and not as the mere replication of pre-packaged strategies, it is ever more apparent that change takes time.

Second, the function of professional development must be seen in broad educative terms rather than in terms of training teachers in the mastery of certain skills or behaviors. The function of the change process must be seen as building on already established competencies to enhance practice in an ongoing manner rather than as a one-shot remedy for perceived deficiencies. Teachers cannot be in-serviced as passive patients; they must be active participants in a continuous educative process.

Third, the governance of change programs must be largely in the hands of teachers. They must have the power to make decisions not only about the way to arrive at a particular goal, but whether or not the goal is, in fact, worth pursuing. The subjective reality for each teacher at any particular time is idiosyncratic so that the direction, speed and suitability of any change in practice must be contingent upon the teacher's professional judgement. It is then imperative that this judgement and this power are grounded in being familiar with the research and theories upon which sound pedagogical decisions are made.

Fourth, teachers are learners and as such require peer support in a collaborative, collegial environment. It may well be that if a school system can provide a climate for this to occur, its major function has

been fulfilled. There are numerous other contributions that administration could provide (Henk, 1992) that would contribute to the consistency of system-wide changes, but these may not be essential for significant growth among individual groups of teachers (Smylie, 1988).

Fifth, reflection is essential in order that experience can become a part of the curriculum for change. As teachers take control of their own experience, analyzing for success and failure, and experimenting in a supportive environment, feelings of efficacy will be enhanced. Furthermore, as they identify themselves as important factors in their student's learning, they will be further motivated not by promises of promotion or increased pay but by their involvement in their students' performance.

Finally, teachers must be considered as learners of content area as well as learners of pedagogy. It seems clear that, in the case of language arts instruction, if teachers are to expect their students to become writers and readers, they too must rediscover themselves as writers and readers. It would follow that teachers must also see themselves as mathematicians, scientists, and historians in order to be motivated in enhancing their ability to teach this content.

Implementation of the Guidelines

Although, as expected, the process changed, it was planned that these guidelines would be implemented as six teachers of secondary English met five times between March and June of 1993. The purpose of these meetings would be to: (a) examine language learning theory, (b) reflect upon individual teaching practice, (c) identify common and

individual needs, and (d) collaboratively plan and initiate appropriate professional development responses to needs.

The initial focus of the sessions would be to develop awareness of current language learning theory and insights into personal teaching practice. Participants would be asked to select journal articles dealing with issues related to language learning from either their own sources or a bibliography provided by me. It was intended that time would be provided in each session to discuss these issues. Participants would also be asked to reflect upon their own practice through reflective journals and each session would include an opportunity for disclosure of journal writing, either to the group or with a peer. Courtland (1990) describes this process as follows:

> . . . implementers must be assisted in raising to a conscious level their implicit theories. They must have opportunities to gain knowledge about language teaching and learning, test new teaching strategies, receive feedback, dialogue with peers, and reflect on their practice (p. 49).

It was intended that attempts would be made to examine or consider, as a group, the agendas of each individual. Through reflection and discussion, participants would be encouraged to identify common and personal, long and short term needs for professional development. Points where the group could provide collaboration and support would be identified, especially where these needs involved language instruction.

In summary, the participants would be asked to keep a journal, prepare a portfolio, do some professional reading and attend sessions. Each session would involve three activities.

1. Question Time: Investigating issues and concerns raised by the professional readings. The focus will be considering how the ideas presented relate to the present practice of each member of the group.

2. Reflection Time: Disclosure of journals and portfolios. Talking about the emerging issues and determining ways to address them.

3. Writing Time: Time to write in journals and reflect on the process and other considerations.

Researcher's Role

Just as I had included plans for the overall process, so it was that I had given some thought to my place in this study. My role would be to collaborate with teachers to find appropriate processes for professional growth and change. I would provide resources that articulate theory and practices supported by research, vehicles for reflection, and a forum for collaboratively examining our own practices. We would attempt to find to what extent we could or wished to implement strategies consistent with current language learning theory in a high school setting. Specific issues and plans for addressing these issues would emerge from the group.

It should be pointed out that as the designer and a participant in the process, I had objectives for my own professional development that dealt specifically with (a) improving my own understanding of the extent to which current theory is practically applicable to a secondary school setting and (b) developing ways of incorporating strategies based on current language learning theory into my practice. I wanted to do this in a collaborative and supportive environment. However, it was understood that the emergent agendas of the other participants might be so diverse

that attempts would have to be made to find a way to incorporate these differing goals into the group process and follow the direction of the group consensus. Gitlin (1989) explains this process in this way:

> What this means is that the educative researcher must take an openly political stance in considering what projects to approach. However, the projects must be approached and developed such that decisions made with those studied and others reflect the power of persuasion, not the entrenched position of individuals or the legitimized status of particular types of knowledge (p. 249).

If, through the power of persuasion to maintain consensus, the group could not accommodate or support an individual's goals, the participant could define the extent to which he or she wished to be involved even to the extent of withdrawing from the group.

As a teaching colleague with some specialized knowledge in teacher change, but no greater expertise in the instruction of high school English, only more access and opportunity to provide some resources, I felt I would be able to achieve what Anders and Richardson (1991) call the desired violation of staff development norms: the expectation of a top-down process with an expert giving the answers, the resistance to revealing one's practice to colleagues, and the location of authority and expertise as coming from someone else. It would be my task to find a balance between support and empowerment (Courtland et al., 1989) by encouraging participants to share in providing resources and determining the direction of the process, even to the point of deciding which if any of the mechanisms for reflection and collaboration I have suggested should be continued.

These were all initial considerations--a general map to follow, but, as many aspects of the project as possible were open to negotiation. We had general agreement that we would meet a number of times between March and June and I had outlined some activities for us.

The Process

The process had to be allowed to evolve and the narrative of the events as they occurred reveals the modifications in process and research design that were made to accommodate the directions set by the group.

First Session

March 17, 1993

The first session turned out to be an indication of things to come since only three out of the five participants were in attendance: Gordon, Edith, and Wesley. Shelly and Shari were sick and through some miscommunication, Sean had gone to the wrong place and by the time he realized it, it was too late to get to the session.

We were able to move through the agenda, as displayed in Appendix B, quite satisfactorily except for setting the date for the next meeting. The most appropriate time would be a Wednesday afternoon when we had early dismissal and if we wished we could be released at noon. However, it seemed that there were numerous impediments to this plan. Edith had one of her two preparation periods of the week after lunch on Wednesday and she didn't want to lose that time. Gordon was concerned about missing too many of his English 30 classes. As principal, Wesley had conflicts with staff meetings on some of the Wednesdays. As we discussed session schedules, concerns were raised about the amount of homework expected by the project. Wesley indicated

that he wouldn't be doing any journal writing since he was under pressure to finish his graduate program and any writing he did at home would be on that. Edith was also concerned about her family commitments inhibiting her reading and writing. Gordon felt he would have no problem with the journaling task since through his graduate program, he had much reflective writing that he could bring. At the end of the session most of the concerns seemed to have been aired and if not satisfied, at least made tolerable. We agreed to meet every third Wednesday beginning on April 7, then April 28, and so on. Everyone chose a journal article to read and I gave them a list of issues to consider in their journal writing (see Appendix C).

At this point, my agenda was complete, but Gordon raised a question about the teaching of grammar. The group seemed to frequently come back to this issue throughout the sessions. The question was, "Should grammar be taught directly or in context?" Most of the group seemed to feel that the public hue and cry for a return to the basics and the apparent expectations of some standardized testing made it clear that students should have a traditional knowledge of grammar that could only be acquired through direct instruction. This discussion went on for almost a half hour with no resolution.

Second Session

April 7, 1993

Almost as if by some plan, none of those who was at the first session was able to attend the session on April 7. The only participants who came were Shelly and Shari, who, along with Sean, had been absent from the first session. Sean was unable to attend this second session

because he had to supervise the badminton team at a tournament. Gordon had to attend a funeral; Wesley had parent/teacher interviews, and Edith forgot about the session.

As it was, things worked out all right since I was able to repeat the introductory agenda with the newcomers so that everyone but Sean would be beginning from the same point at the next session. When I described the guidelines for professional development, specifically the importance of collegial support, Shelly and Shari spent a great deal of time talking about the absence of collegial relationships in the jurisdiction. When the guideline regarding reflection came up, the discussion about reflection led them to consider the effects of whole language on standards of correctness that inevitably led to another protracted discussion about issues related to the teaching of grammar. They felt that language learning theory and practices in elementary and junior high school were in direct conflict with post-secondary requirements that apparently included a more traditional knowledge of grammar.

Third Session

May 5, 1993

On Tuesday, April 27, I learned from Shelly and Shari that they wouldn't be able to attend the session the next day. The short notice was a problem since I had arranged with the Superintendent to allow the participants to be released at noon. To postpone, substitute teachers would have to be cancelled and plans changed. When I called the participants, it seemed that postponement would not be difficult and so I set the next Wednesday, May 5 as the session date. It was probable that

there would be conflicts, but it was readily becoming apparent that they couldn't be avoided.

At the May 5 session only Sean, Shelly and Edith were present. Gordon was coaching baseball, Wesley had a Principal's session and Shari had a doctor's appointment. This, of course, was Sean's first time at a session, but I had sent him information about the journals, the readings and the portfolios. The first few minutes were spent firming up the next session date, deciding whether it would be a lunch session, and reviewing the litany of things that would interfere--personal appointments, baseball games, grad ceremonies and staff meetings. As planned, we proceded through a question time in which we addressed issues raised by the professional readings. From their reading, Shelly and Edith talked about authentic learning activities and student involvement that came about when poetry, in particular, addressed concepts that are important to students. They talked about student ownership when students are given structures to help them express their feelings in real literary forms. The discussion was purposeful and lively. I was excited because it looked as though the process would work as long as people could attend.

This optimism was short lived for when we moved to the next phase in the process, reflection on journals and portfolios, only Sean had written anything and he bravely agreed to share some of it. I read an example of a poem that I would be including in my portfolio. After that there was an awkward silence and then Shelly, Shari and Sean told me that they just couldn't do what I had asked them to do. Journals and portfolios were out of the question. They didn't possibly have the time to do them.

It appeared that the study, as it had been conceived, was history. The process that I had presented was unsatisfactory, but they decided that they would still like to get together if the result of session would be something practical, like a thematic unit or a novel study that they could take back to their classrooms.

Between May 6 and May 18, I made a decision that if the sessions were going to continue at all, the group's wishes would have to take priority over the requirements of my study. I would have to alter the study to suit the evolving events. As I was making this decision, Wesley T. had made a decision as well. Because of his work load, it would be impossible for him to participate. It became clear that we couldn't limp along in this manner so I decided that we would meet at least one more time. The session would be a lunch session where the teachers would have an opportunity to either commit to a collaborative project or withdraw. I couldn't get permission for release time since the Superintendent and the principals of the schools were away at a conference, but when I explained the situation to the vice-principals of the schools, they were able to make arrangements. I either phoned or visited each participant and requested that we meet one more time under these terms.

Fourth Session

May 19, 1993

Everyone but Wesley was at the May 19 session. Lunch was a congenial affair. There seemed to be a feeling of camaraderie and we all seemed to enjoy each other's company. We made a decision that developing a collaborative thematic unit would be a worthwhile endeavor.

I then invited those who wished to work on the unit to go to the school board office to begin work and those who didn't wish to continue were welcome to leave. All five decided to continue and so we decided that we would develop a unit on gender issues and began to discuss how we would go about meeting our objective.

As I considered the desire of the teachers to come away with something tangible from these sessions, it became obvious that we would need more than a half-day. I asked the Superintendent if this would be possible. He agreed. The teachers were not so agreeable. Those who were teaching English 30 were particularly hesitant to give up a class this close to final exams. In fact, Sean decided that he couldn't be away from his classroom.

Individual Interviews

June 7-11, 1993

It seemed that we had just passed through a critical period in the process. I felt that it would be important to find out what had been happening with the participants, so I decided to conduct interviews with each of the participants. I used an informal interview schedule (Appendix D) and taped the interviews. I went to the participants' schools and interviewed each person individually. I was unable to talk to Sean until after the final session.

Fifth Session

June 10, 1993

The culmination of this process occurred on June 10. We met at the school board office bringing arm loads of textbooks and anthologies.

I attempted to provide a structure for our planning by webbing various elements that the unit could include. That didn't seem to be much use or of much interest. Instead the group began sharing examples of literature related to the theme. After a good deal of enthusiastic sharing, it was decided that we should take the opportunity to read some of the literature. We read and to save time while we read, we had lunch delivered to the meeting room. Participants ate, read, and talked. I asked about the possibility of doing a novel study in connection with the theme but this didn't seem feasible. I suggested that we determine the extent to which we wanted to collaborate. We could collaborate to the extent of a resource unit, resources and suggested strategies, or a fully developed unit. The group was unprepared to commit beyond the second level and so that when I presented a plan for using a writers workshop strategy for the unit, there seemed to be little interest in pursuing it. When the day was done, the participants left with a short list of materials that would provide an opportunity to address gender issues that would be the only tangible product of the project as summarized in Table 4.

Data Sources and Collection

Ethnographic methodology was selected for this study because the essential nature of the study required that, as researcher, I could not be an external force implementing a treatment on subjects. The methodology had to be sufficiently flexible to respond to events as they unfolded since, in essence, I was interested in making it possible for the voices of the participants to be heard which meant adapting to the participants (Gitlin, 1990). Every aspect of the process had to continue

by consensus even though some broad, initial directions were set in the research design.

Table 4
Summary of Sessions

Date	Present	Reasons Away	Planned Agenda	Emerging Agenda
March 17	Edith Gordon Wesley	2-illness 1-communi-cation	Review Goals, Procedures,	Time commitments Public expectations about grammar
April 7	Shelly Shari	1- funeral 1-parent teacher interviews 1- coaching	Review Goals, Procedures,	Absence of collegiality Public expectations about grammar
May 6	Edith Sean Shelly	1-coaching 1-medical 1-meeting	Professional readings Journal sharing* Reflecting*	Rejection of journal and portfolio
May 19	Edith Gordon Sean Shari Shelly	1-withdrew from program	Determine theme Confirm participation Prepare for next meeting	Agenda as planned
June 7, 8 & 11	Interview		Interview Schedule	
June 10	Edith Gordon Shari Shelly	1- commit-ment to class	Plan unit including resources, strategies*, novel study*, assessment procedures*	Sharing of literature resources

*Planned items that did not occur in the meetings

Two data collection procedures, portfolios and journals, were part of the initial plan. As the group made decisions on the process, they chose not to produce these collection instruments. It was therefore necessary to modify the methodology to adapt to the circumstances. The result was three sources of data collection procedures.

Participant observer notes. These were recorded post hoc in a field journal. They consisted of records of procedures, impressions of events observed, and personal reactions to events.

Verbatim Records of Meetings. These were transcriptions of audio tapes of meeting sessions that took place in the school board office in one of two conference rooms.

Interviews. These were individual interviews conducted once with each participant. They took place just before the final session using an informal interview schedule. The interviews were conducted in the participants' school, recorded on audio tape, and transcribed.

Data Interpretation

Theoretical Framework

Occasionally throughout the data collection stages, I made analytical notes in my journal regarding some of the themes I was seeing. During the summer months after the data collection was complete, I transcribed the tapes which provided an opportunity to reflect upon the overall data. I left the data alone during the latter part of the summer and while I began the fall semester of instruction. When I came to analyze the data after it was all gathered and transcribed, I began with the session transcripts. The data in the session transcripts were more diverse and would likely yield a wider variety of themes whereas the interview was guided by the ongoing analysis during data collection so that it already was focussing on issues and possible themes and would therefore limit the possibilities for interpretation.

I read the session transcripts and began coding statements according to the ideas or issues that they seemed to raise using what Van Manen (1990) calls "Interpretation through Conversation." He describes a conversation as a triad consisting of the two speakers and the notion or phenomenon that drives and keeps the conversation intact.

The conversation is by nature, then, a hermeneutic process of making sense of the notion or theme. The researcher's task in analysis is one of entering into the conversation with the text or data to allow the themes to emerge. The participants in the study participate in this analysis as they engage in the conversation and provide direct statements regarding the notion or theme. Each new conversation with the text can provide opportunities for the discovery of new notions or themes.

I entered the conversation with the text, or analysis process, using a form of analytic induction (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984) which involves reviewing the data for categories of phenomena or emerging themes. The data were reviewed using approaches suggested by Van Manen (1990). The wholistic or sententious approach was used as field notes were made and tapes were transcribed. I formulated and recorded statements that expressed my impressions of the significance of the text as a whole. After all the data were transcribed, I used a more detailed approach by placing each cluster of sentences in a database record. I then coded them depending upon what they seemed to reveal about teacher-directed professional development. For instance, the following excerpt from my field journal was coded with the label "professional concern" and "professional development" because it seemed to have something to say about both of these concepts.

> There was silence. Then Shari began to talk about the difficulties with finding something that would be useful to all because each person had different interests and concerns. Even she and Shelly had talked about collaborating, but they teach different subjects so how could they do anything together. She suggested that there wasn't much room to be flexible with the 30's and that the curriculum dictated what

> she had to do and that she taught by genre because she had to be sure that the students were getting the skills.

Once the text was grouped into categories, I reviewed the text using the selective or highlighting approach to identify particularly revealing statements (Van Manen, 1990). This passage was also highlighted since I thought it was significant in understanding a skills orientation to teaching and professional development.

Coding Categories

All the data were divided into meaning "chunks" mostly consisting of a statement made by one individual; however, where an interchange between two or more people carried the meaning, the dialogue was grouped together as one piece of data. There were 727 such pieces of data from the combination of the three data sources: transcripts of sessions, transcripts of interviews, and my field journal. The majority of the pieces of data were coded using more than one category. The multiple coding occurred when the meaning chunks were fairly large containing more than one idea; or, where two categories could be connected by a preposition as in "participant's attitude *about* pressures" or "Change *in* professional concerns."

At this point in the process, I wasn't concerned about pieces of data having multiple codes because, for one thing, I did not consider the codes to be themes. Furthermore, I was not, at this time, concerned with the theoretical antecedents of these categories. They were merely large bins into which I could sort the data so that I could access different sets of data in some way to allow it to speak without preconceived

notions of the kinds of things it should be saying. For instance, I could have approached the analysis using the factors that the literature indicates influences professional development as my categories. Rather, I chose to work back to the theoretical antecedents after I had articulated themes that seemed to be emerging. All pieces of data were described using the codes listed in Table 5 and defined in Appendix E.

Table 5
Analysis Codes

Concerns	**Culture**	**Process**
Help	Time	Leader's Attitude
Personal	Authority	Participant's Attitude
Professional	Pressures	Decision Making
	Professional Dev.	Relationship
	Collegiality	Change
	Administration	

I read and reread the data by sorting it into different sets and sub-sets to see what the data were saying about each of these conceptual bins. I examined each of the sets of data that were coded by the fourteen sub-categories and then I examined a sub-set of each of those categories by adding another coding category to my search criteria. For example, I read all data pieces that were coded as "Administration" and then I read only that sub-set that carried the code "Administration" and "Professional Concerns." I wanted to see if different ways of looking at the data might lead to different understandings, but I did not examine all possible combinations. Some issues came up frequently, were addressed by most, if not all, of the participants, or were identified by the participants or me as affecting the professional development process.

Reliability

Internal reliability is concerned with whether multiple observers within a particular study would agree upon what is being observed. I used two inter-rater reliability procedures to specifically assess internal reliability. I first had a teacher of language arts not involved with the study, but who had some familiarity with research techniques read a set of data that I had coded as relating to collegiality. Without informing her of my coding, I asked her what themes she could identify in the data. She confirmed that the data were concerned with collegiality and further that it seemed to be speaking of the importance of support and validation that comes from one's colleagues, but that this was absent in the experience of the speakers. Her analysis concurred with mine both in the application of the general code and in the statement of theme.

In addition, I had a teacher involved in graduate studies code a part of the session transcripts using the coding categories and the descriptions I provided. There was less than 15% disagreement in the codes applied to the data chunks. Most of these differences could be attributed to the fact that whereas I coded the data according to the few major ideas present, the second reader applied the codes wherever there was a nuance of the idea present. Another source of disagreement occurred as a result of ambiguity in code definitions; these were revised accordingly. Finally, there were a few instances where the context or tone of the speaker's voice, with which I was familiar but the second reader was not, resulted in different codes being applied.

There are two other aspects of the research design that contribute to the reliability of this study. One is the presence of low-inference

descriptors--two of the data sources are verbatim accounts of participant conversations. The other is the extensive supply of raw data in the report that should assist readers to assess the validity and reliability of the interpretations (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984).

External reliability is provided for, as recommended by Goetz and LeCompte (1984), by a detailed description of the following: researcher status and position, choices of participants, social situation and conditions of the treatment and data collection, analytic constructs and premises, and methods of data collection and analysis.

Validity

Internal validity is concerned with whether what is reported as being observed or measured is actually what is being observed or measured. Although this is one of the strengths of ethnographic studies, it is important to include in the study design allowances for establishing internal validity. In this case, I presented the eight thematic statements (Table 6) to the participants and asked them if those statements accurately described their experience (Appendix F). I also asked the participants to provide alternative interpretations or to expand upon the ones presented if they desired.

Four of the five questionnaires were returned. Of the responses received, there was only one instance in which a participant disagreed with the perceptions as stated. One participant responded that he agreed that there were limitations to change due to the influence of administration, students and the public, but these weren't the real reasons for the reluctance to change. He felt that some of the

participants were using these expectations as excuses for not changing their practice.

The comments made in the spaces available for elaboration and qualification generally supported the interpretations of the events as presented in the discussion and analysis.

Further internal validity was provided by inviting each of the participants to read the final draft of this analysis. At this writing two of the participants responded concurring with the events and the interpretations of these events as presented.

CHAPTER 4

INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION

From Themes to Voices

The aspect of professional development that was being manipulated, almost as an independent variable, was the element of authority. The central focus of the study was around teachers having authority over their own professional development. Therefore, it is not surprising that the strongest theme that emerged from the initial analysis had to do with the source of professional development authority. This became the first of eight issues described in Table 6 that would be my initial themes. However, it soon became apparent that these initial themes constituted only one level of understanding.

As I examined these themes, it was clear that the central idea of authority was present in each of the eight statements. This led me to examine the themes from the point of view of who was authoring, giving voice or directing the course of professional development. Therefore, just as this study moved from traditional interpretive-qualitative approach to the methodology of educative research (Gitlin, 1990) to adapt to the needs of the participants, so it was that the analysis of the data shifted. The analysis began as a search for generalizations from which guidelines for facilitating growth and change in teachers could be drawn. It evolved into an attempt to facilitate the articulation of the various voices that shaped this professional development experience.

Table 6
Initial Themes

•The Search for Authority	The group recognized the absence of an official authority figure and in its absence deferred to organizer as the ostensible decision-maker, and spent considerable time trying to discover authority.
•The Role of the Organizer	The quasi-leadership role and the special interest in the outcome of the project seemed to inhibit the degree to which the organizer could be a fully collaborative partner in the process.
•The Role of Time	In the busy lives of teachers, there seems to be the perception that there is little time for professional development that involves intensive reflection, analysis and action on personal theory and practice.
•Participants' Experience with Collaboration	The participants reported having had very little experience in working collaboratively with each other.
•External Expectations	Participants perceived the expectations of the administration, the students and the public as limitations to the possibility of changing their practice.
•Personal Theories	Personal theories derived from experience limited the receptivity to change.
•Conditions of Change	There were indications that conditions conducive to change occurred: collegial relations were enhanced; innovative practices were examined; a degree of self-disclosure occurred; a collaborative project was undertaken.

This perspective yielded an understanding of the events of the study through four voices that seemed to have shaped the process in which we were engaged: the voice of a professional development leader; the voice of external influences on one's professional life; the collective voice of teachers collaborating in professional development, and the individual teacher's voice.

As the interpretation moved from the themes to the voices, a further validity check was needed to confirm that the concept of voices was grounded in the data as well as in the theoretical antecedents established in the literature. Table 7 illustrates the relationships between the theoretical antecedents revealed by the literature, the initial

coding categories, the thematic statements and the final conceptual framework of authority.

The voices logically evolved from the thematic statements which in turn emerged from the data grouped by the topical codes. In addition, the interpretations made are consistent with the aspects of change identified in the literature. To say that the voices exist seems to be logically validated, but validating what the voices say becomes quite difficult.

When I moved my analysis from theme identification to voice identification, a whole new layer of complications was introduced to the analysis. These problems were invited but were not fully appreciated by my basic research design. For as I indicated in my earlier discussion of the initial focus and the researcher's role, the process acknowledged that I had a particular professional purpose for engaging in this project and it was expected that the participants also had their agendas. It was the purpose of the project design to allow these agendas or voices to emerge. This seemed to be fairly straight forward and it was--as long as the analysis was done from the stance of the objective researcher passing judgement on the anonymous participants--as long as a subject/object relationship was maintained between the researcher and those being researched.

However, as soon as I attempted to explicate the voices of others, I came up against the hypocrisy of speaking in my voice and presenting it as the voice of someone else--especially when these others were friends and colleagues. This problematic is one shared by critical pedagogy theorists in all aspects of education. Power imbalances are unavoidable and attempts to empower those who seem oppressed often only give the

illusion of equality (Ellsworth, 1989). The situation between student and teacher discussed here can be applied equally to researcher and researched. As the one conducting the research, I was in an unavoidable position of authority so that if the voices of others were to be heard at all, I, as the researcher, had to be open to the dialogical process with the participants in the study so as not to "silence and objectify those studied" (Gitlin, 1990, p. 448).

Table 7
Logical Validity of Voices

Thematic Statement	Voices of Authority	Code Origin	Theoretical Antecedent
1. There occurred a continual search for authority within the group and with the individual. The group recognized the absence of an official authority figure and in its absence deferred to organizer as the ostensible decision-maker, and spent considerable time trying to discover authority.	The collective voice The individual voice	Authority	Governance
2. The quasi-leadership role and the special interest in the outcome of the project inhibited the degree to which the organizer could be a fully collaborative partner in the process.	The leadership voice	Leader's Attitude	Leaders of Teacher Change
3. In the busy lives of teachers, there is the perception that there is little time for professional development that involves intensive reflection, analysis and action on personal theory and practice.	The external voices	Time	Functions of Change and Reflection and Change
4. The participants have had very little experience in working collaboratively with each other.	The collective voice	Collegiality	Teachers as Learners
5. Participants perceived the expectations of the administration, the students and the public as limitations to the possibility of changing their practice.	The external voices	Pressures	Cultural Milieu

(Continued next page)

Table 7 Continued
Logical Validity of Voices

Thematic Statement	Voices of Authority	Code Origin	Theoretical Antecedent
6. For most of the participants, professional development involves the provision of practical teaching strategies and ideas that have immediate application to the classroom, rather than the provision for a more general personal/professional growth.	The external voices	Professional Development	Functions of teacher Change and Reflection and Change
7. Personal theories derived from experience limited the receptivity to change.	The individual voice	Professional Concerns	Teacher Change and Language Learning
8. There were indications that conditions conducive to change occurred: collegial relations were enhanced; innovative practices were examined; a degree of self-disclosure occurred; a collaborative project was undertaken.	All Voices	Change and Relationship	Guidelines for Teacher Change

Searching for Authority

When I embarked on this project, I invited my colleagues to join me in the journey. We would explore new territory together, and I would be just one of the travellers. The intention was that we should direct our own professional development--that we should discover and speak our voices, that we should author our own professional development. However, the initial and persistent response from the participants seemed to be a search for another authority that would determine the course the process would take.

The first place they looked was to me, the organizer of the project. For instance, when I contacted Shelly in January and asked her to participate, she said she would participate if I made it interesting for her.

She assumed my authority and my responsibility for making the project happen.

My authority was assumed by Edith as well. She was uncomfortable with defining the reflective journal herself. Instead, she felt that her responses to the journal questions had to be in accordance with my expectations.

> *Edith:* Well, I find that while I was writing this, I was just answering the questions. But I thought this isn't really what he wants here. . .
> Bryan: First of all don't think you're writing for me. You're writing for the question or the issue. For yourself, and that's it.
> (Session Transcripts, 5/6/93)

Even after most of the meetings had taken place, there were still indications that the participants were confused about the source of authority. Shari felt that, as the initiator of the project, my agenda had to take precedence. When I asked her in the final interview why she didn't offer an opinion on the direction we should take, she indicated that she felt that she should follow my lead.

> *Bryan:* Why didn't you suggest that? Why didn't you. . .
> Shari: I wasn't sure what direction you were going. . . I wasn't sure of what you wanted from us and I wasn't sure of your direction so I didn't want to interfere.
> (Interview-Shari, 6/8/93)

In spite of my intention to empower the participants to author this project, they felt that since it was my project, my authority should

prevail. This, of course, is understandable since it would be normal for the organizer of an activity to take the leadership role.

Similarly, the group seemed to look to other usual sources of authority in an attempt to understand the direction they should take. Here Edith wonders about the superintendent's role and attempts to understand what his motives might be:

> Well, I admit to being a bit confused before our last meeting. I couldn't quite figure out what we were doing. I guess it is unclear to me what information you needed and how [the superintendent] would give us release time that would benefit merely you and not us. And how what we were doing for you benefitted the group. Like all of that was kind of confusing in my mind. Like I was trying to figure that out. (Interview-Edith, 6/7/93)

Here Edith seemed unable to accept that the participants could be in control so she seemed to suggest that somebody other than them must be pulling the strings and determining direction. This feeling that authority lay somewhere outside the individual teacher occasionally caused me to try to convince the participants otherwise. Here, I try to convince Shelly of the validity of our collective expert judgements:

> *Bryan:* Again, I think that if we as a group of English teachers said that we know this to be right or we feel that whatever it is that we are doing is right and good, who could argue with us. You know what I mean? That if we said, for this section we are going to use portfolio assessment. We're going to give you some marks, don't worry about it, but for this period of time it's going to be just this. Or we're going to do multiple novels and open reading or whatever. If we

> committed ourselves to experimenting, honestly, who could argue with us? Especially if all six of us were doing it. If we said, we have considered this, we want to give it a try, we think it's good, let's go for it.
> (Interview-Shelly, 6/8/93)

When I interviewed Gordon, he offered his insights on this search for authority. He felt the questionable success of the project was attributable to the inability of the group to discover the authority within.

> *Gordon:* . . .I think the way to [be successful] would be to somehow work more closely with the administration of the jurisdiction and set this aside as a professional activity that teachers are required to attend. Do it during school time so you would have control over whether or not the teacher attends. And, all right, "This is going to be a half-day thing; or, it's going to be a full-day thing and these three half-days as well. And everyone will attend this." That's one way to do it. The other way to do it would be through the locally developed course type of activity. . . But I think there has to be some kind of--I would like to use your agenda--but there had to some kind of planning take place where we really didn't have that much choice and then once you get started, I think it becomes very, very valuable very quickly.
> (Interview-Gordon, 6/7/93)

As Gordon says, this project may have enjoyed more success as a professional development activity had there been sufficient external authority exercised over the participants to get them familiar with the process to help them buy into it. However, the absence of authority and the subsequent search for it provided and opportunity for the research project to meet some success by allowing other voices to emerge. So it is

that the function of this analysis is one of exploring the partial, multiple and contradictory voices to get a deeper understanding of the problematic nature of professional growth. The leadership voice, the collective voice, the external voices and the individual voices are all examined, especially in terms of their contradictions, in hopes of understanding the way the voices heard and the voices silenced shape a professional development activity.

The Voices Speak

The Leadership Voice

The literature on change clearly indicates that the most promising conception of professional development leader is one of collegiality rather than one of authority. This conception recognizes that the leader has personal interests and biases that require attention but does not see them as the only legitimate ones. The leader's voice is just one voice among the participants engaged in any professional development activity. I enthusiastically embraced this stance in the planning stages of the project, but the reality of the experience reveals it to be a complex and difficult stance to maintain. The difficulty comes as the contradictions inherent in one's voice become clear. As the project leader or facilitator, I found my voice to be one of both authority and collegiality.

Leader as Authority

The authoritative nature of my voice became particularly noticeable concerning when and how the other voices would be heard. When it came to matters of time commitment and matters of process, I attempted to control the group. However, in the formative stages of this

project, I thought I would be quite comfortable with an egalitarian stance, and expressed this at our first meeting.

> And as I told you earlier, people have already asked me why are these people doing this. In fact way back when I had this idea, [a friend] said, well "What happens if these guys don't want to play with you?" I said, "Well I guess I don't do it then." And fortunately you've agreed to do it so far. And I suppose if things fizzle that's part of my thesis. That's part of the conclusion. . . things just don't pan out in this situation. So I would like to find out why you people want to play with me.
> (Session transcript, 3/17/93)

I felt that if the others saw no benefit in it they could easily refuse since neither they nor I were obligated to the project. This assumption proved to be fallacious. As the project progressed, my commitment quite naturally increased to the point where I began to feel ownership. As I waited for the participants to arrive at the first session, I worried that they would not show up. My field journal records the feelings I had as I waited.

> I'm sitting here all alone in the board room hoping that the fears that kept me awake last night have not come true. . . . Basically if they were registered in Graduate studies it would constitute a complete course and here I'm expecting them to do it totally voluntarily.
> (Journal, 3/17/93)

It is apparent that by this time that I had begun to appreciate that I had a vested interest in seeing the project through so that the degree to

which the participants could or could not participate would significantly affect me. This being the case, it was difficult to be attentive to the group's directions regarding when and how their voices were heard.

With some difficulty, I was able to attend to the directions about when the participant's voices would be heard although in the beginning it was even difficult to let go of authority concerning this. When Edith showed some early misgivings about what was expected of her and how it would infringe upon the time that she had available, I attempted to accept her concerns.

> *Bryan:* So it's pretty free floating and I don't want you [Edith] to feel obligated as if you're committing yourself to something. . . like if you're feeling that already. . . You know maybe it's not the time for you. Maybe you don't have the time to do it, period. And don't feel like you're obligated to me or anyone else to do it. I mean the reality of our professional lives is that sometimes it just isn't the time. So when I put that in the letter, I meant that if you don't have the time to do it. . . . Anyway let's just say we'll meet on some Wednesdays at about three o'clock and we'll try to finish the business by four or four-thirty. And like you said Gordon, if we could negotiate a noon meeting and go until three or three thirty we would have lots of time. I know that takes up your [Edith's] spare, but if you could stay until two and had something pressing you could leave and take your spare afterward. Or not.
> (Session transcript, 3/17/93)

I had more misgivings than the words indicate. I recall that I did not feel that magnanimous and flexible. On one hand, I was sincere that she should feel no obligation, but on the other hand I did not want

to lose her from the study. I presented a compromise and left an opening so that the decision concerning time would be postponed until later. Edith seemed somewhat placated and I became more comfortable with the possibilities.

> She seemed relieved. In fact, I was relieved because I realized that we could be flexible. We could be there for each other when we needed it and not at the beck and call of someone else.
> (Journal, 3/17/93)

Then Wesley indicated that he too would not be able to promise much since he was under some pressure to finish his own Masters program. Any writing he would be doing at home would be for his program. I began to worry that this might be the beginning of a trend that would eventually result in everyone abandoning the ship.

> I felt a little uneasy at this point. . . I wondered if the whole thing was coming unravelled before it got started. (Journal, 3/17/93)

But by the end of this first meeting, we finally negotiated our way through the obstacles of staff meetings, teaching commitments, coaching responsibilities and valuable spare time to find an acceptable meeting time. I had accepted the necessity of modifying the schedule to find the time for the voices to be heard. In my journal, I expressed comfort with the give and take on this issue.

> I felt relief that we were able to stretch to accommodate people. I know it would be better if everyone could do everything together but this is reality! This is what I want to know about! Besides there is still the possibility that stuff will catch on and people will make the time. As Gordon said at one point "Hey we might get so carried away that we'll just go for supper and carry on." Secretly that's my hope. . . that we'll just carry on.
> (Journal, 3/17/93)

I was optimistic that the busy lives of high school teachers would not be a major impediment to the process. I wanted to believe that if it did become an impossible obstacle then the study would be complete and I would be able to draw some very simple conclusions; however, more than a month later I was still attempting to exercise authority over and taking responsibility for what happened.

> Depression! I have arranged to have all the teachers released from class at noon. The superintendent was very cooperative and cleared it with very short notice. It was to be the first time we all met. The date was set months ago. I sent a fax to all participants last week with the agenda and reminders. Tonight I began phoning everyone to inform them that I had applied for PD money for us and that we could go to lunch tomorrow. My second phone call was to Shelly who informed me that she and Shari have a budget meeting tomorrow and couldn't attend. She had left me a message today! Now I have to phone everyone to see if they can postpone until next week. I only hope that they have not arranged for subs etcetera. If they have, we will have to go ahead. I was really hoping to get everyone together. . . It's difficult to keep chipping away at this wall. I'm sure that if a thesis wasn't in

> the balance I would give up. Beware anyone who thinks this can happen easily.
> (Journal, 4/27/93)

As difficult as it was to relinquish authority regarding when the voices would be heard, I found it more difficult to accommodate trade-offs when it came to how the voices would be heard. I thought that changes here would threaten the viability of my research by eliminating important sources of data. These changes, it seemed, would also threaten the essence of the professional development process as I conceived it because the journals, the readings, and the portfolios were not just sources of data, they were the research treatment. I tried to be flexible as participants challenged my expectations but it wasn't easy.

I had taken ownership and responsibility. I had authored some parameters regarding process that were very broad, but it is important to note that they were parameters--a preset script that I found extremely difficult to negotiate. The strength of my voice concerning process inhibited a truly dialogical relationship in the group and it took a crisis to reveal the situation. That crisis occurred at the third meeting after all the participants had been briefed on their responsibilities in the program and they had a chance to consider the implications.

Between each meeting the participants were to do some professional reading, do some reflecting in a journal and begin collecting material for a portfolio. There were only three of the participants in attendance at the third meeting and their preparation for the session was minimal. Shelly and Edith had done some reading and Sean had hurriedly scribbled a short response to one of the reflection questions. When I inquired about the possibility of more engagement occurring,

they were all definite in their rejection of the degree of involvement I expected. Those present (Shari even sent her vote by proxy) stated very clearly that not only was it going to be difficult to attend meetings, but that it would be difficult to find the time for the process of journaling, reading and assembling a portfolio. When I outlined what I expected, I found it difficult to accept what they were telling about the process.

> *Edith:* It's going to be tough. You know, in May and June, I think, to find time for that kind of thing, Bryan. (silence)
> . . .
> *Bryan:* I'm more in a panic now. You've just told me that this isn't going to work.
> *Edith:* Oh I don't know if. . . I hope I didn't say that but for me it's going to be tough. Cause I have revisions to make to exams and all kinds of things.
> *Shelly:* I think we came initially with good intentions, but I guess we're looking at our battlefield, to use [Sean's] words. . . and then time allowing and life allowing, we'll make room for you. So I guess the question I would ask of you is how much do you expect in the journals, the portfolios? Do you expect an odd piece or. . . how much would you like?
> . . .
> *Bryan:* Obviously although I said it at the beginning and I think I can say it now, whatever happens, happens--that's true--it has to be. But it would be nice at this point in time that if this is an impossibility--that it's just not going to happen--it would be nice for me to know because I'm going to have to make. . . find out what's happening then.
>
> And don't think I'm laying a guilt trip on you here. I mean I hope I'm not. The reality is your reality, then. There is nothing I can do about that. I'm just saying that if that is your reality right now saying that I can't do that, I can't do this, I won't be able to do this, it would be nice to know

> that. Just like it would be nice to know whether or not people could make it today.
> (Session transcript, 5/6/93)

At this point it seemed to me that what was required was not just accommodation, but a total reconceptualization of the process that would seriously limit the extent to which I could reach my goals: the exploration of change and language learning theory, and the completion of a legitimate study on the process. I seemed to ignore the fact that the group had cooperated with the project to some extent. The discussion related to the readings that were done were fruitful and Sean had bravely shared his journal entry. However, they couldn't see a possibility for being involved with all aspects of the process and I couldn't see the possibility for the hit-and-miss approach that seemed to be emerging. Throughout this conversation I was trying to persuade them to buy in totally by putting the effort I expected into context. But, more insidiously, I was resorting to appealing to their guilt, and when I asked that they let me know what their position was, I was not so much asking for information as I was presenting an ultimatum with the intention of getting an iron-clad commitment to the process to which I felt bound. What was important at this time was not the professional development experience but the viability of my study. I realized the dilemma I was facing and tried to come to grips with it in my own reflection on this meeting.

> I was feeling desperate. I wanted to get angry and say things like "You promised" or "You agreed," but I tried to keep my disappointment under control but I expect they could tell. I

> wrestled with what to do. On one hand I wanted to do whatever I could to force them to do what I had set out, but on the other hand, the whole purpose of this was that it was to be a consentual arrangement. I couldn't use whatever force or authority I had (as a friend, colleague in need of help appealing to their compassion, or as a teacher-leader with some knowledge or expertise that they didn't have) without compromising the basic premise of my study: that teachers could and would direct their own professional development if given the chance.
> (Journal, 5/6/93)

We had arrived at a critical point and my difficulty with tolerating the needs of the participants threatened to destroy the essence of the process. For the most part, the group wanted to spend the time together working on practical projects that they alone had not had the time to pursue. This was not in contradiction to what I wanted to do. I had suggested collaborating on a thematic unit or novel study, but the way in which they saw us arriving at these practical outcomes was considerably different from the way I saw it. They wanted to do only the practical planning whereas I wanted our planning to be grounded in research theory and the knowledge gleaned from reflection on our present practice. My attempt to exercise authority because of my commitment to the process was becoming extremely divisive.

> I was devastated as we left the meeting room. My isolation was emphasized as Shelly left from one door, Sean and Edith left ahead of me chatting together in the parking lot while I walked alone to my car. I did not feel like a colleague.
> (Journal, 5/6/93)

As a result of this difference, I was beginning to be seen as the other--as the authority dictating a path that for these practicing teachers seemed to be unworkable. My effectiveness as a facilitator that may have existed because I was a colleague was being jeopardized and the potential of the project for creating conditions of real change was becoming questionable.

Over the next number of days, I attempted to deal with the crisis. I discussed the situation with friends and colleagues and tried to sort out my own involvement and interests.

> I have decided that a decision has to be made--that this is a watershed point or turning point of some kind. If I am to keep the group or part of the group going, I have to address their specific and practical needs. I cannot, nor will they let me, insist on the reflection and self analysis elements of the meetings. We have time for only two more sessions. It seems I have one of two choices, given the fact that my subjects have basically rejected my plan: (a) call them all ask them what they want to work on for the next meeting--thematic unit or a novel study. If neither, they are free of commitment to the project. (b) Meet as planned on May 19 and decide what project we will embark upon and who will participate. The advantage of (a) is that we would have two days to get something done. The disadvantage is that it wouldn't be a group decision, consensus would really not have been created, I would be unilaterally ending the group process with no data being gathered (what if nobody came). The advantage of (b) is that the group would be allowed to make the decisions about direction even if it meant discontinuing and the mandate of self-direction will be fulfilled, but, this would be inefficient use of time since there then would be little time to actually accomplish anything before the end of the term. (Journal, 6/6/93)

I made the decision to combine these two alternatives. I would invite the participants to at least one more meeting. I would ask them to come to the next meeting with their suggestions of something they would like to address in our group. It could be a thematic unit or a novel study or any other issue that was relevant to them so that whatever we did would not be extra to the things they had to do anyway. Within the first half hour, we would decide what it was that we would address and with whom it would be addressed. At the end of that half hour, if there was nothing that any one of them could comfortably buy into, he/she could end his/her participation immediately. Essentially this decision was a very pragmatic one, but it was based upon a realization and an acceptance of a shift in paradigm.

> What has become apparent is that I have to turn things around in priority. That is, the group process, the professional development experience, has to come first and my study second. I have to allow the process to unfold and devise appropriate methodology to document and study what happens. I have decided to free them from the journal and portfolio "assignments" or, rather, not fight the decision they have already made. I have also decided to give them an opportunity to leave or stay. I do not want them to feel obligated to stay. I only hope one or two of them will.
> (Journal, 5/10/93)

As the initiator of the project and ersatz leader, I had gone through a process of unpacking my attitudes of ownership so that the voice of the group could be heard. Different aspects of the project posed different degrees of trauma depending upon my perception of how intrinsic they

were to the overall thrust of the project. The inability of the participants to attend the meetings on a regular basis was relatively easy to accommodate, but the rejection of the process that would provide me with the necessary data for my study and that I saw as necessary for significant change in practice was extremely difficult for me to negotiate.

This difficulty did not exist in all aspects of the project. If my voice as leader was one of differing degrees of authority as it dealt with when and how other voices were heard, it was a voice of collegiality as it dealt with what these other voices of professional development said.

Leader as Colleague

My voice as leader did emerged differently concerning issues of professional practice. In the case of introducing language learning innovations and issues of professional practice, I was more flexible. My voice was more dialogical. I invited, consulted and volunteered so that we might explore possibilities for change in practice. I persisted, I did not insist. I accommodated, I did not polarize.

I provided explanation and support from language learning theory when we broached reader response as a necessary ingredient for the study of multiple novels:

> *Bryan:* This article . . . is based on that sort of thing where, when they talk novel study it doesn't mean that they all have to read the same novel or groups of novels. . . . Like how do you read novels? Why do we expect students to read them differently: "Hey Shelly! I read this great novel, you ought to read it. It's about such and such. . . great description, great action. . . super." Why would we necessarily always want our novel studies to be an academic

> analysis of the book? Why can't they read it and respond to it?
> (Session transcript, 5/6/93)

I also shared my personal goals and plans that did not necessarily involve them or require them to conform or change.

> *Bryan:* You see that's my personal agenda. I will teach, I will continue to teach one novel but I also want kids just to read. . . to have multiple novels, to do some reading, I would like to set up in a reader response sort of setting with reader response journals being a key factor, with some creative writing ideas sort of thrown in there.
> (Session transcript, 5/6/93)

I volunteered to participate in the work of change and make an offering of my time and energy.

> *Bryan:* OK. What I would have to offer would be. . . I would be interested in designing a portfolio assessment package. I mean something that would work as a portfolio assessment. Like you're concerned about the marking. Like something in that area where the marking is at a different. . . you know. . . I'll look at evaluation and put together something that would work as a writing evaluation tool: peer assessment, checklist, portfolios. That sort of line. And you may or may not want to buy into that, but that would be something that I would put together. Here's how to put together a portfolio and non-teacher directed sort of marking. (Pause)
> (Session transcript, 5/19/93)

I shared my experience, illustrated here as I explain how presenting literature for response often results in students making their own connections if I allow them.

> *Bryan:* They say "Oh yeah like this is like Chris in 'Horses of the Night.' And you just have to say, Here are some poems. Read the poems and see how they relate to the story." And students start sparking back and forth like crazy.
> (Session transcript, 5/6/93)

I entered into the debate equally when such things as the issue of reader response evoked a voice that was somewhat more forceful. Here, two opinions on the validity of student response to other students' writing is openly debated.

> *Bryan:* Ok then my second argument is, are you the only person in that room that has. . . that is capable of giving an intelligent response, to someone's writing?
> Shari: Some days. (laughter) Yes.
> *Bryan:* Yes? Are you saying that you are the only person. . .
> *Shari:* No, I'm saying that. . . What I'm suggesting to you is that if it is in fact a personal response then, many times students do not want to share that with everybody in the classroom.
> *Shelly:* That's right.
> *Bryan:* But that's another argument.
> (5/19/93)

I spoke with the authority of conviction, but for the most part, the tone of my voice as I presented professional issues was more invitational

than directional. I wanted to explore different strategies so I invited them to consider alternatives.

> *Bryan:* OK. What about activities. Does anyone want to explore alternative activities. Like Gordon, could you for instance think of how we could tie in your interpretive inquiry process into this?
> *Gordon:* HmmHmm. Some of this stuff, some of these songs and stuff I'll pull that in. (pause)
> Bryan: Like Edith, you might like to think about how this group activity you did from that article you read and this group activity you did. . .
> *Edith:* And novel. . .
> *Bryan:* And see how that kind of works in. Shelly, do you want try and find some stuff in that Bridging English book? (Session transcripts, 5/19/93)

I was able to compromise so that the contributions of the participants did not involve a power struggle.

> *Shari:* Oh I understand what you are saying (*Is she perplexed? See my next comment. Did I read nonverbal disapproval?*)
> Bryan: Or maybe you can do a test, I don't know. But I'd like to do a portfolio type of thing.

I felt that we should move away from the traditional understandings of evaluation, but when I read some skepticism in Shari's voice, as indicated by the comment made in transcription, I conceded that we could individually exercise options in any collaborative project.

I also tried to be sensitive to the need to voice support and encouragement for some of the participants as they made tentative steps into new terrain. At the third meeting, Sean indicated that he had done some reflective writing. (He was the only one to try the reflective writing part of the process.) He brought a short piece to the meeting and shared it with the others. He was understandably uncomfortable with this kind of sharing as indicated by his hesitancy.

> *Sean:* I got this in my journal. I thought of myself as an English teacher and . . . wrote to that. (pause) Now you want to know what it is? Well. . . you're sure we're on this part--this journal?
> (Session transcript, 5/6/93)

This is difficult for anyone to do in front of colleagues and for Sean, being the youngest and most inexperienced of the group, it must have been especially threatening. But, he did it and I indicated my support initially by encouraging him to read it and then later in my interview by acknowledging the discomfort that he experienced.

> *Bryan:* Well that would be an interesting point to develop a little bit. Like you said, there was trust among the group. And I think you demonstrated some of that trust by reading that piece. It wasn't particularly easy, was it?
> (Interview-Sean, 6/11/93)

Similarly, Edith read the beginning of a poem that she had written as a result of some of the reading she had done for the sessions. When I interviewed her, I expressed understanding for her situation.

> *Bryan:* Well, you know. . . when you think about the trauma that you went through when deciding to read those two lines to us, you start to understand that when these kids give you something to read, they are sharing a big part of themselves. Especially if you've asked them to write something that's important to them. I mean, they're taking a lot of risks to have that paper read. And say if you put yourself in the same situation, I'm risking, you're risking. I have to trust you, you have to trust me. I mean it has to develop more openness about writing.
> (Interview-Edith, 6/7/93)

I demonstrated, through the issues that I raised, that I wanted examine my own practice in terms of language learning theory. At various times, I asked the group to experiment with the teacher's role in language learning, reader response, assessment, writer's workshop, young adult literature and thematic planning. These ideas were presented to the group not as prescriptions from a leader, but as offerings from just another voice. As the group dealt with issues of professional concern, the "what" of the project, the leadership voice was much more collegial than it was when the issues were related to the "when" and the "how" of professional development. This collegiality was manifested as I explained, volunteered, debated, invited, compromised and supported.

The simultaneous and contradictory leadership voices of authority and collegiality seemed to emerge as a result of what I, as leader, was prepared to negotiate. My consideration of the methodology of the study had prepared me to be somewhat flexible in the process of the project--the time and work involved. However, as I began to claim ownership of

the project, I was less prepared to negotiate changes here and found it quite difficult to let go.

The relative flexibility when it came to the professional issues addressed may have been a consequence of my early stance as a full participant in the exploration of improving practice as revealed to the group in the first session.

> *Bryan:* I can't speak for you people, but personally I feel that I would like to have a lot more to do with people that are doing the same thing. I would like to have a lot more to do with Edith, Wesley and Gordon to find out more of what's going on.
> (Session transcript, 3/17/93).

The significant difference between issues of process and issues of content is that, with the latter, I considered my voice as one of the six because I had my own interests for professional growth. With the former, I was unable to mute the voice of leadership and be just another person on the journey.

The Collective Voice

Though hardly audible, throughout the exploration of my voice as leader, there is assumed another voice in this dialogue: the voice of the collective other. It was this entity, the group of teachers exclusive of me, with whom the conversation in the sessions took place. It seemed that there wasn't a great deal except this separation from me that was the primary factor that defined these teachers as a group.

The Emergence of the Group

The overwhelming pattern of talk was participant-me-participant-me-participant. The conversation was not equally shared among all individuals. As a result, rather than a multiplicity of voices, it seemed that the sessions were dialogues between the leader and the others. There was very little cross-talk between other participants. A typical sample of these transcripts looks like this:

> *Bryan:* Have you ever done that before with translating from prose to poetry?
> *Shelly:* Just from the [Poetry in Focus] text.
> *Bryan:* Anything else in there that you liked?
> *Shelly:* I think I have something else marked. Yeah again because I am dealing with poetry.
> *Bryan:* Do you guys, do you have your kids write poetry?
> *Edith:* HmmHmm
> *Sean:* Yeah more so with my nines as opposed to my high school.
> *Bryan:* Why not?
> *Sean:* A little bit with my tens and twenties and thirties but. (Session transcript, 5/6/93)

The emergence of the participants as an entity separate from me was not only implied, it was stated. Here, when Shari and I were arguing about accountability in relationship to evaluation, she clearly sees a difference in her and the other participants' experience and my experience:

> *Shari:* No, no, no, you can argue it all you want Bryan, but we are on the firing line of parents, administrators. . .

Bryan: I know that. I know that, but I have not been "out" that long. . . (laughter)
Shari: Oh I know that. I know that.
(Session transcripts, 5/19/93)

Saying that "we" but not "you" are on the firing line and the laughter after I protested that I was not that different from them identifies the participants as being separate from me. Certainly, the year and a half that I had spent out of the high school classroom on sabbatical and instructing at the university necessarily contributed to the sense of "we" opposed to "you." But the strength of my voice concerning language learning innovations, and my authority as leader further contributed to my separation. The participants showed the distance and distrust inherent in this of relationship when I followed up my suggestion of doing some work on young adult literature with the announcement of a workshop on the topic.

Bryan: The Annual General Meeting of ELAC [English Language Arts Council] at which time we're going to be having some people to talk about some of the novels they are familiar with (sighs from Edith). So if you're interested in that, it will probably be a wine and cheese or maybe even a meal. . . . (group was smirking, indicating that they felt that they were being manipulated)--does this seem like a master plan . . . it's not . . . it just so happened that this is something that we just decided upon. (laughter).
(Sessions transcript, 5/6/93)

My recollection of the incident, Edith's sigh, the tone of my protestation and the tone of the laughter prompted me to make the parenthetical remark while transcribing the tapes. Their responses to my suggestions were guarded as if they were coming from a source that could not be altogether trusted.

Articulating Isolation

Interestingly, it may well have been that the separateness from me as the leader was one of the few things that identified these individuals as a group. Their experience in the jurisdiction had been such that they had very little opportunity to develop an understanding and appreciation of each other. Some of the participants only knew each other by name and face after fifteen to twenty years of teaching in a system that has fewer than one hundred and fifty teachers.

> *Shelly:* Yeah, cause we are very lucky if we know the name of someone else in the other high schools.
> *Shari:* That's right.
> *Shelly:* Our people just do not get together.
> *Shari:* No, No, and I do not know why that is. I often wonder. It can't be distance. . . although I don't really know. (Session transcript, 4/7/93)

It wasn't distance that has kept these teachers apart, but geography did seem to have some effect. There was a sense that there was competition between schools that had lead to feelings of mistrust and inadequacy.

Shelly: Somehow you have to sort of overcome this feeling of "He's from. . . Am I going to be good enough for him."
Shari: That's right and I think that's. . . a very big part of the feelings that are brought into this room. "Oh he's from such and such a school and they feel such and such a way." You know it's all these sort of prejudices that have to be broken down.
(Session transcript, 4/7/93)

Even though there have been attempts to bring teachers together system-wide, the absence of collegial respect and trust has short circuited any real professional growth.

Shelly: I mean even just look at our professional development days we have tried to do that. . . to bring a lesson that you put together, and how well has that gone over? That should be an excellent way of sharing ideas, but it isn't something that's done readily.
Shari: No
Shelly: It's almost a case of I have an idea and I have to guard this idea and then. . .
Shari: And I think it's more. . . It might be that and it might also be a fear. You know what I mean.
Shelly: Of that it might be wrong.
Shari: Yeah, is my idea even worthwhile even sharing with anyone else. You know are they going to scoff at what I'm doing or say, "My gosh, I wouldn't do that in my classroom."
(Session transcript, 4/7/93)

All but one of these teachers has been teaching successfully for over twenty years as neighbors in the same system and they felt uncomfortable with sharing a simple lesson plan. What makes the situation more disturbing is that all the participants understood the

value of peer support and collaboration for their own personal growth and job satisfaction, but could not seem to surmount the barriers of inadequacy and mistrust. Shelly expressed a desire shared by all the participants beginning this project:

> *Shelly:* I would hope that the barrier. . . that if that barrier that we just talked about is broken down or even if there's been a rock thrown out of it. I think that that would just be fantastic. Because you know, if it just started or if we were so lucky to have it broken down then we could begin the sharing. . . . I think the fact that we recognize the fact that we are all professionals, we all have these insecurities and that you're very good in one area and I am in another. If we could recognize that fact rather than go to our school, close our school door and then close our room door. . .
> (Session transcript, 4/7/93)

This was Shelly's hope, but she knew early in the sessions that the prospect of the group coming together in a meaningful fashion was not very likely. There had been too much history of isolation and not enough opportunity to develop a relationship among these individuals making it difficult for a common voice to be found.

> *Shelly:* And so therefore, I'm not sure that how and what are you doing is going to work because of the insecurity because of the competition that's there.
> (Sessions- Transcripts, 4/7/93)

Shelly reaffirmed this opinion during her interview two months later. I asked her if she thought, in retrospect, whether we should have engaged in the journal writing.

> *Shelly:* The way it was going, no. And I think if the group was comfortable with one another then it could have, yes. But I think that we're still. . . there's no cohesiveness there. We're all individuals and we don't know one another well enough to be really willing to share what's going on in our classrooms and what we think about something.
> (Interview-Shelly,6/8/93)

Even as we approached the final meeting when we had agreed to collaborate on the development of a thematic unit, the conversation indicated that true collegiality had not been established.

> *Gordon:* Well, I think one thing that has really stepped forward for me, that I really didn't think about before, is my relationship with other teachers and how, you know, I feel there are other things I can share with teachers, and I think these other people have an awful lot of things that they can help me with too and that I can learn from. But, there are just huge obstacles there to prevent that. And I have become concerned that this collegial, this collegial relationship that I had with other English teachers in the jurisdiction isn't really a collegial relationship at all. It's merely a certain set of formalities. We can joke around and we can kid around, we can give each other certain courtesies, we can say hello, but that's all it really is. It's not a collegial relationship and it is not a professional relationship at all. I found that very problematic and a bit frustrating. Oh and if you were to say to another teacher, Gee why don't you come into my classroom and observe for an hour and just watch what's happening and tell me what you think (I laugh in sympathy and the impossibility of it all) and the reaction would be, "What? Why would I want to do that?"
> (Interview-Gordon, 6/7/93)

Even though at any one time there would be fewer than ten teachers in this jurisdiction teaching high school English, these teachers did not identify with each other, they did not know each other, they did not trust each other. There was little potential for entering into truly collegial interactions although even in this short time small steps were made. Possibly by being named as a group and brought together for this project, or by their identification as separate from me as leader, the assembly of participants began to identify themselves as a group. As a group, they began to become articulate and to find a collective voice. They found this voice partly in the recognition that they didn't have one.

The first thing that this voice did was to speak of the group's isolation. There have been few forums in which this kind of conversation could have taken place so that it may have well been the first time that these participants were able to speak of their feelings of mistrust, competition, and insecurities. It may well have been the first time that these participants, like Shelly, began to speak their vision of the barriers that exist between teachers. It may well have been the first time that the participants, like Gordon, began to articulate the degree to which collegiality was absent from their professional lives.

Articulating Priority

It is at this point that a contradiction seems to occur. The participants had, by their willingness to volunteer, stated a desire to become involved with this project as a favor to me as a colleague and to have the opportunity to interact with each other and yet, they seemed to be reluctant to buy into the process. For instance, of the five meetings,

there was only one that all five participants were able to attend. Overall, there was only a 64% attendance rate with everyone missing at least one meeting. Furthermore, there was an unwillingness to participate in the project as it was presented. The group chose not to be involved with either the reflective processes of journals and portfolios or the discussions of research and theory.

One way of understanding this contradiction might be that as the group began to discover its voice, it began to exercise that authority to declare priorities. After the May 6 meeting, I noted in my field journal:

> Something had been accomplished by the meetings to date and that is, the group did feel comfortable with taking charge. They did not passively follow the direction I set for them because of friendship or whatever. They identified their own needs at this particular time and stated them.
> (Journal, 5/10/93)

The optimism expressed here was somewhat misplaced. The group was taking charge, but not necessarily in the way I first thought. At this time, I assumed that they were making an informed decision choosing one kind of professional development over another: they were rejecting the reflective, educative kind of program I had planned for something more focused and practical. This was not entirely the case. The choice was not solely made on the basis of need; rather, the choice was made on the basis of time. Making this choice was a statement of priority and reflective, educative professional development competed fairly poorly.

When I proposed that the journal writing wouldn't necessarily be all that time consuming, Sean's reply was facetious, but within his

humorous comment is an indication of the relative priority of this kind of professional development.

> *Sean:* Even though it is just that fifteen minutes or whatever, but it does seem to me to be more work. More work as opposed to just a sharing of ideas. And some of these things like the portfolio kind of threw me probably because I didn't necessarily know what you wanted because I missed the meeting so--It kind of threw a little panic at me so I--Not that it is extremely difficult or anything. I'll admit that I did have a bit of apprehension when this [today's agenda] came over the fax. . .definitely. And it is--to sit here and discuss it is one thing--even though it is being taped--that's one thing, but then spending the time just sitting down and putting it on paper. Well--every game seems to go into overtime [hockey play-offs are on] (laughter). It does make it a little difficult. (Sessions- Transcripts, 5/6/93)

One could find the time to sit down and talk about teaching issues, but if a greater time commitment was required, then professional development had to compete with all kinds of priorities. Sean, in his humorous fashion, was pointing out that teachers' lives are busy and that there are always pressing matters with which one must deal.

As early as the second meeting, Shari made a statement about the kind of commitments she had to sort into her day.

> Shari came first and immediately took out some marking to do while she waited. I gave her the reflection questions and she began to jot things in the spaces and margins. I suggested that she should take them home because I would like some considerable thought and discussions in writing. She seemed surprised. (Journal, 4/7/93)

The way that Shari attempted to squeeze her marking into the ten or fifteen minute interstice between her arrival and the beginning of the session and the way she pushed aside her marking to quickly complete the questions in the margins of the page seemed to be symbolic of how teachers must deal with demands upon their time: each new thing must displace something else. Professional development becomes another item that must be juggled into one's schedule.

There may have been many reasons for the apparent reluctance to buy into the process, but it seemed that the practical consideration of available time was first and foremost. During the interview with Shari, I explored the sources of her reluctance and she replied:

> *Shari:* No. I'm not reluctant to commit. What I was reluctant to do was--I don't have time to do all the extra things that seem to be coming up. The journal writing, the reading of the articles, the portfolio. I simply don't have time for that. (Interview-Shari, 6/8/93)

The group tiptoed around the fringes of the process, declining the invitation to reflect and analyze their practices not through informed judgment regarding quality professional development, but through their survival instinct that kicked in to preserve the valuable commodity of time. Sean explained the relationship between the resistance he felt in the group and the idea of priorities.

> *Sean:* I sensed rather similar things. That everybody had, you know, certain priorities and it seems like at that time of year there's that stress level that everybody has to get certain

> marking done and tests written and trying to finalize marks. Then to take some time--although it may be helpful--whether it be as a coping strategy or planning for next year--it's just to take that time out. . .
> (Interview-Sean, 6/11/93)

Regardless of what the frame of reference or benefits of a professional development activity might be, the time factor alone could be enough to prevent teachers from committing to a professional development process if they have the authority not to commit. This group did not feel compelled to supplant other important aspects of their professional lives with this project and as such found a voice to articulate priorities.

Articulating Direction

The group found a voice to speak of isolation and to resist further claims on their time, but the voice to author their own professional growth was a little less articulate. Ostensibly they preferred activities that were more practical, but there didn't seem to be a strong impetus to move in that or any other direction. Direction was eventually found, but it was often through a time consuming process. It is not remarkable that the decision making was inefficient given the ambiguity of leadership and group purpose; however, there seemed to be an attitude within the group that contributed to the ineffectiveness of the group in shaping the events of the sessions.

The following discussion to fix the time of a meeting illustrates the difficulty the participants experienced in finding compromise and consensus. It took approximately fifteen minutes of a ninety minute

meeting. The comments in italics were inserted during transcription in an attempt to capture the message sent through tone of voice.

> *Bryan:* The next session we have planned is for let's see, May 18 I believe. No, it's three weeks from last week whatever that is.
> Shelly, Edith: It's the 19
> *Bryan:* Yeah May 19. What does that look like for everyone?
> *Edith:* Were you thinking of like the same time as now?
> Bryan: Well actually I wouldn't mind trying for one longer session, like one o'clock. John agreed last time to give us a one o'clock time so I was thinking of that for either the next one or the one after that. There is only two more left. What do you think about that?
> *Edith:* Well, I've got to be gone by four. I have a hair appointment. *(Tone: definite, bottom line)*
> *Bryan:* Today.
> *Edith:* No, no the 19th. That's the only reason I knew it was a Wednesday.
> *Bryan:* What about one o'clock?
> *Edith:* I don't know, it depends. *(Tone: noncommittal, not inviting compromise or solution)*
> *Shelly:* It should be okay with us I think. *(unenthusiastic)*
> *Bryan:* Sean?
> *Sean:* One o'clock . . . Wednesday? . . . I would imagine probably.
> *Edith:* You guys have set staff meeting days and we don't.
> *Shelly:* Hmhm and that's next week.
> *Sean:* We get grad on Friday. I think our staff meeting is next week too.
> *Shelly:* Yeah ours is the second Wednesday and that's next week.
> *Sean:* Yeah probably. Depending on . . . I don't know how long I would be able to stay depending on . . . my baseball schedule. But at one o'clock I'd probably be free.

...

Bryan: Three weeks from that date. Which is June 9.
(silence)
(Session Transcript, 5/6/93)

It would seem that it shouldn't have been very difficult to arrive at a consensus for the next meeting date since the dates had been established and I was just attempting to get confirmation for the date, but the decision wasn't easy. Part of what made it difficult was the concern about staff meeting and graduation days. These dates posed no direct conflict with the proposed meeting date, but the participants seemed to find some significance in them and their mention interfered with the decision making process. Furthermore, it seemed that each participant stated his/her individual position that was followed by long silences as each participant waited for someone to make sense of the situation. It seemed that there was no group will to find consensus.

Getting consensus on the projects to undertake was characterized by similar hesitancy. This is best illustrated by the way we finally decided that we would collaborate on the development of a thematic unit related to gender issues. Shelly suggested this project as early as the second session and again at the third session, but no action was taken until the second to last session. I had asked the participants to come to this meeting with a specific idea about what they wanted to do.

After socializing over lunch, I asked the participants to tell the group what they would like to pursue. Shari began to talk about the difficulties in finding something that would be useful to all, due to the fact each person had different interests and concerns. She said that she and Shelly had talked about collaborating, but couldn't because they

teach different subjects. Furthermore, she suggested that there wasn't much room to try different things with the senior academic classes because the curriculum dictated what had to be done. The focus seemed to be on the impossibilities of collaboration rather than the possibilities. I suggested that we confine our comments to "I" statements so that rather than anticipating the barriers, we would focus on what we would like to accomplish. I asked them to make statements like "I want to do this" or "I don't have anything I'm interested in doing."

Then, among other things including writing instruction, Shari and Shelly said they would be interested in working on some thematic planning since they currently organize by genre. Gordon said he was interested in developing critical reflection where the students wrote and then reflected on their own writing as literature. Sean and Edith said as the novice English teachers, anything would be all right for them, but writing was a definite concern. I said I was interested in developing a young adult novel study.

After each person stated an interest, there was silence. They expressed their needs, but there didn't seem to be a collective or individual authority to extend the individual statements to a group dialogue. At this point, I said that it looked like doing a thematic unit could meet everyone's needs. There was silent agreement and it seemed that the big decision was made: we would do a thematic unit likely on gender issues. We left the restaurant and went to the meeting room to discuss the next steps, but a clear consensus had not as yet been established.

Gordon: I can come up with some, an essay and I can come up with some stories on a thematic unit on gender issues for sure.
Bryan: OK
Gordon: And I might be able to come up with something else too that might be different from what we got in curriculum.
***
Bryan: So essays. . . . So what's the way to go?
Shari: Well, I sort of want to know like this next meeting, what are we supposed to come up with?
Bryan: That's what we want to find out.
Shari: That's what we want to find out. And I think it's important for all of us to know so that we know whether we can allocate the time necessary to . . . do this.
Gordon: Well, I can come up with a collection of five or six pieces of literature that will be new. And I can come up with a number of different activities that the students can participate in related to that same literature. I mean that's a start.
Shari: Gender issues?
Bryan: Is that an issue? . . .Maybe that's the place to start. From your knowledge. . . like Gordon is obviously speaking because he knows he has some literature in mind for gender.
Gordon: Hmhm
Bryan: You know are there other themes that you guys can say Gee, I know this novel or this poem that I really like and it's on this theme.
Shari: On gender issues?
Bryan: On any . . .
Shari: On any issue.
Bryan: Any issue or any theme. Like is there a theme. . . I think if we start off from the theme we're going to build on, then we can start plugging in the literature.
Shari: Hmm (pause)
(Session transcript, 5/19/93)

Gordon's willingness to contribute and get on with the project was counter-balanced by Shari's questions to clarify goals and expectations. She seemed to be asking, "Why take a step in any direction unless one is sure that there is time to complete the journey?" The necessity of declaring priorities in the context of time available and an apparent absence of the trust and the desire seemed to muffle the collective voice so that a clear direction was slow in being articulated.

Interestingly, when I interviewed Shari after the above session, she recalled the decision about thematic units as being quite efficient and direct. She felt that the group seized authority when it was offered.

> *Shari:* Do you know how [decision-making] was done [at the last meeting]? By simply asking what would you like to see done? And all of a sudden people said well I'd like this, I'd like that, we found a common thread and boom we were away. That's how it could have been--I guess. . . and I. . . my personal feeling, probably because I'm just that kind of personality: get on with it. If that had been done at the first meeting then it would have been a far more valuable experience because I think in whole we could have gotten not only one unit based on genders, but it's quite possible that we could have investigated other things that could have led other things and so on.
> (Interview-Shari, 6/8/93)

There is clearly a contradiction between my understanding of this situation and Shari's. If both perceptions are in some way accurate then this decision was efficient only relative to the other decisions made by the group; therefore, if this decision was inefficient, the other decisions were even more inefficient. On the other hand, it may have been that

this judgement was being made from two entirely different premises. I understood the process to this point as part of this decision. That is, the major function of all the sessions was to identify concerns and decide direction. If Shari didn't see all the sessions as leading up to this decision--if she didn't understand that the opportunity to claim authority was there from the beginning--then it would be understandable that she would perceive this decision, made over lunch and clarified in thirty minutes, as being quite efficient.

If making decisions on what direction to take was characterized by an apparent absence of collective will, this did not seem to be the case when it came to the directions the group did not want to take. There seemed to be a consensus to withhold commitment when it came to innovative practices in language learning. During the course of the sessions, a number of innovative ideas were presented either through some of the readings or by me. These included such concepts as using multiple young adult novels, portfolio assessment of performance, reader response, and peer editing. The group did not seem to be inspired to pursue any of these practices. At times there would be vocal resistance as when I proposed we explore portfolio assessment:

> *Bryan:* Yeah. You could basically give an anecdotal response to it.
> *Shelly:* You mean a written response?
> *Bryan:* Yeah, that doesn't involve. . .
> *Edith:* And just not use it at all in terms of marks that you use to calculate report card grades?
> *Shari:* How long could you. . .
> *Edith:* I wonder if you could motivate kids to work and do their best?

Bryan: I don't know. That's something I would like to experiment with. Because I really do think that feedback comes in a lot of forms. I've had. . . . Don't look at me like I'm from an outer planet (laughter). . .
Shari: You've been out at that university too long Bryan. (laughter) I'm kidding.
Bryan: I know what you mean. I know what you mean. But I've had kids do things that had no marks attached to them and they do a wonderful job at it.
Shari: Oh I'm not suggesting that that might not possibly happen but. . . Okay, I think if I look at the nature of the student today, it's unusually. . .
(Session transcript, 5/19/93)

At other times, proposals would be met with no response by the group so that they would just slide by the wayside. This seemed to be the case as we planned what we would do for the thematic unit and our last collaborative session.

Bryan: OK. What I would have to offer would be . . . I would be interested in designing a portfolio assessment package. I mean something that would work as a portfolio assessment. Like you're concerned about the marking. Like something in that area where the marking is at a different. . . you know. . . I'll look at evaluation. Put together something that would work as a writing evaluation tool: peer assessment, checklist, portfolios, that sort of line. And you may or may not want to buy into that, but that would be something that I would put together. Here's how to put together a portfolio and non-teacher directed sort of marking. (Pause)
Shari: Should we decide on a couple [themes] now?
Edith: You know many of these are so interrelated.
(Session transcripts, 5/19/93)

The pause after my offer and Shari and Edith's return to discussing the choice of the theme seems to suggest that they were not interested in my suggestion.

This kind of response to my suggestions for change in practice struck at the root of the study in that it indicated the degree to which these high school teachers were willing to embrace the paradigm shift that has occurred in language learning and instruction. Therefore, I decided to explore individual attitudes towards innovative language learning practices by interviewing (Appendix D) each participant to get an opinion on some of the practices associated with current language learning theory. Examples of their responses are presented in Table 8.

Table 8
Representative Responses to Language Learning Issues

Name	Portfolio Assessment	Student Control Reading/Writing	Writers/Readers Workshop
Edith	. . .that would really stimulate writing. I really can see that. But what do you do when somebody comes to you and says how do you justify this mark.	The only problem is what happens if a kid comes in, let's say with a short story, and really has thought about this short story and I haven't read it. And sometimes I may not even have time to read it within even the next week.	I'm not that familiar with it. I've taken a look at some of the printed stuff that I have seen, but I think that that was more geared to elementary and junior high.
Gordon	I think that it is an evaluation process that can be valuable, but which could never be relied on to carry the grading for an entire course. I would probably be concerned about that.	I'm pretty traditional when it comes to student control over what they read in class. I don't even use multiple novel approach. And a lot of my teaching is teacher directed. Student control over what they write. . . I try to get students to do a certain amount of interpretive inquiry in their personal writing so there is a tremendous amount of student control there. On the other hand we have the constraints of curriculum. . .	I've never participated in that sort of thing and tend to be probably negative on it. Probably for selfish reasons. I probably have the opinion that I can help a student writer better in a one-on-one situation than to try and do a workshop kind of thing where we are publishing a collection of writing.

(Continued next page)

Table 8 Continued
Representative Responses to Language Learning Issues

Name	Portfolio Assessment	Student Control Reading/Writing	Writers/Readers Workshop
Shelly	I haven't done it because [students ask] Is this going to be marked--Is this for marks. That being a question that is asked so regularly, that I've been afraid to use it because they won't write it. They won't do it.	Okay, again I don't do that because usually I give them a form. The topic, they'll spend too much time-- time to think of a topic as opposed to okay this is the topic I wanted. In the last little while again I've realized that I almost give them an outline when I give them an assignment.	I have never used it. I've thought about it. But I've never used it. I suppose because it takes a lot of time organizing it on my part so as a result I have not taken the time maybe because I haven't said okay this is what I want to do and this is what I want to try.
Shari	I think it's a good idea, but I think. . . you would have to assign more than anecdotal comments. Because I think students-- I would like to think you wouldn't have to, but I've done some portfolio work with kids and initially their first comments are how much is this worth?	. . .whenever we're doing a form of personal writing, I try to give them as much leeway as I possibly can-- with free writing, personal responses. With reading I guess they have very little in terms of what we cover in the class simply because most of it is based on the curriculum.	We share some of what we write. At times we write as groups rather than individually, but very little. I tell you, I used to do a lot more of the group writing with sort of focus on an end product, strangely enough, when I taught when the course ran for a year [rather than a semester].
Sean	I think it has its merits. We talked about cutting down marking time. I think if you have some sort of evaluation. . . I always feel secure, whether it be a checklist or some sort of set form rather than holistic marking. Then I would feel a little more comfortable with it.	I have been giving a lot more choices in the past little while. I think there is a lot of benefit in it. It's tougher to mark. You have to have certain criteria. I mean it stands to reason that if a student enjoys or wants to write something the chances are that they will write something better.	As far as the workshops for the students to get together. I think that's.. I use a lot of group work. I try to integrate most of the different things as opposed to separating them. I can see there's some merit in that.

The collective voice of these high school teachers generally expressed an unfamiliarity with the practices presented. This voice indicated some interest or experience with them, but overall, there was reluctance about implementing this type of practice in their own classrooms. This message seemed to be consistent from the first to the final session so there is little reason to believe that the degree of openness to innovations changed. The collective voice was quite clear in withholding commitment regarding these teaching practices.

Whether the decision making process was efficient or not, the collective voice was a weak voice when tested against the final product that it shaped. The final sharing session may well have fallen short of the kind of collaboration possible where more than resource ideas are shared, where teaching strategies, evaluative techniques and even other concerns that come closer to the essence of a person as teacher are laid on the table for scrutiny. However, this voice was heard even though a collective identity was just emerging and a collective will was yet to be discovered. It was heard even though this group found itself in a situation that amounted to a whole new game with unfamiliar rules of leadership and purpose. Although the final product of collaboration may not have brought about lasting change to teaching practice, probably for the first time as a group, these teachers were able to articulate their feelings of isolation and declare priorities for their own professional lives.

The External Voices

To describe this collective voice as weak may be an injustice, especially as one considers the cacophony of competing voices external to the immediate participants in a professional development endeavor. Many of these were not really voices, but noises that served to obfuscate and confuse.

Professional Development

The first among these voices is the authorized voice of professional development--the kind of professional development that the participants considered legitimate. In my interview with Gordon, he describes some of the common perceptions of professional development held by teachers.

> *Gordon:* But, as it is now, it's a, "Ah gee, you want me to write something, you want me to do something?" That becomes difficult because of the attitude that says professional development is feeding me something. It's not that I take some activity and initiative on my own. It's that you give me something. That's not professional development, but that's the image of professional development that most teachers--many, many teachers have. That is I'll go to the workshop and if I can carry out a package that I can use in my classroom tomorrow morning then that's good. Otherwise I've wasted my time. (Interview-Gordon, 6/7/93)

Not only is professional development described as passive activity for teachers, professional knowledge is described in terms of technical rationality so that professional development is limited to the collection and accumulation of strategies, ideas and resources. Two metaphors emerged that add further dimension to this perception of professional development. The first was that the role of professional development was to add to the teacher's "arsenal" in the educational battle.

> *Sean:* [The purpose of professional development is] to find out that other people are having similar problems, or other people have had those problems before and they can tell me how they dealt with it. And you deal with a lot of trial and error and a lot of individuality in this profession and I think the more weaponry you can go in with, the better.
> (Interview-Sean, 6/11/93)

The second is not quite as clearly stated, but is more widely held. That is that professional development is a response to a pathology or, as the word "in-serviced suggests, a response to a mechanical deficiency.

> Shari: Like well I'm talking about my own needs here, okay. So what I'm saying is that, okay if I'm having difficulty with a certain idea, and if this was when I was at [my previous school], I would sit down with [my friend] and say, "I don't know I'm having a heck of a time with this. Have you ever dealt with a situation like this?" And there would be sharing.
> (Interview - Shari)

Understanding professional development in this way interferes with open exploration of professional growth. If a professional development activity is going to add to a teacher's arsenal, then it must be a meaningful addition that will meet the very specific needs of that teacher. This dooms most professional development activities to failure since who can diagnose the varied requirements of a group of teachers.

> I then asked each person to say what it was that they would be interested in doing. Shari began to talk about the difficulties of finding something that would be useful to all because each person had different interests and concerns. Even she and Shelly, who teach in the same school, had talked about collaborating, but they teach different subjects so how could they do anything together.
> (Journal, 5/19/93)

If a professional development activity addresses a pathology or failure, then to admit a desire to engage in professional development is to admit failure; but, if there is an acceptable reason for this need, there is no problem. Early in the project, I asked these teachers why they chose to participate. It might be that Edith admitted her need because,

as a Modern Languages major, she was comfortable in not being an expert in language arts.

> *Edith:* I feel that I should be a sponge when it comes to this because being a Modern Languages teacher, I feel a little incompetent every now and then in this area and like I'm hoping to get something out of it in terms of expertise. Just to start to think along the lines of an English teacher or something. . . .
> (Sessions- Transcripts, 3/17/93)

Teaching high school English was a relatively new assignment for Edith as it was for the youngest member of the group. Sean felt intimidated by the whole situation because he saw his need for help to be great and the experienced teachers' needs to be small.

> *Sean:* I don't know maybe for some of the teachers that have a pretty good handle or grasp on what on what they're doing, or feel confident on what they're doing, maybe [professional development] isn't always important to them. I know for me, because I'm always struggling with whether or not I could do better or I could improve or try something else. Maybe for me, it seems like a little more of a benefit.
> (Interview-Sean, 6/11/93)

To admit that one has need for professional development is to admit a degree of weakness. This might be the reason that when asked at the first session why they agreed to participate in this project, all the participants, including Sean and Edith, said that the primary reason was to help me. There is no doubt that the participants did feel an obligation to help out of friendship or collegial commitment, but it is significant

that they saw my need for subjects greater than their need for professional development.

> *Shari:* Hmm. I think probably the main reason, Bryan, is to help you with your thesis.
> *Bryan:* Okay. But, you remember that I said. . . at that point in time that that didn't matter
> *Shari:* Well, it mattered it to me because you're a fellow professional and, you know, I would say that would be the main reason. I think, I'm hoping, to get something out of this. To get some sharing, and some good ideas. That would be the second reason. Because I think as a professional, you're always looking for ideas that you can use in your classroom so I would say that would be the second reason. (Interview-Shari, 6/8/93)

So the prevailing voice of professional development said that since professional development consists of adding to or fixing the equipment, one only needs professional development if there is a deficiency or to pick up the odd accessory to embellish the good work one is already doing. All but one of the participants basically shared this view of professional development which for the reasons stated would tend to inhibit open and positive engagement with any professional development activity. The exception was Gordon.

Gordon did not conform to what the others saw as the authorized version of professional development. When asked in the interview if there was any particular needs he was attempting to meet by continuing with the project, he expressed his differing views.

> *Gordon:* Not necessarily, no. Because I don't have a new teaching assignment that I'm worried about that I need to

> get at. I don't have a new textbook that I have to get some help with. I feel very capable and competent with my teaching assignment and with what I'm asked to do, but the thing that I'm looking at is that there are a number of things that I can still continue to do that are really pretty exciting and in the last two or three years I've found a lot of approaches to what I've been doing in the classroom that really make it interesting for me and better for the kids. That's probably one of my main motivations.
> (Interview-Gordon, 6/7/93)

Gordon views professional development enhancing an already healthy teaching situation. He also was most supportive and positive about participating in this project as a reflective, educative endeavor. Gordon gave the following reasons for his participation:

> *Gordon:* I think that any kind of activity that makes you a better teacher is worthwhile. And even if I can only participate up to a certain level, I'm also going to benefit from what the other people do. And I guess my question is why not? Why not? I mean the problem with teachers period is that we lock ourselves up in our classrooms, we stay there and then we go home and come back and we do the same thing the next day. And anything you can do outside the classroom is good for you. Anything that will give you a different kind of look. But, all people don't feel that way and I think that is part of the problem.
> (Interview-Gordon, 6/7/93)

Part of the problem encountered by this project, and possibly other professional development activities, was the contradictory nature of the voice of professional development. Whether the function of professional development is to remediate or whether it is to enhance personal

professional growth will clearly affect the way in which teachers engage in it. This engagement was also affected by other voices external to the teacher, including that of the school administration.

Administration

The voice of the administration of the jurisdiction, primarily in the form of the superintendent, seemed to be in contradiction as well. On one hand during this project, the superintendent was extremely empowering; but on the other hand, the participants had a sense that he restricted exploration and change.

The superintendent provided support throughout the project. He gave moral support right from the beginning expressing hope that the project would catch on with the high school English teachers. He followed up on this approval and agreed to provide release time for our meetings that included a cost factor for substitute teachers. His cooperation in this regard was so complete for the first three meetings that as we were trying to plan for our next working session, I was able to boast about his support.

> *Bryan:* Look, I've already proven this part, if we want time [the superintendent] will give it to us. If we want some time he'll find the time for us, but we've got to want the time. I'll bet that if I went to him and said we want a whole day, he'd give us a whole day. I would even suggest if we said we wanted two days he would give us two days.
> (Session transcript, 5/6/93)

This confidence in his commitment to the project was born out when I did ask him for a whole day to meet and work on a collaborative unit. I noted his response in my journal.

> He agreed, but suggested we take a day other than Wednesday so the teachers would get the full benefit of a sub rather than leaving on an early dismissal day. I thought this was a super idea and thanked him for the suggestion. I told him we had gotten funding from the A.T.A. and asked if he felt there was a need to see if we could get sub funding from them. He said there should be no problem for the board to cover it this time.
> (Journal, 6/1/93)

Not so significant, but nevertheless important was support provided for meeting space in the school board office, often complete with refreshments, and secretarial help. This cooperation was even encountered quite by accident in the schools. When I was finally ready to seek approval for our second to last meeting on May 19, I discovered that the superintendent and the principals were all away at a retreat so I contacted the vice-principals at each school.

> I explained that [the superintendent] had given us permission to take a period off previously and we didn't use it so I would assume this would be all right. He checked his schedule and said there would be no problem. He would cover the class since he wouldn't like to pay a sub for a half day just to teach one period. I went back to the University and called North Fork. The vice principal there did the same thing and quickly volunteered to cover Gordon's class (Edith had a prep). I then called Hillside and when I explained the situation, he asked what the others were doing. When I told

> him that they were covering classes, he agreed. All is set for possibly my last meeting with the whole group.
> (Journal, 5/18/93)

Specific support was provided for the project by all levels of administration. I communicated that support to the participants, and they had concrete material proof of this support, yet there was a vague sense that administrative authority would somehow restrict independent decision making. One participant noted that it might be difficult to look at portfolio assessment because when the superintendent last visited, he had expressed concern that the number of grades collected on the students was insufficient. Another expressed concern about how the administration would view spending money on multiple novels.

Administrative involvement was not pro-active, but this was by design. The administration was not asked to provide initiative or leadership, only some space and time. I wanted to examine teachers directing themselves, but it seemed that the teachers were reluctant to seize the authority available to them and it seemed that in fact, this could be partly traced to the relationship between administration and teacher--whether it was by study design or not. It was not what the administration said; rather, it was messages interpreted from the past. It seemed that the participants were looking for some official external authorization. They seemed to need the administration to direct them to author their own professional growth which of course is another paradox.

> *Bryan:* Yeah, and Shari mentioned in my conversation with her that she felt almost that somebody has to be there to tell

> you to be there. You know like the principal saying, "This is priority one. The afternoon is yours, you be at the county office." Where you don't have to make up your mind, "Do I stay with my class and prepare them for the exam. My principal told me to get out of here." Do you think that's. . .
> *Sean:* I suppose. I mean if it was more of a priority and they said get here. Because I suppose that everybody feels a little guilty. I know for myself, I leave here--not that I'm going to do anything great and astounding that I couldn't get a sub to do--but you feel that you have to be here and you should be here. If you feel there isn't anything with a big title or a big name or something that is all important, you don't want to leave here. Death bed or whatever, you don't want to leave here. And whether that's dedication to the job or. . .
> (Interview-Sean, 6/11/93)

To be present to their students seemed such a priority that only direction from an administrator could cause it to be displaced. It seemed that these teachers needed authorization to engage in personal professional development in the face of numerous other voices that demanded their attention. They were aware of the other facets of their lives to which they were accountable and which competed for priority.

Accountability

Student achievement and hence teacher performance is understood by education stakeholders in terms of student grades. When asked to consider portfolio assessment procedures, the group may have seen the educational value, but perceived it as having a negative impact on their ability to be accountable.

> *Edith:* See I can see if you just had one report card you could get away with [portfolio assessment], but you see every six weeks I've got to crank out a mark. And I can remember when [the superintendent] came to see me the second time so I could get my permanent contract. He counted the number of marks that I had for that round.
> *Shari:* That's what I mean by being accountable. Now I'm not suggesting that we have to mark everything, Bryan, I'm going to be honest with you. I have the kids do free writing, but I'll say hand it in. I'll do it every time, hand in, and you know what I do, I don't even read it. I look at it and go 5/5, 5/5, 4/5. OK that's all I do and that's their participation mark. But I tell you something, if I didn't do that and I said, "Okay we're going to do some free writing now." There are some who are mature enough to say, "Oh this is going to be good for me, I can't wait." But the majority are taking English 30 because they are expected to take it and they want a mark. (Session transcript, 5/19/93)

Very much of what seemed to drive these high school teachers was the necessity of generating numbers. This seemed to determine the nature of their evaluation procedures which in turn affected their teaching strategies and their ability to change these strategies. Whatever is done has a connection to numbers. These numbers must be seen to be valid and reliable. Therefore, making significant changes would threaten the reliability of evaluation procedures developed over time.

The ultimate incarnation of accountability is the English 30 external provincial exam, which, more than the curriculum, dictates what can and can not be done in the high school English class. Even when considering varying writing assignments, these teachers were aware of the impact of the grades that a student would eventually earn.

> *Shari:* There is a tremendous focus on that [Diploma Exam] essay. And it would be easy to say don't do it, do other kinds of writing just as much. But at the same time, it's not just parents pressuring and it's not just administrators pressuring, it is pressure from the kids who say look Mr. O, my mark in English 30 may determine whether or not I get into that program in university or that program in college. And if I don't make it then I hold you responsible because you're the one who's giving us the assignments. You are the one who is actually defining, in a sense, the program.
> (Session transcript, 5/19/93)

The accountability to the stakeholders in high school education most often finds expression in the numbers, but these high school teachers were also challenged about what is taught. Apart from numbers are the expectations of some post-secondary institutions and the public at large who seem to be demanding retrogressive shifts in instruction. Gordon noted that he had some concern about the poor performance on the S.A.T.'s by some of our students wishing to go to U.S. universities. Shelly lamented the dilemma she faces trying to teach skills in a more holistic fashion when her students are faced with the examinations of the local college.

> *Shelly:* These kids go in and write and half or three quarters of their exam is on grammar. You know--parallelism, choose the correct pronoun, that kind of thing. And then they come back and say they failed that test because they didn't know any grammar. So on one hand, I think the problem is--on one hand we're told no direct teaching of it and on the other hand, the college does expect that.
> (Session transcripts, 5/6/93)

Parents, students, post-secondary institutions and the public at large all voice their expectations of the educational system so that to the teachers, it sometimed seems risky just to maintain the status quo let alone change in more progressive directions.

Awareness of the expectations of others did not only become manifest in negative terms. The accountability to those most likely to benefit by a teacher's professional growth, the students, impeded that growth. When I tried to arrange a full day in June for the final workshop so that we could get something concrete done, Shari, Sean and Gordon all expressed concern about missing their English 30 classes at this time of year. Edith worried that getting a uni-lingual substitute teacher for her two French classes would essentially mean that they would get nothing done. Sean decided that he couldn't possibly attend and gave his reasons.

> *Sean:* I lost a few classes and I only had Thursday and Friday to prepare English 30's for that exam and we went over a bunch of past exams--different things they needed tc do--thesis statements and things like that. And I thought I could miss a lot of days in the year and it probably wouldn't matter, but that day it probably would have mattered. (Interview-Sean, 6/11/93)

Besides accountability to students, other school related voices also took their toll. Wesley, of course, dropped out early because of his duties as principal and the necessity of committing his time to completing his own graduate program. Gordon coached baseball and this occupied many of his afternoons. Edith was involved with a

professional development consortium as the Modern Languages representative.

Voices unrelated to professional commitments and that relate to the one's personal life were also heard.

> *Shelly:* I think we come across and we came initially with good intentions, but I guess we're looking at our battlefield, to use [Sean's] words. . . and then time allowing and life allowing, we'll make room for you.
> (Session transcript, 5/6/93)

In this professional context, personal concerns were not addressed specifically, but they did become a factor. Whether it was the family wanting supper, the local slow-pitch team wanting a shortstop, or a child needing attention, these teachers found it necessary to listen to the growing din competing for their attention. One of the consequences was the confusion of conflicting messages. Another consequence was that time was seen as the legal tender for this bidding war for the participants' attention.

Whatever the voice of professional development being heard, there seemed to be an implication of time. Professional development days are negotiated into contracts and professional development time is purchased with substitute pay. An often used tool for the administration to support professional development is to allow time for it to occur, as did our superintendent. All the other competing voices are essentially asking for time. The issue raised at almost every meeting and affecting almost every decision was a concern for where does one find the time. Almost one quarter of the chunks of data from all sources contained within them the word "time." From the very first meeting, it

became apparent that each of the participants was dogged by the same concern for how to partition out the available time.

> The next thing caused considerable problem. We tried to find out when we should meet again. This was the problem that I had feared. I asked if they would be interested in negotiating a noon release so we would have more time. I told them that I didn't commit us to it because I knew that it would mean preparing for a substitute though I had mentioned it as a possibility to the superintendent and he seemed receptive to the possibility. Edith pointed out that she only had two spares and one of them was after dinner on Wednesday so if we negotiated a release from class, she would miss her spare and she said she needed it to get caught up on the weeks work. Wesley, as an administrator, had trouble working around staff meetings that were held the second Wednesday of each month. Gordon felt that he had no problem with staff meetings, but he couldn't miss too many English 30 classes that were scheduled at that time. If it was only one a month he could probably live with it. Edith seemed particularly agitated so I asked her if she felt really uptight about the situation. She said she really did because of all the things I was asking her to do and the time commitment. She pointed out the home responsibilities of suppers, kids involved in sports, husband (a teacher too) involved in coaching, etc.
> (Journal, 3/17/93)

So the concept of time became one of the major ways that all the voices of external factors affected the participants. And as the voices of professional development, administration, and innumerable other responsibilities were added to the voice of the professional development

leader, it is of little surprise that the voice of the participants was hardly audible.

The Individual Voice

The participants had little opportunity to make sense out of what was happening because so much of the time together was spent filtering the noise. There was little opportunity to author one's own professional growth. The individual voices of the teachers participating in the project may have been only a whisper in comparison to the many other voices, but as their voices addressed the other issues presented here, the nature of the individual voices began to emerge as well. The extent and nature of the data available does not allow conclusive observations about the individuals involved in the project; however, in more or less explicit ways, the participants did speak of their personal professional development needs.

Edith

Edith spoke of her feelings of inadequacy at being assigned to teach English, but not being a graduate in English. Her expressed reason for participating in the project was that she felt she had so much to learn that any kind of help would be useful to her. She felt that there was some inherent quality that she was missing that made her presence in an English classroom a masquerade.

> *Edith:* But the whole idea of teaching English and you're not an English major. Yeah that's made me pretty darn introspective in the last . . .

> *Bryan:* What are some other thoughts about your teaching in the last three months or so? Like is there anything else, are there any other issues or concerns that have emerged?
> *Edith:* Well, the more I think about English, the more panicky I get. The more I think about it, there just seem to be so many areas that you should be covering. And things you could be doing for the kids. In English there's explore the ideas and think about it and there's a hundred ways to think about it and how do you get them to that stage where they can explore. It just scares the hell out of me. It just scares me because it's such a tremendous responsibility.
> (Interview-Edith, 6/7/93)

Edith had probably addressed her feelings of inadequacy when it came to teaching English many times before, but these sessions seemed to allow her to revisit these concerns. What she found was somewhat overwhelming so, initially, she seemed interested in coping strategies. As with the group as a whole, she was concerned with practical assistance for her instruction, including a repertoire of strategies and methods. At the first meeting, Edith outlined her purposes for volunteering.

> *Edith:* Well, I just wonder when I'm standing there and going about teaching. I wonder if "experts" would go about it in a different way. And if I went about it that way if it would be much more effective. I ask myself that question a lot of times. You know I'm getting more confident, but that's sort of I guess, hoping that . . . maybe not so much expertise, but . . . what's the word . . . method of attack or something will rub off on me so "Oh yeah right so this is the way it should be in English as opposed to French."
> (Session transcripts, 3/17/93)

This interest in methodology was born out when she alone among the participants experimented with changing her instruction. She tried a strategy suggested in one of the professional readings provided for the group.

> *Edith:* It was a three stage thing. Stage one the students read and responded to the story. They made notes pertaining to any questions, reactions, confusions, predictions and so on. Then they wrote a preliminary response essay. I tried it. Hey just out of curiosity, I tried it. We had just finished the novel. I said, "OK guys let's get into groups. When you get back write down everything that you think. . . ." And then I wondered around. Well, anyway, stage two, then you have to be prepared for class discussion based on the student responses. The teacher skims them and says, "Janey, Joey you did a good job. This was a good thought, what a wonderful question." Then the teacher adds some thoughts that the students may not have thought of. And then stage three is they construct interpretive essays. I'm trying it. I'm going to be really curious to see what my grade nines come up with.
> (Sessions- Transcripts, 5/6/93)

Edith didn't have much faith in the effectiveness of this procedure and she couldn't imagine that her grade nine students would be able to come up with the mature responses reported in the article, but she did try it.

Later in the interview, when asked why she chose to continue with the sessions, Edith talked of another situation where she decided to try a new strategy.

> *Edith:* And actually, I'll tell you, Bryan, some of it [the project] actually did do me some good. . . I told you, I sat down and wrote poetry with the kids. And I might have eventually done that, or I might never have done that. But we got to talking and I went home and talked to [my husband] about some of things we had discussed and I thought, "Gee tomorrow, maybe I will sit down and try to write with these guys. I wonder what that would do to the whole process." You know it really made a big difference to them that I sat down with them. And I suppose that that came out of this. . . these discussions that we've had. And if you look at it, from that regard then I guess it's worthwhile.
> (Interview-Edith, 6/7/93)

She had examined some significant practical and philosophical facets of her teaching and had attempted to change. Later in the interviews she revealed some of the other aspects of professional development that might be of interest. For Edith, this acceptance of what she had to offer and the resulting increased confidence also had a social element because the contributions of her colleagues were also important.

> *Edith:* You know whenever we get together, and I hear what other people are doing and some are having the same problems or thinking about the same things. Yeah, it helps me to accept myself more. "Oh, Geez, I'm not the only one that has been worried about this." Yeah, I think that's probably an important part of professional development, don't you think?
> (Interview-Edith, 6/7/93)

She seemed to find satisfaction in having the opportunity to reflect on her own abilities and coming to understand her strengths and limitations:

> *Edith:* Yeah. Okay. to me. I've gone through a lot of [feelings] since we've started. you know. feeling stressed. feeling whatever. thinking about what we were going to do. and okay saying to myself. "Holy mackerel. what are you doing teaching English. This is more than you can handle." And then like I told you. "Wait a minute. maybe this is okay. maybe this is better than someone who's not enthusiastic and doesn't sit down and read every. . . thinks about every nuance that you can teach and bring out to the kids. or look for in the kids' responses. Maybe that's better than someone who knows all the literature. but can't do that.
> (Interview-Edith. 6/7/93)

The exposure to innovative strategies. the support and feedback from peers. the opportunity to reflect on her own practice all were very important parts of professional development for Edith. So that even though Edith concurred with the general group consensus that these sessions should conform to the practical approach to professional development. her needs were more complex than what could be addressed by an isolated workshop on some strategy or teaching activity. Even if they were not addressed in a completely satisfactory manner. these concerns did emerge in this circumstance.

Sean

Sean's expressed needs in professional development were less complex. As a relatively inexperienced teacher. he saw his needs in very

specific terms. He stated his reasons for continuing with the project when there was a promise of developing a collaborative unit.

> *Sean:* I mean for me, almost anything that comes out of there, I can use. With my assignment ranging from grade nine to grade twelve and the other people discussing how it would be multi-level, multi-genre, I thought it would be something practical.
> (Interview-Sean, 6/11/93)

He had identified certain parts of his program that needed improvement. He felt that he needed to critically assess the literature he was using in his classes and he needed to develop some strategies for teaching writing that would yield more consistent results.

> *Sean:* A few concerns I've had. . . Some of the literature I've used--I think I would like to branch out and try some different literature. I do have a lot of things built around that literature so I feel that's a lot more work. But maybe it's just certain classes that don't enjoy certain pieces of literature and other ones will relate a little bit better to it. I think that is always an ongoing problem. Plus, like I think we talked about before, the whole idea about becoming a better writer. I've got some top-notch writers. From grade nine to grade twelve, I've got some excellent writers and on the other hand I've got a couple groups that are very weak. . . I've been thinking about different strategies to make them better writers.
> (Interview-Sean, 6/11/93)

At this point in his career, Sean was primarily concerned with developing his technical effectiveness. He was open to learning tried and

true strategies from more experienced colleagues, and he was open to experimenting with more innovative strategies. Sean responded positively when he was asked what he thought of some of innovative strategies. Here he talks about portfolio assessment:

> *Sean:* I think it has its merits. We talked about cutting down marking time. I think if you have some sort of evaluation--I know for me, I always feel secure, even though it doesn't mean anything, if I have a checklist or some sort of set form rather than holistic marking. Then I would feel a little more comfortable with it.
> (Interview-Sean, 6/11/93)

He sees this innovation as having some possibilities in his program and has begun to consider the practical factors that would make implementation possible. This willingness to consider change seems to be partly connected with Sean's easy acceptance of his position as a novice who probably shouldn't be expected to possess all the desirable competencies. To the query about whether he would share his weakness with the rest of the group, Sean responded:

> *Sean:* Yeah I'd tell them. What's going to happen? They gonna fire me (laughter) and then--hey? I haven't put in that many years, it's not a big thing. Sell shoes at Sears. I don't know. I can wear a paper hat again. I don't know. I'm not that confident in my teaching and at this point I don't think I have a reputation that's going to stand up to the great. I just come out and this is. . . you know. I'm still learning and hopefully still improving.
> (Interview-Sean, 6/11/93)

He is willing to take risks he seems to feel that he has little to lose and a great deal to gain by being open to change. This attitude seems to have continued since Sean reported in the follow up validity check that he has made some changes to his program as a result of our sessions and reported that his professional life has changed in that there are "possibly more questions, more introspection, more headaches."

Shelly

Shelly spoke too of her practical professional development needs which involved not only sharing ideas but collaborating in creating something new that could be implemented by each participant.

> *Shelly:* I would love to be able to teach in a thematic way, but I really struggle with that. So would it be possible to get together and structure a unit. You know that you could use in grade nine and someone else could use in grade six or someone could use in 30. In such a way that if you are dealing with the various aspects of short story or poem--those elements--that could be used across the board rather than just 20 or 10 or 9 or whatever. In your expertise, do you see that as a possibility. Can that type of thing be done. (Sessions- Transcripts, 5/6/93)

This type of pursuit would indeed be challenging and beneficial, but it seemed that these needs were part of a more significant need for collegial affirmation and support.

When I first asked Shelly to participate in this project in January of 1993, she said that she would really like to be involved because over the past two years some questions had been raised about her approach

to teaching. At the first meeting she attended she stated her reasons for agreeing to participate.

> *Shelly:* Well yeah, an exchange of ideas would be really helpful and I also wanted to be able to see what . . . I've done a lot of soul searching in the last couple of years and therefore would like to see if it was worthwhile, if it was going in the right direction. Am I going in the right direction. So therefore your idea of taking a look at what I am doing and what others are doing in the classroom . . . I wanted to see if I am in the right direction or am I off base completely. You know because I don't think there has been a whole lot of sharing. I think like you said, even within our own little school we go to school, to our room and a sharing of a book is incidental, the sharing of an idea is incidental rather than planned. And there's a wall to be broken down before the sharing feelings get out there.
> (Sessions transcript, 4/7/93)

Shelly indicated an interest in exchanging teaching ideas and strategies, but seemingly more important to her at this time was the feedback from trusted colleagues that would affirm the soul searching she had done. It seems that compassion and understanding are pre-requisites for sharing even at this level. She indicated a sensitivity to the conditions that have prevented her from finding the support that she needed. Primary among these was the feeling that teachers were measured against other teachers in a competitive fashion.

> *Shelly:* Somehow you have to sort of overcome this feeling of "He's from [another school]. Am I going to be good enough for him?" And the exams that the kids write, like now they just add to the competition because you look at what North

> Fork did, what Naylonville did--but it shouldn't be that way . (Sessions transcript, 4/7/93)

Her need was for open and honest interaction with colleagues in a supportive, nurturing environment. She wanted to be free of interpersonal politics and competition and so she suggested that whatever project the group embarked upon should be new and exploratory for everyone so that true sharing would take place rather than a show and tell session. She wanted a level of collaboration and involvement that went well beyond the passing around of pre-packaged ideas.

Shari

Shari, too, expressed her interest in practical professional development; however, she seemed to define practical in terms of her own very specific subjective reality. As a result, it often seemed that Shari rejected activities because they didn't fit into her understanding of the possibilities. In fact, the data related to examining innovations in practice--from the process of reflection to the use of portfolio assessment--suggests that Shari often found reasons to be skeptical about most of the ideas suggested.

I had used the example of a teacher that I had observed using response journals to illustrate that there is room for other kinds of assessment other than grading each paper. Shari presents arguments against that type of assessment referring to the teacher in my example.

Shari: No [she] responds. She writes. But I can't see how that's going to cut down on my marking load. That still means that I'm reading every blasted thing.
Bryan: That's, that's, but you're shifting the argument now. All I was arguing was that you don't need the number.
Shari: Oh, OK. All right. But for. . .
Bryan: They need a response.
Shari: But they do need some numbers.
Bryan: Oh yeah. SOME numbers you say. But I'm saying they don't need numbers on everything they do.
Shari: But Bryan, you use the argument when you are complaining about your marking load. I'm saying responding is going to take just as much time. . .
Bryan: OK then my second argument is, are you the only person in that room that has. . . that is capable of having an intelligent response, to someone's writing?
Shari: Some days. (laughter) Yes.
Bryan: Yes? Are you saying that you are the only person. . .
Shari: No, I'm saying that. . . What I'm suggesting to you is that if it is in fact a personal response then, many times students do not want to share that with everybody in the classroom.
Shelly: That's right.
Bryan: But that's another argument.
Shari: But it's a valid argument.
Bryan: Yeah it is, but I'm saying you do not have to be the person. . . .
Shari: No, I don't. . . .
Bryan: (a) you don't have to..
Shari: But how do I find an appropriate avenue for that student's assignment.
Bryan: OK (a) You don't have to put a number on everything, (b) you don't have to read everything, (c) You don't have to. .
.
Shari: I don't read everything.
Bryan: (c) You don't have to respond to everything.

Shari: HmmHmm
Bryan: OK
Shari: HmmHmm
Bryan: So that in itself should remove some of the pressure on the marking.
Shari: Absolutely.
(Session transcript, 5/19/93)

Of course, as I've already shown, the group as a whole was resistant, but Shari was particularly so. Often she seemed more intent on finding reasons why things wouldn't work rather than appreciating why they would. I had had this sense throughout the sessions so that after I called her to arrange a time for the last meeting, I noted in my field journal:

> She had the attitude that it was my call whether we had a full day and what day it should be. In other words, it seemed that both of these actions involved her doing me a favor and she would comply but had no particular desire to do either. I tried but apparently to no avail to shift the choice to her, but she seemed to maintain an attitude of reluctant compliance. I think I will explore this in my interview with her since as I noted earlier she seems to be one of the more resistant.
> (Journal, 6/1/93)

In the course of the interview I asked, "I sense a bit of reluctance on your part to commit." To this she responded:

> *Shari:* No. I'm not reluctant to commit. What I was--What I was reluctant to do was. . . I don't have time to do all the extra things that seem to be coming up. The journal writing,

> the reading of the articles, the portfolio. . . . I simply don't have time for that.
> (Interview-Shari, 6/8/93)

It seems that those "external voices" were particularly loud for Shari so that her resistance was in response to the other priorities in her life. This sense of other more important things to do resulted in frustration and maybe even a bit of animosity toward the person or the situation that presented yet another competing responsibility.

> *Shari:* And I think that's part of where my frustration came. You see I'm saying, holy crow, I've got. . . I could be marking, I could be doing that and I'm not saying that was your fault or anybody's fault. It's just sort of. . . and that's when I began to think, this is artificial, this is like, you know, we're lumbering off to this meeting again, wondering is it going to be worthwhile, is there going to be something there.
> (Interview-Shari, 6/8/93)

So Shari's resistance may have been no different from that which occurred with the other participants. It could be that her voice was just more articulate and forceful so that it was more noticeable. After reading the whole analysis, Shari herself noted that it was she who provided the conflict for this story. She jokingly suggested that I owed her a box of chocolates for adding spice to the study. However, her explanation of why she found the sessions "artificial" suggests another interesting layer of understanding.

> *Shari:* I tell you Bryan, what I have felt is wrong with this situation, okay. And you know me, I'm going to be totally honest about this. I think this could be a very valuable

> situation. But what I think is wrong with it, is that it seems like an artificially imposed situation to me. And here's what I mean by that. It's sort of like--I think if I'm professional enough and I think I've done it all through my teaching career, I know I have a sense of when something is not going over well in the classroom, or when I've run up against a brick wall or when I'm having trouble getting a concept across or I want to create more excitement about a certain subject or theme. And when I do that, I go to journals, I go to teachers that I've known who have taught for a long time. I'll phone up and ask what do you do in a situation, or I'm having trouble with this, or it's just someone on staff. Or I listen and I'm observing all the time. Things that are going on around and thinking where I can incorporate it into a teaching plan, etc. And so it's a sort of organic sort of thing. It grows and it grows. In the situation that I think I've been placed, it's sort of like forcing a group of people together and saying let's find a common need. . . .
> *Bryan:* Or it seems to be what you're saying is that, when I have a concern, I will determine with whom I talk, and when I want to talk with them.
> *Shari:* Okay.
> (Interview-Shari, 6/8/93)

It seems possible that the premises upon which this whole project was based conflicted with Shari's way of thinking. She may have felt independent and self-sufficient regarding professional development. To her, being a professional could mean to be in control of one's own development, identifying and solving specific problems. It could have been that being put into a group to collaborate and reflect on teaching went against the grain. This experience may have been artificial to her because it was not the way she had operated in the past, and the way she had operated in the past had worked quite well for her.

Gordon

Gordon, alone among all the participants, expressed very little concern with the technical aspects of teaching as the focus of his professional growth. He wanted to continue with the project as initially planned because he saw a value in the reflective process and the opportunity to examine personal theory and practice in a supportive, collaborative environment. During the project, he began to realize that his understanding of professional development was quite different from that of the others and it caused him some concern.

> *Gordon:* Yeah, because quite frankly I was shocked at the attitude of some of the other teachers who said I don't want to do this and then my question would be, "But gosh why wouldn't you want to do this? This is great, this is good, there are no risks here, there are no costs, there are only benefits." Yet there is an attitude that says professional development is difficult, it's painful, it's consuming and it won't help me. That sort of an attitude I found quite. . . I found it to be quite shocking. You know it bothers me. And I say to myself, "That's not a good attitude for teachers to have. They're getting into a rut that they're not going to get out of if that's how they feel about this whole business." Yeah, so that's. . . I was quite surprised that I was hearing that. And I didn't like to hear it.
> (Interview-Gordon, 6/7/93)

What he didn't like to hear was that some of his colleagues had limited their expectations for professional growth while he could see a more promising potential for his own professional development.

> *Gordon:* You see what I'm trying to do right now is compare myself to some other teachers and say we have a distinctly different attitude towards professional development here and I didn't really think that I was an individual or different when it came to this particular area before. You know, maybe it's a positive thing. Maybe I actually feel personally that I'm beyond the survival level and I'm really reaching at kind of a growth level as far as my profession goes. And I think that that might be true and if that's the case then that's good.
> (Interview-Gordon, 6/7/93)

Gordon's growth level was certainly different from what the other participants expected from a professional development activity. Gordon was confident in the craft of his teaching and had begun to examine the very foundations of his teaching. He was less concerned with what he would do Monday morning than with who he would be Monday morning.

> *Gordon:* But the other thing that I've really started to focus on in recent years is the relationship of me as a teacher and each individual student and I've started to ask myself the question, "What effect am I having on this particular student in the context of what is going on in this classroom right now or what just finished going on." And being able to look at that and to start to analyze some of those interactions and what those interactions really mean has really made a difference to me in teaching. And some of those effects, some of those interactions when you really look at them closely are extremely positive and some of them are things that make you say to yourself, "Wait a minute I don't know if what I've done here is so positive and what we really needed to happen." And when you're able to look at it at that level--how did I effect that individual--oft times you're agenda changes. You know often in the past, my

> agenda has been what's expedient, what's easiest, what's the least painful to me and how can I manage things so that everybody remains relatively happy. But on the other hand this way makes things sometimes more difficult, but it also makes it more rewarding. Because you really start to understand what kind of effect you're having on an individual person.
> (Interview-Gordon, 6/7/93)

Gordon seems to have found ways of examining his professional life in such a way that it has brought about important changes in how he views his practice. He has been critically assessing his performance in the classroom to discover and rediscover what is rewarding about his job. Instead of looking at this process as the curing of ills, he looked at it as growth--a natural process of change. Instead of looking at teaching as separate from himself, he saw the teaching act as an extension of himself as a person.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The results of this examination of the voices of professional development are neither clear nor absolute. Not only are the voices incomplete, but even within what has been revealed, the one common feature is that contradictions exist in each voice. The voice of the leader seems, at one time, both authoritative and collegial. There was a collective voice, but it seemed to emerge from the common feelings of isolation that each teacher felt. The collective voice seemed to want professional growth beyond the rational technical, but did not pursue it. Similarly, what was considered the voice of legitimate professional development spoke simultaneously of being in-serviced and engaging in professional growth. The administration seemed to be supportive of authentic professional development while sending unintentional messages against change and experimentation. Finally, these teachers seemed to have the contradictory responsibility of being innovative while still satisfying the conservative expectations of some stakeholders in education. The multiple and contradictory nature of the voices make it difficult to clearly define them; however, the dialogue among them does inform our understanding of professional development.

The Participants' Experience

Out of this cacophony of voices a professional development experience did occur. The products of the project are not as tangible as measurable changes in practice or even usable packages of materials to

evidence a new level of collaboration and trust, but the weeks of interaction with each other were not without positive results. The last theme that emerged from the initial analysis of the data stated that there were indications that conditions conducive to change occurred: collegial relations were enhanced, innovative practices were examined, a degree of self-disclosure occurred, and a collaborative project was undertaken. Although more might have been hoped for, one should not underestimate these gains.

Collegial relations were, for the most part, enhanced at least in the sense that we came to a better understanding of each other. Gordon agreed in his response to the validity questionnaire.

> *Gordon:* Collegial relations: yes these were enhanced. As well, I have a greater understanding of those with whom I work. This will be useful in future dealings with these individuals.

Part of this greater understanding came from the limited self-disclosure that took place. As the researcher who had access to all the various data sources, I got more insight into the participants; nevertheless, each of the participants made tentative steps toward revealing themselves to one another.

Innovative practices were examined and, although only one teacher reported having tried any of these practices, it might be that some of the others at least arrived at Hall's (1979) awareness or even informational stage of concern. Again Gordon confirmed this perception.

> *Gordon:* Innovations examined: They may have been examined, but they were just as quickly discarded by most of

> us. If the most innovative thing we actually worked on was a unit on gender, that isn't all that innovative.

Sean indicated that in some respects he was experiencing Hall's (1979) third stage of concern, personal uncertainty about adequacy and role regarding innovations. In answer to the question "Has there been any change to your professional life that might be connected to the project?", Sean responded: "Possibly, more questions, more introspection--more headaches." However, there is little indication that much progress was made toward understanding and experimenting with current language learning theory.

Finally, we did attempt to collaboratively plan a thematic unit. A common unit did not result from our work. Indeed, no one left the room with a written unit in hand, but we did share some literature and some ideas; at least one of the participants eventually did some planning based on our discussions.

Informing Professional Development

The interplay of the voices and their inherent contradictions serve to give form to this particular professional development experience. It cannot be concluded that given similar circumstances, another professional development activity will be authored in the same way. Similarly, it cannot be concluded that the description of these voices as they occurred in this situation is complete or definitive. It is only clear that to approach an understanding and to begin enhancing teacher change and growth, the voices that direct it must be heard; and, one of the ways by which this can occur is by altering the influence of the

traditional sources of authority. Although, none of these facets has been extensively explicated by this small study, a little can be said about each of them. I will address them one at a time and demonstrate how each contributes to understanding professional development.

Function

Because there was an absence of traditional authority determining purpose, this study has much to say about the function or purposes of professional development. When these teachers expressed a preference for professional development activities related to the technical implementation and application of skills (Showers et al., 1987) rather than on broader educative goals (Smylie & Conyers, 1991), it may not have been the result of an informed decision based on interest and need. The voices of the individual teachers also expressed professional needs beyond the technical level--needs that were unique and complex. This study suggests three factors other than the teachers' need that might have influenced their preference for focussing on teaching strategies and skills.

First, the teachers' preference may have been an expression of their perception of their subjective reality (Knowles, 1984), especially as it relates to time available for professional development. In this study, the teachers seemed willing to fit the practical teaching strategy into their lives, but seemed unable to find space for intense reflection and analysis. This may have been an expression of what these teachers knew to be true: there might be time to do justice to a technical matter, but there would not be time to do justice to a more educative endeavor.

Second, the predilection toward practical helps and hints might be a consequence of learned expectations of professional development. All but one of these teachers came to this project framing professional development as transmission from an authority rather than transaction. They also saw professional development as remedial rather than developmental (Smylie & Conyers, 1991). This may have prevented a willingness to engage in the educative process.

Third, the preference for the practical may be a product of a familiar top-down model of professional development. There have been few studies that alter the traditional authority relationships in professional development. It is, therefore, questionable whether teacher preferences would be the same given different professional development authority models. In this study, the participants showed little interest in pursuing the strategies that were presented to them. So the question remains, would these teachers have made more of an effort to try innovative ideas if they had been presented by an authority?

Governance

If there is a treatment in this study in the traditional sense, it is the manipulation of the governance or executive decision making function of professional development. It was moved from administrators or professional development planners and invested with teachers. In this study there is some indication that teacher-directed or bottom-up professional development can occur. However, attempting this by merely removing the existing authority structure seems to offer limited potential for success. This group made some significant progress, but there were many factors inherent in the collective voice and the external voices that

impeded a complete realization of the project's potential. Official authority might have lessened the impact of the external effects on these teachers' professional development. The tendency to maintain the status quo might have been stronger when the governance of professional development was shifted to a bottom-up model. Involvement by administrators in this project might have modified the perceptions that administrators, evaluation procedures, the public, the curriculum and post-secondary institutions inhibited change. If a senior administrator had been able to allay fears of censure from these sources, the security needed for change may have been present.

Cultural Milieu

The cultural milieu or the environment in which professional development took place was not conducive to change. First, these teachers seemed to perceive their school and community culture as reinforcing the status quo and discouraging change and innovation. Without exception, the voices that emerged as those of external pressures were understood by these teachers as extremely conservative. There was little, if any, indication that these teachers felt encouragement to be current or up to date while there were numerous indications that they felt pressure to maintain or return to traditional practices. Second, the whole concept of time pervaded almost all aspects of this project. The teachers in this study saw time as a reason for becoming involved or not becoming involved. They saw it as an indicator of priority. They also saw it as a commodity to be traded, hoarded and parcelled out. This study does not fully explore the role that time played, but it does reveal its importance and its complexity as an element of teachers' lives.

Leadership

In this study, it was intended that authorship of professional development be shared as much as possible with the participants, but as with most such activities, someone must be the implementer of the professional development activity and take on the role of leader. As the leader or facilitator of this professional development program, regardless of official status, I needed to continually define and redefine, discover and rediscover my role in terms of collegiality and authority. In this study, I wanted to enter into a dialogue with teachers so that their voices could be heard; however, my agenda or biases tended to become central to the process. The problematic nature of this role emerged only through a close examination of the nature of the situation.

Reflection

This group of teachers chose not to participate in the avenues of reflection presented to them in the form of journals and portfolios so limited insight can be provided here. But, this study indicates that teachers would be more inclined to independently engage in professional development and personal growth through reflection if they had prior opportunity to learn approaches to reflection and experience the benefits of reflection. In this study, two of the participants who had the opportunity through graduate studies to explore different models of reflection on and in practice (Schön, 1983) wanted to be involved with the project as planned. The other participants had no prior experience and seemed to have little confidence in the worth of this type of pursuit.

Language Learning

This study focused on high school English teachers because of the major changes that are taking place in curriculum directions and in the way we understand language learning. These high school teachers seemed to perceive current language learning theory as being incompatible with their instructional context. The teachers in this study were reluctant to explore such strategies as readers' workshop, writers' workshop and portfolio assessment. It seemed that this was the case, at least in part, because they perceived that they were inhibited from doing so by the reality of external examinations, curriculum prescriptions, and stake-holder expectations.

Guidelines

The guidelines for effective professional development suggested in the literature are preconditions for change projects. These guidelines cannot be seen as ingredients that can be assembled to create a successful professional development project, rather they must be seen as goals in an of themselves that once achieved will provide the basis for professional development. Therefore those involved in the professional development of teachers must move to understand the long-term nature of professional development, the complexity of identifying or establishing need, the nature of the teacher as a learner, the role of collegiality and collaboration, the capabilities of the teacher as decision maker, and the role of reflection in change.

Establishing understanding in all of these areas seems to be especially true when a bottom-up model is desired. In this study, there was an attempt to implement the guidelines with the whole population of the jurisdiction's high school English teachers. The participants did not volunteer to participate out of a common commitment to this approach to professional development so that the degree to which they were able to animate the professional development guidelines varied considerably. It would seem that without the traditional power to authorize these guidelines, the leader or facilitator must function through consensus. This is possible only to the degree to which the participants share a common discourse. A more successful professional development experience may have been enjoyed had the participants concurred on their understanding of such issues as the function of

professional development, the governance of professional development, the role of reflection, and the teacher as learner.

Recommendations

The literature on change and professional development has sent us on a journey in a direction where teachers must take more ownership of their professional growth. This study shows that, not only is such a journey possible, but it is an important journey to undertake. The contradictory and incomplete nature of the voices of professional development clearly problematize professional development so that any recommendations to improve the conditions for teachers' professional growth cannot pretend to be a final solution. They can only provide insight into ways of negotiating within the tensionality of the professional development experience.

It is therefore appropriate that the first recommendation should be directed toward further research. There are a number of exploratory trips within the journey that researchers should take using the methodology of educative research. This methodology holds much promise in the area of professional development since it has as its goal giving voice to the voiceless. As the voices of those most immediately affected by professional development are no longer silenced, new insights into the nature of professional growth can be explored.

Self-directed professional development should be explored in a variety of cultural contexts. Some variations to study would be urban schools, elementary schools, and teachers in other subject areas. It would also be important to investigate what institutional factors would facilitate teacher empowerment for professional development. Of special

interest would be how various levels of administrative involvement affected the results of such a project.

For those actually involved in the journey, it would be important to discover what kinds of education equip teachers to take ownership of professional development. Researchers must attempt to identify both the pre-service and in-service experiences that encourage teachers to become self-directed and to independently sustain professional growth. It would then be incumbent upon universities at the graduate and under graduate levels to see the development of independent professionals as important as the development of skilled practitioners. This would include doing more work to identify and develop the traits and the skills needed by the leaders or facilitators of a group of teachers that would enable them to join in the journey, but not control it.

The second recommendation is directed to school administrators. They should move to contextualize various elements of school culture so that teachers can become more aware of the degree to which these elements inhibit change and professional growth. They should join with researchers to identify professional development through reflective practice as an important priority in a teacher's professional life.

Third, professional development planners must reassess the goals of professional development and the manner in which these goals are addressed. When these goals include meeting the needs of individual teachers, planners should not assume that traditional methods of determining professional needs adequately describe the professional development requirements of teachers. For instance, teachers completing questionnaires without adequate opportunity to reflect will not likely provide the necessary insight into their needs.

However, once these needs are determined, it is recommended that planners do not expend their efforts trying to meet the vast range of specific possibilities identified. It would seem that it would be much more effective if professional development initiatives focussed on providing teachers with the tools to become more independent. This could be done by attempting to establish two very important preconditions for self-directed professional development. Planners need to routinely provide opportunities for teachers to develop the necessary skills for reflection through experience with any number of promising approaches to professional reflection. They should also plan programs that would the opportunity for teachers to work in collegial and collaborative ways.

Fourth, all the recommendations to this point have others doing something to correct the professional development ills for teachers. This would contradict the basic premise of this study; teachers must author their own professional development. The last recommendation is that we teachers should not assume nor expect any other educational stakeholder to take responsibility for our professional development. As professionals, we must take responsibility for our personal journey so that the educational experience can be enriching and gratifying for us and for our students. Therefore, we should come to see ourselves as researcher, administrator, and professional development planner charged with all of the above responsibilities. Once we accept these roles, we can begin to author our own professional development. We cannot be empowered unless we apprehend our personal authority; we cannot be liberated unless we apprehend personal freedom.

REFERENCES

Aber, J. (1988). Composition teachers need to become teacher-researchers: Reflections based on an ethnography of teacher training sessions. In Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, St. Louis, MO.

Anders, P. L., & Richardson, V. (1991). Research directions: Staff development that empowers teachers' reflection and enhances instruction. Language Arts, 68, 316-321.

Aoki, T. T. (1991). Teaching as In-dwelling between two curriculum worlds. In Inspiriting Curriculum and Pedagogy: Talks to Teachers (pp.7-10) Edmonton, AB: Faculty of Education, University of Alberta.

Bogdan, R. C., & Biklan, S. N. (1982). Qualitative research methods for education: An introduction to theory and methods. Toronto: Allyn & Bacon.

Boiarsky, C. (1985). Changing teachers' attitudes and behaviors through modelling and coaching. English Education, 17(1), 26-31.

Boud, D., Keogh, R., & Walker, D. (1985). Promoting reflection in learning: A model. In D. Boud, R. Keogh, & D. Walker (Eds.), Reflection: Turning experience into learning (pp. 18-40). New York: Nichols.

Boyd, E. M., & Fales, A. W. (1983). Reflective learning: Key to learning from experience. Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 23(2), 99-117.

Cook, G. E. (1985). Six honest serving-men: Using the messages of research to design effective staff development programs. English Education, 17(1), 18-25.

Courtland, M. C. (1990). The process of teacher change in literacy instruction. In L. Walker & C. Chambers (Ed.), Tenth Invitational Conference of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies: The Literacy Curriculum in Canada in the 1990s, (pp. 48-61). Lethbridge, AB: University of Lethbridge.

Courtland, M. C. (1992). Teacher change in the implementation of new approaches to literacy instruction. Journal of Reading, 35(7), 542-548.

Courtland, M. C., Luke, F., & Letourneau, M. (1989). Teachers and the writing process: The not so black and white portrait of change. Reading-Canada-Lecture, 7(2), 96-108.

Crandall, D. P. (1983). The teacher's role in school improvement. Educational Leadership, 41, 6-9.

Dewey, J. (1933). How we think: A restatement of the relation of reflective thinking to the educative process. Chicago: D.C. Heath.

Duffy, G., & Roehler, L. (1986). Constraints on teacher change. Journal of Teacher Education, 37(1), 55-58.

Ellsworth, E. (1989). Why doesn't this feel empowering? Working through the repressive myths of critical pedagogy. Harvard Educational Review, 59(3), 297-324.

Fenstermacher, G. D. (1987). On understanding the connections between classroom research and teacher change. Theory into Practice, 26(1), 3-7.

Freire, P. (1970). The Pedagogy of the Oppressed (Myra Bergman Ramos, Trans.). New York: Herder and Herder.

George, J. E., Moley, P., & Ogle, D. S. (1992). CCD: A model comprehension program for changing thinking and instruction. Journal of Reading, 35(7), 564-570.

Gitlin, A., Siegel, M., & Boru, K. (1989). The politics of method: from leftist ethnography to educative research. Qualitative Studies in Education, 2(3), 237-253.

Gitlin, A. (1990). Educative research, voice, and school change. Harvard Educational Review, 60(4), 433-467.

Goetz, J. P., & LeCompte, D. M. (1984). Ethnography and Qualitative Design in Educational Research. Orlando, FL.: Academic Press.

Grimmett, P. P. (1988). The nature of reflection and Schön's conception in perspective. In P. P. Grimmett & G. L. Erickson (Eds.), Reflection in teacher education (pp. 5-15) Vancouver, BC: Pacific Educational Press.

Guskey, T. R. (1986). Staff development and the process of teacher change. Educational Researcher, 15(5), 5-12.

Hall, G. E. (1979). The concerns-based approach to facilitating change. Educational Horizons, 57(4), 202-208.

Henk, W. A., & Moore, J. C. (1992). Facilitating change in school literacy: From state initiatives to district implementation. Journal of Reading, 35(7), 558-562.

Howser, M. A. (1989). Reluctant teachers: why some middle-aged teachers fail to learn and grow. OSSC Bulletin, 33(3), 48.

Joyce, B. R., & Showers, B. (1983). Power in staff development through research. Alexandria, VA.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Joyce, B. R., & Showers, B. (1988). Student achievement through staff development. White Plains, NY: Longman.

Knowles, M. S. (1984). Andragogy in Action. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kottkamp, R. B. (1990). Means for facilitating reflection. Education and Urban Society, 22(2), 182-203.

Loucks, S. F. (1983). At last: good news from a study of school improvement. Educational Leadership, 41, 4-5.

Mezirow, J. (1990). How critical reflection triggers transformative learning. In J. Mezirow & Associates (Eds.), Fostering critical reflection in adulthood: A guide to transformative and emancipatory learning (pp. 1-20). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Myers, K., & Briggs, I. (1977). Myers-Briggs Type Indicator . Palo Alto, CA.: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.

Ohlhausen, M. M., Meyerson, M. J., & Sexton, T. (1992). Viewing innovations through the Efficacy-Based Change Model: A whole language application. Journal of Reading, 35(7), 536-541.

Pahl, M. M., & Monson, R. J. (1992). In search of whole language: Transforming curriculum and instruction. Journal of Reading, 35(7), 518-524.

Perl, S., & Wilson, N. (1986). Through teachers' eyes: Portraits of writing teachers at work. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Richardson, V. (1990). Significant and worthwhile change in teaching practice. Educational Researcher, 19(7), 10-18.

Rogus, J. F. (1988). Teacher leader programming: Theoretical underpinnings. Journal of Teacher Education, 39(1), 46-52.

Schön, D. A. (1983). The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action. New York: Basic Books.

Showers, B., Joyce, B., & Bennett, B. (1987). Synthesis of research on staff development: A framework for future study and a state-of-the-art analysis. Educational Leadership, 45(3), 77-87.

Smylie, M. A. (1988). The enhancement function of staff development: Organizational and psychological antecedents to individual teacher change. American Educational Research Journal, 25(1), 1-30.

Smylie, M. A., & Conyers, J. G. (1991). Changing conceptions of teaching influence the future of staff development. Journal of Staff Development, 12(1), 12-16.

Stringfield, S., & Schaffer, E. (1986). A study of the generalizability of teacher change quasi-experiments. Journal of Classroom Interaction, 21(2), 9-15.

Vacca, J. L., & Manna, A. L. (1985). Professional growth of secondary English teachers. English Education, 17(3), 162-69.

Valencia, S. W., & Killion, J. P. (1988). Overcoming obstacles to teacher change: Direction from school-based efforts. Journal of Staff Development, 9(2), 2-8.

Valencia, S. W., & Killion, J. P. (1989). Implementing research-based reading and writing programs overcoming obstacles to teacher change: Three case studies. (Technical Report No. 462). University of Illinois, Urbana: Center for the Study of Reading.

van Manen, Max. (1990). Researching Lived Experience. London, Ont.: The Althouse Press.

Wells, G. (1990). Creating the conditions to encourage literate thinking. Educational Leadership, 47(6), 13-17.

Willinsky, J. (1990). The New Literacy. London: Routledge, Chapman and Hall.

Wilson, D. E. (1988, March). Writing projects and writing instruction: A study of teacher change. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, St. Louis, MO. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED295148).

Wollman-Bonilla, J. E. (1991). Shouting from the tops of buildings: Teachers as learners and change in schools. Language Arts, 68(2), 114-20.

Zeichner, K. M., & Liston, D. P. (1987). Teaching student teachers to reflect. Harvard Educational Review, 57(1), 23-48.

Zellermayer, M. (1991, April). How teachers restructured their professional knowledge: A triangulated analysis. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 335 373).

Appendix A

Volunteer Consent Form

University of Lethbridge
329-2443
January 24, 1993

Dear (Teacher's Name):

Within the last ten to twenty years, the knowledge base regarding language learning has expanded significantly. Indeed what it tells us may require a significant shift in the assumptions, values, skills and behaviors that teachers bring to the classroom. In addition, the literature on teacher change informs us that traditional approaches to professional development are ineffective in making a real difference in classroom instruction. I would, therefore, invite you to collaborate with me in investigating some of the issues that emerge from these two areas of research. This study will be the basis for my thesis in the M.Ed program at the University of Lethbridge.

Generally, I am interested in discovering whether a small group of teachers can collaboratively initiate and control their own professional development. More specifically, I would like to identify some of the factors that facilitate or impede professional development in this situation.

Participation in this study is completely voluntary and you may withdraw from some or all of the activities involved in the study at any time without prejudice. Names and other identifying information of individuals will not be used in any papers, products or conversations related to the study. Information developed in the course of the study will not be used or discussed in other contexts. Furthermore, upon request, there will be complete disclosure of all observations that relate to your participation.

If you are willing to join with me in exploring the factors related to teacher professional development, please sign the form on the back of this page. Please note that your participation will involve meeting together for one Wednesday afternoon a month from February to June, 1993. The Superintendent of the County of Lethbridge, John Bolton, has approved the use of this time for this project.

Your cooperation and participation are truly appreciated.

Yours truly,

Bryan Ellefson

Further enquiries may be made to myself or to either:

Jane O'Dea, Chair
Faculty of Education
Centre
University of Lethbridge
Human Subjects Research Committee

or Pamela Winsor
Language Education
University of Lethbridge
Thesis Supervisor
329-2456

I, _____, am willing tc participate in a study of professional development with Bryan Ellefson. I understand that if my comments are quoted or my materials used in sharing this study, it will be done anonymously unless I give my express permission for authorship.

_____ _____
(Signature) (Date)

Appendix B

First Session Agenda

1. Briefly review why I'm here.
2. Ask teachers to comment on why they are here.
3. Discuss what we consider to be professional development.
4. Outline the guidelines and the way the process works. Talk about disclosure.
5. Discuss procedural things: meeting times, finances, agenda.
6. Show available resources, invite them to choose.
7. Begin writing first reflection.

Appendix C

Topics for Reflection

Between now and our next meeting, please reflect on the following two topics. You may wish to use some of the questions to guide you. Do not feel that you have to give a definitive response for these questions since opportunities will arise during the course of our meetings to deal with them again. This will serve to clarify where we are in terms of this project.

Comment on Professional Development for your district:

1. What is the history of curriculum reform in your district? Do you feel that there is support for teacher-initiated innovations? Do you feel comfortable in taking risks?
2. Are teachers involved in making curricular decisions?
3. Is the system/school staff collegial in its interactions or are teachers isolated?
4. To what extent does the teaching staff accept the concept of "whole language" as responding to teacher and student needs?

Comment on yourself as an English Teacher:

1. How would you describe your writing instruction? Your literature instruction?
2. How do you structure your units (by genera, theme, form, topics, etc.)?
3. Do you assign writing topics? Do you assign readings?

4. Do students write/read alone? Do they write/read in or out of class?
5. What do you think reading comprehension is?
6. How would you describe your role in the classroom?
7. How would you describe yourself as a reader? as a writer?

Appendix D

Informal Interview Schedule

1. Why are you continuing with this?
2. What are your thoughts on the group meetings so far?
3. What thoughts have you had about your teaching in the past three months? Had you thought about your teaching in this way before? (Are they becoming more reflective)
4. What is your degree of comfort about your teaching? (Boyd-Inner discomfort)
5. If there is discomfort, what do you think is at the root of it? (Boyd-Identification or clarification of the concern.)
6. What do you think about such things as portfolio assessment, writer's workshop, student control over choice in what is read and what is written? (Boyd-Openness to new information)
7. Following are social skills suggested as being necessary for collaborative inquiry. Based on these, do you think we are ready to collaborate?
    - •self disclosing
    - •developing and maintaining trust
    - •communicating with others
    - •listening and responding
    - •accepting yourself and others
    - •resolving interpersonal conflicts
    - •confronting and negotiating
    - •managing anger and stress

Appendix E

Coding Definitions

Following are descriptions of the codes and exemplars of passages for each code:

Concerns: This code attempts to identify personal motives and impediments for participating in this project as well as more general motives for professional growth and development. The following sub-categories identify the personal agendas for this project and possibly for professional development as a whole.

Help: Identifies statements that indicate that a reason for participating in this project was to help me with my thesis. (n=11)

Bryan: I would like to know why did you two agree to participate:

Sharon: To help you Bryan.

Shirley: That was the primary reason.

Personal: Identifies statements that express concerns of a personal nature - concerns that had to do with the teacher as a person: efficacy, need for support, self-esteem. (n=33)

Erika: Well, you know what motivates me, Bryan. Like I have to know how to do this. And so I always figure if we're together, all these English teachers together, that I'm going to absorb something and so I should be there. Call it guilt, call it whatever. (laughter) You know me, I'm motivated by what I should be doing, and trying to find the time to do it.

Professional: Identifies issues of a professional nature: the "what's and "how's" of teaching. Identifies statements which reveal issues and questions related to personal theories of English instruction and learning. (n=231)

Sharon: And what I think is really interesting, if grammar came up last time, then what is obviously happening already is that we are sharing common concerns... I mean that would be a wonderful common ground to start with at least it would give us some direction.

Shirley: Yup.

Culture: This code identifies statements that identify issues external to the individual that are perceived as effecting professional development and change.

Time: Identifies statements referring to the absence of adequate time in one's professional life as a factor in participating in the project or professional development generally. (n=54)

Glenn: I have as little time as anyone does right now. Things will start to loosen up after this weekend but you know that for the last two months I've had not one spare evening at home at all but ...

Authority: Identifies statements that deal with issues regarding who authors professional development. These statements deal with the source of decision making power in this project as well as with professional development in general. (n=60)

Glenn: If we were getting course credit for this then everybody would say alright. I'm expected to do something. I'll get something in return. If this were a directive from the superintendent of schools that said I want this done with these English teachers, you do this, they would do it. But...

Pressures: Identifies statements which refer to societal expectations that are perceived to affect professional development and change. (n=47)

Shirley: You and I were both, our hands were slapped last year for grammar content, for having it and yet my 33 kids are coming back to me and saying "Hey I went to the college and I failed that exam because I didn't know what parallelism is." And yet don't you dare, and so therefore you don't dare and when you don't dare, you are failing these kids.

Professional Development: Identifies statements which reveal the beliefs and preconceptions about professional development and professional development activities that the participants brought to the project. (n=87)

Scott: I mean for me, almost anything that comes out of there, I can use. With me ranging from grade nine to grade twelve and the other people discussing how it would be multi-level, multi-genera, I thought it would be something practical. I know a couple units in some of my classes could use some brushing up. I'm looking for things to replace. Also it's kind of nice to find out the views of the other people and what other people are using and what works with them.

Collegiality: Identifies statements which identifies the nature of collegial relationships within the jurisdiction. (n=41)

Shirley: The way it was going, no. And I think if the group was comfortable with one another then it could have, yes. But I think that we're still, there's no cohesiveness there. We're all individuals and we don't know one another well enough to be really willing to share what's going on in our classrooms and what we think about something.

Administration: Identifies statements which relate to the influence of the school administration in professional development. (n=24)

Bryan: Look, I've already proven this part, if we want it John will give it to us. If we want some time he'll find the time for us but we've got to want the time. I'll bet that if I went to him and said we want a whole day, he'd give us a whole day. I would even suggest if we said we wanted two days he would give us two days. But you know...

Process: This code identifies statements that identify issues that relate to the way in which this project unfolded.

Facilitator's Attitude: Identifies statements which reveal my attitude toward what is happening in the sessions. (n=93)

Erika: So did you feel better after that last get together we had.

Bryan: Umh.

Erika: More panicky because it wasn't going in your direction?

Bryan: No, no. The only panic I had was the one prior to this when I thought the whole thing... that there was going to be no common ground that we could find.

Participant's Attitude: Identifies statements which reveal the participants attitude toward what is happening in the sessions. (n=169)

Shirley: They've been a waste of time. There didn't seem to be any focus. You had an idea and even though I think that maybe ... even though we are all English teachers we need to know ... we need some direction... And I think we've gone to the meetings because we felt okay, let's go and see what we can get done. Let's see what we can do for Bryan now...

Decisions: Identifies points where process decisions are made. (n=87)

We finally agreed on April 7 as near to three as possible. (Wayne will not be able to make it because they have parent interviews on that day but we felt that it was plain not everyone was going to be able to make every meeting...Flexibility is the name of the game) We also scheduled April 28 in order to squeeze in two meetings for the month. I felt relief that we were able to stretch to accommodate people. I know it would be better if everyone could do everything together but this is reality! This is what I want to know about!

Relationships: Identifies interactions and relationships that emerge during the process. These would include specific group roles and functions adopted by group members. (n=88)

We had a great lunch. The day was sunny and warm and everyone came with what seemed to be an upbeat attitude. We joked and gossiped and teased each other. Related the teasing that went on via fax nominating Scott for ATA president. Teased Erika about her dedication/seriousness. Scott about his eating habits. Gossiped about administrative appointments. Generally seemed to enjoy each other's company. Shirley was very quiet here and throughout the meeting.

Change: Identifies statements which suggest participant's willingness to change or unwillingness to change attitude or practice. (n=184)

Erika: How do you give a real mark though. Cause I'm thinking of some of the kids I have that get right down there and they start writing and then they come up to you and you say Ugh, yuk, yuk... you know and you have a real good writer sitting there struggling, right. And I can see some kids handing in all ten things, it's all done. A hundred percent? And then how do I translate that to a valid report card grade when you know the kid, you know the kid is writing at a 60% or 70%. That means a lot of playing around with marks to get a valid...

N.B.: Is a way statements within categories which are especially telling or significant are highlighted.

Appendix F

Validity Check

Dear : (Participant)

As I indicated last Spring, I would like to do some follow-up to our meetings. I appreciate the time you have already committed to this project but I need to prevail upon you just one more time.

It would suit my purposes best if you would answer these questions in writing. However, if that does not suit you, we can make arrangements for me to interview you again and tape the conversation. Either way I would expect that it will require at least an hour to complete. I will call in a few days to see what your preference is.

I have read and reread the transcripts of our meetings and interviews in an attempt to find some common messages coming through. I have made a number of generalizations and I would like you to examine them to: (a) see whether you agree that these generalizations describe your experience, (b) provide further information about some of these generalizations.

The answers to both of these questions should be **about you** and **not your assessment of the group**: your answers should be from the point of view of "I think..." or "I felt..."; rather than, "The group..." or "They..."

Theme 1: There occurred a continual search for authority. The group recognized the absence of an official authority figure and in its absence deferred to me as the ostensible decision-maker; and spent considerable time trying to discover authority within themselves and within the group.

Does this statement accurately describe your experience? What qualification or clarification could you make?

Would your participation have differed; or, do you think the group would have taken other forms or directions had the process been initiated and/or managed by a senior administrator?

Theme 2: The organizer (Bryan) was not a fully collaborative partner in the process. Due to his quasi-leadership role and special interest in the outcome of the project, he was able to be more collaborative and flexible in regard to the professional interests addressed than in regard to the general purpose and process of the project.

Does this statement accurately describe your experience? What qualification or clarification could you make?

Are you aware of any other factors that may have contributed the kind of role that Bryan played in the project?

Theme 3: In the busy lives of teachers, there is the perception that there is little time for professional development that involves intensive reflection, analysis and action on personal theory and practice.

Does this statement accurately describe your experience? What qualification or clarification could you make?

To perceive that one does not have time for something could indicate that it is not a high priority or that there are other reasons not to be involved. Why did or didn't you feel you had time for this project?

Theme 4: The participants have had little experience in working collaboratively with each other.

Does this statement accurately describe your experience? What qualification or clarification could you make?

To what extent have you collaborated with other teachers? To what extent have you been able to examine important elements of your teaching with the help and support of another teacher?

Theme 5: Participants perceived the expectations of the administration, the students and the public as limitations to the possibility of changing their practice. This was most notable in regard to the evaluation of student performance.

Does this statement accurately describe your experience? What qualification or clarification could you make?

Are there innovations that you are reluctant to adopt because you feel they are inconsistent with the expectations of administrators and the public? Explain.

Theme 6: Participants chose not to explore innovations on the basis of personal theory derived from experience.

Does this statement accurately describe your experience? What qualification or clarification could you make?

Are there current innovations that you are reluctant to try because you know from experience that they likely won't work?

Theme 7: Most of the participants expect professional development to involve the provision of practical teaching strategies and ideas that have immediate application to the classroom, rather than the provision for a more general personal/professional growth.

Does this statement accurately describe your experience? What qualification or clarification could you make?

Theme 8: There were indications that conditions conducive to change occurred: collegial relations were enhanced; innovative practices were examined; a degree of self-disclosure occurred; a collaborative project was undertaken.

Does this statement accurately describe your experience? What qualification or clarification could you make?

If you essentially agree, what factor(s) do you see as having contributed to these changes?

General Questions

1. Have you introduced or are you considering any changes in your instructional repertoire since last Spring? If so, did this project have anything to do with these changes.

2. Have there been any other changes in your professional life that might be connected to the project?

3. Would you be interested in continuing with this project. Why or why not?