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Abstract

This study describes, analyses and evaluates a specific methodology for staff development known as 'Teacher as Co-researcher'. It is a methodology which is based on the collaborative enterprise of teachers working with their students and other interested stakeholders in the education process. It uses naturalistic principles of inquiry to examine both common and individual interests and concerns about literacy and language teaching and learning in the classroom.

Naturalistic and ethnographic research methodologies were used to explore the nature of the co-researching process, how it worked and its potential value for the professional growth and development of the participants.

Two different sources of data were used. The first presented the experiential responses of two teachers in different school contexts, working collaboratively with an 'outsider', an educational administrator. The second source presented the retrospective recall of a number of educators (teachers, a principal and two academics) who had used the Teacher as Co-researcher methodology for several years. This group of informants provided retrospective insights into how the process worked and how the relationship developed over time.

Final analysis of the data provided understandings of the nature of the Teacher as Co-researcher process by revealing a number of key characteristics upon which effective collaborative enterprise is dependent. It shed light on the nature of interactions that transpired during the collaboration and how these affected and were affected by the nature of the relationship.

Furthermore, the study highlighted the developmental nature of the collaborative enterprise. Of specific interest was the nature of the relationship between participants as revealed through the nature of the discourse. Issues related to status, role definitions, reciprocity, autonomy, ownership, control and responsibility were discovered to be critical elements of the initial and ongoing negotiations of the co-researching relationship.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Purpose of Study

This study set out to conduct a 'responsive evaluation' of a collaborative approach to professional development known as 'Teacher as Co-Researcher' (TACOR) within the specific curriculum area of literacy and language learning.

It seeks to gain a deeper appreciation of the TACOR process and to inquire about the nature of the collaboration involved (how the participants see the process, what occurs and how). More specifically, it offers a number of case study narratives derived from mutually constructed meanings about the way that participants collaborate with each other and it evaluates the impact that the TACOR strategy had on the participants.

The 'responsive evaluation' model, pioneered by Stake (1975) and extended and refined by Guba and Lincoln (1981), is used to take account of the feelings, beliefs, concerns, perceptions, understandings and experiences of the participants during the TACOR process. The evaluation has no predetermined goals or outcomes and is not concerned with measuring the attainment of the strategy's objectives but rather seeks to determine its value and worth to the participants themselves and uses these responses to indicate the impact that this strategy may have had on their professional growth and development.

Background to the 'Teacher as Co-researcher' process as a methodology for professional development

Initially the Teacher as Co-researcher process grew out of a perceived need by two university teacher educators at the Centre for Studies in Literacy, University of Wollongong, to find out more about how 'whole language' classrooms worked. They were both aware that teachers faced considerable demands from a rapidly changing

1 All information presented in this section was obtained informally through personal communication.
language and literacy curriculum and that up until that time the professional development that was available to teachers had made little impact on their classroom practice. Teachers too were feeling the pressures of change and, when the opportunity to set up a partnership with someone from the university was offered, although anxious about such a partnership, they responded.

From these first tentative partnerships grew a collaborative process based on the equal status of its participants. Both teachers and academics were surprised to find that they had a lot to offer each other and in ways that they had not expected. As these partnerships developed, the potential of this process for staff development and the development of other kinds of collaborative relationships was realised. A principal began working with his teachers, teachers worked with other teachers and one of the academics set up the co-researching process with a student.

The outcomes for those who were involved in the initial trials of TACOR were highly visible. Presentations at national and international conferences were made, papers were written, workshops presented and books published on aspects of teaching and learning in the 'whole language' classroom. The participants had developed their own voice and felt empowered.

This process has now been used in a number of different situations over a period of five years. Most recently it has been trialled in the United States of America with a large group of teachers as an integral part of an intensive inservice program on whole language teaching and learning (Turbill, Butler and Cambourne, 1991).

As the Teacher as Co-researcher process had not been well documented or evaluated it seemed important to find out more about the nature of the co-researching process by discovering how and why it seemed to work so well for those who participated.

As TACOR is essentially a methodology for staff development, it was important that an attempt was made to locate it within the current professional development scene and to describe the socio-political contexts that have shaped educators responses to change.
A Review of the socio-political context of professional development in Australia.

Educational reform and research on the professional development of teachers has an interesting but complex history. Its development did not happen in a vacuum but in a social, political, cultural and economic context.

During the past decade, both here in Australia and around the world, we have seen shifts from an industrial to an information society, from national to global economy and from centralisation to decentralisation of power and control. In Australia particularly we have experienced and felt the impact of the development of high technology and are moving away from institutional help and support to self help.

Social forecasters, Naisbitt and Aburdene (1990) in their new book Megatrends 2000, suggest that the nineties herald a new world view, one which encourages self reliance, has a new respect for the human spirit and that builds on an increasingly interconnected world. These forecasts are based on the emergence of new ways of looking at science, truth, reality and knowledge and new ways of exploring and understanding them.

For example, James Gleick, a New York science writer, in his latest book Chaos: Making a New Science (1987), suggested that Chaos Theory has changed our attitudes about how the world works. Unlike relativity or quantum mechanics, chaos is a new science, a science of everyday things. Chaos theory describes the order of disorder. It has created special techniques of using computers which capture the fantastic and delicate structures underlying complexity. Physicists see chaos as a science of process rather than state, of becoming rather than being. Chaos theory has broken across the lines that have traditionally separated scientific disciplines and has become the third great revolution in the physical sciences.¹

¹ 'Relativity eliminated the Newtonian illusion of absolute space and time; quantum theory eliminated the Newtonian dream of a controllable measurement process; and chaos eliminates the Laplacian fantasy of deterministic predictability' (Gleick, 1987, p.6).
These and other major global changes have affected our cultural perceptions and values about education, the ways in which we organise and prioritise its management and the ways we look at, explore and understand educational contexts. TACOR is a reflection of these changing perceptions.

In Australia we are still trying to come to terms with the changes of the last decade whilst also trying to respond to a new set of forces coming into play. Education has felt the affect of the imbalances which have occurred between these forces. The way we have organised and managed change, through professional development initiatives reflect these imbalances.

Language and literacy educators have experienced their own revolution during the past twenty years. Changing perceptions of how children learn language matched with changes in the way we research problems of teaching and learning have in turn changed the ways that we see, understand and do things in language classrooms. The traditional roles played by teachers and researchers are also changing, there is more discussion across disciplines and, like the physical scientist, educators have become more interested in process rather than state or product.

International research on literacy and language learning has provided a revised view of the relationships between reading, writing, listening and speaking and this has had important implications for both teaching and learning. In the 70's presentations at national conferences in Australia from two eminent North American researchers, Kenneth Goodman and Donald Graves caused a dramatic change in our thinking about language teaching and learning. Goodman suggested that reading was not a code breaking skill based on decoding letters to sound and then blending them together, but rather a psycholinguistic process where meaning making was the main task. Graves presented a view of writing also as a meaning making process rather than a knowledge of the conventions of print. The important connections between reading and writing became obvious and so also the need for radical change in classroom practice.
A 'Butterfly Effect' (a term borrowed from the literature on Chaos theory, the notion that a butterfly stirring the air today in Peking can transform storm systems next month in New York), sent violent ripples through language curriculum development departments in Australia and prompted extensive curriculum change. From these new ideas about language learning emerged a movement towards holistic approaches to teaching and learning.

The curriculum designers were quick to pick up on these new notions of 'whole language' (a term used in North America) and teachers were soon faced with a series of new and mandatory language curriculum documents. The vast majority of teachers, however, had no idea about process writing, psycholinguistics or about whole language.

Large scale curriculum development was also happening overseas not only in the area of language learning but generally across the curriculum. Studies of the dissemination and utilisation of new educational knowledge became increasingly important and necessary. A developing understanding of the characteristics of innovations and the kinds of educational processes which were associated with effective utilisation and change in schools (Fullan and Pomfret, 1977), helped to explain the complexities of the problems being encountered by schools as they sought to keep abreast of the curriculum research and development mayhem. Inevitably this kind of frenetic change across curriculum areas would impact on the professional development domain.

The period of educational reform enjoyed during the seventies in America, the United Kingdom and in Australia, came to an abrupt end by the early eighties due to an under estimation of the degree of professional development that was necessary to support the intended curriculum change. In Australia, Boomer (1986) pointed out that schools had been traditionally slow to take up the challenges associated with change but conceded that the problems related to rapid change were indeed complex. He argued that the changes that had taken place focused almost exclusively on curriculum content and that little support had been given to teachers and therefore there had been little impact of new educational knowledge on classroom practice, particularly in the area of language learning.
In the early seventies in Australia, despite Commonwealth Government funds being made available to support change through professional development, and our growing understandings of the connections between adult learning styles and the process of change, inservice activities did little to convince teachers that they were useful. Indeed, they were generally regarded as unhelpful and therefore failed to have the desired impact on classroom practice.

Whilst research in the northern hemisphere had revealed a great deal about the nature and characteristics of effective professional development and training (Stenhouse, 1975; Joyce and Showers, 1980; Fullan, 1982), the impact of this knowledge on education in Australia did not emerge until the late seventies. From this time and through to the mid eighties, a series of Government initiated reports were commissioned to identify priorities in education. Coulter and Ingvarson (1985) in a report commissioned by the Commonwealth Schools Commission entitled Professional Development and the Improvement of Schooling, strongly argued that quality of education was dependent on the effective professional development of teachers.

Unfortunately little became of this report, along with many others written at this time. One in particular, again from the Commonwealth Schools Commission, entitled In the National Interest (1987), highlighted the importance of high quality education for the support of national interests. In particular it identified a number of key issues that were considered an important part of the educational agenda. These included improvement in leadership, organisational structures and staff development.

Later in the same year, at a national conference on inservice education, Ingvarson (1987) further emphasised that we had reached a point where we needed to critically examine the methods and practices of professional development for teachers. He pointed out that until this time, professional development had largely been '....the ad-hoc provision of brief one-off activities and courses' that gave little heed to the large body of research which illustrated the severe limitations that this practice had on providing teachers with support for change. He described this provision of inservice activities as having 'the marginal status of a cottage industry' (p.24)
and urged that planning of staff development programs should be an integral component of a school's organisation and growth.

Whilst there was little response to any of the recommendations made in these Government initiated reports, or to the plethora of research that came from overseas, Fullan (1990) recently suggested that there were at least two major and often mutually reinforcing reasons for this. The first a technical one. Principals and administrators did not know enough about how to design and carry out effective professional development activities. Secondly, Fullan pointed out that professional development was a political issue concerned with '...power, bureaucratic positioning and territoriality' (p.4). Both these observations describe well the present situation here in Australia.

Despite the political rhetoric of Government reports however, in the early eighties the South Australian and later the Victorian state departments of education began to take their own initiatives for professional development based on British and American research on effective professional development, and the work of Goodman and Graves in language learning. A group of language consultants in South Australia developed an inservice program for infant teachers (K-3 only) called The Early Literacy Inservice Course (ELIC). This course consisted of a series of presentations over a ten week period. Each session included workshops, suggestions for practical classroom activities, content input and shared discussion and reflection. Groups of teachers, rather than language 'experts' were given a short intensive training and then became the course presenters for their own and neighbouring schools.

This course was well received by teachers and, equally as important, caught the attention of both Federal and State educational bureaucracies. Here was a compact and relatively economical package that could be effectively marketed and distributed to most schools throughout Australia. The acceptability and comparative success of this staff development package for both teachers and bureaucracies had a profound effect on the way that staff development was later designed and administered.
The success of ELIC saw the development of many other similar staff development packages, using the ELIC formula. These packages responded to the needs of both primary and secondary teachers in mathematics as well as language learning.

Current political agendas in Australia

The present agenda of the Australian Government is that of 'national economic readjustment' (DEET, 1988, p.3) and education is seen as an integral part of the process of building economic recovery. Priority has been placed on two aspects of education; an increase in retention rates of students and the improvement in the quality of education by supporting the professional development of its teachers. The Government, concerned about national economy, felt that education systems had lost their focus on the basics and therefore were not preparing students adequately to take their place in a highly competitive technological society. The Government expressed its concern in the following way:

'.... a national effort to strengthen Australia's schools as part of national economic readjustment. The nation is being asked to upgrade the skills of its workforce. Schools are seen as a base upon which to build economic recovery..... Strengthening Australia's schools means strengthening and upgrading its teaching force' (DEET, 1988, p.3)

These revised edicts heralded a new era of educational reform, one of conservatism, caution, the cry for accountability and a thorough review of the purpose, nature and direction of education for the nineties and beyond. More recent reports have clarified new directions and strategies and made strong reference to the importance of professional development and inservice training of teachers and provide specific guidelines as to how this should be achieved.

The first of these reports entitled Teachers Learning (DEET,1988), provided the strongest critique about the general ineffectiveness of many current inservice education practices. It singled out the flaws of the nature and format of professional development activities, the isolation of teacher education institutes from schools and the costs
related to inservice activities. It cited a list of 'principles of good practice' and suggested that schools should have 'control over a significant proportion of their own funds which (would) give (them) the capacity to use staff time flexibly, to purchase external expertise or specialist resources, to mount staff and community development courses and to plan coherently' (p.45).

This report also introduced the concept of 'user pay' for professional development and extended the concept of professional development to include all stakeholders in the education process - parents, ancillary staff, teachers, administrators and other community members such as staff of higher educational institutions.

These notions along with many others were taken up by Scott in the final recommendations made in his 'management review' of the Department of School Education in New South Wales (1990). Scott recommended a devolution of power and control from a central office directly to the schools, placing the focus squarely on the school and the classroom. This report aptly called School-centred Education: Building a More Responsive State School System, suggested that schools should be responsible for their own school renewal and have a greater control and responsibility for financial and administrative organisation and management.

With the Scott Report (1990) came a new contemporary discourse which indicated a shift in ideology not only for education in general but of the way that professional development was to be 'managed', delivered and financed in the future.

The report described the decentralisation of power, decision making and financial responsibility for staff development by saying:

'The majority of funding for human resource development should be allocated directly to schools.... Within broad policy guidelines, principals and schools should be able to purchase staff development services which they consider to be best suited to staff needs' (Scott,1990:110).

The discourse of this document indicated a strong move towards 'human capital theory'; the purpose of human resource development
and management is for the 'good' of the organisation rather than for the benefit of its individual members. A report from the New South Wales Ministry of Education, Youth and Women's Affairs (1990) entitled *Teacher Education: Directions and Strategies* also supports this particular ideology with respect to teachers as 'human resources' rather than as professionals.

This approach serves as a mechanism for enabling issues of personal autonomy to be bypassed, a movement away from individual needs to those of the school and its community, to the group as a whole (New South Wales Ministry of Youth and Women's Affairs, 1990. p.84).

Another major change in educational management being canvassed was that professional development should be tied inextricably to teacher appraisal and a School Renewal Plan.

>'The setting of performance targets.... needs to take place in the context of the annual Renewal Plan of the school. What teachers are trying to achieve in the classroom should be related to the school's improvement goals. Consequently staff development plans for teachers and other staff should be based on what knowledge and skills areas need further development to achieve performance targets' (Scott,1990. p.110).

A further report prepared by the Schools Council for DEET entitled *Teacher Quality* (1989) presented a summary of conclusions including those made by *Teachers Learning* (1988) and other pertinent overseas reports, on what constituted effective teacher training and development. Effective training and development was said to occur when:

- there was a recognition that teachers are learners in need of new knowledge, new practices and support and encouragement (adult learning);

- the value of both innovation-focused and action research delivery modes was recognised (delivery modes);

- the school was the principal focus of professional development (setting and focus);
it was directly related to support provided by principals and
enhanced through collaborative approaches to leadership
(leadership);

relevant internal and external support services were provided
(support structures);

it involved joint planning and collaborative control (control);

teacher commitment was supported by providing opportunities and
incentives (commitment);

results of research in disciplines and new knowledge fields
applies (subject matter);

institutions, systems and individuals commit themselves
(climate) and when

it moved beyond justificatory evaluation to conscientious

This provides a valuable blueprint for the design and organisation of
staff development in the future.

This philosophy now needs to be put into practice and there has been
some evidence of response, albeit in small ways. For example, a
document entitled Professional Development, 1991: A School Based
Approach, developed by the Riverina region of the Department of
School Education, has recently been circulated to all the schools in
the area. This pamphlet provided schools with clear guidelines as to
the Department’s expectations of school responsibility for
professional development. Schools were expected to purchase on a
'user pays' basis, a range of 'training' activities that would be
designed and organised by the Regional Education Office. Schools
were advised that these 'external' offerings should be offset by
professional activities developed within and between clusters of
schools.

But what kinds of activities and strategies can schools develop
internally and how? No guidelines have been provided to suggest how
'in-school' professional development might be developed. Although schools in New South Wales have been given some funds to develop appropriate professional development programs, these funds are limited.

Furthermore school personnel are for the most part ignorant about the nature of teacher change as the design, organisation and implementation of professional development in the past has been the responsibility of an 'outside expert' with little or no consultation with schools. The range of professional development strategies that have been offered to schools by external agencies have provided limited and often less than successful demonstrations of sound models of learning and the change process and therefore schools have an inadequate knowledge base from which they might develop their own professional development programs.

The recommendations made by these more recent reports from all levels of Government, National, State and local, emphasised the important role of professional development and have therefore generated an urgent need for more practical information on strategies that schools might use. In order to take up the challenges which these reports present, schools need to have a variety of strategies through which professional development can become an integral part of its school renewal.

The context of this study on TACOR is therefore a product of the present socio-political climate. This climate has and will influence the way in which staff development will be developed in the future. The changing agendas of National and State Governments, current beliefs about educational change, a rapidly expanding school curriculum seen particularly in a strong move towards 'whole language' teaching and learning, changing perceptions of how adults learn and a recognition of the importance of professional development of teachers in supporting the political agenda of the country are the factors which provide the context and credence of this study.

As with any intended change it is the harmony between these socio-political forces which allows change to take place. When one element or force changes it sends ripples through the others which
causes disharmony and mismatches in ideology. It takes time for changes in education to respond to socio-political agendas and these inconsistencies make the planning, organisation and management of education change more difficult. The following figure summarises some of the socio-political forces which have affected teachers of language over the past three decades.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decades</th>
<th>Political agenda</th>
<th>Current beliefs about learning</th>
<th>View of language development</th>
<th>Views of Prof. Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960's</td>
<td>Calls for educational change.</td>
<td>Part to whole Fragmented Skills based program supported by structured commercial reading programs.</td>
<td>Highly structured developmental curriculum. Fragmented approach to teaching of literacy.</td>
<td>Experts are the creators and holders of knowledge. Expert vs novice. language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late 80's</td>
<td>In N.S.W. decentralisation to schools for management &amp; financial planning</td>
<td>Naturalistic views of learning. Empowerment of learners. Learning seen as social &amp; interactive. Value of collaborative partnerships.</td>
<td>Identification of indicators of language learning.</td>
<td>P.D. part of human resource management. P.D. should be a deliberate activity. a shared responsibility and include all educational stakeholders. Training to be organised on a user pay basis. P.D. to be linked with teacher appraisal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early 90's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1:** A summary of some of the socio-political factors that have impinged on language educators' practices in Australia
Rationale of study

This socio-political context explains a number of forces that are operating on and affecting educators' response to change. The imbalances that exist between the major forces at work on the provision of in-school professional development opportunities for teachers, need to be understood in that context.

There is an urgent need to find professional development strategies which fulfil and are consistent with certain parameters of good practice and reflect changes in ideology about how children learn language.

In a position of responsibility for the planning of professional development initiatives, the writer realised the necessity to critically examine the types of activities that could be offered to schools.

Although not well documented, TACOR appeared to be most successful as it displayed many of the characteristics that had been identified as necessary if effective and lasting change was to take place.

This study presented a real opportunity to explore and evaluate a different approach to professional development, one that was consistent with changes in ideology about both teaching and learning.

The development of TACOR as a methodology for professional development is appropriately timed in the light of changes in current political, economic and educational agenda. If we want children to be prepared for the twenty-first century then they will need to be highly articulate rational thinkers. If we are to empower learners then we must assume that teachers also need to be empowered for this to happen.

It has become essential that we identify approaches to professional development that enable school communities to work together on improving the quality of educational outcomes of students for the future. Although much has been written about collaboration as an
approach to staff development, little has been said about the nature of the collaborative process, how it works, what the effect is on the participants and what the potential outcomes might be. There is a need therefore to add to the theory about the nature of collaboration and to find out why the Teacher as Co-researcher approach to staff development has been so successful.

It is the bringing together of these aspects, the timeliness of TACOR and the need for a more specific knowledge about collaboration that provide the rationale of this study.

**Physical locus of study**

The physical locus of this study has two parts. The first involves the retrospective recall and reconstruction of interpretations of those who had been through the original TACOR process. This involved two academics, three teachers and a principal.

The other focuses on an attempt by two partnerships each comprising of a teacher and the writer, to put into practice the Teacher as Co-researcher process, in an independent school setting. This focus records the reflections and reactions of the participants as they engage in this co-researching process.

**Personal theory which guides this study**

The theoretical orientation of this study is based on a set of presuppositions derived from personal interpretations of the socio-political context, tacit knowledge which has been developed through many years of experience as a language consultant and the literature on professional development. These presuppositions include the belief that:

- professional development/learning is a process that is best grounded in 'real' experiences therefore the best context for staff development is the classroom and the concerns and issues that naturally arise from this context;

- teachers need to be cognitively aware of their own beliefs and assumptions about language teaching and learning and how this drives their teaching practices;
- learning is a social and interactive process where the need for shared talk, shared reflection and reciprocal feedback are essential features;

- learning involves an ongoing process of creating and recreating knowledge about teaching and learning;

- ongoing learning through the constant refinement of practice, in consultation with the students, is the basis of the development of craft knowledge in teaching and an essential part of professionalism;

- the concepts of 'deliberateness', 'shared responsibility' and the 'involvement of all stakeholders' are important parameters of the professional development process and

- the act of teaching is by nature a natural research process.

Organisation of this study

Having described the socio-political context, the intention now is to review the literature on various approaches to the professional development of teachers and to explore their underlying assumptions about the change process and how teachers learn. The third chapter will explain the methodology used for the conduct of the study and the following chapter will present two narratives which provide its results. It is at this point in the study where a change of genre has been adopted. Because of the personal level of the involvement by the researcher, a personal report style is introduced and continues to the end of the study. The study concludes with the the presentation of grounded theory and the writer's personal reflections on the study's findings.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

In the introduction to this study a brief history of the socio-political contexts of change highlighted the factors that have influenced and shaped the way that educators have responded to educational change. It noted how global changes have affected our perceptions about education; it pointed out the advancements in our knowledge about how children learn language and provided an overview of some of the political and educational agendas for change here in Australia. This general overview forms an essential backdrop for this review of literature.

This review of the literature presents a developmental account of our changing perceptions about the planning and management of educational change. It identifies the research literature which describes the varying approaches that have been used for the professional development of teachers, and by analysis, shows where the Teacher as Co-researcher strategy fits into the context of other literature on professional development.

Whilst the focus of the review highlights the course of professional development initiatives in Australia, it would be inappropriate to ignore the research and development which has emanated from North America and Britain. Often the initiatives and experiences of educators and researchers overseas has served to guide, explain or contribute to the changes that have taken place here in Australia.

This chapter will review a number of differing methodologies which have been and continue to be commonly used for professional development. In this instance 'methodologies' refers to any planned activity or strategy for change. With each methodology comes a set of assumptions about change, adult learning and the conditions that need to be present if change is to be implemented at the classroom level by teachers.
These many methodologies have been classified into a number of different models of professional development, each model representing a particular purpose or historical context of change and reflecting a similar set of assumptions about how teachers make changes to their practice.

It is the description of the evolution of these models which forms the organisational structure of this review.

For each model, where appropriate, some brief historical context is given. The theoretical underpinnings of each model are identified and described and an account given of the development of the specific strategies used and their outcomes, with particular reference to the teaching of literacy and language learning. Furthermore this review will attempt to tease out the assumptions upon which each model has been developed and provide a critique of each model from both a personal perspective and that of other researchers.

The field of research literature on the professional development of teachers is vast and originates from many differing sources: research on the conditions necessary for change, the change process itself, school improvement, effective school climates, curriculum change, how adults learn, how knowledge can be created as well as literature from the world of management and training. All these sources have contributed to our present understandings about the design, management and support of professional development.

Whilst the viewpoints expressed across these different avenues of research reveal many differing perceptions about effective professional development, there is, however, general agreement about its purpose. Although the approaches or strategies that encompass different models vary greatly in both their context and format, a certain commonality emerges; a commonality of definition which emphasises purpose, a purpose that is designed to:-

'.....alter the professional practices, beliefs, and understanding of school persons towards an articulated end.' (Griffin, 1983, p.2)
In a recent Australian Government publication entitled *Teachers Learning* (1988) from the Department of Education, Employment and Training (DEET), the definition offered by Griffin (1983) has been extended to include recommendations for the management and planning of professional development as follows:-

'Inservice training and development for professional educators involved in schooling is a deliberate adult learning activity initiated by teachers themselves, by their employers, by tertiary institutions or by other agencies with a stake in education. It has as its purpose the improvement of the educational enterprise, particularly the quality of teaching, and, in the final analysis, better outcomes for students.' (1988, p.4.)

This definition introduces the concepts of 'deliberateness', the 'involvement' of a number of different stakeholders in the education process and the necessity of 'shared responsibility' for professional development. These concepts emphasise the importance of the planning for professional development and provide a backdrop against which the varying methodologies of professional development might be critiqued.

**Organising and Describing Approaches to Professional Development**

As the array of approaches used for professional development is so vast and complex it is necessary to find a way of organising them. Ingvarson (1987), in an attempt to make sense of this chaos, suggested that it was important to construct a framework that exposed the 'specific design for learning' being used and to identify the most important factors of this design as it related to how teachers learn, how knowledge is created and how change takes place (p.26.).

By adopting this approach it is possible to identify a series of differing models for professional development. Each model encompasses a cluster of characteristics by which we can organise a variety of different methodologies used for professional development. Each model displays its own 'design for learning' based
on what is perceived as the major characteristics that underpin effective professional development.

In reviewing the literature it became apparent that only four researchers, two here in Australia and two working together overseas, have made a serious attempt to organise the field. They have used the notion of 'model' as a framework for classifying and describing models of professional development. Ingvarson (1987) and Johnson (1989), both Australian researchers, share a similar philosophical framework for the organisation of strategies for professional development. More recently, however, Sparks and Loucks-Horsley (1990) researchers in North America, have also proposed a series of models of professional development but have highlighted the features of the learning process involved in each methodology, its context, outcomes and how these might relate to its planning and management at the district level.

The following figure (2) shows the descriptors that each of these researchers has used to identify differing models of professional development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Innovation focused</td>
<td>1. Outside expert interventionist</td>
<td>1. Individually guided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Partnership innovation-focused</td>
<td>3. Development/improvement process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Inquiry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2: Models of professional development.**

In classifying and describing approaches to professional development, Ingvarson (1987) was concerned about 'how knowledge about teaching practice is generated and whether it was generalisable and how teachers acquire or extend their knowledge about teaching practice' (p.26).
Based on these specific concerns he identified two basic models of professional development. These he described as an 'innovation focused' model (a model first named by Fullan, 1985) and an 'action research' model.

Ingvarson (1987) suggests that the way that professional development is designed and managed is dependent upon how a series of questions, that arise from the design for learning, are answered. These questions, he argues, should focus on where knowledge about new practices comes from, who takes part in its creation, how teachers learn and about what conditions might be necessary if new knowledge is to be meaningfully implemented by people other than the original developers.

Johnson's (1989) classification uses a similar framework. He also highlights the importance of the learning design of each model by questioning the source of knowledge and how this knowledge is created and utilised. Furthermore he is concerned about the perceptions of knowledge that teachers see as important in teaching practice and what value is attributed to the craft knowledge that teachers already have (p.6). Johnson also stresses the importance of examining the impact that the learning design has on teachers and their ability to make changes to their craft knowledge.

These questions allowed Johnson (1989) to build on Ingvarson's initial framework and to extend it. He labelled his models 'outside expert interventionist', 'inside collaborative interventionist' and 'partnership innovation-focused interventionist'. He points out that this classification also describes different kinds of management of change; whether externally developed and administered inservice, internal collaborative teacher initiatives or initiatives which involve a partnership between both internal and external personnel.

Identifying three major characteristics Johnson (1989) highlights the differences between the models as shown in the following figure

---

1 Another model was identified but not labelled. This model was restricted to a 'one shot' approach to professional development and focused exclusively on information-giving and awareness-raising.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Outside Interventionist</td>
<td>Outside experts provide research and development knowledge. Teacher's craft knowledge is not acknowledged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Inside Collaborative Interventionist</td>
<td>Knowledge is developed through 'reflection in action' by the teachers. There is no such thing as 'expert' knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Partnership innovation-focused interventionist</td>
<td>Both the craft knowledge of practitioners and knowledge from research and development is valued.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3: Characteristics of professional development models (Johnson, 1988, p.3)

Sparks and Loucks-Horsley's (1990), North American researchers, present a classification of approaches used for staff development by uncovering their theoretical and research base, by providing program descriptions and by examining evidence about the outcomes. Although concerned to expose the learning design of each model, their purpose for classification was quite different from that of Ingvarson (1987) and Johnson (1988). Sparks and Loucks-Horsley (1990) focused on 'what' and 'why' questions about the effectiveness of the staff development strategies rather than ones which asked how the process of change worked. They were concerned about the effect of various strategies on teachers' classroom behaviour, how strategies might be implemented by staff developers in schools and school districts and what evidence there might be that indicated a difference in teacher performance.

This more recent classification and description of professional development strategies reflects the immediate concerns of North American educators. The framework does, however, provide a contrastive view of how professional development strategies can be
organised and for this reason is used here to highlight the varying purposes and functions for which such classifications might be used.

In summary, the ways that Ingvarson (1987), Johnson (1988) and Sparks and Loucks Horsley (1989) have organised strategies for professional development is guided by the personal assumptions that each has about how teachers learn. This is evident in the kinds of questions they raise. The following figure highlights some of their common concerns about the nature of professional development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How is knowledge about teaching practice generated and is it generalisable?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do teachers acquire or extend their knowledge about teaching practice?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What value is attributed to the knowledge that teachers already have?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What view of the teacher as learner is appropriate?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How does change happen?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under what conditions is new knowledge likely to be meaningfully implemented by people other than the original developers?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where is it assumed that knowledge about new practice will come from? Who takes part in its creation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is new craft knowledge utilised?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What perceptions of knowledge do teachers see as important?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why should one believe that this model should affect teachers' classroom behaviour? Why should one believe that this model can be implemented by staff developers in schools and school districts? What evidence indicates that this model makes a difference in teacher performance?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4:** Researchers' concerns about the nature of professional development.
Organisation of this Review of Literature

The organisational framework for this review of literature has developed from a number of sources. As the models identified by Johnson (1988) are based on a set of assumptions which closely relate to the focus and scope of this study, they have been used as a basis for the organisation of this review. However, the labels that Johnson (1988) used for each model have been changed and the framework extended in order to highlight not only the design for learning but the roles, relationships and status that the various stakeholders play in the learning process.

The figure below (5) introduces this revised classification, pointing out the similarities and differences with those identified by Johnson (1988) and showing where the classification has been extended.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Johnson's (1989) models of Professional development</th>
<th>Classification for this literature review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Outside expert interventionist</td>
<td>1. The authoritarian model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Inside collaborative interventionist</td>
<td>2. The support model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Based on Ingvarson's (1987) innovation-focused model)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Partnership innovation focused intervention</td>
<td>3. The individual to co-operative model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The collaborative model</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5: Organisational structure for this review

The first two models identified for this review both extend and refine Johnson's (1988) view of 'an outside expert interventionist model'. The third model incorporates Johnson's collaborative and partnership models. The fourth model serves to emphasise distinctions between co-operative and collaborative approaches to professional development and to provide a place where the 'Teacher as Co-researcher' methodology might fit more comfortably.
A following visual representation of the organisation of this review into models of professional development serves to highlight their major differences with particular reference to the roles that participants play in the process, where control and responsibility for the learning is centred and where knowledge comes from.

**Figure 6:** Models of professional development highlighting the roles and relationships between the various stakeholders and the source of recognised knowledge.
These models can be summarised in the following way.

The 'Authoritarian Model' presents an approach to professional development that arose in response to a rapidly expanding curriculum. It is a model that makes a clear distinction between expert and novice, reflects a deficit view of teaching and learning and a limited delivery methodology.

The second model, the 'Support or Training Model', presents strategies that evolved from research on school improvement. This model is primarily concerned with the adoption and implementation of new practices by teachers. This model could equally be called the 'training model' as much attention is given to the support and/or needs of the learner in-training. More research literature is available on this model than any other that have been developed since. The literature that supports this model also identifies a number of specific conditions that need to be present if teachers are to learn new ways of working.

The 'Individual to Co-operative Model', the third, encompasses methodologies designed for both individual or groups of teachers. The characteristic which binds these seemingly disparate approaches is their focus on the classroom context as a source of investigation and learning. In this model the importance of developing craft knowledge is emphasised. It incorporates a number of different strategies which were designed to either respond to the individual needs of teachers in the classroom or by getting teachers to work together.

Finally the 'Collaborative Model', charts a movement towards the empowerment of teachers through the development of collaborative partnerships. Collaboration in this review, is based on a concept of mutualism, where participants in the collaborative enterprise share equal status and responsibility for the learning process.

Whilst this organisation reflects a similar classification to the one developed by Johnson (1988), the manner in which the literature is reviewed and critiqued is a reflection of a personal set of assumptions and beliefs about how teachers learn, about the design and management of professional development and about the nature of
teaching and the change process. Whilst this personal theory was made explicit in the introduction, there are, like Ingvarson (1987), Johnson (1988) and Sparks and Loucks-Horsley (1990), a number of specific interests and concerns which further shape this review and can be couched in a series of questions. Many of these questions are similar to those that have been previously expressed while others present a personal focus of interest. These questions are a reflection of personal theory in action and include the following:

- How is new craft knowledge created and utilised? (Ingvarson, 1987)

- What recognition and value is ascribed to the knowledge that teachers already have and are able to create for themselves? (Johnson, 1988)

- To what extent can staff development become an integral and deliberate part of school policy and development? (DEET, 1989)

- What roles do participants play in the professional development process?

- Can teachers take responsibility for the planning and management of their own professional development?

- How do the roles that participants play in the learning process dictate the value of the experience and its outcomes for the participants?

- Can the concepts of deliberateness, shared responsibility and the involvement of all stakeholders be developed?

- Does professional development have the potential to be a natural part of the teaching process?

- Do collaborative approaches to professional development allow for the development of new teaching and learning ideologies?

Against this backdrop of personal theory each model will be described, noting in brief the historical context and the purpose of
the change intended, the assumptions upon which the learning design has been developed and the extent to which the model represents potential for the professional growth and development of teachers.
The Authoritarian Model

'Reformers have the idea that change can be achieved by brute sanity'.
(George Bernard Shaw)

Historical Context and Nature of the Change Proposal

With the large scale curriculum reform and development in the fifties and sixties in Britain and North America, the dissemination and utilisation of new theoretical knowledge became crucial.

In Australia, curriculum reform, especially in the area of literacy and language learning, did not explode until the seventies and early eighties by which time twenty years of new knowledge had accumulated. This led to an explosion of regionally developed mandatory policies and curriculum directives on language teaching and learning. It also placed considerable pressure on teachers to take on board a vast quantity of new theoretical and practical knowledge concerning not only what children needed to know about literacy and language learning but how best they might know it.

These new curriculum statements did not reflect simple cosmetic changes but a radical theoretical shift in the way that children were perceived to learn language.

The research indicated that children used a complex repertoire of strategies when trying to make sense of both oral and written language. An increasing awareness of the social nature of learning, the role that language plays in the learning process and the way that language is determined by the social situation had important
implications for teachers and their classroom practice.

In brief, language learning research had provided valuable insights into the linguistic sophistication of young children's oral language development (Chomsky, 1970; Bloom, 1970; Halliday, 1975, 1978; Wells, 1980) and awareness of and interactions with written language (Newman, 1985). Further clarification of children's writing development was presented (Emig, 1971; Clay, 1975; Bissex, 1980; King, 1982; Ferriero, 1981) and writing was described as a process of making meaning (Graves, 1975, 1983; Calkins, 1983). Reading was also defined as a process of meaning making, a 'psycholinguistic guessing game' (Goodman, 1967, 1973; Goodman and Goodman, 1977; Smith, 1971, 1982, 1983), which extended our hitherto limited view of reading as a phonetic code breaking skill.

All these developments in our knowledge of the child as a language user and learner became the basis of new language curricula in Australia which demanded very different approaches to the teaching of language in primary schools. Policy documents in New South Wales alone included a new statement on reading and three years later one on writing.

So the nature of the change proposal which forms the basis of this model was external to schools and had been largely created by university academics. Teachers and schools had played no part in the ensuing curriculum development activity.

Those who were responsible for the planning and management of change recognised the immediate need to 'inform' teachers of this new 'instrumental knowledge' but failed to recognise the importance of developing new 'conceptual knowledge' which would provide guidelines for action (Fullan and Pomfret, 1977).

Hence, this model of professional development only reflects a concern for the development of instrumental knowledge. It was assumed that conceptual knowledge would follow automatically.
Theoretical and Research Underpinnings

The implications that this surge of curriculum development activity had for inservice education and teacher change were grossly underestimated both overseas and in Australia (Raizen, 1979; Emrick and Agarwak-Rogers, 1978). A unidirectional flow of knowledge was intended to pass from researchers and curriculum developers directly to teachers.

In North America it was felt that the Research, Development and Diffusion (RD&D) paradigm was the most suitable basis for effective implementation and utilisation of new innovations at the classroom level (Havelock, 1973). It was an approach that involved getting teachers to change by telling them about better and improved ways of teaching, peppering them with a plethora of new and innovative teaching practices. These innovations were assumed to be preferable to any that might already be in existence. The implementation of new innovations into classroom practice was assumed to be automatic once the teachers appreciated their characteristics, values and benefits.

Fullan and Pomfret (1977) however, pointed out the complexities associated with the phenomenon of 'implementation'. They described the implementation of new innovations as a highly complex process involving intricate relationships between users, managers and the other stakeholders involved in the process of change. They alluded to the difficulties of measuring and justifying the process of 'implementation' in scientific terms and pointed out that there were serious limitations when trying to measure change in terms of success or failure.

Based on observations about the weaknesses of this approach Fullan and Pomfret (1977) further suggested that teachers should be encouraged to experiment with the innovations and then feel free to change the innovation if necessary. They pointed out the importance of time provision, resources, personal interaction, inservice training support and personal contact.

They particularly emphasised the need for major changes to be made in the definition of roles of researchers and curriculum developers
and recommended collaborative forms of development with practitioners, a point which Fullan (1991) continued to make fifteen years later. House (1974) too, in questioning 'the doctrine of transferability' that permeated the assumptions which supported the socio-political agendas for change, pointed out that initiatives which were intended to strengthen the relationship between researchers and practitioners were designed to get practitioners to use products of RD & D 'without shifting any initiatory power from the planners to the practitioners side of the spectrum' (p.241).

At this time our perceptions of how adults learn was governed by behaviourist theory. These perceptions were somewhat narrow in focus and viewed teaching and learning as a fragmented collection of skills and subskills which resulted in a very fragmented curriculum (Cambourne, 1989). Teaching was perceived as being objective and goal based, a technical career rather than a profession.

**Strategies**

A single strategy was used for professional development to assist teachers to understand and implement new curriculum initiatives. This strategy was limited to 'one-shot' inservice presentations, varying from two hours to one day in duration. They were offered to any teacher who could get release from face to face duties of the classroom. Very often only one teacher from a school could attend and therefore the audiences represented a huge cross section of needs.

This approach to professional development reflected a limited view of adult learning. The focus of in-service was almost exclusively on the imparting of chunks of knowledge to teachers in one-shot events by experts. Learning was seen as a passive activity in which teachers became docile and passive recipients of someone else's reality (Dawson, 1978).

**Illustrations and Outcomes**

Based on the experiences of curriculum change and its implementation overseas, Australian agencies, at a national and state level, developed a number of initiatives that were felt would
improve modes of dissemination and utilization of new information. Such initiatives included the provision of more consultancy support at the school level and the development of the Australian Schools Catalogue Information Service (ASCIS), a curriculum resource which could be accessed through computer.

In New Zealand SET was published, a magazine which attempted to present theory to teachers in a more palatable and 'easy to read' way (Owen and Hall, 1981).

Whilst these initiatives attempted to hand back to the school and the individual some of the responsibility for resourcing their own perceived professional development needs, it had little impact on teaching practices.

Prior to 1986 the Commonwealth had provided all funding on a State by State basis, for inservice education in Australia. In 1986 these Commonwealth funds were withdrawn. In New South Wales the Inservice Education Committee (NISEC) had been responsible for planning, organising and administering inservice education activities for the State's teachers. Most of these strategies were based on an 'outside expert interventionist approach' (Johnson, 1988). The extent of impact that these programs had on classroom practices was seriously questioned and shortly before NISEC's final demise, a review, evaluation and critical analysis of its activities was commissioned.

This evaluation (Duignan, 1986) highlighted the weaknesses of the approach being used for professional development and made specific mention of its fragmented approach, the lack of follow-up support and the need to address the real concerns and issues of teachers. It was recommended that teachers should be more involved in the planning of programs and that planners should ask themselves what it was that they were really trying to achieve. Furthermore Duignan (1986) recommended a greater degree of collaboration and negotiation between all the stakeholders and that professional development initiatives should be school based (p.159-163). These recommendations reflected twenty years of research since the 'one-shot' approach was first conceived as an appropriate agent for change.
This evaluative report served to prompt the end of an era of Nationally funded inservice provision in Australia.

Unfortunately this authoritarian approach to professional development is still favoured at many State and Regional levels around Australia. This approach helps to maintains the power and authority of the central bureaucracies.

**Underlying Assumptions and Critique**

The 'Authoritarian Model' of professional development is characterised by a number of strong assumptions about where knowledge comes from and who creates it, about the roles that different stakeholders play in the implementation of new curriculum and about how teachers learn new ways of working.

Within the historical and developmental context of this model knowledge was created by experts, academics and curriculum developers, in isolation from teachers and classrooms. Experts were seen to know what was best for teachers and had the authority to impose their ideas on practitioners. Here there is an inbuilt assumption that teachers have gaps in their knowledge that require filling. It represented a deficit view of learning. It devalued the knowledge the teachers have and endorsed the power and authority of the 'expert' outside the school organisation. The implementation of new curriculum was considered to be a 'technical process that could be orchestrated from outside the schools' (Smyth, 1982).

Implicit in this model was an expert versus novice mentality which was evident in the ways that inservice developers planned and presented new curriculum to teachers. Planners saw teachers as 'consumers' rather than 'producers' of knowledge (Johnson, 1989). Wood and Thompson, (1980) suggested that organisers of inservice had negative attitudes towards teachers, and that teachers were disinterested learners who needed to be persuaded, rewarded and controlled. Teachers were perceived to need direction and did not wish to take responsibility for their own learning.

This apparent lack of interest from teachers, however, could be directly attributed to inappropriate content of the course, having
little to do with the day to day problems and concerns of classroom
teachers (Wood and Thompson, 1980). Lack of participation or
involvement either in the learning or in the planning, further
exacerbated this disinterest.

Furthermore, the activities were usually held away from the
classroom which served to widen the gap between theory and
practice. The model of practice which was demonstrated in the
conduct of these activities was not one which the teachers were
being asked to use in their own classrooms.

Fullan (1982) provided an illuminative summary of research findings
that expressed the inadequacies of inservice education based on this
authoritarian approach. They were as follows:

1. One-shot workshops although widespread are ineffective
because:

   - topics were frequently selected by people other than those
     for whom the in-service was intended;
   - follow-up support for ideas and practices introduced in in-
     service programs occurred in only a very small minority of
     cases; and
   - follow-up evaluation occurred infrequently.

2. In-service programs rarely addressed the needs and concerns
   of individual teachers.

3. The majority of programs involved teachers from many different
   schools and/or school districts, but there was no recognition of
   the differential impact of positive and negative factors within
   the system to which they must return.

4. There was a profound lack of any conceptual basis in the
   planning and implementation of in-service programs that would
   ensure their effectiveness. (p.263)

In summary, the weaknesses of this approach to inservice included
the failure to acknowledge the complex nature of the improvement
and change process. It served to highlight the problems associated
with the diffusion and utilization of new educational knowledge and demonstrated the limited perceptions of the needs of adult learners. As a result, curriculum reforms were never realised at the school level and failed to have any impact on either the teachers or their students.

The expected conversion process of theory into changed classroom practice was riddled with problems not least of which was the untold damage that these 'one-off' inservice activities had on teachers' self concept and their vision of themselves as teachers (Fenstermacher, 1980). In hindsight how wise is the saying 'blowing out another man's candle does not make one's own burn more brightly'.

Studies of the characteristics of change (Fullan and Pomfret, 1977) made it clear that new strategies would need to be developed to improve the flow of new information to schools. However, many of the strategies that were developed still maintained the exclusive authority of the expert and continued to devalue the craft knowledge of the teacher.
The Support Model

The Historical Context and Nature of the Change Proposal

The rapid development of new primary school (K-6) language curriculum documents in Australia which had prompted the development of the previous model of professional development, remained the source of the change proposal. Effective dissemination and utilisation of new research and curriculum remained problematic both here and overseas.

This 'support' model, so called because of the strategies that comprise it, placed emphasis on the support of teachers as they made changes to their classroom practice, and grew out of a realisation of the ineffectiveness of 'one-shot' inservice presentations to effect change at the school level.

Whilst the previous model of professional development had focused primarily on 'instrumental' knowledge (Rich, 1977), informing and enlightening teachers about changes in curriculum, the various strategies which have been clustered under this model sought to provide clearer guidelines to teachers for action, 'conceptual' knowledge (Rich, 1977), and how they might go about making changes to their practice. This resulted in a focus on the technical skills that teachers employed in their own classrooms.
Theoretical and Research Underpinnings

One of the major strengths of this model of professional development was the volume of robust and thorough research that supported it. What had been learnt about the process of change served to sustain the development of many new initiatives for professional development many of which are still being widely used both here and overseas.

Fullan (1985) labelled this model 'innovation focused' as researchers had turned their attention to the nature of the multiple innovations that formed the basis of the change proposal. He described this model as one which sought to improve schools through 'the identification, adoption or development of specific proven or promising new programs or exemplary practices' (p.405).

This model of professional development evolved from a large body of mostly American research on 'School Improvement' (Crandall et al, 1982; Lehming and Kane, 1981; Emrick & Peterson, 1978). It was realised that curriculum change could not happen in isolation of the culture of the school.

The literature on 'school improvement' is broad ranging and sets out to describe many of the organisational and process variables associated with effective schools and the effects that these variables might have on the professional development of teachers (Fullan, 1985). It also helped to clarify our understanding of how teachers make changes to their practice (Huberman, 1981; Stallings, 1981, Huberman & Miles, 1984; Huberman & Crandall, 1983; Crandall, 1983) and the conditions or factors which were necessary if new ways of teaching were to be realised (Joyce and Showers 1980; Huberman, 1981; Stallings, 1981; Fullan, 1982; Crandall, 1983).

Researchers had developed a clearer picture of the process of change at the school level (Huberman and Miles, 1984; Fullan, 1985; Firestone and Corbett, 1987). They suggested that change involved a number of different stages including initiation (adoption of new ways of working), implementation (putting the change into practice) and institutionalisation (building on the innovation). Fullan (1985) maintained that effective planning and management of change was
dependent on an understanding of the complexities of the change process.

Fullan (1985) pointed out that there were many interacting factors both internal and external to schools which might impede or facilitate a school's ability to be able to respond to change. He concluded by providing a summary of the conditions that needed to be considered if professional development was to be effective. He pointed out that:

- The focus of professional development should be on job or program related tasks.

- Programs of staff development should include the training components identified by Joyce and Showers (1980) - theory, demonstration, practice, feedback and application with coaching.

- Professional development activities needed to be on-going and required support. A series of presentations over time would allow teachers to trial new ideas and to reflect on their own practice.

- Professional development activities should offer a variety of both formal and informal elements and should involve both teachers and consultants or other experts.

- It was important to recognise and address the relationship that exists between the implementation of change and the approach used for professional development (p.286).

The research of Joyce and Showers (1980), during the late seventies and early eighties in North America, was also instrumental in developing our understandings of the conditions necessary for the effective support of teachers as they tried to implement lasting changes to their teaching practice. They identified a number of training components which they maintained needed to be an integral part of any staff development program. These will be described later.
The following figure summarises the key characteristics of the 'training or support' model showing the origins of its research base and the professional development strategies that were developed to realise the purpose of the change proposal.
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**Figure 7:** Context of the 'support' model of professional development.

**Strategies and their Theoretical Underpinnings.**

The strategies or methodologies which characterise this model take account of the nature of the change proposal, the importance of its source, the scope of change presented and in particular the process of implementation.

These strategies include the use of 'exemplary practices' and on-site training techniques which were supported by peer coaching, peer observation and discussion. The conduct of these strategies provide some valuable insights into the nature of the professional development and the roles that different stakeholders might play in this process (Fullan, 1986; Johnson, 1985; Berman and McLaughlin, 1976; Crandall, 1983).
The Use of Exemplary Practice:

This approach to professional development was based on the notion that change could be promoted by offering 'exemplary practices' of innovations. They were developed by teachers for teachers and supported by a set of co-ordinated strategies within the context of planned professional development activities and which adhered to a set of recommended conditions for effective learning.

When questioning teachers about quality examples of good practice, their responses were not so much about content but about the 'hows' of teaching, what the teacher does. Shulman (1987) called this 'pedagogical reasoning', the 'intellectualisation of what good teachers do and why they do it' (p.11). This notion about the nature of change referred to the importance of a conceptual understanding of the innovation and its realisation in practice; a paradigm rather than a pendulum change.

The notion of 'exemplary practices' was therefore developed in response to the problems associated with the transferring of innovative ideas into concrete forms at the classroom level, the bridging of the gap that existed for teachers between theory and practice (Fullan, 1982).

Guskey (1986) suggested that the value of using exemplary practices was dependent upon teachers seeing that a practice really worked - a proven practice. He maintained that use of a natural role model - a peer, another teacher, whose classroom practice had been identified as exemplary, set up a cycle of emulation and was an essential ingredient of successful change and assisted teachers to make their own connections between theory and practice.

Further support for this strategy came from research on teacher commitment. Crandall (1983) discovered that, contrary to previous research, teacher commitment to new ways of teaching developed as a result of their active engagement with a new practice and after teachers had adequate training in how to use the new approach and received feedback on its effects on their students (p.7). Previously it had been assumed that commitment developed out of 'an act of intention' or 'by engagement in a bargaining process', an involvement
of teachers in the problem solving and decision making process and in the development of materials and strategies.

These findings challenged the commonly held view that change in classroom practices came about as a result of changes in teachers beliefs and attitudes. Guskey (1986) maintained that the temporal sequence of the major outcomes was in fact very different. He suggested that changes in beliefs and attitudes only happened when changes in student learning outcomes could be seen by the teachers. 'Commitment' to change, he suggested, was regulated by teachers perceptions of the benefits that might be in it for the improved quality of learning opportunity for their students rather than their own personal growth and development (p.6). This concept was also supported by the research of McLaughlin and Marsh (1978), Harootunian and Yargar (1980) and Lortie (1975).

Guskey (1986) thus provided a revised view of the relationship between changes in teacher attitudes and beliefs and the use of new practices as follows:-

![Diagram](Figure 8: How teachers change their beliefs and attitudes about teaching (Guskey, 1986, p.7)

**Illustrations and Outcomes**

The use of exemplary practices fitted Guskey's (1986) view of the change process and their use was widely trialled in both America and Australia.

In America the National Diffusion Network (NDN) was responsible for the development of two hundred innovative programs. In Australia, in response to new curriculum demands in mathematics (K-10), the
Curriculum Development Centre, a Federally funded organisation, in consultation with State and Territory Education Departments, developed a professional development package known as The Mathematics Curriculum and Teaching Program (MCTP).

The purpose of this program was the identification, collection and sharing of 'exemplary practices' in mathematics teaching. The program sought to provide a range of resources that had been developed by teachers for teachers' use in the classroom. It hoped to 'facilitate debate about the effectiveness of, and theoretical support for such approaches' and 'to assist teachers towards an expanded teaching repertoire through selective adoption by them of the principles underpinning the changes.' (Owen, Johnson, Clarke, Lovitt and Morony, 1987)

The package consisted of a number of exemplary activities covering a number of mathematical themes. These were supported by a set of guidelines on their implementation by the school. These guidelines were based on established principles of effective professional development (Fullan, 1985; Joyce and Showers, 1980) and described how best the package might be integrated into a school or 'between school' program of professional development.

The Mathematics Curriculum and Teaching Program was widely distributed throughout Victoria and to a lesser extent in New South Wales.

The notion of exemplary practices as a strategy for professional development was not, however, used to support innovations in literacy and language teaching.

Use of Training Techniques:

One of the major characteristics of training techniques was its focus on the needs of the learner in training.

Joyce and Showers (1980) emphasised that if teachers were to learn new ways of teaching, 'fine tune' existing ways or develop a 'new repertoire' of teaching, then a certain combination of training components needed to be present. After an extensive review of
Joyce and Showers (1980) concluded that there were five major components which characterised effective professional development. These included an exploration of theory, the demonstration or modelling of a skill, the practice of this skill under simulated conditions and feedback on performance and classroom application.

The presentation of theory or a description of the new skill or teaching strategy had previously been the only component of in-service but this had failed as it was found that an understanding of theory did not result in the transfer of new skills into the classroom. Joyce and Showers (1980) found that theory needed to be presented to teachers but supported by a number of other essential training components.

The second element concerned the observing, modelling or demonstration of the new skill. Teachers needed to observe new practices in operation (Joyce and Showers, 1980). The modelling of a new practice was said to have considerable effect on teacher awareness and understanding of what it was that they were being required to learn (Cruickshank, 1968; Vlcek 1966).

The third and fourth elements involved the provision of allowing teachers to try out new practices for themselves in their own classroom setting and then to have an opportunity for personal or shared reflection and either structured or informal feedback. (Tuckman, 1969; Saloman and McDonald, 1966; Joyce and Showers, 1980).

The initial training techniques developed by Joyce and Showers saw administrators setting the agenda for change and determining objectives and outcomes. Later in its development, however, teachers became an integral part of the planning, identifying their own needs and determining their own goals and objectives (Wood, McQuarrie and Thompson, 1982).

As a result of extensive trailing of these elements throughout North America Joyce and Showers (1982) identified the need for an element of coaching as a further element of the process. The concept of 'coaching', had originated from a union between the
coaching techniques used in the world of athletics and their own research into the special relationship that facilitates transfer of training.

Stallings (1981) and Sparks (1983) in reviewing the work of Joyce and Showers emphasised the importance of this additional element of coaching as a means of on-going follow-up support. They argued the need for collaborative engagement in diagnosis and problem solving as well as providing more structured learning experiences. They suggested that the initial elements proposed by Joyce and Showers, without the element of coaching, would have little impact on changed classroom practice. This observation was further supported in the literature by Sharon & Hertz-Lazarowitz (1982), Kurth (1985) and Bennett (1987).

The concept of prolonged support was also seen as particularly important at the points when teachers actually tried to implement and come to grips with what the innovation meant to them (Baker and Showers, 1985; Sharon and Hertz-Lazarowitz, 1982; Bennett, 1987; Kurth, 1985) and that a process of ongoing discussion and peer observation might provide this.

It was further suggested that the conditions of training should be refined to include multiple demonstrations and that time for discussion both prior to and during the demonstrations should become an integral part of the process (Sparks, 1983; Showers, 1984; Joyce and Showers, 1988).

Building on these ideas other researchers began to realise the importance of peer interaction. The concept of coaching became extended to become a strategy of its own for professional development.

**Peer coaching:** Showers continued to extend and refine the initial training framework and by the mid eighties had acknowledged the potential of 'coaching' as a discrete strategy of its own. Showers suggested that peer coaching had the potential 'to build communities of concerned teachers, to develop a shared language and a set of common understandings necessary for the collegial study of new knowledge and skills' (Showers, 1985. p.43-44).
Showers (1985) perceived 'coaching' to be a process by which peers could assist each other in 'negotiating the distance between acquiring new skills or teaching strategies and applying them skilfully and effectively for instruction' (p.46).

The cyclical process of coaching involved three basic stages. The first, the training of coaches and the establishment of teams. Secondly, the trying out of new teaching strategies which involved trials, observation, demonstration and feedback; and finally, the opportunity for the mutual examination of the appropriate use of the new teaching strategy. This final stage focused on the cognitive aspects of transferring new behaviours into the already existing teaching repertoire.

Joyce (1987) emphasised the importance of this third stage of the process saying that if the strategy was to be absorbed into the teachers' own repertoire then the companionship of other teachers was essential.

Showers (1985) proposal of 'partnership' raised issues of equality. Showers (1985) suggested that coaching should imply 'assistance' with learning rather than judgement. She argued that 'by placing the major responsibility for coaching with peers, status and power differentials could be minimised (p.46). When making comparisons between supervision and coaching, she also noted that coaching could only be effective if those participating had a 'common language' for the study of teaching. Further, she stressed that the failure to separate evaluation and the status and power differentials then the less likelihood that the appropriate climate, so necessary for learning, could develop.

Peer coaching, however, remains a strategy that is being commonly used in America and most reports indicate that Showers' observations about the effects of status and power differentials are being ignored. Most reports indicate that peer coaching relationships are based on partnerships of novice with expert or inexperienced teachers with more experienced teachers.

Discussion and peer observation: Literature that described this as a discrete strategy of its own was of two kinds. The first
involved ongoing discussion about the finer points of Joyce and Showers (1985) training components and their extension and refinements. The second involved a growing interest in the concept of partnership and the power of shared dialogue (Little, 1982; Holly, 1982).

Illustrations and Outcomes.

In Australia, at both a national and State level, a number of inservice 'packages' were developed that reflected elements of the 'training' components developed by Joyce and Showers (1980) and the conditions that Fullan (1982) had identified as necessary if professional development initiatives were to be effective.

The Early Literacy Inservice Course (ELIC), an in-school inservice package modelled after a package that had been developed in New Zealand (LARIC), was developed by a group of language consultants in South Australia. This inservice package consisted of a series of in-school presentations given by specially trained tutors who were also fulltime practising teachers.

As well as providing a site-based strategy for professional development in language teaching and learning, it sought to promote an interactive approach to learning rather than the direct transmission of knowledge. Each session provided opportunity for the exchange of ideas between teachers, the trialling of 'exemplary' activities, shared discussion and reflection as well as an input of new theoretical knowledge. Clearly the development of this package reflected the work of many American researchers and in particular the work of Joyce and Showers during the seventies.

Based on the success of ELIC in South Australia, and its neat marketing and distribution qualities, the program was sold to all States and Territories throughout Australia. The marketing and widespread distribution was heavily funded by the Federal Government and the package was hailed as a major breakthrough in approaches to professional development.

As an aftermath of ELIC's success, most State Education departments around Australia began to develop similar inservice
packages, not only about language learning but also for mathematics. The Key Group Mathematics Project (KGMP) and one for early childhood teachers called Exploring Mathematics in Classrooms (EMIC) was developed by the Victorian Ministry of Education.

In New South Wales, Queensland, the Australian Capital Territory and Western Australia similar programs promoting language teaching and learning, in particular, developed ELIC 'look alikes' not only for primary school teachers but extending the concept to include secondary school teachers. Over the period of 1985 to 1990, a National Survey (DEET, 1990) indicated that approximately forty packaged programs in the area of literacy and language learning for teachers of Junior Secondary students had been developed, distributed and implemented by regional and State education departments. The main purpose of these packages had been to promote new State curriculum policy documents.

The success of the early packages was seen to depend heavily on the personal interactional skills and expertise of the facilitator. Whilst the teachers perceived this approach to professional development as being far more useful and practical than previous initiatives, the long-term effects on teacher change have not been clearly established. Evaluators determined that ELIC had a high level of impact on classroom practices (Centre for the Studies in Literacy, 1988) but long term evaluation of changes in teachers' beliefs and attitudes about language teaching and learning was not examined or determined.

Because of its compactness, cheapness and ease of marketing and distribution this 'package' approach became the major strategy for professional development in Australia during the eighties.

**Assumptions and Critique**

The strategies of professional development that are clustered under the banner of an 'innovation focused' or 'support' model reveal a number of assumptions about adult learning and how craft knowledge might be generated, acquired and extended. These stand in marked contrast to those that supported the previous model.
The design for learning that underpins this model recognises that learning has to be related to some specific context. Classrooms and teaching practice are the basis and focus of the learning experience. It was assumed by some that knowledge about teaching could be generated by both experts and practitioners. This is described by Crandall (1983) who, in the Study of Dissemination Efforts Supporting School Improvement, noted that:

'solid solutions to real school classrooms do exist - solutions that have been developed through both research and practice. Teachers are willing to implement these solutions - but to do so they need concrete and continuous help from credible people and clear directions from their (school) administrators'. (p.9)

To what extent, however, teachers saw themselves as creators of knowledge is doubtful. Use of exemplary practices required trialling other teachers' ideas, and who was responsible for deciding what was 'exemplary' and what was not? Whilst teachers may have been perceived as active, autonomous agent or the holder and user of practical knowledge, the craft knowledge that teachers already had was largely overlooked or was recognised and treated as an impediment rather than a resource or starting point.

A positive assumption underlying this model was that learning takes time and is affected by a number of factors both external and internal to the site of learning.

Whilst it was recognised that the training components recommended by Joyce and Showers (1980) needed to be extended over time and supported by ongoing shared discussion and observation, there was an assumption here that teachers needed a deliberate and systematic process involving an input of theory, multiple demonstrations or modelling and practice with feedback before effective changes to practice could be made.

But what impact did new teaching repertoire have on the learning opportunities of the students. Planners became concerned about this and felt that teachers needed direct evidence of the results of their efforts on students (Hall & Loucks, 1978).
The packaged programs developed in Australia that were loosely based on the Joyce and Showers (1980) training components, failed to acknowledge the importance of ongoing support. On the completion of the packaged courses teachers were left to 'sink or swim' and the initial momentum and enthusiasm that may have been generated during the course soon dissipated. Only a few teachers were able to use the courses as a starting point for ongoing development. (Centre for Studies in Literacy, University of Wollongong, 1988)

The 'package' concept of professional development, whilst initially popular with teachers remains patronising and 'expert' designed. Teachers had little input, control or responsibility for the learning. Outside experts, as the writers of these materials, remained in control, deciding what teachers needed to know and how they should know it.

Each of the strategies within this model demanded cooperation from teachers rather than collaboration between planners, developers and teachers. The level of co-operation was tied to the concept of helping teachers to 'seeing things the way I do' - a controlling manipulative mentality and at worst displayed a lack of trust and respect for teachers and the knowledge that they already had.

These approaches continued to see teachers as technicians rather than professionals. Elliot (1985) described this as a 'narrow technical rational model' which maintained hierarchical control over both teachers, and the creation and distribution of what counts as professional knowledge. Berliner (1980) claimed that there was a 'belief that knowledge generated, while serving to help others, is of less worth than knowledge arrived at by other means' (p.206).

Ebbutt and Elliot (1985) expressed the concern that all the strategies used in this and the previous approach, placed teachers in the subservient role of a disempowered technician. Dillon (1984) warned also that this model perpetuated the social, intellectual and political structure of expertise and therefore fostered dependency and insecurity among learners (p.679).

Many other issues have been raised in relation to significant and sustained educational change. These include the necessary
recognition that change is a gradual and difficult process for teachers and that planners need to be mindful of the extra anxiety and tension that extra workloads bring (Fullan, 1982).

It was strongly recommended that close collaboration should take place between program planners, researchers and teachers (Ward & Tikinoff, 1982) and that personal concerns of teachers should also be addressed (how it would affect them personally).

Although the seventies produced a great deal of research on the process of change and knowledge of effective school organisations, educational bureaucracies continued to be slow to make connections between newly developed theory and teacher growth and development (Boomer, 1990). Fullan (1985) pointed out that generally the research that served to support this model of professional development had failed to shed sufficient light on the process variables and as such did not adequately explain how the change process actually worked.

The concepts of ongoing support, reflection, shared talk, collegiality and the potential of collaboration, although raised by researchers during the eighties, had not been translated into practical strategies for staff development.
The Individual to Co-operative Model

In this model of professional development, the improvement of local practice, the fine-tuning of existing repertoire, is the central focus of action not the production and dissemination of new knowledge:

'Directing attention to knowledge production and utilisation diminishes attention to practice. Building dissemination mechanisms diminishes emphasis on practice' (Stake and Trumbull, 1982, p.4.).

It is a model that encompasses strategies which are concerned with curriculum renewal (Henry, 1981). This individual to co-operative model of professional development is characterised by two specific methodologies or strategies for action. The first involves a process of action researching and the second introduces possibilities for in-school research partnerships.

Unlike the previous models of professional development, the source of the change proposal is the teachers and the pressure for change arises from questions which individuals or groups of teachers have identified as important. Teachers within a school setting are encouraged to identify their own issues and concerns as they arise from practice and implement strategies for change through a systematic and cyclical process of observation, data collection, reflection and then modified action in response to what has been learnt.
Johnson's (1988) label for this model 'Inside collaborative interventionist' presents some dilemmas. If there is intervention then can there also be collaboration - a 'mutuality' between the participants where the status of these participants is equal? The nature of the intervention, Johnson explains, is seen as a negotiated partnership where the teachers know what they need to know and may seek help from a peer or an 'outside' expert (Johnson, 1988). How this partnership develops and how collaboration is defined is unclear.

With the rapidly increasing development of our knowledge about how teachers learn, the boundaries between action research, clinical supervision and interactive research and development are often indistinct and the extent to which any one strategy can be seen as authentically collaborative is difficult to determine.

Whilst there are similarities between these strategies there are also some significant differences. These differences relate to the degree of respect and recognition given to the knowledge that teachers already have and the underlying philosophy which governs the notion of teachers as researchers.

The literature which serves to describe individual and partnership strategies for professional development, described here as the individual to co-operative model, make some implicit assumptions about principles of adult learning and the value and ownership of teacher research. Research on practice is seen to have the potential to confirm and contribute to theory. Professional development is seen as a long term ongoing endeavour, focusing on the school so that professional development can be grounded in the real experiences of teachers in classrooms with their students. It is concerned with teachers' development of their craft knowledge and professional development is perceived as an activity which involves the active participation of both teachers and administrators.

**Strategies and their Theoretical and Research Underpinnings**

The kinds of strategies that both Johnson (1988) and Ingvarson (1987) identified as falling within this category include action
research as a process of classroom inquiry, clinical supervision and interactive research and development.

The characteristics which bind these strategies together relate to a knowledge source which is developed through 'reflection in action', by individual teachers or between 'co-operating pairs' and a learning design which sees the practitioners learning for themselves by systematically reflecting on their practice (Johnson, 1988).

The theoretical and research underpinnings of these strategies and the assumptions upon which they have been developed are intricately interwoven and therefore in continuing this review of literature it seemed more appropriate to simultaneously combine the elements of description and critique.

**Action research:**

Action research as a strategy for teacher growth and development, focuses on a set of procedures that teachers might use to conduct experiments in their own classrooms (Corey, 1953; Wann, 1952).

Unlike other approaches where an emphasis was placed on 'learning from others', this strategy relies heavily on the concept of 'learning for ourselves' using a local site as the basis for problem solving (Ingvarson, 1987). This concept sees teachers being actively involved in the recognition of their own problems and that learning comes from practical action. Learning is based on teachers taking a research stance towards their own practice (Stenhouse, 1975), an approach, however, which Borthwick (1982) suggests may not appeal to all teachers.

Whilst action research was initially seen as an individual activity, the more recent literature reflects the potential that the methodology might have for teachers to work together.

Action research was first conceived by Kurt Lewin (1948), a social psychologist, as a result of work he carried out in community action programs in the 1940's in the United States. Lewin, strongly motivated by practical concerns, used action research as a term to describe a kind of research which brought together "the
experimental approach of social science with programs of social action in response to major social problems of the day" (in Kemmis, 1988, p.29). Lewin argued that it was possible to simultaneously advance theory and social change.

Sandford (1970) described action research as a process of

'... fact-finding, conceptualisation, planning, execution, more fact finding or evaluation; and then a repetition of this whole circle of activities; indeed a spiral of such circles.' (p.4).

This presents action research as a direct plan for a program of social action. It assumes that those directly involved in the social action are the best researching participants at each stage of the cycle.

Lewin (1952) contended that the only way to understand social problems was to be involved in the action, action where the subjects of the research were participants. He decried the notion of the 'disinterested objective observer', suggesting that this was of little value in helping us to understand human concerns and issues.

The procedure of action research is based on two psychological processes: action and reflection. Learning, using action research, is seen as an 'active process of making sense of experience: articulating and building on one's stock of knowledge in such a way that it may inform future action.' (Borthwick, 1982. p.2)

By definition, any approach to teacher development must be founded on a theory of learning. Central to action research is the power of reflection in the learning process.

'To reflect is to look back over what has been done to extract the net meanings which are the capital stock for dealing with further experiences.' (Dewey, 1963. p.87)

More than this, reflection provides opportunities for learners to know what it is that they know, to become metacognitively aware.
'Reflection is self communication. It provides time and focus for (teachers) to reconsider, self correct and modify their thoughts on the hows and whys of their own thinking and learning.' (Bartlett, Barton and Turner, 1989. Bk.3, p.3)

Smyth (1982) argues the importance of having 'a body of teachers who are knowledgeable about themselves as professionals'. He states that teachers 'need to be aware of their own strengths and weaknesses as classroom practitioners, and (who) are able to be reflective and introspective about their teaching and what transpires in their classrooms' (p.332).

Reflection, then, is an essential component of the learning process but not in itself sufficient for developing thinking and reasoning skills. To be able to think critically it is suggested that we need to reflect both inwardly and outwardly (Dillon, 1987, p.708). We need to be objective about our thoughts and they need to be balanced with the realities of life and the world. They have to be based on certain rules, criteria or generality. We have, to a certain extent, to be accountable for our professional thinking which requires the thinking to be reasoned and critical. Whether this can be achieved by individuals working in isolation of others is questionable.

The assumptions upon which action research is based include the notions that:

- teachers are intelligent inquiring learners and have legitimate expertise and experience;

- teachers are inclined to search for data and reflect on the information they gather in order to answer their questions arising from practice;

- by formulating their own questions teachers will develop new understandings (Sparks and Loucks-Horsley, 1990);

- teachers have the capacity to improve their practice by refinement of existing practices without outside help, and that
active participation on the part of the learner insures that involvement and ownership remain a central component of the learning process (Howey, 1981).

Ingvarson (1987) argued, however, that the overarching assumption of any teacher inquiry should involve the,

'......cooperative study by teachers themselves into problems and issues arising from their attempts to make practice consistent with their educational values.....' (p.15)

This notion of co-operation raises a note of discordance about the use of action research. If learning is perceived as a social and interactive process (Kolb, 1984) then the effectiveness of action research is dependent on collaborative action.

Ingvarson (1987) also argues that the action research process is a knowledge generating process, a process of developing knowledge through reflection-in-action and as such 'aims to give greater control over what counts as valid educational knowledge to teachers' (p.17).

It has also been argued that teachers doing research are ill-equipped to carry out such an exacting activity and that research should be limited to academics who have proven skills. Applebee (1987) saw teachers' research as an unnecessary re-invention of the wheel.

Although it is commonly acknowledged that teachers have valuable experience, this experience is still not seen as sufficiently 'in depth' to warrant the creation of new knowledge (Clandinin, 1986). Unfortunately, the value placed on teachers research or craft knowledge has won few accolades from the community and least of all from academics. Hence this kind of research remains low in the social pecking order. With prestige and status comes power and the notion of teachers as researchers challenges the traditional notions of power and authority (Dillon, 1987).

Whilst the advocates of action research argued that, as a strategy for professional development, it valued teacher knowledge and
sought to dissipate traditional expressions of power by encouraging those of us who have direct contact with 'learners', to be more self-reliant by taking control and responsibility for our own learning, it has failed to gain the universal acceptance of university-based researchers. Interactive research and development, as an alternative strategy for cooperation between schools and universities, however, sought to address this problem (Cochran-Smith and Lytle, 1990).

As a research methodology, action research, whilst not conforming with positivist views of scientific truth and credibility, challenges an orthodoxy not only about the role of the social scientist but also the function and purpose of researchers.

The notion of teachers as researchers has raised epistemological questions about the traditional view of the nature of knowledge: what kind of research knowledge counts, and political questions to do with the 'value' and 'ownership' of research knowledge: whose research knowledge counts (Dillon, 1987). What constitutes knowledge or what is considered 'valued' knowledge by the teacher or by others and whether this knowledge is private or public form the heart of the debate about the notion of teachers as researchers.

Dillon (1987) suggested that the answers to the epistemological questions are determined by the research tradition one favours. Lincoln and Guba (1985) describe the rationalist as believing that the knower and the known are separate and that knowledge is a separate entity, a thing or an object outside and separate from the learner/knower. Knowledge in this case is public and therefore objective which provides the necessary 'external standards of validity.' Knowledge within this tradition is viewed as explanatory, intellectual and objective (Dillon, 1987. p.707).

In contrast, a naturalistic or transactional view of research sees knowledge and the knower as interactive, inseparable and where participants influence one another (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). In this case, Dillon (1987) points out, knowledge is not only intellectual but also emotional, intuitive and physical in an holistic fashion (p.707). This view would contend that we can be 'both subject and object of our knowing, an active participant engaged in the process of knowing as well as in the construction and reflection of our knowing. We can
be consciously aware of the simultaneous and interrelatedness of these processes both inwardly and outwardly' (Dillon, 1987, p.708). In this case, standards of validity are internal, based upon our experiences and the way we value, shape and develop them.

These differing views of research knowledge are based upon our own personal view of the world which includes whether we believe in standards and absolutes or whether we believe that responsibility and control of learning and subsequent knowledge about teaching are held externally or internally to the school.

Political issues related to ways of knowing are inextricably linked to issues of prestige, status and hierarchy. The politics of knowledge that are an outcome of a traditionally scientific notion of knowledge and do not sit comfortably with notions of collaboration especially if these are to extend past the boundaries of school organisations.

During the past few years with greater credibility being attributed to naturalistic and interpretive methods of educational enquiry (Stake, 1975; Wolcott, 1977; Partlett and Hamilton, 1976; Kemmis, 1988), educational researchers have been encouraged to define and examine the problems expressed by practitioners in a different and more useful way. A research emphasis on practicality has raised the legitimacy of practitioners being considered legitimate researchers through a process of critical self-reflection, a process that provides,

'.....workable procedures through which aspirations of critical theory might be realised......, a process for organisation of enlightenment in communities bound by common interests....(and who participate in a)....democratic process for social and intellectual reconstruction.' (Kemmis, 1988, p.36)

Advocates of action research have laid claim that such an approach emancipates and empowers teachers by valuing the teacher as a professional and as a researcher. Teachers, it is believed, are able to make their own decisions about the nature of change, what action is needed and make their own decisions about what and how things
should be done. Action research acknowledges teachers as creators of knowledge.

Action research was, however, until recently, an orthodoxy and as such had little flexibility. It was said to only provide small insights into what was going on in the classroom (Ingvarson, 1987) and did not recognise that an outside expert, alongside a teacher, might be able to contribute to the generation of new knowledge. Possibilities for cooperation and collaboration were limited to teachers or school administrators.

Since the university-based advocates for action research have begun to work alongside teachers, the recent literature indicates that these partnerships are developing new possibilities for action research which, to a large extent, respond to many of the major criticisms levelled at this strategy for teacher change.

The merits of action research as an approach to professional development, as well as educational research, however, are obvious. Action research was the first strategy for professional development that sought to link the development of theory and practice by teachers themselves, having as its focus the issues and concerns of those involved and where the practitioners became an integral part of the investigations.

It is interesting to note that recent publications on action research include far more articles written by teachers themselves and that many of these address issues to do with co-operation and collaboration.

Furthermore, reports of specific action research projects in schools in Victoria indicate that there may be roles that outsiders can play and that collaborative action between teachers and others based on a more equal status, may be possible. Borthwick (1982) talks of a new perspective to action research, one which is characterised by a collaborative process of research into, and the development of, practice by practitioners (p.384).
Clinical supervision:

Clinical supervision is another strategy that fits neatly into this 'school' model of professional development. Most of the literature on clinical supervision emanates almost exclusively from North America. The mainstream literature reflects a technocratic and positivist approach that links supervision to the assessment of teacher efficiency. It is a management technology and its primary purpose is concerned with the improvement of student instruction (Neagley and Evans, 1970).

Retallick (1988) describes the function of clinical supervision as a 'mechanism of bureaucratic and ideological control over the actions of teachers' (p.3). Within this definition, teachers are seen as passive recipients of management directives and clinical supervision then becomes the process by which instruction can be managed and controlled.

Thew (1987) suggests, however, that when supervision can be oriented towards professional development rather than supervision, then a more collaborative and collegial approach is likely to be more successful (p.134). Unfortunately he does not make it clear what he means by 'successful' and it would seem that the structural dimensions of power and control still remain, therefore collaboration, an act of mutualism, seems improbable.

As a strategy for professional development then, the term "clinical supervision" is problematic. Whilst the structure of school organisations remain hierarchical, then clinical supervision seems unlikely to be useful in helping teachers to take control and responsibility for their own learning.

Moore and Mattaliano (1970) identify three main purposes of clinical supervision as follows:

- to help teachers to solve problems that arise naturally from their classroom practice;

- to assist teachers to understand their practice so that they may be more aware of their teaching strengths and weaknesses, and
to assist teachers to 'scientifically view .... (their) teaching so ...
(their) outward teaching behaviours are synchronised with ....
(their) own inward intent.' (p.3)

These purposes raise a number of other anomalies not only about the philosophical basis of clinical supervision but also what it says about how teachers learn. The process of clinical supervision is invariably described in quasi-scientific terms, suggesting that the underlying process is based on a scientific paradigm. Mosher (1972) describes a 'scientific view' of teaching as resulting from the teacher and the supervisor formulating hypotheses or predictions, based on their experience and then testing these against the actual teaching that takes place.

Use of the terms 'assist' and 'help' rather than 'facilitate' or 'support' would tend to indicate that the level of 'collaboration' is somewhat lopsided and that the relationship is not based on one of equality and respect for the knowledge that the teacher may already have but rather one of amiable cooperation.

In 1985 the Minister for Education in New South Wales presented a report entitled Quality Education - Teacher Efficiency. This report was circulated to all schools in the State. It advocated that all teachers should be assessed annually and suggested that 'the monitoring and assessment of teacher efficiency should be done largely through the supervision processes by executive staff as a component of professional development'. However, 'efficiency' was not described and the report was rejected by the State's teachers in the following year.

Despite the seemingly inappropriate underpinnings of this strategy for professional development, many researchers have argued that clinic supervision has the potential to be something other than clinical or managerial. Goldhammer (1969) and Cogan (1973) attempted to create a new style of supervision. As Cogan explains 'clinical supervision is conceptualised as the interaction of peers and colleagues. It is not unilateral action taken by the supervisor and aimed at the teacher.' (p.11) Despite these intentions, reports of the process in action have not supported this.
Smyth (1982) suggests that like action research, the intention of this strategy is the development of teachers' craft knowledge. He argues that it is a strategy that is concerned with helping teachers to utilise teaching to locate, diagnose and attend to concerns within their own teaching.

But what does this process do about the 'intentions' or belief systems that teachers already have? Does it assist teachers to develop, refine or modify their beliefs about either teaching or learning and how does this actually happen?

Weller (1971) described the process of clinical supervision as systematic cycles of planning, observing, data collection and intensive analysis of actual teaching through a series of conferences. This 'process' would seem to be its strongest and most useful feature although Smyth (1982) described it as a cycle that 'represents a closed loop pattern of activities or procedures..... (and may be) limited by the experiential background of the participants and their individual introspective prowess'(p.337).

The focal point of Weller's description of the process, however, is the conferences that are conducted between the teacher and the supervisor, both before (at the planning stage) and after the teaching. Using the collected data, these conferences focus on the teachers' intent and the links that can be made to their belief system and to see how effectively intent and action compare.

Built into this model is the concept of 'transformation' which involves the 'presentation' to teachers of new ways of working (Goldhammer, Anderson and Krajewaki, 1980). But it is the supervisor who does the presenting and suggesting. It is believed that this process of clinical supervision will allow the teacher to see how these tentative propositions weigh up against their own beliefs. The teachers are then in a position to make their own decision about whether to adopt or reject the proposal (Fernstermacher, 1980. p.131).

Most of the literature on clinical supervision from America concentrates largely upon 'demonstrating the superiority of the clinical mode over traditional modes of supervision (Smyth, 1978;
Boulet, 1980). Research studies report that clinical supervision has the potential to change teacher behaviours (Garman, 1971; Kerr, 1976; Shrak, 1973) and that teacher attitudes towards the strategy are more positive because of the changed relationship between themselves and their supervisors (Eaker, 1972; Reavis, 1976).

Much of the literature presented on clinical supervision is largely offered by academic researchers or by 'supervisors' and based on American conditions. Little seems to have been written by the 'recipients' of clinical supervision - the teacher.

One report, however, by a teacher in Victoria, made a number of illuminating observations during the process which highlighted the inequalities of the relationship between supervisor and teacher and made it plain that the role of the supervisor was clearly perceived as 'friendly' supervision.

Although often argued to the contrary, this model is one of 'expert' working with novice. McCoombe (1982), the teacher in question, reported in his diary about his own seeking of approval from the supervisor during the teaching process and described the conference which followed as one which is aimed at 'detecting andremedying any areas of weakness.' (p.155)

McCoombe (1982), went on to outline what he felt were the strengths and weaknesses of clinical supervision. He outlined the strengths as providing the opportunity for teachers to 'see' their own performance, to use self analysis for self improvement and to interact more closely and develop a closer working relationship with the supervisor. One of the most interesting observations, however, was a comment made about the involvement of principals and administrators. He wrote, 'it provides a tangible opportunity for administrators to show teachers that they are concerned about their professional development, by actually doing something' (p.156). Indeed a positive feature.

Of the weaknesses, McCoombe (1982) suggested that teachers who need this kind of professional development do not necessarily want to be involved. He also found that the process was very time consuming. In America 'supervisors were specially trained to carry
out the process of clinical supervision which made it an extremely costly approach to implement in schools (Smyth, 1978. p.28). McCoombe suggests that supervisors in Australian contexts also needed specific training on how to gather and analyse data and in the area of 'skill development and counselling' (p.155).

McCoombe finally made mention of the general lack of specific definitions and ways to 'measure' such things as instructional improvement or 'good' teaching. The lack of opportunity to call in people from outside was also considered to be problematic which indicates its rather inflexible structure.

Gagne (1980) suggests that clinical supervision might be improved if a collaborative partnership between teachers and outsiders could be developed to allow them to work together to design better ways of trialling new ideas. But again, whose ideas was he referring to? It would seem that although the beliefs and practices of teachers were acknowledged there was also an assumption that these could be improved with the assistance of 'informed experts'.

The literature on both action research and clinical supervision, whilst suggesting that notions of collegiality and collaboration are compatible with the theoretical underpinnings of each methodology, it did little to describe the actual nature of the collaborative process nor what was involved in the development of collaborative roles and relationships.

**Interactive research and development:**

By the mid-seventies, researchers had become increasingly conscious of their failure to communicate with school personnel (Baine and Gooseclose, 1979; Odell, 1976; Rainey, 1972, 1973; Shalaway and Lanier, 1979; Travers, 1976). Closer collaboration between universities and schools was seen as necessary to overcome this dilemma. The United States Department of Education decided to fund two important 'collaborative' research projects. The first, a project between teachers and university staff, initiated by the Institute for Research and Teaching at Michigan State University.
This project involved teachers as clinicians. Teachers were withdrawn from their classrooms for a period each week to work with university staff. This project took on board the concept of parity within the relationship, although it is questionable how this was realised. This project, however, led to a greater understanding of the nature and complexities of teaching and served to strengthen the relevance of research to practice (Porter, 1990).

The second project grew out of an extended view of action research as a methodology for staff development. Tikunoff and Ward (1983) at the Far West Laboratory for Education Research and Development, conceptualised the idea of Interactive Research and Development (IR & D). This third strategy, grew out of the strengths and limitations of the other strategies included in this model. It was initially based on a process of action research and attempted to redefine its possibilities for professional development without using labels from the past and by creating a new way of talking about teachers as learners and collaborative enterprise.

Until this time university-based researchers had been active in developing a body of knowledge about teaching but little attention had been given to the repertoire that the teachers already had and the role that they might play in generating or creating a new knowledge base. It was recognised that the principle actors in teaching, the teachers, had little opportunity to speak and less opportunity to become part of the literature on teaching or their own learning (Cochran-Smith and Lytle, 1990).

The concept of action research as a methodology was thought to provide an appropriate union between teachers and university researchers, a valuable framework for collaborative team work. It was thought that teams of in-school personnel and other outside experts could work co-operatively on issues and concerns that teachers themselves identified. The main role of external participants, however, was to provide 'expertise' in the conduct of the research and to give 'advice' on the appropriate development of research product (Sparks & Loucks-Horsley, 1990, p.247). Was this to extend some credibility to teachers as researchers?
Informal settings, however, provided opportunities for these teams to share resources, gain new knowledge, provide support and the opportunity for voluntary participation. Little (1984) reports that these team projects showed 'the potential power of people working together to learn, to support, to practice new skills and attitudes and to improve schools and the relationships among the people in them.' (Little, 1984, p.15)

The projects associated with interactive research and development on teaching placed an emphasis on the teacher and the classroom. Unlike the other strategies, however, this approach to professional development stressed the importance of the social interactions within the school. The teachers and their world and work become the starting points for improving schools and this had important implications for staff development. Professional development strategies took on a 'life-centred' orientation of adult learning, sharing and group interaction (Knowles, 1978).

Tikunoff, Ward and Griffin (1979) reported on a study of two teams consisting of four teachers, a researcher and a staff developer. From this study six features were noted as important in interactive research. These features related to the mixed composition of the group, the collective decision-making regarding the research questions and data collection, the importance of teachers' identification of issues and problems, the need for knowledge production and use, the classroom focus and finally the recognition of the research and development as an 'intervention' approach to professional development. Does not the use of this descriptor 'intervention' again say something significant about the nature of the collaboration?

This study was considered 'successful' although it was stated that not both teams were able to produce 'rigorous and useful research and development' (Lieberman, 1986). Again what constitutes 'success' or 'rigorous and useful research' was not explained but indicates that maybe the action of the team was a 'co-operative enterprise' rather than a collaborative one. For instance, did the researchers have questions too or was their role simply to provide technical support on the research process and what were the outcomes for each of the different stakeholders?
Reports of teachers being able to do 'research on their own behalf' as a valued outcome, however, indicated a lack of equality in these partnerships (Tikunoff & Ward, 1983).

The findings of the Tikunoff, Ward and Griffin (1979) study were used by Lieberman and her colleagues to develop and refine understandings of the possibilities associated with collaborative research (Lieberman, 1986; Watts, 1985; Sparks, 1983; Glickman, 1986; Glatthorn, 1987 and Sparks & Simmons, 1988). Although initially their projects focused on teacher problems, problems associated with the school were also explored (Griffin, Leiberman & Noto, 1982).

One of the outcomes of these projects was the presentation of a step-by-step guide for collaborative research (Hovda and Kyle, 1984; Glatthorn, 1987). The emphasis here, however, was on making the research task easier rather than guidelines on the development of collaborative action.

Some of these studies, however, raised important questions related to the nature of collaborative action. Questions relating to issues of parity, the roles played by the participants and their personalities were considered to contribute significantly to the sustained interest and commitment of the participants (Lieberman, 1986).

In a one-year study of urban schools in America, Little (1982) examined the organisational characteristics that were conducive to continued 'learning on the job'. Successfully schools were observed to be ones where,

'.....teachers valued and participated in norms of collegiality and continuous improvement; they pursued a greater range of professional interactions with fellow teachers or administrators, including talk about instruction, structured observation and shared planning or preparation' (p.325).

Little, in her investigation of collegiality, was particularly interested in 'the nature of role definitions, the shape of role relationships and the degree to which existing role expectations


permit or encourage teachers' professional development (p.326).

This study provided valuable insights into the nature of interaction. Little concluded that focus and concreteness, relevance, reciprocity, inclusivity and the characteristics of the participants themselves (status, knowledge and skill and social or role competence) and the organisational structure of the school largely determined the qualities of the interaction between the staff (p.335-338).

Interactive research and development projects as well as raising critical questions about the nature of collaborative action, heralded a move towards the notion of the building communities of learners as an approach to professional development.

A few questions about interactive research and development as a strategy for professional development, however, still remain. Was the purpose of the partnerships between schools and universities an attempt by the tertiary sector to provide credibility to teacher research, a control of reliability or did the university personnel accept the informal methodologies that teachers themselves were developing?

Did this approach provide teachers with a greater public voice? Many of the research findings from interactive research and development projects were published in the Handbook of Research on Teaching in 1986 (Wittrock, 1986). It is interesting to note, however, that none of these were written by teachers (Cochran-Smith and Lytle, 1990). Did the university staff involved in supposedly collaborative projects really understand the concept of collaboration?

It is the literature that responds to the questions raised by Lieberman (1986) which suggests a need for change in our approach to professional development. The notion of a workable process of professional development coupled with the notion of collaboration is most powerful; collaboration built on new role definitions, that allows for genuine 'shared talk', 'shared work', 'shared contexts', 'shared observations' and a problem solving approach to the concerns and issues that teachers identify as immediately important to them.
It is the literature that focuses on these notions that provides the basis for identifying and describing a fourth model of professional development.
The Collaborative Model

The Context and Nature of the Change Proposal

During the eighties the notion of teachers as researchers had blossomed. By the end of the eighties researchers and teachers in literacy and language learning, both here in Australia and overseas, had found new ways to explore and describe language learners at work. The distinctions attributed to the differences between 'big R' and 'little r' research have all but disappeared and been replaced by an integrated notion of teaching, development and research.

This model of professional development naturally evolved from the previous model and particularly from interactive research and development projects. This model, then, is not about teachers being professionally developed by external agencies nor about learning how to become researchers in the traditional sense but rather about a change in the culture of teaching. It is a model of transaction rather than transmission and sees teachers more determined to take control of their own destinies by taking a greater responsibility for their own growth and development.

Teachers are now generating their own questions about teaching and going about finding their own answers to the refinement of their practice. However, there is an implicit demand that requires teachers to re-examine their assumptions and beliefs about language learning and teaching (Cambourne, 1989). Fullan (1991) expresses well this double headed purpose of change.
'Educational change depends on what teachers do and think - it's as simple and as complex as that.' (p.117)

This implicit demand of changed 'thinking' is a reflection of the dramatic paradigm shift which has changed our perceptions about learning and our role in the teaching and learning processes.

Fullan (1991) points out that professional development is no longer about the implementation of single innovations but about a change in the culture of teaching as well as the development of a new school culture. Fullan stresses that if this is to happen then 'everyone is implicated' (p.143). Collaboration between all stakeholders in the administration and conduct of education must be involved in the development of these new cultures and change must be a shared responsibility (DEET, 1988).

This model reflects initiatives that have forged closer communication and working relationships between schools, tertiary institutions, regional administrations, curriculum developers and consultants (Harste, 1990; Olson, 1990). It is a model that encourages these stakeholders to engage in shared problem solving and 'learning about the craft of learning as well as teaching' (Boomer and Torr, 1987, p.6.). It emphasises the need for all those involved to be active learners and to work together in ways that not only create new knowledge about teaching and learning but support whole school renewal (Jaggar, 1989).

The discourse of the literature reveals changing attitudes towards the knowledge and professionalism of teachers and the important role that teachers can play in the development of new knowledge about language teaching and learning (Strickland, 1988). 'Outsiders' are learning to work with teachers rather than on teachers. The literature then, highlights the professionalism of teaching, the demystifying of research and the empowerment of teachers.

Theorists are working in real classrooms using naturalistic research methodologies with teachers to extend both theoretical and practical knowledge about language teaching and learning (Harste, Burke and Woodward, 1984; Bissex, 1980, 1987; Calkins, 1983). The focus of research is 'learning' rather than teachers (Avery, 1990).
Ways of conducting research, ways of teaching and ways of learning about teaching now have the same goals; the empowerment of all who participated, students, teachers and others concerned in literacy and language learning.

There are few labelled strategies that can be attributed to this model of professional development as stakeholders are finding their own ways of researching. However, it is within this model that the 'Teacher as Co-researcher', as a methodology for staff development seems to fit most comfortably.

The literature, whether from Australia or overseas, reveals a number of interrelated concepts. These concepts include the effects that a change in research paradigm has had on new methods of inquiry and the notion of teaching as a natural research process. Further it describes some of the characteristics of the collaborative enterprise including 'voice, conversation and community' (Harste, 1990), and their relationship to the development of new learning partnerships. Finally, albeit in a limited way, the literature provides some insights into issues related to the nature of the relationships within collaborative enterprises.

Concepts that describe collaborative action

A definition: The literature on collaborative enterprise as an approach to professional development is plentiful but the interpretations of how collaboration works is limited. Many professional development initiatives reported, whilst based on principles of collaboration, still remain examples of amiable co-operation. Dawe (1989) identifies these different potentials in the following way.

'In the one, it is a tool of teacher empowerment and professional enhancement, bringing colleagues and their expertise together to generate critical yet also practically-grounded reflection on what they do as a basis for wiser, more skilled action. In the other, the breakdown of teacher isolation is a mechanism designed to facilitate the smooth and uncritical adoption of preferred forms of action (new teaching styles) introduced and imposed by
experts from elsewhere, in which teachers become technicians rather than professionals exercising discretionary judgement. (p.7)

It is these contradictory forms of collaboration that separate this model from the previous one. This model reflects a move towards a refined definition of 'collaborative action' based on a concept of 'mutualism' (Paterson & Stansell, 1987, p.720).

Erickson (1989) described collaboration thus:

'Collaboration means working together in ways that exchange mutual help. The help that is exchanged must be genuine, not just action that looks like help-going through the motions of being mutually helpful.' (p.431)

Erickson (1989) also uses a metaphor to describe collaborative action by likening it to a set of actors where each holds different pieces of the same puzzle. Fullan adds another dimension to this definition by describing a vision of teachers as 'continuous learners in a community of learners.' (1991, p.142) In this way he places teacher growth and development as an integral part of whole school improvement.

The concept of 'mutualism' which is seen as the essence of effective collaboration, is said only to occur when all participants benefit from the partnership. (Paterson & Stansell, 1987, p.720).

In the reports of collaborative enterprise the extent to which collaborative relationships reflect this mutualism is difficult to determine.

Changes in research methodology: Strickland (1988) reports that university-based academics have developed a number of new research interests and an increased desire to conduct research in naturalistic settings, based on increased knowledge about the context-specific nature of teaching and learning (Green and Wallat, 1978; Cook-Gumperz and Gumperz, 1976; Erickson and Shultz, 1977; Harste, Burke and Woodward, 1984). A specific interest in 'process', how teaching and learning takes place, has dictated that investigations take place in their natural settings, the classroom.
A naturalistic or transactional stance towards collaborative educational inquiry works on the assumption that education involves a complex network of transactions in which participants come together in specific contexts for a variety of different purposes (Harste, Woodward & Burke 1984; Rosenblatt, 1985). During these transactions participants affect and are affected by one another and by the context itself, becoming different people than they were before (Patterson & Stansell, 1987).

**Teaching as research: research as practice:** With the increase in popularity of naturalistic research methodology, where prolonged observations are required, the teacher has assumed a central role in the research process and recognition of their importance and value as an investigator, is being more widely acknowledged (Strickland, 1988; Santa, 1990). Strickland (1988) suggests that this has caused us to reflect more carefully about the notion of teachers and students working together as learners and the potential of the concept of *teaching as research* (Strickland, 1988).

This concept reflects an expanding view of what is meant by teaching, learning and research and thus what is meant by teaching as research as distinct from teachers as researchers described in the previous model. **Research as practice** sees staff development as an integral part of the natural day to day life of the classroom, where all stakeholders may be participants in the learning process. With this perception of staff development, research ceases to be perceived as a separate activity (Strickland, 1988).

Research-as-practice has provided valuable new insights for teachers and learners and the outcome of this collaboration generates not only new ways of teaching but also new ways of knowing.

Research as practice allows teachers to use strategies which form parallels between the conditions that support children as they learn to complete difficult learning tasks and those that support teachers as they strive to be successful learners (Badger and Cormack, 1987).
The focus and direction of teacher inquiry is the student learning. Through close observation of students as learners - 'kid watching' (Goodman, 1978) and an increasing recognition of the value of students as informants (Coughlan, 1988) the necessity of rigid and inflexible research methodologies was no longer considered appropriate.

It is these changed views of teaching and learning that has the potential to develop a **new culture of teaching** as well as a **new school culture**.

**Characteristics of collaborative enterprise**

Harste (1990), suggests that there are three fundamental principles of this new movement towards collaborative action. He describes these as 'voice, conversation and community' (p.vii).

**Voice:** Harste (1990) suggests that:

> 'Too frequently, education seems better at silencing children and teachers than it is to listening to them. 
> ....... The role of schools in a democracy is not to silence voices, but to hear from them. Education begins with the notion of voice.' (p. vii)

In becoming the focus of teacher inquiry, 'learners' have provided a new source of knowledge about teaching and learning. The learner reacts and responds to and informs the teacher about their practice. The teacher observes, responds and raises further questions about what is happening with both the teaching and learning process (Comber and Hancock, 1987).

As a consequence of many new kinds of collaborative partnerships, educators are finding new ways of talking about teaching and learning. Teachers are finding their own professional voice, voices that until now have been unheard. They are talking freely and openly about what they are doing and how they are attending to their own professional needs. They are now being heard at national and international conferences and their discoveries are being shared through professional journals and books. Professional organisations
too have been legitimising this professional voice by making available funds for teachers to embark on educational enquiry in their classrooms. (Strickland, 1988)

Harste (1990) insists that collaborative enterprise is about supporting teachers in the development of their own voices. He argues that education can only be enriched by hearing new voices and it is these new voices from which new conversations can begin. Knowledge, he points out is 'socially created through conversation.' (p.viii)

**Conversation:** Pablo Freire (1975) has long advocated the power of open dialogue between teachers and students, an honest dialogue with each person trying to understand the other's understandings, and each being influenced by the understanding and learning of the other. As a result of this open dialogue between teachers and their students, practice is constantly being reflected upon, refined and extended and both teacher and student maintain ownership of the learning agendas.

'Education begins when learners ask questions and then begin to talk.' (Harste, 1990, p.viii) Social dialogue is essential for learning.

'Talking about research, theory and practice permits us to examine our theories and beliefs and helps to clarify our thinking. Making our ideas explicit through discussion can lead to a fuller understanding of things that we had previously known only intuitively' (Jaggar, 1989, p.76).

'Moreover, language makes it possible for us to think about what we know and to take conscious responsibility for it, reshaping it for new purposes and taking a critical attitude to it' (Barnes, 1978, p.156).

Collaboration allows for shared discussion and reflection, the sharing of ideas and expertise and the making of connections between new and old ideas. Britton (1982), however, makes the point that,
'There are great opportunities for us, provided that we see that interactive learning applies to teachers as well as to those we teach; provided we see our role as helping each other to theorise from our own experience, and build our own rationale and convictions. For it is only when we are theorizing from our own experiences that we can, selectively, take and use others people's theories' (p.214).

This indicates the importance and power of talk in helping teachers to uncover their assumptions and beliefs about language teaching and learning and to understand the extent to which these drive their actions in the classrooms. Having been made explicit, learners are better able to modify change or refine them.

**Community:** The notion of community relates to the community of the school and those can be created between schools and between schools and other communities.

Harste (1990) maintains that,

>'Strong communities are forged by hearing many voices, by engaging in new conversations, and by knowing the particular strengths and differences of individual members. It is when the strengths and differences of community members are known and explored that they become a resource for re-searching.....' (p.viii).

At the end of Fullan's most recent book *The New Meaning of Change* (1991), he insists that unless both individuals and institutions join together to get into 'the change business' and create a new profession of teaching, a new culture, then school renewal is impossible (p.354).

Many new partnerships have been reported. These partnerships involve many different stakeholders who, in assuming different kinds of roles, are creating new possibilities for learning (Asher, 1987). As well as teachers working with children as research collaborators in the classroom and teachers working with their peers, reports of other relationships are emerging as follows:
teacher educators working alongside college undergraduates (Robinson and Saberton, 1985);

- schools working with private enterprise (Lundin, 1988);

- schools and school districts forming productive liaisons (Cronk and Crowther, 1988);

- national and inter-systemic co-operative planning for professional development (Kidston, 1988);

- colleges working with education departments (South Australian College of Advanced Education with the South Australian Education Department, 1987-8);

- teachers working with college graduates and undergraduates (Schwartz, 1988; Troen & Boles, 1988) and

- university based researchers collaborating with teachers or administrators (Kyle and McCutcheon, 1984; Oakes, 1985; Comber and Hancock, 1987; McKernan, 1988).

For example, in a study conducted at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, the notion of learning partnerships was explored with graduate and undergraduate students. It had been observed that students naturally formed into small groups or dyads and so it was decided to formalise this by turning it into an opportunity to learn with and from a peer. This learning partnership, as described by Robinson and Saberton (1985), involved a peer relationship between two people for whom the main objective was learning. They suggested that learning was predominantly a relational activity that involved a peer partnership, partnerships that were based on the equal status of the participants.

Erickson (1989) points out that professional development can only be effective 'if practice in teaching is to be improved in ways that are fundamental and enduring' (p.431). It has also been found that collaboration between teachers and students and between teachers and other teachers results in high levels of trust, mutual respect (Erickson, 1989; Oaks, 1985), risk taking and a pervading
expectation that learning and development will take place for all participants in the process (Little, 1983; Erickson, 1989). These kinds of responses to collaborative action are essential if communities of learners are to be developed and sustained.

The nature of collaborative relationships

Whilst the literature provides abundant examples of collaborative enterprise, Little (1982) has stressed the importance of addressing issues related to the nature of the collaborative relationship itself. Little suggests that notions of parity, role definitions and responsibilities need to be examined and that participants responses to these issues will determine the extent of the effectiveness of the collaboration.

Reciprocity and status: Little (1982), as part of her research into the nature of school as a workplace, noted that interactions between teachers about teaching should be seen as a 'reciprocal' process, even if the people involved were of different status (teacher and principal). The notion of 'reciprocity' is a useful descriptor for collaboration. Reciprocity, Little (1989) suggested, means 'equality of effort by the parties involved (and) in part, equal humility in the face of the complexity of the task, and of the limits of one's own understanding' (p.335). She goes on to say that reciprocity is about 'deference, a manner of acting and speaking' (p.335).

Responsibilities and role definitions: It has been noted that with the development of new partnerships, educators are changing their perceptions about responsibilities for professional development and the nature of the roles and relationships that they might play. It has been suggested that effective collaboration is dependent upon participants taking responsibility for their own learning and new roles and relationships (Hannay and Stevens, 1985; Kyle and McCutcheon, 1984).

A shift in responsibility for and control of professional development sees school communities and teachers being more involved in their own professional lives (Dillon, 1988). Allen and his colleagues (1988) noted that teachers are identifying their own concerns and
problems, developing their own strategies for coping with these and going about finding their own resources and support. Teachers are taking a greater responsibility in decided what they want and how they want to go about their own development (p.375).

In a study of classroom practices and the process of change in one school district in Canada, a group of teachers, using a strategy which they called 'learning partnerships', reported that this responsibility did not, as is more customary, result from an administrator declared crisis, a decree for curriculum reform or increased teacher effectiveness, but rather evolved from a group of teachers taking control of their own development. They were not 'empowered' to take action. Action, they observed, came out of their own insights about teaching and learning, and their need to articulate and share with others their experiences and perceptions about their own needs. (Allen, et al., 1988).

Assumptions and Critique

'The capacity to bring about change and the capacity to bring about improvement are two different matters. Change is everywhere, progress is not. The more things change the more they remain the same, if we do not learn our lessons that a different mind-and-action-set is required.' (Fullan, 1991, p.345)

This model of professional development presents a 'different mind-and-action-set'. It provides a more wholistic approach to educational reform.

Whilst the previous model worked on an assumption that teachers did not need outside help, this model recognises the potential of combining different sources of knowledge to create new craft knowledge and theory about teaching and learning.

However, it assumes that all teachers are happy to share, trust and collaborate with their peers and other stakeholders in the education process. It assumes that teachers want to identify and work on problems to do with their own practice and that schools naturally generate the appropriate atmosphere of trust which is seen as
essential for the development of effective collaborative partnerships. It also implies that collaboration is an approach which has the potential to be effective for all teachers despite the argument that teachers respond to change in different ways (Doyle and Ponder, 1977).

As an interested and concerned reader of new professional learning initiatives, one is struck by the sense of euphoria that surrounds reports of collaborative enterprise. There is a strong sense of enthusiasm and hope that pervades these reports of successful enterprise but there are still many unanswered questions about how collaboration actually works and the strategies we might employ to improve our ability to work in partnerships with others.

This model of professional development is not just an invitation to stakeholders in the education process to engage in collaborative inquiry but also a vision of what might be. In this case it is about the development of a new culture of teaching and a new culture for schools (Fullan, 1991). Because of the visionary element of this model there remain many unanswered questions. However, this model does represent a call to educators to humanise teaching and learning by improving the nature of the relationships we have with each other and the ways in which we interact. It represents a special image of the world which sees hope for 'a new literacy for teachers and a renewed profession', where teachers and students and other interested and concerned stakeholders will be 'collaboratively empowered and democracy enhanced' (Harste, 1990, p.viii).

In looking to the future Fullan (1991) identifies six themes which he believes are central to a new emerging paradigm and a new mindset for managing and for planning change. These include:

- 'from negative to positive politics;
- from monolithic to alternative solutions;
- from innovations to institutional development;
- from going it alone to alliances;
- from neglect to deeper appreciation of the change process and
- from "if only" to "if I" or "if we." (p.347)

Fullan suggests that these themes have the potential to create new mind sets which will create the necessary new cultures to support and develop change proposals (p.352-354).
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Logic of Research Design

This study set out to conduct a 'responsive evaluation' of a specific strategy of professional development called Teacher as Co-researcher (TACOR) by inquiring into the dynamic nature of the collaborative process, finding out what the process looked like, what happened and how it worked, and to evaluate the strategy's impact on the participants.

In an experimental research paradigm there is concern for controlled environments, the apriori formulation of hypotheses or the judgement of success or failure against some predetermined standard. These elements would not provide the interpretive accounts that were sought in this study.

The Teacher as Co-researcher process involves the active collaboration of educators exploring issues and concerns that arise from normal everyday teaching and learning activities in the classroom. It is a process which revolves around the interactions between people operating in a particular social and cultural context, where the researcher is simultaneously a participant and an observer and where the research is both a phenomenon and a method.

Because of the nature of both the phenomenon and the process of TACOR, a naturalistic paradigm was considered to be theoretically and conceptually most appropriate in achieving the purposes of this study. The axioms upon which naturalistic enquiry is based recognise the existence of multiple realities that are intangible and holistic, that the evaluator may be a participant in the process under observation, that the inquiry is value bound, that the study is context specific and that action is best described in terms of multiple interacting factors. These elements provided the most appropriate framework for the development of an interpretive account of the Teacher as Co-researcher process.
There are a number of characteristic postures of naturalistic enquiry that have particular relevance to the methodology of this study. These include the use of human as instrument where the tacit as well as propositional knowledge is recognised and utilised; the emergent nature of the research design which expects hypotheses to be generated and revised and where substantive theory is grounded in the data that has emerged from, in this case, a collaborative enterprise. Furthermore naturalistic inquiry focuses on natural settings.

Use of a naturalistic paradigm of enquiry commits the researcher to a certain set of methodological procedures or tools because of the axioms upon which it is based. These include procedures which are also consistent with responsive evaluation. Multiple data gathering methods and sources (observation, interview, fieldnotes and documents) make for a more flexible and responsive research design and enable the researcher and the participants to engage in a continuous process of collaborative rethinking, reshaping and reflecting. This provides opportunity for new questions to be raised and new sources of data to be identified.

The hallmark of good experimental research is dependent on the extent to which measures of validity, reliability and objectivity have been ensured and maintained. These concepts are not congruent with a naturalistic paradigm therefore Lincoln and Guba (1985) have proposed some analogous concepts that are compatible with naturalistic enquiry and these describe the way that trustworthiness can be ensured. They include the concepts of credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). These measures of credibility and trustworthiness form an integral part of the ongoing inquiry process and are of prime importance in the study.

Naturalistic inquiry provides the conceptual umbrella under which the model of responsive evaluation sits. The axioms of naturalistic enquiry provide the framework in which a process of responsive evaluation can operate. The methods and process are congruent.

This specific model of evaluation was pioneered by Stake (1975) and over the past two decades has been further extended and refined by

Stake (1975) describes responsive evaluation in this way:

'Responsive evaluation is less reliant on formal communication, more reliant on natural communication. It is evaluation based on what people do naturally to evaluate things: they observe and react. It is dependent upon subjective perceptions and ignores causes. Its orientation is more to program activities than to program intents as it responds to audience requirements for information, and if different value perspectives of the people at hand are referred to in reporting the success and failure of the program'. (p.292)

Its design is emergent and uses many of the informal qualitative methods of investigation common to case study methodology and seeks to perform a service:

'It is an approach that sacrifices some precision in measurement, hopefully to increase the usefulness of the findings to persons in and around the program' (Stake, 1980, p.76).

Stake (1980) suggests that use of case study methodology gives readers vicarious experience of the evaluand in context. Because of the emergent quality of responsive evaluation, the evaluators are encouraged to respond to the emerging issues as well as those which may have originally initiated the action.

The methodology of a responsive evaluation is governed by a number of elements related to its advance organisers, its audience, its purpose and the anticipated outcomes. These elements are consistent with the axioms associated with naturalistic inquiry and are pivotal to this study. They include:

- **Use of human-as-instrument**: the 'methods of studying human affairs needs to capitalise upon the natural powers of people to experience and understand' (Stake, 1987, p.280).
- **Use of tacit knowledge**: it is from the tacit knowledge of how things are that naturalistic generalisations are developed by the participants. It is these naturalistic generalisations that guide action and are therefore inseparable from action (Kemmis, 1974).

- **Use of natural settings**: responsive evaluation emphasises the natural settings, in this case the classroom, where learning occurs and therefore is intentionally context-bound and where findings are interpreted within a particular social and cultural context.

This study is the product of observed values and the quality of the opportunity to learn - the intrinsic merit of the experience rather than the more elusive payoff compared to some standard. As this study is the first on TACOR, appropriate benchmarks or indicators have not yet been generated. It represents expressions of worth and merit by those participating and conveys holistic impressions that represent the multiple realities of teaching experience.

Lincoln and Guba (1985) provide a visual presentation of the flow of naturalistic enquiry (see figure 9 shown on the following page).
The Study

The study comprises of a number of case studies that are operating at different levels and which have produced different sources of data. Whilst the principles of methodology remain the same across
all groups, the methodological tools and the credibility measures employed vary slightly for each case.

I was involved in multiple roles in the conduct of this study. These included a co-researcher/participant role in the TACOR process (experiential), an observer role of the process in action (reflective) and an investigator/evaluator role. This provided opportunities to work simultaneously on both the outside and inside of the TACOR process and to view the process from many differing perspectives.

The following figure (10) shows the extent of these roles and the scope of the data. These will be further explained in the description provided later, on the nature and purpose of the data.

---

Figure 10: Different perspectives of the co-researching process

The Context of the Study

In response to a perceived need for professional development strategies that could be developed by teachers both within and between schools, I decided to trial the TACOR process. Two teachers had indicated their desire to look more closely at the ways they were teaching language in their classrooms and this provided me with the opportunity to work with them.
Initial negotiations with the two teachers and their school administrations took approximately three months as there was a concern about the nature and role of the teachers in this project. It was this trial of the TACOR process between myself and these two teachers that became the basis of the two case studies presented in this research.

After the study had commenced I felt that the quality of the data might be enhanced if educators who had already been using this approach to professional development for some years were also interviewed. Six participants offered their retrospective recall of the process and were able to provide data on the impact that it had on their own professional development and growth.

The Sites and the Participants

Two groups of educators participated in this study. The first group (Group A) consisted of myself and two teachers who were using the TACOR process in a normal classroom environment. The second group (Group B) comprised of six educators who had been involved in the TACOR process over an extended period of time (three to five years).

Group A: The two teachers in this study worked in Independent Schools in New South Wales. The first teacher, Bill, had a year six class in a boys Preparatory School located in an affluent Sydney suburb. It was a small class of seventeen boys. The second teacher, Pam, had the responsibility for a small group of students from years eight to ten, in a girls Secondary School. This group had been established to assist girls from Hong Kong, Thailand and Malaysia with their English. This school was also situated in an affluent Sydney suburb but unlike the first, had a high intake of students from overseas.

Group B: The six educators taking part included three teachers, two academics and a school principal. They had all been involved in the development of the TACOR process and had meetings together as a group to make explicit their understandings of the process. They had all engaged in the TACOR process in a number of different partnerships as are illustrated in the following figure:
Figure 11: TACOR partnerships

Purpose and Nature of the Data

The purpose of the data was to provide a descriptive narrative of the TACOR process at work and interpretive insights of the process of collaborative action. Each of the participating groups provided different kinds of responses to the process and these have been described as:

Experiential response - Group A
Retrospective recall - Group B

The following figure summarises the range of data collected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Semi-Structured Interview</th>
<th>Focused Interview</th>
<th>Classroom Observations</th>
<th>Reflective Journals</th>
<th>Teacher Docs</th>
<th>School Docs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group B</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 12: Summary of core and supportive data collected

Data gathered with Group A participants was collected over a period of six months and forms the core data of this study. The retrospective recall offered by Group B and the reflective journals of the researcher provides the support data.

The data has been divided into two kinds, core data and support data from both group A and Group B as follows:
### Core Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>GROUP A: Experiential Response</strong></th>
<th><strong>Support Data</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fieldnotes and tape recordings</td>
<td>School Policy statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcripts of the debriefings</td>
<td>Students' work samples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' journals</td>
<td>Teachers' programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher's journal</td>
<td>Interview transcript with principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcripts of focused interviews and discussions on specific issues to do with teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcripts of semi-structured interviews to review the TACOR process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>GROUP B: Retrospective Recall</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semi-structured interviews (transcripts)</td>
<td>Artifacts which included examples of journals, fieldnotes and diagrams created by all those involved in co-researching.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 13:** Nature of core and supportive data

**Core Data: Group A**

Each kind of data served to contribute different information about the TACOR process and how it worked. The fieldnotes provided a description of the classroom context. The journals provided personal responses and insights into the TACOR process in action, to the individual learning that took place and, in the researcher's case, insights into the process of naturalistic enquiry. The transcripts of the debriefing sessions explained the nature of the developing relationship, how the co-researching process worked, and the development and changes in our concerns and interests. Combined, this core data also provided a record of the extent to which change in classroom practice and the thinking of the participants took place.

**Fieldnotes** were taken weekly of events that happened in the classroom during the language classes. These notes involved detail observations of a class at work for approximately forty-five minutes. For example:
'B continues to move around the classroom. B clarifies questions again and seeks more information from the boys. B ignores the restlessness. He finds a boy who has completed the task and congratulates him. This is done publicly and B uses the occasion to draw out further responses from the boys.'

**Focused interviews** were conducted at regular intervals with both of the participating teachers. The purpose of these interviews was to provide the interviewer with specific information about the intent of the classroom activities, the nature of the teaching and learning and to provide a basis for collaborative discussion on areas of mutual interest. Some of these discussions were recorded and transcribed while others were summarised in the following way:-

'We talked about alternatives to this approach. I asked Peggy to explain to me what she hoped to do during the next lesson and what aspect of language she would focus on. She explained that she wanted to start a theme on 'Drought, Fire and Flood'. She said that she was unsure of what the focus might be. This raised the issue of planning and her expectations of the girls. She suggested that she wanted the girls to write good descriptions and to realise what was involved in a good description.'

**Semi-structured interviews** were conducted approximately once a month and served to focus discussions on participants experience of the TACOR process. All these interviews were recorded and transcribed.

Teacher: I own this class, you don't own the class, ownership is important. In our present roles it's more of a, well, we're both on equal footing in that the research that's going on in the classroom has to do with my class and I can stop it whenever I like or I can allow it to go as much as I like. So in a way, I've got control over what happens.

Administrator: And you think that's important?

Teacher: Yes, where you own the model in a way......

Administrator: So what I think you are saying is.... the element of equality was important. You're saying it was important
because you felt you still maintain control and ownership about what is going on in the class. Is that right?

Teacher: Yes, that's an important factor.

**Reflective journals** were kept by the participants engaged in the TACOR process. The data from journals kept by the teachers was limited.

'After discussing the journal with BB, I am beginning to realise the value of keeping a journal. In this way I will be able to see my own growth as a teacher.....I have introduced uninterrupted sustained silent reading (USSR) on a regular basis for 3 periods X 15 mins. At this stage it is progressing well with more than two thirds of the class actively involved.'

'I was quite pleased with their response to this lesson - they seemed to put more into it. But will wait to see the transcript to check that perception. It was also nice that B joined in more today - I like the extra input.'

**Focus-related artifacts and products** included school language policy documents, teachers lesson plans and examples of children's work.

**Supportive Data**

There were two kinds of supportive data. These were derived from the participants in Group B and my own reflections.

**Group B: Semi-structured interviews** were conducted with each of the participants in Group B. Each interview lasted for about ninety minutes and subsequent follow-up discussions were held when further explanation, or clarification was needed. The questions focused on the participants view of how the TACOR process worked, what made it work, and about their response to the process in terms of their own learning. For example:

Interviewer: In terms of the data then that you have collected you have described one of these main functions of the data is being
the basis of questioning and reflecting. Do you analyse it at all? Do you do anything else with it? What else do you do with it?

Academic: Well, every now and then I analyse it for a specific purpose.

Interviewer: What you or you and Hazel

Academic: Well, we have done both but we have to have a purpose to do it. Mainly, I analyse it for the purposes of the debriefing but its a fairly shallow analysis because I'm using the data only as a medium to get Hazel and myself thinking about larger macro issues.

The researcher's journal:

Throughout the study I kept a journal. This journal documented a range of reflections covering:

- observations of the TACOR process;

- notes about myself as a learner;

- my personal feelings and frustrations about how I was collaborating with the teachers;

'My behaviour to Bill is extremely tentative. I don't quite know how to behave so that I am not seen as an expert.'

- my thinking and responses to the literature I was reading on professional development;

- a dialogue with myself about the emergent nature of the research design;

'I will need to ask Hazel for some more information about outcomes as I didn't really allow enough time on this.'

- notes to myself about what I was observing in the classroom concerning both the children's learning and the teachers' teaching;
'Bill seems uncertain about purpose of conferencing - maybe we could discuss this. Must remember to ask him about the boys response to the retelling activities.'

- thoughts, ideas and understandings about the nature of teachers' learning and professional development.

'How can I break down his perceptions of me as an expert. He wants me to tell him what to do. I really need to provide support in such a way that allows him to pursue his own ideas, create his own craft knowledge otherwise I don't suppose he will make many lasting changes to his classroom practice.'

In this way the journal served functional as well as reflective purposes.

These reflections were not shared with my co-researchers.

The data analysis

The data was analyzed inductively at a number of points during its collection to illuminate and articulate emerging working hypotheses, to ask questions, to modify or change action, for member checking, for debriefing and to establish other sources of data that might be needed.

Whilst the nature of the information was considered as the data was collected, as time went by the worth or value of information became more obvious and therefore influenced not only the nature of follow-up debriefing but also the manner in which the data was analyzed.

In order to facilitate synthesis and analysis a number of essential processes were necessary. These included:

- the identification of a number of dominant themes

- the unitising of the text into chunks of meaning

- the sorting of the units of meaning under each theme
The data was read a number of times and from this a number of dominant themes emerged. This provided a basis for sorting the data rather than by matching it to a set of predetermined categories. As the data was being analyzed, however, many of the initial themes collapsed into each other or changed as a result of peer debriefing. For each theme descriptors were used to determine the categorisation of the data into themes. After identifying the general themes the text was then 'unitised'. This involved chunking smaller pieces of text into units of information or meaning.

The mapping rules used for identifying the units required that the data was read and re-read, questions were asked, comparisons made and discussions held with the participants to clarify ideas and meanings. Each unit identified contained one or more pieces of information about the same concept.

After all the text had been appropriately unitised it could then be sorted under the identified themes. The interpretations of meaning were again confirmed or negotiated with each participant.

**Themes that emerged from the data**

As there were three sets of data, so there were also three sets of themes. These have been summarised in the figure below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes for Group A (experiential response)</th>
<th>Themes from Group B (retrospective recall)</th>
<th>Themes of Researcher (reflective response)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tacor Process (what happened)</td>
<td>Tacor Process (distinctive elements)</td>
<td>Tacor Process (how is it happening)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual Factors</td>
<td>Major Characteristics of Collaboration</td>
<td>Nature of Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes/Impact</td>
<td>Conditions for Success or Failure</td>
<td>Tensions/Anxieties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs, Attitudes &amp; Assumptions</td>
<td>Beliefs, Attitudes &amp; Assumptions</td>
<td>The research process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Concerns, Issues &amp; Needs</td>
<td>Outcomes/Impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 14:** Themes that emerged from the data
Themes: Group A (Experiential responses)

Tacor Process: This category records the nature of the interactions during these meetings and covers such processes of informing, facilitating, resourcing, making connections and shared dialogue.

Contextual Factors: This category refers to references in discussion to contextual factors such as the school ethos or culture, the school community or mismatches between the expectations of the various stakeholders within the extended school community (parents, principal, teachers, students or the senior school).

Outcomes: This theme records the instances where the participating co-researchers talked of the spin offs of being involved in the TACOR process. It also records the co-researchers perceptions of the impact that this process was having on themselves as teachers and learners and their students.

Beliefs, Attitudes and Assumptions: This category refers to any reference made to how students learnt language, about how the teacher was learning, about the teachers own craft knowledge and the interactions between teacher and learners.

Perceived Concerns, issues and needs: Both teachers/co-researchers talked about their own personal and professional needs. References to their careers, their theoretical knowledge, their craft knowledge, relationships and the links that they were making between theory and practice are all included in this category.

Themes: Group B (Retrospective recall)

Tacor Process: This theme included details about the TACOR process with particular reference to why and how the process was conceived and how it developed. Issues related to the distinctive elements of the process are related and detail provided of each separate component. These include debriefing, the role of field notes, negotiation of process and organisation, logistics, negotiations, resources and initial concerns, issues and problems.
**Major Characteristics of Collaboration:** The nature of the collaboration emerged as a major theme and included the roles and responsibilities that each partner assumed and how these roles were negotiated. Issues related to ownership and control and the nature of the relationship as it developed also feature strongly in the data.

**Conditions for Success or Failure:** This theme incorporates all information related to the perceived strengths and weaknesses of the TACOR model.

**Beliefs, attitudes and assumptions:** This theme captured all references made by the respondent's beliefs about teaching and learning and their awareness of the impact that this had on their teaching.

**Outcomes/Impact:** This theme recorded separately the outcomes or impact that the process had on the respondents or their observations on the impact on their students.

**Further layers of analysis: an emergent reality**

The concepts of sorting and unitising formed the basic unit of analysis. However, because the power of this process stems from the use of 'human as instrument' and the emergent quality of the research design, two further layers of analysis occurred with the data from both Group A and B after the sorting and unitising.

The first involved a further ordering of the data when the results were being compiled. As patterns emerged from the analysed data, so the data was reordered as the story unfolded. Decisions about chronology, the sequence of events and the identification of borders between elements of the process were established.

A second level of analysis was also found to be necessary when analysing this experiential data. Having analysed the data by the process of identifying themes, unitising and sorting, it was discovered that this analysis did not serve to identify the multiple realities that existed. From the reading of the data, it became clear that in combining the data gained from a number of different sources, the personal journals of the participants, the fieldnotes as
well as the transcripts of the debriefing sessions, that there were many differing perspectives. Each perspective represented an additional facet of meaning to the story being told. The personal journal of the researcher, who was also a participant in the TACOR process, reflected an ongoing analysis not only of what was happening but of the overall process in action.

Furthermore, to gain insights into the nature of the developing relationship between the participants during the process, it became necessary to analyse the data to allow for the identification of changes in patterns of behaviour. In this case, rather than sorting data into dominant themes, the data from the debriefing sessions was sorted into types of questioning and response and matched with the 'intent' expressed in the personal comments made in the researcher's journal.

The credibility measures employed in naturalistic enquiry ensure that maximum benefit can be gained from this use of human as instrument whilst at the same time limiting the adverse effects of inherent bias.

**Determining Credibility and Trustworthiness**

Throughout the various stages of the data collection and its analysis certain precautions were taken to ensure that the findings and interpretations of the data maintained a high level of credibility and trustworthiness. These were consistent with the naturalistic paradigm's analogies of reliability and validity as outlined by Lincoln and Guba (1985) and included such controls as the triangulation of data, subjective audits, peer debriefing, member checking, using a variety of data sources and prolonged engagement.

**Triangulation of data:** The purpose of triangulation is twofold; to help to alleviate problems associated with the control of bias and to identify possible convergence, inconsistency and contradiction in the data. The process of triangulation seeks to improve the probability that the interpretations that have been made will be credible.

The data in this study was triangulated in two ways; using different data collection modes and through use of different investigators.
**Controlled Subjectivity:** A naturalistic paradigm acknowledges the inescapable influences of subjectivity in this kind of inquiry but emphasises the importance of taking certain precautions which might otherwise allow the research to degenerate into relativism.

Three initiatives have been instigated in this study to ensure a system of 'controlled subjectivity'. The first, by being aware that subjectivity operates during the entire research process, "being mindful of its enabling and disabling potential" (Peshkin, 1988, p.18) and by making these understandings explicit. Secondly, by presenting the researcher's personal set of presuppositions (Chapter 1) and thirdly, by actively seeking out and responding to personal subjectivity by making a subjectivity audit an integral part of the fieldwork procedure. A personal subjectivity audit was conducted by the researcher through a personal reflective journal in which a systematic monitoring of self as researcher was followed (Peshkin, 1988).

**Different modes of data collection:** By having a range of data collection modes it was possible to them for cross referencing and this way provide credibility for the data gathered. These modes included:

- Field notes of classroom observations
- Transcripts of debriefings after each class
- Journals
- Interviews

**Different investigators:** The investigators involved in this study included:

- Co-researchers working in the classroom and one school principal
- Educators providing their retrospective recall
- Peers

Lincoln and Guba (1985) suggest that the probability that findings will be credible is increased if all data, whilst it is being collected is tested by those who are participating and by any other interested parties. This credibility measure involved a process of member checking and peer debriefing.
**Member checking/negotiating outcomes:** This was a continuous process that went on both formally and informally throughout the study. At the end of each classroom session the participants informally discussed the lesson that had just been observed. When the transcripts had been prepared, they were examined by all participants and comments were made, clarifications given and further notes written. This process occurred each week and was an integral part of the collaborative process.

**Peer debriefing:** For the full year of data collection the evaluator was able to discuss with fellow students and the supervisors of the study, on a monthly basis, the design of the enquiry, the decisions that had to be made and the directions that needed to be pursued. In this way the entire process was constantly under review and provided an external audit trail of the research in progress.

Extracts of the field notes and transcripts of the meetings held between the co-researchers were presented for scrutiny. This provided opportunity for me to share and make explicit my personal feelings about not only the research study but about the TACOR process.

**Prolonged Engagement:** An important aspect of credibility in naturalistic inquiry is to allow for prolonged engagement and persistent observations in the selected sites. This allows for behaviours to be understood in relation to the context; it allows opportunity for the participants to build a rapport and to identify any distortions that may arise from the special events that often happen in schools. Before this study started I spent about two months visiting the teachers in their classrooms, talking with the children, sometimes teaching, and generally becoming involved in the activities of the class. We also spent a lot of time discussing and negotiating how things might work, what time commitment was necessary and keeping the principal informed about these plans. When these plans were formalised I visited each classroom for a period of four and six months respectively.

Whilst this chapter has justified and explained the research design, the model of evaluation used and the methodology, the next chapter presents the results of the data analysis in the form of narrative
vignettes. These vignettes will provide a basis for a series of narrative pictures about the collaboration process and form the basis of an interpretative account and evaluation of the Teacher as Co-researcher approach to professional development.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

The results presented in this chapter have been organised into two narratives each reflecting two different perspectives of the Teacher as Co-researcher process. The first narrative tells of the experiences of co-researchers as they try the TACOR process for the first time (Group A) and the second records the retrospective recall of experienced co-researchers (Group B). The logic which guides this organisation represents the chronology of the research in practice and collectively these narratives serve to provide a description of the nature of the Teacher as Co-researcher process.

Figure 15: Organisation of results

The first narrative, relating the experiences of an administrator and two classroom teachers, working in two different contexts, and engaged in the TACOR process for the first time, contains two case studies. In each of these case studies the researcher is both a participant and an observer of the TACOR process. Because of the personal nature of this involvement, it seemed more appropriate to report the findings using a personal narrative genre.
During my early experiences of co-researching, it became apparent that I needed to consult with others who had used the TACOR process over an extended period of time and who were experienced co-researchers. I needed to clarify my understandings of the elements of the process and to share some of my initial concerns.

As the data analysis is ongoing throughout the research process and forms an integral part of the research design, I therefore sought the retrospective recall of the TACOR process from a number of experienced co-researchers. This retrospective recall served the dual purpose of guiding my own co-researching experience and provided further insights of the TACOR process and how it worked. It is this retrospective recall of experienced co-researchers that forms the basis of the second narrative.

Both narratives indicate the multilevels at which the conduct of this study proceeded, the emergent nature of the research design, the multiplicity of roles that were played and the temporally continuous and socially interactive nature of the Teacher as Co-Researcher process, both in the context of the research paradigm that was used and the focus of the research.

At the end of each narrative I have summarised the results, highlighting the key characteristics, the significant experiences, events and information gained from the participants of both Group A (Experiential Response) and Group B (Retrospective Recall).

These summaries provide the opportunity to make comparisons by noting similarities and differences and from which the emerging patterns from both within and between each story, can be identified. It is these patterns that will form the basis of interpretive comment and the presentation of grounded theory in the final chapter.

Before detailing how these TACOR relationships were established it is important to mention that the Independent schools in which these relationships took place, are not bound by mandatory curriculum change. Independent schools are autonomous bodies and develop their own curriculum. Whilst the State Education Departments, in response to Government directives and research, are responsible for
the development and dissemination of curriculum directives and policies, independent schools are not bound by Government policy changes. With the considerable curriculum development in the area of language development over the past decade, however, Independent schools have begun to take on board new approaches to teaching and learning.

The results presented in this chapter attempt to explain a very complex reality. In describing this reality, similar ideas kept reoccurring as the data was analysed from a number of different perspectives. The themes which determined the way that the texts were analyzed, are all highly interrelated. For instance, data that described an element of the TACOR process also provided insights into the nature of the collaboration and the participants' belief system. For this reason, the seemingly repetitious nature of the results, in some areas, serve only to emphasise the complex nature of the co-researching process.

**NARRATIVE ONE: Experiential Response to the TACOR Process (Group A)**

This personal narrative describes two co-researching relationships and how they developed. It describes how the TACOR process worked, what happened, the participants' reflections of the process in action and the impact that the experience had on each of them.

These elements of the process emerged from the analysis of the data and form the organisation of this first narrative. These elements are described as follows:

1.0 How each of the TACOR relationships were initially established and negotiated;

2.0 About the TACOR process in action - what happened and how;

3.0 The participants' perceptions and reflections of the TACOR process during the experience

4.0 The impact and outcomes for the participants as a result of their involvement in the TACOR process
Whilst the second case study reports a far less complex process than the first and has many distinctive features of its own, the same themes serve to describe both co-researching experiences.

1.0 How each of the TACOR relationships were initially established and negotiated.

I announced to a wide variety of independent schools, my interest in a collaborative co-researching project which had as its focus the teaching and learning of literacy and language. I also indicated my interest in understanding at first hand how teachers go about making changes to their classroom practice. Whilst I received some interest in the idea of co-researching and made a number of presentations to staff on the idea, I received no expressions of interest from teachers.

It was, therefore, by informal means, that two teachers were identified, one primary teacher (Bill) and the other an ESL secondary teacher (Pam). After lengthy discussions both indicated their interest in participating in a co-researching relationship with me using the TACOR process.

1.1 About the participants and how the TACOR process started

For this narrative it was important to integrate the data from a number of different sources. The fieldnotes provided a description of the context. The debriefing sessions explained the nature of the relationship, how the process worked and the way in which our focus of interest developed. The personal journals provided personal insights into individual responses to not only the co-researching process in action but to the learning that was taking place.

Each of these sources of data required its own analysis and in reporting the results it was necessary to integrate and compare the analyses in order to be able to tell the whole story of our partnerships.
CASE STUDY ONE: Bill and Bridget as Co-researchers.

Bill: Bill had been teaching for eight years in small independent boys preparatory schools. He had taught primary grades for most of this time and most recently had been teaching grade six (eleven year olds). Bill saw himself as a traditional teacher but since completing the Early Literacy In-service Course (ELIC) had become more critical and frustrated with his own teaching. He recognised that a gap existed between the things that he thought should be happening in his classroom and what actually happened.

After completing ELIC, and at the beginning of a new year he was given a third year class. He was excited about the prospect of trying new approaches in his classroom and he felt confident that these changes would benefit the students. After taking this class for only three months, however, he was transferred to a year six class. Because of the pressures of Common Entrance exams for the students who were competing for limited places into highly elite independent secondary schools, Bill felt that to make changes to his practice whilst taking this class might be problematic. Added to this, the Headmaster took the students for English. Grammar, comprehension, spelling and 'creative writing' were the programmed components of English for Grade six (eleven year olds).

At this point I had advertised the opportunity for teachers to undertake a special training course for teachers to become tutors for an in-service course entitled 'Literacy 3 - 7'. This professional development package had been developed as an extension of the ELIC program but targeted primary and lower secondary teachers. Bill was interested in undertaking this tutor training. He was the only male who applied.

Whilst Bill acknowledged that he had not had extensive experience using what he referred to as 'an ELIC approach' to language teaching and learning (by this he was referring to principles of 'Whole Language'), we were sensitive about the high percentage of men working with upper Primary aged students in independent schools. It was therefore important that Bill should undertake the Tutor Training.
Bill became an active participant in the Tutor Training programme but as the course progressed he notes 'how lousy' he started to feel about his teaching. He notes his concern,

'I knew there had to be something better than.....(his present) teaching style of just take out your books, open it to page this and do that exercise. It was totally teacher directed....I'm opposed to this kind of philosophy. I'm opposed to that style of teaching'.

He went on to say,

'Well, I've always had the notion that the kids can learn more, or learn better when they sort of, they take control even though that's a term I've never used before the course'.

Bill was making connections with his personal frustrations about teaching and what he was hearing about during the course. He indicated, however, that he felt positive about his feelings of unease as he realised the potential of what he was hearing. It supported and extended many of his own concerns about teaching and learning. He also noted that whilst initially he felt intimidated by his fellow tutors, this changed to respect as he realised how committed they were to their students.

So on completion of this course Bill asked if I would be willing to help him make changes to his practice. As I was also interested to have closer links with teachers in schools and about problems associated with change I agreed to start working with him.

Bridget: At the time of this research project I was responsible for the development and organisation of professional development activities for Independent Schools throughout New South Wales. Prior to this I had been a teacher for many years and had also spent about six years as a language consultant, travelling around Australia providing 'one-off' in-service presentations, consulting in schools and developing teacher resource materials. In the position of consultant I was beginning to become sceptical about the value of this approach to professional development as it did not seem to provide the kind of support that teachers needed in order to either initiate change or to sustain their ongoing professional development.
In the administrative position of developer and organiser of professional development activities, I was anxious to find strategies which reflected a revised set of beliefs and assumptions about effective professional development. I also felt the need to work more closely with teachers in classrooms and to experience first hand the problems associated with change.

As a result of these needs, my co-researching partnership with Bill was established. Our relationship developed in the following way:

April/June Literacy 3 - 7 course

June     Bill indicated at the end of the course that he would like some help and support in developing new practices in his classroom.

July     I visited Bill twice at his school to see how things were progressing.

August   I identified a research topic for my thesis and decided to try and find teachers as co-researching partners. I wrote to all independent schools for expressions of interest. I started to keep a personal journal to record the beginnings of the research project.

September I started to visit Bill weekly for general discussion and to provide support where requested. I suggested to Bill that he might find it useful to keep a personal journal. He was unsure about this and only made three entries during the month. No expressions of interest in co-researching were received from teachers but I was invited into two schools to talk about the possibilities of the TACOR model as a professional development strategy. I reflected on the possibility of asking Bill to become involved in a co-researching relationship as we seemed to be getting along well. I did not mention my idea of a possible co-researching partnership with Bill.
October I continued to work with Bill informally but was timid to propose a more formal arrangement.

November I finally proposed to Bill that we trial the TACOR process for a month. He agreed to this trial and so negotiations started between Bill, myself and the school. I started to visit Bill's year three classroom and fieldnotes were taken followed by debriefing sessions.

December Bill and I reviewed the process and discussed the strategy's value and potential. Bill agreed to become involved in a co-researching project at the start of the following year.

February The TACOR process between Bill and myself commenced. I also started to negotiate with a secondary ESL teacher and a science teacher about the possibility of a further co-researching relationship.

From this timetable of events it can be seen that our co-researching relationship developed over time and passed through three stages:

- Setting up initial contact based on Bill's request for help to implement new practices of language teaching and focusing on trying to lessen the gap between his beliefs and practice in his year three classroom.

- Conduct of a brief trial of the process of co-researching (in a year three classroom).

- Commencement of ongoing co-researching relationship with Bill in a year six classroom.

At the second stage of development Bill needed to be assured that there was something in it for him. He indicated his concern about becoming a 'guinea pig' for someone else's research. He had discussed the pros and cons of my proposal with his wife and it was only when he had a chance to see how it worked and what might be in the relationship for his own development, that he agreed to become a participant in the project. He realised that the relationship was not based on the principles of 'guinea pig' research.
1.2 Initial negotiations.

Much of the initial negotiations took place either before or during the very brief trial of the project held at the end of the school year and whilst Bill was still teaching a third grade class. These negotiations included defining the purpose for the co-research, discussion about how the TACOR process worked, what our roles and responsibilities would be, about our status and about the time involved in the project. We also discussed the need to seek approval to proceed with the trial from the Headmaster.

1.3 Defining the purpose and identifying a focus for co-researching.

As part of these preliminary negotiations we also discussed in general terms what we both wanted to do. I explained to Bill that I was interested to understand more about how teachers went about making changes to their classroom practice and the problems that might be associated with this. Bill indicated that during his attendance at the Literacy 3 - 7 course he had become increasingly aware of the gap that existed between how he believed children learnt language and how he taught them. He therefore wanted to start making changes to the way he taught language by initially introducing new activities which would 'motivate the boys to be more interested in their work'.

1.4 How the process worked.

I explained what I knew about the TACOR process and how we might go about co-researching. I presented the following diagram of the process which had been developed by other co-researchers.
Figure 16: The TACOR process (Turbill, Butler and Cambourne 1991)

With the aid of this diagram, I explained the need to collect data by taking fieldnotes of what happened in the classroom and the importance for our own learning in keeping a personal journal and how these sources of data would become the basis of a debriefing session. I suggested that it was likely that issues might arise from the debriefing that we might want to discuss and explore in more detail.

Furthermore, I expressed my interest in monitoring his response to the TACOR process from time to time so a special monthly meeting...
was arranged specifically for this purpose.

1.5 Roles and responsibilities

We discussed our individual roles in the process and I made a strong point about not seeing myself as a visiting expert. We discussed the nature of co-researching and the need for us both to learn from each other. Understanding this concept, however, took many months to realise.

1.6 Time and logistics involved.

Bill expressed a concern about the time that might be involved in the project and what I might ask him to do.

We discussed the logistics of such a project and it was decided that I would visit Bill's classroom once a week for about an hour. This would be followed by a debriefing session on the same day after the classroom visit. At a later stage in the week we also agreed to have a further meeting over lunch to discuss specific issues if we felt the need.

1.7 Negotiations with the school.

I had an interview with the Headmaster to describe what Bill and I wanted to do, what was involved and how we would proceed. The Headmaster was most supportive of the proposal. He did, however, spend a good deal of time telling me about the ethos and purpose of independent preparatory schools and of his own personal philosophy about language teaching and learning and in this way made it clear that any changes had to take into account and be sympathetic with the school philosophy. At the time I was uncertain whether change was valued but I was assured that improved practice was highly desirable. As my relationship with Bill developed the implications and effect of school ethos and climate on change became a difficult issue for us both.

As a result of these initial negotiations between Bill, the Headmaster and I, we embarked on a co-researching relationship which extended over a period of ten months.
2.0 About the TACOR process in action - what happened and how.

Unlike the data collected for the second narrative describing retrospective recall, the data analysis of the experiential responses of Bill's co-researching experiences with me, reflected an untidy process which often typifies naturalistic inquiry. Furthermore, the boundaries between the various phases of the relationship were often indistinct.

2.1 Initial concerns: finding a focus.

Bill's initial interest in co-researching was motivated by two main factors; a concern about his career path and prospects for promotion and his interest in improving the learning opportunities for his students which he believed would result in an increase of interest and motivation in language learning. The data analyses indicated a constant friction between these two factors which was further exacerbated, in Bill's opinion, by the ethos and climate of the school.

Since completing ELIC and the Tutor Training for the Literacy 3-7 course, Bill had been actively seeking a promotional position both within and outside the school. His concerns about his career opportunities pervaded a great deal of the discussion throughout the partnership. He wanted more time on year six as he felt this would improve his promotional opportunities as a deputy head.

As Bill was confused about what the co-researching process had to offer, no specific focus within the context of his concerns was identified in the initial stages of the relationship.

My focus, however, was made explicit. I wanted to learn more about how Bill went about making changes to his practice. The focus initially was centred on Bill. The purpose and focus of our co-researching partnership, however, changed throughout the process.

2.2 Elements of the TACOR process

Bill and I followed the identified elements of the TACOR process (Fig.16) which included the collection of data and analysis.
well as these elements we had a series of meetings which were an extension of the debriefings during which we discussed specific topics of interest or concern.

**Data Collection:**

Many kinds of data were gathered and analysed as an integral part of the co-researching process and thus each source provided a basis for discussion and exploration. Fieldnotes, transcripts of the debriefing sessions and personal journal entries were supplemented by school policy statements, transcripts of two interviews that I conducted with the Headmaster, teaching programs and examples of student's work arising from the class activities.

![Diagram of Data Sources](image)

**Figure 17:** How the data supported the debriefing sessions

**Fieldnotes:** Each week I visited the classroom for about an hour and during this time, recorded as much as possible about what was happening in the classroom. This included descriptive details of the
teaching agenda, the tasks set, the responses of the students to the teacher and general observations of how the students were engaging in the activities. The fieldnotes were entirely descriptive and did not include any judgemental comments.

During or at the end of each session I made a list of about half a dozen questions that I wished to ask Bill. These questions arose from the observed class sessions and became the basis of the debriefing session which immediately followed. The nature and purpose of these questions, however, changed as the relationship developed.

In keeping with the TACOR process, role reversal is recommended and so on two occasions Bill took over the responsibility of taking fieldnotes whilst I did the teaching.

Initially I found the fieldnotes difficult to take and this uncertainty I recorded in my journal. I recognised that the taking of good fieldnotes was a skill which would probably develop over time. I noted also that on the first few visits my fieldnotes focused almost exclusively on Bill's teaching, his organisation and management of the class activities.

As time passed, however, the fieldnotes changed focus providing more description of the students reactions and responses to the tasks. An extract from my journal described this change as follows:

'My fieldnotes seem to be improving at last. During the first few sessions I was so frustrated at having to take such a passive role. It's difficult not to get involved with the boys. The boys are beginning to accept my presence and I'm managing to get a lot more written down. It reminds me of when I started snorkelling. At first I saw nothing much but after my eyes got used to the underwater environment I began to see all sorts of things that had been there all the time but I just hadn't seen them. It's the same with my fieldnotes. Maybe this has something to do with getting to know the boys and being able to predict what Bill will do or how he is likely to respond....
I think I'll try moving around the class a bit more so that I can hear what the boys are actually saying to each other.'
Initially I felt that it was important not to become involved in the activities of the class so that I could focus my attention on taking good fieldnotes. In a subsequent debriefing session, however, Bill indicated that this didn't feel right and that he would prefer me to become more involved in what was going on. After this the nature of the fieldnotes changed. They became more focused on what the boys were doing, how they were reacting and engaging in the task and what they were saying rather than on Bill's teaching.

'The boys are talking about the task, defining the task and trying to work out how to actually start. One group decide that one boy should read the story to the others and another should identify and record the main events...The boys assist each other and offer each other advice. All the other groups seem to be well involved in the task.'

After taking fieldnotes, they were typed and returned to Bill for comment. Sometimes Bill would make notes in the margin which would provide some background on a particular incident. More often, however, this background would be offered during the debriefing sessions as we discussed the transcript together.

**Journals:** As we had both been keeping personal journals prior to the commencement of the TACOR process we decided that we should continue to do so. However, Bill indicated that he found these difficult to keep as he didn't know what to write. We discussed the potential value and purpose of such a practice and I showed him a copy of a journal that had been written by another teacher. He was most interested and made the following comments:

'It seems to be a valuable part of her evaluation... She records a lot of anecdotal comments and she always focuses on the children. It is like an evaluation of herself as well as the children and her teaching effectiveness. It's like talking to yourself.....She seems to be asking herself questions and then trying to answer them.'

He said that,

'he didn't know what exactly to write as he wasn't sure whether he could use it as an evaluation of himself as he tended to be very critical of himself and therefore this might not be useful.'
Bill found, however, that the act of writing helped to generate some response but he only made a few entries and these focused over the period of a month on the issue of control and responsibility. He wrote:

'They're not capable of taking more responsibility unless I give them more responsibility. I've got to keep leading them into it believing that they're capable. If I give up then I'm giving up on my own views and values and what's the point in having them if I'm going to give up on them.'

After three months of co-researching and very few entries in the journal, Bill said that he didn't have time to continue with it. I continued to keep a journal throughout the co-researching period.

Although we discussed the possibility of sharing our journals with each other, this only happened in a limited way as I felt hesitant and reluctant to share mine. I felt it was too personal to share. This lack of sharing on my part may say a good deal about my role and perceptions of collaboration.

Debriefing:

To provide a description of the debriefing sessions it was necessary to bring together the data analysis of three different sources of data, the fieldnotes, the reports and transcripts of the debriefings and the personal journals.

The fieldnotes described what happened in the classroom and provided a context for the subsequent debriefing sessions. The transcripts of the debriefings served to highlight the scope and focus of our shared reflections about what was happening in the classroom but also became a record of the nature of our partnership through the manner of our interactions. Finally, my personal journal provided insights into my reactions to the research process as well as the co-researching process along with my anxieties, frustrations and understandings.

The debriefing sessions lasted for approximately one hour and were held each week immediately after the observed teaching session. These debriefing sessions extended over a period of eight months.
Time actually spent in the classroom taking fieldnotes and the following debriefings, however, were interrupted by school holidays (summer and spring), sickness and constant school events like excursions, cricket matches and sporting carnivals.

The nature of the debriefing sessions changed as the partnership developed and the purpose of the co-researching became more clearly defined. There were a number of distinguishable phases in the development of these sessions but the demarcation points between each phase were often unclear. The phases that were definable are described as:

- working out our roles and a way of working;
- getting to know the class;
- becoming a member of the class community;
- uncovering the thinking behind the action and
- a new beginning.

The major indicator of the different phases of development was reflected in the changing nature of the dialogue between Bill and myself. During each of these phases the intent of the questions or statements and the nature of the responses, provided insights into the changing roles that were assumed and how the co-researching relationship developed. The nature of the interactions in the initial phase could generally be described as 'reactive'. As the relationship developed, however, interactions became more 'responsive'. Examples of the changing dialogue will be presented as each phase of the relationship is described.

**Working out our roles and a way of working:** At the beginning of our relationship Bill taught language in two classrooms, years three and six. Initially we decided to focus our attention on the year three classroom although after much negotiation with the headmaster, Bill was transferred to year six. Bill was pleased with this change as he felt this responsibility held greater benefit for his professional career. Unfortunately, however, the Headmaster had always taken the year six boys for English classes as he felt that it was his responsibility to prepare them for their common entrance exams.
Hence the first four months of our relationship involved frequent changes in arrangements and an ongoing dialogue with the Headmaster about the extent of his and Bill's responsibilities for English. It transpired that much of our time was spent in discussing what it was that Bill could or could not do. After a lengthy meeting with the headmaster during which he indicated his support for our co-researching, he agreed to allow Bill freedom to develop his own language program with the exception of one period per week that he would take for 'creative writing'.

For many months, however, Bill felt constrained by this arrangement and by 'tradition'. Of the five periods he had assigned for language activities, he felt it necessary to continue with formal spelling, grammar, comprehension exercises and study skills using an S.R.A. kit during four of these five periods.

Bill's initial commitment to change then was confined to one period a week lasting for an hour and a half. During this time he wanted to focus on literature. It was this class time that became the focus of our co-researching partnership and commenced after four months of our relationship.

The classes which form the basis of this phase of the debriefings were conducted in a formal manner. Desks were arranged in rows and Bill tightly controlled the conduct of both the boys and the activities. Typically the lesson fell into the following pattern;

- **5 mins:** Settling boys and calling them to order
- **5 mins:** Announcing what will be done during the session and then a recap on the story he is reading - The Space Demons
- **15-20 mins:** Bill's reading of Space Demons
- **5 mins:** Recap and questioning
- **30-40 mins:** Writing activities unrelated to reading. Writing sessions started with 'free writing time' and were followed by activities outlined on a worksheet. These stencilled activities focused on providing opportunities for the boys to write for different purposes- reports and recipes.
- **15 mins:** DEAR (Drop Everything And Read)
Although the class was conducted with formality and control, all activities constituted a new agenda for Bill.

The initial debriefing sessions which followed these classes were controlled by a set of questions that I had identified as being necessary to ask and which evolved directly from the fieldnotes I had taken. The nature of these questions provided insights into the tentative nature of the co-researching relationship during the first few weeks and reflected the gap that existed between what I thought my role should be and what I actually did.

'My behaviour towards Bill is extremely tentative. I don't quite know how to behave so that I'm not seen as an expert. What I want to be, the way I want this relationship to develop, and the quality of my real interactions with Bill, will, I fear, be difficult. I fear a knowledge and practice gap.'

The focus of these initial questions sought clarification of Bill's actions, finding out more about the 'hows' and 'whys' of Bill's teaching practice. They revealed two different purposes. Some questions genuinely sought clarification of Bill's actions and thinking, seeking factual information. These included questions like:

'What was the plan for the day - the focus?'
'I noticed that you started with a reading again today. What made you decide on this particular book?'
'Had you talked to the boys about DEAR before today?'

Bill's responses to these questions were short and directive.

Other questions, however, had an entirely different intent. They were questions to which I was seeking a specific response. They were 'testing' questions that carried some prejudgment on my part. They were questions which I felt he needed to think about and highlighted practices which I thought were inappropriate or needed to be changed. They were questions to which I already had an answer, my answer. These questions served to assert my control over the debriefing sessions and reinforced my role as expert. They included questions like:
'What kind of help do you give the boys with their writing?'

'Have you discussed with the boys what they might do during a peer conference?'

'What was the purpose of the questioning after the story and what kinds of questions did you ask?'

'What was the purpose of the work sheet? What do you think the boys may have learnt from this activity?'

Bill seemed to accept this interrogation and in most cases provided confident and short responses as though I were genuinely seeking information. He did not see them as a criticism of his practice. The questions stimulated no further discussion.

My journal indicates my discomfort with the nature and intent of my questions and the controlling and patronising role that I had assumed.

'The questions I'm asking seem to illustrate my old crafty ways of working on teachers rather than with them. I already know the answers to them. Am I really trying to help him to reflect on his practice or am I trying to point out in a not so subtle way that he is doing something wrong? I must try to change the format of our debriefings and certainly I must try to use language which facilitates thinking rather than questioning.'

As a result of this realisation I changed my approach to the debriefing sessions. I no longer identified specific questions but rather let discussion on the class activities evolve more naturally and spontaneously. This course of action resulted in a less precise format, and provided the opportunity for me to try and back away from an 'expert' role.

This change, however, affected the nature of the debriefings and for about three weeks following this, the sessions showed a lack of direction, focus and purpose. I could not find a role that I felt happy about and Bill took no initiatives. We were both floundering.

'I'm not sure whether he anticipated that I would solve all his problems or whether he thought I would tell him what to do. I did neither and he didn't take any lead.'
My earliest written records of these debriefing sessions were succinct and only outlined the questions I wished to ask Bill and the content of his responses. As such they did not provide sufficient detail of our interactions to be able to determine the effect that this kind of questioning may have had on Bill. This data only served the limited purpose of functional reporting. My journal expresses this realisation and so after four weeks I also changed my system of reporting by using a tape recorder and then prepared typed transcripts which we could both share.

**Getting to know the class:** Bill had begun, at this stage of the relationship, to change the format of his classes. He had finished reading *The Space Demons* and now began to introduce new activities. Writing for different purposes became the focus of his activities. He introduced SSW (Sustained Silent Writing) and provided demonstrations and encouraged discussion of different kinds of writing before asking the boys to complete a follow-up activity.

This second phase of our debriefings saw a change in focus away from Bill and his teaching to clarification about incidents that happened in the classroom. We began to look at the fieldnotes together, going through what had happened. I asked specific questions about the boys' behaviour and about their engagement and responses to the set tasks.

Now, the questions which I asked genuinely sought information. Bill's responses were a little more expansive as he provided background information on the students, explained behaviour, provided anecdotes and a description of their development.

B.B: 'I noticed that John spent most of the time trying to find his work and didn't really get down to any writing.

Bill: Yes he's been very unsettled over the past few days and it's the same for most of his work. He is very disorganised and is always losing everything.'

The format of the debriefings at these phases fell into a pattern of direct question and response. There was little shared discussion.
Becoming a member of the class community: Over a period of a month Bill had worked hard to develop a series of new activities based on writing for different purposes. For the first time these classes showed signs of planning. He had been reading some of the teacher reference books published by the Primary English Teachers Association (PETA) on genre and had decided to extend the activities in this area.

As a result of my ongoing anxiety about the development of a co-researching relationship built on equal status, I suggested to Bill that we might reverse roles occasionally. I might do some teaching and he could take the fieldnotes. He thought this was a good idea and asked me to summarise with the boys the work they had been doing on different genres. As a result of this decision the nature of the following debriefing sessions which followed indicated another dimension of our relationship.

We shared the fieldnotes as before but now there was a genuine exchange of information, views and opinions about what had happened and why. The debriefings became a sharing session about what had happened in class. The format was no longer dependent upon question and response. We began to listen to what each of us had to say.

Bill: Marcus is the sort of kid that is an unusual boy. He's very intelligent but not in what we would call academic ways.

Bridget: Well I kind of thought I could challenge him.

Bill: Yes.

Bridget: I felt I knew him well enough to be able to make that challenge, and the other little fellow...

Bill: Justin?

Bridget: Justin, yes. He seemed to be a lot more settled. I was quite impressed with what he'd done and so I felt I could challenge him too. But some of the other boys well I just don't know them well enough yet.
Bill: Yes. Marcus and Justin almost wanted to be challenged because they love that. They love that sort of centre of attention.

Bridget: Yes they do.

My journal indicates that this initiative assisted me to have a better understanding of what was going on in the class and had provided an opportunity to reestablish a different kind of working relationship with both Bill and the boys. At this phase of our debriefings Bill indicated that he was feeling happier about our relationship.

Uncovering the thinking behind the action: This theme involved us both in the exploration of new teaching purposes and practices. It exposed the dilemmas involved in these changes by uncovering the thinking behind the action.

Having completed the unit on genres Bill then passed on to a unit on literature-based activities and a look at fairy tales, myths and legends. For the first time Bill had started to display the boys' work on the walls of the classroom. The desks had been rearranged to allow the boys to work in groups.

Bill indicated his enjoyment of the new activities and was both surprised and pleased with the boys' responses. He observed that those classes that he had not planned in sufficient detail or was hesitant about had seen the boys lose discipline. He started to make connections between his teaching and the boys' discipline rather than seeing it as a separate issue. In discussion he revealed that in the past he would have seen this loss of discipline as the boys' problem but now realised that he had to think about his behaviour, its affect on the boys and to find different ways of working with them. As a result of this incident he began to realise that his program lacked direction and 'wholeness'.

I continued to visit the classroom and take fieldnotes and Bill indicated his enjoyment of the debriefing sessions. However, after about four weeks of frenzied activity in the classroom, the focus of the debriefings became confused. I continued to seek clarification, focusing on the organisation and purpose of activities that Bill had
planned. I hoped that my questions would assist Bill to better understand the thinking behind his actions. I asked questions like:

'Why did you choose to do a series of classes on different genres?'
'Where did you get your ideas from?'
'Are you pleased with the work you have done on different genres during the past few weeks?'
'If you do this again will you do it in the same way?'
'What did you think about the quality of the boys responses?'
'You've changed the physical arrangement of the desks. Why?'
'Why did you choose to do plot profiles today?'

The intent of this questioning did not seem to be very different from those asked in the initial stages of our relationship, but the way they were asked and the nature of Bill's responses changed. I was beginning to become interested in what was going on in the classroom and genuinely interested in Bill's thinking. It was at this point in the relationship that I became a learner, interested in the process of change.

The format of the interactions extended beyond just a question and a response. I began to play the role of facilitator, evident in the dialogue by the use of fillers (Mmm-hum, mm, yes, oh, O.K., right) or by questions that signalled my interest and which encouraged Bill to continue. This had the effect of keeping the topic going and encouraged Bill to say more and provide more detail.

The detail that he provided, however, began to reveal the extent of Bill's concerns, dilemmas and uncertainties about teaching. The discussion reflected his attempts to make connections between what he wanted to do, what he had done in the past and what he saw happening as he tried new activities. Whilst the fieldnotes were still used as a starting point for discussion on teaching practice, they became less important. The effect of playing a facilitating role during our discussions did not serve to solve any of his dilemmas but only to make them more explicit.

Discussion covered a wide range of topics and included discipline and responsibility for learning, the boys' responses to new activities (highlighted by details provided in the fieldnotes), classroom
organisation, programming and planning. More specifically they included:

- Inability of children to stay on task.

- Break down in discipline which he identified as having happened as a result of not establishing appropriate routines or ground rules for working and not making explicit to the boys what his expectations were.

- Bill's uncertainty of the expectations he should have of the students and what they should be doing. He felt sure that they could perform much better.

  'They're not producing their best and maybe that's because of my programming so if I change my program I can change their attitude and they'll start to produce their best.'

- Problems with programming. He described his program as 'bitsy' and recognised that 'interesting content' was his prime concern. He pointed out that at college he had never been taught how to program and he felt at a disadvantage. He said that as a result of his experiences as an ESL teacher he had a particular concern that children should understand 'the structure of language that makes it what it is'. He felt that often he had presented details of structure out of context and he felt this was not the way to do things. He pointed out that his program was fragmented and reflected no developmental sensitivity as he had been taught to do in his training.

Bill's seemed to have run out of ideas for new activities and the classes started to revert back to more formal tasks from text books and work sheets. At this point in the relationship I resolved that our debriefing sessions had reached a point where they were ceasing to be helpful. I also felt that my visits to the classroom were creating pressure on Bill to perform. I discussed this with Bill and it was decided that we would have a break of a month from observing and debriefing. Instead, as there were a number of specific issues which Bill wanted to discuss, we resolved to have a series of meetings which focused on specific issues. Bill decided that he wanted to talk about programming and planning.
As a result of this decision the nature of our co-researching relationship changed along with the role that I assumed. I became aware that Bill wanted some specific guidance and suggestions as to what he might do to disentangle himself from his dilemmas. I felt trapped into becoming an expert once more but my journal indicates a new reasoning about my role:

'It is very difficult to find the appropriate language which invites the collaboration between two people in a mutually beneficial learning process. It's not a case of me expert bashing myself. I don't need to walk around busily knowing nothing. When we talk sceptically about specialist we mean all the trappings that go with being an expert - things like power and authority over others, being patronisingly warm and fussy, being all knowing in an unpretentious and suitably modest way. This is a case of getting people who know different things assisting each other to find their own ways of knowing. In this way we are both experts. What I need to do is a matter of learning how to facilitate and resource learners. I wonder how I do this to myself?'

This was an important realisation for me. I decided that being an expert, rather than hindering our relationship, should enhance it. I stopped feeling guilty about having knowledge that Bill didn't have. I began to acknowledge that Bill also had knowledge which I needed and valued. This knowledge was entirely different to my own.

A new beginning: I resumed classroom observations at the beginning of a new school term. Bill had prepared for a project on 'newspapers' as a result of the discussions we had held during the holidays on programming and planning. For the first time he had a program and a lesson plan prepared. His lesson plan looked like this:

1. Read Cannily Cannily
2. Review Newspapers - 4 main roles
   - Particular language
     In pairs make a list of particular language.
     News Reporting - Stories
     Commenting - Editorial
     Letters
     Public Info - Ads
4. Sharing
In pairs choose a story - article to read and comment on style.
6. Sharing

In the debriefing that followed this class, on Bill's request, we started by looking at his lesson plan together. The dialogue that ensued took on a new flavour. I felt involved as we had planned some of the ideas together. Bill started to initiate the dialogue by asking for my input and opinion about what he'd done.

Bill: 'Well I bet you were surprised. (We both laugh)

Bridget: Yes I must admit I was a bit.

Bill: It's good isn't it. I've spent the last week on it.

Bridget: Great.

Bill: Yes my wife wasn't very impressed. (We both laugh) Well there's still things which I haven't got like, well you know, like when you ask me why I'm doing stuff and what I expect. Where do I put that?

Bridget: What you mean you want to put that in your lesson plan?

Bill: Yes 'cos I saw in that Education Department sheet you gave me. I didn't like it but they have got aim or something in there and Hazel puts in her expectations doesn't she. Or does she put it somewhere else. I don't know.

Bridget: Well let's look at what you've got so far.

Bill: Can we arrange it another way?

Bridget: I don't know but we could have some headings like What I'm going to do How I'm going to do it and Why I'm doing it.

Bill: No. That sounds like a story. No but ......
The dialogue here indicates an involvement and commitment by both of us to see the task through. This is the first occasion where Bill asks direct questions, seeks my opinion and explicitly rejects a suggestion if he does not like it. After an hour of discussion and negotiation we arrive at the following format.

**Alternative LESSON PLAN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PURPOSE</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>ORGANISATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To look at the particular language of newspapers</td>
<td>Read Cannily Cannily</td>
<td>Work in pairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review Newspapers</td>
<td>to make a list of particular language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4 main roles)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>News Reporting</td>
<td>Work in pairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Stories)</td>
<td>to make a list of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commenting</td>
<td>particular language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Editorial Letters)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Info</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Ads)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Pictures Comics Interest stories)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To comment on the written style</td>
<td>Choose a story - article to read and comment on style.</td>
<td>Sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Work in pairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sharing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whilst this session formed a milestone in our relationship, my journal indicates the following concern:

'Well at least we seem to be co-operating with each other now, but I wish things would move along a bit more quickly. It seems we've got off to the new term on the right foot. On looking back through my data a lot of it reads like gobbledegook. I'll need a debriefing. I wonder if we'll ever get to the stage where Bill will debrief me and ask me some difficult questions. Heaven knows I'd really benefit from this.

Think I'll start writing my questions directly into the fieldnotes then he can choose which ones he wants to respond to or talk about.'

I returned to the practice of identifying questions arising from the fieldnotes and inserted these at the end of the transcript before returning them back to Bill.
'I wasn't sure what the purpose of this activity was - the writing of a list of words and then commenting on the style.'

'What do you intend doing with the boys' written work?'

'After each activity is there anything that you'll do besides sharing?'

'Do you look at the boys' work when they have done it?'

'I noticed that you've re-arranged the room again. Was there any particular purpose in your mind which determined the layout?'

'How do you record and evaluate the boys' progress in language learning?'

'How often are reports written?'

'Is it a good idea to time them all the time? What advantages do you think this might have for the learner?'

In hindsight, these questions looked somewhat threatening, not too dissimilar to those asked in the early stages of our relationship but with one significant difference. Now we knew each other better and there was a greater feeling of trust and sense of purpose in our actions. I was no longer concerned about not contributing expertise if it was appropriate and Bill was not slow to respond with his own opinions and ideas.

At this stage in our relationship it became obvious that Bill had regained control of his own development. We had come through a complete cycle of co-researching using the TACOR model.

In consultation with my research peers, it was decided that I had taken the strategy through a full cycle of events and Bill had now developed some specific ideas on the direction that he wanted to go. I decided, therefore, to withdraw from my co-researching relationship with Bill. I continued, however, to visit him once a fortnight to see how things were going. Bill's interest in change, however, began to wane and applying for a new job became his primary focus of interest.
Meetings focusing on specific issues:

Throughout our co-researching relationship, besides the debriefing sessions, we got together to discuss specific areas of interest. These meetings served to keep our relationship going throughout the holidays or when there were long gaps between classroom visits. They provided me with the opportunity to follow up on my interests and to get to know Bill better.

The dominating topics arising from these meetings changed with time and the development of Bill's classroom practice and our relationship. Topics which Bill wanted to pursue included the following:

- Bill's personal and career needs:
  
  Initially Bill was constantly concerned and anxious about issues related to his position in the school, promotion opportunities and his relationship with the Headmaster.

- Issues related to the ethos and climate of the school and his own internal relationship with his peers and superiors.

- His concerns about his own theoretical and craft knowledge and the gap that existed between his theory and practice

- Issues to do with control

- Unsure of how to re-organise the classroom. He wasn't sure whether to try new activities first or to organise the classroom differently before introducing new activities.

- Programming and planning

The nature of our interactions followed a similar pattern to those described of our debriefing sessions with the exception of the last topic on programming and planning. Bill's responses to direct suggestions for action were evasive. As soon as writing something down seemed appropriate, Bill would provide non-responses, evading the issue by raising other unrelated problems. I challenged
Bill about this when we were reviewing the transcripts of our discussions. He agreed and pointed out his own underlining with a red pen. I asked him why he had been so evasive and he said that he had a lot on his mind at that time.

My interests during these meetings focused on his response to the co-researching process. What I learnt forms the basis of the next section.

3.0 The participants' perceptions and reflections on the TACOR process

Although meetings to discuss the TACOR process had been arranged to take place once a month, in reality it was only on two occasions during our co-researching process that we focused our attention on our perceptions of how the TACOR process was progressing. Our discussions included our concerns and anxieties about the partnership, our perceptions about the value of each element of the process and the impact and outcomes that we felt the process had on us.

3.1 Concerns and anxieties about a co-researching partnership:

Our major concerns about the TACOR process were not the same. Bill was concerned primarily about the notion of 'researching' and the contextual factors which he felt impinged on his professional aspirations and needs. I was more concerned about our roles in maintaining a co-researching relationship based on equal status.

3.2 About researching:

Bill made it clear that he was concerned about his role in the co-researching process. He recalled his initial concerns about co-researching in the following way:

'At first I wasn't sure what it was going to be like. I was apprehensive because I suppose I looked at it as guinea pig research and then what effect it would have on the kids.'
Bill noted that he had no idea of what his role in a co-researching process might be. He needed to establish that there was some benefit in the activity for his own development. It was for these reasons that he wanted to trial the process for a few weeks before making a greater commitment.

3.3 Contextual Factors: ethos and climate of the school.

The Headmaster had indicated that the ethos of an independent boys preparatory school grew out of its purpose and the expectations of the parents. This preparatory school's major purpose was to prepare boys for their Common Entrance into one of the independent secondary schools. This success was dependent upon the boys' ability to pass the Common Entrance exam set by these schools. Whilst academic ability was important other attributes were also valued. A good sporting record, participation in music and drama and leadership qualities were valued commodities that assisted the boys to enter these elite secondary schools.

The means by which these qualities were developed in the preparatory school involved a strict code of behaviour and discipline, religious devotions, a clearly defined moral code and a strong sense of team spirit.

The stance taken by the teachers in their classrooms reflected an authoritarian approach, one in which the learning environment was tightly controlled by the teacher.

Whilst Bill recognised and believed in these tenets of the school, he felt that the nature of the curriculum dictated a certain approach to teaching and learning. He therefore felt a number of pressures affected his ability to make changes in his teaching practice. He was concerned about what the headmaster might think at the possibility of change in the classroom.

Right from the beginning of our relationship Bill suggested that there might be a conflict of interest between what he thought he should teach and the way he should teach it and what he thought the school expected the boys to learn. He made strong links between what was to be taught with a special way of teaching. He talked
about the things he wanted to teach as though they were incompatible with the content of the school curriculum. This was not confirmed, however, by the school program.

Throughout the relationship Bill was consumed by his desire to improve the learning experiences of the students. He felt that by relaxing his concern for discipline and control of the class and transferring some of this responsibility to the students, this might ultimately improve the learning outcomes for the students. Bill constantly referred to these differences in beliefs about the way to achieve the schools' objectives as a hinderance to his own development as a teacher. He suggested that the climate in the school wasn't helping him to make changes. For these reasons he suggested that his participation in a co-researching relationship might be affected.

3.4 About roles and relationships:

The nature of the development of our relationship was reflected in the nature of the dialogue during the debriefing sessions. This development can be highlighted by the following summary (page 137) of the changes in the dialogue over a period of nine months.
Initially we did not have a common language to describe and talk about what was happening.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BILL</th>
<th>BRIDGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initially we did not have a common language to describe and talk about what was happening.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Working out our roles and a way of working**

- Responses were short
- Acceptance of interrogation and responses were short but confident. Responses were 'reactive' in nature.
- Questions seeking clarification of Bill's actions - the hows and why's.
- Testing questions intended to cause some reflection on practice.
- Questions exerted control and authority over relationship.
- I became aware of the control and patronising quality of my own questioning.
- No shared dialogue

**Getting to know the class**

- Responses become more expansive but still remain 'reactive'.
- Focus of my questions moved away from Bill to the students and their responses to tasks and activities.

**Becoming a member of the class community**

- Here there is an exchange of information, the sharing of each others views and opinions. Interaction is no longer based on question/response format.
- Evidence of listening to each other and responding rather than reacting to what had been said.

**Uncovering the thinking behind the actions**

- Bill started to talk about his real concerns and to act upon his own solutions. He was beginning to reflect upon his own practice. This became an integral part of our shared dialogue.
- A gradual withdrawal from the commitments he had identified for himself.
- Questions that sought to facilitate Bill's thinking - the why's. These questions, unlike the questions I asked in the first phase of our relationship, did not attempt to glean a pre-determined response.

**A new beginning**

- We started to engage in a shared dialogue.
- There was evidence of a greater involvement and commitment by each of us. We both became involved in trying to find appropriate solutions.
- I continued to ask questions but Bill also began to ask questions too. We sought each others views and opinions and began to negotiate what action could be taken.
- We had found a shared language for our dialogue.

Figure 18: Phases in the development of our relationship reflected in the nature of the dialogue.
We both conceded that it had taken us both over two months to work out our roles, to establish a routine and to feel reasonably comfortable about the relationship.

'We are both feeling our way not only in terms of what is or is not going to happen but also in the establishment of our relationship. Neither of us is sure what is going to happen and what each of us might expect from each other.'

Bill suggested that although he didn't mind having someone in the classroom he remained a little unsure of the value of such a partnership. Bill pointed out that it was difficult to think about your teaching and at the same time worry about how you were developing a collaborative relationship. He notes that throughout the relationship he has had a problem of trying to teach, be an observer of what was happening and being a co-worker all at the same time. He suggested that co-researching was dependent upon the kind of relationship that you developed with people and that to develop the right kind of relationship was difficult.

During the first two months of our relationship my journal revealed my uncertainties about my role. I didn't want to be perceived as an expert but at the same time Bill seemed to have expectations that I would help him make changes to his practice.

'How can I fulfil Bill's expectations of me without taking away his control of his own learning?'

Through the journal I expressed my own limited perceptions of the nature of change and the lack of personal interaction skills that I had for 'leading from behind'. My journal recorded these personal realisations and reservations and specifically about the need for equality that I knew was necessary if co-researching was to be effective for both of us.

I also recorded my disappointment at what I was seeing in the classroom and how powerless I felt to do anything about it. After about a month, I indicated that being 'disappointed' told me something about my own lack of ability to accept the situation and to become a learner.
During one of our meetings, Bill and I had spent about two hours talking about responsibility and control in the classroom. He felt uneasy about the extent of his control and this caused me to reflect on similar problems that I had too. In my journal I recorded the following:

'It was after reading Independent Teachers and my talk with Bill today that I had a long serious think about my role, attitude and approach to the consultancy work I had done with teachers. The focus of my thoughts centred very heavily upon control. Most of the professional development strategies I had used really were based on having control and responsibility for the learning. So how can I use strategies that encourage teachers to take the responsibility. This is a real issue for me. Maybe my attitude has something to do with my impatience with other learners.'

A growing awareness of the difficulties associated with narrowing the gap between what I believed I should be doing and what I was actually doing assisted me to work out my role in the co-researching relationship.

The analysis of my journal, however, indicated that my concerns about my role in the relationship changed over time. Initially I had been consumed with the need to be seen as an equal and not as an expert. In the early stages I was a reticent and hesitant participant which severely restricted my ability to collaborate. With time, however, this reticence changed to one of support. The dialogue indicated that I had learnt how to play the role of facilitator and informant, offering and suggesting resources when Bill demanded this.

Towards the end of the relationship my journal indicated a recognition that it was alright to be an expert and that I could collaborate. The difference was that I had begun to recognise that the knowledge that Bill had to offer was something that I needed to think about and understand.

Only on one occasion did Bill challenge my role and notes:

Bill: 'I can see over the past, well this term, that there's been greater leaps forward (in our relationship). Today, I don't know what you
think, but it seems as though today you felt more comfortable to actually participate in what was going on in the room instead of being, in the kids' eyes, a passive observer.

B.B.: Do you think that's a good thing?

Bill: I do, yes.

B.B.: I mean I purposely held back before.

Bill: Yes but I don't know why.

B.B.: So as not to participate, well, I suppose because I saw my role just as an observer rather than a participant. Also I find that when I participate, I'm not so good at writing my fieldnotes. You know, I've got to do one thing or the other and it's difficult to do both.'

As a result of this revelation, we decided to change roles from time to time where I would do the teaching and Bill would take the fieldnotes. Bill noted that he found this most useful as it gave him the chance to really examine what was happening in the class. I noted in my journal that it also brought us together in our discussions about the students. When both of us became part of a shared context then the discourse became shared. This shared dialogue only occurred when we both felt we had a stake in the action.

3.5 Perceptions about the process itself

Data Collection: He indicated that he found the fieldnotes really useful as I often recorded incidents that he had not been aware of and this helped him to reflect on the effects of his own practice on the boys.

Debriefing: Bill indicated that the debriefing sessions had caused him to reflect on his practice. He noted:

'It makes me reflect upon what I'm doing in the room and whether you give me the ideas or if the ideas just come from our discussion or if I get the ideas, they just seem to come out in some way...its good that we've got this
time to sit and reflect on things. I haven't been totally concerned with content. I can think about methodology.'

'It helps you look at the process of how things are being done and monitoring your own process.'

'We can use each other as a sounding board like do you think this would go right or not or that was really good or that wasn't really the way it should have gone or something along those sorts of lines. So that's where it's of greatest assistance to me. The other thing is it makes me plan.... By the simple fact of you coming into the room I have to plan. There are some mornings that you think well I'll just thumb my way through it today. It's easy to say well open your books to page 63 and do exercise 13.... but with you coming in I've got to actually sit and stop to think about it. I find this a real positive aspect for me, I don't know what others think about it.'

4.0 The impact and outcomes for the participants as a result of their involvement in the TACOR process

Bill and I discussed the impact and outcomes of our co-researching relationship. The outcomes were different for each of us.

Bill indicated that he felt that he had 'grown as a teacher' and had made great strides in the implementation of new practices in the classroom. The data analysis supports this and indicates a number of changes made to his teaching practice. His teaching repertoire had been extended to include many new strategies particularly in the use of children's literature as a basis for his language program. He had changed the physical layout of the class to allow for small group work and made way for the display of boys' work on the walls. Whilst these changes only applied to one of the weekly language times, towards the end of the relationship he was trying to develop a program and select appropriate materials for the boys to use that would extend his new repertoire to other language periods.

Bill made many references to new teacher reference material he had found and was using to support his new initiatives. He indicated that he had done no professional reading since leaving college. Bill also felt that our collaboration had provided him with more confidence and the necessary sensitivity to work with other teachers in his
school in a similar way.

Bill indicated that our work together and the language inservice courses that he had attended had given him extra responsibilities for language teaching in the school. As he recalled,

'Well the headmaster has asked me to chair a committee to rewrite our school language policy so he must think I know something.'

There was a ripple effect of our co-researching on other members of the school community. Bill noted that the librarian was frequently seeking out his advice as to what books he could order for the school. New books received by the library were often left on Bill's desk so that he would know what had arrived. Bill noted the interest that the librarian had taken in the kinds of things that Bill was trying. He also described the interest he had received from some of the other teachers in the school. They were curious about our activities and often approached Bill with questions about their own language program.

My journal revealed the extent of the impact of the TACOR process on my own development. This development included both professional and personal dimensions.

Out of my frustrations about the slow pace of change and the complexities involved in the process of change grew a greater tolerance and patient. The degree to which the climate of the school impacted on my relationship with Bill surprised me. I began to question whether the values and beliefs about 'whole language' were compatible with the ethos of independent schools. I was not able to resolve this.

The greatest impact of the TACOR process on my development was at a personal level. It started a journey of discovery about the human qualities that were necessary if growth through collaboration was to be effective. My reflections, therefore, focussed mainly on the human aspects of the experience. The TACOR process caused me to reflect upon myself as a teacher, a learner and as a co-researcher. One of the major spin-offs that this experience had was to alter the nature of my interactions with teachers and children. I now listen
more carefully and try to respond rather than react. I started to try asking questions which would leave control of the learning in the hands of those I was working with.

1 A preparatory school is an independent private school for boys aged 5-11 years and who intend to enter an independent private secondary school.
2 This was an inservice package designed for schools to use themselves and to cater to teachers of children from five to eight years of age.
3 The Literacy 3 - 7 Course was a professional development packaged for teachers of years 7 - 9. It was developed by the Association of Independent Schools and the Catholic Education Office in Sydney, NSW.
CASE STUDY TWO: Pam and Bridget as Co-researchers.

The co-researching relationship established between Pam and I extended over six months. The initial negotiations for a co-researching partnership involved three participants, Pam (the ESL teacher), the Head of the Science Department and myself.

1.0 About the participants and how the TACOR process was initially established and negotiated.

Pam was an experienced English teacher. She had gained an Arts degree overseas and after working in various parts of the world had settled in Australia. Two years ago she had been asked to form a special language class for students coming to the school from overseas and who were having problems with their English.

I received a telephone call from Pam seeking assistance and support for some problems that she perceived she had in her position of ESL teacher within the secondary school in which she worked. She wondered whether there were other teachers working in a similar situation that she could contact or whether there was a consultant who might help her. Although I had no specialised knowledge of ESL teaching and learning, I mentioned that I would be most interested to work with her to explore the issues causing her concern.

Pam indicated that she had been invited into the classroom of the head of the science department to assist her with what she identified as 'the language demands of the science classroom on the ESL students'. Pam was anxious to get some help and to identify how she might go about this task. She was aware of the demands that the texts books made of readers and the difficulties that the ESL students were having in class and with their homework. Pam was also anxious to receive suggestions of ways in which she might work in the classroom with the science teacher on these problems. The science teacher had suggested this arrangement rather than withdrawal of the students.
As this was the first time that she had been invited into a classroom by one of the teachers she was anxious that all should go well. I briefly told her of the TACOR process and she seemed interested. We made arrangements to meet to further discuss the problem and to look at ways of proceeding.

The following week we had a meeting during which general problems of second language learners were discussed and in particular the demands that texts books placed on her ESL students. I offered to send her a number of articles that addressed this specific issue.

After this meeting Pam made arrangements for me to meet the science teacher and the head of the English department to discuss TACOR and its possibilities. The science teacher reacted positively to the suggestion although she said she would prefer to be an observer rather than a participant in the process as she did not have sufficient time to be involved.

I left Pam and the science teacher with an article outlining details of the TACOR process and arranged a further meeting to discuss details of the proposal with them.

As a result of this meeting it was decided that Pam would like to participate in a co-researching relationship and that the science teacher would join in only when necessary. Permission to proceed was then sought from the school principal.

A further meeting between Pam and myself was arranged and final details were discussed. We talked about my role as a co-researcher and about my interests in the project. We made arrangements to get together once a week and we also discussed the elements of the co-researching process and the responsibilities and expectations we had of each other.

The following week I attended the science class with Pam. Prior to this visit Pam and I had established what our roles should be for this first encounter. I was to take fieldnotes focusing on the general activities of the class whilst Pam would circulate amongst the girls
who had been identified as having problems and look carefully at the
tasks that they had been set. The girls provided her with limited
information about their language problems during these science
classes.

After two months of irregular classroom visits and follow-up
debriefings, it became apparent that the process could not work
effectively without the science teacher's participation, interest and
commitment so it was resolved that Pam and I would continue on our
own and focus on her special language classes for second language
learners.

As a result of this false start, whilst my co-researching
relationship with Pam extended over a six month period, only the
last four months, where we focused on Pam's classroom, will be
reported.

Unlike my experiences with Bill, Pam maintained a certain degree of
autonomy. Her part time responsibilities for the ESL classes were
generally seen by the staff as a student support service and as a
result of this she did not seem to be greatly affected by either the
climate or ethos of the school. The principal seemed pleased that
Pam had taken the initiative to accommodate her own professional
needs, and indicated support for the project.

1.1 The context and focus of our co-researching
partnership.

Pam decided that we should focus our attention on just one
particular group, a group comprising of six girls drawn from Year 8
to 10 classrooms and who had been identified by their teachers as in
need of extra help with their English.

Pam worked with this group twice weekly for an hour and a half. In
the first of these sessions she provided support and guidance for the
work that they had been set by their teachers. This usually involved
a focus on written tasks that had been set for homework or on
preparation for classroom tests.
Pam used the second session to focus on the development of their understanding of English. It was this session that she wished me to join. She had planned a unit of work on Australia as she felt that the girls had little knowledge of the country.

Although most of the girls had either family friends or relatives here in Australia, their immediate families lived in their 'home' countries. The girls came from Hong Kong, Malaysia, Thailand and Singapore. They had come to Australia for their secondary education, and whilst most of them had studied English in their primary schools or with special tutors, their understanding of English as required by their secondary studies was weak.

Pam had a clear idea of the focus which she wished us to pursue. She expressed her immediate concerns of this group in her journal as follows:

"Factors which make this a difficult group for me are:

1. Their passivity in my lessons.
2. The wide range of their grasp of English...
3. The age range: Yr. 8 - 10
4. Their expectations of the lesson format and my teaching; for example, I want them to aim for effective oral performance and try to extend and develop their speaking skills, but only L (and B to a lesser extent) really makes an effort. They seem most at ease reading and writing individually in silence whereas I want to encourage interaction.
5. The limited time available.
6. Factors 1, 4 & 5 result (I feel) in too little writing that is of real value to them, and factors 1 & 4 result in my feeling that they are not trying hard enough with oral English. For each of us some frustration results.
7. I sense a lack of commitment in this group, and I probably intervene too much and in too dominant a way.

Factors 1, 4, 6 & 7 are the ones I want us to work on. Nos. 2, 3, & 5 I have to accept as limitations imposed from outside.....I think when I get 4 right, the other factors may fall into place."

These clearly articulated concerns became the basis of our co-researching partnership. We decided to see if we could increase the students level of involvement and participation in class activities. We wanted to provide opportunity for greater interaction between the students which would create more opportunities for discussion.

2.0 About the TACOR process in action - what happened and how.

The results of the data analysis and focus of this narrative is very different from that which explained the previous co-researching experiences with Bill. Because a useful and productive relationship was established almost immediately, the analysis indicated that the content or substance of our co-researching became the primary focus rather than concerns about status, role or relationship.

2.1 Initial expectations of our roles within the partnership.

By the time I began to attend Pam's classes, I already had some experience of the TACOR process to draw on. This may have influenced the more organised and focused way in which this relationship developed.

One of the distinct differences between this relationship and the one I had with Bill was Pam's perception of my role in the process. I knew little about second language learners but had some knowledge and understanding of the language demands of a secondary curriculum. We both entered the relationship anticipating that we would need to bring together our different areas of expertise. I note in my personal journal that:

'I feel entirely different about the beginning of my relationship with Pam. It's going to be interesting as I'd like to learn more about second language learners. Maybe my experiences in cross-cultural education will be useful. Pam does not see me as an expert coming in to tell her what to do. It's very much a case of let's see if we can solve these problems together. I feel much more comfortable about this.'
Pam also indicated no hesitancy or uncertainty about our coresearching relationship and noted the following in her journal:

'It looks as though getting together with Bridget is really going to help me. It's good to have someone else in the classroom as two heads are always better than one. I'm really interested to hear her feedback on the activities that I've planned.'

These perceptions indicated that we both felt a degree of equality about the partnership.

2.2 Elements of the TACOR process

All elements identified by the originators of the TACOR process were followed. One further element, however, which we called 'refocusing', also became a specific characteristic of the coresearching process.

![Figure 19: Elements of the TACOR process](image)

**Figure 19:** Elements of the TACOR process

**Data Collection:**

**Fieldnotes:** I was responsible for the taking of fieldnotes throughout our relationship. Fieldnotes were taken during each class session attended. However, as the group was so small, it seemed more appropriate to tape each session from which a transcript was made. All transcripts were typed and returned to Pam for comment. Pam found these transcripts of the class sessions both interesting
and useful and inserted questions or personal reflective responses to her own teaching into the text. For instance:

'I was appalled to see I'd talked for so long!'

'This was much too short a 'thinking' time for B. How to avoid dead silences but still provide thinking time? I often think I intervene because I feel the silence is 'dead' time rather than 'thinking', and so I should give another prompt or give someone else a chance to answer.'

'Seeing a transcript is really useful. This one has alerted me to the fact that I talk without break for too long, and that I could take more advantage of opportunities for spontaneous natural practice of language structures.'

These transcripts also afforded her the opportunity to examine the language the students were actually using. She notes;

'To see the form of these responses is interesting. J has already internalised the common form of the response and it comes out naturally as "I'd write". L and B respond with the bit they are sure of like, "Go to the office", though I realise this could also be their response to the choices I gave at the beginning.'

By taping each session it was possible for me to become an observer and a participant in the classroom activities. I made observations of the student's responses, raised questions and made note of ideas that I thought Pam might be interested to discuss during the following debriefing session.

**Personal Journals:** We both kept personal journals and these became an integral part of the data collected and the basis for discussion during the debriefing sessions. We shared our journal entries with each other.

Pam used her journal to reflect on her planning, on the girls responses to the tasks and on her own learning.
'The poor part was
a) too much teacher control and
b) trying to locate the photographs that matched the lines.
This destroyed any rhythm and was simply awkward. I was afraid of that, but didn’t know how else to show the photographs to a group of six. Obviously loose pictures would have been easier to manage. Still it needed a different approach.'

My journal involved similar comments about what was happening in class but also reflected on Pam’s actions as she tried to refine her practice. I also made comparisons between the two very different co-researching relationships that I was experiencing.
I was using my personal journal to reflect on the change process.

'Pam has such a different attitude to change than Bill. She is willing to have a go even though the changes don’t always work well. Every time we talk we make new decisions. We raise problems and straight away Pam seeks a solution and takes action.'

**Debriefing and Refocussing:**

Debriefing sessions were held once a week. The fieldnotes or transcripts taken of the lessons and the sharing of our personal journals, formed the basis of these sessions and provided a common context for our subsequent shared reflections on what had happened and discussions of what we might do next time.

Full transcripts of our debriefings revealed the nature of the roles we assumed throughout our co-researching relationship. Like the relationship I had with Bill, it was the language of our dialogue during the debriefing sessions that most clearly indicated our ability to collaborate. The way we spoke to each other showed a sense of mutual sharing and comparing of our knowledge. Ideas were discussed, knowledge was pooled, personal reflections made explicit and, as a result, new approaches were tried.

Unlike my relationship with Bill in which I described our dialogue during the early stages of the debriefings as *reactive*, the
dialogue between Pam and I, right from the beginning, showed interactions which were 'responsive', 'reciprocal' and 'interdependent'. These characteristics typified the nature of our dialogue throughout the relationship.

In the previous relationship I had with Bill, the nature of the debriefings were often governed by outside factors that Bill felt impinged on his ability and willingness to make changes in his teaching practice and his commitment to change. Our debriefing sessions went through a series of marked phases that directly related to our developing relationship. In the co-researching relationship with Pam, however, distinguishable phases of the debriefings were not so clearly defined.

The first two weeks involved a period of orientation where I needed to become familiar with Pam's program, her teaching style and the students themselves. After this initial period of orientation questioning, the nature of the debriefing sessions changed. Discussion was no longer based on a set of predetermined questions but rather evolved from Pam's written responses to the class transcripts. I continued to debrief Pam but the questioning spontaneously arose from Pam's focus of interest. Our debriefing sessions became highly focused on our mutual effort to make changes in the classroom and involved considerable discussion of Pam's beliefs and assumptions about language learning.

The debriefings reflected a chronology of our developing understandings of how we could increase the level of active participation and interaction between the students. Our changing focuses included:

- teaching practice and the nature of teacher interaction with the students

- student responses to set tasks and levels of interaction

- opening up the options for readers and writers.
In describing these different phases of debriefing, the teaching program is provided to explain the context of our discussions and to record the changes made in organisation as a result of our refocussing.

**Teacher interaction with the students and teaching practice**

**The Context:**
The theme for the next three weeks focused on trying to extend the stu and some of its distinctive features. The theme involved:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTENT</th>
<th>LANGUAGE FOCUS</th>
<th>ORGANISATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The landscapes and differences between each State.</td>
<td>Writing letters. Making comparisons. Application for grant.</td>
<td>Pam provides individual support and guidance and further demonstrations of what is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'My Country' by Helen MacKellar.</td>
<td>Talk about structure of poem, descriptions and descriptive language. Make list of author's likes. Learn poem by heart.</td>
<td>Activity lead and guided by Pam throughout.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Lesson Transcripts:** The transcripts of the classroom sessions interested Pam as she noted that they provided the opportunity to examine the nature of her interactions with the girls and to consider the effect of her planning and teaching practice on the girls learning. Notes that Pam had inserted in the margins of these transcripts as well as the transcripts themselves become the focus of our attention. She noted the following:

'Seeing a transcript is really useful. This one has alerted me to the fact that talk without break for too long, and that I could take more advantage of opportunities for spontaneous natural practice of language structures. e.g. when I asked them what they'd choose I should have responded to C with "You'd go to the office", and got them all to use the shortened 'would'
structure in their answer. This needs to be followed up with more opportunities to practice the conditional. Spontaneous drills are the most useful sort of drills, I think.'

**Discussion:** This realisation prompted us to discuss Pam's teaching practice with particular reference to the degree of control that Pam exercised over the proceedings. In the margin of the debriefing transcript where the degree of Pam's control over class proceedings is recorded she noted:

'This is so true of my work with this group! There is an inherent contradiction here because I want them to interact with each other but my control isn't allowing this to happen.'

**Refocusing:** Our discussions about levels of teacher control led us to look more closely at the ways in which the activities were organised. We decided that activities needed to be more open ended, more flexible and that opportunities for small group discussion needed to be introduced. It was further determined that Pam should try to maximise where possible on what the students already knew, their own personal experiences.

**Student responses to set tasks and levels of interaction**

**Context:** As a result of our debriefing sessions and our refocussing a number of changes were made to the organisation of activities. Pam began to relinquish some of the control and became a participant rather than a director of activities.
This planning strongly reflected a number of changes in practice and it was the effect of the changes on the nature of the responses of the students which became the focus of our attention. Pam commented:

'I was quite pleased with their response to this lesson - they seemed to put more into it. But will wait to see B's transcript to check that perception. It was nice that B joined in more today. I like the extra input.'

'Lots more interaction now especially when I allowed them to talk about their own countries and what they liked. Left them to it....Pairs worked well together....This was the first time that any spontaneous talk about the topic had arisen with them. I felt quite easy about letting them work out their own problems.'

**Discussion:** The focus of our interest was on the nature of the students responses to the activities. My debriefing questions tried to allow Pam to decide how and why the level of interactions had increased. We discussed the conditions necessary for students to
learn language and compared this with the purpose of the activities and the students responses over the past three weeks.

Whilst examining student responses we also discovered that whilst participation and interaction had increased, some of the girls were not involved in the recording or completion of the activities. This was left to the most able member of the groups.

**Refocusing:** We felt that we needed to question the difficulty of the texts being used, specifically the poems. Much of the language was very demanding. Pam decided that she needed to review the texts she had planned to use for the next sessions. She decided that she might have to present a variety of texts with varying difficulty rather than one text for everybody. Pam indicated that she also wanted to see how much the students knew about other genres.

**Opening up more options for readers and writers**

Our final sessions focused on further refinements of practice. Pam found that asking students to work in pairs, with different activities, using different texts was more suitable to their levels of understanding and achieved better levels of interaction, engagement and learning.

We determined that if students were to increase their understanding of how texts worked then they would need to read and write more frequently. We also felt that they needed to read and write for their own purposes as well as those that had been predetermined by Pam. Classes, we decided, needed to offer more choices of activities, demonstrations and a range of follow-up activities.

Pam set about preparing a new program. The content had not changed much but its scope was extended. The major change was reflected in the teaching-learning processes that were being established. This included:

- general discussion about what students already knew
- demonstration of some kind from Pam
- students working in pairs on activities
- students reporting back to whole group on what they had done.

**Concluding the relationship:**

At this point, after identifying other ESL teachers involved in similar work to Pam and who were interested to pursue some communication and sharing of ideas, I withdrew from our co-researching relationship.

**3.0 Perceptions and reflections of the TACOR process**

Very little of our time was spent discussing our perceptions of how the TACOR process was working nor of the personal value that the process had for us as individuals. It was the development of our understandings, the action we initiated, the changes that we were developing and the students positive response that kept the process going.

Throughout the process there was no discussion about our roles or the relationship. Our discussions were at all times 'workman like'. There was a clear focus of interest and an energy and commitment in finding solutions to perceived problems. The transcripts of the debriefing sessions showed little evidence of idle chatter. My journal makes frequent reference to this quality of the relationship.

Pam makes note of the value of both personal reflections arising from the fieldnotes and the shared reflections during the debriefing sessions. In one of her later journal entries she comments on the value of 'extra input' during class time and having someone with whom to discuss problems.

**4.0 Impact and outcomes of the TACOR process**

Again, because of the brevity of our relationship, we did not spend time discussing either the impact or outcomes of the process. However, the data revealed that the process had done much to activate change in the refinement of Pam's teaching practices and as a consequence of this the level of student participation had
increased considerably.

For me the greatest impact was the differences that existed between the two different relationships. My relationship with Pam had been so uncomplicated whereas with Bill I suffered constant feelings of failure as a collaborator and was constantly aware of the complex problems associated with Bill's efforts to make changes in his classroom. My journal makes frequent reference to my own thoughts about the change process. Towards the end of my second co-researching relationship I make the following observation:

'Change seems to be as complicated or as easy as you wish to make it or as circumstances allow. Whilst I can appreciate that the school climate plays an important role in many subtle ways on teachers' attitude to change there still remains a strong element of personal responsibility if change is to take place.'

After the co-researching relationships had finished I continued to make entries in my reflective journal. These entries make clear my continued anxiety about the complex nature of change and raised many more questions than answers.
SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR NARRATIVE ONE

The first summary charts the key characteristics of my co-researching relationship with Bill.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Characteristics</th>
<th>BILL</th>
<th>BRIDGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Establishment and Negotiations of the TACOR Relationship</td>
<td>* An experienced teacher (eight years) of primary grade classrooms (3 - 6).</td>
<td>* Experienced classroom teacher, language consultant and more recently an administrator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Needs and interests of the participants were very different.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Site</td>
<td>* A Year 6 class in an Independent boys' Prep school (K-6), preparing boys for a Common Entrance exam into one of the elite Independent secondary schools.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Climate and Ethos of the School</td>
<td>* The school had a strong set of values and traditions and a clear vision of purpose.</td>
<td>* Professional development of staff was encouraged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Decisions are made by working parties in consultation with the Headmaster.</td>
<td>* Sporting achievement and a competitive spirit is nurtured.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Catalyst &amp; Purpose for Change</td>
<td>* Needs and interests of both participants were very different.</td>
<td>* I wanted to know more about teachers and the process of change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Bill's interest in change had come about as a result of his attendance at two major inservice programs. He became interested in language and literacy learning. He realised that a gap existed between what he knew and understood about language learning and his teaching practice.</td>
<td>* A greater understanding of the change process might help me develop and organise professional development activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Bill was also interested in promotion and felt that a co-researching project might enhance his chances.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation of Partnership</td>
<td>* Initial negotiations took several months to complete. We were both tentative about a co-researching partnership. Bill had a perception that it might be 'guinea pig' research. A trial of the process was used to allay doubts and concerns.</td>
<td>* Further negotiations involved finding a focus for co-researching, discussion about the TACOR process itself and how it worked, the time involved and what our roles/responsibilities and commitment would be.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Negotiations were also initiated with the Headmaster seeking approval for the project to proceed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The TACOR Process in Action</td>
<td>* No specific purpose was identified except that new activities might be tried during class time.</td>
<td>* How Bill went about making changes to his classroom practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding a Focus</td>
<td>* My focus of interest changed as the relationship developed. My focus became more introspective.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td>* Each kind of data served to contribute different information about the relationship and the process:- Fieldnotes - description of context. Journals - personal response to the TACOR process and to individual learning. Debriefing - explained the nature of the developing relationship, how the co-researching process worked and the development and changes in our concerns and interests.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fieldnotes:
* Collected by Bridget during classroom sessions once a week. Bill did not share in the collection of data.
* Fieldnotes were descriptive of classroom action/activities and were non-judgemental.
* Questions were identified from the fieldnotes that formed the basis of the debriefing session.
* On two occasions our roles were reversed.
* Focus of the fieldnotes became more focused as our research interests became more clearly defined.
* The taking of fieldnotes improved with practice.
* As time progressed I became more involved in class activities and therefore the fieldnotes were often written from direct recordings and transcripts.
* All fieldnotes were typed and returned to Bill for comment.

Journals:
* Although Bill saw the potential value of this activity he made only a few isolated entries.
* My journal became a record not only of reflections concerning Bill, his class and our relationship but also reflections about my understandings of professional development, teacher change and the process of naturalistic enquiry.
* I did not share my journal with Bill.

Debriefing
* Held weekly over a period of eight months.
* Used the fieldnotes as a basis for discussion.
* The manner of the interactions during the debriefings became a reflection of the nature of our developing relationship and the roles that we assumed.
* The nature of the dialogue and the focus of our attention revealed a number of distinguishable phases of debriefings which were described as:

a) Working out our roles and a way of working;
* Initially tentative.
* Theory/practice gap - whilst I didn’t want to be seen as an expert, seeking a more equal relationship, I could not carry this out in practice. This realisation led to a change in approach where I stopped initiating the lead. This caused a temporary loss of focus and purpose for co-researching.

b) Getting to know the class;
* Nature of my questioning changes.
* Change in focus away from Bill’s teaching to the response of the students to the activities.
* We begin to look at fieldnotes together although there continues to be little shared dialogue.

c) Becoming a member of the class community;
* Suggest that we should change roles.
* Bill starts to plan his work more carefully. He uses teacher reference material to find new activities.
**Uncovering the thinking behind the action**

- We begin to work together to explore teaching practices and discuss the assumptions upon which they are based.
- Evidence of real response from Bill and a shared dialogue starts between us.
- Bill begins to show satisfaction with the changes he has made and the boys responses.
- A marked change of role for me to that of facilitator.
- Gained an understanding of how we could work together where I could contribute my expertise without controlling the relationship.

**A new beginning.**

- Greater level of trust has developed in our relationship and our roles more clearly defined.
- We both display a greater level of commitment to the relationship.
- Bill takes control of his own agenda for change.

**Meetings**

- These focused on specific areas of concern or interest. These topics covered both professional and personal issues. The tenor of these meetings was much the same as the debriefing sessions.

**3. Perceptions and reflections of the TACOR process.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill's Perspective</th>
<th>My Perspective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bill was concerned about the notion of research as he did not wish to become someone's guinea-pig.</td>
<td>I was anxious about the development of a relationship built on equal status.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ethos of the school affected Bill's ability to engage fully with the process of change.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill found that playing a variety of roles, teacher, observer and co-researcher, difficult to maintain.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill found fieldnotes useful and interesting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing a productive relationship for both parties took several months.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The nature of our developing relationship was evident in the nature of the dialogue between us.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initially we had different expectations of the co-researching process and what our roles should be.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4. Impact and Outcomes of the TACOR Process**

- Bill felt he had 'grown as a teacher'.
- I learnt about myself as a teacher, a learner and as a collaborator.
- Had implemented many changes in his classroom which included many new teaching strategies, changes in physical layout of the room, development of a literature-based program.
- The experience had increased my sensitivity to the affects of ethos and climate on teacher change.
- Greater use of teacher reference books and general professional reading.
- I began to realise the problems associated with the theory/practice gap.
- Introduced a new range of reading materials for the boys - real books.
- The nature of my interactions with both children and teachers changed as I became more aware of the language I was using to communicate.

**Figure 20:** Summary of the key characteristics of Bridget and Bill's co-researching relationship.
The second figure summarises the results of my co-researching experiences with Pam.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Characteristics</th>
<th>PAM</th>
<th>BRIDGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Establishment and Negotiations of the TACOR Relationship</td>
<td>An experienced teacher (fifteen years) of English and for the last two years a teacher of English as a Second Language.</td>
<td>An experienced classroom teacher, language consultant and more recently an administrator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Participants</td>
<td>An ESL class for Year 8 - 10 students from Hong Kong and South East Asia, in an Independent girl's secondary school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Site</td>
<td>The principal was supportive of the project.</td>
<td>Pam decided that she needed support and assistance to develop her ability to respond to and plan for ESL students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Climate/ Ethos of School</td>
<td>This did not infringe on either the project or our relationship.</td>
<td>The principal was supportive of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Catalyst &amp; Purpose</td>
<td>Pam decided that she needed support and assistance to develop her ability to respond to and plan for ESL students.</td>
<td>Pam had no preconceived or negative ideas about research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Change</td>
<td>After a false start, negotiations with Pam were straightforward and the principal was supportive of the project.</td>
<td>I had already some experience of setting up a co-researching relationship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation of Partnership</td>
<td>As soon as a focus of research interest had been negotiated, then logistics, expectations and commitment were clarified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The TACOR Process in Action</td>
<td>Based on a set of concerns that Pam had identified, we both decided that we would try to increase the level of student involvement and participation in class activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding a Focus</td>
<td>From the beginning of the relationship we both recognised each other's area of expertise and realised that we would need to work closely together so as to combine our knowledge.</td>
<td>I had already some experience of setting up a co-researching relationship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing Our Roles</td>
<td>The relationship, from the beginning, was based on one of equality.</td>
<td>Pam had no preconceived or negative ideas about research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We both saw a value in a co-researching partnership and recorded this in our personal journals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection Fieldnotes</td>
<td>Pam found this data both interesting and helpful.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pam used the fieldnotes to reflect on her teaching practice and to closely examine the language that the students were using.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collected by Bridget during classroom sessions once a week.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Because of the smallness of the group fieldnotes were often substituted with exact transcripts of class proceedings. This allowed more opportunity for me to participate in class activities, to make observations and to raise questions for discussion in the debriefing session.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pam responded to the fieldnotes/transcripts by inserting her own comments or perceptions to what was going on.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Journals</td>
<td>Pam used the fieldnotes to reflect on her teaching practice and to closely examine the language that the students were using.</td>
<td>I used the journal to reflect on class activities, Pam's actions and the co-researching experience and the change process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Debriefing and Refocussing Sessions

- Held weekly.
- Fieldnotes, transcripts and personal journals formed the basis for debriefing.
- Transcripts of the debriefings showed nature of roles assumed through the language that was used. Language used indicated a sense of mutuality, pooling knowledge and trying new approaches.
- Interactions were 'responsive', 'reciprocal' and 'interdependent' rather than 'reactive'.
- Debriefings maintained specific focus and although phases in debriefing not clearly defined, the focus changed with time as follows:

a) Teaching practice and the nature of teacher interaction with the students.
   - Problem: Issues related to locus of control.
   - Solution: Activities designed to be more open ended and flexible
     - Small group discussion
     - Make activities more personally relevant.
     - Pam to increase level of participation in activity rather than assuming position of director
   - Outcome: Increased student participation and discussion.

b) Student responses to set tasks and levels of interaction.
   - Problem: Some students hanging back leaving other more capable language users to scribe and report.
     - Text difficulty.
   - Solution: Review texts and the demands placed on readers. Select texts of different levels rather than one text for all.
   - Outcome: Students working in pairs on different tasks resulting in higher levels of interaction.

c) Opening up more opportunities for readers and writers.
   - Problem: How to provide greater range of reading and writing options and more frequent opportunities for students to write.
   - Solution: Offer greater range of activities/texts
     - Provide more demonstrations
   - Outcome: Changed organisational format of teaching-learning process.

3. Perceptions and reflections of the TACOR process.
   - Little explicit discussion of process or our roles.
   - High level of commitment and engagement in the process
   - Pam identified the value of both the personal and shared reflections and having someone else in the classroom.

4. Impact and Outcomes of the TACOR Process
   - The process continually activated changes in Pam’s classroom practice.
     - The continual monitoring of student response set the agenda for the refinement of practice.
     - Became more selective about the texts used and provided a greater range of materials for students to use.
   - For me the greatest impact involved the constant comparisons that the process caused me to make between my two very different co-researching relationships. The process caused me to reflect on the complexities associated with the change process.

Figure 21: Summary of the key characteristics of Bridget and Pam’s co-researching relationship.
The first case study describes the co-researching experiences of Bill and myself, and tells of a hesitant and sometimes difficult attempt at collaborative enterprise. Many external factors impinged on the development of our relationship. Bill, although wanting to make changes in his classroom felt the need to establish a career path for himself. He felt the pressures to prepare his students for the Common Entrance exam in ways that were accepted by the culture of the school. The headmaster valued change and staff development providing it did not interfere with traditional values.

I entered the relationship expecting Bill to make quantum changes in both his philosophy and his practice. I was disappointed at the small changes that occurred. Bill on the other hand was delighted and felt a great sense of achievement. I was frustrated by the lack of direction and focus that the relationship seemed to have and my inability to work 'with' Bill rather than 'on' him.

Our relationship was complex. We both sought answers to questions that we were finding difficult to articulate and we found it difficult to respond to each other's needs.

In the relationship with Pam, with some successes and failures to my record of co-researching and a good deal of information and advice from experienced co-researchers, our relationship developed quickly into a highly focussed working partnership. Unlike the partnership with Bill, the data collected became the nucleus of our shared learning. Identifying the problem, discussing options for a solution, trialling ideas and arriving at new understandings made the co-researching relationship with Pam an uncomplicated and somewhat linear affair.
NARRATIVE TWO: Retrospective Recall of the TACOR Process (Group B)

This narrative reports on the retrospective recall of six participants in each of four co-researching partnerships as follows:-

Academic 1 with Teacher 1
Academic 2 with Teacher 2
Teacher 2 with Teacher 3
Principal with Teacher

In the first three partnerships the retrospective recall from both partners was gained. In the fourth partnership only the principal's responses are presented as the teacher with whom he worked was unavailable.

All participants, as well as recalling their past experiences of these partnerships, provided details of other co-researching experiences that they had with other teachers and academics.

For the purposes of this study 'academic' refers to staff from the School of Education at a local university and who were engaged in teaching and research in the area of literacy and language learning.

The major themes that emerged from the data analysis and which form the organisational structure of this account include the following:

1.0 How the TACOR process was conceived: an historical overview.
2.0 The co-researching process - its distinctive elements.
3.0 Major characteristics of the collaborative enterprise.
4.0 The impact and outcomes of the TACOR process.
5.0 The TACOR process in hindsight.
1.0 How the TACOR process was conceived: an historical overview.

This theme provided information that identified how the TACOR process was conceived and how it started.

Two academics, approximately six years ago, at different times, with different agendas and with differing experiences and knowledge about teachers, classrooms and research, began an informal dialogue between themselves about how best they might conduct research in a classroom setting. Both academics also wanted to understand better the processes of naturalistic enquiry.

The differences of the role played by a scientific researcher and that suggested by the methodology of naturalistic enquiry, became the focus of an ongoing debate. One academic had many years experience of scientific methodology whilst the other had been a language consultant for many years and although she did not see herself as a researcher, felt she knew a great deal about how to work with teachers.

Both academics had questions which they knew could only be answered through a closer and more open relationship with teachers and children in real classrooms.

Both academics had their own particular questions and interests. One was interested to find out from children their understandings about written register and learn more about the nature of the linguistic interactions between teachers and children. The other academic was more interested in how teachers' underlying philosophies about literacy and language teaching and learning influenced their practice. He also wanted to find out how whole language classrooms worked.

In response to these needs, at different times and in differing ways, both academics approached a group of teachers with the hope that they might be able to work with them.

The first academic started up a Special Interest Group for teachers meeting once a month to discuss writing. A room at the university
was put aside and teachers from local schools were invited to come along to talk about the new writing syllabus and to hear about some strategies that the academic knew about. This initial group of interested teachers grew from seven to about forty and as the academic related, 'with me very much in control, dominating the whole thing all the time and feeding teachers information and things to read. I was very conscious of the fact that if they were going to keep coming along I had to give them strategies, that's all they wanted and of course after about a year I started to run out of strategies'.

This academic soon realised that this kind of interaction was limited in terms of his own development and his specific research interests. He continued his account of the next stage. 'So it was then that I thought it would be a good opportunity to get these teachers involved in doing something and so I threw out a challenge about whether the conditions they were using for process writing could also be applied to something called process reading'. The teachers were invited to brainstorm this idea and the academic, as 'just a throw away line', suggested that he would be interested to observe a teacher trying 'process reading' in the classroom. One teacher expressed an interest and invited the academic to come out and 'observe' her.

The second academic had been visiting teachers and classrooms regularly to explore various issues and had developed a number of informal relationships. Her initial experiences involved visiting classrooms and keeping a journal. The teachers she was working with had also been encouraged to keep journals which later they began to share. Informal follow-up meetings were held in the staff room. She saw these activities as natural extensions of her work as a language consultant.

The basis of these initial interactions between teachers and academics were different. One based her interactions on what she had learnt about teachers through many years of consultancy work, whilst the other entered a relationship as a researcher who wished to use new research methodologies.
It was from these initial relationships that the dialogue between the academics grew in intensity as they tried to make connections between their own past experiences, what they wanted to do and their new research relationships with teachers. They recognised that the processes they were using with their respective partners were similar. The one difference, however, was the dependence in one partnership 'on the collection of data of some kind which both parties could have access to and respond and react to'.

The potential value and the crucial role that data collection and the joint ownership of data was soon realised and acknowledged. A meeting was convened, of all those who had been participating in informal co-researching relationships, to see if they could formalise the specific process they had been using. Their shared perceptions were made explicit and expressed in the following figure. The process became known as 'Teacher as Co-researcher' and reflected not only their co-researching experiences but the principles of naturalistic enquiry.

It was now possible to describe a particular process of co-researching to other teachers. It was described to teachers as a process based on equality of status between participants.

Within the schools that both academics had been working, other teachers and one of the principals became interested and involved in what was going on. As word spread, many other collaborative partnerships were established, teachers with teachers, teachers with the principal, teachers with administrators and teachers with their children.

With the exception of the two academics most respondents indicated that they had entered their co-researching relationships with someone they knew well. Teachers working with academics only knew their partners by reputation.

All teacher participants and the principal had recognised that change was necessary in their language teaching and had already attended many inservice presentations (one-off sessions), read professional journals and newly-published teacher-reference material and trialled new strategies in the classroom. They had already made a
personal commitment to change and were looking for more help and support at the classroom level.

All the initial participants came from a group of schools that surrounded the university and had been influenced by the work of the two academics who initiated the TACOR project. The administrative office of the school district was committed to encourage and support any initiatives that would help teachers to take on board the new policy documents on language. This particular school region had a long history of commitment and support for change in this curriculum area. Excellence in language teaching was valued by the educational hierarchy.

So evolved the TACOR process using the principles of good consultancy matched with the methodology of naturalistic enquiry.

2.0 The Co-Researching process - its distinctive elements.

This theme includes the participants' descriptions of the starting points of the co-researching process and of its distinctive elements which included the initial and ongoing negotiation, the collection of data, debriefing and data analysis.

The extent to which the TACOR process was followed varied in small ways according to the underlying purpose of the co-researching partnership and the relationship between the participants themselves. In relationships that involved academics, for instance, the process was far more systematically adhered to. Teachers working with other teachers, however, were more flexible in their use and interpretation of the process.

2.1 Starting points:

The participants described two different entry points to the TACOR process. The first came about as a result of a perceived need for new craft knowledge or the refinement of existing teaching repertoire by the individual teacher. The second entry point occurred as a result of the opportunity to work collaboratively with a colleague. In these cases it was the co-researching process itself which generated an
interest in teaching and provided the stimulus to explore issues related to classroom practice. In the schools where the initial teachers had co-researched with academics, other teachers became interested and wanted to become involved.

Most of the participants stated that the TACOR process was 'problem driven'.

'You must have a problem to solve. I can really concentrate on what I want to know, not necessarily just on what the teacher wants to know.'

Whilst most participants entered the co-researching relationship with their own specific concerns and interests, it was noted that these continually changed. Besides individual questions there was usually a common focus in the partnership. One participant commented on this distinction between individual concerns and a shared focus of the partnership as follows:

'Over the periods that we have worked together.... the focus has changed considerably. They change from week to week or month to month but I think the global focus hasn't changed much.'

The shared focus across all participants was concerned with literacy and language teaching and learning. Individual interests were wide ranging and included the following:

Academics:

'I wanted to find out how whole language classrooms worked.'

'Understanding about field, tenor and mode and what to do about it with the children.'

'What do teachers need to know about language in order to teach it.'

'I need information from people like Diane to talk about current things that happen with children.'

Teacher:

'I've been really tossing around, trying to explain how I go about programming and the decisions I make and why I make them......'

'How to support other teachers in the school.'
'How and why the program is written the way it is.'
'I'm sick of the way I'm teaching reading as it's a contradiction to the way
I'm teaching writing. I want to change it.'
'...how children learn different registers.'

Professional Development Co-ordinator:

'I wanted to see how teachers go about taking ownership and responsibility
for their own learning, if indeed they do.'

Principal:

'I thought I'd learn more about whole language if I worked with someone
else... I wanted to know what these infants teachers and whole language
teachers were actually doing.'
'I got into the process first and then when I saw what was going on I
identified things that I was interested in.'

2.2 Initial and ongoing negotiation

Having found a partner to work with, a series of negotiations
between the participants took place. These negotiations included
discussion of time commitment, how much, how often and when, as
well as how the process worked.

When the project was first started by the academics, before a
specific process had been identified, the participants discussed how
they might proceed, so negotiations about roles and responsibilities
were usually discussed. Later on, when a clearly defined process or
modus operandi had been identified, and in cases where teachers
were working with their peers, these discussions took less time.

In co-researching partnerships that were well developed and had
lasted over a long period of time other issues needed to be
negotiated. These issues related to ethics, the use and ownership of
the data in the public domain, and acknowledgement of knowledge
sources.
2.3 The 'Teacher as Co-researcher' process in action.

In most cases, it was reported that the process involved visits to the classroom during which fieldnotes would be taken, followed by a meeting which would include a debriefing session from which more specific discussion, centring on the particular interests of each participant, would take place.

Interviews with the participants indicated that there was some variation in how often this process took place. The degree to which a specific process was adhered to also varied. The principal, for instance, indicated that in his partnership with a teacher, very few fieldnotes were taken. A teacher in another partnership indicated that the debriefing session was often done on the way back to the staff room after observations had been taken and was therefore very short. A few days later a scheduled meeting would take place where issues could more thoroughly be discussed. Another partnership indicated that the debriefing session was not held until after the fieldnotes had been typed and returned to the teacher.

Whilst the process seemed flexible, most of the elements were used by all the respondents although each partnership organised the process in slightly different ways to suit their own needs, questions and purposes.

Data Collection:

Fieldnotes formed the most important component of the data collected although reflective journals were also kept by many participants. As relationships developed it was reported that videos and tape recorders were also used. The nature of the data depended on the focus of the research.

Whilst the 'outsider' was generally responsible for the collection of the data, sometimes this role was reversed, the outsider becoming the teacher and the teacher the observer. Data collection was, however, seen as a joint responsibility. Teachers often became involved in gathering supplementary data between visits.
Fieldnotes: Most participants reported that their co-researching partner would visit their classroom about once a week. During this visit one of the partners would observe the class, taking descriptive fieldnotes of everything that happened. Sometimes the outsider would do the teaching and the teacher would take fieldnotes. More often, however, the outsider would take the fieldnotes whilst the teachers went about their normal tasks.

The fieldnotes taken presented a detailed descriptive specimen record of what was happening in the classroom. One teacher commented that 'it was like having another pair of eyes in the room, picking up things that she had never seen before'. The extent and the focus of these fieldnotes varied between partnerships and with the changing interests of the participants.

Sometimes the observer, whilst taking fieldnotes, would include comments in the form of questions which s/he wanted to ask of the teacher like, 'I missed what you did. What were you doing over there'? Or 'why are you doing that?'

Partnerships found their own way of doing fieldnotes and arrived at a methodology that best suited their questions. As one participant explained,

'I suppose what I eventually had to do was find how they worked for me and be happy with that in the context of the school and the teachers I was working with. What I found most useful for me was to get a little notebook and at the front of one side write out what I saw happening. Then the other side of the page I wrote my reflections, my interpretations about what was going on. I also put in questions I wanted to ask.'

Most of the respondents, however, initially found it difficult to take good fieldnotes and conceded that this was a skill that they had to develop. Of data collection in general, one participant commented thus,

'I think before I was never quite sure (about data collection) because I wasn't too sure about research. I wasn't too sure what to collect, so I collected everything but I found I couldn't do it so I got frustrated. I felt that I wasn't a very good researcher.'
Each of the collaborating pairs who were interviewed stressed the value of these fieldnotes. The fieldnotes were seen to serve a variety of purposes as follows:

- to provide a basis for discussion and reflection in the debriefing sessions;
- 'as a medium to get Hazel and myself thinking about larger macro issues';
- to explore specific areas of interest;
- as a 'memory jogger' as to what had happened in class;
- became a record of development and changes that had taken place and
- to allow participants to revisit the data as different questions, connections, interests or purposes arose.

'We went back through the data and pulled out the bits that related to evaluation and another time we were interested in retelling.'

It was also noted that the observer also gained much from taking fieldnotes as it allowed him/her to become familiar with the classroom and involved with the children. As the relationship between the observer and the children developed, individual children were mentioned by name in the fieldnotes. This was said to be particularly useful in tracing the individual's development.

**Journals:** Journals were kept by participants in three of the six partnerships. These journals served the individual as a personal notebook of observations, queries, reflections and concerns. In one of the partnerships these journals were shared and formed the basis of discussion, reaction and feedback during the debriefing session. In other partnerships the journals remained personal documents and therefore were not shared or discussed. In this case the teacher noted that her journal became a valuable record of her own developing thoughts and learning. Another teacher said that her journal had become an integral part of her teaching and that learning
to write descriptive rather than judgemental notes was a valuable skill for monitoring and recording children's language development. In two cases the journal had been kept over an extended period of time. In some partnerships no journals were kept.

**Videos:** The use of a video to collect data was mentioned by most of the respondents. At the initial stages of the relationship teachers indicated their discomfort with this approach to data collection. As a greater level of trust developed so these initial reservations disappeared.

As the outsider became more integrated into the life of the classroom, the students began to make demands on the outsider's attention which made the taking of fieldnotes difficult. To record classroom events by video rather than by fieldnotes, in these cases, became a more practical option.

The students were also reported as using the video to record interactions between a student and the teacher and thus became partners in the collection of data. These videos were then used by the teacher to analyse interactions and make self-evaluations or to share it with their co-researching partner.

**Tape recordings:** In one case the teacher carried a microphone to record her interactions with the students. This approach to collecting data was not used often.

**Debriefing:**

This session was described by one participant as the 'why did you session'. Debriefing was initially led by the outsider, or observer, using the fieldnotes as a basis for questioning. This activity was conducted soon after the fieldnotes on classroom activity had been taken. It became apparent that the nature of the debriefing sessions varied slightly between partnerships and, like the purposes of the data collection, its nature and purpose changed as the relationship developed.

There were, however, a number of common characteristics which all agreed were essential elements of a debriefing session. The line,
however, between debriefing and shared dialogue was often indistinct. The questions which initially formed the basis of this session led to shared dialogue and shared reflections about a whole range of issues. The respondents indicated that the purposes of these debriefings were:

- to seek clarification and reasoning for actions;
- as a basis for discussion, sharing and reflection;
  
  'At times you do things and it seems really incidental to you but then when you go back to it and see it in black and white and by being asked questions about it you realise that it was very significant.'

- to exchange viewpoints;
- to examine assumptions and beliefs and
- to develop a common language for talking about what was going on in the classroom.

The participants of three partnerships emphasised that debriefing was essentially a way of 'getting into the head of the teacher' through a process of questioning. In a partnership between a teacher and a principal, the principal described the debriefing session as one which allowed him to use the data to

  '... understand the teacher but also to help the teacher to understand himself (the principal).'

By talking, he suggested,

'It helped me to look inside that persons' brain and what their theory of teaching or learning was.'

It was reported that the value of debriefing was dependent on the quality of the questioning and this developed with time and practice.

The nature of the questioning also changed with the development of the relationship. Respondents used words like 'at first', 'initially'
and 'later on' to draw distinctions between the changing nature of debriefing. Respondents often referred to different stages of the debriefing process. They used descriptors for these developmental phases which included such phrases as 'establishing shared understandings', 'making assumptions and beliefs explicit' and 'shared dialogue'. I have used these descriptors to illustrate the developmental nature of the debriefing sessions as follows:

Stage One: Establishing shared understandings:

At the beginning of the partnership the initial purpose of debriefing was to seek specific information and clarification of the specimen records about what was going on in the classroom. Debriefing at this level provided a focus for discussion where the observer would ask questions about what was going on in class such as:

'Why did you do this?'
'What were you thinking of here?'
Have you thought about trying it this way?'
'What do you think of what Johnny's done here?'

One participant described this stage of the debriefing process in the following way:

'She's always asking me why I'm doing that. She'll say now why did you decide to do that. She never says, Oh or placed a judgement on what I've done (whether I've) done the right thing or the wrong thing. If I fall flat on my face she'll say, well, why do you think that happened. She never judges at all, it's always why and that's how I teach.'

Stage Two: Making explicit and examining assumptions and beliefs:

'Brian has this skill of being able to stand back and start pulling together a bigger picture.'

As the outsider became more familiar with the classroom and the teacher, the debriefing sessions focused more specifically on clarification of philosophy. The questioning focused on explanations of the thinking behind the teaching practice like;
'Why do you assess this way?'

Participants describe their role at this stage of the debriefing as follows:

'I would explore the illogicalities in what she said and what she did...to find out whether or not she was aware of being illogical or whether I had missed something."

'I gave her the opportunity ....to talk about things that she didn't normally talk about in a professional sense."

'This is what I'm doing and this is why I'm doing it. So every little unit I have has a rationale to it."

At this level, debriefing provided the opportunity for the teacher to use their partner as 'a sounding board'. The partner would help the teacher, through questioning, to 'make certain connections and make her think things through'.

It was at this level that reflection on practice, not always shared, was reported to be an integral part of the process. Participants now saw themselves as 'reflective practitioners'.

These first two levels of debriefing were often said to be 'teacher centred'.

Stage Three: Shared dialogue and the development of new knowledge:

It was reported that when partners had worked together over an extended period of time and were able to predict what theory their partners were displaying, the debriefing focused upon 'a macro theoretical level'.

At this level the debriefing became a two-way activity where both parties debriefed each other. It was this reciprocal process of debriefing that suggested most strongly that a truly collaborative relationship existed. One respondent suggested that when both partners recognised the value and worth of the other's knowledge
then the nature of the debriefing changed. As one of the participants explained:-

'I think when she got to what I would call co-equal status, the debriefing sessions became more two way especially in the last year. In the last year and early this year she started to talk about things in ways that I thought were quite inappropriate for what I thought was inside her head and so she really started to push me about my beliefs about phonics and grammar and so on and I had to clarify a great deal.'

At this stage the nature of the questioning provided a window on the reciprocity of roles within the partnership. In one particular partnership the teacher's increased confidence in her own knowledge, and the understandings she had of her own assumptions and beliefs (these were clearly articulated in two books that she had written), caused her to begin challenging her partner's (an academic) beliefs. As the academic commented:

'She's really telling me that I should go and re-examine my theories.'

In this same partnership the debriefing sessions were reported as a time of shared discussion, often heated argument and debate which generated the development of new knowledge and new theory.

The debriefing sessions were considered by all participants to be the most valuable part of the process as it helped them to reflect upon their practice or as one participant described it to 'get stuff from inside you, your thinking, get your thinking out in the open so that you can think some more about it'.

**Data Analysis:**

Whilst only two partnerships talked about the specific analysis of data, it was clear that the debriefing process was the means by which data was analysed and answers to questions were resolved. In this event analysis was seen as an integral but informal part of the co-researching process.

In the two partnerships involving academics working with teachers, data analysis was identified as a separate element of the co-
researching process. One of the academics described the data and its analysis in this way:

'What I have is a huge set of archives with an enormous lode which I can mine again and again.'

It was pointed out that if data was to be analysed then there needed to be a particular purpose. As the data was used for different purposes the analysis was dependent upon having a specific research question to answer. In most partnerships little reference was made to the re-examination of the data.

In either spontaneous or more structured approaches to the analysis of data, several participants suggested that the knowledge obtained from the data caused them to refocus their observations, refine their actions or to modify or re-define their research questions.

In cases where teachers had gathered supplementary data between visits, they reported that they had used this data for self evaluation purposes.

3.0 Major Characteristics of the Collaborative Enterprise.

As well as describing the distinctive elements of the TACOR process itself, all the respondents commented at length on the importance of the relationship to the success of their co-researching.

Whilst all respondents indicated that they had come to co-researching already committed to the development of new ways of working whether as an academic pursuing research interests or as a teacher learning how best to support language learners, they all brought to their co-researching partnerships many misconceptions, false expectations and general concerns and anxieties about their ability to fulfil adequately their role as a co-researcher.

Relationships took time to develop. Each relationship passed through a number of distinguishable developmental phases. Again the respondents used expressions like 'at first', 'initially' and 'after a while' to describe these different phases of their developing
partnerships. Four different phases emerged. These phases are described as:

3.1 Getting to know your partner

3.2 Developing a working relationship.

3.3 Developing equality and reciprocity

3.1 Getting to know your partner:

This first phase of the relationship's development reflected a period of concern, uncertainty, misconception and false expectation. Participants came to the relationship with preconceived understandings about the nature of a co-researching relationship based on a set of personal assumptions about adult learning, professional development and about the nature of research and researching.

Participants entered their relationships with different expectations. They were concerned about issues related to status and their role in the process and in particular, the teachers all indicated their lack of confidence during the early months of the relationship. They had little sense of their own worth and doubted the potential value of their knowledge to such a partnership.

The greater the perceived difference in status between the partners, the longer it took to develop a productive collaborative enterprise. Teachers working with outsiders indicated that it took anywhere between three and seven months to break down their preconceived expectations of their role in a co-researching relationship.

In two of the four partnerships, those between teachers and 'outsiders' (in this study, academics), the teachers reported their initial apprehensions and expectations about the difference in status of the players. In both of these partnerships the teachers knew only 'by reputation' their proposed partners. The academics were well known for their expertise in the area of children's language learning and therefore the teachers expected that the co-researching relationship would be an unequal one based on an 'expert versus novice' approach.
'The way you relate to people is based upon what you know about that person already.'

They saw their role as passive recipients of the knowledge of the outside expert. The teachers indicated their fear of being judged, and that they suspected that they would be used as guineapigs for the research.

'When you enter into a co-researching relationship I think the initial stage is that you don't really have a strong close relationship...... You might be very compatible but it's not what I would call a strong relationship and the way you relate to people is based upon what you know about that person already. In the case of Jan and I, I perceived her as the expert. The esteem that she's held in the school, the esteem that she's held at the university....I felt that maybe she was judging me at first - am I doing this right and am I doing it wrong.'

'I really felt he was very much the expert 'cause I was in awe of him. I didn't know him terribly well....I considered him to be the expert...'

'I felt that maybe she was judging me at first. Am I doing this right and am I doing it wrong.'

'At the beginning I really did feel he was the expert and that the paper we did last year that was 'From Guineapigs to Co-Researchers, I really did feel like the guineapig.'

The outside academics were sensitive to this problem but took no specific action to rectify these apprehensions. They offered the following observations:

'At the beginning of the relationship we had different expectations.'

'She invited me in as the visiting expert and I think she had expectations that I was going to tell her what to do.'

The 'outside experts' had their own perceptions of how the relationship should develop which initially caused very conflicting expectations about the nature and purpose of the co-researching.
'I went into the relationship with the vague idea that I was going to be as low key as possible and I wasn't going to dominate and I wasn't going to take charge because I sensed that she was ....taking a huge risk. So I made up my mind from the very beginning that I was going to be, kind of Rogerian, Karl Rogers in my approach and that I was going to observe, report back to her, listen very carefully to what she said but not offer any kind of direction or any kind of formal suggestions that she should try this or she should try that.'

'I should be....non-judgemental... I was not going to be suggestive, evaluative in any way. I didn't go into these classrooms thinking these are guineapigs and I'm going to try things out on them. That was my (initial) perception of what a researcher did.'

These assumptions resulted in individuals setting their own initial limitations on the level of interaction within the partnership. One of the academics interviewed described an initial interaction with a teacher as follows:

'I would usually begin by saying "well what has happened during the week that you would like to tell me about" and she would usually say "Oh nothing much" and there would be silence and I would read that silence as her waiting for me to start commenting on what I'd seen and what I thought she should be doing.'

The teachers, on the other hand also commented on their initial false expectations of a co-researching relationship as follows:

'I thought he was going to say I'll come along and help but he said I'll come along and watch and that really threw me.'

'I was hoping that he would give me ideas but it didn't work out that way.'

These differences in expectation of roles were said to have made initial communications frustrating for both parties. At this stage of the relationship one partner had a clear idea of the necessity of equality as a basis for the collaboration, whilst the other remained uncertain and hesitant. Neither partner was sure about how to proceed so that both became involved in a waiting game - waiting for someone to take responsibility and control.
The breaking down of these misconceptions and the development of a new kind of relationship was reported to be dependent on the extent to which roles had initially been made explicit through discussion and negotiation prior to or soon after the commencement of the partnership.

Where partnerships comprised of teachers working with other teachers, problems of equity did not seem to be a major issue, although concerns were expressed about self worth and the value of their knowledge to their partner.

Most teachers expressed reservations about 'doing research'. These reservations revealed their preconceived ideas of what research involved. They expressed doubts that they had anything of worth to share, saw research as an academic pursuit and therefore did not perceive that they could become a valued research partner.

It was typical of young relationships that teachers had little sense of the value of their own craft knowledge. Furthermore academics didn't want to be cast into the role of expert. In this respect the academics, or outsiders, were also unsure of the value of their knowledge. The academics recognised that whilst they had a good deal of specific knowledge they were not sure whether this kind of knowledge would be valued by the teacher.

These uncertainties on both sides of the partnership limited the potential for collaboration in the initial stages.

As the partnerships developed, however, status and who had what knowledge and when and how it might be shared, ceased to be a cause for concern. When both parties recognised each other's areas of expertise and were able to it as a valuable resource and when mutual respect and trust had been established then a reciprocal relationship began to develop.

It was reported that in the early stages of the relationship dialogue reflected a deficit view of teaching and learning. The teachers would make apologies for their actions, they would seek 'fix it cures' or want to be told what and how to do things, thus relinquishing responsibility for their own learning.
'She had expectations that I was going to tell her what to do, give her whiz-bang ideas and she was going to turn her class around. I got the distinct impression during the first three or four months that she was continually waiting for me to tell her what to do.'

These behaviours and expectations served to demonstrate the teachers preconceived ideas about learning and how they felt about themselves as professionals.

As the relationship developed with time, the roles played by each of the partners evolved and changed dramatically.

3.2 Developing a working relationship:

'You have to accept people as they are...it's part of the role.'

Participants identified five specific factors which they regarded as pre-requisites for an effective working relationships. They indicated that:

- it was important to identify a specific focus of interest;
- the generation of data was an essential part of the process and formed the basis for discussion and exploration;
- it was important to make connections between your own learning and that of the students;
- roles should be interchangeable; and
- there was a need to develop a common language.

3.3 A definition of focus and the generation of data as a basis for discussion and exploration.

It was suggested that the development of the relationship was dependent on the individuals identifying a specific focus for the activity rather than worrying about the status of the players.

'You've got to have a focus...so that you can be feeding each other (with) data and that's what it's (the relationship) built on.'
3.4 The assumption of a number of different roles:

The roles that the respondents identified as being an integral part of the co-researching relationship included such roles as facilitator, supporter, adviser, resourcer (identifying and providing professional readings if requested), learner, informer, teacher, catalyst, respondent, confidant, listener and organiser. These roles were seen as interchangeable between the partners.

These roles, they suggested, described the nature of the interaction between the participants and the development of the collaborative enterprise. All of the respondents saw the perceptions that individuals had of their role in the co-researching process as a crucial characteristic of effective collaborative co-researching.

3.5 Making connections between personal learning and the students as learners:

Some respondents indicated that underpinning the development of an effective working relationship was the participants own personal theory about teaching and learning. These participants often made explicit the connections between their relationship with their students and the manner in which they worked with their partners in the co-researching process.

'I think, I can't remember exactly how it happened, but there came a time within the first month or three months where suddenly the penny dropped in H's head and she realised that I was applying the same set of conditions (of learning) to her that she was applying to the kids and I wasn't conscious of that it was her who made the connection.She said one morning 'you are really making responsible for part of this aren't you, you are applying that model of learning to what we are doing.'

For other participants, however, it was the development of the co-researching relationship that helped them to reassess and change the nature of their relationships with their students.

'Watching other people work with teachers and becoming more aware of the impact of different teaching models caused her to start interacting with the children in different ways.'
Most partnerships recognised the importance of leaving responsibility and control for the learning with the learner and open acknowledgement of your partners' expertise.

'You leave it up to them to make decisions about what they need and when they need it.'

'My role was...always allowing the teacher to have, or that person you are working with, always allowing that person to feel that they have an area of expertise that I didn't have...There's expertise in me, but we bring different depths of expertise to whatever problem that you're facing together. We can look at it and solve it but I need your expertise as much as you need mine.'

'We bring different depths of expertise to whatever the problem is that you're facing and together we can have a look at it and solve it.'

'Listen very carefully to what the teachers issues, concerns, problems were rather than go in with this is my agenda. A consultant went into the classroom or worked with the teacher and said well what's your agenda.....always allowing that person to feel that they have an area of expertise that I didn't have.'

'If you are a 'process' person or teacher, you 'guide' people, like if this is their point of need, he needed some readings, so O.K. that's what I'll give him. If he wants to talk about things then a discussion will (be) generated...It's like when you are conferencing kids, you know, you don't say, right you need a lesson on speech (marks) or stuff like that.'

3.6 The development of a common language:

The debriefing sessions, one participant suggested, allowed for the development of a common language which was a critical factor in the development of a sound working relationship. Respondents indicated that meanings and understandings could only be shared and developed if the participants had a common language to express their ideas.
3.7 Developing equity and reciprocity:

In all cases, participants reported that effective collaboration was dependent upon equality and reciprocity within the relationship.

Participants suggested, however, that equality and reciprocity could only be developed if certain conditions existed within the relationship. These conditions included both personal and professional dimensions and served to describe the nature of the equality and reciprocity within the relationship. Participants indicated that it was these characteristics that made the process of co-researching so valuable for their own development.

3.8 Recognition of the value of your partner's knowledge.

All participants emphasised that it was important to recognise, in explicit ways, the often differing 'depths' of expertise that each of the partners brought to the relationship. It was also seen to be important that both partners should use this communal pool of knowledge. It was the coming together of this expertise that helped in the collaborative solving of problems.

'Together we can have a look at the problem and solve it but I need your expertise as much as you need mine.'

Initially, however, one of the academics wasn't sure what he might learn until the co-researching process began.

'As the academics continued with their co-researching relationship with teachers they began to realise the extent of their teacher's expertise and therefore a more co-equal relationship began to develop.'

3.9 Recognition of the value of your own knowledge to the relationship.

It was particularly important in partnerships where the status of the participants was seen initially as unequal that the teacher was able to acknowledge his/her own knowledge and its potential value to the co-researching relationship.

'One day I said to him "I know a lot more about what happens in my
classroom than you". I think that at this point the relationship started to change.... It was very definitely a co-equal relationship after that.

3.10 Mutual respect

This was said to occur when outcomes of the collaboration like professional articles or presentations were shared and discussed. Both partners became co-presenters and co-authors.

3.11 Trust, openness and honesty

It was reported that a personal trust and confidence in the partnership was important. Indicators of this trust was seen in the personal nature of many of the interactions.

'When they started (to tell) you personal titbits about their personal lives.'

'Sharing other important agendas in the teacher life which effected their teaching.'

'When we made admissions to each other and there was a level of personal openness and honesty..... Making admissions about things that hadn't gone well.'

3.12 Acceptance of each other

It was indicated by many of the respondents that equality within the co-researching relationship was dependent on each persons need to feel that their partner was genuinely interested in what they had to say.

Equality was also said to exist when 'the debriefing sessions became more two way'.

'She really started to push me to the degree I pushed her....about my beliefs about phonics and grammar and so on, where I had to clarify a great deal.'

'Whilst Brian's initial relationship (teacher and researcher) with Hazel
was perceived by him in a more traditional sense - taking all the information away, but also wishing to carry out the tenets of qualitative methodology and as he understand the depth and extent of the expertise that Hazel had so the relationship changed into a more equal one.'

3.13 Personal self esteem and confidence

Participants indicated that their self confidence and self esteem and the perceptions that they had of themselves as learners, if not strong, often served to hinder or slow down the development of a collaborative relationship.

All participants agreed, therefore, that the level of their own self esteem and confidence had an effect on the level of reciprocity and equality in the relationship. Whilst the co-researching process helped to develop their confidence and self esteem both professionally and personally, it wasn't until they felt that their contribution was valued, that they could fully participate in the process.

'But through the six months the gap (between expert and novice) got smaller and smaller. It would have been....three quarters of the way through the year before I realised that what I had to offer was also worth while and I hadn't felt that until then. It wasn't because of anything B had done it was just because of my own feelings of insecurity.'

It was also suggested that confidence and self esteem had grown as a result of the presentations they had made for their peers and colleagues beyond the school at conferences and inservice courses. This newly found confidence made it possible for them to disagree, to speak up, and to justify and defend their position or actions with their partners.

'I was much more confident I think , to say this is what I'm going to do and this is why I'm going to do it and I wasn't waiting for his stamp of approval.'

'As time passed, however, this perception changed. Teachers made remarks like 'I found out that it was O.K to disagree, to have differences of opinion' and that 'academics and researchers are not infallible!'
3.14 When the focus of the co-researching revolves around the children's learning rather than teacher performance.

In two instances participants reported that it was when they realised that their partner was genuinely interested in the children's development that they began to relax. Initially many of the participants had felt that they were the focus of their partners' attention.

It was conceded by all parties that these conditions could not develop without time, a belief that co-researching was a rewarding activity and that the relationship was a three way process (teacher, partner and student) where all parties needed to work at maintaining the relationship.

Many indicators were provided of when the relationship was seen by both partners as an equal one. The time it took to get to this point of equality varied between partners and seemed to depend to a certain extent on how well the participants knew each other before the partnership was established.

'She began to take responsibility and tell me what I could do and what I couldn't do, in other words, where she started to assume what I thought was some degree of control over what happened in her classroom irrespective of what I did or said or reported.'

With the development of self esteem came a sense of the value of the participants own craft knowledge and, in consequence, demonstrations of ownership, control and responsibility for their own learning.

3.15 When both parties had a stake in the interactions.

It was suggested that a certain degree of autonomy was healthy. It was felt important that all concerned should have personal agendas, individual interests as well as a shared focus.
4.0 The Impact and Outcomes of the TACOR process for participants.

There were clearly articulated outcomes of the co-researching process for all participants, children, teachers, academics and the principal. All participants talked about how they had changed as a result of the experience and the impact that it had on both their personal and professional lives.

4.1 Children:

Many of the participants noted that by inviting the children to become informants and co-researchers, they assumed a greater sense of responsibility and ownership for their work. The children soon became decision makers. They were also more able to ask questions and to seek feedback and support.

One of the participants, an academic, noted that in classrooms where teachers had a clearly articulated theory about teaching and learning, the children's self confidence in themselves as learners and the degree of control and responsibility that they assumed for their learning was marked.

'I was amazed how well children learn when the teacher possesses a well articulated theory or can understand why she is doing what she is doing. The impact on kids is incredible.'

4.2 Teachers:

The teachers noted a number of outcomes for their own professional growth and suggested the following:

- Growth in **self esteem and confidence**.

- Changes in their **assumptions and beliefs** about language teaching and learning.

- An increased understanding about **the process of teacher change**. It increased the participants understanding of the conditions which were necessary for effective professional development to take place.
A greater sensitivity to the nature of their interactions with students. One teacher said,

'I have tried to implement the nature of the co-researching process with my students'.

The co-researching process had helped the teachers to understand and see 'the big picture'.

Changed perceptions of themselves as both learners and teachers.

Becoming a reflective practitioner. One teacher said that the process had helped him to reflect. He had not been used to thinking about things and the reflective behaviour of his collaborative partner had not only increased his ability to do so but had changed his behaviour towards the children.

'I'm always asking myself questions, I've become far more reflective about my teaching. Asking questions, reflecting and finding solutions has become a part of my teaching practice.'

A certain notoriety with their peers both within and between schools in their area. In cases where teachers had worked with outside academics, their work and ideas were being used as examples in books articles and conference presentations. As one academic recalled,

'I would use examples of her work and give people her address and phone number. From this notoriety came many new professional opportunities and roles for the teachers; conducting inservice for other teachers, publishing, taking responsibility for professional development in the school and offering presentations not only to their peers but at national and international conferences.'

An increase in professional reading. As questions were being raised constantly, there was a need to read more,

'... because I had to know why I was doing things.... This was reflected too in my classroom practice.'
- Increased awareness of the teachers role. Three of the participants made mention of the impact that the experience had on their view of teaching and the new ways in which they listened to and heard what children had to say.

- Taking risks in the classroom by trying things they had never done before.

One of the academics suggested that as a result of her co-researching experiences she had observed certain connections between teachers' changes in classroom practice and changes in their personal lives. She cited several incidents where personal events in the teachers' lives had affected, either positively or negatively, their interest and commitment to change in their thinking and classroom practice.

4.3 Academics:

Both academics involved in a co-researching relationship commented on the significant effect it had on their perceptions of themselves as tertiary educators and learners. This had implications for the nature of their interactions with both their colleagues and their students. They also commented on the ways in which their roles and responsibilities as researchers had changed and about how the ways they reported their research had been influenced.

Of their changed perceptions of themselves as teachers and learners one academic mentioned that as a result of the co-researching experience he was a little more humble as both a teacher and a learner. He commented thus,

'Now I give much more responsibility to the students so its really affected the way I teach at the university. Its affected the way I listen. I think I have learned to look for cues in the language that I didn't look at before and learn to understand them. I'm starting to read body language better. It has made me a little more humble.'

For this academic, the ways in which he worked with students, especially those writing a thesis, had caused him to see the value of assuming a co-researching stance. He noted that this change of role
from evaluator and judge to facilitator, had allowed him to ask different kinds of questions, ones which maintained the integrity of the students own knowledge and where ownership, control and responsibility remained with the student.

The second academic involved in the TACOR project had already considerable experience of working with teachers through her previous role as a consultant. Whilst she felt that she was already sensitive and aware of her role as a teacher, she was less confident about her role as a researcher. Her engagement in several co-researching relationships, however, had caused her to reflect upon her past experiences as a consultant and work out what she knew about interactions with teachers and about the roles that she had played as a consultant and how her work was often related to working on action research projects. She came to realised that she had, in fact, been a researcher for some years. Working in co-researching experiences had helped her to breakdown some preconceived notions of what researchers do and how they might do it.

'I feel more confident about myself as a researcher. I feel more confident about myself in the whole area of naturalistic enquiry (and its) methodologies.'

Both academics acknowledged the importance and value of their co-researching partners input into their understandings. They commented on 'how rich and fruitful' their relationship had been.

'It has helped me look at children and learning in different kinds of ways from which I am able to make enormous generalisations.'

Furthermore, this academic said,

'There are lots of things about classrooms that I thought I knew that I didn't know and it made me realise that a lot of my colleagues who have been teacher-educators for years and never gone to a classroom are full of shit and they have a lot to learn.'

Their understandings, they felt, had become more credible and far more useful. This had become particularly apparent in the way they
now reporting their research findings. Both academics were now able to use specific examples from their classroom experience. These examples of 'real observations' were used when preparing papers, writing books or when making presentations at conferences. Many of these articles and books were now co-written and teachers alongside their academic partners were sharing the rostrum at conferences.

As well as their new found knowledge about children as language learners, both researchers commented on their new awareness of the role that classroom teachers might play in curriculum development. They spoke of their increased understanding of the process of teacher change and the implications this had in the development of effective approaches to professional development. They recognised the necessity for certain conditions to be present if professional development was to have the desired impact on teachers.

In summing up the TACOR process and its implications for professional development, one academic described the changes in his thinking as follows:

'Well, I think I have realised that the model of learning that underlies what we are trying to push in the classroom if you really want to bring about important and significant change in teachers you have got to extend that model to the professional development of teachers and the co-researching (process) is one way of doing that. It's not the only way, there are other ways but I think that the one thing that has come out of it is that professional development is a from of learning, it's learning how to be a better professional; that learning optimally proceeds if certain kinds of conditions are in place. If we are really fair dinkum about professional development of teachers which is just another way of saying we want to help teachers learn then we have to try and set up a context in which those conditions of learning are allowed to operate and this can be done in a whole range of ways.'

'I think it has made me realise that the one hour staff meetings after school, a professional development lecture that I used to go and give is absolutely useless, it's a waste of time. I think that the one day professional development day is a series of sit up, shut up and listen lectures doesn't achieve very much at all. I think I have realised that
giving teachers a set of recipes without any theory is the hard way to bring about professional development, hard in the sense that it's very chancy. You may professionally develop them if you cause some unrest through the strategies you give them but if they haven't got a theory to look into, forget it.....So its hard to say what it is that has changed my views of professional development but they have all converged. I think I have learnt most about teacher change through the co-researching process."

4.4 A Principal:

The principal indicated that the process had helped him to appreciate better the implications for teachers of his administrative and organisational decisions.

5.0 The TACOR process in hindsight

'Professional development is one form of learning, its learning to be a better professional and optimal learning precedes if certain conditions are in place and if we are really fair dinkum about professional development of teachers....then we have to try and set up contexts in which those conditions of learning are allowed to operate.'

Participants reflected on their experiences and provided a number of perceptions of the value of TACOR as a professional development model.

They stressed that collaboration between teachers could only occur when it was perceived by the school hierarchy as a valuable activity and where support, if necessary, was available.

One of the participants suggested that,

'If we want to help teachers then we have to try and set up a context in which certain conditions in which conditions of learning are allowed to operate.'

By conditions the participant was referring to a number of elements of the TACOR process such as debriefing, data gathering, discussion and class observation all of which had helped the participants to discover the theories which underpinned their teaching practice.
Most participants made the point that if the process was to work for all then it was important to discuss roles right at the beginning and to make feelings explicit as the relationship developed.

'Collaboration could only be said to happen when the roles had been clearly established and were maintained on the premise that the relationship would be equal; that both partners were learners and teachers, both having information to offer each other.'

In conclusion, one respondent suggested that,

'... if we want teachers to make significant changes in classroom practice then it is necessary to use the same model of learning that we are using in our classrooms and co-researching using the TACOR process is one way of doing this.'
SUMMARY OF RESULTS FROM NARRATIVE TWO

The next figure provides a summary of results from the retrospective recall of a number of educators who have used the TACOR process over an extended period of time.

### How the TACOR process was conceived: an historical overview

- As a result of a need to work with teachers in real classrooms two academics developed informal co-researching relationships with teachers. They recognised the value to their studies of the knowledge which only teachers have of literacy teaching and learning, knowledge which in their positions they had no access.
- Using principles of naturalistic enquiry they developed a co-researching process which used collaborative enterprise to create new knowledge about teaching and learning.
- The relationship was based on equal status of the participants.
- The school district was supportive of change.
- Teachers who entered into the initial partnerships were already committed to change and had already started to make changes in their classroom.

### 1. The Co-researching process - its distinctive elements

- Major elements included initial and ongoing negotiation, the collection of data, debriefing and data analysis.
- The degree to which the TACOR process was followed depended on the needs, questions and purpose of the co-researching. In partnerships involving academics, the TACOR process was adhered to keenly, whereas teachers working with other teachers used a more flexible process.

### Starting Points

- Identified need to use a deliberate process to solve a specific problem or to develop new knowledge about teaching and/or learning.
- Wanted to work collaboratively with another teacher. The process generated the interest in exploring what was happening in the classroom.
- Whilst there was usually a common interest, participants also explored personal concerns and interests.

### Initial and Ongoing Negotiation

- After finding an appropriate partner, initial negotiations were concerned with identifying a focus and logistics - time, commitment and how the process worked.
- In long term relationships, ethical and professional issues had to be negotiated. Ownership of data in the public domain and acknowledgement of knowledge sources needed to be considered and discussed.

### 2. The TACOR Process in Action

#### Data Collection

- Co-researching process was generated through the collection of data which included fieldnotes and personal journals.

**Fieldnotes:**
- Descriptive, non-judgemental fieldnotes were taken weekly of everything that happened in the classroom over a short period of 'language' time.
- Fieldnotes generated specific questions which formed the basis of discussion during the subsequent debriefing session.
- Taking fieldnotes required skill which was developed with practice.
- Fieldnotes served a variety of purposes.
- The partner responsible for the fieldnotes also became an accepted member of the class community.

**Journals:**
- These were used by participants for observations, to raise questions and to reflect upon their practice and thinking.
- Journals were sometimes shared and provided a basis for further discussion.

**Videos and Tape-recordings:**
- These were often made as a further source of data on classroom interactions.
**Debriefing**
- Usually led by visiting partner.
- Described as 'a way of getting into the teacher's head'.
- Nature and purpose of debriefing varied between relationships but a number of common characteristics prevailed. Questions arising from fieldnotes formed the basis of this session, providing opportunity for discussion, shared reflection, examining assumptions and beliefs, seeking clarification for actions, exchange of viewpoints and to develop a common language for talking about what was happening in the classroom.
- The value of debriefing was dependent on the quality of the questioning. The nature of this questioning changed over time.
- Debriefing was described as passing through different stages. These included:
  - establishing shared understandings (clarifying thinking and actions);
  - making explicit and examining assumptions and beliefs (pushing the partner to make explicit the whys and wherefors of their teaching and thinking);
  - shared dialogue and the development of new knowledge (looking at macro theoretical issues as partners with equal status and authority; reciprocity).

**Data Analysis**
- In partnership where academics were working with teachers, the data collected was used as an integral part of the co-researching process to address issues or problems that interested the participants.
- Analysis of the data was said to help participants refocus their observations or actions or to modify or refine their research questions/interests.

### 3. Major Characteristics of the Collaborative Enterprise

- Productive collaborative enterprises take time to mature and are dependent on the development of strong relationships.
- Relationships passed through a number of distinguishable stages as they develop. These stages were described by participants as:
  - Getting to know your partner
  - Developing a working relationship
  - Developing equality and reciprocity
- Each of these stages provided insights into the nature of collaborative enterprise.

**Getting to know your partner:**
This stage involved the breaking down of misconceptions and preconceived ideas about adult learning, professional development, the nature and value of research and researching.
Many participants entered their partnerships feeling uncomfortable about differences in status and had different expectations of how the relationship would develop - expert vs. novice

**Developing a working relationship:**
Five requirements were identified:
- needed a specific focus of interest
- importance of data as the basis for discovery and discussion
- needed to have a personal theory about teaching and learning; control and responsibility for learning left with the learner
- roles should be interchangeable
- need to develop a common language so that a shared dialogue could develop

**Developing equality and reciprocity:**
These were dependent on a number of conditions being present. These included:
- Recognition of the value of your partner's knowledge as well as your own.
- Mutual respect, trust, openness and honesty.
- Genuine interest and acceptance of each other.
- Personal self-esteem and confidence in themselves as learners.
- When individuals had the opportunity to pursue their own interests.
- When the focus of interest was the children rather than teacher performance.
4. The Outcomes and Impact of the TACOR Process

* **Children:**
  When the teacher had a clearly articulated theory about teaching and learning then the children's self confidence in themselves as learners seemed to improve along with their ability to take greater control and responsibility for their own learning.

* **Teachers:**
  - Growth in self-esteem and confidence;
  - changes in their assumptions and beliefs;
  - increased understanding of the process of change;
  - greater sensitivity to the nature of their relationships with students;
  - more positive perceptions of themselves as learners and teachers;
  - better sense of perspective about their classrooms;
  - more reflective about their teaching;
  - assumed leadership roles within and beyond school community;
  - more inclined to engage in professional reading; and
  - more inclined to try new ways of working.
  - made public their knowledge and understandings through publications and presentations at National and International conferences, inservices and presentations for graduate and undergraduate students at the university.

* **Academics:**
  - Changed perceptions of themselves as tertiary educators and learners and changing the nature of their interactions with both colleagues and students.
  - Nature of roles and responsibilities as researchers changed specifically in the area of reporting their research.
  - Changed approaches to lecturing, giving more responsibility to students, listening more carefully and being more sensitive to human behaviours.
  - Had learnt the value as thesis supervisors of maintaining the integrity of the students' own knowledge and thus allowing them to take ownership, control and responsibility.
  - Increased confidence and knowledge of the research process.
  - Found new ways of looking at children and their language learning.
  - Felt they had become more credible as researchers and that the knowledge they had acquired was more useful to the teachers.
  - Became aware of the valuable role that teachers might play in curriculum development.
  - Increased understanding of a set of conditions that needed to be present if professional development was to be effective.

* **Principal:**
  - Greater appreciation of the implications of his decision-making on teachers.

**Figure 22:** Retrospective Recall of the Key Characteristics of the TACOR process (Group B).

In the next chapter these results will be presented as grounded theory of the TACOR process and provide significant insights into the nature of the collaborative enterprise.
CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSIONS

This study set out to describe and evaluate the effectiveness of 'Teacher as Co-Researcher' as an approach to professional development at a time when change in the teaching of language and literacy learning had become imperative. This curriculum change represented a dramatic change in ideology. 'Whole Language' teaching and learning encompasses a set of values and beliefs about how children learn language and about how teachers can best support them. TACOR was developed by two academics to assist educators to collaboratively explore the implications of 'Whole Language' in practice and to come to grips with these new perceptions of language teaching and learning. What they knew about research and effective consultancy became a methodology for staff development.

This study has recorded the experiences of a number of teachers, academics, a principal and an administrator as they engaged in the TACOR process. These responses have provided a detailed description of the TACOR process at work and some valuable insights into the nature of the collaborative co-researching enterprise, the pitfalls, the potential impact and outcomes and the conditions that are necessary if this approach to professional development is to have value for the participants.

Before proceeding further, I think it is important to acknowledge the extent and nature of the subjectivity that has permeated every aspect of the research in progress and my awareness of its influence on the conclusions that I have drawn from my co-researching experiences. Whilst I became concerned with what seemed like excessive wallowing in a quagmire of human experience, I now realise the important role that my personal journal played as an explicit control of subjectivity. The nature of the data collection, its analysis and the reporting of the results strongly reflects this personal subjectivity and therefore the meanings and interpretations presented in this chapter.

This final chapter therefore, presents not only a set of interpretations, conclusions and grounded theory on Teacher as Co-
researcher as an approach to professional development, but an amalgam of personal values, attitudes and persuasions that have changed and developed with the conduct of the study. It reveals a 'unique configuration' of personal values and assumptions joined together with the data that were collected (Peshkin, 1988) and presents a set of objective realities from a complex set of subjective meanings.

In reviewing the results of the data analysis a number of significant points emerged that serve to either support or substantiate the existing literature on professional development and educational change or to elaborate and extend on our knowledge where little detail has been available.

Many recurrent messages emerged from the results of the data analysis and these have been brought together into two major themes. These present 'Teacher as Co-researcher' as both a process and a relationship. The first theme presents the key tenets upon which this approach to professional development is based. The second theme presents the insights that were gained from the study into the nature of collaboration.

These themes serve to provide the opportunity for both evaluative comment in response to the research topic and the presentation of grounded theory.

1. The potential of TACOR as an approach to professional development.

From the results of the data analysis in this study, it is possible to identify a number of key characteristics which form the basis of Teacher as Co-researcher process. These characteristics serve to describe the process, how it operates, its particular qualities and its potential as an approach to professional development.

The major characteristics can be expressed as a set of descriptors. The Teacher as Co-researcher process is therefore described as:

- a systematic process;
- a process that can involve different stakeholders;
- a response to a variety of needs;
- a relationship built on the equal status of its participants;
- a way of thinking and knowing;
- a way of making teaching an ongoing research process;
- an approach to school renewal and
- a way to improve the learning opportunities for students.

'Teacher as Co-researcher': a systematic process

The Teacher as Co-researcher process provides teachers and other educators with a deliberate and systematic process, within a shared context, for classroom enquiry and discovery. This process is firmly based on the tenets of an accepted research paradigm, a paradigm which lends itself so appropriately to educational contexts. It is also ideologically in harmony with the principles of natural language learning and therefore the basis of 'Whole Language' classrooms.

Central to the effectiveness of this process is the necessity for the shared collection of data, its review and analysis through a system of debriefing, reflection and action. It is the ongoing data collection and analysis which drives the process and allows the participants to engage in a responsive evaluation of classroom practices and to refine or modify them if and when required.

'Teacher as Co-researcher': the involvement of different stakeholders

The concept of the involvement of all stakeholders is closely associated with the notion of shared responsibility. Stakeholders in the education process, as well as teachers, the students and school administrators, might include parents, school support personnel, central bureaucracy personnel (including inspectors, consultants and curriculum developers) and tertiary institutions.

Whilst not all of these combinations have been reported on directly in this study, the participants providing retrospective recall were drawing on co-researching experiences that extended beyond that between teachers or academics and teachers. Thus the co-researching process allows the development of different alliances both within the school and with other institutions or communities.
This potential breaks down many of the existing barriers which keep schools cloistered away from the community they serve and encourages inter-institutional and inter-community partnerships.

Including different stakeholders in the education enterprise allows for the utilisation of different knowledge sources and greater scope for the sharing of two worlds of experience. In the cases where academics work with teachers then there is greater potential for the blending of theory with practice.

'Teacher as Co-researcher': a response to a variety of needs

It is the needs of the individual teacher, the school, the tertiary institution and departmental personnel that provides the impetus for the development of co-researching relationships. Each participant entered their relationships with their own agendas. These agendas included:

- the need for curriculum change;

- an examination of a particular dimension of language teaching or learning; i.e. to increase the use of children's literature in the classroom or to examine the role that phonics might play in children's early reading and writing behaviours.

- the development of new teaching repertoire or to refine or extend existing teaching practices;

- the development of new craft and/or theoretical knowledge about language teaching and learning;

- an examination of personal assumptions and beliefs about language teaching or learning;

- extending opportunities for career advancement and

- a specific school interest or need or a departmental mandate.
The TACOR process allowed many different needs to be accommodated although results indicated that these needs often changed as the co-researching relationship developed. The purposes for co-researching largely determine the manner of the relationship and its outcomes.

'Teacher as Co-researcher': a relationship built on the equal status of its participants

Equal status as a prerequisite of the co-researching partnership sets a special kind of agenda. There are no experts or novices and no guineapigs. There is an assumption that each participant has knowledge of worth to contribute to the relationship, and it is the amalgam of these two different knowledge sources that helps each participant to pursue individual and collective research interests.

This is a very new ideology and therefore most participants had many misconceptions about their likely status within the relationship or the roles that they would play. As the relationship within the partnership grew, however, an atmosphere of trust and openness developed, a sense of shared responsibility, reciprocity and empowerment, and the development of mutual respect for which allowed equality to exist.

'Teacher as Co-researcher': a way of thinking and knowing

Effective thinking has to be both cognitive and metacognitive. Cognition helps us to identify and follow through the processes of learning. Metacognition refers to awareness and conscious control over these skills. It is the tool whereby we can judge their value, a strategy which allows us to make not only judgements but also modifications of both thoughts and processes. Metacognition helps us to make connections, generalisations and justifications.

The potential and positive advantages to making our thinking and knowing more explicit forms the essential value of the TACOR process. The keeping of personal journals and the subsequent debriefing provides the opportunity to be both cognitive and metacognitive through a process of shared discussion and shared reflection about what it is we know and how we know it. These
elements in particular provide for a powerful and productive dialogue with ourselves and with others.

The TACOR process generates opportunity for different kinds of metacognitive activity. Participants through a process of shared reflection learnt about themselves as learners and made connections between their own experience and the students in the classroom. Throughout the process problems were identified and explored, connections made to other situations that might provide clues, action was monitored through the fieldnotes, discussion was pursued and new action initiated. Participants also reported that shared reflection had also helped them to self evaluate and to regulate their behaviour both within the partnership and in the classroom with the students.

Participants commented on the value of having someone to ask provocative questions as a way of 'getting things out of their head', knowing what it is you know. The 'why' nature of the questioning during debriefing encouraged participants to make explicit what it was that they knew or believed and why. Making assumptions and beliefs explicit made responding or reconsidering them an essential part of the shared reflections.

Paris and Winograd (1988) described these findings as knowledge and control of self and knowledge and control of process.

This constant metacognitive activity forms an integral part of the process and an essential ingredient of the participants' growth.

'Teacher as Co-researcher': teaching as a research process

The Teacher as Co-researcher process is not about 'doing research'. It is a process which allows teachers and other stakeholders to engage together in the improvement of quality teaching and learning opportunities of the students and where all stakeholders can be participants in a learning process. It is an ongoing process where the classroom remains the context of the shared explorations and where researching becomes a natural part of the day to day life of the classroom. The co-researching is not a separate activity.
The momentum that results from the process causes ongoing reflection and action. As one participant in this study remarked, the experience of a co-researching relationship had helped him to become a reflective practitioner. He said,

'I'm always asking myself questions, I've become far more reflective about my teaching. Asking questions, reflecting and finding solutions has become part of my teaching practice.'

'Teacher as Co-researcher': developing a community of learners

For many years researchers have emphasised the importance of whole school renewal. Fullan (1991) talks of the need for 'new forms of leadership, collegiality, commitment to and mechanisms for continuous improvement.' (p.353)

This study has revealed many indications of the potential that the co-researching process has for the development of a community of learners as a means of school renewal. It provides opportunities for:

- the building of alliances both within the school and between the school and other institutions or interested stakeholders;
- an approach to professional development that is built around the everyday life of teachers where the context is the classroom and students;
- the development of a shared vision through collaboration;
- teachers to take initiative and responsibility for their own learning. Furthermore, with responsibility comes power both within the school and the wider education community;
- teachers to initiate whole school change by developing a climate of learning within the school;
- developing its own momentum for change within the school.
Teacher as Co-researcher: improving the learning opportunities for students.

The co-researching process helps teachers to make explicit their own theory about teaching and learning. In classrooms where teachers have a clearly articulated theory, students display greater confidence in themselves as learners and take more control and responsibility for their own learning.

In the literature review it was noted that there is a parallel between the conditions that support students as they learn and those that support teachers as they strive to be successful learners (Badger and Cormack, 1987). Students, through participation in the co-researching process, learn how to take responsibility for their own learning and have a greater sense of ownership and control. These developments in their attitude to learning enhance their opportunities to be successful learners.

Many of these characteristics have been described as 'levels of potential'. This has been done quite specifically, for the extent to which the TACOR process reflects these characteristics is dependent upon the initial purpose of the collaboration and the quality of the relationship that sustains and develops the partnership.

2. Insights into the Nature of Collaboration

One of the major insights gained as a result of this study was that the nature of the relationship between learners determines the value of the outcomes. The greater the ability of participants to empower each other, the greater the rewards. The most successful relationships investigated indicated a high level of caring demonstrated in the extensive repertoire of interactional skills. These skills seemed to have the potential to encourage professional growth through an increase of personal self esteem and confidence, a sharing of responsibility and through professional empowerment.

The nature of collaboration within the partnerships became a particular focus of interest as the analysis of the data developed. Three elements emerged:
- that collaborative enterprise needs to develop its own culture;

- that effective collaboration is dependent on the nature of the relationship which is established and developed between the participants and

- that collaboration has many different levels of potential.

It is the description of these elements that provides the grounded theory of this study and extends our knowledge about what it means to collaborate.

The culture of collaboration

The TACOR process provides a deliberate means by which participants can work together to develop their understandings about teaching and learning. The extent to which a partnership using this process is considered successful, would seem to be dependent upon the participants' ability to develop an appropriate culture of collaboration.

The term 'culture', in this instance, refers to a set of shared beliefs, an accepted system of social interactions and a common language within the community. The culture of collaboration between educators has a number of distinctive and highly interrelated elements.

It is dominated by the set of values and beliefs that each participant brings to the partnership about teaching and learning and the links that they make between their own personal theory and this theory in practice. In developed co-researching relationships, the TACOR process has the potential to change these values.

An effective collaboration is reflected in the extent to which these values are shared by the participants. In partnerships where the assumptions about teaching and learning were very different (as seen in the relationship between Bill and I), then the development of an effective culture of collaboration that allows for the growth and understanding of new ideologies are slower to develop.
The greater the differences of values between participants, the greater the differences in the language used to express and share ideas, the behaviours of interaction and the expectations of what learning is about. Effective cultures of collaboration need to share a common language and share or develop similar perceptions of thinking, learning and knowing.

**Effective Collaboration: the product of a quality relationship**

An effective culture of collaboration is dependent on the nature of the interactions which sustain and develop the thinking and the learning. These interactions are governed by the participants' perceptions of their status and role within the relationship, their perceptions of themselves as learners, the value placed on research as an activity and their ability to recognise and develop the knowledge which each brings to the relationship.

The extent to which a relationship demonstrates its quality becomes evident through the nature of the discourse that is used. The discourse reveals the roles that are being assumed, the level of trust that exists in the relationship, whether the relationship is based on one of equal status between the players and indeed everything about the relationship.

Developing a culture of collaboration is reliant on the development of a special tenor of language that needs to exist both to bond and bind the relationship. With the development of this tenor comes growth in the relationship. In the early stages of the relationship the results suggested a certain tenuousness in the interactions. There was greater need for explanation, making meanings explicit and the careful choice of words in an attempt to avoid the ambiguity that seemed to pervade the early interactions within the relationship. As levels of trust increased so language and its meanings became shared.

Developing a common language to sustain and develop the culture of collaboration refers not only to the transmission of ideas but the expression of shared understandings developed from shared meanings.
It also seems likely that the greater awareness of the effect that language has on the development of trust then the more rapid the growth of the relationship. In my relationship with Bill, I became aware of the controlling role I was assuming through the kind of language I was using. When I realised this I started to try and find new ways of interacting; from talk that instructed to talk that facilitated, from talk that reacted to talk that responded and from 'you' language to 'I' language. For these to work I also needed to become a better listener.

Typical too of effective collaboration is the air of tension that pervades the relationship as different areas of knowledge that participants bring to the enterprise are reshaped, developed into new craft knowledge and absorbed into a personal construct. This tension, however, is constructive and as Brock (1987) notes 'stress and anxiety are an indication that we are living our lives and making choices.' (p.191)

From this research study it has became apparent that if new ideologies are to be developed, new theoretical or craft knowledge created about language teaching and learning, and improved learning outcomes for students, then the partnership needs to reflect the personal empowerment of its participants.

An effective co-researching relationship resulted from collaboration that:

- reflected equal status between the participants;

- was based on a reciprocal sharing of ideas and engagement in the process;

- where participants had confidence in themselves as learners, a sense of personal empowerment;

- where the participants were prepared to take control and responsibility for their own learning;

- where each participant needed to have a genuine interest in the learning and a sense of caring for the welfare of their partner and of the students and
where there was potential for *autonomy*, the pursuit of individual interests as well as a shared focus and a personal as well as a shared voice.

One respondent described her relationship in this way:

"When we talk about our relationship we are talking about the way we feel about each other, the roles we think we should play, the agenda we have for ourselves and each other and the degree of trust that we have in each others knowledge and professionalism. This trust is reflected in the degree of honesty that exists and the principles we are really operating on as teachers, despite our rhetoric, and how much we care about each other's as learners and in what way.'

**Effective collaboration: different levels of potential growth**

Effective collaboration is also typified by a constant ebb and flow of growth. In describing how a collaborative culture develops we need to appreciate that the TACOR process generates its own momentum and that change is an integral part of this.

Collaborative enterprise is therefore developmental in nature. Patterns or indicators of development become apparent as participants engage in the co-researching process. All major elements of the process reflect phases or levels of growth in the development of the collaborative culture.

If we imagine a set of concentric circles where the outer layer represents the beginning of the relationship and the centre a developed culture of collaboration, the layers in between represent the journey that participants take. Each layer is separated by a semi permeable membrane and therefore development is the outcome of a process of osmosis that flourishes when the behaviours and language reflect genuine reciprocity. The journey is both personal and shared and is like a learning continuum. The outcomes for students depend on how far the participants have travelled.

In this study each element of the process reflected growth and development. The following figure describes the phases of development that were evident.
Process of negotiations

- Time commitment (How much, how often & when)
- Initial expectations
- Identifying personal interests, needs and focus
- How the process worked
- Roles and responsibilities
- Status
- Refining the process
- Ethics
- Use & ownership of data in the public domain
- Acknowledgement of knowledge sources

Use of data

- To provide a context for discussion & reflection
- To familiarise outsider with the culture of the classroom
- Basis for preliminary questioning
- To explore specific areas of interest
- As a memory jogger
- To trace individual development
- To refocus attention/interest
- Self evaluation
- Record of development and changes taking place
- To revisit for other areas of interest
- Making connections

Debriefing

- Questions by outsider seeking clarification or information
- Establishing shared understandings
- Making assumptions explicit
- Exchange of viewpoints beliefs
- Reflecting on practice
- Understanding of partner's thinking
- Shared meanings & shared dialogue
- Development of new knowledge about teaching and generation of new theory
Figure 23: Phases of potential growth in collaborative relationships

These specific indicators of growth seem to be closely related to the extent to which participants were able to make changes to their classroom practice. They also provide an indication of the extent to which collaborative action facilitated this change and the ability of the participants to be able to establish and develop an effective collaborative relationship.
At the centre of these layers of growth a special kind of collaborative relationship emerged. The behaviours that developed the collaborative culture were also being reflected in classroom practice. The teachers reported that they had become better listeners, more able to respond to their needs that were now being made more explicit by the students. They took more risks, trying things that they had never tried before. They did more professional reading and gave more responsibility for learning to the children.

There were also noticeable changes in the behaviour of students. Students displayed more self confidence in themselves as learners and took more control and responsibility for their learning.

This stage of the relationship could be described as symbiotic. There was a coming together of the participants' knowledge that allowed for the production of something else. This concept of symbiosis recognises that the level of productivity of a single organism is limited but when working together with another can create something new. At this stage of growth, participants were creating new theoretical as well as practical knowledge.

But there were other outcomes of this symbiosis. The new theoretical and practical knowledge about language teaching and learning was seen by the educational community as both credible and useful. The participants from these symbiotic partnerships were writing joint publications and making joint presentations at both national and international conferences. Each participant, however, also maintained a personal voice and was publishing and presenting in areas of personal interest.

The process of collaborative co-researching

In an attempt to bring these two themes together and to show the connections between the various characteristics, the following figure tries to explain the recursive nature of the co-researching process and to highlight the interrelationships of the key characteristics that best describe it.
**Figure 24: Developing a culture of collaboration**

This study has highlighted the importance of the human dimensions of teaching and learning. Tacor is not just a strategy or technique but rather a living expression of the participants' changing beliefs and intentions as educators, much more a genuine expression of oneself than a method.

**External & internal influences on the development of a culture of collaboration**

Whilst growth was recognised by all who participated in this study, there were a number of both external and internal factors that impinged on the effectiveness of the co-researching process and therefore the participants potential for growth.

External factors reported only included the socio-political influences within the immediate work environment of the school. The ethos, the value attributed by other teachers and the administration on the professional development of teachers and the
value of co-researching as a credible activity were reported as important.

Internal factors only impinged on the initial growth of the relationship and included their perceptions of the value of research knowledge and of researching, a lack of self confidence and self-esteem, and the value to the relationship of their own knowledge.

Limitations of this research

The limitations of this research include its failure to discover its reproducibility to other schools. Most of the participants have moved on to new schools and to positions of responsibility for staff development. To what extent they have been able to develop a community of learners with a shared vision for literacy and language learning is unknown. To what extent a school community can affect and be affected by the enthusiasm and collaborative enterprise of a few is also not known.

Furthermore, only a limited variety of stakeholders contributed to this study and one wonders whether partnerships of more participants would operate as effectively as two or three.

In this study, although collaborators shared different values and beliefs about teaching and learning, there were no clashes of personality. Is collaborative enterprise limited to those who can find a compatible partner? What about the others? Can it be assumed that all teachers want to share their knowledge and ideas? There are still many unanswered questions

Recommendations

The many unanswered questions arising from this study become recommendations for further research.

For instance, how might the TACOR process be useful to parents working with teachers or principals? How effective might larger co-researching groups operate? How exactly can learning communities be developed?
Furthermore, a full discourse analysis of the interactions throughout a co-researching relationship might shed further light on the complexities of collaboration and identify the kind of language which enables learning.

Coda

Whilst many different approaches to professional development have been developed to assist and support teachers as they endeavour to make changes to their practice, they have been mostly ineffective. Changes which are made are largely cosmetic, at best the development of a few new teaching strategies and some use of new teaching resources. This does little to support teachers to make dramatic changes in their ideology.

Effective 'whole language' classrooms require very different ways of working with children. 'Teacher as Co-researcher' as a methodology for staff development was designed to address this problem and to provide teachers with a process which allowed them to engage in the new ideology, to experience it for themselves, to make connections with their own classroom practice and to transfer these new experiences and understandings to their classrooms and their students.

Without the experience of a changed ideology in practice it is difficult to believe that teachers could understand what it is that they are being asked to implement.

Involvement in The TACOR process has effected both the professional and personal lives of those who participated. We have learnt how to see ourselves as learners and how to facilitate learning in others. We have learnt how to take responsibility for our own learning and to share the responsibility for professional development within the community. We become more sensitive to others' needs and learnt how to respond rather than react. We have had the opportunity to become empowered.

This approach to professional development helps to close the gap in understandings of the concepts of research and practice and provides possibilities for university staff to do research with teachers in new ways in pursuit of common goals.
The main purpose of Teacher as Co-researcher is to help participants to examine their own assumptions about teaching and learning. With varying degrees of success, new ideologies were developed and in this sense this methodology for staff development extends beyond those described in the literature review. Instead, this methodology is better described as having an important 'critical' element. Unpacking and repacking our values, assumptions and beliefs requires an intense level of self and shared critique. It is this constant critique which prompts changed ideology in practice.

For this reason, I believe that collaborative approaches to professional development need to reflect this 'critical' dimension. From this, a new model of professional development might emerge, one which could best be described as the 'Critical Collaborative Model' of professional development.

In concluding, Fullan (1991) provides an appropriate raison d'être for this study.

>'New meaning and reform are created in a thousand small ways that eventually add up to a new order of things. Systems do not change by themselves. People change systems through their actions.' (p.352)

I believe the 'Teacher as co-researcher' process, as a methodology for staff development, has considerable potential to provide a means whereby educators through collaborative enterprise can change existing ideologies of language teaching in ways that will help students take responsibility for their own learning and become more effective readers and writers.
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