Collaborative Planning and Team Teaching in a Large Lecture Hall: Modeling Leadership for Change

Jennifer BRANCH, Associate Professor,
Department of Elementary Education,
University of Alberta, Canada

Leonora MACY, Sessional Instructor,
Department of Elementary Education,
University of Alberta, Canada

Jill MCCLAY, Associate Professor,
Department of Elementary Education,
University of Alberta, Canada

Carol LEROY, Associate Professor,
Department of Elementary Education,
University of Alberta, Canada

This paper presents data from initial interviews of instructors collaboratively planning a new course in the Faculty of Education at the University of Alberta. There is a need to investigate the courses we offer in pre-service teacher education in order to understand the best ways to prepare pre-service teachers for teaching in today's ever changing environments. The interviews were the first part of an action research cycle that follows students and instructors through the initial implementation of the course. The paper discusses the collaborative process and highlights five themes that emerged from the data: fear and risk-taking, control, course content, process, and the possibilities for positive change. Recommendations for pre-service teacher educators and teacher-librarians involved in collaboration are included. Through studying the implementation of this complex course, the research will provide us with information to improve the course and to offer our experiences as models for others involved in such a process.

One of the stories we like to tell our pre-service teachers is of one instructor's recent visit to the headquarters of Google in Mountain View, California. The instructor expected to see huge rooms full of cubicles with a young man working on a computer in each cubicle. Instead, Google headquarters was made up of small glass rooms with three or four young people working together. No one was working alone. There were common spaces with comfortable furnishings, large white boards for working together on the creation of ideas, and people were talking, eating, and laughing together. The instructor came back with a new understanding of the innovative workplaces of our times and a renewed focus on helping teachers work and teach in collaborative ways. This is essential if we are going to help prepare children to live and work in the information age.

There is a need to investigate the courses we offer in pre-service teacher education in order to understand the best ways to prepare pre-service teachers for teaching in today's ever

changing environments, particularly with respect to issues such as the integration of language, literacies, and technology across the curriculum. This study examines the first stages of the implementation of an innovative introductory education course that integrates considerations of language and literacy with those of technology, planning and language across the curriculum in the pre-service teacher education program at the University of Alberta.

About two years ago, the Department of Elementary Education at the University of Alberta set up a committee to look at creating a new required course for all students that they would take as one of the first courses in their pre-service teacher education program. It was decided that the course would be taught by a team of teachers and that it would be collaboratively planned by the instructors.

The course, EDEL 394 – Introduction to Language and Learning Across the Curriculum, is taught during the Introductory Professional Term (IPT) and is required of all students in the Elementary Education program. Students usually take this course in their third year of university. The students take four courses during the term (Inclusion, Classroom Management, Assessment, and EDEL 394) as well as having a one-week orientation to their placement school and four weeks of student teaching at the end of the term. Students have taken no curriculum and instruction courses before coming into the IPT term and have completed two introductory courses about the profession. The rest of their coursework prior to the IPT will be other non-education courses in other faculties on campus or in community colleges with university transfer agreements. The authors of this paper are the three instructors for the course and the graduate research assistant for the initial implementation of the course. The instructors are all full-time tenured faculty in the Department of Elementary Education and all the writers have all been classroom teachers and/or teacher-librarians before taking up academic positions.

Review of the Literature

Early in the planning when examining literature for the research the team focused on teacher-librarian and teacher collaboration, pre-service teacher education and collaboration, and other courses in pre-service education developed and taught collaboratively.

For more than twenty years, articles in professional and research journals have been encouraging teachers to collaborate with each other and with teacher-librarians to enhance the educational experiences of their students. One instructor was familiar with articles on collaboration in the area of teacher-librarianship (Brown, 2004; Buzzeo, 2002; Doiron & Davies, 1998; Geiken, Larson, & Donham, 1999; Gross & Kientz, 1999; Muronaga & Harada, 1999; Small, 2002; van Deusen and Tallman, 1994; Wolcott, 1996; Wolcott, 1994; Wolcott, Lawless, & Hobbs, 1999). Our look at the research on collaboration found much work done in such areas as special education (for example, Pugach & Allen-Meares, 1985) and physical education (for example, Lytle, Robinson, Lavay & Heuttig, 2003).

The literature from the field of teacher-librarianship highlights the benefits and barriers to collaboration. When teachers are working with teacher-librarians to collaboratively plan lessons and units, environmental factors such as time to plan, administrative support for collaboration, and adequate resources and facilities can have a major affect (van Deusen & Tallman, 1994; Bishop & Larimer, 1999). However, Muronaga and Harada (1999) argue that

> *Although these concerns are indeed critical ingredients in building collaborative cultures in schools, equally vital are the internal factors influencing collaboration itself. These are factors that shape the interpersonal dynamics of how people work effectively with one another. Unfortunately, this aspect of collaboration is not well documented in library literature (p. 9).*

What we do know about collaboration is that there needs to be clearly defined roles for each person involved in the collaboration (Buzzeo, 2002), that team leaders can be important for cohesiveness (Brown, 2002), needs to be a shared vision for the project (Muronaga & Harada, 1999), that is, "mutual goals and objectives" (Brown, 2002, p. 4). Brown also highlights the importance of open communication, mutual trust and respect, and self-confidence in enhancing the contributions each person can make to the project.

It is this "art" of collaboration that is interesting to this research group. While most programs that train teacher-librarians do a good job of preparing them for collaboration the same is not true of training for pre-service teachers (Small, 2002). Small states, "pre-service teacher training has traditionally taught prospective educators to function within the confines of their four-walled classroom, collaborating strictly within confines of their disciplines or grade levels" (p. 3). In the area of adaptive physical education, Lytle, Robinson, Lavay, and Huettig (2003) discuss the need for "professional preparation programs to train preservice teachers in adult-to-adult interactions, communication and facilitation skills" (p.1). Friend and Cook (1999) list the defining characteristics of collaboration as

- Collaboration is voluntary;
- Collaboration requires parity among participants;
- Collaboration is based on mutual goals;
- Collaboration depends on shared responsibility for participation and decision making;
- Individuals who collaborate share their resources; and
- Individuals who collaborate share accountability for outcomes (pp. 6-11).

Their book is useful in that it provides a detailed description of how to collaborate in many types of teaching situations in school communities. Friend and Cook also highlight the importance of preparing pre-service teachers for collaboration. The authors acknowledge that the professional socialization of many teachers continues to foster a "culture of independence or self-reliance" and a "belief that you should handle your professional problems yourself" (Friend & Cook, 1999, p. 20).

Bullock, Park, Snow and Rodriguez (2002) describe their journey to create a collaborative, interdisciplinary course for secondary pre-service teachers. Their hope was to "work together to develop an interdisciplinary curriculum for [their] classroom, and through this collaboration [they] would need to model a sense of interdisciplinarity that [their] students could take to their future classrooms (p. 160). They highlight some of their challenges including student resistance to move away from the idea of being a "discipline-area teacher" (p. 162), "uncertainty of bringing new knowledge to [the] class" (p. 168), fear that by "bringing [their] experiences to the class [they] would lose the authority that academia invests" (p. 168), and the fear of how "students would react to [an] invitation to look at themselves, at their experiences, as a source of knowledge" (p. 168). They also noted that letting go "of what each individual module instructor considered essential was difficult and at

times impossible" (p. 169). The authors concluded that "just because one puts forth time and energy does not mean one will get the hoped for results" (p. 170).

Methodology

The action research model appealed to our research group as we would be directly concerned with planning how to change an existing course in the Introductory Professional Term (IPT) at our university. Kemmis and McTaggert (1988) describe the action research process as a spiral which begins with reconnaissance or reflection on the educational situation in light of a concern. The spiral then moves into planning and identifying strategically what is to be done, how it will be done and who will do it. This leads to enacting a plan and observing how it works through data collection and then moves to reflection or the process of analyzing, synthesizing, interpreting, explaining and drawing conclusions. The new course would be based upon the existing needs of the pre-service teacher education program which had been identified in feedback received from school districts, mentor teachers, university facilitators, and students. The first part of the study was based on determining what needed to be changed, or more accurately, what needed to be included in the existing program. One of the needs addressed was the need to include more language arts into the program. A vast number of pre-service teachers were receiving only one three-credit course throughout our program.

In the reconnaissance phase of the research, a teacher-librarian educator worked alongside two language arts educators from our department as we grappled with a way to bring about changes that could address the identified areas that were not well represented in the program. In this phase, we recognized that one course in the IPT was taught through our department while the other three courses were taught in related departments. We focused our attention on the content being presented in the EDEL 394 course. In the spring of 2003, the research team worked together with a research assistant to plan strategically what needed to be done, how we would do it, and what each person's role would be in the newly developed course and in the research.

Stringer (1999) suggests that the action research process is reflected in a spiral of looking, thinking, and action. Our research community acknowledges Stringer's notion that the spiral is not neat, orderly and linear, but is a process of repeating and revising procedures and interpretations. In this paper, we reflect upon the notion of collaboration as part of the research process. As we began to think about the new course, EDEL 394, we were positioned alongside each other as learners who were seeking to narrow the gap between practice and our vision of education. The spiral shifted continually as we revisited what we were suggesting needed to be included or excluded from the course. We had to shift from our well established individualism into a collaborative community who had to work alongside each other in order to bring about change in the program.

Individual semi-structured interviews of each instructor would be conducted at three points throughout the initial implementation. The first round of interviews would take place at the end of the first major planning phase. The second interviews would be conducted after the implementation phase of the course. The third interviews were conducted after the second implementation phase of the course. The interviews were conducted in order to understand the experience of the people in our group and the meaning they made of that experience (Marshall and Rossman, 1999). This paper highlights the findings from the first round of

interviews and the field notes taken during the collaborative planning phase of the process. One member of the research team who was not directly involved in teaching the course took on the role of the participant observer and kept field notes about the course as it unfolded in the fall term, 2004. She kept notes on the content that was being introduced into the course and created a file for all department members. The members of the team also kept notes during the planning sessions.

The EDEL 394 students were also included in the study. At the start of the implementation term, the students were invited to participate in a variety of ways in the research. Individual interviews were conducted with twenty of the students in order to understand the background of the pre-service teacher community. The students were also invited to participate in a focus group on the last day of the course. In order to protect the students, all interviews and contact directly related to the research was conducted by the research assistant who was not involved in teaching the course. The three instructors had no access to the student data while we were involved in teaching the course. The students were also invited to complete feedback forms in order to provide us with suggestions to consider in regard to the ongoing development of the course.

Our action research project is still in progress. However, the transcripts from the research teams' interviews have been open coded (Sowell, 2001). The transcripts from the first interview have undergone a second coding process which Sowell (2001) terms axial coding. In this coding process, we have reduced the open coding by tracing reoccurring codes. During the third reading of the transcripts an additional theme emerged and it was traced. In the next section, we address the themes that emerged from this coding process of the first interviews.

Findings and Discussion

In retrospect, the most useful metaphor for the process of collaboratively planning the EDEL 394 course came from one instructor in her initial interview. We have found this metaphor useful in thinking about the process and also in continued planning, revision and reflection on the collaborative experience.

> *Carol: I'll just give you a metaphor for the big process and see if it fits what other people say. It's almost like you are going on a trip. Like everybody brings the stuff they want to pack in the car. Jennifer has all her luggage, the skis and her racquet and that thing and this thing. And Jill has all her stuff and I have all my stuff and we have to decide. We only, we find out that we only have one small space so we have to decide what's going on in the car. That's what the process is all about. But also too, it's not just a matter of each person giving up stuff. It's also clarifying what is it that all three of us are going to use. So you know, if it's a tennis racquet, do all three of us play tennis? Or do two out of three play tennis?*

In another part of the interview Carol continued.

> *Carol: And with the struggles we went through I think it forced us to unpack all the baggage. It was like get out all the dirty laundry, let's look at it, let's inspect it, let's just take it all out and now it's all gone. And I think it a way it was painful for everybody but when I look back on it, maybe that's why we can work together the way we can now.*

Several themes emerged from the coding of interviews and we will each of them.

Fear and Risk taking

Fear and risk taking were themes that came up in all three interviews with the instructors. Carol expressed fear about whether the team was initially "headed in the same direction." She added, "I was hesitant to go along with something I didn't understand because I wasn't sure of where it was going." Jennifer questioned, "How do you sit in front of three other smart people and say I don't feel so smart here." Carol commented that "it was such an emotion-laden period of time for everyone that you can understand how people in the end would have all these misconceptions and if there was a certain amount of fear in the middle of the process, to actually say what you were thinking or feeling, that would have retarded the process as well."

There was a feeling among all three that this was "a high stakes" collaboration. It was a very public event with the department members having input into the course and also some indication that some departmental misgivings about changing the course. There was also concern about how the course would be received by students, teachers in the field and by department members when we brought the course forward for approval.

> *Carol: Yeah, it's been an enormous amount of time and energy and it's a big investment on our part and so that's where the risk came in. Part of it is the risk to our egos, if our colleagues don't like our ides, but the real practical risk is that the course wouldn't go. And one of the reasons we know that's a very real risk is that when this course was presented at the department last year, there were people in there who trashed the idea. There were a couple of people in there who totally trashed it.*

Jennifer expressed the concerns about the student evaluations and the public nature of the course and how it is different from the experience of classroom teachers.

> *Jennifer: I mean you don't get evaluated [by your students] as teachers. You don't get evaluated as teacher-librarians. It doesn't affect your tenure. Whether you can win a teaching award, whether the course goes or stays, what other people in the department are going to say about you, you know, what the students are going to say about the course, what the people in Undergraduate Student Services, what the teachers in the field are going to say and what is going to happen at our department meetings.*

Jill echoed these sentiments.

> *Our Department has given us this opportunity to do something and we darn well better produce. We're going to have 340 [students] in fall and 200 or more after Christmas. If you make a course that they don't much see the point of, you're going to be concerned about that, so it's very public, very high stakes and that's very stressful in itself even without anything else. If we were teaming to hold a course for 20 students, we would still be stressed but [not to the same level].*

There was also fear about team-teaching. Jennifer felt that "team teaching is when you have it all at stake. When you are both ultimately responsible." Jennifer also compared this collaboration with the kinds of experiences she was more familiar with as a teacher-

librarian. "It's two weeks or it's three weeks. There's not that ownership and ultimate responsibility there. And so, therefore the control issues and the fear [are different]." Carol noted that

> *If there is anything that worries me a little bit it's team teaching because of the need to fit in with somebody else, that I might be too self-conscious about what I say, more than I would be if I was on my own. Because it is a big group and there are people watching, you know, you're (Leonora) watching, Jennifer's watching and I'll be too self-conscious in a sense that I'll be thinking twice should I use this word or that word.*

The interviews clearly indicate that this collaboration was considered risky and there were times during the collaborative process when all the instructors felt some fear.

Control Issues

Another theme that emerged from the interview data was the idea of control which was closely related to fear and risk taking. What does classroom look like and sound like when you are team teaching? Who is in control, or is anybody in control? Who has the ultimate/final responsibility? These were all questions the team wrestled with as they collaboratively planned the course. Issues of control occurred when trying to decide how to approach the course. Jill commented that "Jenn and me saying that these kids are just beginning their program and Carol saying we can't water down the program either. Our students need to have theory too. And we're all right. Both parts of that, absolutely correct." We also had control issues about the assignment and how much detail needed to be in the course outline. Carol stated:

> *I learned a long time ago that you always prepare your course documents to stand on their own. Always. Because you won't be there necessarily. People will judge {the course on it} whether it's a faculty evaluation committee, whether it's at a department meeting, whether it's students, whether it's field experience associates, whether it's the cooperating teachers that get a copy of it. They will be making judgments on what you wrote. So you write it as if it's going to be read by people who weren't in on your class or didn't hear the discussion. And that was so clear to me. That the thought didn't occur to me and as soon as Jennifer started talking like that, "No it's a living document."*

There was also some disagreement among the instructors on how much flexibility there needed to be. Jennifer stated, "I thought it [the assignment] sounded interesting, let's give it a try. I mean we're trying all this other stuff." Because we were team teaching in different pair in the fall semester and the winter semester there was also some discussion about which pair should "take over." Leonora noted that, "you [Jennifer] and her [Carol] now owned the course, whereas, with Jill present, Carol all the time had to fight for the ownership for this term."

The department was also watching the development of this course and so some times it felt like there were other people working as a hidden part of the collaboration. Certainly the chair of the department was keenly interested in the course. We did small focus group meetings with members of the department asking for their input. Jennifer found that

Everybody had something to say about what should be in this course. And the suggestion that any of us would sit down and say okay, we're teaching [introduction to social studies teaching], let's sit everybody down from physical education and God only knows where and decide what should be in the course. And that anybody could feel good about that process. Or that a group of people from a variety of teaching areas sit down to decide what is in our introduction to the language arts. It was that everybody saw this as a course they had ownership over, yet two or three people are responsible.

Not surprisingly, given the high risk nature of this course, control issues were an important discussion point during the process of collaboration.

Course Content

The content of the course also was a theme that emerged from the interview data and it is closely linked to risk-taking, fear, and control. A key component of the course had to be language. Jill emphasized,

Language underpins all our learning, most of our learning anyway. And that if we can help them understand really what that means that that would help them in a general teaching methods sense of things. If you understand about language and culture of learning and can use language productively that helps you organize groups, that helps you plan your lessons, that helps you structure the ways in which you teach and assess in the classroom. I have a real strong belief that understanding how we use language for learning should be a foundation of an education program.

Carol confirmed this when she stated "you have to have a strong foundation in language before you can understand literacy. Once our student teachers understand language, then it's easier for them to understand reading."

Carol made an important connection to another content area of the course when she stated, "language is the focus of the course because language is the root of our inquiry." For Jennifer, it was important that inquiry be a part of the course because "the three fit together, research or inquiry, information and communication technology, and [curriculum content areas such as] social studies and language arts." It was the notion of integrating curriculum within an inquiry framework and using technology to move the inquiry forward that was the key part of this course for Jennifer and Carol. It was clear from almost our first meeting that the key components of the course were going to be language, resources, planning and inquiry. In fact Leonora reminded us during the interviews that at one of our very early planning sessions these components came shining through.

The Process of Collaboration

In the interviews, all of the instructors talked about the process including what worked, what didn't, and what we could do differently next time. During the collaborative process we had many times when we felt we were all understood. Carol noted, "Jennifer looked at me and I looked at her and I think that was the moment where I experienced that we are really on the same wavelength." Jill stated, "There have been lots of moments like that, you know the moments

when things fell into place and we all knew they had fallen into place. It wasn't like two people saw it and one person hadn't seen it yet. When things fell into place we all got it right away." Jennifer added, "I mean it's been a wonderful learning experience. As much as it has caused me great stress and upset and everything else, I think the course is stronger and better."

Certainly, the process of collaboration brought us together as a team and also closer as people. Jill stated, "I am enjoying hearing Carol and Jenn talk right now. I'm so pleased to see them… enjoying each other as a team member. But when you're doing something new there's an energy you get from it. I think you can see that in Carol and Jenn right now." Carol noted "From this point on I feel a high degree of mutual confidence. Jennifer and I had a really strong, shared foundation. So that whatever happens on the surface, we can work it out."

One of the clear comments was that three was a difficult number to work with and at times throughout the process we all felt alone, confused, or in the minority. Carol stated clearly that with collaboration "it is easier when there are two people." Certainly at times during the process we were all frustrated. Jennifer stated, "I could feel it in the way I was responding but I wasn't as emotional. That was the way of her dealing with the stress. Now I went home and cried. And I went home and screamed and I called my friends and complained and bitched and carried on." Jill admitted, "I might have the advantage in that way because I think I probably knew each of them individually than they knew each other. Better than Carol and Jenn knew each other. And so in terms of the process of bringing this course together I think, I never actually thought about that before but part of me wasn't too worried on one level because I figured it would be all right." Carol noted "moments of feeling really puzzled. I felt that I was all so clear to me what should be in it. I had different things in mind, different expectations, and I remember being surprised by that and feeling confused."

Jill described one such difficult meeting day from her perspective,

Jenn walked out, Carol cried. I felt, I mean I could see everybody's reasoning and I kept thinking, right it's up to me to put this back together again and yet I felt stress too. I couldn't see a way to get it back together again because I didn't know what these particular people need when they're stressed. And I think I said that day, afterwards, or at some point, when people try to team sometimes, you know, if you're smart, you do a little discussion and thinking about how you work best and everybody always starts out by saying, oh yes, we're going to be a great collegial team and we're going to be very honest and very supportive and we mean that, because you know we're all nice people and we all respect each other and it's a joy to be on a team where you do respect everybody else. I don't think there is any doubt that we all respect each other. But, I think when people are teaming, what I learned from that day and I will do this in the future, if I'm working with a team, I will start out, not just by saying and how do you work best on a team but by saying what do you do when you get stressed?

Jill clearly emphasized that you can't create a course like this in a very "business-oriented way." The process of collaboration is much bigger than that. She continued,

If you're actually talking about integrating it doesn't work too well. You don't integrate by putting two things next to each other. You integrate by throwing them in a pot together, letting it bubble together, very bad metaphor here, you know that you really have to pull it apart. You can't just say we're taking these

pieces from these three areas. I know that very well from my background and I think I've reached a point where I could see what was happening and articulate that. And ultimately that's the real efficiency. That you have to go through the process that looks like this in order to get the result you want. And there's no more direct way to it. The direct way to do it is by messing around with it and going through that sometimes very frustrating process. So as much as we would like some shortcuts, were not going to get them.

Jill also highlighted the fact that experience with this type of collaboration helps for the next time. She stated,

And I think that this experience gave me the opportunity to being to conscious level some of those things that I did learn before. Because I would find myself observing for a little while, you know I would sort of take myself out of the discussion for a few minutes and I would be watching what was going on. And if I could get it fast enough and verbalize it, I think there were a couple of times when I could put my finger on what was going on that is would be helpful in that way.

Opportunity for Positive Change

This leads into the final theme which is the idea of positive change. Carol stated, "I was very excited. And the reason I was excited about it was because I just saw so much opportunity in this course." Jill really wanted to be involved in the course and was recruited because of interest shown in the department lunch room. She stated, "I am willing to give it a shot. That's why I said yes right off the bat. I have a strong sense that a lecture can be interesting. I had some good lecturers when I was a student." Jennifer saw this course as offering an opportunity to introduce pre-service teachers to information literacy and inquiry-based learning and this is an important move for a faculty of education. This course provided Jennifer with an opportunity to "bring together the needs of the field and the department to make a really important course."

Carol saw this collaboration as an "opportunity to create change in the program. It's exciting to me because I have been talking to people in the different subject areas and it's exciting to me to realize that we're creating something that is going to support the students' learning on an ongoing, continuous basis. I feel very strongly that we're doing something good so I'm not worried what do people think." It was clear that the instructors' dedication to the course and to the collaborative process was underpinned by the real promise of making an important change in the program.

Discussion

In this study, both the environmental factors and the personal factors of collaboration were evident. Environmental factors such as departmental support, time for collaboration, and the public nature of the collaboration contributed at times to the stress and the amount of risk taking but also to the success of the collaboration. Funding for a research assistant, for resources, and for the occasional lunch or dinner, helped sustain the collaborators. Personal factors that were found to be a part of this collaboration included trust, a shared vision, mutual

goals, respect, and self-confidence. These were similar to the list of the factors that Brown (2002) identified as important to collaboration.

However, this collaboration also highlighted the fear involved in such public and high risk collaboration. All instructors saw this as a very high risk endeavour and indeed it was when you factor in

- 350 students
- a large lecture hall with a lot of technological gizmos
- integrated and interdisciplinary curriculum
- a focus on social constructivism (in a transmission type space)
- an online discussion forum required of all students and a webpage for the course
- two instructors and four graduate assistants
- a written assignment that involved inquiry (this was outside the comfort zone of some students), and
- the fact that these students were heading out into the first practice teaching experience during the term.

It is no surprise really that there were control issues that arose as part of the collaboration. The importance placed on student evaluations for tenure and promotion, on the official course outline, and on making sure that students feel that the course is fair required that we look carefully at these issues during the collaboration.

The process of collaboration did not run smoothly for our team. There were times when individuals felt alone, confused, or frustrated. It was an intense process and we met for more than 100 hours during the summer before the course began. For one week we met every day and it isn't surprising that we had a bit of a "boil over" during that week. We learned from the process that it is important to talk about how you work and how you deal with stress early in the collaboration. Two of the defining characteristics from Friend and Cook (1999) that seemed to really apply to our process was the notion of "shared responsibility for participation and decision making" and "shared accountability for outcomes" (pp. 9-10). For every time there was frustration and confusion, there were also times when we felt that we were all in agreement and you need to celebrate those moments.

Many of the risks and fears involved in our collaboration were similar to the experiences of Bullock, Park, Snow and Rodriguez (2002). These included bringing a new approach to the teaching of the course and one that was different from what the students had previously experienced. A new assignment that required students to move out of their comfort zone also contributed to our feelings of taking a risk and concern about how students would react. Also, we realized during the term that some students unfamiliar with team teaching were unsure of what to make of the relationships between the instructors.

Implications and Conclusions

This study provides some insight into the benefits of and barriers to working in collaborative ways when designing and delivering courses to pre-service teachers. It can also provide insights for teacher-librarians who engage on a regular basis in collaborative activities and who want to work with more reluctant teachers on collaborative units. For us, the risks and fear associated with the collaboration had an impact on our collaboration. Certainly, this risk taking caused some emotional side effects during the process. It is important for all those

involved to collaboration to look carefully at the public nature of collaboration and to the fears, control issues, and content issues that members of your collaborative team might have. Talking about the issues early in the collaborative process will help make them apparent to the whole team. It will also provide a space to talk about what you are afraid of and how to deal with your fears during the process.

Jill found that since she had been through a similar process before, she was able to use her previous knowledge to move the collaboration forward. For teacher-librarians, it is important to keep in mind that because you might have more experience collaborating it will be easier for you than for the teachers without that experience. Their fears and the risks they are taking are real for them and need to be honoured. Because many teachers are socialized to be the "in control person" in their classroom, moving to a shared control situation may be difficult and challenging for some. Teacher-librarians need to give teachers the time and space to make their transition to a more collaborative model and teaching and to not expect teachers to give up all control on the very first try. Also it is important to remember that teachers have the ultimate responsibility for the students in their classes so they may feel they are taking a greater risk than the teacher-librarian.

A defining characteristic of collaboration is that participation in collaboration must be voluntary (Friend & Cook, 1999). For teachers to commit to the process of collaboration they have to see that it will be a positive thing for them and for their students and they have to be seen as having valuable knowledge and skills to contribute. They must be made to feel that they are equals on the team. For those teachers afraid of collaboration it may be helpful to remember that they have been socialized to behave in a certain way in schools and making a change without having personal experience with collaboration will be very difficult. Ultimately, it will be the possibility and opportunity of making a positive change that will move people away from their comfort zones into the risky world of collaboration.

There have been relatively few inquiries into the implementation of new approaches in teacher education that take into account the needs for both technology in the classroom, inquiry-based learning, and the integration of language and literacies across the curriculum. It is hoped that the information gathered from this study will help current and future instructors of this course, those looking for new ideas for their pre-service educational programs, and those interested in the process of collaboration in other educational settings. Results of the research will also be of interest to teacher educators and researchers elsewhere because so many of the issues we are attempting to address permeate teacher education programs generally. These issues include: collaboration in course development, preparing pre-service teachers to integrate language and technology across the curriculum, and the melding of theory and practice in education programs.

References

Bishop, K., & Larimer, N. (1999). Literacy through collaboration. *Teacher Librarian, 27*(1), 15-20.

Brown, C. (2004). America's most wanted: Teachers who collaborate. *Teacher Librarian 32*(1), 13-18. Retrieved May 25, 2005 from Proquest Education Database

Bullock, P., Park, V., Snow, J., & Rodriguez, E. (2002). Redefining interdisciplinary curriculum: A journey of collaboration and change in secondary teacher education. *Interchange, 33*(2), 159-182.

Buzzeo, T. (2002). Collaborating to meet standards: Teacher/librarian partnerships fo 7-12. Worthington, OH: Linworth.

Doiron, R., & Davies, J. (1998). *Partners in learning: Students, teachers, and the school library*. Englewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited.

Friend, M., & Cook, L. (1999). *Interactions: Collaboration skills for school professionals* (3rd ed.). New York: Addison Wesley Longman.

Geiken, N., Larson, J., & Donham, J. (1999). Opportunities and challenges for collaboration. *Teacher Librarian, 27*(1),26-31.

Gross, J., & Kientz, S. (1999). Collaboration for authentic learning. *Teacher Librarian, 27*(1), 21-25.

Lytle, R., Robinson, N., Lavay, B., & Huettig, C. (2003). Teaching collaboration and consultation skills to preservice adapted physical education teachers. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance, 74*(5). Retrieved May 25, 2005 from Proquest Education Database

Kemmis, S. and Mc Taggart, R. (1988). *The action researcher reader.* Victoria, Australia: Deakin University Press.

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (1999). *Designing qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Muronaga, K., & Harada, V. (1999). The art of collaboration. *Teacher Librarian, 27*(1), 9-14.

Pugach, M. C., & Allen-Meares, P. (1985). Collaboration at the preservice level: Instructional and evaluation activities. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 8*(1), 3-11.

Small, R. V. (2002). Collaboration: Where does it begin? *Teacher-Librarian, 26*(5). Retrieved May, 25, 2005 from http://www.teacherlibrarian.com/tlmag/v_29/v_29_5_feature.html

Sowell, E. J. (2001). *Educational research: An integrative introduction*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Stringer, E. T. (1999). *Action research* (2nd ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Wolcott, L. L.(1996). Planning with teachers: Practical approaches to collaboration. *Emergency Librarian, 23*(3), 9-14.

Wolcott, L. L. (1994). Understanding how teachers plan: Strategies for successful instructional partnerships. *School Library Media Quarterly, 22*(3), 161-165.

Wolcott, L. L., Lawless, K. A., Hobbs, D. (1999). Assessing pre-service teachers beliefs about the role of the library media specialist. In Lighthall, L. & E. Howe (eds.), *Unleash the power! Knowledge – technology – diversity*. Papers presented at the Third International Forum on Research in School Librarianship (Birmingham, AL, November 10-14), pp. 155-162.

van Deusen, J. D., & Tallman, J. (1994). The impact of scheduling on curriculum consultation and information skills instruction. *School Library Media Quarterly, 23*(1), 17-26.

Authors Note

Jennifer Branch is a former teacher-librarian and the Coordinator of the Teacher-Librarianship by Distance Learning Program at the University of Alberta. Leonora Macy just completed her PhD from the University of Alberta and will be a sessional instructor in the Department of Elementary Education next year. Jill McClay is the Associate Chair of the Department of Elementary Education. Carol Leroy is the Director of the Reading Clinic in the Faculty of Education.