

**Characteristics of Good Collegiality
Among Secondary Social Studies and
Science Teachers When Teaching
Academically Diverse Classes**

Authors:

B. Keith Lenz, Jeff Melvin, Brenda Kissam, Janis Bulgren, & Janet Roth

The University of Kansas
Center for Research on Learning NO. 66

©August, 1992

Characteristics of Good Collegiality Among Secondary Social Studies and Science Teachers When Teaching Academically Diverse Classes

B. Keith Lenz
Jeff Melvin
Brenda Kissam
Janis Bulgren
Janet Roth

The University of Kansas
Center for Research on Learning

August, 1992

Running Head: Characteristics of Good Collegiality

This research is supported by a grant from the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS) within the United States Department of Education (Award #H023E90009) under the research initiative of "Research on General Education Teacher Planning and Adaptation for Students with Handicaps." The views expressed here are those of the Center for Research on Learning, and do not necessarily reflect official positions of the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, USDE.

Abstract

The work environment of teachers has long been characterized by isolation. Most teachers are separated from colleagues as they work alone in their classrooms with groups of students. In recent years those groups of students have become more and more academically diverse as, among other developments, students with special educational needs are placed in general education settings. This diversity has increased the demands placed on teachers, adding to the stresses in their work environments. Although teachers work alone much of the time, they value collegial interaction. Furthermore, collegial support can serve as a source of professional growth and as an ameliorating influence on the stresses they experience in their work environments.

The purpose of this study was to explore with teachers the characteristics of good collegiality that would enhance teacher satisfaction and effectiveness in facing the challenges presented by teaching academically diverse classes. The study was carried out by working with groups of secondary science and social studies teachers in Cooperative Study Groups. These groups discussed issues related to teacher professional growth and collegiality with a view toward identifying what characterized good collegiality for these teachers.

Teachers indicated that they valued opportunities for collegial interaction and wished they had more such opportunities. They also characterized good colleagues as being positive, pleasant and supportive. In the view of these teachers, good collegiality, however much it was valued, should not require additional time commitments from teachers who already feel overwhelmed by the demands of their profession. The challenge for both teachers and administrators is to find a way for teachers to have regular, or at least more frequent, opportunities to work and learn from each other without adding to teachers' already substantial time commitment to their profession.

Characteristics of Good Collegiality Among Secondary Social Studies and Science Teachers When Teaching Academically Diverse Classes

Teachers in public schools today are teaching classes filled with students of widely varying academic experience and ability. Adding to this diversity is the increasingly frequent placement of students with mild handicaps in regular education settings for at least a part of the day (Lovitt, 1989). Secondary school teachers are hindered in addressing the needs of these students by the way most secondary schools are organized: teachers usually see students for only one period a day, making accommodation of special needs difficult (Brandt, 1989). Attempting to address the needs of so many different students is a challenge for most teachers (Graden, Zins & Curtis, 1988). Attempting to pursue professional growth goals at the same time can become, at a minimum, an additional and possibly burdensome time commitment. Yet professional development and growth has long been recognized as an important part of teaching - evidence of this may be seen in the regularity with which most school districts plan for inservice training for teachers.

Despite offerings of inservice study opportunities for teachers, the isolation and demands in their work environments present many obstacles to their professional growth. The present study was undertaken to develop an understanding of how teacher characteristics and characteristics of their work environments affect teachers' perceptions of their effectiveness with students from academically diverse classrooms.

A cooperative research approach was adopted. Researchers and teachers worked together to identify problems facing teachers of academically diverse classes and the role that collegiality may play in addressing those problems. This cooperative relationship was developed through the creation of small work groups, Cooperative Study Groups (CSGs), comprised of teachers and investigators representing the research project. These work groups served as the primary force in determining the research direction and carrying out various research activities. In all instances, the primary purpose of the CSGs was to explore teachers' experiences with planning for and teaching in academically diverse secondary science and social studies classrooms. This report, which presents findings from the work of the Cooperative Study Groups, addresses the issue of characteristics of good collegiality in teaching.

Method

Initiating the Cooperative Study Group Process

An invitation to apply for project participation was extended to all secondary social studies and science teachers in two school districts in eastern Kansas. We sought teachers who were interested in jointly conducting research related to meeting the challenge of planning and teaching in the face of academic diversity.

Each teacher's class schedule and class composition was requested to determine the extent of academic diversity in their classes and to screen for students participating in special education programs. Since our goal was to identify a pool of teachers with whom we could work for the duration of the project, we also identified those teachers who had previously worked with students with mild handicaps and who would likely continue to have these types of students in their classes. Nevertheless, it was impossible to ensure that these teachers would continue to have students with mild handicaps in their classes throughout this project.

Approximately 76 teachers expressed an interest in participating. This number was reduced to 52 as a result of phone calls to each applicant explaining the time commitments. Participating teachers were informed that they would become part of a research team that would meet and discuss problems and solutions related to teaching in diverse secondary classrooms. For the first and second meetings, teachers were organized into groups of four to eight members. These groupings, referred to as Cooperative Study Groups, served as the basis for identifying key characteristics of efforts that would enhance personal growth in teaching.

To facilitate the work of the Cooperative Study Groups, a set of questions was developed related to personal growth in teaching, given the demands posed by students in academically diverse classes. The questions and questioning process were first discussed with Dr. Christopher Clark of Michigan State University, who served as a project consultant on teacher research and growth. Procedures for conducting the CSGs were developed and delineated in writing. Additionally, three project staff members were trained as moderators and six research assistants were trained as note takers and recorder assistants. Finally, the duties and responsibilities of note takers and recorder assistants were specified in writing.

Subjects

Fifty-two teachers participated in the first CSG meetings. For 51 of the 52 teachers for whom demographic data was collected, 25 were men and 26 were women. With a mean

age of 46 years (range=31-63 years), most were very experienced teachers, having taught for an average of 20 years (range=1-36 years; $SD=8$ years); only six teachers had taught for less than 10 years. Eleven were middle-school science teachers, 18 high-school science teachers, eight were middle-school social studies teachers and 14 were high-school social studies teachers. Four of the teachers held part-time positions (i.e., they taught 1-3 classes per day), the remaining taught full time.

The teachers were teaching an average of 4.66 classes per day, with a total average student enrollment of 107. They averaged about two class preparations per day (range=1-4) and had one class period for planning within the school day. Participants reported that an average of 5.7% of the students in their classes were students with learning disabilities and an additional 11% could be considered at risk for failure in school.

Personal growth study subjects. To specifically address the issues surrounding personal growth, 42 of the 52 teachers described above participated in the second set of cooperative study groups. Based upon knowledge gained from previous CSGs that middle school teachers felt uncomfortable when mixed with groups of high-school teachers, seven study groups were formed in which an effort was made to group these teachers separately. Due to teachers' personal schedules, this proved feasible only for four groups: two high-school science groups ($N_s=8$ and 8), one high school social studies group ($N=8$), and one group of six middle-school science teachers and one middle-school social studies teacher ($N=7$). The remaining three groups included one with two high school and two middle school social studies teachers ($N=4$), one with two middle-school social studies teachers and one high-school science teacher ($N=3$), and one with two middle-school social studies teachers, one middle-school science teacher and one high-school science teacher ($N=4$). Assignment to a group was based on geographic location and compatibility of after-school schedules.

Three additional teachers were unable to attend any of the scheduled CSGs. Staff members interviewed these teachers individually to discuss the questions related to personal growth in teaching. These interviews were audio taped and transcribed. These teachers' comments served as a basis for qualitative descriptions in the report; however, they were not included in any of the quantitative analyses.

Procedures and Measures

Teachers were asked to meet as a group three times in the spring of 1990. The second set of meetings for seven groups was held in April and May. The teachers met for

a two-hour period after school in one of the district administration offices or in a meeting room on the campus at the University of Kansas. No meeting was held in the teachers' schools. Teachers received ten dollars in appreciation of their participation in each of the meetings.

At each meeting, participants were asked questions related to personal growth in teaching, given the demands posed by students in academically diverse classes. Each group was to be asked the same set of four questions. Due to time constraints, however, not all groups discussed all four questions. The first and second questions were discussed by all seven groups. The third and fourth questions were discussed by six of the seven groups. Teachers were asked questions that required them to think about their personal growth in teaching, given the demands posed by students in academically diverse classes. An "academically diverse" class was defined as "a class comprised of students with widely varying achievement levels such as a class with students with learning disabilities, other low-achieving students, as well as average-achieving students." The fourth question, the one reported on here, was "What would be the characteristics of good collegiality, given the demands of teaching science or social studies to an academically diverse group of students?"

Each question was posed, one at a time, by a researcher who served as a moderator for the group. Also present were two research assistants; one took notes about teachers' responses, the other audio taped the session. The teachers discussed each question for 15-20 minutes. When additional responses were not forthcoming, the moderator summarized (orally and in list form on a large tablet) the major points expressed so far in the discussion. The moderator then asked the group members to check the accuracy of the summarized statements. The teachers also were asked whether they wished to add anything to the listed responses. Any new suggestions were added to the list.

Next, the teachers were asked to indicate to what degree they agreed with each item or to what degree it represented a barrier or problem for them. Two groups used a special form on which they wrote down the summarized statements and indicated their agreement with each item on a 7-point Likert-type scale (ranging from 1 -"I strongly agree"- to 7- "I strongly disagree"). For each of the other five groups, the summary statements were recorded and presented to each group at their next meeting at which time the teachers indicated their agreement on the Likert-type scale for each item that had been generated in their groups. This process of finalizing the list and rating the responses was referred to as the "Member Check" phase of data collection.

Because six teachers attended a different group after the first meeting, they indicated their degree of agreement with summary statements generated in CSGs other than the one they had previously attended. Additionally, Member Checks from one group were inadvertently omitted from the categorization process and one teacher's Member Check ratings were not turned in.

Data Analysis

The CSGs yielded several types of information: basic demographic data about the teachers and transcripts of all CSG meetings. Reliability checks were performed on the accuracy of these transcriptions and the data collected through the Member Check process were compiled and categorized.

The data were analyzed by two methods: transcript evaluation and quantitative compilation. For the transcript evaluation process, the audio tapes of the meeting and the notes taken by the research assistant and the moderator were used to create a transcript of the meeting. These transcripts were used to interpret the meaning of items generated through the Member Check process and to identify themes and trends in the data that were not apparent from the Member Check data. The transcripts were read and major impressions were summarized by two independent readers who had participated in the Cooperative Study Group meetings. These impressions were synthesized, and a set of summary statements was generated.

After all groups had met, project staff developed categories for grouping (sorting) teacher responses. All responses in the Member Checks from the seven CSG meetings were placed on individual 3X5 cards and grouped by the question to which they related. Each group of cards was then sorted into categories. The wide range of responses made the categorization process difficult. A procedure was developed to establish four Category headings: **(a) Teacher Issues** -- issues related to teacher actions and attitudes; **(b) System/Administrative Issues** -- issues related to the role of administrators and school systems in supporting and/or providing opportunities for collegial interaction.

A project staff member and a research assistant devised subcategories within each category as appropriate for each question. Another research assistant then sorted the cards into the categories and noted any difficulties matching individual responses or categories. Some categories were revised in response to this feedback and some responses were accepted as being related to more than one category. Alternate choices (13.3 % of all responses for this question) were sorted in two subcategories. Using a final set of categories and subcategories, interrater reliabilities of 87.95% and 84.3%

were achieved. These reliabilities were achieved by having two research assistants not involved in developing the final categorization sort responses independently into the developed categories.

Since the teachers had indicated on the Member Check forms their level of personal agreement with each item generated in their group in response to each question, it was possible to determine the relative agreement between the group-generated Member Check items and an individual teacher's viewpoint. Since Member Check items were not consistent across groups, an attempt was made to determine within-group agreement, or the homogeneity of attitudes toward stated Member Check items within each group. A homogeneity index was calculated for each respondent under each question by taking the standard deviation of his or her responses to the Member Check items under each question and then calculating its reciprocal (or dividing one by the standard deviation value). To determine the degree to which individuals in each of the groups were in consensus on each question, the standard deviation of the homogeneity indexes for each respondent was calculated. This calculation was carried out for each of the four questions.

The Member Check ratings also allowed us to calculate teacher agreement with the pooled items in each subcategory. In order to analyze this level of agreement, teachers' numerical ratings for items assigned to a specific subcategory were totaled and divided by the number of teachers who had ranked those items in that subcategory. Items, or responses, with an average rating close to "1" showed that most of the teachers agreed with it (i.e., it held personal meaning for them) whereas responses having an average rating closer to "7" showed that most of the teachers did not agree with it (i.e., it did not hold personal meaning for them.)

Results

When teachers in our study groups were asked "What are the characteristics of good collegiality in teaching, given the demands posed by students in academically diverse classes?", they most often identified having colleagues who were positive, open-minded, supportive, and accessible and having administrators and school structures that provided time and opportunities for teachers to interact with one another and share successes and disappointments. Table 1 summarizes the Member Check information for this question.

(1) Teacher Issues. The greatest number of responses related to teacher issues, or issues related to teacher actions and attitudes. Within this category, the largest single subcategory was opportunities as well as teacher willingness to give/share/help/observe other teachers. This subcategory generated 17 responses

across all six groups discussing this question. The responses in this subcategory indicated strongly that teachers are eager not only to learn from their colleagues, but also to share their successes and work with them more closely than they do at present. However, although teachers are eager to work more cooperatively with their colleagues, they want to do so only with those colleagues who are positive and share an interest in solving problems, not just complaining about them. This became evident in the second largest subcategory of responses which identified having friendly, trustworthy, open, pleasant, responsible, and positive colleagues as an important characteristic of good collegiality. This subcategory received 13 responses across all six groups discussing the question. Five of the six groups also indicated that good collegiality required a forum for sharing ideas, brainstorming, and discussion of ideas that work and do not work. Other response subcategories emphasized (a) that teachers are eager to work cooperatively rather than competitively with colleagues, (b) that such joint efforts must be goal-oriented and positive, and that (c) they should be voluntary on the part of teachers.

(2) System/Administrative Issues. This category included responses related to the role of administrators and school systems in supporting and providing opportunities for collegiality. The subcategory with the third largest number of responses overall and with the largest number of responses within this category was the need for time for professional interactions and social contacts. This subcategory received 11 responses across all six groups. Thus, teachers clearly felt that collegial interactions require time and that there is not presently time available within or outside their work lives to devote to collegial efforts. One teacher asserted that "If it's on your own time, you're so busy with other responsibilities, you can't do it." Consequently, most teachers in our groups believed that time must be structured into their school lives through such means as allowing for common lunch hours within departments, setting aside half days or inservice times for teachers to work together, or reducing noninstructional duties to permit more collegial interaction.

Teachers also pointed out that good collegiality requires flexible and supportive school/administration/personnel systems, good physical conditions like space and proximity, and opportunities to attend conferences and share with colleagues what has been learned there.

Table 1

CSG Member Check Results for Question 4: Characteristics of Good Collegiality in Teaching Academically Diverse Classes

Response Categories/Subcategories	No. of Items	No. of Groups (N=6)	Mean Agreement Rating*
Teacher Issues			
Working with Teachers: (a) with Same Experience Level, (b) Cross Level, and (c) Cross Dept.	6	3	2.16
Climate Is Cooperative, Not Competitive	5	4	2.30
Goal-Oriented, Problem-Solving, Content-Oriented, Interesting Meetings	6	3	1.81
Importance of Social Contacts, Informal Sharing, and Good Conversation	6	5	2.62
Forum for Sharing Ideas, Brainstorming, Discussion of Ideas That Work/Don't Work	5	5	1.97
Meet with Experts and/or in Workshops to Gain New Knowledge	3	3	1.95
Friendly, Trustworthy, Open, Pleasant, Responsible, and Positive Colleagues	13	6	1.78
Participation and Requirements Are Voluntary, Chosen, and Pleasant	6	3	1.76
Opportunities as well as Teacher Willingness to Give/Share/Help/Observe Others	17	6	1.88
Opportunities to Share in or Focus on Teaching Students Who Need Extra Help	4	4	1.85
System/Administrative Issues			
Opportunity to Attend Conferences and Share Flexible and Supportive	2	2	2.29
School/Administration/Personnel/System	5	4	1.80
Good Physical Conditions (Location, Space, Refreshments, etc.)	4	3	2.56
Time Provided for Professional Interactions and Social Contacts	11	6	1.87

*7 = Low Agreement ; 1 = High Agreement

Within-group agreement results. Based on the indexes of homogeneity of attitudes toward listed Member Check items in each group, the groups can be divided into three categories: most consistent, moderately consistent and nonconsistent. Table 2 lists the within-group agreement results for the six groups discussing this question. Values are to be interpreted in the same manner as standard deviations, that is, low values indicate less variation and more agreement whereas high values indicate more variation

and less agreement. Inspection of the statistics indicates that group #4 showed the most consensus, with the variability observed in members' indexes being low. Group #5 reached moderate consensus, whereas groups #1,2,3 and 7 were nonconsistent with the least degree of consensus.

Table 2

Standard Deviations for Homogeneity Indexes for Cooperative Study Group Question #2.4

Group	Question 4
Group 1	.56
Group 2	.56
Group 3	1.00
Group 4	.33
Group 5	.45
Group 6	*
Group 7	.61

* Question not discussed

Discussion

The vast majority of teachers in our study groups indicated that they are eager for more interaction with their colleagues and that such interactions should be voluntary, cooperative, positive, and goal-oriented. Participants also made it clear that working with colleagues should not be structured as an additional responsibility to their already substantial time commitments to their profession. Thus, the one or two teachers who were reluctant to commit to the idea of greater collegial contact appeared to hold back, not due to lack of interest but out of concern that time for their personal and family lives not be further sacrificed to their teaching duties.

The research literature on collegiality in teaching indicates that several elements are necessary to promote good collegiality. For example, Johnson (1990) described good collegiality as requiring (a) a group of good, positive teachers, (b) supportive organizational norms, (c) cooperating teachers who work on the same level, (d) time, and (e) administrative support. Further, Little (1982) found that in successful

schools collegiality is characterized by purposeful teacher talk, nonevaluative teacher observation of peers, common preparation of instructional plans and materials, and teachers (rather than outside experts) teaching each other. Glatthorn (1987) also identified several organizational factors necessary for cooperative professional development to exist: (a) strong administrative leadership, (b) climate of trust between teachers and administrators, (c) separating cooperative programs from any evaluation process, (d) focused cooperative programs, (e) district-provided resources needed to initiate and sustain cooperative programs, and (f) administrative support for structural arrangements necessary to foster cooperation.

Many of the same elements were also brought up by teachers in our groups as being important to collegiality. Generally, teachers in our groups believed that, above all, good collegiality means having opportunities to share instructional knowledge and experience with each other. They also believed that good collegiality is positive, purposeful, pleasant, voluntary, and noncompetitive; that it is not an extra time commitment; and that it has administrative support.

Collegiality means opportunities to share. Teachers in our cooperative study groups indicated that an important characteristic of good collegiality was sharing between teachers of professional knowledge and ideas. Of the 17 responses among six groups in this subcategory, seven used the word "sharing." Indeed, one of the teachers said "To me, collegiality is sharing ideas." Thus, these teachers believed they have something to offer their colleagues and that their colleagues have something to offer them, and they are eager to share with and learn from others.

Researchers have noted that teachers see each other as a primary and important source of ideas about teaching (Kasten, 1984; Lortie, 1975). In order for sharing between teachers to occur, teachers must have opportunities to be together and interact. Such opportunities are rare, however (Boyer, 1983; Carnegie Foundation, 1990; Mac-Phail-Wilcox & Hylar, 1985). Furthermore, Maeroff (1988) and Johnson (1990) argued that the structure of schools works against collegiality; teachers work in classrooms isolated from colleagues, the daily schedule allows little time flexibility, and there are few organizational supports in most schools to encourage collaboration.

Yet even while opportunities for collaboration are largely absent from teachers' professional lives, participants in our study groups as well as teachers elsewhere in the nation *do* want to work with each other. For example, in a 1990 survey of 231 teachers honored by the National Education Association for excellence in teaching, 84% said that "Meeting with other teachers and colleagues" would help them a "Great Deal" in doing their job. An additional 14% said it would help them a "Fair Amount" in doing their job

("Research Clues," 1990). The teachers' belief that such collaboration would be helpful was substantiated in a study by Swan, Carnes, and Gilman (1988), who found that staff development activities involving teachers teaching teachers significantly enhanced teachers' attitudes and beliefs about teaching.

Teachers in our study groups suggested many ideas on how they would like this collaboration to occur. Some just wanted to brainstorm about how to present content information, while others wanted to hear other teachers' ideas about instructional plans or techniques that worked, as well as those that did not work. Some teachers wanted more collaboration within their departments or across the grade level they taught, while others wanted to have more interactions with colleagues in other departments. The latter felt that such contact would spark creativity and expose them to new ideas. In an extension of the idea of interdisciplinary contact, Maeroff (1988) suggested that an interdisciplinary approach in schools would be "a device for breaking down isolation" as well as "facilitating the sharing of knowledge among teachers" (p. 44).

Collegiality is positive, purposeful, voluntary and noncompetitive.

Teachers in our groups remarked that collegiality must be positive, pleasant and noncompetitive; preferably, collegial work should be focused and have a purpose related to participants' teaching concerns and interests.

Many teachers indicated that on the limited number of occasions when they could be with other teachers in their schools, they sometimes merely encountered "gripe sessions." For them, this kind of negativism did *not* characterize good collegiality; in fact, they avoided spending time with colleagues who complained a lot, believing that chronic complaining among teachers was discouraging. One teacher commented, "I get frustrated by teachers becoming negative." Another teacher said, "If there's just nagging and whining [when teachers get together], I'll find something else to do."

Apparently, it is not uncommon for talk among teachers to be "gripe sessions." Kasten (1984), for example, found that much of the informal interaction that occurs among teachers is characterized by griping.

Rather than gripe sessions, teachers in our groups wanted contacts with colleagues to be friendly, open, supportive, and positive. One teacher said, "People I want to form a group with are positive people who want to make positive changes." Another noted that good collegial gatherings "would not be gripe sessions but rather would involve constructive problem solving" and another teacher indicated that "Instead of [focusing on] what's wrong, I want to know how to fix it."

In addition to being constructive, teachers preferred that their time spent working with colleagues have a purpose and be related to issues and concerns that are of

interest to them. One teacher said, "We need to have a goal ahead of time"; others characterized good collegiality as "Working together for a common goal," "structured in a way that was meaningful", and having a "common goal or problem to work on rather than tea time."

These comments are consistent with Little's (1982) findings that teacher participation and productivity in collegial activities are enhanced when the relevance of the activity is made clear. Purkey and Smith (1983) have also found that collegiality in successful schools is characterized, in part, by clear goals commonly shared.

In teachers' views, collegiality must be voluntary. One teacher observed, "I'll bet if someone said we have to meet, it wouldn't be well-received." Another commented that although she believed all teachers in a school "should" participate in meetings set up to share ideas, "it shouldn't be required"; another teacher said such meetings should include only "people [who] want to be there." These views echo Lortie's findings (1975) that norms among teachers regarding collegial relationships "are permissive rather than mandatory. Normative permissiveness has a self-evident function; it encourages individuals with different needs to satisfy themselves along lines they find most rewarding" (p. 194). However, this toleration of self-isolation has limits. Thus Lortie noted that teachers believe their colleagues should in any case "respond when called upon" and "the etiquette rule seems to be 'live and let live, and help when asked'" (pp. 194-195).

Lortie observed also that teachers' toleration of self-isolation does not extend to a "license for haughty standoffishness" or "putting on airs" (p. 194). This is consistent with remarks made by teachers in our study groups. For example, several teachers said that good collegiality is characterized by "open-mindedness" and a recognition that everyone is a professional and is competent. Good colleagues should be "willing to listen to others and not put others down." "Trust," "cooperation," and "openness" were other terms used to characterize the qualities teachers ascribe to good collegial relationships. These comments bear out an observation of Johnson (1990) that "collegial workplaces depend on teachers' openness and readiness to improve" (p. 151). Similarly, Little (1982) found that in successful schools, interactions about teaching were seen as reciprocal regardless of the status of the participants.

While teachers prefer that their colleagues be open, Johnson (1990) observed that there are among teachers "strong norms of autonomy and privacy" and that "creeping fears of competition, exposure of shortcomings and discomfiting criticism often discourage open exchange, cooperation, and growth" (p. 179).

Because establishing collegiality may be contingent on reducing competitiveness, intolerance, and insecurity among teachers, it is perhaps important to examine some of the possible sources of these impediments to collegiality. Johnson (1990) believed that "Teachers' feelings of vulnerability in their interactions with colleagues may derive, in part, from the very personal character of teaching and the uncertainties that pervade it" (p. 168). Another source may derive from the fact that teachers' principal rewards in teaching are the psychic ones of seeing students succeed. Lortie (1975) describes how this may encourage competition among teachers:

In assessing whether they are attaining their objectives, teachers observe student behavior and use indexes to interpret it; students who show enthusiasm for the teacher may, after all, be showing that they are learning and enjoying that learning. Such student affection and regard are also intrinsically rewarding; people normally enjoy being the object of affection and esteem. In trying to elicit favorable feelings from students (whatever the motivation), teachers are willy-nilly placed in competition with each other; some will obviously succeed better than others. (p. 120)

Lortie's theory may explain a situation described by one of the teachers in our groups, who remarked on the "competition among individual teachers for certain types of students ... the cream of the crop." These are the types of students most likely to become engaged in learning and to succeed -- and also to provide the psychic rewards teachers naturally seek.

Whatever its sources and characteristics, competitiveness among teachers does exist and the participants in our study groups clearly indicated it was an impediment to collegiality. To foster collegiality, therefore, teachers' vulnerabilities as well as any practices encouraging competition between them must be recognized and ameliorated to the extent possible.

Collegiality is not an extra time commitment. Teachers in our groups were emphatic that increased opportunities for collegial interaction must not constitute an added time commitment; rather, it should be built into the system. One teacher argued that "Time should be made available, so there is not that feeling of conflict." Another teacher observed that "Teachers are big on denying themselves things. We have so many other activities. Even if it's good for you ... you wouldn't do it [if it required extra time]." Johnson (1990) noted that "By far, the most frequent explanation teachers offered for scarce collegial interactions was inadequate time ... the educational workplace requires that teachers continuously deliver services during all but a small portion of their time, necessarily pushing collegial interactions to the margins of the

workday" (p. 172). Similarly, Little (1982) found that there were few occasions and places during the course of the school day for teachers to work together.

Finding or making time for collegiality may be important, not only as a means of helping teachers become more effective at what they do, but also as a way of reducing teacher burnout. Schwab, Jackson, and Schuler (1986) found that facilitating social support among teachers by providing adequate time and locations for collegial interactions helped reduce burnout.

Collegiality requires administrative support. Teachers in our groups expressed a desire for their administrators to support the idea behind and the realization of greater collegial contact. They also expressed a desire to feel that they had the trust of administrators. For example, one teacher commented, "We have to get the administration to trust us to talk business."

Collegiality depends on administrative support in several ways. Among these, perhaps the biggest issue involves making time available for teachers to work together. As indicated, teachers do not believe that collegiality as an add-on commitment will be successful. Hawthorne (1986) argued that opportunities for collegial exchange must be structured into the organization through district and school policy and organizational norms. If collegiality is not integrated into teachers' professional lives, it will continue to occur only at the margins of teachers' school days (Johnson, 1990).

Johnson (1990) found that teachers believed principals and department heads could promote collegiality if they chose to, because they controlled the teaching schedule and the use of meeting time. Indeed, in her study, principals who were thought to be effective in promoting collegial interaction

did not set the agenda at meetings or direct the interaction, but rather encouraged and enabled teachers to do so. They created coffee areas for informal discussion, arranged for skilled aides to cover classes so that teachers could observe each other, scheduled time carefully to permit collaboration, and asked teachers to design meetings and workshops. They were very influential, but not controlling. (p. 177)

The influence of administrators and gaining their confidence may be as fundamentally important to teachers as time is in establishing opportunities for collegial relations. As one of the teachers commented, "You have to convince the administration that teachers have the intelligence to use their talents and time, that we know what we're doing." Without the confidence and support of administrators, teachers can do little constructive problem solving on a collegial basis.

Conclusion

Teachers in our groups appeared to know what they wanted in terms of good collegiality and were definite about their desire to have more opportunities to work closely with colleagues. Yet, they did not seem confident that they could do much within the confines of their present situations to enhance or increase opportunities to work with colleagues.

For example, they indicated that time for them to work together was at a premium - or nonexistent. Yet, it was not clear that they had made concerted efforts to find or organize time for collegial interaction. Most likely they had not done so because of time pressures. Throughout these cooperative study group meetings it has been clear that teachers are constantly fighting the battle of time to fulfill the responsibilities they already have. Nevertheless, the many complaints about inservice activities as currently provided by school districts suggest one approach to carving out some time for collegial work. However, persuading administrators to let them use inservice time for collegial ventures would require teachers to develop a plan showing that the time would be used productively; having to prepare such a plan would violate the teachers' already stated preference that collegial work not be an added time commitment.

In spite of such overall attitudes, when the need arises teachers often do seem to make time to attend to pressing problems. One teacher in one of the study groups reported that she and a group of other teachers faced a truancy problem that they believed required administrative help. They approached administrators and counselors and, having convinced them of the seriousness of the problem, were able to work effectively with them in devising a solution. This group clearly had a common goal and were able to work together to successfully address a common problem.

A more comprehensive solution to the problem of finding time for collegial interactions was offered in recommendations made by Boyer (1983), Goodlad (1984), and Powell (1985) that teachers not be expected to teach as many classes as they are at present. For example, Powell said that

Teachers need a more flexible day, they need to get away from the exhausting routine of large-group instruction, they need to spend time with students in different formats, and they need to talk more to each other about teaching and about students. (p. 261)

An example of successful teacher cooperation is found in the Collegial Interaction Process described in a case study by Anastos and Ancowitz (1987). Teachers worked together to develop instructional plans and materials and then observed and critiqued

each other by means of videotaping. Among the benefits of the program, teachers expressed a new appreciation and respect for their peers. Johnson and Johnson (1989) suggested several ways whereby time and opportunity could be arranged for teachers to observe each other. If each principal took one teacher's class for one period a day, about one-fourth of teachers would be released for one period each week. Also classes could be combined to view a video or participate in some other group instructional activity, thus freeing one teacher for one period. Research projects such as this also provide collegial opportunities that might not otherwise be available. One of the teachers in the study groups characterized good collegiality as "Sitting in a group like this with volunteer people.... Sessions like this are encouraging."

The present school day does offer possibilities for teachers to find time to work together. However, to do so would require some extra time commitment initially as well as initiative and drive on the part of teachers. However, if teachers are to work productively together on more than a sporadic basis, time must ultimately be built into the structure of schools. This would most likely require basic structural changes that are not apt to come about soon. Teachers *are*, however, ready and willing to work together and research gives every indication that teachers are the most effective teachers for other teachers - sharing and working together. The challenge is for committed administrators, teachers, and researchers to creatively carve out of the present system as much time and opportunity as possible for teachers to take advantage of the largely untapped resource represented by the shared knowledge and experience of good colleagues.

References

- Anastos, J., & Ancowitz, R. (1987). A teacher-directed peer coaching project. Educational Leadership, 45(3), 40-42.
- Boyer, E.L. (1983). High school: A report on secondary education in America. New York: Harper & Row.
- Brandt, R. (1989). Responding differently to student differences. Educational Leadership, 46(6), 2.
- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1990). The condition of teaching: A state-by-state analysis. Lawrenceville, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Glatthorn, A.A. (1987). Cooperative professional development: Peer-centered options for teacher growth. Educational Leadership, 45(3), 31-35.
- Goodlad, J.I. (1984). A place called school. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Graden, J.L., Zins, J. E., & Curtis, M.L. (1988). Alternative education delivery systems: Enhancing instructional options for all students. Washington, DC: National Association of School Psychologists.
- Hawthorne, R.K. (1986). The professional teacher's dilemma: Balancing autonomy and obligation. Educational Leadership, 44(2), 34-35.
- Johnson, S.M. (1990). Teachers at work - Achieving success in our schools. New York: Basic Books, Inc.
- Johnson, D.W., & Johnson, R.T. (1989). Leading the cooperative school. Edina, MN: Interaction Book Co.
- Kasten, K.L. (1984). The efficacy of institutionally dispensed rewards in elementary school teaching. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 17(4), 1-13.
- Little, J.W. (1982). Norms of collegiality and experimentation: Workplace conditions of school success. American Educational Research Journal, 19(3), 325-40.

- Lortie, D.C. (1975). Schoolteacher - A sociological study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lovitt, T.C. (1989). Introduction to learning disabilities. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Mac-Phail-Wilcox, B., & Hyler, L.R. (1985). Improving the quality of worklife for teachers: A contingency approach. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 18(3), 16-24.
- Maeroff, G. I. (1988). The empowerment of teachers: Overcoming the crisis of confidence. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Research clues - Getting to the sources. (1990, December). NEA Today, p. 24.
- Powell, A.G. (1985). Being unspecial in the shopping mall high school. Phi Delta Kappan, 67(4), 255-261
- Purkey, S.C. & Smith, M.S. (1983). Effective schools: A review. The Elementary School Journal, 83(4), 427-452.
- Schwab, R.L., Jackson, S.E., & Schuler, R.S. (1986). Educator burnout: Sources and consequences. Educational Research Quarterly, 19(3), 14-30.
- Swan, E.T., Carnes, W.J. & Gilman, D.A. (1988). The effects of teachers teaching teachers. an Indiana staff development model on educator attitudes and beliefs. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Association of School Administrators, Las Vegas, NV (ERIC Document Reproduction Service).